

Detailed rules for the conduct of the mid-term evaluation in the Doctoral School of Quantitative and Natural Sciences

§ 1

1. No later than six weeks before the mid-term evaluation date, the Director of the Doctoral School of Quantitative and Natural Sciences (hereinafter referred to as "SDNŚiP") appoints members of the 3-person Committee for the mid-term evaluation (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee").

For this purpose:

- 1) The Director of SDNŚiP shall request the Council of the Doctoral School to identify at least two persons with a postdoctoral or academic degree in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, employed outside the entities conducting SDNŚiP, from among whom at least one member of the Committee will be appointed, after receiving a positive opinion from the Council of the Doctoral School.
- 2) The Director of SDNŚiP asks the competent authorities of the entities running the SDNŚiP to indicate a maximum of two people for the Committee with the degree of a habilitated doctor or the title of professor in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, employed in the entities running the SDNŚiP.
- 3) The number of members of the Committee employed outside the entities running the SDNŚiP and those employed by the entities running the SDNŚiP is decided by the Director of SDNŚiP in a given academic year.
- 4) The co-author of the publication of the doctoral student under assessment or the supervisor of his master's or bachelor's thesis cannot be a member of the mid-term evaluation committee.
- 5) Members sign a declaration that they meet the criteria of § 15 points 2 and 3 (the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Quantitative and Natural Sciences).
- 6) The Director shall appoint the Chairperson of the Committee.
- 7) The Committee's composition shall be determined individually for each doctoral student.

2. The SDNŚiP Director or a member of the Doctoral School Council appointed by the Director is responsible for organizing the Committee's work.

3. The mid-term evaluation shall be conducted in the last month before the statutory deadline for its conduct. The date of the review, consistent with the individual research program of the Doctoral Student, is determined by the Director of the SDNŚiP. In exceptional cases, upon the request of a Doctoral Student, the Director may decide to evaluate up to 10 weeks before the statutory deadline.

4. The Director or a member of the Doctoral School Council appointed by the Director shall schedule the mid-term evaluation of Doctoral Students and notify each Doctoral Student via email of the date of the Committee meeting. The Doctoral Schools' Office provides technical support for notifying the Committee members and sending the necessary materials.

5. Twenty-one days before the scheduled date of the Committee's meeting, the Ph.D. student is obliged to submit the paper and electronic documentation on the progress of the research and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (Individual Research Plan – IRP – implementation report) and to indicate a maximum of 5 the most important

documented scientific achievements. An integral part of the documentation is the supervisor's opinion, containing a statement that the materials prepared by the doctoral student have been read and accepted. In strictly justified cases, the documentation referred to above may be submitted by the Ph.D. student exceeding the time limit specified in the first sentence. A template form for implementing the individual research plan is attached in Appendix No.1 to this resolution.

6. The Doctoral Schools' Office shall submit to the Committee members the documentation prepared by the Doctoral Student at least two weeks before the scheduled date of the Committee meeting.

7. The Committee's deliberations shall be held in closed session, with the doctoral student participating only during the first part of the evaluation procedure and no third parties present.

8. During the Committee meeting, the Doctoral Student must present a presentation prepared in PDF or PowerPoint format on the research results obtained, lasting a maximum of 20 minutes.

9. During the meeting, the Committee members are provided with the documentation of the Doctoral Student from the Doctoral School.

10. All members of the Committee shall sign the protocol of mid-term evaluation. In case a member or members of the Committee are unable to sign the protocol, only the Chairperson shall sign it, indicating why the other members cannot sign it. A protocol template is attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Resolution.

11. After the evaluation, the Chairperson of the Committee submits the protocol's original to the Director of the Doctoral School no later than within 14 days, which is placed in the documentation of the Doctoral Student.

12. The school Director shall inform the Doctoral Student of the mid-term evaluation result immediately upon receipt of the original protocol.

13. A negative mid-term evaluation results in removal from the list of doctoral students. The director's decision on removal may be applied for reconsideration.

14. The Committee's face-to-face meeting is the recommended form of Evaluation. However, a mid-term evaluation can be conducted using technical devices enabling remote transmission with simultaneous direct image and sound transmission in real-time or hybrid mode.

15. The evaluation is conducted by the end of the fourth semester.

16. The primary way of providing information in the evaluation process is through email and the SDNŚiP website.

§ 2

The mid-term evaluation in SDNŚiP includes:

1. Assessment of the advanced level in implementing the Individual Research Plan and evaluation of the Ph.D. student's most important scientific achievements related to implementing IRP. A doctoral student may present up to 5 of the most essential (documented) achievements related to implementing the Individual Research Plan. The candidate may provide the following achievements: scientific articles published in journals included in the current list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (MNiSW), reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the current list of journals of the MNiSW, monographs, and chapters in monographs published in publications included in the current list of the MNiSW along with the assigned number of points, participation in an international or national research project, participation in an international or national research internship, presentation by a Candidate of a paper at an international or national scientific conference, authorship or co-authorship of a poster at a scientific international or national conference, active participation or co-organization of events popularizing science, submission and/or acquisition of a grant application financed from external sources, patent application.

2. The maximum number of points a Ph.D. student can obtain during the mid-term evaluation is 100. This includes:

- 1) Assessment of the implementation degree of IRP:
 - a) Information on the progress in implementing the Individual Research Plan - **maximum 60 points.**
 - b) Oral presentation and discussion of the achieved results - **maximum 15 points.**

2) Scientific achievements – **maximum 25 points**

Up to five of the most significant achievements are evaluated, including:

a) authorship or co-authorship of a scientific article accepted for publication related to the doctoral thesis being carried out in a journal included in the current list of the journals of the MNiSW, including the Ph.D. student receives:

- 20 points for a publication with a score of 200 points on the list of the MNiSW
- 14 points for a publication with a score of 140 points on the list of the MNiSW
- 10 points for a publication with a score of 100 points on the list of the MNiSW
- 7 points for a publication with a score of 70 points on the list of the MNiSW
- 4 points for a publication with a score of 40 points on the list of the MNiSW
- 2 points for a publication with a score of 20 points on the list of the MNiSW

b) peer-reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the current list of the journals of the MNiSW - 1 point;

c) monographs and chapters in monographs published in publications included in the currently valid list of the MNiSW - 8 points;

d) chapters in monographs published in publications not included in the current list of the MNiSW - 3 points;

e) participation in an externally funded research project - 4 points (plus 4 pts. for project management);

f) participation in a research project funded by internal funds of the entities running the doctoral school - 2 points (plus 2 pts. for project management);

g) participation in an international research fellowship - less than 30 days - 3 points, 30 days and more - 5 points;

h) participation in the national research fellowship - less than 30 days - 1 point, 30 days and more - 2 points;

i) delivering a paper by the Doctoral Student at an international scientific conference - 5 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished speech);

- j) delivering a paper by the Doctoral Student at a national scientific conference - 3 points (plus 1 point for the distinguished presentation);
- k) presenting a poster at an international scientific conference - 3 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished poster);
- l) presenting a poster at a national scientific conference - 2 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished poster);
- m) submitting a grant application financed from external sources - 2 points
- n) obtaining a grant financed from external sources - 5 points.
- o) co-organization of events popularizing science - 2 points
- p) patent application - 7 points
- q) The Committee can award points for documented achievements not listed above - no more than 10 points.

At the end of the interview, the Chairperson of the Committee informs the Doctoral Student of the points awarded for the indicated scientific achievements.

2. A total of at least 60 points is required for a positive evaluation.

3. The Committee, in an open vote, shall adopt a resolution on the pass/fail result of the evaluation by a simple majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the Committee members. The result of the review, together with the reasons, shall be made public. The number of points obtained due to the mid-term evaluation is made public only to the Doctoral Student and Supervisor(s).