

Detailed rules for the conduct of the mid-term evaluation in the Doctoral School of Social Sciences

§ 1

1. No later than six weeks before the mid-term evaluation date, the Director of the Doctoral School of Social Sciences (hereinafter referred to as "SDNS") appoints members of the Committee for the mid-term evaluation (hereinafter referred to as: "the Committee").

For this purpose:

- 1) The Director of SDNS shall request the Council of the Doctoral School to identify persons with a postdoctoral or academic degree in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, employed outside the entities conducting SDNS, from among at least one member of the Committee will be appointed, after receiving a positive opinion from Council of the Doctoral School.
- 2) The Director of SDNS asks the competent authorities of the entities running the SDNS to indicate 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 SDNS.
- 3) Members of the Committee sign a declaration that they meet the criteria of § 15 point 3 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Social Sciences.
2. The Director or Deputy Director of SDNS is responsible for organizing the Committee's work.
3. The Director shall appoint the Chairperson of the Committee from among the selected members.
4. The Director or Deputy Director sets the schedule for the Mid-term Evaluation Committee's work and emails the Committee Members and the Doctoral Student with the date of the Committee's meeting.
5. The Doctoral Schools' Office provides technical support for notifying Committee members and sending necessary materials.
6. The mid-term evaluation shall be conducted in the last months before the statutory deadline for its conduct. The date of the review, consistent with the Individual Research Plan of the Doctoral Student, is determined by the Director of SDNS.
7. By July 31, the Doctoral Student is obliged to submit documentation on the progress of the research and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (including, in particular, the implementation report of the Individual Research Plan, documentation confirming the academic and grant activity, and fragments of the dissertation under preparation). An integral part of the documentation is a short opinion of the supervisor, containing a statement that the materials prepared by the doctoral student have been read and accepted.
8. A template form for implementing the Individual Research Plan is attached as Appendix 1 to this resolution.
9. 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.
10. 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.

11. The members of the Committee prepare a written opinion on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan of the Doctoral Student.
12. During the meeting, the Committee members are provided with the documentation of the Doctoral Student from the Doctoral School.
13. During the Committee meeting, the Doctoral Student presents a presentation prepared using multimedia on the status of implementing the Individual Research Plan (max. 20 minutes).
14. If justified, a remote or hybrid mid-term evaluation may be conducted.
15. A protocol template is attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Resolution.
16. All committee members shall sign the protocol of the mid-term evaluation. The committee Chairperson shall sign the evaluation protocol if the meeting is held remotely or hybrid mode.
17. After the evaluation, the Chairperson of the Committee submits the original protocol to the Director of the Doctoral School no later than within 14 days, which is placed in the documentation of the Doctoral Student. The protocol contains the result of the mid-term evaluation along with the justification and recommendation for further implementation of the Individual Research Plan or removal from the list of doctoral students in the case of a negative review.
18. The school Director shall inform the Doctoral Student of the mid-term evaluation result immediately upon receipt of the original protocol.
19. A negative mid-term evaluation results in removal from the list of doctoral students. The director's decision on removal may be appealed for reconsideration.
20. The results are made public on the Doctoral School website upon completion of the mid-term evaluation.
21. The mid-term evaluation is conducted by the end of the fourth semester.
22. The primary way of providing information in the evaluation process is through e-mail and the SDNS website.

§ 2

The mid-term evaluation in SDNS includes:

1. An evaluation of the Doctoral Student's significant accomplishments.

The doctoral student presents the progress and achievements of implementing the Individual Research Plan. A doctoral student 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, presentation by Candidate of a paper at an international or national 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.

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 degree of implementation of IRP. The Ph.D. student presents in written form and refers, with possible use of multimedia, the degree of progress of IRP implementation – **maximum 60 points**, including:

I. Complete, according to the schedule, implementation of IRP for the 1st and 2nd year of studies: more than 50 points;

II. Partial implementation of IPB: **40-50 points**;

III. The unsatisfactory implementation of IRP of less than **40 points** results in a final negative assessment.

2) Academic activity – **maximum 20 points**, including:

I. A Doctoral Student may receive:

a) **15 points** for publishing or acceptance into print an article in a journal with a score of 70 points or more on the list of the MNiSW¹

b) **10 points** for publishing or accepting into print an article in a journal with a score of 40 points on the list of the MNiSW²

c) **8 points** for publishing or acceptance into print an article in a journal with a score of 20 points or a chapter in a monograph from the Level I list of Publishers of the MNiSW³.

d) **2 points** for publishing a peer-reviewed scientific article in journals not included in the current list of journals of the MNiSW.

e) **15 points** for publishing a monograph from the Level I list of Publishers or a chapter in a monograph from the Level II list⁴.

II. Delivering a paper by the Doctoral Student at an international scientific conference - **5 points**.

III. Delivering a paper by the Doctoral Student at a national scientific conference – **3 points**.

3) Information about submitting or obtaining a research grant - **maximum 20 points**, including:

I. Submitting a grant application financed from external sources - **5 points**.

II. Obtaining a grant financed from external sources - **20 points**.

III. Participation in a research project financed from external sources (including an applied doctorate) - **10 points**.

IV. Participation in an international research fellowship - less than 30 days - **5 points**; 30 days and more- **9 points**.

V. Participation in the national research fellowship - less than 30 days- **3 points**; 30 days and more - **5 points**.

¹ an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated

² an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated

³ an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated

⁴ an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated

Additionally, a doctoral student may receive points for:

4) Co-organization of events popularizing science - **2 points**.

3. A total of **at least 70 points** is required for a positive evaluation.

4. 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 members of the Committee.