**Regulation No. 25/2021**

**of the Rector of the University of Wrocław**

**of 3 March 2021**

**regarding the schedule for the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students attending the Doctoral School at the University of Wrocław, and the introduction of the model documents required**

**in the mid-term evaluation procedure**

Pursuant to sec. 23 (1) and (2) of July 20, 2018 (Journal of Laws 2020, item 85 as amended), it is hereby ordered as follows:

§ 1.1. The implementation of the doctoral student's individual research plan is subject to mid-term evaluation in the middle of the education period, before the end of the fourth semester.

2. The schedule of preparation and conducting of mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School at the University of Wrocław is established in **Appendix No. 1** to this regulation.

§ 2.1. At the latest 30 days before the scheduled meeting of the Committee, the doctoral student shall submit to the relevant dean's office, or other organizational unit of the faculty responsible for the administrative services of the doctoral college, a report on the implementation of the individual research plan, the template of which is established in **Appendix No. 2** to this regulation, along with the opinion of the supervisor(s) on the progress of a doctoral student in the implementation of an individual research plan, the template of which is established in **Appendix No. 3** to this regulation.

2. The documents referred to in section 1 shall be submitted in the form of a scan attached to the message which shall be sent from the doctoral student’s e-mail account, granted as part of university e-mail. Moreover, doctoral student shall submit the printout version of the document immediately to the dean’s office, or other organizational unit of the faculty responsible for the administrative services of the doctoral college. The submitted documents shall include the date of receipt, the name of the institution and the signature of the person accepting the documents, after checking that the electronic version and the printout are indistinguishable.

3. The doctoral student’s report along with the opinion of the supervisor(s) – in electronic version – shall be immediately forwarded to the Commission.

4. Based on the documents received, the members of the Committee compose an individual preliminary assessment of the doctoral student’s achievements, the model document of which is established in **Appendix No. 4** to this regulation.

§ 3.1. Public presentation of the doctoral student’s achievements happen in a face-to-face or remote mode. The appropriate dean determines the procedure, depending on the epidemic situation. In the case of using the remote mode, the dean indicates the person(s) responsible for the technical support of the meeting.

2. When the Committee is appointed, the head of the appropriate doctoral college shall immediately notify doctoral students of the initial date of the mid-term evaluation. The head of the appropriate doctoral college informs the doctoral student at least 7 days in advance about the exact date and place, or remote procedure for conducting the assessment.

3. During the presentation, the doctoral student displays the assumptions of the individual research plan and introduces the tasks completed so far, the research’s results in particular because they are to be the basis for the doctoral dissertation, and the justification of any delays or discrepancies in implementation in relation to the schedule. The presentation time should not be less than 15 minutes and should not exceed 25 minutes.

4. The doctoral student’s presentation should consist of the following elements:

1. research topic;
2. expected form of the dissertation;
3. main assumptions of the work;
4. summary of completed tasks in relation to the IPB (individual research plan) schedule;
5. the results of the research conducted so far, including the ways of disseminating partial research results;
6. indication of planned and unrealized points from IPB, explaining the reasons for the discrepancies;
7. discussion of possible modifications made to the planned research prior to the mid-term evaluation (especially if included in the form of an appendix);
8. brief presentation of the plan of further actions.

The printout of the presentation provided by the doctoral student is attached to the mid-term evaluation documentation.

5. After the doctoral student's speech is finished, the Committee conducts a discussion with the doctoral student on the research and realization of the IPB schedule; it is possible for the audience to ask questions (discussion time should not exceed 20 minutes).

6. In justified cases, the doctoral student or the supervisor may apply to the relevant discipline council for permission to conduct the mid-term evaluation, with the exception of the publicity of the part of the Committee meeting where the results of the research work are presented. The application together with the justification should be submitted no later than 30 days before the scheduled date of the Committee meeting through the competent head of the college (if the applicant is a doctoral student, the supervisor's opinion is attached to the application).

§ 4.1. During a closed session, the Committee gives a positive or negative assessment in writing, together with a justification. All members of the Committee shall sign the assessment and its justification. The template is in **Appendix No. 5** to this regulation.

2. The Chairman of the Committee shall draw up a report on the mid-term evaluation, the model document of which is set out in **Appendix No. 6** to this regulation.

3. All documentation relating to the mid-term evaluation shall be forwarded by the Chairman of the Commission to the head of the relevant college. The head of the college immediately makes the result of the assessment available to the doctoral student and the supervisor or supervisors.

§ 5. The regulation is effective as of the day it is signed.

**R E C T O R**

**from the power of attorney**

**dr hab. Patrycja Matusz, prof. UWr Vice-rector for projects and international relation**

Appendix No. 1

To the regulation

No. 25/2021 z of 3 March 2021

## SCHEDULE

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Scope of actions** | **Deadline for performing the actions** | **Executor** |
| **1** | Application to the Dean to appoint a Committee | ------------------------- | head of the doctoral college |
| **2** | Opinion of the scientific discipline council | immediately after submitting the application by the dean | The legitimate council of the scientific discipline |
| **3** | Appointment of the Committee with an indication of the President of the Committee | at least 3 months before the scheduled date for the mid-term evaluation | the appropriate dean for a given doctoral college |
| **4** | Applying to the legitimate discipline council for permission to conduct a periodic assessment with the exception of publicity | 30 days before the scheduled date of the Committee meeting | PhD student or supervisor |
| **5** | Notifying doctoral students of the initial date for mid-term evaluation | immediately after the appointment of the Commission | head of the doctoral college |
| **6** | Submitting reports on IPB implementation to the dean's office or other organizational unit of the relevant faculty dealing with the administrative support of the doctoral college together with the opinion of the supervisor/supervisors | 30 days before the scheduled date of the Committee meeting at the latest | PhD students |
| **7** | Submission of reports on IPB implementation to the Commission | immediately upon receipt | administrative support doctoral college |
| **8** | Informing doctoral students about the exact date, procedure and place of the mid-term evaluation | at least 7 days before the date of the Committee meeting | head of the doctoral college |
| **9** | Meeting of the Committee | scheduled date between June 15, 2021 and July 15, 2021 | Commision  and PhD students |
| **10** | Transfer the documentation to the head of the doctoral college by the Committee | immediately after evaluating the assessment | Commisson |
| **11** | Informing doctoral students and supervisors about the result of the mid-term evaluation | immediately after receiving the documentation from the Commission | head of the doctoral college |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appeal procedure** | | | |
| **12** | The right to appeal against a negative assessment to the head of the doctoral college | within 14 days from the date the assessment results are made available | PhD student or supervisor |
| **13** | Transferring the appeal against a negative assessment to the relevant scientific discipline council | immediately upon receipt of the appeal | head of the doctoral college |
| **14** | A meeting of the scientific discipline council | immediately, but not later than within 30 days from the date of submitting the appeal | the legitimate council of the scientific discipline |
| **15** | Appointment of the new Committee and ordering a new Committee meeting | immediately after the negative decision has been revoked | the appropriate dean for a given doctoral college |
| **16** | Meeting of the Committee | by the date set by the dean | The Commission with its new members |

Appendix No. 2

To the regulation

No. 25/2021 z of 3 March 2021

**REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESEARCH INDIVIDUAL PLAN (IPB)**

(should be completed using computer and submitted in electronic form and in the form of a printout at the dean's office of the relevant faculty or in another organizational unit of the relevant faculty dealing with administrative services for the doctoral college no later than 30 days before the scheduled date of the mid-term evaluation)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PhD student data and information about supervisors** | |
| First name(s) and surname |  |
| Index number |  |
| ORCID identifier |  |
| Scientific discipline |  |
| Name of the doctoral college |  |
| An organizational unit of the University of Wrocław where the research is conducted |  |
| Supervisor's name and surname, academic degree/title, organizational unit in which the supervisor is employed |  |
| Name and surname of the auxiliary supervisor, academic degree/title, organizational unit in which he is employed (if appointed) |  |
| Start year of the education at the School Doctor |  |
| **Information about the planned hearing** | |
| Research topic |  |
| Justification for choosing the topic |  |
| Research questions, theses or hypotheses of a dissertation |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Information on the implementation of the IPB schedule** | |
| Completed research tasks, obtained results, form of development and dissemination of results1, connection with the work on the doctoral dissertation; comments on necessary corrections; explanation of any discrepancies in implementation compared to the schedule | |
| 1st year of education (academic year……./ ) | |
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |
| …… |  |
| 2nd year of education (academic year……./ .) | |
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |
| ….. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research tasks planned in the IPB schedule to be performed after the mid-term evaluation  completed earlier (with justification) | |
| Research task; description of the results; reasons for changes in the schedule |  |
| The most important effects of changes for further research |  |
| Research tasks planned in the IPB schedule to be performed before the mid-term evaluation  not implemented (with justification) | |
| Research task; reasons for not accomplishing the task |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Information on disseminated partial research results** | |
| Scientific articles/other publications2 |  |
| Presentations at scientific conferences (papers, posters) |  |
| Others |  |
| **Other actions related to scientific work** | |
| Preparation and submission of a grant application (NCN, other) |  |
| Participation in the scientific life of the unit in which the research is carried out |  |
| Other (including awareness-raising activities) |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information about the course of education3** | | | | |
| apprenticeship | | | | |
| name of the subject | | number of hours  performed | | academic year |
|  | |  | |  |
| Classes carried out within the appropriate doctoral college4 | | | | |
| name of the subject | | number of hours | academic year | |
|  | |  |  | |
| Classes carried out as part of general university classes4 | | | | |
| name of the subject | | number of hours | academic year | |
|  | |  |  | |
| Others | | | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | | | | |
| Date and signature of the doctoral student |  | | | |

1. Detailed information should be provided under the heading *Information on disseminated partial research results*
2. Please indicate publications that have been (a) published, (b) accepted for publication, (c) submitted for publication and awaiting reviews separately
3. This information confirms the implementation of the education program, but does not affect the result of the mid-term evaluation
4. Please, list the planned activities for the fourth semester as ongoing activities

Appendix No. 3

To the regulation

No. 25/2021 z of 3 March 2021

**SUPERVISOR'S OPINION**

THE PHD STUDENT'S PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IPB)

........................................., on ……………………….

(location) (date)

.................................................................................................................

(name and surname of the supervisor/auxiliary supervisor, degree/academic title)

...............................................................................................................

(organizational unit)

APPLIES TO THE DOCTORAL STUDENT

.................................................................................................................

(name and surname of the doctoral student)

................................................................................................................

(name of the doctoral college / scientific discipline)

OPINION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IPB

(After reading the doctoral student's report on the implementation of IPB)

*the opinion should take into account the following elements:*

*punctual implementation of IPB;*

*compliance of the implemented activities with the IPB;*

*the stage of advancement of the work that will be the basis for the doctoral dissertation;*

*negotiations for further implementation of the IPB;*

*cooperation of the doctoral student with the supervisor (including communication).*

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………

legible signature of the supervisor

Appendix No. 4

To the regulation

No. 25/2021 z of 3 March 2021

**INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION**

**OF THE RESEARCH PLAN**

Based on the doctoral student's report on the implementation of IPB

and the supervisor's / supervisors' opinion on the doctoral student's progress in the implementation of IPB

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Name(s) and surname of the person assessing the results of the doctoral student's research

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Name(s) and surname of the doctoral student

…………………………………………………………………………….

Index number

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Name of the doctoral college

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Graded element** | **Pass / fail assessment** | **Justification** |
|  | IMPLEMENTATION OF IPB | | |
| 1. | punctuality |  |  |
| 2. | justification for the discrepancy of works in relation to the schedule |  |  |
| 3. | the manner of disseminating partial research results |  |  |
| 4. | other actions related to scientific work |  |  |
| 5. | cooperation of the doctoral student with the supervisor (including communication) |  |  |

#### ……………………………………..

date and signature of the evaluator

(member of the Committee)
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**MID-TERM ASSESSMENT OF A DOCTORAL STUDENT**

**AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WROCŁAW**

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Name(s) and surname of the doctoral student

…………………………………………………………………………….

Index number

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

name of the doctoral college

Committee composed of:

#### **Head of the Commission:**…………………………………………………………………………………….......................

degree / academic title / name and surname

#### **Member:** …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

#### degree / academic title / name and surname

#### **Member:** ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

degree / academic title / name and surname

gave the student (name and surname)……………………………………………………..: positive/negative\* mid-term grade

#### **Justification of the assessment**

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

Indication of desired changes in IPB

…...............................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

*Signed:*

*Head of the commission*

#### ................................................................

date and signature

*Committee members:*

1. *..........................................................................*

##### 2. ….......................................................................

\* delete inappropriate

Appendix No. 6
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**MINUTES**

**OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE FOR MID-TERM EVALUATION**

**AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW**

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

First name(s) and surname of the doctoral student

…………………………………………………………………………….

Index number

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

name of the doctoral college

Doctoral student (name and surname)………………………………………………………… on (date) …………………………… proceeded the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of the University of Wrocław in a scientific discipline: …………………………………………………………… .

(the name of the discipline)

Remote / face-to-face mode \*

### before the mid-term evaluation Committee composed of:

#### **Head of the Commission:**…………………………………………………………………………………….......................

degree / academic title / name and surname

#### **Member:** …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

#### degree / academic title / name and surname

#### **Member:** ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

degree / academic title / name and surname

In the open part (open to the public), the PhD student presented the completed elements of the Individual Research Plan.

If the doctoral student or the supervisor submits an application to the relevant scientific discipline council for consent to permission this part of the meeting of the Committee with the exception of publicity - date of submission of the application …………………………………

In the discussion that followed the presentation, the doctoral student was asked the following questions:

1. .......................................................................................................................

The answer was accepted / not accepted \* by the person asking the question.

2. ........................................................................................................................

The answer was accepted / not accepted \* by the person asking the question.

3. ........................................................................................................................

The answer was accepted / not accepted \* by the person asking the question.

In the closed part of the meeting, referring to the preliminary individual assessments and the data presented by the doctoral student in the presentation and the subsequent discussion in the part of the public vote, the committee evaluated a mid-term assessment: positive / negative \*

#### **Justification of the assessment**

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................

Indication of desired changes in IPB

…...............................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................

#### .................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................

##### Signed:

*Head of the commission*................................................................

\* delete inappropriate