



WROCLAW DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF INSTITUTES
OF POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

DETAILED PROCEDURE FOR THE MID-TERM ASSESSMENT

of the Wrocław Doctoral School of Institutes
of Polish Academy of Sciences

(English translation, the Polish version is legally binding)



The document was adopted by a resolution of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Low Temperature and Structural Research of Polish Academy of Sciences on July 2, 2021 and by a resolution of the Scientific Council of the Hirsfeld Institute of Immunology and Experimental Therapy of Polish Academy of Sciences on June 17, 2021.



§ 1

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The mid-term evaluation of doctoral students of the Wrocław Doctoral School of Institutes of the Polish Academy of Sciences (WSD IPAN) is carried out based on the Act of July 20, 2018 - Law on higher education and science (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1668, with as amended) and the Regulations of the Doctoral School (Resolutions of Scientific Councils of April 24, 2020, and April 27, 2020).
2. Before the end of the two-year training period, the WSD IPA manager or his deputy notifies the doctoral student about his preparation for the mid-term evaluation and sets a 14-day deadline for submitting the documentation necessary to conduct it, including:
 - a. short description of the research subject matter,
 - b. a proposal of candidates for members of the Commission conducting the mid-term evaluation, who are not employed in any of the institutes co-running WSD IPAN and meet the conditions specified in § 2 sec. 4 and 5,
 - c. optional: a list of persons who should not be included in the mid-term evaluation committee due to the possibility of an actual or potential conflict of interest leading to a lack of impartiality, along with a justification (this list is only considered as a guide when appointing the Committee's composition).
3. The Head or his Deputy informs the doctoral student's supervisor (s) about the preparation for the mid-term evaluation and the possibility of proposing candidates for members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee to the School Council within 14 days.



§ 2

MID-TERM EVALUATION COMMITTEE

1. Mid-term evaluation of a doctoral student is done by Mid-term Evaluation Committee, hereinafter referred to as the Committee, appointed separately for each doctoral student.
2. The Committee and its Head are appointed by the School Council of WDS IPAS (hereinafter referred to as the School Council) no later than two months before the end of the full two years of doctoral student education from among the candidates indicated by the School Council, the doctoral student (in the documentation referred to in § 1 (2) and the supervisor (s), in compliance with the principle of avoiding actual and potential conflicts of interest between members of the Commission and the supervisor, auxiliary supervisor and doctoral student.
3. The composition of the Commission is open to the public and is published on the WDS IPAS website.
4. Only a person with the academic title of habilitated doctor or the academic title of professor may be a member of the Committee.
5. The Committee consists of three persons, including at least one person with the degree of a habilitated doctor or the title of professor in the discipline and achievements in the field of research in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, employed outside the Doctoral Entities running the School and not employed in these Entities.
6. A member of the Committee may not be the supervisor, assistant supervisor of the doctoral student, Director of any of the Doctoral Entities running the School, or the Head of the Doctoral School or his Deputy.
7. In the event of an actual or potential conflict of interest between a member of the Committee and the supervisor, assistant supervisor, and doctoral student, the School Council may change the composition of the Committee.
8. The Head of the Committee organizes and conducts the meeting at which the mid-term evaluation is carried out and also notifies its date, at least 14 days in advance, to the members of the Committee, the doctoral student concerned, the supervisor (s), and the doctoral students' self-government.



§ 3

HOW TO CARRY OUT THE MID-TERM EVALUATION (COMMISSION MEETING)

1. Not later than seven days before the date of the Committee meeting:
 - a. the doctoral student provides the Head of the Committee with the Mid-term Evaluation Report, constituting Appendix 1 to this document (presentation of abstracts),
 - b. the supervisor (supervisors) provide their assessment of the progress in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation and the possibility of completing education in accordance with the deadline, as well as their opinion about the doctoral student containing information about his(her) individual contribution to research.
2. After receiving the documents, the Head shall immediately forward them to the members of the Committee, and convey the opinion of the supervisor (s) also to the doctoral student.
3. The mid-term evaluation shall be carried out by the Commission on the basis of:
 - a. Analysis of the documentation provided by the doctoral student and supervisor (s),
 - b. Approved, individual Ph.D. student research plan (IPB),
 - c. Interviews with the doctoral student during the Committee meeting, during which the doctoral student presents his achievements to date, a report on the implementation of an individual research plan, and answers the Committee's questions. The presentation of the doctoral student's achievements is in English and the discussion with the Committee is in English or Polish.
4. The doctoral student and all members of the Committee shall participate in the Committee meeting at which the mid-term evaluation is carried out, provided that the doctoral student only takes part in the open part. Moreover, the representative of doctoral students appointed by the self-government may participate in the entire meeting of the Committee without voting rights. The participation of a representative of doctoral students takes place at the doctoral student's request, addressed to the doctoral students' self-government.
5. In justified cases, after agreeing on the details with the Head of the School or his Deputy, a meeting of the Committee or participation in a meeting of individual members may take place using electronic means of communication.



6. The implementation of an individual research plan by the doctoral student is subject to mid-term evaluation. The Commission's assessment is based on the following criteria:
- a. Has the implementation of the tasks planned in IBB for the period subjected to assessment been completed, and has it been adequately documented in the report?
 - b. Is the stage of advancement of the tasks, the completion of which is planned for a period exceeding the subject to be assessed, consistent with that provided for in IPB?
 - c. Have the scientific publications (articles, conference presentations) planned at IPB for the period subjected to assessment been implemented and whether their subject matter is consistent with the planned?
 - d. Is the justification of possible delays in the implementation of tasks planned in IBB documented and credible, and whether the actions taken to eliminate possible delays were appropriate?
 - e. Do any backlogs in the implementation of IPB threaten the planned deadline for submitting the doctoral dissertation, and is it possible to make up for them in the period after the environmental assessment?

In particular, the Commission shall assess the following elements of the implementation of an individual research plan, if they have been included in it to be implemented during the period under assessment:

- a. compliance of the conducted works with the general concept of the doctoral dissertation presented in IPB;
- b. progress in the design, manufacture or reconstruction of apparatus or station;
- c. progress in developing a test procedure, algorithm, or technology;
- d. type and scope of performed experiments or numerical calculations;
- e. the degree of advancement of the analysis of the obtained experimental or computational results;
- f. the form and scope of disseminating research results (including the number and type of publications, conference presentations, seminars, etc.);
- g. patent applications;
- h. participation in training;
- i. participation in research outside the subject of the doctoral dissertation;
- j. research trips.



7. After the doctoral student finishes the presentation and answers questions from members of the Committee, the Committee conducts a discussion in a closed session and adopts a resolution on a positive or negative result of the mid-term evaluation.
8. In the event of a lack of unanimity among the members of the Committee, the Head of the Committee shall order an open vote, in which the members of the Committee vote for a positive or negative result of the mid-term evaluation, and the decision is taken by a simple majority of votes.
9. The Committee draws up the meeting minutes, which in particular include the assessment and its justification. If the Committee's meeting takes place using electronic means of communication, the minutes of the meeting are signed by the Chairman of the Committee.
10. The result of the mid-term evaluation, together with the justification, is public and is delivered in writing to the doctoral student and the supervisor (s) within 14 days after the evaluation.

§ 4



FINAL PROVISIONS

1. In the event of a negative mid-term evaluation, the doctoral student has the right to appeal to the School Council within 14 days from the delivery of the result.
2. The School Council shall consider the appeal within 14 days of its submission or supplementing formal defects. In the event of any formal deficiencies, the School Council forwards the matter to be reconsidered by the Committee. In case of justified doubts as to the impartiality of the Commission, the School Council appoints a new Commission.
3. Failure to provide the required documents by the doctoral student or to participate in the mid-term evaluation within the time limit resulting from the detailed procedure of the mid-term evaluation (except for random events) may result in initiating the procedure of removing him (her) from the list of doctoral students.
4. If it is not possible to conduct an mid-term evaluation in connection with the submitted medical certificate or for any other justified reason, the evaluation shall be carried out within 30 days from the date the cause ceases to exist. However, the assessment must be carried out in the middle of the eight-semester period of education, i.e., in time allowing for admission to the classes in the fifth semester.



Zał. 1

Wrocław Doctoral School of Institutes of Polish Academy of Sciences***Mid-Term Report (Self-Presentation)***
Raport Oceny Śródkresowej (Autoreferat)***for the period ...(dd.mm.yy)... to ...(dd.mm.yy)...*****Basic data****Podstawowe dane**

	
Names and surname of PhD student:	Discipline:
_____	_____
Institute:	Department:
_____	_____
PhD student e-mail account: (in Institute's domain)	Student ID:
_____	_____
ORCID:	Researcher ID:
_____	_____
Date of beginning of doctoral studies:	Year of studies/semester:
_____	_____
PhD dissertation supervisor (1):	PhD dissertation supervisor (2):
_____	_____
Auxiliary PhD dissertation supervisor:	Date of submitting the Mid-Term Report:
_____	_____

**Information on doctoral dissertation****Informacje o rozprawie doktorskiej**

Title of doctoral dissertation Tytuł rozprawy doktorskiej (<i>w języku dysertacji i w języku angielskim</i>)
Planned deadline for submission of dissertation (month, year) Planowany termin złożenia rozprawy doktorskiej (m-c, rok)
Scientific report (motivation to undertake research and its innovativeness, aim and research hypothesis, subject of study and research methodology) (DESCRIPTION – MAX 1 PAGE A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, LINE SPACING 1) Raport naukowy (motywacja do podjęcia badań i ich innowacyjność, cel i hipoteza badawcza, przedmiot i metodyka badań) (OPIS – MAKS. 1 STRONA A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, INTERLINIA 1)

Report on progress in implementation of Individual Research Plan (IRP)**Sprawozdanie z postępów w realizacji Indywidualnego Planu Badawczego (IPB)**

A. Timely execution of research timetable stages planned for the first 2 years and degree of realization of IRP (expressed as a percentage) (DESCRIPTION – MAX 2 PAGES A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, LINE SPACING 1) A. Terminowość realizacji etapów harmonogramu prac badawczych zaplanowanych na pierwsze 2 lata i stopień realizacji IPB (wyrzucić w %) (OPIS – MAKS. 2 STRONY A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, INTERLINIA 1)
B. Progress in implementation of doctoral dissertation and degree of its realization (expressed as a percentage) (DESCRIPTION – MAX 1 PAGE A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, LINE SPACING 1) B. Zaawansowanie w przygotowaniu rozprawy doktorskiej i stopień jej realizacji (wyrzucić w %) (OPIS – MAKS. 1 STRONA A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, INTERLINIA 1)



C. Explanation of any discrepancies between stages of realization described in point A and B, and timetable and dissertation submission deadline declared in IRP (DESCRIPTION – MAX 1 PAGE A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, LINE SPACING 1)

C. Wyjaśnienie rozbieżności pomiędzy stopniami realizacji opisanymi w pkt. A i B, a zadeklarowanym w IPB harmonogramem i terminem złożenia rozprawy (OPIS – MAKS. 1 STRONA A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, INTERLINIA 1)

**SWOT analysis of IRP realization and preparation of doctoral dissertation
Analiza SWOT procesu realizacji IPB i przygotowania rozprawy doktorskiej**

Strengths / Silne strony	Weaknesses / Słabe strony
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• XXX	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• XXX
Opportunities / Szanse	Threats / Zagrożenia
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• XXX	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• XXX

**Additional comments, remarks and/or conclusions by PhD student
(DESCRIPTION – MAX 0.5 PAGE A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, LINE SPACING 1)**

Dodatkowe wyjaśnienia, komentarze, podsumowanie doktoranta (OPIS – MAKS. 0,5 STRONY A4, ARIAL NARROW 11, INTERLINIA 1)

--

The undersigned hereby certifies that the above information is correct.

Niżej podpisany potwierdza niniejszym, że powyższe dane są zgodne z prawdą.

.....
Date

Legible signature of PhD student