

**The Rules of the mid-term evaluation of PhD students
of the Doctoral School of the University of Agriculture in Krakow**

§ 1

1. According to the Article 202 s.2 of the Act of 20 July 2018 – Law of Higher Education and Science, the completion of an individual research plan (IPB) is subjected to a mid-term evaluation in the middle of the study period specified in the education program, i.e. after completing term 4.
2. The mid-term evaluation has to be carried out within 3 consecutive months.
3. The mid-term evaluation of the PhD student is conducted considering:
 - 1) a submitted report on the implementation of the IPB, the form of which is included in the appendix no.1 of the rules (stage I);
 - 2) an interview with the PhD student (stage II).
4. The report of on the implementation of IPB written in Polish or English, signed by the PhD student and supervisor, is submitted to the office of the Doctoral School by the end of the first week of October of the year in which the mid-term evaluation takes place.
5. The interview with the PhD student is conducted in Polish or English and can be conducted online.
6. The copy of the IPB should be attached to the IPB report as well as the documents confirming the PhD student's activity resulting from IPB, including the first pages of scientific publications published during the Doctoral School education, decisions to award a grant, the confirmation of the leader of the research project, the patent application number, the confirmation of taking part in a conference including the type of performance and the title of the presented work.
7. The mid-term evaluation is completed by a negative or positive score. The score and its justification are publicly transparent.

§ 2

1. Mid-term evaluation is conducted by the Mid-Term Committee appointed by the right council of the discipline upon the request of the Director of the Doctoral School. The council of the discipline appoints the Mid-Term Committee in one month since receiving the application.

2. The Committee consists of 3 members with the degree of habilitated doctor or professor at the discipline in which the doctoral thesis is prepared, including one employed outside of the University.
3. Members of the Committee should be active researchers, which means that during previous 6 years they have published at least 4 scientific publications (articles in journals, conference materials, books as part of book series) included in the Scopus base, at least two of them had to be published in the journal in the discipline according to the ministerial list and had to score at least 30 points according to the MNiSW list, when published by 2018 or 100 points according to the list of the MEiN, when published after 2018. In the case of economy and finances these thresholds are 25 or 70 points, respectively.
4. One of the members of the Committee can be a researcher from abroad. The participation of that person in the work of the Committee is only online.
5. A supervisor and assistant supervisor cannot be the members of the Committee.
6. The council of the discipline chooses the chairman, the secretary and the member of the Committee. In justified cases the Director of the Doctoral School applies to the council of discipline for dismissal of a Committee member and for choosing another member on her/his place.
7. A member of the Committee, employed outside of the University is offered a salary of 20% of the professor's salary. The costs are paid from the scientific subsidy transferred to the right discipline.
8. The chairman of the Committee convenes the meeting by setting the dates and places of meetings. All the necessary information is forwarded to the secretariat of the Doctoral School which gives the PhD student and the supervisor the information about the dates and places of committee appointments.
9. The mid-term evaluation report is assessed for up to 30 days since being given to the members of the Committee.
10. The Committee suggests the date of the interview with the PhD student.
11. The presence of the PhD student at the meeting of the Committee for interview is obligatory. The excuse of the absence can be a sick leave presented on the assessment day (or in particular cases within 7 days at the latest since the date of the committee meeting) or an important random event. In that case the PhD student is given a new date of interview. Unexcused absence will lead to a negative score of the mid-term evaluation.
12. During the interview the PhD student presents in the 20 minute presentation the implementation status of IPB. Every member of the Committee asks the PhD student one

- question regarding the content of the presentation or the implementation of IPB. The questions are documented and the protocol form is included in the appendix no.2 of the rules.
13. After completing both stages of the assessment (I and II) the Committee agrees the final result (score) of the mid-term evaluation of the PhD student, making a protocol (appendix 2). Committee presents the result of the evaluation as positive or negative. The result of the mid-term evaluation is positive if most members of the Committee give the positive assessment.
 14. To receive a positive mid-term evaluation, the following conditions have to be fulfilled:
 - 1) PhD student has completed the tasks given to be implemented in the IPB by the end of the 4th term of education.
 - 2) PhD student shows a delay in the IPB implementation but not over 30%, however, there is a possibility of the IPB implementation within the time specified in the rules of the Doctoral School and the previous research and publication activity of the PhD student clearly indicate her/his right involvement in the implementation of the research tasks.
 15. The negative mid-term evaluation is given when the committee states no progress in the IPB implementation.
 16. Both positive and negative assessments have to be justified.
 17. The Committee deliberates over the result of the evaluation in the closed (secret) part of the meeting.
 18. The negative result of the mid-term evaluation is tantamount to removal from the list of doctoral students.
 19. The members of the Committee provide the Director of the Doctoral School with the final evaluation within 3 days since the last meeting. The Director of the Doctoral School presents the final grade to the doctoral student and the supervisor, who sign the evaluation protocol, and also presents it to the coordinator and the discipline council.
 20. The PhD student can appeal against a negative mid-term evaluation to the Director of the Doctoral School within 7 days from the date of making the results of the evaluation available.
 21. At the request of the Director of the Doctoral School the Rector appoints three-person Appeals Committee with at least 2 persons not employed in the University including at least 1 person with the title of habilitated doctor or professor in the research discipline of the doctoral thesis.
 22. After checking all the documents the Appeals Committee conducts an interview with the PhD student in order to make the final decision. The decision has to be made not later than

1 month after the date of the appeal of the PhD student. The Appeal Committee decision is final.

§ 3

1. In justified cases the Director of the Doctoral School may change by the message the dates indicated in these rules.
2. The Director of the Doctoral School decides on the scope of the Committee's activity, which are not included in these rules.

In line with the original

DYREKTOR
SZKOŁY DOKTORSKIEJ
Zaczn
prof. dr hab. Zygmunt M. Kowalski