

**Detailed description of the process for the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of
the Maria Grzegorzewska University
for the academic year 2025/2026**

Pursuant to the Act of 20 July 2018 – The Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2024, item 1571, as amended) and the Regulations of the Doctoral School adopted by the Senate of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, a mid-term evaluation of doctoral students shall be conducted. The mid-term evaluation is subject to the implementation of the individual research plan, in particular, the timeliness and quality of tasks resulting from the doctoral dissertation preparation schedule.

The course of the mid-term evaluation:

1. The Doctoral Student shall submit a written Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (attached as Appendix No. 3 to the Order) by the date specified in the mid-term evaluation schedule (attached as Appendix No. 2 to the Order) to the Secretary's Office of the Doctoral School.
2. The administration office of the Doctoral School sends electronic versions of the following documents necessary for the mid-term evaluation to the members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee (2 internal experts, 1 external expert, PhDs, and professors):
 - Individual Research Plan (with a detailed research project)
 - Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.
3. Based on the above-mentioned documentation, the experts prepare individual expert assessments on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by the doctoral student according to the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School (attached as Appendix No. 4 to the Order). The opinion comprises two criteria:

- implementation of tasks in accordance with the Individual Research Plan (IRP)
- Substantive evaluation of ongoing activities, including the research project:

The review must include a justification for the assessment of each evaluated element. Additionally, the expert should, where possible, provide a descriptive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the research project and completed tasks, as well as offer guidance for the future.

The prepared opinions are part of the documentation necessary for the mid-term evaluation of a doctoral student and are forwarded to other members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. Opinions are also made available to the doctoral student before the interview with the Committee.

4. Members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee will review the documentation necessary for the evaluation. They hold meetings during which the implementation of the doctoral student's IRP is evaluated. During the meeting:

- interviews with doctoral students are held. Part of the interview is a short presentation on the progress of the preparation on the doctoral student's dissertation (up to 15 minutes) and a scientific discussion. The doctoral student is required to answer the Committee's questions related to the implementation of the IRP;
- the Committee, without the participation of the doctoral student, discusses and evaluates the implementation of the IRP and prepares an evaluation with justification.

When conducting the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student's implementation of the IRP, the Committee takes into account the following aspects:

- an assessment of the timeliness and quality of tasks resulting from the doctoral dissertation preparation schedule included in the IRP and the consistency of these activities with the Individual Research Plan,
- an assessment of the presentation prepared and delivered by the doctoral student;
- an assessment of replies to the Committee's questions.

The evaluation can be positive or negative. The Committee decides by vote in line with the rules set forth in the Statute of the University provided for the procedure of

collegiate bodies in personnel matters. The evaluation and justification are recorded in the Mid-term Evaluation Form established by the Head of the Doctoral School (Appendix 5 to the Order).

5. The results of the mid-term assessment are announced by publishing the public part of the aforementioned form on the Doctoral School's website.

Roles in mid-term evaluation

Doctoral student

1. The doctoral student prepares and submits, in hard copy, Report on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan (Appendix No. 3 to the Order).
2. The doctoral student prepares a presentation on the progress of the Individual Research Plan to be presented during the mid-term evaluation.
3. The doctoral student appears before the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee presenting progress on the IRP implementation and participates in a discussion on the topic.
4. At the request of the doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation, at least one representative of doctoral students may participate in the meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee as an observer.

Supervisor(s)

1. The doctoral student(s) approve(s) and sign(s) the Doctoral Student's Report on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan.

Pursuant to the Act of 20 July 2018 – The Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended) and the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the University, the supervisor and assistant supervisor may not be members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. They do not attend any committee meeting.

Members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee

1. For each doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation, they make an individual assessment of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan according to the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School.

2. They review the complete set of documents necessary for conducting the mid-term evaluation (Individual Research Plan with detailed research project of the doctoral student; report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan; and opinions of other experts on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan).
3. They attend a Mid-term Evaluation Committee meeting to evaluate the doctoral student's IRP and participate in an interview with the doctoral student.
4. During the aforementioned meeting, they make a final decision on the mid-term evaluation.
5. They prepare a justification for the evaluation – both in cases of positive and negative assessments.

Members of the Council of the Doctoral School

1. They appoint candidates from the Scientific Discipline Councils and from outside the entity managing the Doctoral School as members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.

Head of Doctoral School

1. After consulting with the Council of the Doctoral School, the Head of Doctoral School sets a mid-term evaluation schedule in the respective academic year.
2. The Head of Doctoral School arranges templates for the forms applicable to the mid-term evaluation.
3. The Head of Doctoral School submits requests to the Chairmen of the Discipline Councils to appoint experts to the Committee.
4. The Head of Doctoral School submits a request for the appointment of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee containing the candidates identified by the Council of the Doctoral School to the Rector of the Maria Grzegorzewska University.
5. The Head of Doctoral School supervises the manner and timeliness of the mid-term evaluation process.

Administration of the Doctoral School

1. The administration office provides administrative and organizational support for the mid-term evaluation.

2. The administration office ensures timely circulation of documents related to mid-term evaluation.
3. The administration office organizes meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.