

Appendix No. 1
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
of 19 December 2022

**GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A MID-TERM EVALUATION
AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY IN THE 2022/2023 ACADEMIC YEAR**

1. The rules and procedures for conducting the mid-term evaluation are specified by:

- ✓ Article 202 (2-5) of the Act;
- ✓ § 20 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the University.

2. A detailed schedule of dates for the mid-term evaluation is set forth in Appendix No. 2 to this Order.

3. The mid-term evaluation is carried out in four stages:

Stage 1 - submission by the doctoral student of a written Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan, constituting Appendix No. 3 to this Order.

Stage 2 - reviews of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan prepared on the basis of the doctoral student's documentation (i.e. report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan, Individual Research Plan, Research Project to date). The review form is attached as Appendix No. 4 to this Order. Reviews are written by two reviewers appointed by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. The reviewer is not a member of the Committee. Reviews are made available to members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, as well as to doctoral students.

Stage 3 – meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee consisting of two parts:

- 1) in the first part interviews are held with doctoral students. An element 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 discussion. The doctoral student is required to answer the Committee's questions related to the implementation of the IRP;
- 2) in the second, closed part (without the participation of the doctoral student), the Committee discusses and evaluates the implementation of the IRP and prepares a justification for the evaluation. The Committee's mid-term evaluation form is attached as Appendix No. 5 to this Order.

Stage 4 - announcement of the results of the mid-term evaluation.

4. The Committee conducts a mid-term evaluation on the basis of:

- ✓ reports of the doctoral student on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan;
- ✓ reviews of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan by two reviewers;
- ✓ Individual Research Plan;
- ✓ Research Project;
- ✓ presentation and interview with the doctoral student.

5. The Committee's evaluation is determined by consensus. In the absence of consensus, 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.

6. The evaluation can be positive or negative. A positive evaluation requires the doctoral student to receive recommendations from two reviewers both for compliance with the plan and the timeliness of task completion, as well as for the substantive evaluation of completed tasks, including the ongoing research project.

7. The evaluation and its justification are public.