

Decree No. 3/2022
of Director of the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies
of June 24, 2022

on: introduction of a detailed procedure for conducting the mid-term evaluation at the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies

Pursuant to § 18 (2) of the Organizational regulations on education at the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies, I hereby order as follows:

§ 1

I hereby set up a detailed procedure for conducting the mid-term evaluation at the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies, which constitutes Annex no. 1 hereto.

§ 2

1. The decree shall enter into force on the day of its announcement.
2. With the entry into force of this decree, the Decree of the Director of the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies No. 3/2021 shall be no longer in force.

Director of the Krakow School of
Interdisciplinary PhD
Studies

prof. dr hab. Andrzej Horzela

Detailed procedure for conducting the mid-term evaluation at the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies

§ 1 Documentation required for the mid-term evaluation

1. For the purpose of the mid-term evaluation, the PhD student is obliged to prepare a written summary of professional accomplishments according to a template given in Attachment no. 1.
2. The PhD student shall prepare the summary of professional accomplishments in Polish or English.
3. The summary of professional accomplishments shall include a detailed description of progress in an individual research proposal (hereinafter referred to as the IRP).
4. If progress in research and in preparation of a doctoral dissertation diverges from the IRP, the PhD student is obliged to include a written justification for the occurring differences in his/her summary of professional accomplishments.
5. In the event of updating the IRP, the PhD student shall prepare the description referred to in Point 3 in accordance with the updated IRP.
6. The compatibility of the summary of professional accomplishments with the factual status shall be approved by the PhD student's signature and the signature of his/her supervisor or supervisors or a supervisor and an auxiliary supervisor.
7. The PhD student shall submit the summary of professional accomplishments, approved by a supervisor or supervisors or a supervisor and an auxiliary supervisor, to the competent PhD School Deputy Director.
8. The following documents should be attached to the summary of professional accomplishments:
 - 1) documentation of the accomplishment of research effects indicated in the summary of professional accomplishments, including copies of first pages of publications, certificates of acceptance for publishing, certificates from conference organizers etc.
 - 2) documents confirming that the student has undertaken activities preparing him/her for research or research and development work indicated in the summary of professional accomplishments
 - 3) supervisor's or supervisors' opinion containing an assessment of the student's progress in the preparation of a doctoral dissertation
 - 4) print-out of the presentation prepared by the PhD student for the purpose of the mid-term evaluation.
9. The committee appointed to conduct the mid-term evaluation of progress in the implementation of the student's IRP (hereinafter referred to as the Committee for the Mid-term Evaluation or the Committee) shall have access to the student's summary of professional accomplishments, IRP and annual reports.

§ 2 Mid-term evaluation criteria

1. The mid-term evaluation assesses the student's progress in the implementation of his/her IRP.
2. The evaluation referred to in Section 1 includes:
 - 1) on-time completion of tasks resulting from the schedule of the preparation of a doctoral dissertation specified in the IRP,
 - 2) progress in research work planned in the IRP,
 - 3) compatibility of research effects with those scheduled in the IRP,

- 4) compatibility of activities preparing the PhD student to undertake research or research and development work with those scheduled in the IRP.

§ 3 Committee for the Mid-term Evaluation

1. The Program Board of the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies appoints the Committee for the Mid-term Evaluation in each unit of the PhD School not later than a month prior to the date of conducting the mid-term evaluation.
2. The Board may appoint more than one Committee in each unit of the PhD School.
3. In the event of appointing more than one Committee in a given unit of the PhD School, the Program Board of the Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies shall determine the lists of PhD students that will undergo the evaluation by a given Committee.
4. Immediately after appointing the Committees, their compositions and the lists of PhD students assigned to those Committees shall be published on the website of the PhD School.
5. The Committee is composed of three members.
6. When appointing the members of the Committee in each unit, the Program Board takes into particular account whether a candidate for the Committee:
 - 1) holds the title of professor or the post-doctoral degree of doctor habilitated in one of the scientific disciplines in which PhD students undergoing the mid-term evaluation in a given unit prepare their doctoral dissertations,
 - 2) is of good repute and observes the principles of scientific ethics,
 - 3) can demonstrate a significant academic record for the past 5 years or has an outstanding achievement in the preparation and implementation of an original design, constructional or technological solution,
 - 4) has expertise in PhD student mentorship.
7. A person in respect of whom there are reasonable doubts as to his/her impartiality cannot be a member of the Committee. A supervisor and an auxiliary supervisor cannot be members of the Committee.
8. The term of office of the Committees is specified by the Program Board.
9. A change in the composition of the Committee within the period referred to in Point 8 can be made at the request of the competent PhD School Deputy Director or the PhD School Director after its prior approval by the Program Board of the PhD School.
10. An agreement shall be concluded with a member of the Committee employed by an entity different than the unit running the PhD School. The agreement shall specify in particular the conditions of the remuneration referred to in Art. 202 (5) of the Act of July 20, 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science.
11. The agreement referred to in Point 10 shall be concluded by IFJ PAN Director or a person authorized by him, according to a template in force at IFJ PAN.
12. Each Committee appoints its chairperson and secretary at the first session of the Committee.
13. The Committee makes decisions by simple majority and by open voting. The Chairperson of the Committee shall have the casting vote in the event of a tie.
14. Sessions and voting of the Committee may take place in a remote manner with the use of electronic means of communication ensuring simultaneous real-time image and sound transmission, in accordance with necessary safety regulations.

15. The secretary of the Committee or a person authorized by him/her shall provide technical and organizational support during the Committee sessions.

§ 4 Mid-term Evaluation procedure

1. Within the last two weeks of the second year of education (if the academic year starts at the beginning of October, within the last two weeks of September of the following calendar year), the PhD student submits the summary of professional accomplishments, accompanied by the documents referred to in § 1 Point 8, and an annual report for a given year. In the case of PhD students carrying out the Industrial Doctoral Program (“Doktorat wdrożeniowy”), the deadlines for submitting the summary of professional accomplishments depend on the deadlines for submitting the annual reports in the program indicated by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, and shall be announced by the PHD School Director by way of a decree immediately after receiving the information.
2. Failure to submit the summary of professional accomplishments by the PhD student within the period specified in Section 1 translates into the negative result of the mid-term evaluation.
3. The PhD School Director may postpone the deadline for submitting the summary of professional accomplishments or the date of conducting the mid-term evaluation at a written request of the PhD student only in emergency circumstances when the personal appearance of the PhD student is impossible, e.g. as a result of an accident or prolonged illness.
4. The competent Deputy Director of a given Unit together with the members of the Committee determines the schedule of conducting the mid-term evaluation of PhD students in a given unit and passes this information to the PhD School Director without undue delay. The schedule is published on the PhD School website not later than 14 days prior to the date of the mid-term evaluation.
5. The Secretarial Office of the PhD school shall pass individual research proposals and annual reports of PhD students of a given unit to the competent PhD School Deputy Director at his/her request.
6. The PhD School Deputy Director notifies the doctoral student self-government of the competent unit about the dates of conducting the mid-term evaluation without undue delay. Having received this information, the self-government immediately appoints its non-voting representative to take part in the activities of the Committee and informs the competent PhD School Deputy Director about this fact.
7. The PhD School Deputy Director passes the documentation of the PhD student to the members of the competent Committee within 7 days from the deadline for submitting the summary of professional accomplishments referred to in Section 1.
8. At its session, the Committee evaluates the submitted documents and conducts an interview with the PhD student. The interview may be omitted at the request of one of the Committee members, if the decision in this case was undertaken unanimously by the Committee.
9. During the interview referred to in Section 8, the PhD student gives a presentation on progress in the implementation of the individual research proposal. The duration of the presentation cannot exceed 15 minutes.

10. Failure to appear for the interview referred to in Section 8 by the PhD student translates into the negative result of the mid-term evaluation.
11. The Committee makes a decision about the result of the mid-term evaluation based on the assessment of the criteria referred to in § 2, Section 1. The members of the Committee assess individually whether each criterium has been met by the PhD student and grade it as positive or negative.
12. The criterium is graded positively if it receives at least two positive grades.
13. Each criterium must be graded positively to get the positive result of the mid-term evaluation.
14. Minutes of the sessions of the Committee shall be drawn up by the secretary according to a template given in Attachment no. 2 and shall be signed by all members of the Committee.
15. The mid-term evaluation is completed on the day of the Committee session at which the result of the mid-term evaluation is determined for the PhD student.
16. The dates of sessions of the Committee with regard to the mid-term evaluation of the PhD student shall be indicated in the minutes.
17. The component grades and the final result of the mid-term evaluation together with a justification shall be recorded in the minutes.
18. The secretary shall immediately pass the minutes of the mid-term evaluation to the PhD School Director through the competent PhD School Deputy Director.
19. The minutes shall be kept in the PhD student's personnel file.

§ 4 Disclosure of results

1. The result of the evaluation, together with the justification, shall be public. Getting acquainted with the result of the evaluation and the justification is possible at the secretary's office of the Doctoral School after prior appointment.
2. The PhD School Director shall present a report on the results of the mid-term evaluation to the Program Board.

§ 5 Assessment of the way of conducting the mid-term evaluation

1. Once the mid-term evaluation is completed, the Chairpersons of the Committees shall communicate their observations on the way of conducting the mid-term evaluation to the competent PhD School Deputy Director, including recommendations for future changes. Recommendations may also be provided by the representative of the student self-government taking part in the Committee's sessions.
2. Any changes to the way of conducting the mid-term evaluation shall be defined by the PhD School Director in agreement with the PhD School Deputy Directors by way of a decree.
3. Changes to the way of conducting the mid-term evaluation cannot be introduced during the mid-term evaluation of a given student age group.

Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies

MID-TERM EVALUATION – Summary of professional accomplishments

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION:	
Name and surname of PhD student:	
Register No.:	
Unit:	
Scientific field/discipline:	
Research topic:	
Supervisor (name, surname, academic degree/title, parent unit):	
Supervisor (name, surname, academic degree/title, parent unit):	
Auxiliary supervisor (name, surname, academic degree/title, parent unit):	
PhD student education period (a period of 4 years from the day of beginning of education)	

PART II. PREPARATION OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION - PROGRESS (please describe the completed stages of doctoral dissertation following the order indicated in the PhD student's IRP and a justification for discrepancies according to the following plan):
1st year of education
1. Stage of preparation of doctoral dissertation according to the IRP:
Planned completion period according to the IRP:
Description of completion (please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress):
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
2. Stage of preparation of doctoral dissertation according to the IRP:

Planned completion period according to the IRP:
Description of completion <i>(please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress)</i> :
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
3.
2nd year of education
1. Stage of preparation of doctoral dissertation according to the IRP:
Planned completion period according to the IRP:
Description of completion <i>(please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress)</i> :
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
2. Stage of preparation of doctoral dissertation according to the IRP:
Planned completion period according to the IRP:
Description of completion <i>(please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress)</i> :
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
3.....
Additional progress not planned in the IRP <i>(please indicate in chronological order additional completed stages not planned in the IRP, specify their period of completion and give detailed description):</i>
1. ...
2. ...

PART III. IMPLEMENTATION OF RESEARCH PLAN <i>(please describe completed stages of research together with a justification for discrepancies according to the following plan):</i>
--

1st year of education

1. Stage of research/research task according to the IRP:
.....

Planned period of completion:
.....

Description of completion (*please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress*):
.....

Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
.....

2. Stage of research/research task according to the IRP:
.....

Planned period of completion:
.....

Description of completion (*please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress*):
.....

Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
.....

3.

2nd year of education

1. Stage of research/research task according to the IRP:
.....

Planned period of completion:
.....

Description of completion (*please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress*):
.....

Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
.....

2. Stage of research/research task according to the IRP:
.....

Planned period of completion:
.....

Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the stage has been completed or not and include description of progress</i>):
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
3.
Additional progress not planned in the IRP (<i>please indicate in chronological order additional completed stages not planned in the IRP, specify their period of completion and give detailed description</i>):
1. ...
2. ...

PART IV. EFFECTS OF RESEARCH ACTIVITY (<i>please indicate achieved effects of research activity together with a justification for discrepancies according to the following plan</i>) ¹ :
1st year of education
1. Effect of research activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the effect has been achieved or not and include its description</i>):
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
2. Effect of research activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the effect has been achieved or not and include its description</i>):
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
3.
2nd year of education
1. Effect of research activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the effect has been achieved or not and include its description</i>):
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:

.....
2. Effect of research activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the effect has been achieved or not and include its description</i>):
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress:
3.
Additional progress not planned in the IRP (<i>please indicate in chronological order additional completed stages not planned in the IRP, specify their period of completion and give detailed description</i>):
1. ...
2. ...

¹Please attach documents confirming the achievement of a given effect (e.g. certificate from a conference organizer, certificate of acceptance for publishing, copies of first pages of publications, etc.)

PART V. ACTIVITIES PREPARING A PHD STUDENT TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH OR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK (<i>please describe the accomplished activities and give a justification for discrepancies according to the following plan</i>) ¹ :
1st year of education
1. Activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the activity has been accomplished or not and include its description</i>):
Achieved learning outcomes ² :
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress (<i>if there is no discrepancy, please enter: "No discrepancy"</i>):
2. Activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the activity has been accomplished or not and include its description</i>):
Achieved learning outcomes ² :
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress (<i>if there is no discrepancy, please enter: "No discrepancy"</i>):

3.
2nd year of education
1. Activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the activity has been accomplished or not and include its description</i>):
Achieved learning outcomes ² :
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress (<i>if there is no discrepancy, please enter: "No discrepancy"</i>):
2. Activity according to the IRP:
Planned period of completion:
Description of completion (<i>please indicate whether the activity has been accomplished or not and include its description</i>):
Achieved learning outcomes ² :
Justification for discrepancies between the IRP and actual progress (<i>if there is no discrepancy, please enter: "No discrepancy"</i>):
3.
Additional progress not planned in the IRP (<i>please indicate in chronological order additional completed stages not planned in the IRP, specify their period of completion and give detailed description</i>):
1. ...
2. ...

¹Please attach documents confirming the accomplishment of a given activity (e.g. internship completion certificate, course completion certificate, certificate from a conference organizer, etc.)

² <https://kisd.ifj.edu.pl/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/program-ksztalcenia.pdf>

.....
(date and legible signature of PhD student)

.....
(date and legible signature of supervisor)

.....
(date and legible signature of supervisor)

.....
(date and legible signature of auxiliary supervisor)

Krakow School of Interdisciplinary PhD Studies

MID-TERM EVALUATION

Minutes of the session of the Committee for the Mid-term Evaluation

of:

(date of determining the result of the mid-term evaluation)

On the Committee for the Mid-term Evaluation conducted the mid-term evaluation of progress in the implementation of the Individual Research Proposal, based on the submitted documents and the interview with the PhD student:

Composition of the Committee for the Mid-term Evaluation:

Name and surname	Employing entity	Function in the Committee (Chairperson, Secretary or Member)
1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.

PhD student data:

Name and surname of PhD student:	
Unit:	
Scientific field/discipline:	
Research topic:	
Supervisor (name, surname, academic degree/title, parent unit):	

Supervisor (name, surname, academic degree/title, parent unit):	
Auxiliary supervisor (name, surname, academic degree/title, parent unit):	
PhD student education period (a period of 4 years from the day of beginning of education)	

The following representative of the Doctoral Student Self-government took part in the session of the Committee in (KISD unit): (name and surname of the representative).

The PhD student's supervisor took part / did not take part* in the interview (please enter the supervisor's data):

.....

Mid-term Evaluation Result

Criterion:	Chairperson	Secretary	Member of the Committee	Criterion assessment (graded positively if it receives at least two positive grades from the Committee members):
1. On-time preparation of doctoral dissertation (positive/negative):
2. Progress in research work (positive/negative):

3. Effects of research activity <i>(positive/negative):</i>
4. Activities preparing PhD student to undertake research or research and development work <i>(positive/negative):</i>
Mid-term evaluation result <i>(positive if each criterium is graded positively):</i>	Positive / negative*			
Justification for the result:				
1. On-time preparation of doctoral dissertation:				
2. Progress in research work:				
3. Effects of research activity:				
4. Activities preparing PhD student to undertake research or research and development work:				

**delete as appropriate*

Comments of the Committee (e.g. recommendations and proposals for amendments in the IRP):

.....

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

(signatures of the Committee members)