

Regulations of mid-term evaluation in the Poznań University of Life Sciences Doctoral School

§ 1 General regulations

1. The following regulations determine the manner of conducting the mid-term evaluation at the Poznań University of Life Sciences Doctoral School.
2. Realisation of the individual research plan prepared by the Ph.D. student is subject to a mid-term evaluation in the middle of the education period specified in the education programme – at the Poznań University of Life Sciences the deadline is by the end of September in the 4th semester.
3. Whenever these Regulations refer to:
 - 1) PULS – Poznań University of Life Sciences, hereinafter referred to as PULS,
 - 2) The Statute of the Poznań University of Life Sciences, hereinafter referred to as the Statute,
 - 3) Poznań University of Life Sciences Doctoral School, hereinafter referred to as the School,
 - 4) The Regulations of PULS Doctoral School, passed by the Senate of the Poznań University of Life Sciences Doctoral School, hereinafter referred to as the Regulations,
 - 5) Scientific Council of Discipline, mentioned in § 37 of the Statute, hereinafter referred to as the Scientific Council, of the respective scientific discipline of the PhD student.
 - 6) The Committee of the Discipline – mentioned in § 6 of the Regulations, of the respective scientific discipline of the PhD student.
 - 7) The Director of PULS Doctoral School, mentioned in the Regulations, hereinafter referred to as the Director.
 - 8) The Mid-term evaluation Committee – appointed and acting according to the Regulations, especially § 13, hereinafter referred to as the Committee,
 - 9) The Doctoral School Council - hereinafter referred to as the the School Council, mentioned mentioned in § 6 of the Regulations.
4. The mid-term evaluation schedule in graphic form is attached as Appendix 4.

§ 2 The Committee

1. The mid-term evaluation is performed by a committee composed of 3 members, neither of whom can be the PhD student's scientific supervisor.

2. At least one member of the Committee must be employed outside the Poznań University of Life Sciences, having a post-doctoral degree of [doktor habilitowany, comparable to DSc or Assistant Professor] or full professor in the discipline, in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared.
3. The committee members employed outside the Poznań University of Life Sciences are entitled to remuneration amounting to 20% remuneration of a Professor.
4. Not later than by the end of May the School Director presents the Council of the respective Discipline with a list of Ph.D. students subjected to the mid-term evaluation along with a request to propose min. 6 candidates for the committee for the mid-term evaluation, including min. 2 persons not being PULS employees. Individual research plans of the Ph.D. students are attached to this list.
5. A separate committee is appointed for each discipline. The Scientific Council of Discipline, if needed, may decide that there will be more than one Committee appointed within a single discipline.
6. Not later than by the middle of June the Scientific Council of the Discipline presents the chairman of the Committee of the respective Discipline with a list of candidate members of the committee for the mid-term evaluation. At least two members of the Committee must fulfill the criteria indicated in points 1 & 2. Being appointed for one Committee does not exclude from participation in another Committee.
7. Within 14 days from the receipt of this list of candidates proposed by the Scientific Council of the Discipline the Committee of the Discipline selects members of the committee for the mid-term evaluation and its chairman and informs the School Director.
8. The committee is appointed by the Rector.

§ 3 The presentation before the Committee of the Discipline

1. In agreement with the members of the Committee, the chairman of the Discipline Committee sets a date for the mid-term evaluation.
2. Not later than 60 days before the mid-term evaluation, not later than July 15th, the chairman of the Committee of the respective Discipline informs the Ph.D. students and

their scientific supervisor or scientific supervisors on the venue and date of the mid-term evaluation, at the same time informing the Ph.D. students on the date and venue for the presentation of their self-presentation and the submission of their report.

3. Under exceptional circumstances and in the case of chance events (suspension of the Ph.D. student, maternity leave, a state of natural disaster) the School Director may propose a modification of the schedule for individual stages of the mid-term evaluation, provided that the date of the mid-term evaluation is accepted both by the chairman of the committee for the mid-term evaluation and the Ph.D. student, as well as the scientific supervisor or scientific supervisors.
4. Not later than 30 days before the specified date of the mid-term evaluation, not later than the end of July, Ph.D. students submit to the respective Committee of the respective discipline reports from the realisation of their individual research plans (Attachment 1) authorised by their scientific supervisor or supervisors, with the reports including information concerning:
 - 1) the degree of progress in the execution of the research tasks comprising their Ph.D. dissertations;
 - 2) compliance with the schedule presented in their individual research plans;
 - 3) additional activities and accomplishments, including the realisation of the education programme and internships/placements.
5. Ph.D. students present the contents of the report in person in the form of a presentation (e.g. Power Point) before the Committee of their Discipline.
6. Immediately after the completion of their presentation the Ph.D. students submit their reports to the Committee of their Discipline, which promptly hands over the reports to the chairman of the respective committee conducting the mid-term evaluation, according to the previously set dates.

§ 4 Mid-term evaluation

1. The Committee for the mid-term evaluation interviews Ph.D. students, as well as their scientific supervisor or supervisors concerning the submitted report. Representatives of the Self-government of PhD students participate in the meetings of this Committee in an advisory capacity.

2. The interview with the PhD student is open.
3. This interview proceeds as follows:
 - 1) a 15-minute presentation (e.g. Power Point), during which the Ph.D. students discuss their reports and explain potential alternations and modifications in their individual research plans;
 - 2) questions asked by the committee members to the Ph.D. students concerning their reports and future actions aiming at completion and submission of the Ph.D. dissertation;
 - 3) questions asked by the committee members to the scientific supervisor or scientific supervisors concerning their scientific supervision and the progress in the realisation of the Ph.D. dissertation;
 - 4) a discussion between the mid-term evaluation committee and individual Ph.D. students and their scientific supervisor or scientific supervisors.
4. After the interview the Committee debates and by a majority vote makes a decision on the result of the mid-term evaluation (positive or negative). The debate and voting are classified.
5. Upon the completion of the vote the committee informs verbally the Ph.D. student and the scientific supervisor or scientific supervisors on the evaluation result, quoting the motive for the decision.
6. The Committee prepares the minutes from the proceedings of the mid-term evaluation (Attachment 2), which are signed by all the committee members. An attachment to the minutes is the mid-term evaluation card (Attachment 3).
7. A score of min. 65 points out of the total of 100 points needs to be obtained for a positive result of the mid-term evaluation.
8. Minutes from the mid-term evaluation proceedings together with the evaluation card are promptly handed over to the School Director. The minutes from the proceedings of the mid-term evaluation are open and the Ph.D. students as well as their scientific supervisor or scientific supervisors may read them at the School office.
9. The School Director informs in writing the Ph.D. student and the scientific supervisor or scientific supervisors on the result of the mid-term evaluation not later than 7 days from the receipt of the evaluation card.
10. Ph.D. students may appeal against the negative result of the mid-term evaluation to the School Council within 14 days of the date when the results of this evaluation were made public.

11. In the case of a negative evaluation result the Ph.D. student is discontinued by the administrative decision issued by the School Director based on the power of attorney granted by the Rector.
12. In the case of a positive mid-term evaluation result the Ph.D. student continues education and the scholarship amount is increased as specified in the Act of 20 July 2018 - the Act on Higher Education and Science.