

## Mid-term evaluation for the doctoral students of the Chemistry programme at the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences of the Jagiellonian University

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to verify progress of a doctoral student at the mid-point of the education period at the doctoral school as well as assessment of quality of scientific guidance provided by the supervisor(s). The mid-term evaluation includes the analysis of documentation related to the personal research schedule of specific PhD student and their progress in the educational programme, a PhD student's presentation and a conversation with such PhD student. Positive result means that general scientific progress of a doctoral student is sufficient to expect timely completion of their doctoral paper.

A primary document on which preparation and proceeding of the mid-term evaluation is based is "Regulamin przeprowadzania oceny śródkresowej w Szkole Doktorskiej Nauk Ścisłych i Przyrodniczych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego" (Mid-term Evaluation Procedure at the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences of the Jagiellonian University) dated 15 April 2021, accepted by the Council of the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences of the Jagiellonian University on 22 April 2021. For the purpose of the Chemistry programme, this document sets out specific time limits for submission of appropriate documents, document descriptions, procedure for providing opinions on the members of the mid-term evaluation committee, the mid-term evaluation process, and the framework criteria for evaluation of a doctoral student.

### 1. Time limits

- 1.1. The mid-term evaluation is carried out before the 24th month of education. The following time limits apply to doctoral students enrolled in regular enrolment; in case of doctoral students in grant-holder enrolment these time limits will be postponed in accordance with the admission times at the Doctoral School.
- 1.2. Specific time of the mid-term evaluation is determined by the Programme Manager and further submitted to the Director of the Doctoral School in the last week of May. The times for committee meetings, as agreed with their members, should be communicated to the School and the doctoral students once determined, however, no later than 6 weeks before the scheduled date of evaluation.
- 1.3. In the first week of July or, in justified cases, no later than 30 days before the scheduled meeting of the committee where the presentation of and conversation with a doctoral student takes place, such doctoral student provides the Manager with a written report on the implementation of their personal research plan, approved by the supervisor(s).
- 1.4. In the second week of July or, in justified cases, no later than 20 days before the scheduled meeting of the committee, the documentation of the personal research plan is provided to the committee members. No later than two business days before the committee meeting, any annexes supplementing scientific, teaching and organisational activities of the doctoral student have to be submitted to the committee members and the Manager by e-mail. The annex is always included in the mid-term evaluation documentation.
- 1.5. The foregoing time limits may be postponed for a few days, depending on the dates of meetings of the Discipline Council in specific calendar year.

### 2. Mid-term evaluation commission

- 2.1. The committee members are selected in accordance with the Act of 20 July 2018 Law on higher education and science. The mid-term evaluation is proceeded by a committee with three members, among them at least one with a degree of *doktor habilitowany* (a post-doctoral degree) or *profesor* (a professor) in the discipline the doctoral paper refers to, employed outside the entity conducting the doctoral school. The supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor are not allowed to be the members of the committee.
- 2.2. For each doctoral student, the composition of the committee is determined separately. The candidates for the committee members should have a significant number of works in the discipline the doctoral paper refers to. The composition of the committee is approved by the Discipline Council; in case of doctoral students in grant-holder enrolment the time limits will be postponed in accordance with the admission times at the Doctoral School.

- 2.3. No later than 6 weeks before the evaluation date, the Programme Manager provides the Director with a request to appoint the Committee with three members, all approved by the Discipline Council, submitting the files of proposed members of the Committee, with one of them indicated as a candidate for its chairperson.

### **3. Documentation**

- 3.1. The personal research plan completion report, providing a description of scientific activities and attached annual review sheets of specific doctoral student, a document showing an analysis of discrepancies against the most recent (and valid) personal research plan (including a list of any courses yet to be completed, if applicable), and the supervisor's opinion.
- 3.2. The doctoral student's review sheets for the last two years of education preceding the mid-term evaluation as provided by USOS (which contains the grades and the ECTS score), and, in case of doctoral students participating in any courses external to the Jagiellonian University, certified grade reports. Such documents serve to verify the educational progress of specific doctoral student at the doctoral school.
- 3.3. The copies (in electronic form) of all published works, divided to the ones related to the doctoral paper and the remaining ones; the doctoral students submits a statement on their contribution to such works.
- 3.4. A statement by the doctoral student, certified by their supervisor, concerning projected form of the doctoral paper (a doctoral paper, a cycle of publications with a foreword).
- 3.5. The scientific report by the doctoral student (no more than 4 pages), including:
  - a description of current state of knowledge in specific research field, including references to the most recent scientific literature;
  - a progress report on the doctoral paper, including preliminary results and their overview (it should include all published works resulting from the doctoral student's own work and indicate their places in the doctoral paper being prepared);
  - an overview of research plans for the remaining period of the doctoral studies.
- 3.6. The supervisor's opinion (no more than 1 page).

The opinion should indicate whether the previous work of the doctoral student has been successfully passed or not. Furthermore, the supervisor makes an assessment whether the student's activities yet to be completed may or may not be successfully completed in the time remaining to the end date of the education period (this refers to preparation of a scientific publication, completion of any research in progress, any new research paths, implementation of any planned courses which have not been completed yet).

### **4. Evaluation process**

As the committee meets with a doctoral student, they present an oral presentation, followed by a conversation concerning the topic of the presentation and the topic of their doctoral paper being prepared, and some answers provided by the student to questions chosen by the committee from a number of questions, previously made public.

- 4.1. A speech in the form of oral presentation of the topic, the purpose, the primary scientific hypotheses of the student's doctoral paper, and a synopsis of major results. The presentation time has to be less than 20 minutes. The presentation must include the following:
  - An introduction, emphasising substantive justification for the choice of the topic and the purpose of the student's work, and its research problem;
  - the hypothesis and the research questions;
  - any major research results which have been achieved yet.

#### 4.2. The conversation with a doctoral student:

- the doctoral students answers the questions of the committee members concerning the presentation, the topic and the research plans;
- they answer 3 questions on general knowledge, taken from a previously determined group of questions; the committee members decide which questions are asked. These questions are selected according to the panels, selected in the course of education, conforming to the Chemistry education programme at the Doctoral School and indicated by the doctoral student in their personal research plan. The coordinators of specific panels will be responsible for preparation and validity of specific panels. A valid list of questions will be made available no later than 2 months before the scheduled date of evaluation.

### 5. Framework criteria of evaluation

The committee evaluates the following items (a weight assigned to each item is provided in parentheses):

- 5.1. implementation of the personal research plan (50%), including:
  - 5.1.1. major theses of the paper being prepared;
  - 5.1.2. methodology of the paper;
  - 5.1.3. the paper's milestones and its progress percentage resulting from the doctoral student's review sheets;
- 5.2. the supervisor's opinion - if negative, a meeting of the supervisor and the committee has to be arranged to explain any problem (no percentage);
- 5.3. the doctoral student's presentation (10%);
- 5.4. the educational progress of specific doctoral student at the doctoral school, including completion of the teaching programme (5%);
- 5.5. the scientific works, including publications, patents, conference speeches (10%);
- 5.6. any awards (5%);
- 5.7. the answers to the questions asked by the committee (20%).

### 6. Evaluation result

The mid-term evaluation is concluded with a positive or negative result, communicated to the doctoral student immediately after the meeting is closed. The evaluation is a result and its justification are both public. If appropriate, the committee will recommend remedies, and the supervisor should ensure such remedies are implemented, if possible.

### 7. Extraordinary circumstances

In case of any unforeseen random events, it is possible to change the date of the mid-term evaluation provided that the promoter and the programme manager have approved it. Any replacement of the member of the mid-term commission has to be approved by the doctoral school. Such replacement has to be made with the amount of remaining time sufficient for the commission members to get familiar with relevant documentation.