**MINUTES OF THE EVALUATION COMMISSION MEETING**

**appointed to carry out the mid-term evaluation of a PhD student**

1. Full name of a PhD student:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Date of commencement of education: academic year 2019/2020

3. ORCID:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Scientific discipline:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. The planned title of the doctoral dissertation:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. Name and last name of a PhD supervisor(s), degree or scientific title:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. Name and last name of the auxiliary supervisor (if designated):

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. Members of the mid-term Evaluation Committee:

1) chair of the Committee (name and last name, degree or scientific title, position):

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2) member of the Committee (name and last name, degree or scientific title, position):

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3) member of the Committee (name and last name, degree or scientific title, position):

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. Date of presentation at the meeting of the Scientific Council of the Institute:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Date of mid-term evaluation of a PhD student:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Questions posed to the PhD student (both at the second stage, at the Scientific Council meeting of the Institute, and at the third stage):

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

12. The Evaluation Committee, acting on the basis of Article 19 of the Resolution No. 75 of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of January 26, 2021 on defining the Regulations of the Doctoral School at the University of Silesia in Katowice has conducted a mid-term evaluation of

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

After reviewing the Individual Research Plan, the Report on the execution of the educational program and the execution of the Individual Research Plan, the supervisor’s opinion, hearing the presentation at the meeting of the Scientific Council of the Institute, having discussion with the PhD student and discussion with the supervisor[[1]](#footnote-1), the Committee issues the following evaluation:

 …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**RESULT OF MID-TERM EVALUATION (positive/negative):**

13. Vote results:

 Number of votes for positive evaluation: ..............................................

 Number of votes for negative evaluation: ..............................................

 Number of votes abstaining: .............................................

14. Remarks:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

15. Detailed justification of the Commission on the result of the mid-term evaluation (justify the result in detail; under the Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science [Ustawa z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce], the evaluation result with justification is public and will be published):

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

16. Signatures of the members of the Evaluation Committee:

1) (name and last name of the chair, signature)

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2) (name and last name of the member, signature)

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3) (name and last name of the member, signature)

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

1. Cross out if the discussion has not taken place. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)