

Mid-term evaluation scenario

Definitions and abbreviations:

DS - Doctoral School at the University of Silesia in Katowice

IRP - individual research plan (template available at: <https://us.edu.pl/szkola-doktorska/en/indywidualny-plan-badawczy/>),

report - a report on the implementation of the education program and the implementation of PhD candidate's individual research plan at the Doctoral School at the University of Silesia in Katowice (template on the website: <https://us.edu.pl/szkola-doktorska/en/indywidualny-plan-badawczy/>),

abstract - an overview document on the research project, prepared by the PhD candidate for members of the scientific council - a summary of the substantive part of IRP (up to 2000 characters)

The course of the mid-term evaluation:

1. The PhD candidate completes the 2nd year of education and submits to the doctoral office the report signed by himself/herself and the Supervisor (s) (in a scan and paper document).

2. The PhD candidate submits an application to the doctoral office for a mid-term evaluation (template on the page: ...). The proposal initiates a mid-term evaluation. Suppose the doctoral candidate passes a year earlier and is not yet ready for the mid-term evaluation (e.g. waiting for the publication to be published). In that case, he may delay the submission of the application up to September 30. After this date, the assessment is initiated ex officio by the Doctoral School.

3. From the moment of applying, Doctoral School has 14 days to initiate the mid-term evaluation (from July 10 to August 30 - 30 days), that is, to start the first stage of the evaluation.

4. The doctoral office settles the PhD candidate, Dean of the Doctoral School credits the PhD candidate for a year.

5. The PhD candidate sends the Supervisor an abstract.

6. The Dean of Doctoral School asks the institute's director to include the PhD candidates' speech in the institute council's program (or convene an additional council meeting devoted exclusively to PhD candidates joining the mid-term evaluation). The application shall be appended with:

- 1) abstract
- 2) a list of members of PhD candidate's evaluation committee with e-mail addresses,
- 3) the PhD candidate's e-mail address.

7. The director of the institute sends an invitation to the institute council meeting devoted to the PhD candidate and the members of the institute council, members of the PhD candidate evaluation committees concerned by this meeting, as well as supervisors, auxiliary supervisors, and PhD candidates themselves (in this part of the meeting, apart from the members of the institute council, the following participants are: at least two out of three members of the evaluation committee and the Supervisor/Supervisors).

8. The Doctoral School Office sends the chairman of the evaluation committee the report of IRP approved by the Dean and the attachments.

9. The PhD candidate appear before the institute council, presenting his research project and paying particular attention to the already-completed parts of IRP (he has a maximum of twenty minutes).

10. Members of the institute council, members of the evaluation committee, and the PhD candidates' Supervisor (s) participate in the discussion.

11. The PhD candidates' speech is recorded in the minutes of the institute council meeting (name and surname of the PhD candidate and the subject of the project).

ROLE OF PhD CANDIDATE, SUPERVISOR, INSTITUTE DIRECTOR AND MEMBERS OF THE INSTITUTE COUNCIL IN THE MID-TERM ASSESSMENT

The PhD candidate

1. Suppose the PhD candidate wants to start the mid-term evaluation before September 30, 2021. In that case, he/she submits an application to the Dean of the DS for participation in the mid-term evaluation.
2. The PhD candidate completes the second year of education, that is:
 - 1) the PhD candidate has grades from all classes in which he participated,
 - 2) the PhD candidate has a confirmation of the classes conducted as part of the academic internship (point c of the report),
 - 3) the PhD candidate submits a report for two years (from the beginning of education in DS).
 - a) link to the report from: <https://us.edu.pl/szkola-doktorska/en/indywidualny-plan-badawczy/>
 - b) link to the place where the doctoral student uploads the report: <https://formularze.us.edu.pl/form/index/2590>.
3. The PhD candidate submits an application to the Doctoral School office for a mid-term evaluation (**template on the page:**)
4. The PhD candidate prepares an abstract and sends it to the Supervisor for approval.
5. The PhD candidate appears before the institute council, presenting his/her research project and paying particular attention to the already completed IRP parts (he/she has a maximum of twenty minutes for this) and then discusses it.

A Supervisor (Supervisors):

1. Provides opinions and signs the report.
2. Accepts the abstract.
3. Participates in the institute council meeting where the PhD candidate presents his/her research project and may participate in the discussion after the PhD candidate's speech.
4. If invited to the final evaluation committee meeting, the Supervisor participates in this meeting.

Chairman of the evaluation committee:

1. After receiving the report and IRP of the PhD candidate from the doctoral office, the Chairman forwards the documents to other commission members.

2. The Chairman makes sure that all commission members know about the meeting of the institute council.
3. The Chairman agrees with the commission members on the date of the commission's final meeting; informs the PhD candidate and the Supervisor(s) as well as the doctoral office about this date. The Chairman determines the validity of the supervisors' participation in this interview and invites him/her to a meeting with the committee.
4. The Chairman participates in the institute council meeting attended by the PhD candidate and discusses his/her project.
5. The Chairman organizes the final evaluation committee meeting, **during the PhD candidate's IRP implementation is assessed** and takes place an interview with the PhD candidate (and - if the committee decided so – with the supervisor as well), and prepares the meeting protocol (on the template provided by the Doctoral School).

Evaluation committee members:

1. They participate in the institute council meeting attended by the PhD candidate and participate in the discussion on his/her project (at least two out of three committee members).
2. They participate in the final meeting of the evaluation committee, where the implementation of the PhD candidate's IRP is assessed.
3. If the PhD candidate is invited to the meeting of the commission, they conduct a conversation with him/her on the implementation of IRP and the resulting research plans; if the supervisor is invited to the meeting, they conduct a conversation with him/her on the implementation of the PhD candidate's research plan. Meetings that take place after September 30 this year, due to the change in the regulations, obligatorily take into account the presence of the PhD candidate.
4. During the meeting, they adopt a resolution on mid-term evaluation. The assessment can be positive or negative.
5. The resolution of the committee is adopted by voting. The vote is open unless a member of the committee requests that a secret vote be held.
6. The Commission adopts a resolution by an absolute majority of votes (positive assessment is at least two votes for a positive mid-term evaluation).
7. They prepare the justification of the assessment - both in the case of a positive and negative assessment.

Director of the Institute

1. At the Dean's request, DS shall include the PhD candidate's speech in the program of the institute council or organize a separate meeting. Invites to this meeting:
 - 1) members of the institute council,
 - 2) members of the evaluation committee,
 - 3) the Supervisor (s),
 - 4) the PhD candidate,

by sending them a link to the meeting.

2. Members of the institute council are informed about the inclusion of the PhD candidate's speech in the council's program and send them an abstract provided by the supervisor and information on the role of the institute council in the mid-term evaluation of the PhD candidate.

Members of the institute's scientific council

1. They participate in the meeting at which the PhD candidate presents his/her research project.
2. They participate in the discussion after the PhD candidate's speech.
3. The PhD candidate's presentation does not require a vote or a resolution of the institute council. It should only be recorded in the protocole of the meeting.