

ORDER No. 1/2021
of the Head of Doctoral School at the Maria Grzegorzewska University
of 12 January 2021

on establishing a schedule of the work of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee and establishing the mid-term evaluation form and the individual research plan report form.

Pursuant to §20 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of 20 March 2019, the consolidated text of which constitutes an appendix to Resolution No. 249a/2019 of the Senate of the Maria Grzegorzewska University of 18 December 2019, as amended, I hereby order as follows:

§1

The schedule of work of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee is hereby established as set out in Appendix No. 1.

§2

A mid-term evaluation form is introduced as set out in Appendix No. 2.

§3

A report form for the implementation of the individual research plan is introduced as set out in Appendix No. 3.

§4

The Order comes into force on the date it is adopted.

Anna Zajenkowska

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Zajenkowska', is written over the printed name.

SCHEDULE OF WORK OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION COMMITTEE

stage	period	activities	performer
1	by 15.01	Designation of external members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.	scientific council
2	by 29.01	Establishment of a Mid-term Evaluation Committee.	rector
3	by 15.02	Submission of the report prepared by the doctoral student on the implementation of the IRP (as of 30.01.2021).	doctoral student
4	16.02	Submission of materials to the Mid-term Evaluation Committee	BOPA
5	22-26.03	Presentations by doctoral students.	doctoral students
6	31.03	Announcement of evaluations with justification.	committee

MID-TERM EVALUATION FORM

doctoral student:

Documents subject to evaluation:

1. Individual research plan;
2. Research project - as an appendix to the IRP;
3. Report of the doctoral student on the implementation of the IRP.

The subject of the evaluation is the implementation of the individual research plan by the doctoral student.

The form must include a justification for the score assessment of each evaluated element. The prerequisite for a positive evaluation by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee is to obtain at least 9 points, both for the compliance of the implementation with the plan and timeliness of task completion, as well as for the substantive evaluation of the tasks carried out, including the research project carried out.

Evaluation criteria:

Criterion	Points
Compliance with the plan and the timeliness of task completion (0-12 points) Justification:	
Substantive evaluation of the tasks carried out (0-12 points) including:	
- scientific level of the tasks carried out (0-6 points) Justification:	
- innovative nature of the tasks carried out (0-3 points) Justification:	
- impact of implementation of the research project on the development of the scientific discipline (0-3 points) Justification:	
TOTAL:	

Opinion:

positive / negative

Justification

--

Signatures:

Warsaw, date:

--	--	--

Warsaw, date:

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN - REPORT

A. DOCTORAL STUDENT INFORMATION	
FIRST AND LAST NAME	
STUDENT ID NUMBER	
YEAR OF COMMENCEMENT OF STUDIES AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL	

B. DOCTORAL DISSERTATION	
TITLE OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION	
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE	
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION (PURPOSE, RESEARCH PROBLEM, RESEARCH HYPOTHESES, THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL BENEFITS; MAX 500 WORDS)	
SUBMISSION DEADLINE FOR THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION	
SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	

ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	
TASKS OF SUPERVISOR/ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR	
PLANNED NUMBER OF CONSULTATION HOURS WITH SUPERVISOR OR ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR IN 1ST, 2ND, AND 3RD YEAR OF STUDY	

C. DETAILED RESEARCH PLAN COVERING THE PERIOD OF STUDIES AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL

YEAR OF STUDY	RESEARCH TASK NAME	IMPLEMENTATION
I		
II		

D. PLANNED OUTCOMES OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES	IMPLEMENTATION
1. SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES/OTHER PUBLICATIONS	
2. PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCES/SYMPOSIA/CONVENTIONS	
3. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL/NATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS	

E. PLAN OF ACTIVITIES AIMED AT ENHANCING COMPETENCIES TO PREPARE THE DOCTORAL STUDENT FOR RESEARCH AND/OR RESEARCH AND TEACHING WORK		
YEAR OF STUDY	ACTIVITY	IMPLEMENTATION
I		
II		
III		

F. TIMELINE FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION			
Item	Deadline/implementation period	Planned stages of dissertation preparation ¹	IMPLEMENTATION
1ST YEAR OF STUDY (academic year 20...../20.....)			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

2ND YEAR OF STUDY (academic year 20...../20.....)			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

.....

(date and signature of the doctoral student)

G. SUPERVISOR'S OPINION*

* - opinion consulted with assistant supervisor

.....

(date and signature of the supervisor)

.....

(date and signature of the assistant supervisor)

ORDER No. 6/2022
of the Head of Doctoral School
of the Maria
Grzegorzewska University
of 19 December 2022

on establishing a schedule of the work of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee and guidelines for conducting the mid-term evaluation in the 2022/2023 academic year, as well as establishing the mid-term evaluation form, the individual research plan report form and the mid-term evaluation review form

Pursuant to § 12(1)(7) and § 20(1) of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, adopted by Resolution No. 138/2019 of the Senate of the University of 20 March 2019 on the adoption of the Regulations of the Doctoral School run by the Maria Grzegorzewska University, as amended, the consolidated text of which constitutes Appendix No. 1 to Resolution No. 346/2022 of the Senate of the University of 27 April 2022 (hereinafter referred to as: "Regulations"), it is hereby ordered as follows:

§ 1

1. The following are introduced:

- 1) Guidelines for conducting a mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of the University, which is attached as Appendix No. 1 to this Order;
- 2) Schedule for conducting a mid-term evaluation in the 2022/2023 academic year, which is attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Order;
- 3) Individual Research Plan (IRP) Report Form, which is attached as Appendix No. 3 to this Order;
- 4) Mid-term evaluation review form, which is attached as Appendix No. 4 to this Order;
- 5) Mid-term evaluation form, which is attached as Appendix No. 5 to this Order.

§ 2

The Order comes into force on the date it is signed.

Head of Doctoral School:

PhD Hab. Aleksandra Tłuściak-Deliowska, professor at the University

Appendix No. 1
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
of 19 December 2022

**GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A MID-TERM EVALUATION
AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY IN THE 2022/2023 ACADEMIC YEAR**

1. The rules and procedures for conducting the mid-term evaluation are specified by:

- ✓ Article 202 (2-5) of the Act;
- ✓ § 20 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the University.

2. A detailed schedule of dates for the mid-term evaluation is set forth in Appendix No. 2 to this Order.

3. The mid-term evaluation is carried out in four stages:

Stage 1 - submission by the doctoral student of a written Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan, constituting Appendix No. 3 to this Order.

Stage 2 - reviews of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan prepared on the basis of the doctoral student's documentation (i.e. report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan, Individual Research Plan, Research Project to date). The review form is attached as Appendix No. 4 to this Order. Reviews are written by two reviewers appointed by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. The reviewer is not a member of the Committee. Reviews are made available to members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, as well as to doctoral students.

Stage 3 – meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee consisting of two parts:

- 1) in the first part interviews are held with doctoral students. An element of the interview is a short presentation on the progress of the preparation on the doctoral student's dissertation (up to 15 minutes) and a discussion. The doctoral student is required to answer the Committee's questions related to the implementation of the IRP;
- 2) in the second, closed part (without the participation of the doctoral student), the Committee discusses and evaluates the implementation of the IRP and prepares a justification for the evaluation. The Committee's mid-term evaluation form is attached as Appendix No. 5 to this Order.

Stage 4 - announcement of the results of the mid-term evaluation.

4. The Committee conducts a mid-term evaluation on the basis of:

- ✓ reports of the doctoral student on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan;
- ✓ reviews of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan by two reviewers;
- ✓ Individual Research Plan;
- ✓ Research Project;
- ✓ presentation and interview with the doctoral student.

5. The Committee's evaluation is determined by consensus. In the absence of consensus, the Committee decides by vote in line with the rules set forth in the Statute of the University provided for the procedure of collegiate bodies in personnel matters.

6. The evaluation can be positive or negative. A positive evaluation requires the doctoral student to receive recommendations from two reviewers both for compliance with the plan and the timeliness of task completion, as well as for the substantive evaluation of completed tasks, including the ongoing research project.

7. The evaluation and its justification are public.

Appendix No. 2
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
of 19 December 2022

SCHEDULE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION IN THE 2022/2023 ACADEMIC YEAR

A detailed schedule for conducting the mid-term evaluation is set forth in the table:

Item	Date	Activities	Performer
1	By 30.12.2022	Submission of nominations for reviewers for each doctoral student undergoing mid-term evaluation in the 2021/2022 academic year by the Chairs of Councils of the Discipline.	Chair of Councils of the Discipline
2	By 30.12.2022	Selection of external members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.	Scientific Council of Doctoral School
3	By 20.01.2023	Establishment of a Mid-term Evaluation Committee.	Rector
4	By 31.01.2023	Appointment for each doctoral student undergoing mid-term evaluation in 2022/2023 of two reviewers from three candidates nominated by the Council of the Discipline relevant to the doctoral dissertation.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees
5	by 03.02.2023	Submission of a written report on the implementation of the IRP (as at 31.01.2023) by doctoral students to the Office for Academic Promotion.	Doctoral Students
6	By 10.02.2023	Submission of doctoral students' documentation (i.e. reports on the progress of their individual research plan, together with individual research plans and research projects) to reviewers appointed by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee for assessment.	Office for Academic Promotion
7	By 26.02.2023	Review date.	Reviewers
8	By 05.03.2023	Submission of doctoral students' documentation and reviews to members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.	Office for Academic Promotion
9	By 05.03.2023	Submission of reviews to doctoral students.	Office for Academic Promotion
10	15-24.03.2023	Meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, including presentations by doctoral students and interviews with doctoral students; preparation of evaluations.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees; Doctoral students
11	By 31.03.2023	Announcement of evaluations with justification.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees; Office for Academic Promotion



Appendix No. 3
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
of 19 December 2022

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP)

GENERAL INFORMATION

A. DOCTORAL STUDENT INFORMATION	
FIRST AND LAST NAME	
STUDENT ID NUMBER	
YEAR OF COMMENCEMENT OF STUDIES AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL	

B. DOCTORAL DISSERTATION	
TITLE OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION	
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE	
PLANNED DATE OF SUBMISSION OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION COMPLIANT WITH THE IRP	
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION (Briefly state the scope of the thesis; describe the research problem, the objective adopted, the expected results; max. 500 words)	
SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	
ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	

ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP)

Each time, the status of the task implementation should be specified as: (1) completed, (2) in progress, (3) not completed.

For (1) completed task, specify the results.

For (2) task in progress, describe the measurable results to date.
In the case of delays in implementation, the reason should be explained.

For (3) task not completed, state the reason for non-implementation and describe the corrective actions taken.

C. DETAILED RESEARCH PLAN COVERING THE PERIOD OF STUDIES AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL		
YEAR OF STUDY	NAME OF RESEARCH TASK	STATUS OF COMPLETION
I		
II		

D. PLANNED OUTCOMES OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES	STATUS OF COMPLETION
1. SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES/OTHER PUBLICATIONS	
2. PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCES/SYMPOSIA/CONVENTIONS	
3. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL/NATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS	

E. PLAN OF ACTIVITIES AIMED AT ENHANCING COMPETENCIES TO PREPARE THE DOCTORAL STUDENT FOR RESEARCH AND/OR RESEARCH AND TEACHING WORK		
YEAR OF STUDY	ACTIVITY	STATUS OF COMPLETION
I		

II		

F. TIMELINE FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION			
No.	Deadline/implementation period	Planned stages of dissertation preparation	STATUS OF COMPLETION
1ST YEAR OF STUDY (academic year 20...../20.....)			
1			
2			
3			
4			
2ND YEAR OF STUDY (academic year 20...../20.....)			
1			
2			
3			
4			

I confirm the truthfulness of the data provided in the report with my own signature

..... <i>Date of report</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the doctoral student</i>
Confirmation of the assistant supervisor (if appointed)	
..... <i>Date</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the assistant supervisor</i>

Confirmation of the supervisor	
..... Date	 Legible signature of the supervisor

Appendix No. 4
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
of 19 December 2022

MID-TERM EVALUATION REVIEW FORM

FIRST AND LAST NAME OF DOCTORAL STUDENT:	
FIRST AND LAST NAME OF THE REVIEWER	

The review focuses on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by the doctoral student.

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASKS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP):

PLEASE SELECT THE CORRECT ONE:		
☐	RECOMMENDATION	In accordance with the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the University can be granted in two cases: ✓ most of the tasks are carried out, with reasons provided for why some tasks have not been completed, and alternative solutions are proposed, or ✓ all tasks have been completed.
☐	NO RECOMMENDATION	It means that most tasks are not being carried out.
JUSTIFICATION		

SUBSTANTIVE EVALUATION OF ONGOING TASKS, INCLUDING THE RESEARCH PROJECT:

PLEASE SELECT THE CORRECT ONE:		
☐	RECOMMENDATION	In accordance with the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the University can be granted in two cases: ✓ The project is promising: meaning that the scientific quality of the tasks performed suggests that the doctoral dissertation will receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process ✓ The project is promising (with remarks): meaning that the scientific quality of the tasks performed is promising enough for the doctoral dissertation to receive positive

		reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process, but improvements and adherence to the reviewer's comments are necessary.
☐	NO RECOMMENDATION	It means that the scientific quality of the tasks carried out does not promise that the dissertation will receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process.
JUSTIFICATION		

WEAKNESSES AND STRENGTHS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT AND THE TASKS COMPLETED

WEAKNESSES	
STRENGTHS	
TIPS FOR THE FUTURE AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	

.....
Reviewer's signature

Appendix No. 5
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
of 19 December 2022

MID-TERM EVALUATION FORM

Name of doctoral student:

Name of the supervisor:

Name of the assistant supervisor (if appointed):
.....

Scientific discipline:

Year of commencement of studies at the doctoral school of the University:
.....

Mid-term Evaluation Committee composed of:

Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs:
.....

Head of Doctoral School:

External member:

at a meeting held on

carried out

- ☐ in stationary mode
- ☐ in mixed (hybrid) mode
- ☐ remotely by means of electronic communication

evaluated the implementation of the Individual Research Plan of Ms./Mr.

.....

doctoral student of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University in Warsaw.

The Committee reviewed the documentation for the mid-term evaluation:

- ✓ report of the doctoral student on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan
- ✓ reviews of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan
- ✓ Individual Research Plan
- ✓ Research Project

and after the presentation and interview with the doctoral student

proceeded to a discussion, during which it was pointed out that

.....

.....

.....
.....

(start from the new page - public part)

RESULT OF MID-TERM EVALUATION

Mid-term evaluation of Ms./Mr.

.....
.

ended with the result

- ☐ positive
☐ negative

Justification for the mid-term evaluation:

.....
.....

Warsaw,

Member of the Committee	Name, university	Signature
Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs		
Head of Doctoral School		
External member		

ORDER No. 7/2023
of the Head of Doctoral School
of the Maria Grzegorzewska University
of 1 December 2023

on establishing a schedule of the work of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee and a detailed description of the conduct of the Mid-term Evaluation and establishing the Mid-term Evaluation form, the individual research plan report form, the review form on the implementation of the individual research plan, and the statement of the reviewer/member of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee

Pursuant to § 12(1)(7) and § 20(1) of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, adopted by Resolution No. 138/2019 of the Senate of the University of 20 March 2019 on the adoption of the Regulations of the Doctoral School run by the Maria Grzegorzewska University, as amended, the consolidated text of which constitutes Appendix No. 1 to Resolution No. 523/2023 of the Senate of the University of 22 March 2023 (hereinafter referred to as: "Regulations"), it is hereby ordered as follows:

§ 1

1. The following are introduced: 1) Schedule for the conduct of the mid-term evaluation in the 2023/2024 academic year, which is attached as Appendix No. 1 to this Order;
 - 1) A detailed description of the conduct of the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of the University in the 2023/2024 academic year, which is attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Order;
 - 2) Individual Research Plan (IRP) Report Form, which is attached as Appendix No. 3 to this Order;
 - 3) Review form on the implementation of the individual research plan, which is attached as Annex No. 4 to this Order;
 - 4) Mid-term evaluation form, which is attached as Appendix No. 5 to this Order.
 - 5) Statement of the reviewer/member of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, which is attached as Appendix No. 6 to this Order.

§ 2

The Order comes into force on the date it is signed.

Head of Doctoral School
PhD Hab. Aleksandra Tłuściak-Deliowska, professor at the University

Appendix No. 1
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 7 of 1 December 2023

**Schedule for the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University
for the 2023/2024 academic year**

A detailed schedule for conducting the mid-term evaluation is set forth in the table:

Date	Action	Performer(s)
by 6.12.2023 (Wednesday)	Nomination of candidates from outside the entity running the Doctoral School to the Mid-term Evaluation Committee for each discipline in which doctoral students are educated in the 2023/2024 academic year.	Council of the Doctoral School
by 6.12.2023 (Wednesday)	Request to the Chairs of Councils of the Discipline to nominate three candidates for reviewers for each doctoral student subject to mid-term evaluation in the 2023/2024 academic year.	Head of Doctoral School
by 20.12.2023 (Wednesday)	Submission of nominations for reviewers for doctoral students undergoing mid-term evaluation in the 2023/2024 academic year by the Chairs of Councils of the Discipline.	Chair of Councils of the Discipline
by 19.01.2024 (Friday)	Appointment of a Mid-term Evaluation Committee for each discipline in which doctoral students are educated in the 2023/2024 academic year.	Rector
by 31.01.2024 (Wednesday)	Appointment of two reviewers from among three candidates nominated by the Councils of the Discipline for each doctoral student undergoing mid-term evaluation in the 2023/2024 academic year.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees
by 05.02.2024 (Monday)	Submission by doctoral students who commenced their studies at the Doctoral School on 1 October 2022 to the Office for Academic Promotion of a report on the implementation of the IRP (as at 31 January 2024) in paper form, in accordance with the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School. Doctoral students who began their education later than 01.10.2022 deliver the report one month before the end of the fourth semester of education at the Doctoral School ¹ .	Doctoral students undergoing mid-term evaluation
by 12.02.2024 (Monday)	Submission to the reviewers appointed by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee of the following documents necessary for the mid-term evaluation in electronic form: — Individual Research Plan (with a detailed research project) — Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.	Administration of the Doctoral School

¹ Further activities related to the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students who began education at the Doctoral School later than 1.10.2022 take place during the last month of the fourth semester of education including the announcement of the results of the mid-term evaluation. Information on the date of the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students who began their education at the Doctoral School later than 1 October 2022 will be sent individually to the e-mail account in the @aps.edu.pl domain.

by 26.02.2024 (Monday)	Review date.	Reviewers appointed by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee
by 04.03.2024 (Monday)	Forwarding to members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee of the following documents necessary for the mid-term evaluation: — Individual Research Plan (with a detailed research project) — Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan — Reviews of the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.	Administration of the Doctoral School
by 04.03.2024 (Monday)	Provision of electronic reviews of the implementation of Individual Research Plans to doctoral students.	Administration of the Doctoral School
13-22.03.2024 (Wednesday- Friday)	Completion of mid-term evaluation by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, including presentations of doctoral students' achievements and interviews with doctoral students.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees; Doctoral students undergoing mid-term evaluation
by 29.03.2024 (Friday)	Announcement of the results of the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students, together with justification.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees; Administration of the Doctoral School

**Detailed description of the process for the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of
the Academy of Special Education
for the academic year 2023/2024**

Pursuant to the Act of 20 July 2018 – The Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended) and the Regulations of the Doctoral School adopted by the Senate of the Maria Grzegorzewska Academy of Special Education, a mid-term evaluation of doctoral students shall be conducted. The mid-term evaluation is subject to the implementation of the individual research plan, in particular, the timeliness and quality of tasks resulting from the doctoral dissertation preparation schedule.

The course of the mid-term evaluation:

1. The Doctoral Student shall submit a written Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (attached as Appendix No. 3 to the Order) by the date specified in the mid-term evaluation schedule (attached as Appendix No. 2 to the Order) to the Office for Academic Promotion Procedures.
2. The administration office of the Doctoral School sends electronic versions of the following documents necessary for the mid-term evaluation to the two reviewers appointed by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee:
 - Individual Research Plan (with a detailed research project)
 - Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.
3. Based on the above-mentioned documentation, the reviewers prepare reviews on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by the doctoral student according to the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School (attached as Appendix No. 4 to the Order). The review comprises two criteria:
 - implementation of tasks in accordance with the Individual Research Plan (IRP)

- Substantive evaluation of ongoing activities, including the research project.

The review must include a justification for the assessment of each evaluated element. Additionally, the reviewer should, where possible, provide a descriptive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the research project and completed tasks, as well as offer guidance for the future.

The prepared reviews are part of the documentation necessary for the mid-term evaluation of a doctoral student which is forwarded to other members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. Reviews are also made available to the doctoral student before the interview with the Committee.

4. Members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee will review the documentation necessary for the evaluation. They hold meetings during which the implementation of the doctoral student's IRP is evaluated. During the meeting:

- interviews with doctoral students are held. Part of the interview is a short presentation on the progress of the preparation on the doctoral student's dissertation (up to 15 minutes) and a scientific discussion. The doctoral student is required to answer the Committee's questions related to the implementation of the IRP;
- the Committee, without the participation of the doctoral student, discusses and evaluates the implementation of the IRP and prepares an evaluation with justification.

When conducting the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student's implementation of the IRP, the Committee takes into account the following aspects:

- an assessment of the timeliness and quality of tasks resulting from the doctoral dissertation preparation schedule included in the IRP and the consistency of these activities with the Individual Research Plan,
- an assessment of the presentation prepared and delivered by the doctoral student;
- an assessment of replies to the Committee's questions.

The evaluation can be positive or negative. The Committee decides by vote in line with the rules set forth in the Statute of the Academy of Special Education provided for the procedure of collegiate bodies in personnel matters. The evaluation and justification

are recorded in the Mid-term Evaluation Form established by the Head of the Doctoral School (Appendix 5 to the Order).

5. The results of the mid-term assessment are announced by publishing the public part of the aforementioned form on the Doctoral School's website.

Roles in mid-term evaluation

Doctoral student

1. The doctoral student prepares and submits, in hard copy, Report on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan (Appendix No. 3 to the Order).
2. The doctoral student prepares a presentation on the progress of the Individual Research Plan to be presented during the mid-term evaluation.
3. The doctoral student appears before the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee presenting progress on the IRP implementation and participates in a discussion on the topic.
4. At the request of the doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation, at least one representative of doctoral students may participate in the meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee as an observer.

Supervisor(s)

1. Approve(s) and sign(s) the Doctoral Student's Report on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan.

Pursuant to the Act of 20 July 2018 – The Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended) and the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Academy of Special Education, the supervisor and assistant supervisor may not be members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. They do not attend any committee meeting.

Reviewer

1. Prepares a review of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan in accordance with the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School.

In accordance with the Regulations of the Doctoral School, the reviewer is not a member of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee and does not participate in its meetings.

Members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee

1. Select two reviewers for each doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation from among the three candidates nominated by the Discipline Councils.
2. They review the complete set of documents necessary for conducting the mid-term evaluation (Individual Research Plan with detailed research project of the doctoral student; doctoral student's report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan; and reviewers' reports on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan).
3. They attend a Mid-term Evaluation Committee meeting to evaluate the doctoral student's IRP and participate in an interview with the doctoral student.
4. During the aforementioned meeting, they make a final decision on the mid-term evaluation.
5. They prepare a justification for the evaluation – both in cases of positive and negative assessments.

Members of the Council of the Doctoral School

1. They appoint candidates from outside the entity managing the Doctoral School as members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.

Members of the Discipline Council.

1. For each doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation, they nominate three candidates for reviewers who satisfy the criteria set out in the Doctoral School Regulations.

Head of Doctoral School

1. After consulting with the Council of the Doctoral School, the Head of Doctoral School sets a mid-term evaluation schedule in the respective academic year.
2. The Head of Doctoral School arranges templates for the forms applicable to the mid-term evaluation.
3. The Head of the Doctoral School submits requests to the Chairs of the Discipline Councils to nominate three candidates for reviewers for each doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation.

4. The Head of Doctoral School submits a request for the appointment of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee containing the candidates identified by the Council of the Doctoral School to the Rector of the Maria Grzegorzewska Academy of Special Education.
5. Determines, together with the members of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee, two reviewers for each doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation in a given academic year
6. The Head of Doctoral School supervises the manner and timeliness of the mid-term evaluation process.

Administration of the Doctoral School

1. The administration office provides administrative and organizational support for the mid-term evaluation.
2. The administration office ensures timely circulation of documents related to mid-term evaluation.
3. The administration office organizes meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.

Appendix No. 3
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 7 of 1 December 2023

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP)

GENERAL INFORMATION

A. DOCTORAL STUDENT INFORMATION	
FIRST AND LAST NAME	
STUDENT ID NUMBER	
YEAR OF COMMENCEMENT OF STUDIES AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL	

B. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE DISSERTATION BEING PREPARED	
TITLE OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION	
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE	
SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	
ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	
CONCEPT OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION (max. 500 words) (purpose, research problem, hypotheses, theoretical and practical benefits)	
PLANNED DATE OF SUBMISSION OF DISSERTATION	

ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP)

Each time, the status of the task implementation should be specified as:

(1) completed, (2) in progress, (3) not completed.

For (1) completed task, specify the results.

For (2) task in progress, describe the measurable results to date. In the case of delays in implementation, the reason should be explained.

For (3) task not completed, state the reason for non-implementation and describe the corrective actions taken.

C. TIMELINE FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION (assignments, including research assignments broken down by subsequent years of doctoral school training)			
YEAR OF STUDY	NAME OF THE RESEARCH TASK ACCORDING TO THE IRP	STATUS OF COMPLETION	DESCRIPTION OF OUTCOME/REMARKS
I			
II			

D. OUTCOME OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AND METHODS OF DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS (according to the IRP)	STATUS OF COMPLETION	OUTCOME/REMARKS
1. SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS		
2. ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES		
3. OTHER		

E. PREPARED GRANT PROPOSALS AND/OR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH PROJECTS

--

F. OTHER ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT

Aimed at improving competencies that prepare for jobs of a research or research and teaching nature

YEAR OF STUDY	ACTIVITY ACCORDING TO THE IRP	STATUS OF COMPLETION	DESCRIPTION OF OUTCOME/REMARKS
I			
II			

G. OTHER INFORMATION REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN, IMPORTANT ACCORDING TO THE DOCTORAL STUDENT

--

I confirm the truthfulness of the data provided in the report with my own signature

..... <i>Date of report</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the doctoral student</i>
Confirmation of the assistant supervisor (if appointed)	
..... <i>Date</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the assistant supervisor</i>
Confirmation of the supervisor	
..... <i>Date</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the supervisor</i>

Appendix No. 4
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 7 of 1 December 2023

REVIEW FORM ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN
- FOR MID-TERM EVALUATION -

FIRST AND LAST NAME OF DOCTORAL STUDENT:	
FIRST AND LAST NAME OF THE REVIEWER	

The review focuses on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by the Doctoral Student.

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASKS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP):

PLEASE SELECT THE CORRECT ONE AND JUSTIFY IN DETAIL:

- ## RECOMMENDATION

According to the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, it can be granted in two cases:

- ✓ most of the tasks are carried out, with reasons provided for why some tasks have not been completed, and alternative solutions are proposed, or
- ✓ all tasks have been completed.

- ☐
- NO RECOMMENDATION

It means that most tasks are not being carried out.

DETAILED JUSTIFICATION (up to 1,000 characters):

QUALITY OF RESEARCH WORK PRESENTED IN THE IRP

PLEASE SELECT THE CORRECT ONE AND JUSTIFY IN DETAIL

☐ **RECOMMENDATION**

According to the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, it can be granted in two cases:

- ✓ **The project is promising:** meaning that the scientific quality of the tasks performed suggests that the doctoral dissertation will receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process
- ✓ **The project is promising (with remarks):** meaning that the scientific quality of the tasks performed is promising enough for the doctoral dissertation to receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process, but improvements and adherence to the reviewer's comments are necessary.

☐ **NO RECOMMENDATION**

It means that the scientific quality of the tasks carried out does not promise that the dissertation will receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process.

DETAILED JUSTIFICATION (up to 1,000 characters):

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT AND THE TASKS COMPLETED

STRENGTHS	
WEAKNESSES	
TIPS FOR THE FUTURE AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	

Appendix No. 5
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 7 of 1 December 2023

MID-TERM EVALUATION FORM

Name of doctoral student:

Name of the supervisor:

Name of the assistant supervisor (if appointed):

Scientific discipline:

Date of commencement of studies at the doctoral school of the Academy of Special Education:

Mid-term Evaluation Committee composed of:

Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs:

Head of Doctoral School:

External member:

at a meeting held on:

carried out

- ☐ in stationary mode
- ☐ in mixed (hybrid) mode
- ☐ remotely by means of electronic communication

evaluated the implementation of the Individual Research Plan of Ms./Mr.

.....

doctoral student of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University in Warsaw.

The Committee reviewed the documentation necessary for the mid-term evaluation:

- ✓ Individual Research Plan of the doctoral student
- ✓ detailed research project
- ✓ report of the doctoral student on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan
- ✓ reviews of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan

and after the presentation and interview with the doctoral student, during which the following questions were asked:

.....
.....
.....
proceeded to a discussion (without the participation of the doctoral student), during which it was pointed out that

.....
.....
.....
Result of the vote on the mid-term evaluation:

1 vote: pass/fail*

2 vote: pass/fail*

3 vote: pass/fail*

As a result of the activities carried out, the Mid-term Evaluation Committee evaluated

☐ positively

☐ negatively

the progress of the doctoral student

.....
in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.

* delete as appropriate.

(start from the new page - public part)

RESULT OF MID-TERM EVALUATION

Mid-term evaluation of Ms./Mr.

.....

ended with the result

☐ positive

☐ negative

Justification for the mid-term evaluation:

.....

.....

.....

Recommendations for further implementation of the Individual Research Plan

.....

.....

Member of the Committee	Name, university	Signature
Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs		
Head of Doctoral School		
External member		



Appendix No. 6
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 7 of 1 December 2023

.....
(title/degree, name)

.....
(discipline represented)

.....
(Name of doctoral student being evaluated)

STATEMENT OF REVIEWER/MEMBER OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION COMMITTEE*

I, the undersigned:

1 Commit myself:

- not to use, to keep confidential all documents received for evaluation, as well as all information obtained during the mid-term evaluation procedures, including in the event of resignation from document evaluation,
- to promptly remove copies of all materials and documents (printouts, photocopies, records on computer storage media, etc.) containing the information referred to above, after completion of the mid-term evaluation procedures.

2 By accepting the documents for evaluation, I unequivocally declare:

- that there is no conflict of interest with the doctoral student being evaluated,
- that there is no conflict of interest with the supervisor or assistant supervisor of his/her dissertation,
- that I have not yet been involved to any extent in the preparation of the individual mid-term evaluation documents of the doctoral student,
- that there is no other reason that may limit my fairness and impartiality in preparing the review/conducting the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student.

3 If I find any reason that may affect the impartiality and fairness of the evaluation, I undertake to immediately inform the Head of the Doctoral School.

.....
(date) (signature)

* Applies to persons outside the Maria Grzegorzewska University.

ORDER NO. 1/2025
Head of the Doctoral School
of the Maria Grzegorzewska University
of 11 June 2025

on establishing a schedule of the work of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee and a detailed description of the conduct of the Mid-term Evaluation and establishing the Mid-term Evaluation form, the individual research plan report form, the individual expert assessment form for the implementation of the individual research plan, and the statement of the reviewer/member of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee

Pursuant to § 12(1)(7) and § 20(1) of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, adopted by Resolution No. 138/2019 of the Senate of the University of 20 March 2019 on the adoption of the Regulations of the Doctoral School managed by the Maria Grzegorzewska University, as amended, the consolidated text of which constitutes Appendix No. 1 to Resolution No. 56/2025 of the Senate of the University of 16 April 2025 (hereinafter referred to as: "Regulations"), it is hereby ordered as follows:

§ 1

1. The following are introduced:

- 1) Schedule for the conduct of the mid-term evaluation in the 2025/2026 academic year, which is attached as Appendix No. 1 to this Order;
- 2) A detailed description of the conduct of the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of the University in the 2025/2026 academic year, which is attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Order;
- 3) Individual Research Plan (IRP) Report Form, which is attached as Appendix No. 3 to this Order;

- 4) The individual expert opinion form concerning the implementation of the individual research plan, which is attached as Appendix No. 4 to this Order;
- 5) Mid-term evaluation form, which is attached as Appendix No. 5 to this Order.
- 6) Statement of the reviewer/member of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, which is attached as Appendix No. 6 to this Order.

§ 2

The Order shall enter into force on the date it is signed.

Head of Doctoral School
Prof. PhD Hab. Anna Odrowąż-Coates

Schedule for the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University **for the academic year 2025/2026**

A detailed schedule for conducting the mid-term evaluation is set forth in the table:

Date	Action	Performer(s)
by 6 May 2025	Nomination of candidates from outside the entity running the Doctoral School to the Mid-term Evaluation Committee for each discipline in which doctoral students are educated in the 2024/2025 academic year.	Council of the Doctoral School
by 20 May 2025	Submission of candidates for members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee who are representatives of the Discipline Council in both disciplines 2024/2025.	Council of the Doctoral School
by 16 June 2025	Appointment of a Mid-term Evaluation Committee for each discipline in which doctoral students are educated in the 2024/2025 academic year.	Rector
by 30 June 2024	Appointment of a discipline-specific Mid-term Evaluation Committee for each doctoral student undergoing mid-term evaluation in the 2024/2025 academic year.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees
13 October 2025	Submission by doctoral students who commenced their studies at the Doctoral School on 1 October 2023 to the Secretary's Office of the Doctoral School of a report on the implementation of the IRP (as at 30 September 2025) in paper form, in accordance with the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School.	Doctoral students undergoing mid-term evaluation
by 20 October 2025	Submission to the committee members appointed by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee of the following documents necessary for the mid-term evaluation in electronic form: — Individual Research Plan (with a detailed research project) — Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.	Administration of the Doctoral School
5 May 2025	Deadline for expressing individual opinions.	Other members of the Committee
by 13 November 2025	Forwarding to members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee of the following documents necessary for the mid-term evaluation: — Individual Research Plan (with a detailed research project) — Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan — Individual Expert Assessments for the implementation of Individual Research Plan.	Administration of the Doctoral School

by 13 November 2025	Provision of electronic individual expert opinions on the implementation of Individual Research Plans to doctoral students.	Administration of the Doctoral School
between 24 November and 3 December 2025	Completion of mid-term evaluation by the Mid-term Evaluation Committee, including presentations of doctoral students' achievements and interviews with doctoral students.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees; Doctoral students undergoing mid-term evaluation
by 10 December 2025	Announcement of the results of the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students, together with justification.	Mid-term Evaluation Committees; Administration of the Doctoral School

**Detailed description of the process for the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of
the Maria Grzegorzewska University
for the academic year 2025/2026**

Pursuant to the Act of 20 July 2018 – The Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2024, item 1571, as amended) and the Regulations of the Doctoral School adopted by the Senate of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, a mid-term evaluation of doctoral students shall be conducted. The mid-term evaluation is subject to the implementation of the individual research plan, in particular, the timeliness and quality of tasks resulting from the doctoral dissertation preparation schedule.

The course of the mid-term evaluation:

1. The Doctoral Student shall submit a written Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (attached as Appendix No. 3 to the Order) by the date specified in the mid-term evaluation schedule (attached as Appendix No. 2 to the Order) to the Secretary's Office of the Doctoral School.
2. The administration office of the Doctoral School sends electronic versions of the following documents necessary for the mid-term evaluation to the members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee (2 internal experts, 1 external expert, PhDs, and professors):
 - Individual Research Plan (with a detailed research project)
 - Report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.
3. Based on the above-mentioned documentation, the experts prepare individual expert assessments on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by the doctoral student according to the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School (attached as Appendix No. 4 to the Order). The opinion comprises two criteria:

- implementation of tasks in accordance with the Individual Research Plan (IRP)
- Substantive evaluation of ongoing activities, including the research project:

The review must include a justification for the assessment of each evaluated element. Additionally, the expert should, where possible, provide a descriptive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the research project and completed tasks, as well as offer guidance for the future.

The prepared opinions are part of the documentation necessary for the mid-term evaluation of a doctoral student and are forwarded to other members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. Opinions are also made available to the doctoral student before the interview with the Committee.

4. Members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee will review the documentation necessary for the evaluation. They hold meetings during which the implementation of the doctoral student's IRP is evaluated. During the meeting:

- interviews with doctoral students are held. Part of the interview is a short presentation on the progress of the preparation on the doctoral student's dissertation (up to 15 minutes) and a scientific discussion. The doctoral student is required to answer the Committee's questions related to the implementation of the IRP;
- the Committee, without the participation of the doctoral student, discusses and evaluates the implementation of the IRP and prepares an evaluation with justification.

When conducting the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student's implementation of the IRP, the Committee takes into account the following aspects:

- an assessment of the timeliness and quality of tasks resulting from the doctoral dissertation preparation schedule included in the IRP and the consistency of these activities with the Individual Research Plan,
- an assessment of the presentation prepared and delivered by the doctoral student;
- an assessment of replies to the Committee's questions.

The evaluation can be positive or negative. The Committee decides by vote in line with the rules set forth in the Statute of the University provided for the procedure of

collegiate bodies in personnel matters. The evaluation and justification are recorded in the Mid-term Evaluation Form established by the Head of the Doctoral School (Appendix 5 to the Order).

5. The results of the mid-term assessment are announced by publishing the public part of the aforementioned form on the Doctoral School's website.

Roles in mid-term evaluation

Doctoral student

1. The doctoral student prepares and submits, in hard copy, Report on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan (Appendix No. 3 to the Order).
2. The doctoral student prepares a presentation on the progress of the Individual Research Plan to be presented during the mid-term evaluation.
3. The doctoral student appears before the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee presenting progress on the IRP implementation and participates in a discussion on the topic.
4. At the request of the doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation, at least one representative of doctoral students may participate in the meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee as an observer.

Supervisor(s)

1. The doctoral student(s) approve(s) and sign(s) the Doctoral Student's Report on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan.

Pursuant to the Act of 20 July 2018 – The Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended) and the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the University, the supervisor and assistant supervisor may not be members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee. They do not attend any committee meeting.

Members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee

1. For each doctoral student undergoing the mid-term evaluation, they make an individual assessment of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan according to the template specified by the Head of the Doctoral School.

2. They review the complete set of documents necessary for conducting the mid-term evaluation (Individual Research Plan with detailed research project of the doctoral student; report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan; and opinions of other experts on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan).
3. They attend a Mid-term Evaluation Committee meeting to evaluate the doctoral student's IRP and participate in an interview with the doctoral student.
4. During the aforementioned meeting, they make a final decision on the mid-term evaluation.
5. They prepare a justification for the evaluation – both in cases of positive and negative assessments.

Members of the Council of the Doctoral School

1. They appoint candidates from the Scientific Discipline Councils and from outside the entity managing the Doctoral School as members of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.

Head of Doctoral School

1. After consulting with the Council of the Doctoral School, the Head of Doctoral School sets a mid-term evaluation schedule in the respective academic year.
2. The Head of Doctoral School arranges templates for the forms applicable to the mid-term evaluation.
3. The Head of Doctoral School submits requests to the Chairmen of the Discipline Councils to appoint experts to the Committee.
4. The Head of Doctoral School submits a request for the appointment of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee containing the candidates identified by the Council of the Doctoral School to the Rector of the Maria Grzegorzewska University.
5. The Head of Doctoral School supervises the manner and timeliness of the mid-term evaluation process.

Administration of the Doctoral School

1. The administration office provides administrative and organizational support for the mid-term evaluation.

2. The administration office ensures timely circulation of documents related to mid-term evaluation.
3. The administration office organizes meetings of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee.



Appendix No. 3
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 1/2025 of 11 June 2025

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP)

GENERAL INFORMATION

A. DOCTORAL STUDENT INFORMATION	
FIRST AND LAST NAME	
STUDENT ID NUMBER	
YEAR OF COMMENCEMENT OF STUDIES AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL	

B. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION BEING PREPARED	
TITLE OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION	
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE	
SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	
ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR'S FIRST AND LAST NAME, ACADEMIC DEGREE/TITLE	
CONCEPT OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION (max. 500 words) (purpose, research problem, hypotheses, theoretical and practical benefits)	
PLANNED DATE OF SUBMISSION OF DISSERTATION	

ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP)

Each time, the status of the task implementation should be specified as:

(1) completed, (2) in progress, (3) not completed.

For (1) completed task, specify the results.

For (2) task in progress, describe the measurable results to date.

In the case of delays in implementation, the reason should be explained.

For (3) task not completed, state the reason for non-implementation and describe the corrective actions taken.

C. TIMELINE FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION (assignments, including research assignments broken down by subsequent years of doctoral school training)			
YEAR OF STUDY	NAME OF RESEARCH TASK ACCORDING TO THE IRP	STATUS OF COMPLETION	DESCRIPTION OF OUTCOME/REMARKS
I			
II			

D. OUTCOMES OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AND METHODS OF DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS (according to the IRP)	STATUS OF COMPLETION	OUTCOME/REMARKS
1. SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS		
2. ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES		
3. OTHER		

E. PREPARED GRANT PROPOSALS AND/OR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH PROJECTS

--

F. OTHER ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT

Aimed at improving competencies that prepare for jobs of a research or research and teaching nature

YEAR OF STUDY	ACTIVITY ACCORDING TO THE IRP	STATUS OF COMPLETION	DESCRIPTION OF OUTCOME/REMARKS
I			
II			

G. OTHER INFORMATION REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN, IMPORTANT ACCORDING TO THE DOCTORAL STUDENT

--

I confirm the truthfulness of the data provided in the report with my own signature.

..... <i>Date of report</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the doctoral student</i>
Confirmation of the assistant supervisor (if appointed)	
..... <i>Date</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the assistant supervisor</i>
Confirmation of the supervisor	
..... <i>Date</i>	 <i>Legible signature of the supervisor</i>



Appendix No. 4
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 1/2025 of 11 June 2025

**INDIVIDUAL EXPERT ASSESSMENT FORM FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN
- FOR MID-TERM EVALUATION -**

FIRST AND LAST NAME OF DOCTORAL STUDENT	
FIRST AND LAST NAME OF EXPERT	

The review focuses on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by the Doctoral Student.

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASKS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP):

PLEASE SELECT THE CORRECT ONE AND JUSTIFY IN DETAIL:

☐ **RECOMMENDATION**

According to the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, it can be granted in two cases:

- ✓ most of the tasks are carried out, with reasons provided for why some tasks have not been completed, and alternative solutions are proposed, or
- ✓ all tasks have been completed.

☐ **NO RECOMMENDATION**

It means that most tasks are not being carried out.

DETAILED JUSTIFICATION (up to 1,000 characters):

QUALITY OF RESEARCH WORK PRESENTED IN THE IRP

PLEASE SELECT THE CORRECT ONE AND JUSTIFY IN DETAIL

☐ RECOMMENDATION

According to the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University, it can be granted in two cases:

- ✓ **The project is promising:** meaning that the scientific quality of the tasks performed suggests that the doctoral dissertation will receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process
- ✓ **The project is promising (with remarks):** meaning that the scientific quality of the tasks performed is promising enough for the doctoral dissertation to receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process, but improvements and adherence to the reviewer's comments are necessary.

☐ NO RECOMMENDATION

It means that the scientific quality of the tasks carried out does not promise that the dissertation will receive positive reviews in the doctoral degree conferral process.

DETAILED JUSTIFICATION (up to 1,000 characters):

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT AND COMPLETED TASKS

STRENGTHS	
WEAKNESSES	
TIPS FOR THE FUTURE AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	

.....
Reviewer's signature



MID-TERM EVALUATION FORM

First and last name of doctoral student:

First and last name of supervisor:

Name of assistant supervisor (if appointed):

Scientific discipline:

Date of commencement of studies at the doctoral school of the Maria Grzegorzewska University:

Mid-term Evaluation Committee composed of:

Chairperson of the Discipline Council:

Internal Expert – Member of the Discipline Council

External Expert – Member from outside the university (external):

at a meeting held on:

carried out

- ☐ in stationary mode
- ☐ in mixed (hybrid) mode
- ☐ remotely by means of electronic communication

evaluated the implementation of the Individual Research Plan of Ms./Mr.

.....
doctoral student of the Doctoral School of the Maria Grzegorzewska University.

The Committee reviewed the documentation necessary for the mid-term evaluation:

- ✓ Individual Research Plan of the doctoral student
- ✓ detailed research project
- ✓ report of the doctoral student on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan
- ✓ reviews of the doctoral student's implementation of the Individual Research Plan

and after the presentation and interview with the doctoral student, during which the following questions were asked:

.....

.....

.....

proceeded to a discussion (without the participation of the doctoral student), during which it was pointed out that

.....

.....

.....

Result of the vote on the mid-term evaluation:

1 vote: pass/fail**

2 votes: pass/fail*

3 votes: pass/fail*

As a result of the activities carried out, the Mid-term Evaluation Committee evaluated

☐ positively

☐ negatively

the progress of the doctoral student

.....

in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.

* Delete as appropriate

(start from the new page - public part)



RESULT OF MID-TERM EVALUATION

Mid-term evaluation of Ms./Mr.

.....

ended with the result

- ☐ positive
- ☐ negative

Justification for the mid-term evaluation:

.....

.....

.....

Recommendations for further implementation of the Individual Research Plan

.....

.....

Member of the Committee	First and last name, university	Signature
Chairperson of the Discipline Council		
Expert – Discipline Representative		
External expert		



Appendix No. 6
to the Order of the Head
of Doctoral School
No. 1/2025 of 11 June 2025

.....
(title/degree, name)

.....
(discipline represented)

.....
(Name of doctoral student being evaluated)

STATEMENT OF MEMBER OF MID-TERM EVALUATION COMMITTEE*

I, the undersigned:

1. commit myself:

- not to use, to keep confidential all documents received for evaluation, as well as all information obtained during the mid-term evaluation procedures, including in the event of resignation from document evaluation,
- to promptly remove copies of all materials and documents (printouts, photocopies, records on computer storage media, etc.) containing the information referred to above, after completion of the mid-term evaluation procedures.

2. By accepting the documents for evaluation, I unequivocally declare:

- that there is no conflict of interest with the doctoral student being evaluated,
- that there is no conflict of interest with the supervisor or assistant supervisor of his/her dissertation,
- that I have not yet been involved to any extent in the preparation of the individual mid-term evaluation documents of the doctoral student,
- that there is no other reason that may limit my fairness and impartiality in preparing the review/conducting the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student.

3. If I find any reason that may affect the impartiality and fairness of the evaluation, I undertake to immediately inform the Head of the Doctoral School.

.....
(date) (signature)

* Applies to persons outside the Maria Grzegorzewska University.