



## Procedure for mid-term evaluation

1. The procedure for conducting mid-term evaluation at the Poznan University of Medical Sciences Doctoral School (from now on referred to as the procedure) specifies the method and principles for conducting mid-term evaluation of doctoral students at the Poznan University of Medical Sciences Doctoral School.
2. The implementation of the individual research plan (IRP) prepared by the Ph.D. student shall be subject to an interim evaluation through the training resulting from the curriculum and in the case of training lasting six semesters - during the fourth semester. In particular, it shall cover the timeliness and quality of the performance of the tasks resulting from the schedule for the preparation of the doctoral thesis.
3. The interim evaluation shall be carried out by a commission for the interim evaluation of Ph.D. students, from now on referred to as the Commission, consisting of 3 persons, including:
  - 1) the Director or Vice-Director acting as the Commission Chairman;
  - 2) one person holding the title of professor or with a post-doctoral degree in the discipline in which the doctoral thesis is being prepared, employed outside the entity conducting the Doctoral School;
  - 3) one person for whom the University is the first place of employment, holding at least a doctoral degree.The promoter and co-promoter may not be members of the Commission.
4. The Director of the Doctoral School shall appoint the interim evaluation commission.
5. The meeting of the Interim Evaluation Commission may be held remotely through electronic communication. In addition to the remote mode, a hybrid mode is permissible.
6. A Commission meeting can be conducted remotely or in a hybrid mode, using technical devices allowing for remote proceedings with simultaneous direct audio and video transmission.
7. A meeting of the Commission for mid-term evaluation of doctoral candidates consists of open and classified parts. The chairperson informs those present about the commencement of the classified part of the meeting.
8. In the case of a Commission meeting held remotely, the Chairman of the Commission shall sign the minutes with the consent of all Commission members.
9. The interim evaluation commission members are tasked with:
  - 1) analysis of the documentation related to the training and the individual research plan of the Ph.D. student,
  - 2) preparing an opinion on the implementation of the individual research plan,
  - 3) attendance at a Commission's meeting, including an interview with the Ph. D. student.

10. After reviewing the documents submitted by the doctoral candidate, each member of the Commission prepares an assessment of the doctoral candidate in the form of a written opinion on the implementation of the individual research plan by the doctoral candidate. The Commission member submits the signed opinion to the PUMS Doctoral School Office before the designated date of the mid-term evaluation Commission meeting.
11. The interim evaluation takes place in two stages:
  - 1) stage I involves the Ph. D. submitting a written summary of work and achievements,
  - 2) stage II involves a practical assessment based on the doctoral candidate's self-report describing the dissertation's progress and a discussion in which the doctoral student is asked questions. The doctoral candidate's presentation must be at most 15 minutes.
12. A written summary representing the completion of Stage I must be submitted to the Doctoral School Office by 31 July of the relevant academic year.
13. **In addition, the report and all attachments should be sent as an electronic PDF to: [szkoladoktorska@ump.edu.pl](mailto:szkoladoktorska@ump.edu.pl) (the report file should be labeled with the Ph.D. student's name in the following way: `surname_name_report.pdf`; attachments should be numbered and marked with the phrase: `surname_name_attachment_nr`).**  
**The scans of the documents must be legible and arranged in the correct order according to the report.**  
**Publications submitted for printing but not yet published by this date may be included in the documentation until August 30th. The content of the report and self-presentation is the responsibility of the doctoral candidate and the supervisor(s).**
14. **The schedule for mid-term evaluation will be provided two months in advance in a separate communication from the Director of the Doctoral School.**
15. The doctoral candidate is informed about the date and location of the meeting via email.
16. A prerequisite for being eligible for mid-term evaluation is submitting documents listed in points 12.1) and 14 within the deadline specified in point 13.
17. The presence of the doctoral candidate at the mid-term evaluation within the deadline specified by the Director of the Doctoral School is mandatory.
18. In justified cases, the Director of the Doctoral School may decide to change the mid-term evaluation date.
19. The evaluation shall comprise three elements:
  - 1) the Ph.D. student's development in a broad sense and their academic achievements:
    - a. research articles accepted for publication or published by the Ph.D. student after admission to the doctoral school in peer-reviewed journals included in the list drawn up following the regulations issued under the Law on Higher Education and Science (among other things, the number of papers, the order of authorship and the journal's score is analyzed)
    - b. the Ph.D. student's active participation in scientific conferences (among other things, the number of speeches and type of conference, as well as prizes and distinctions awarded, are analyzed),
    - c. the Ph. D. student's participation in research projects (the type of grant and the function performed are analyzed, among other things),
    - d. foreign or domestic internships carried out by the doctoral student (the type of internship, duration, etc., will be analyzed),

- e. other outcomes mentioned by the Ph.D. student, e.g., activity in the organization of conferences, activity for the development of science and teaching, patent applications,
  - 2) the Ph.D. student's progress through the doctoral school's program, including the timeliness and quality of the program accomplishment
  - 3) progress in the individual research plan's realization:
    - a. timeliness of completion of the research work schedule milestones to date,
    - b. progress in the doctoral dissertation's preparation
20. The interim evaluation shall result in either a positive or negative outcome. The evaluation's result with its justification shall be public.
  21. The commission shall prepare the result of the Ph. student's interim evaluation and its justification within 14 days of the interim evaluation.
  22. Information on the outcome of the Ph.D. student's evaluation and the justification for the assessment shall be made available within 30 days of the appraisal on the Doctoral School's website under Interim Evaluation.
  23. In the event of a negative result of the mid-term evaluation, the Ph.D. student shall be removed from the list of Ph.D. students.

Legal basis:

- Act of July 20, 2018, Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws 2023, item 742, as amended)
- Regulations of the PUMS Doctoral School (Resolution No. 70/2023 of the PUMS Senate dated April 26, 2023)

**PH.D. STUDENT'S REPORT  
TO THE INTERIM EVALUATION**

<b>PERIOD:</b>	<b>FROM (DD.MM.RR) ..... TO (DD.MM.RR) ....</b>		
<b>PH.D STUDENT'S DATA</b>			
NAME AND SURNAME			
STUDENT ID NUMBER			
UNIVERSITY UNIT			
YEAR OF COMMENCEMENT OF TRAINING AT DOCTORAL SCHOOL			
ORCID NUMBER			
<b>DOCTORAL DISSERTATION</b>			
DOCTORAL DISSERTATION TITLE			
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE (underline applicable)	medical sciences	pharmaceutical sciences	health sciences
PLANNED DATE OF THE DISSERTATION SUBMISSION (indicate month and year)			
<b>PROMOTOR</b>			
NAME AND SURNAME			
DEGREE/TITLE			
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE / SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES (underline appropriate - primary discipline in bold)	medical sciences	pharmaceutical sciences	health sciences
UNIVERSITY UNIT			
<b>SECOND PROMOTOR / ASSISTANT PROMOTOR (delete as appropriate)</b>			
NAME AND SURNAME			
DEGREE/TITLE			
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE / SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES (underline appropriate - primary discipline in bold)	medical sciences	pharmaceutical sciences	health sciences
UNIVERSITY UNIT			

## 1. THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

**A. IMPLEMENTATION OF MILESTONES IN THE RESEARCH SCHEDULE** (DESCRIPTION - MAX. 2 PAGES A4, CALIBRI 11, SPACING 1.5)

**B. PROGRESS IN PREPARING A DOCTORAL THESIS** (DESCRIPTION - MAX. 2 PAGES A4, CALIBRI 11, SPACING 1.5))

**C. EXPLANATION OF THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE DEGREE OF COMPLETION OF THE TASKS GIVEN IN THE IRP AND THE TIMETABLE DECLARED IN THE IRP (IF NECESSARY,** DESCRIPTION - MAX. 2 PAGES A4, CALIBRI 11, SPACING 1.5)

## 2. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES EFFECTS

### I YEAR OF TRAINING AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	TASK COMPLETON DATE
<b>I.1. Publications (Annex I.1:</b> publications that appeared in print during the reporting period and those that were finally accepted by the editors - confirmed by the DOI number, according to the state of the UMP Main Library):	
<b>I.2. Active participation in conferences (Annex I.2:</b> document confirming conference presentations or photocopy of the abstract from the book of abstracts, a document confirming prize/award):	
<b>I.3. Submission of a grant application</b> (e.g., UMP, NCN, NCBIR, FNP, from the start of training in the doctoral school, people recruited for an NCN grant or an implementation-based doctorate, do not show this particular grant; <b>Annex I.3:</b> document confirming participation in the grant - information from the grantor / original application form, printout from the report or other formal document showing the composition of the research team):	
<b>I.4. Research internships</b> (does not apply to professional training, from the start of training at the doctoral school; <b>Annex I.4:</b> document confirming the internship):	
<b>I.5. Participation in the organization of a scientific conference:</b>	
<b>I.6. Activities for the advancement of science and teaching</b> (e.g. membership of a scientific society, foundation or commissions, supervision of a student club):	

I.7. Others (e.g. patent applications):	
<b>II YEAR OF TRAINING AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL</b>	
<b>TYPE OF ACTIVITY</b>	<b>TASK COMPLETION DATE</b>
<b>I.1. Publications (Annex I.1:</b> publications that appeared in print during the reporting period and those that were finally accepted by the editors - confirmed by the DOI number, according to the state of the UMP Main Library):	
<b>I.2. Active participation in conferences (Annex I.2:</b> document confirming conference presentations or photocopy of the abstract from the book of abstracts, a document confirming prize/award):	
<b>I.3. Submission of a grant application (e.g., UMP, NCN, NCBIR, FNP, from the start of training in the doctoral school, people recruited for an NCN grant or an implementation-based doctorate, do not show this particular grant; Annex I.3:</b> document confirming participation in the grant - information from the grantor / original application form, printout from the report or other formal document showing the composition of the research team):	
<b>I.4. Research internships (does not apply to professional training, from the start of training at the doctoral school; Annex I.4:</b> document confirming the internship):	
<b>I.5. Participation in the organization of a scientific conference:</b>	
<b>I.6. Activities for the advancement of science and teaching (e.g. membership of a scientific society, foundation or commissions, supervision of a student club):</b>	
<b>I.7. Others (e.g. patent applications):</b>	

<b>3. REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL TEACHING PROGRAM</b>
<b>EXAMINATIONS AND GRADES INCLUDING WORK PRACTICES (teaching hours) - PRINTED PH.D. STUDENT'S PERIODIC PERFORMANCE ACTIVITY SHEET I and II year</b>

<b>4. PH.D. student's PUBLICATIONS BEFORE ENTERING DOCTORAL SCHOOL</b>		
Number of publications	Total MNiSW/MEiN score	TOTAL IF score

.....  
*(date of report preparation)*

.....  
*(a legible signature of the Ph.D. student)*

<b>5. SUPERVISOR'S OPINION</b>	

Assessment of the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan by the Doctoral Candidate	positive / negative <sup>1</sup>
Assessment of the state of preparation of the doctoral thesis (in %).	
If applicable, provide Information about the delay in implementing the individual research plan	

.....  
(date)

.....  
(a legible signature of the promoter)

.....  
(date)

.....  
(a legible signature  
of the second promoter/assistant promoter)

---

<sup>1</sup> Mark the appropriate



## INTERIM EVALUATION FORM

PH.D STUDENT'S DATA	
NAME AND SURNAME	
PESEL NUMBER	
STUDENT ID NUMBER	
UNIVERSITY UNIT	

### I STAGE – PH.D. STUDENT REPORT

#### 1. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES EFFECTS

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS - the listed effects are taken into account in paragraph 3.
<b>A. PUBLICATIONS</b> (from the start of training in the doctoral school,/that have not been shown in the doctoral school's admission)	according to plan / not according to plan
<b>B. PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCES</b> (from the start of training in the doctoral school)	according to plan / not according to plan
<b>C. SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS/GRANTS</b> (E.G. UMP, NCN, NCBIR, FNP, from the start of training in the doctoral school)	according to plan / not according to plan
<b>D. RESEARCH INTERSHIPS RELATED TO DOCTORAL DISSERTATION</b> (does not apply to professional training, from the start of training at the doctoral school)	according to plan / not according to plan
<b>E. OTHERS</b> (e.g., activities in the organization of conferences, activities for the development of science and teaching, patent applications, from the start of training at a doctoral school)	according to plan / not according to plan

#### 2. REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL TEACHING PROGRAM

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS - the listed effects are taken into account in paragraph 3. Assessment
<b>EXAMINATIONS AND CREDITS, INCLUDING PRACTICAL INTERSHIPS - IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED DOCTORAL STUDENT'S PERIODIC PERFORMANCE RECORD</b>	IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION PROGRAMME/NON-INCOMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION PROGRAMME

#### 3. THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	POINTS SCALE	Average scores of commission members
<b>TERMINOWOŚĆ REALIZACJI ORAZ POSTĘP ZAŁOŻONEGO HARMONOGRAMU PRAC BADAWCZYCH</b>	5 –very good schedule implementation 4 – implementation of the schedule is going well, minor shortcomings noted 3 – implementation of the schedule is proceeding according to the plan 2 – delays in schedule implementation have been identified 1 – implementation of the schedule is not proceeding correctly. However, the completed tasks allow for the completion of the doctoral dissertation	



	0 – delays in the implementation of the research schedule have been identified, preventing the completion of the work within the declared time frame.	
<b>DESCRIPTIVE EVALUATION - THE OPINION OF THE COMMISSION'S MEMBERS IS ANNEXED TO THE EVALUATION FORM</b>		
<b>POSSIBLE COMMISSION COMMENTS</b>		
<b>II STAGE – PH.D. STUDENT SELF-PRESENTATION</b>		
<b>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</b>	<b>POINTS SCALE</b>	<b>COMMISSION EVALUATION (average of scores of ALL COMMISSION MEMBERS)</b>
<b>PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH</b>	<p>5 – very well-prepared and presented presentation.</p> <p>4 - the presentation was very well prepared; minor flaws noted</p> <p>3 - the presentation was prepared correctly; minor shortcomings noted, the time limit was exceeded</p> <p>2 - shortcomings in the presentation of research results were noted</p> <p>1 - errors in research presentation, lack of preparation to give a presentation</p> <p>0 - lack of presentation, very serious errors in presenting results, inability to present the obtained results; the basis for a negative evaluation.</p>	
<b>DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH WORK</b>	<p>5 - addressed the questions and issues raised by the Commission in an very good manner, with extensive knowledge of the research carried out</p> <p>4 - very well answered Commission's questions, correct reference to literature,</p> <p>3 - answered the Commission's questions correctly, draws attention to shortcomings</p> <p>2 - all questions not satisfactorily addressed</p> <p>1 - some questions are not answered, lack of basic knowledge of the research carried out</p> <p>0 - none of the questions were answered of Commission questions, grounds for a negative assessment</p>	
<b>QUESTIONS ASKED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS</b>	<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4.</p>	

<b>THE SUM OF THE POINTS X 10</b>	
<b>RESULT OF THE ASSESSMENT</b>	



### Minutes of the interim evaluation's Commission meeting

Ph.D. student's name and surname:

Scientific discipline:

Topic/title of doctoral dissertation:

Promoter:

Assistant Promoter (if applicable):

I. On ....Mr./Ms. .... participated in the interim evaluation conducted by the Poznan University of Medical Sciences Doctoral School. The interim evaluation was carried out by the Mid-term Evaluation Commission, appointed by the Director of the UMP Doctoral School, consisting of:

1. Commission Chairman:
2. Commission Member:
3. Commission Member:

The Commission meeting was held via the MS TEAMS platform.

II. After becoming familiar with the report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan presented by Mr./Ms....., listening to the presentation, and discussing it at the meeting, the Commission assesses the implementation of the Individual Research Plan POSITIVELY/NEGATIVELY\* (\*note as appropriate)

III. Justification of the Commission's decision regarding the interim evaluation's outcome takes into account specific points from the report and the presentation of the doctoral candidate (in accordance with the Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science, the result of the evaluation and the justification is public and will be made public):

.....  
DATE

.....  
SIGNATURE OF THE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN