



Mid-term Evaluation Procedure

1. The procedure for conducting mid-term evaluation at Poznan University of Medical Sciences Doctoral School (hereinafter referred to as the Procedure) specifies the method and principles for conducting mid-term evaluation of doctoral students at Poznan University of Medical Sciences Doctoral School.
2. The implementation of the Individual Research Proposal (IRP) prepared by the PhD student is subject to an mid-term evaluation, halfway through the training programme specified in the Curriculum of Doctoral School, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, and in the case of training lasting six semesters - during the fourth semester. In particular, it covers the timeliness and quality of the tasks completion according to the doctoral dissertation schedule.
3. The mid-term evaluation is carried out by the Commission for the Mid-term Evaluation of PhD Students, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, consisting of 3 persons, including:
 - 1) the Director or Vice-Director acting as the Commission Chairman;
 - 2) person who is a professor or holding a post-doctoral degree in the discipline in which the doctoral thesis is being prepared, employed outside the entity governing the Doctoral School;
 - 3) person for whom the University is the first place of employment, who is a professor or holding a post-doctoral degree.
4. The supervisor and assistant supervisor of a doctoral student may not be members of the Commission.
5. The Director of the Doctoral School appoints the Commission.
6. The Commission meeting may be held remotely or in a hybrid mode, using technical devices allowing for remote proceedings with simultaneous direct audio and video transmission.
7. The Commission meeting and the interview with the doctoral student is conducted in Polish or English.
8. The Commission meeting consists of a public and closed session. The chairperson announces to everyone present that the closed part of the meeting is starting.
9. In random cases, such as illness of a member of the Commission or of a doctoral student, all decisions concerning the mid-term evaluation (date, composition of the Commission) are taken by the Director of the Doctoral School.
10. In the case of remote Commission meeting, the Chairman of the Commission signs the minutes with the consent of all Commission members.
11. The Commission's tasks include:
 - 1) analysis of the documentation related to the training and the Individual Research Proposal of the PhD student,
 - 2) preparing an opinion on the implementation of the Individual Research Proposal,

- 3) attendance at the Commission's meeting, including an interview with the PhD student.
12. After reviewing the documents submitted by the doctoral candidate, each member of the Commission prepares a written opinion on the implementation of the Individual Research Proposal by the doctoral candidate. The Commission member submits the signed opinion to the PUMS Doctoral School Office before the designated date of the Commission meeting.
13. The mid-term evaluation is carried out in two stages:
 - 1) PhD student submitting a written summary of work and achievements to date,
 - 2) a practical assessment based on the doctoral candidate's self-report describing 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.
14. A written summary, which is the completion of the first stage, must be submitted to the Doctoral School Office by 20 July of the relevant academic year.
15. In addition, the report and all attachments should be sent in PDF format to: szkoladoktorska@ump.edu.pl (the report file should be labeled with the PhD student's name in the following way: `surname_name_report.pdf`; attachments should be numbered and marked with the phrase: `surname_name_attachment_no`).

The scans of the documents must be legible and arranged in the correct order according to the report.

The content of the report and self-report is the responsibility of the doctoral candidate and the supervisor(s).
16. The mid-term evaluation schedule will be provided two months in advance in a separate announcement of the Director of the Doctoral School.
17. The doctoral candidate is informed about the date and location of the meeting via email.
18. Admission to the mid-term evaluation is subject to submitting the documents listed in points 14 and 15.
19. The presence of the doctoral candidate at the mid-term evaluation within the deadline specified by the Director of the Doctoral School is mandatory.
20. In justified cases, the Director of the Doctoral School may decide to change the mid-term evaluation date.
21. The evaluation includes three elements:
 - 1) progress of the Individual Research Proposal:
 - a. meeting the research work schedule in a timely manner
 - b. progress in the doctoral dissertation's preparation
 - 2) the doctoral student's development and academic achievement
 - a. articles accepted for publication or published by the PhD 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
 - b. the PhD student's active participation in scientific conferences
 - c. the PhD student's participation in research projects
 - d. foreign or domestic internships of the doctoral student
 - e. other outcomes mentioned by the PhD student, e.g., activity in the organization of conferences, activity for the development of science and teaching, patent applications,
 - 3) the PhD student's progress in the Curriculum of Doctoral School

22. The mid-term evaluation results in either a positive or negative outcome. The evaluation's result with its justification is public.
23. The Commission prepares the result of the PhD student's mid-term evaluation and its justification within 14 days of the mid-term evaluation.
24. Information on the outcome of the PhD student's evaluation and the justification for the assessment is made available within 30 days of the evaluation on the Doctoral School's website.
25. In the event of a negative result of the mid-term evaluation, the PhD student is removed from the list of PhD students.

Legal basis:

- Act of July 20, 2018, Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws 2024, item 1571, as amended)
- Regulations of Doctoral School, Poznan University of Medical Sciences (Resolution No. 10/2024 of PUMS Senate dated January 31, 2024)



PHD STUDENT'S REPORT FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

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

1. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PROPOSAL
A. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESEARCH SCHEDULE (DESCRIPTION - MAX. 2 PAGES A4, CALIBRI 11, SPACING 1.5)
B. DOCTORAL DISSERTATION PROGRESS (DESCRIPTION - MAX. 2 PAGES A4, CALIBRI 11, SPACING 1.5))
C. EXPLANATION OF THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE COMPLETION OF THE TASKS AND THE TIMETABLE DECLARED IN THE IRP (if applicable, DESCRIPTION - MAX. 2 PAGES A4, CALIBRI 11, SPACING 1.5)

2. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES EFFECTS	
I YEAR OF EDUCATION AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL	
TYPE OF ACTIVITY	TASK COMPLETION DATE
I.1. Publications (Annex I.1: 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 PUMS Main Library):	
I.2. Active participation in conferences (Annex I.2: document confirming conference presentations or photocopy of the abstract from the book of abstracts, a document confirming award/distinction):	
I.3. Submission of a grant application e.g., PUMS, NCN, NCBIR, FNP, from the start of education at the Doctoral School. Persons recruited to the Doctoral School under NCN grant or Industrial Doctorate Programme do not show this particular grant; Annex I.3: document confirming participation in a grant - information from the research funder / original application form, printout from the report or other formal document showing the composition of the research team):	
I.4. Research internships (does not apply to professional training, from the start of education at the Doctoral School; Annex I.4: document confirming the internship):	
I.5. Participation in the organization of a scientific conference:	
I.6. Activities for the advancement of science and teaching (e.g. scientific society membership, foundation or commissions, supervision of a student club):	
I.7. Other (e.g. patent applications):	

II YEAR OF TRAINING AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL	
TYPE OF ACTIVITY	TASK COMPLETION DATE
II.1. Publications (Annex I.1: 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 UMP Main Library):	
II.2. Active participation in conferences (Annex I.2: document confirming conference presentations or photocopy of the abstract from the book of abstracts, a document confirming award/distinction):	
II.3. Submission of a grant application e.g., PUMS, NCN, NCBIR, FNP, from the start of education at the Doctoral School. Persons recruited to the Doctoral School under NCN grant or Industrial Doctorate Programme do not show this particular grant; Annex I.3: document confirming participation in the grant - information from the research funder / original application form, printout from the report or other formal document showing the composition of the research team):	
II.4. Research internships (does not apply to professional training, from the start of education at the Doctoral School; Annex I.4: document confirming the internship):	
II.5. Participation in the organization of a scientific conference:	
II.6. Activities for the advancement of science and teaching (e.g. scientific society membership, foundation or commissions, supervision of a student club):	
II.7. Other (e.g. patent applications):	

3. PHD STUDENT'S PUBLICATIONS BEFORE ADMISSION TO THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL		
Number of publications	Total MNiSW/MEiN score	TOTAL IF score

.....
(date of report preparation)

.....
(legible signature of the PhD student)

5. SUPERVISOR'S OPINION	
Assessment of the Doctoral Student's implementation of the Individual Research Proposal	positive / negative ¹
Assessment of the state of preparation of the doctoral thesis (in %).	
Information on the reasons for the delay of the Individual Research Proposal, if any.	

.....
(date)

.....
(legible signature of the supervisor)

.....
(date)

.....
*(legible signature
of the supervisor/assistant supervisor)*

¹ Mark the appropriate



MID-TERM EVALUATION FORM

PHD STUDENT		
NAME AND SURNAME		
PESEL NUMBER		
STUDENT ID NUMBER		
UNIVERSITY UNIT		

I STAGE – PHD STUDENT REPORT		
1. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES EFFECTS		
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS - the listed effects are taken into account in paragraph 2.	
A. PUBLICATIONS (from the start of education at the Doctoral School/ which were not indicated in the recruitment procedure)	according to plan / not according to plan	
B. PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCES (from the start of training at the Doctoral School)	according to plan / not according to plan	
C. SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS/GRANTS (E.G. PUMS, NCN, NCBIR, FNP, from the start of training at the Doctoral School)	according to plan / not according to plan	
D. RESEARCH INTERSHIPS RELATED TO DOCTORAL DISSERTATION (does not apply to professional training, from the start of education at the Doctoral School)	according to plan / not according to plan	
E. OTHER (e.g., activities in the organization of conferences, activities for the development of science and teaching, patent applications, from the start of education at a Doctoral School)	according to plan / not according to plan	
2. THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PROPOSAL PROGRESS REPORT		
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	POINTS SCALE	Average scores of the Commission members
TIMELINESS AND PROGRESSION OF THE RESEARCH WORK SCHEDULE	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, shortcomings were noted 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 research schedule were identified, preventing the work from being completed on time.	
DESCRIPTIVE EVALUATION - THE OPINION OF THE COMMISSION'S MEMBERS IS ANNEXED TO THE EVALUATION FORM		
COMMISSION COMMENTS, IF ANY		

II STAGE – PHD STUDENT SELF-REPORT		
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	POINTS SCALE	COMMISSION EVALUATION (average of scores of ALL COMMISSION MEMBERS)
RESEARCH PRESENTATION	5 – very well-prepared and presented presentation. 4 - the presentation was very well prepared; minor flaws noted 3 - the presentation was prepared correctly; minor shortcomings noted, the time limit was exceeded 2 - shortcomings in the presentation of research results were noted 1 - errors in research presentation, lack of preparation to give a presentation 0 - lack of presentation, very serious errors in presenting results, inability to present the obtained results; the basis for a negative evaluation.	
DISCUSSION ABOUT THE RESEARCH	5 - questions and issues raised by the Commission were addressed in an very good manner, extensive knowledge of the research carried out 4 - very well answered Commission's questions, correct reference to literature, 3 - answered the Commission's questions correctly, draws attention to shortcomings 2 - all questions not satisfactorily addressed 1 - some questions are not answered, lack of basic knowledge of the research carried out 0 - none of the questions were answered of Commission questions, grounds for a negative assessment	
QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE COMMISSION MEMBERS DURING THE MEETING	1. 2. 3. 4.	
RESULT OF THE ASSESSMENT	POSITIVE/NEGATIVE	



Minutes of the Mid-term Evaluation Commission meeting

PhD student's name and surname:

Scientific discipline:

Topic/title of the doctoral dissertation:

Supervisor:

Assistant Supervisor (if applicable):

I. Mr /Ms attended the mid-term evaluation conducted by Poznan University of Medical Sciences Doctoral School. The mid-term evaluation was carried out by the Commission for the Mid-term Evaluation of PhD Students, appointed by the Director of PUMS 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 Proposal presented by, listening to the presentation, and discussing it at the meeting, the Commission assesses the implementation of the Individual Research Proposal POSITIVELY/NEGATIVELY* (*note as appropriate)

III. Justification of the Commission's decision regarding the mid-term 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):

.....

DATE

.....

SIGNATURE OF THE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

MID-TERM EVALUATION COMMISSION MEMBER OPINION
(OPINION PREPARED ON THE BASIS OF THE DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE DOCTORAL STUDENT *)

The mid-term evaluation is based on the implementation of (name and surname)
Individual Research Proposal, in particular the timeliness quality of the tasks completion according
to the doctoral dissertation schedule.

The following categories were included in the opinion:

1. implementation of the research schedule

2. publications submitted for printing

3. conference presentations

4. projects/ grants

5. research internships

The above assessment of the individual aspects of the doctoral student's performance allows a
a positive/negative assessment**.

.....
(date and legible signature of the Commission Member)

*the opinion may be supplemented after the doctoral student's self-report

**delete as appropriate