

**Procedure for the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students of the Warsaw-4-PhD Doctoral  
School affiliated to the Institute of Physical Chemistry PAS**

**§1**

**Appointment of mid-term evaluators**

1. The mid-term evaluation shall be carried out by a committee of three persons, hereinafter referred to as the "Panel", appointed separately for each doctoral student. The subject under evaluation shall be the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.
2. The Panel shall include at least one person holding a post-doctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor in the field of Chemical Sciences, employed outside the institutes conducting the Warsaw-4-PhD Doctoral School.
3. Neither the Director of the IPC PAS, the supervisor, the auxiliary supervisor nor the head of specialisation of the School, or his/her deputy, can participate in the work of the Panel, subject to the reservations laid down in §2, paragraph 4.
4. The initial selection of candidates for members of the Panel is performed by the Education Committee of the Scientific Board of the IPC PAS, hereinafter referred to as "the Committee". The supervisors and auxiliary supervisors of the doctoral students under evaluation shall be invited, without voting rights, to take part in the relevant sessions of the Committee.
5. After reviewing the recommendations of the Committee, the Scientific Board of the IPC PAS shall indicate candidates for members of the Panel no later than three months before the end of the full two years of study of the doctoral student.
6. The proposed candidates must not be related or connected to the doctoral student, the doctoral thesis supervisor or auxiliary supervisor, they must not have any official relationship with them, and must not have carried out joint research projects or had joint publications with them for at least the last five years.
7. The Warsaw-4-PhD Programme Board shall appoint members of the Panel from among the candidates indicated by the Scientific Board of the IPC PAS.
8. Appointed members of the Panel are obliged to immediately notify the chairperson of the Warsaw-4-PhD Programme Board should a conflict of interest as referred to in paragraph 6 arise or be suspected. Having established a conflict of interest, the chairperson of the Programme Board shall order the procedure for appointing the Panel member to be repeated. Any evaluation conducted by the excluded member of the Panel shall not be taken into account in the process of determining the mid-term evaluation result.

**§2**

**Mid-term evaluation process**

1. The head of the specialisation or his/her deputy, after consultation with the Panel, shall set the date for the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students and shall make this date known to them at least 60 days in advance.
2. No later than 30 days before the scheduled evaluation:
  - a) Doctoral students shall submit - to the head of the specialisation or the deputy head of the specialisation - an interim report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan during the first four semesters of training at the Doctoral School; this report shall be submitted instead of the current semester report,

- b) The supervisor or supervisors (if two supervisors have been appointed) or the supervisor and auxiliary supervisor (if an auxiliary supervisor has been appointed) shall submit to the head of the specialisation or the deputy head of the specialisation an opinion (or opinions) on the work of the doctoral student so far and their progress in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation,
- These documents shall be made available to the members of the Panel in electronic form.
3. The meeting at which the mid-term evaluation is conducted, hereinafter referred to as the "Meeting", shall be attended by the doctoral student under evaluation and all the members of the Panel. In addition, without the right to vote, it may be attended, subject to paragraph 4, only by the following: a representative of the Doctoral Student Self-Government of the IPC, a person taking minutes and, if the means of communication referred to in paragraph 5 are employed, a person necessary to operate said means.
  4. The head of the specialisation or his/her deputy shall participate in the Meeting as an observer - if no member of the Panel is employed in any of the institutes conducting the Warsaw-4-PhD School. Otherwise, participation of the head of the specialisation or his/her deputy as an observer is possible only on the invitation of the Panel.
  5. The Meeting may be conducted by electronic means of communication ensuring multilateral transmission of sound and images in real time, while respecting the rules of confidentiality.
  6. The Meeting shall include the following:
    - a) A brief (approx. 10 min) presentation by the doctoral student of the course and the most important results of his/her research conducted within the framework of Warsaw-4-PhD and the planned course of the remaining two years of study;
    - b) The doctoral student's replies to questions put by members of the Panel;

And in the absence of the doctoral student,

    - c) A discussion among the members of the Panel and a decision to pass or fail the mid-term evaluation together with a written justification.
  7. The result of the mid-term evaluation and the written justification for it shall be made public.
  8. Failure to submit the report within the time limit specified in paragraph 2 or the absence of the doctoral student during the open part of the Meeting (paragraph 6(a-b), without valid reasons, shall be tantamount to a negative mid-term evaluation.

### **§3**

#### **Appeal against the mid-term evaluation**

1. In the case of a negative result of the mid-term evaluation, the doctoral student may, within 7 days from the date on which the written justification is communicated to him/her, submit a request to the Programme Board for a re-evaluation.
2. After receiving the request referred to in paragraph 1, the Programme Board shall appoint members of a Panel to carry out another mid-term evaluation, and then the head of the specialisation or his/her deputy shall set the date for this re-evaluation. The members of the Panel, appointed from among the candidates indicated by the Scientific Board of the IPC PAS according to the rules laid out in § 1, cannot be persons who have already taken part in the mid-term evaluation of a given doctoral student.
3. The repeat mid-term evaluation shall follow the rules set out in § 2. There is no right of appeal against this evaluation.
4. A final negative mid-term evaluation, i.e. an evaluation that has not been appealed against, or a negative mid-term evaluation issued as a result of a request for re-evaluation, shall result in the removal of the evaluated person from the list of doctoral students.