

**DETAILED RULES FOR CONDUCTING THE MID-TERM EVALUATION AT THE
INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
(HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS THE IDSAS)**

§ 1

1. No later than 6 weeks before the date of the mid-term evaluation, the Director of the Leading Institution appoints the members of a 3-person Mid-Term Evaluation Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee"). To this end:
 - 1.1. The Doctoral School Board nominates candidates, including at least one person holding the degree of *doktor habilitowany* or the title of professor in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, who is employed outside the participating Institutions.
 - 1.2. A co-author of the evaluated doctoral student's publications, or the supervisor of their Master's or Bachelor's thesis, cannot be a member of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee.
 - 1.3. Members sign a declaration stating that they meet the criteria of § 19, paragraph 2 of the IDSAS Regulations.
 - 1.4. The members of the Committee elect a Chairperson at the beginning of the meeting.
 - 1.5. The composition of the committee is determined individually for each doctoral student.
2. The Director of the IDSAS or a member of the Doctoral School Board designated by the Director is responsible for organizing the work of the Committee.
3. The mid-term evaluation is conducted in the final month before the statutory deadline for its execution. The date of the evaluation, compliant with the Doctoral Student's individual research plan, is set by the Director of the IDSAS. In exceptional cases, upon the request of the PhD Student, the Director may decide to conduct the evaluation up to 10 weeks before the statutory deadline.
4. The Director or a member of the Doctoral School Board designated by the Director establishes the work schedule of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee and notifies the Doctoral Student via e-mail of the time and place of the Committee meeting.
5. Thirty days before the planned date of the Committee meeting, the Doctoral Student is obliged to submit documentation in both paper and electronic formats regarding the progress of the conducted research and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan) and to indicate a maximum of 5 of their most important documented scientific achievements. An integral part of the documentation is the supervisor's opinion, containing a statement confirming that they have reviewed and approved the materials prepared by the doctoral student. The template for the report on the implementation of the individual research plan is attached as Annex No. 1 to this resolution. The documents are to be submitted to the Institution where the doctoral dissertation is being carried out.
6. The members of the Committee receive the electronic documentation prepared by the PhD Student no later than two weeks before the scheduled date of the Committee

meeting.

7. The Committee's deliberations are held in a closed-door session, with the participation of the PhD student only during the first part of the evaluation, and without the presence of third parties.
8. During the Committee meeting, the PhD Student is required to deliver a presentation prepared in PDF or PPT format on the obtained research results, lasting a maximum of 20 minutes.
9. During the course of the meeting, the PhD Student's file from the Doctoral School is made available to the Committee members.
10. The evaluation minutes are signed by all Members of the Committee. In a situation where a member or members of the committee are unable to sign the minutes, only the chairperson of the committee signs, while simultaneously indicating the reasons for the inability of the remaining members to sign. The template for the minutes is attached as Annex No. 2 to this resolution.
11. After the evaluation is completed, the Chairperson of the committee submits the original minutes and the Report (Annex No. 3) to the Director of the IDSAS no later than within 14 days, which is then placed in the PhD Student's file.
12. The Director of the IDSAS informs the PhD Student of the result of the mid-term evaluation immediately upon receiving the original minutes.
13. A negative result of the mid-term evaluation results in removal from the list of PhD students. The decision on removal issued by the Director of the IDSAS may be appealed by submitting a request for reconsideration of the matter.
14. The recommended format for conducting the Evaluation is a face-to-face meeting of the Committee. It is possible to conduct the mid-term evaluation using technical devices that enable remote transmission with simultaneous direct, real-time image and sound feed, or in a hybrid mode.
15. The evaluation will be conducted by the end of the 4th semester.
16. The primary method of communication during the evaluation process is e-mail and the IDSAS website.

§ 2

The mid-term evaluation in the IDSAS encompasses:

1. The evaluation of the level of progress in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (IRP) and the evaluation of the PhD Student's most important scientific achievements related to the implementation of the IRP. The PhD student may present a maximum of 5 achievements (documented) that they consider the most important in relation to the implementation of the Individual Research Plan. The Candidate may submit the following achievements: scientific articles published in journals included in the currently applicable list of the Ministry of Education and Science (MEiN), peer-reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the currently applicable MEiN list of journals, participation in an international or national research project, participation in an international or national research internship, the delivery of a paper by the Candidate at an international or national scientific conference, authorship or co-

authorship of a poster at an international or national scientific conference, active participation in or co-organization of science popularization events, the submission and/or acquisition of a grant application funded from external sources, or a patent application.

2. The maximum number of points that a PhD Student can obtain during the mid-term evaluation is 100, distributed as follows:

2.1. Evaluation of the degree of IRP implementation:

- a) information on the level of progress in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan, including: alignment of the conducted research with the IRP – **maximum 60 points**.
- b) oral presentation and discussion on the achieved results – **maximum 15 points**.

2.2. Scientific activity – **maximum 25 points**.

A maximum of 5 of the most important achievements are subject to evaluation, including:

- a) authorship or co-authorship of a scientific article accepted for publication, related to the conducted doctoral work, in a journal included in the current MEiN list of journals, where the Doctoral Student receives:

- 20 points for a publication valued at 200 points on the MEiN list
- 14 points for a publication valued at 140 points on the MEiN list
- 10 points for a publication valued at 100 points on the MEiN list
- 7 points for a publication valued at 70 points on the MEiN list
- 4 points for a publication valued at 40 points on the MEiN list
- 2 points for a publication valued at 20 points on the MEiN list

- b) peer-reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the currently applicable MEiN list of journals – 1 point;
- c) participation in a research project funded from external sources – 4 points;
- d) participation in a research project funded from internal sources of the entities running the doctoral school – 2 points.
- e) participation in an international research internship under 30 days – 3 points; 30 days and more – 5 points;
- f) participation in a national research internship – under 30 days – 1 point; 30 days and more – 2 points;
- g) delivery of a paper by the Candidate at an international scientific conference – 5 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished presentation);
- h) delivery of a paper by the Candidate at a national scientific conference – 3 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished presentation);
- i) presentation of a poster at an international scientific conference – 3 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished poster);
- j) presentation of a poster at a national scientific conference – 2 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished poster);
- k) submission of a grant application funded from external sources – 2 points.
- l) securing a grant funded from external sources – 5 points.
- m) co-organization of science popularization events – 2 points.
- n) patent application – 7 points.
- o) The Committee has the right to award points for documented achievements not listed

above, up to a maximum of 10 points.

3. To receive a positive evaluation, a total of at least 60 points must be obtained.
4. The Committee adopts a resolution on the positive/negative result of the evaluation by an open vote by a simple majority, in the presence of at least 2 members of the Committee.