

Ordinance No 52
of the Rector of the University of
Białystok
of 8 June 2021
on the rules of organizing the
commission's work to conduct the
mid-term evaluation of doctoral
students of the University of Białystok

Pursuant to Art. 17(2) and Art. 17(4)(2) of the Statutes of the University of Białystok, I establish the following rules for the organisation of the work of the commission for the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students at the University of Białystok's doctoral schools:

§1

1. The Commission appointed to carry out the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students of the University of Białystok, hereinafter referred to as the commission, carries out an evaluation in accordance with the provisions of the *Law on Higher Education and Science* (JoL of 2021, item 478, consolidated text, as amended) and with the relevant regulations of the Doctoral School of Humanities, the Doctoral School of Social Sciences and the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences.
2. Decisions of the commission shall be taken publicly by a simple majority vote. In the event of an equal number of votes “for” and “against”, the chair’s vote is decisive.
3. The commission shall meet in full.
4. The meeting of the commission may take place using IT solutions and within the time specified in the separate Ordinance of the Rector on the temporary introduction of the possibility of convening meetings and adopting resolutions using IT solutions at the University of Białystok. The procedure for convening a commission meeting shall be decided by the chair of the commission.

§2

1. The director of the doctoral school shall indicate the date and place for the submission of the mid-term report by the doctoral students. The mid-term report together with the supervisor's opinion and the attachments specified in the report template (e.g. Individual research plans, dissertation concept, scans of published and accepted for publication articles, certificates of participation in conferences, internship report, internship certificate, others) is submitted in the form of a scan attached to a message sent from the doctoral student's email account from the uwb.edu.pl domain. The original report and the supervisor's opinion, together with documents certifying the doctoral student's achievements, must be submitted to the place indicated by the director of the relevant doctoral school. Submitted documents shall bear the date of receipt and the signature of the person accepting them, after verifying that the electronic version is the same as the original document.
2. If the report is not submitted at the time and place referred to in paragraph 1, the commission shall adopt a resolution of negative mid-term evaluation.
3. In the case of an inexcusable absence of a doctoral student in an interview with the mid-term commission, the commission shall adopt a resolution on a negative mid-term evaluation. The doctoral student shall notify the director of the doctoral school of the reasons for absence immediately, but no later than 3 days after the date of the scheduled interview. If the absence is considered justified, the Director of the Doctoral School shall, in agreement with the Chair of the commission, set a new date for the mid-term evaluation.
4. The doctoral student's report, together with the opinion of the supervisor and the annexes set

out in the template report in electronic form, shall be transmitted immediately to the members of the commission.

5. The members of the commission shall assess the achievements of the doctoral student on the basis of the mid-term report, the opinion of the supervisor, the results of the conversation and the attached documentation.

A template of the assessment is attached as Annex 1 to this Ordinance.

§3

1. As part of the interview, the doctoral student presents to the commission the achievements to date (no longer than 15 minutes), and then the commission conducts a discussion with the doctoral student on the progress in the implementation of the individual research plan.
2. Minutes shall be drawn up from the meeting of the commission. A model of the protocol is set out in Annex 2 to this Ordinance.
3. The Commission shall, at closed meeting, issue a positive or negative mid-term evaluation in writing, accompanied by a reasoned justification. The members of the commission shall sign the evaluation and its justification. The template for the mid-term evaluation is set out in Annex 3 to this Ordinance. The outcome of the mid-term evaluation, together with its justification, shall be public. A member of the commission may submit a written dissenting opinion, together with the justification and attach it to the minutes and the mid-term evaluation on the date of the commission's evaluation.
4. The doctoral student shall be notified in writing of the result of the mid-term evaluation by registered mail. It is also possible for the doctoral student to collect the assessment result in person from the secretariat of the relevant doctoral school.
5. The commission's minutes and the outcome of the mid-term evaluation, in the event of a commission meeting via information technology, and other documents produced by the commission using information technology shall be signed by the Chair of the commission.

§4

The provisions of Art. 1 and Art. 3 shall apply mutatis mutandis to the decisions of the mid-term evaluation appeals commission. The Commission may invite a PhD student to a discussion. In the event of non-attendance at the interview, the commission shall reach a resolution on the basis of the documents submitted.

§5

This Ordinance shall enter into force on the date of signature.

Rector of the University of Białystok
Prof. dr hab. Robert W. Ciborowski

Assessment of the implementation of the individual research plan¹

Name of commission member

.....

Doctoral student's details

Last name	
First name(s)	
Student Register number	
Name of Doctoral School	
Discipline	

On the basis of the doctoral student's mid-term report, the supervisor's opinion and an interview with the doctoral student, the following elements were assessed:

Evaluated element:	Evaluation (positive/negative)	Justification (indicating strengths or weaknesses in the implementation of the individual research plan)
Preparation of doctoral dissertation (progress of works and research)		
Scientific and research activity, including: published/submitted scientific articles, active participation in conferences, submission of grant application, internships completed		
Dissemination of research results		

¹ the evaluation shall be carried out individually by each member of the commission.

Other activities related to the effects of education in the doctoral school		
Achievement of objectives/tasks recorded in the individual research plan, including timeliness		

.....

Date and signature of commission member

**Minutes of the Commission
meeting on mid-term evaluation
at the doctoral School:**

.....
.....
.....
..... ..

University of Białystok

Doctoral student's details

Last name	
First name(s)	
Student Register number	
Discipline	

Mr/Mrs

.....

underwent the mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral

School:..... of the University of Białystok

Remotely/ in person*

before the mid-term evaluation commission, in the following composition:

Commission Chair:

Member:

.....

Member:

.....

The doctoral student has presented to the Commission his/her achievements to date. In the course of the interview, the following questions were asked of the doctoral student:

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

The commission, after reviewing the mid-term report, the supervisor's opinion and after an interview with the doctoral student, taking into account the individual

assessment of each member of the commission

has given a positive/negative* mid-term evaluation by means of a vote

Justification of the evaluation:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Commission comments

.....
.....
.....
.....

Signatures:

Chair of the Commission

Members

.....
.....

Dissenting opinion, if any, and justification by a member of the Commission

*

.....

Date and signature of commission member

.....

*delete as appropriate

Mid-term evaluation of doctoral student of the doctoral School:

.....
..... **University of Białystok**

Doctoral student's details

Last name	
First name(s)	
Student Register number	
Discipline	

On the day of the mid-term evaluation commission
composed as follows:

Commission Chair:
Member:
Member:

has given you a **passing/failing*** mid-term evaluation. **Justification**

of the evaluation

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Commission comments

.....
.....
.....
.....

Signatures:

Chair of the Commission

Members

.....
.....

Dissenting opinion of a member of the commission and justification, if any*

.....

Date and signature of commission member

.....

Notice

Within 7 days of receipt of the mid-term evaluation, the doctoral student may appeal from the mid-term evaluation to the mid-term appeals commission. The appeal shall be submitted through the director of the doctoral school.

Received on:

Date and signature of the doctoral student

Sent by registered letter on:

*delete as appropriate