

## **Rules for conducting mid-term evaluation of the Individual Research Plan of doctoral students**

approved by the Scientific Board  
of the Poznan University of Physical Education on January 13, 2020.

*Legal basis:* the Law of July 20, 2018 Law on Higher Education and Science, Journal of Laws, item 1668, Articles 202, 203; Regulations of the Doctoral School of the Poznan University of Physical Education, §15 paragraphs 6–8.

### **§ 1**

The Director of the Doctoral School introduces the rules for the mid-term evaluation of the Individual Research Plan (**IRP**) at the Doctoral School of the Poznan University of Physical Education.

### **§ 2**

The implementation of the IRP is subject to a mid-term evaluation at the end of the fourth semester of training at the Doctoral School, i.e. between September 16 and 30.

### **§ 3**

1. The committee conducting the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students' IRP shall be appointed by the Scientific Board of the University.
2. The committee conducting the mid-term evaluation shall be composed of 3 persons holding the habilitation degree or a professor's title, at least one of whom shall be employed outside the Poznan University of Physical Education, shall not be employed in any form at the Poznan University of Physical Education, and shall have obtained the habilitation degree or a professor's title in the discipline of physical culture science. At least two members of the committee must hold the habilitation degree or a professorship in the discipline of physical culture science.
3. The supervisor and assistant supervisor of any of the doctoral students to be evaluated and the director of the Doctoral School may not be members of the committee.

### **§ 4**

1. The basic criterion for the mid-term evaluation is the report on the implementation of IRP submitted by the doctoral student in the second year of training, no later than September 15.
2. The template of the IRP implementation report is included in the Appendix to these rules. The doctoral student is required to submit attachments confirming the implementation of the scientific activities described in the report.
3. The procedure for the mid-term evaluation of the implementation of the IRP is in two parts:
  - a) in the open part, within the framework of the semester seminar provided for in the curriculum, the doctoral student presents his/her research problem that is the basis of the doctoral dissertation and reports on the progress in the implementation of the IRP before the committee and the seminar participants. The doctoral student is obliged to answer all questions from the committee and seminar participants related to the research problem being pursued;

b) in the closed part, the committee discusses and evaluates the implementation of the IRP, votes on the evaluation of the implementation of the IRP and prepares a justification for the evaluation. The Director of the Doctoral School participates as an observer in the closed part of the committee's deliberations.

#### § 5

1. Each member of the committee, by secret voting, evaluates the implementation of the doctoral student's IRP as either positive or negative. The mid-term evaluation of the IRP ends with a positive or negative result. A positive result requires at least two positive and a negative result requires at least two negative votes of the committee members.
2. Failure to submit the report by the deadline specified in § 4 section 1 or absence of a doctoral student during the open part of the procedure (§ 4, 3a), not justified by important reasons, shall be equivalent to a negative mid-term evaluation.
3. The IRP evaluation of a doctoral student with justification shall be public.
4. A negative mid-term evaluation shall result in the removal of the doctoral student from the list of doctoral students.
5. A decision on removal from the list of doctoral students as a result of a negative mid-term evaluation is entitled to apply for reconsideration under the rules set forth in the

#### § 6

The rules enter into force on the day they are approved by the Scientific Board.

Director of the Doctoral School

( ----- )

prof. AWF dr hab. Krzysztof Kusy

## Report on the Implementation of the Doctoral Student's Individual Research Plan for the Mid-Term Evaluation

Please fill out the form in a word processor and print it out

### Doctoral student data

Doctoral student's name:

Doctoral Students ID Card number:

Supervisor (*degree/title, first name, university, department*):

Assistant supervisor (*degree/title, first name, university, department*):

Title of the scientific project on the basis of which the dissertation will be prepared:

### Description of completed research

Please indicate below the degree/range of implementation of the research activities planned in the previously submitted Individual Research Plan, in particular:

- a) application for funds for doctoral project  
.....
- b) submission of an application to the bioethics committee or ethics committee on animal research.....
- c) the subsequent stages of practical implementation of IPB (e.g., recruitment of participants, scheduling of tests, analysis and development of results, etc.).....
- d) participation in internships, workshops, conferences, specialized scientific training related to the implementation of research .....
- e) submission of manuscripts with research results for publication in scientific journals  
.....
- f) submission of dissertation .....

You can add other scientific activities carried out during the training at the Doctoral School.

### Date and signature of the

#### Supervisor's Opinion

positive

negativ

Date, signature: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Assistant Supervisor's Opinion

positive

negative

Date, signature:

**Opinion of the committee conducting the mid-term evaluation**

Justification for evaluation:

.....

Signatures of the committee members:

1. ....

Date: .....

2. ....

3. ....