Annex 3 to Resolution 258
of the Senate of the University of Silesia of 26 April 2022

Principles of organizing and conducting the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students of the International Environmental Doctoral School associated with the Centre for Polar Studies at the University of Silesia in Katowice (IEDS)

§ 1

[legal basis]

1. The mid-term evaluation of doctoral students of the International Environmental Doctoral School associated with the Centre for Polar Studies (hereinafter referred to as the IEDS) is carried out on the basis of Article 202 of the Act of 20 July 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science, hereinafter referred to as the Act, § 13 of the Resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the International Environmental Doctoral School associated with the Centre for Polar Studies at the University of Silesia in Katowice (IEDS), hereinafter referred to as the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS and the following rules for organizing and conducting the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students of the IEDS, being part of Annex 3 to the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS.
2. The mid-term evaluation is made by the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee (hereinafter referred to as the Committee).
3. The subject of the mid-term evaluation is to verify the progress of the IEDS doctoral student who is subject to this evaluation in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (hereinafter referred to as the IRP).

§ 2

[Mid-term Evaluation Committee and its tasks]

1. The Committee, composed of the chair and two members, is appointed by the Council of the IEDS by way of a resolution. The same evaluation Committee may assess the scientific achievements of more than one doctoral student.
2. The Committee may include persons who have the post-doctoral degree or the title of professor in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation of the evaluated doctoral student is prepared. In special cases, the Committee may include no more than one person holding at least a doctoral degree and documented outstanding achievements in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared.
3. The composition of the Committee is selected from among the representatives of the IEDS entities and persons who are not employees of the IEDS entities who may be

employed both in domestic and foreign scientific and research units with the proviso the composition of the Committee:

1) should include not less than one person from outside the representatives of the IEDS entities;
2) must not include the supervisor, auxiliary supervisor, head of a research project from which a doctoral or scientific scholarship of a doctoral student or remuneration for work for a doctoral student is financed.

4. In order to ensure the subject-related support for the Committee, the Council of the IEDS may appoint experts of the Committee from among the persons employed in foreign scientific and research units, holding at least a doctoral degree and documented outstanding achievements in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation of the evaluated doctoral student is prepared. The experts shall participate in the work of the Committee in an advisory capacity.
5. Candidates for the members of the Committee and its experts are indicated by the members of the Council of the IEDS who are then obliged to present their candidacies at the meeting of the IEDS Council related to the appointment of the Committee. The designation of a candidate for the member of the Committee or its expert should include the justification.
6. The justification of designation of the candidates for the members of the Committee or its experts shall include, in particular:
   1) information on qualifications for reliable and subject-related evaluation of the IRP and research projects in disciplines represented by doctoral students who are subject to the mid-term evaluation;
   2) the candidate's statement of consent to participate in the work of the Committee.
7. At the request of the doctoral student, doctoral student and supervisor or member of the Committee, the Council of the IEDS shall exclude a member of the Committee if there is a circumstance that could give rise to reasonable doubt as to their impartiality or qualifications to assess the assumptions and the manner in which the IRP is to be implemented. The request referred to in the first sentence shall be submitted no later than 3 months before the end of the academic year in which the mid-term evaluation is to be conducted. The IEDS Council shall consider this request within 30 days of its submission. If the request is positively considered, the Council of the IEDS shall exclude the member of the Committee indicated in the request and then shall appoint another person instead using the procedure for appointing the Committee indicated in sub-s. 1 – 6.
8. At the request of a doctoral student or the board of relevant structures of the doctoral student government in the entities of IEDS, a representative of the doctoral student government in IEDS entities may participate in the work of the Committee as an observer.
9. A request to the IEDS Council on the inclusion of a representative of the doctoral student government as an observer to the work of the Committee may be submitted by the entities indicated in sub-s. 8 no later than 3 months before the end of the academic year in which the mid-term evaluation is to be conducted.

10. The doctoral student and the supervisor, supervisors or supervisor and auxiliary supervisor shall be informed in writing about the composition of the Committee by the Dean of the IEDS no later than 4 months before the end of the academic year in which the mid-term evaluation is to be conducted.
11. A member of the Committee employed outside the entities of the IEDS is entitled to the remuneration of 20% of the professor's remuneration.
12. The tasks of the Members of the Committee shall include:
    1) participation in open scientific seminars where doctoral students present a progress report on the implementation of the IRP;
    2) being familiarized with the documentation of the doctoral student for the mid-term evaluation, including the current IRP, the opinion of the supervisor or supervisors or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor and the report on the implementation of the IRP;
    3) participation in the meetings of the Committee;
    4) participation in the Committee interviews with the doctoral student and the supervisor, supervisors or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor;
    5) evaluation of the implementation of the IRP by doctoral students of the IEDS on the basis of the criteria consistent with § 5 sub-s. 1;
    6) participation in the Committee's decision on the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student;
    7) participation in the preparation of the justification for the doctoral student's mid-term evaluation;
    8) participation in the preparation of the minutes of the Committee's work.
13. The tasks of the Chair of the Committee shall include:
    1) coordination of the work of the Committee, including convening Committee meetings, inviting the doctoral student, supervisor(s), or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor for interviews; the request to the IEDS office for the documentation necessary to conduct the evaluation and for providing it to the other members of the Committee;
    2) ordering voting on the mid-term evaluation and announcing the results;
    3) forwarding the minutes of the Committee's work to the IEDS Council;
    4) forwarding the result of the evaluation together with the justification to the doctoral student, supervisor, supervisors or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor;
    5) supervising the publication of the mid-term evaluation with the justification on the IEDS website;
14. Meetings of the Committee may be held directly or remotely by means of electronic communication used at the University of Silesia in Katowice that provide in particular:
    1) transmission of the session in real time among its participants;
    2) multilateral communication between its participants in real time, in which the participants of the session can speak, while observing the necessary safety rules.

15. Secret ballot of the Committee may take place directly or remotely using electronic means of communication used at the University of Silesia in Katowice.

§ 3

[schedule for the mid-term evaluation]

1. By way of a resolution, the IEDS Council shall determine the detailed schedule for the mid-term evaluation (hereinafter referred to as 'the schedule') no later than 4 months before the end of the academic year in which the mid-term evaluation is to take place.
2. The schedule referred to in sub-s. 1 shall specify:
    1) the date(s) of open scientific seminars at which the doctoral students of the IEDS subject to the mid-term evaluation will present the progress in the implementation of the IRP and the progress of the research project;
    2) the deadline for submitting the report on the implementation of the IRP;
    3) the dates of meetings of the Committee.
3. Postponement of the dates connected with the activities related to the mid-term evaluation is possible only in emergency when the presence of the doctoral student is impossible, particularly in the case of:
    1) long-term illness;
    2) due to an accident.
4. The doctoral student's request to the Council of the IEDS to postpone the date of the activities related to the mid-term evaluation includes, in particular:
    1) the justification of the request;
    2) copies of documents confirming the existence of premises for changing the dates of the activities related to the mid-term evaluation;
    3) the opinion of the supervisor or supervisors.
5. In the event of documented premises for postponing the date of the mid-term evaluation, the Council of the IEDS shall adopt a resolution to change the schedule for performing the activities referred to in sub-s. 2.

§ 4

[bases and the process of the mid-term evaluation]

1. The mid-term evaluation shall be carried out on the basis of:
    1) a written report on the implementation of the IRP (hereinafter referred to as the report) reviewed by the supervisor or supervisors or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor;
    2) a speech/presentation at an open scientific seminar;
    3) the Committee's interview with the doctoral student and the supervisor or the doctoral student and supervisors referred to below in sub-s. 9.

2. The report is prepared according to the doctoral student's choice either in English or in Polish and English. The model report is attached as Annex 1 to this Annex to the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS. The model of Annex 1 and its translation into English shall be made available via the IEDS website.
3. The report, reviewed by the entities indicated in sub-s. 1 para 1, shall be submitted by the doctoral student of the IEDS who is subject to evaluation on the date consistent with the schedule. It shall be remotely submitted via the IEDS website and in the paper form at the IEDS office.
4. The mid-term evaluation of progress in the implementation of the IRP of the Doctoral Student of the IEDS who is subject to evaluation is a three-stage process.
5. In the first stage, the doctoral student presents to the Committee at a scientific seminar open to the public their previous scientific achievements in the implementation of the IRP and research plans covering the period until the end of education in the IEDS. The time allotted for the doctoral student's presentation may not be shorter than 15 minutes, but not longer than 25 minutes.
6. The speech referred to in sub-s. 5 should be prepared and delivered in English, and its scope should include at least a discussion of the subject and significance of the research covered by the IRP for the development of the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared, a presentation of the progress in the implementation of the IRP, the degree of advancement of the research project, the planned further stages of the implementation of the IRP until the end of the period of education at the IEDS, and, in addition, the most important scientific achievements of the doctoral student, including publication-related achievements.
7. At the end of the speech (presentation) referred to in sub-s. 5 and 6, both the members of the Committee and the audience may ask the doctoral student questions about the implementation of the IRP and the resulting research plans.
8. At the second stage, at a meeting of the Committee closed to the public, its members on the basis of the criteria set out in § 5(1) evaluate the doctoral student's progress in the implementation of the IRP and assess the possibility of achieving the research objectives assumed in the IRP.
9. The agenda of the meeting referred to in sub-s. 8 shall include an individual interview between the Committee and the doctoral student and the supervisor or between the doctoral student and supervisors. The conversation takes place in Polish or English.
10. The subject of the conversation referred to in sub-s. 9 may include issues related to the subject-matter assumptions of the doctoral dissertation presented in the IRP and their implementation, as well as the provision of explanations on the possibility of achieving the assumed research goals and their importance for the development of the discipline in which the dissertation is prepared.
11. An open scientific seminar and the conversation of the Committee with a doctoral student and a supervisor or a doctoral student and supervisors may take place directly or remotely using electronic means of communication used at the University of Silesia in Katowice, which ensures in particular:
    1) transmission of the session in real time among its participants;

2) multilateral communication between its participants in real time, in which the participants of the test can speak, while observing the necessary safety rules.

12. In the third stage, the Committee in a closed session decides on the outcome of the doctoral student's mid-term evaluation based on the criteria and rules indicated in § 5.

§ 5

[IRP evaluation and its criteria and the mid-term evaluation]

1. The Committee shall evaluate the implementation of the IRP on the basis of the following criteria:
    1) compliance of the completed research tasks and the obtained research results with the research assumptions included in the IRP, which were described in the report, and also presented at an open scientific seminar and during an individual conversation of the doctoral student in the presence of the supervisor or supervisors, at the meeting of the Committee referred to in § 4 sub-s. 9;
    2) timeliness of tasks in relation to the research plans included in the IRP;
    3) the effectiveness of the publication and presentation of research results obtained at the current stage of IRP implementation;
    4) the significance of the research projects carried out by the doctoral student;
    5) significance of the forms of raising qualifications in connection with the implementation of the IRP for the achievement of the assumed research goals undertaken by the doctoral student;
    6) the degree of advancement of the preparation of the doctoral dissertation and the possibility of achieving the research goals set in the IRP in the assumed time and its timely submission in accordance with the IRP.
2. The mid-term evaluation shall end with a positive or negative result.
3. The final mid-term evaluation shall be taken by the full Committee by secret ballot by the majority of its members.
4. In the event of a tie, where one of the members of the Committee abstains or where all the members of the Committee abstain from voting, the final decision on the outcome of the final evaluation shall be taken by the Chair of the Committee.
5. The Committee shall draw up an individual protocol for the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student of the IEDS, which constitutes Annex 2 to this Annex to the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS.
6. A doctoral student of the IEDS receives a written certificate of the result of the mid-term evaluation together with the justification signed by the Chair of the Committee. The certificate form is attached as Annex 3 to this Annex to the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS. At the request of the doctoral student, the certificate is translated into English, and the conformity of the translation with the original shall be confirmed by the signature of the Chair of the Committee.

7. The outcome of the mid-term evaluation with the justification shall be open and shall be published on the IEDS website for a period of twelve months from the date of the mid-term evaluation.
8. In the event of negative assessment, the doctoral student is removed from the list of doctoral students by way of an administrative decision issued by the Dean of the IEDS under the authority of the Rector of the University of Silesia in Katowice. The decision related to the removal from the list of doctoral students may be appealed by means of the request for another cognition of the case to the Rector of the University of Silesia in Katowice through the Dean of the IEDS within 14 days from the date of receipt of the decision.

Annex 1 to Annex 3 to Resolution 258
of the Senate of the University of Silesia of 26 April 2022

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP)

prepared as part of the mid-term evaluation at the International Environmental Doctoral School associated with the Centre for Polar Studies at the University of Silesia in Katowice

A. PERSONAL DATA OF THE DOCTORAL STUDENT:			
Professional title **Name and surname:** ……	**Student record book no.:** ……	**Email:** ……	**Date of commencement of education at the doctoral school: .....**
Affiliation: ☐ **UŚ (University of Silesia)** ☐ **IGF PAN (Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences)** ☐ **IM PAN (Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences)** ☐ **IO PAN (Institute of Oceanology, Polish Academy of Sciences)**			**Discipline: .....**

B. PERSONAL DATA OF THE SUPERVISOR(S)/AUXILIARY SUPERVISOR:			
SUPERVISOR:			
Academic title/degree **Name and surname:** ……	**Discipline:** ……	**Affiliation:** ……..	**Email:** ……. ……
SUPERVISOR/AUXILIARY SUPERVISOR*:			
Academic title/degree **Name and surname:** ……	**Discipline:** ……	**Affiliation:** ……..	**Email:** ……. ……

* applicable if the second supervisor or the auxiliary supervisor has been appointed; delete where not applicable

C. THE CONCEPT OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS
TITLE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION:
SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT (up to 5000 characters)**:**

DESCRIPTION OF PREVIOUS RESULTS AND THE MOST IMPORTANT SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS (up to 5000 characters):

D. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN (IRP) IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR 20…./20…. AND 20…./20….				
Task category*	IRP-compliant task description	Planned deadline in accordance with the IRP**	Degree of implementation, effects of implementation	Actions taken/planned to reduce discrepancies between the IRP schedule and the degree of task completion***

E. LIST OF TASKS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT NOT INCLUDED IN THE IRP* **			
Task category*	Task description	Deadline	Effects of implementation

* Categories of tasks of the doctoral dissertation preparation schedule: **RT** – research tasks; **INT** – internships, specialist courses, workshops, other forms of improving qualifications; **PIC** – participation in conferences, symposia, seminars, presentation of research results; **OF** – obtaining funds for the implementation of a doctoral project; **PUB** – preparation of peer-reviewed scientific publications; **OT** – other tasks related to the preparation of the doctoral dissertation.

** Please enter all tasks planned in the IRP to be carried out for the mid-term evaluation and tasks planned in the IRP to be carried out in the following years if they have been fully or partially completed.

*** complete if applicable

F. LIST OF PUBLICATION ACHIEVEMENTS, PARTICIPATION IN SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES, IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS, FORMS OF IMPROVING DOCTORAL STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IRP *			
Publications in scientific journals or peer-reviewed materials from international conferences listed in the annex to the current communication of the Ministry of Education and Science (hereinafter referred to as MEaS) on the list of scientific journals and peer-reviewed materials from international conferences.			
Bibliographic description	Impact Factor	Number of MEaS points	The scope of work carried out by the doctoral student during the preparation of the publication

Scientific monographs or chapters in scientific monographs published by the publishing houses listed in the annex to the current MEaS communication on the list of publishers publishing peer-reviewed scientific monographs.		
Bibliographic description	Number of MEaS points	The scope of work carried out by the doctoral student during the preparation of the publication

Ongoing or co-implemented projects involving scientific research				
Project title and acronym	Project Manager	Source of financing	Implementation period	Role in the project and description of the tasks performed

Speeches at scientific conferences (paper, poster, other)			
Title of the speech/presentation	Conference title	Date and place	Form of presentation (paper, poster, other)

Internships, courses, trainings, academic exchanges, other forms of upskilling			
Organiser/host institution	Title or subject-related scope	Subject-related tutors, instructors, lecturers	Date

Other achievements

* to the report please provide the attachments confirming the achievements: a copy of the title page of the publication or monograph, the conference programme or abstract of the presentation, the decision on financing the project, certificates of training, internships and others.

G. DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION
Planned date of submission of the doctoral dissertation in accordance with the IRP: ..... *(day-month-year)*

Assessment of the level of advancement of the preparation of the doctoral dissertation (in %): .....
Assessment of the risk of the delay in the submission of the doctoral dissertation and planned actions to minimize it (up to 1000 characters):

H. COMMENTS (additional information and explanations to the content of the report; complete if applicable; up to 1000 characters)

I. LIST OF ANNEXES
1.
2.

……..

(date and signature of the doctoral student)

J. OPINIONS OF THE SUPERVISOR(S) OR SUPERVISOR AND THE AUXILIARY SUPERVISOR
Opinion of the supervisor:
…….. *(date and signature of the supervisor)*
Opinion of the supervisor/auxiliary supervisor*:
* applicable if the second supervisor or the auxiliary supervisor has been appointed; delete where not applicable …….. *(date and signature of the supervisor or the auxiliary supervisor)*

It was submitted to the Office of the International Environmental Doctoral School and the Centre for Polar Studies:

……

(date and signature of the Dean of the IEDS)

Annex 2 to Annex 3 to Resolution 258
of the Senate of the University of Silesia of 26 April 2022

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

at the International Environmental Doctoral School associated with the Centre for Polar Studies at the University of Silesia in Katowice

A. DATA OF THE DOCTORAL STUDENT AND THE TITLE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION:		
Professional title **Name and surname:** **……**	**Student record book no.:** **……**	**Date of commencement of education at the doctoral school: .....**
Affiliation: ☐ **UŚ (University of Silesia)** ☐ **IGF PAN (Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences)** ☐ **IM PAN (Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences)** ☐ **IO PAN (Institute of Oceanology, Polish Academy of Sciences)**		**Discipline: .....**
TITLE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION: **…….**		

B. DATA OF THE SUPERVISOR(S)/AUXILIARY SUPERVISOR:		
SUPERVISOR:		
Academic title/degree **Name and surname:** **……**	**Discipline:** **……**	**Affiliation:** **……..**
SUPERVISOR/AUXILIARY SUPERVISOR*:		
Academic title/degree **Name and surname:** **……**	**Discipline:** **……**	**Affiliation:** **……..**

* complete if the second supervisor or the auxiliary supervisor has been appointed; delete where not applicable

C. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION:		
THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE:		
Academic title/degree **Name and surname:** ……	**Discipline:** ……	**Affiliation:** ……..
MEMBER:		
Academic title/degree **Name and surname:** ……	**Discipline:** ……	**Affiliation:** ……..
MEMBER:		
Academic title/degree **Name and surname:** ……	**Discipline:** ……	**Affiliation:** ……..

D. MID-TERM EVALUATION			
Date of submission of the Individual Research Plan (IRP) implementation report: ……	**Date of presentation of progress in the implementation of IRP at the scientific seminar:** ……	**Date of the Committee's interview with the doctoral student and the supervisor(s), or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor:** ……	**Date of mid-term evaluation:** ……
Mode of work of the committee (direct/remote):			
Scientific seminar: ……	**The Committee's interview with the doctoral student and supervisors:** ……..	**Closed session of the Committee:** ……	**Vote on the mid-term evaluation:** …….
Questions to the doctoral student asked during the scientific seminar and the name and surname of the person asking the question*: 1. …… 2. ……			
Questions to the doctoral student asked during the interview with the Committee and the name and surname of the person asking the question: 1. …… 2. ……			
The interview with the Committee was attended by the PhD student, supervisor(s), auxiliary supervisor**			

* the attendance list at the scientific seminar is attached to the minutes of the mid-term evaluation committee

** delete where not applicable

E. OUTCOME OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

Acting on the basis of § 13 of the Resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS and in accordance with the principles of organizing and conducting the mid-term evaluation of Doctoral Students of the IEDS set out in Annex 3 to the resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS, the Committee for Mid-Term Evaluation carried out the mid-term evaluation of:

……

(professional title, name and surname)

After being familiarized with the Individual Research Plan (IRP), a written report on the implementation of the IRP together with the opinions of the supervisor(s)/supervisor and auxiliary supervisor*, listening to the speech at an open scientific seminar, interviewing the doctoral student and supervisor(s)/supervisor and auxiliary supervisor*

……**

The Mid-Term Evaluation Committee issues the opinion/evaluation:

……***

Voting results:

Number of votes in favour of the positive assessment: .....

Number of votes in favour of the negative assessment: .....

Number of abstained votes: .....

In accordance with § 5 sub-s. 4 of the rules for the organization and mid-term evaluation of doctoral students of the IEDS set out in Annex 3 to the resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS in the event of an equal number of votes when one of the members of the Committee abstains from voting or when all members of the Committee abstain from voting, the final decision on the outcome of the final evaluation shall be taken by the Chair of the Committee.

Notes to the minutes****:

……

……

* delete where not applicable

** please indicate the other premises on the basis of which the Committee carried out the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student

***provide: "positive" or "negative"

****please note if a representative of the doctoral student government participated in the work of the Committee as an observer

F. JUSTIFICATION OF THE OUTCOME OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

Student record book no.:.....

Detailed justification of the Committee on the result of the mid-term evaluation in relation to the criteria for evaluating the implementation of the Individual Research Plan set out in § 5 sub-s. 1 of the Annex 3 to the resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS. The result of the mid-term evaluation together with the justification is open and will be published on the IEDS website for a period

of twelve months from the date of the mid-term evaluation (in accordance with § 13 sub-s. 4 of the resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS).

……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……

G. SIGNATURES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION
1. (name and surname of the Chair of the Committee, signature) …… 2. (name and surname of the Member of the Committee, signature) …… 3. (name and surname of the Member of the Committee, signature) ……

Annex 3 to Annex 3 to Resolution 258
of the Senate of the University of Silesia of 26 April 2022

CERTIFICATE OF THE OUTCOME OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

at the International Environmental Doctoral School associated with the Centre for Polar Studies at the University of Silesia in Katowice

A. DATA OF THE DOCTORAL STUDENT AND THE TITLE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION:		
Professional title **Name and surname:** ……	**Student record book no.:** ……	**Date of commencement of education at the doctoral school: .....**
Affiliation: ☐ **UŚ (University of Silesia)** ☐ **IGF PAN (Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences)** ☐ **IM PAN (Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences)** ☐ **IO PAN (Institute of Oceanology, Polish Academy of Sciences)**		**Discipline: .....**
TITLE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION: ……		

B. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION:	
THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE:	
Academic title/degree **Name and surname: .....**	**Affiliation: ……..**
MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:	
Academic title/degree **Name and surname: .....**	**Affiliation: ……..**
Academic title/degree **Name and surname: .....**	**Affiliation: ……..**

C. OUTCOME OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION
Acting on the basis of § 13 of the Resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS and in accordance with the principles of organization and conducting

the mid-term evaluation of Doctoral Students of the IEDS set out in Annex 3 to the resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS, the Committee for Mid-Term Evaluation carried out the mid-term evaluation of:

……

(professional title, name and surname)

After being familiarized with the Individual Research Plan (IRP), a written report on the implementation of the IRP together with the opinions of the supervisor(s)/supervisor and auxiliary supervisor*, listening to the speech at an open scientific seminar, interviewing the PhD student and supervisor(s)/supervisor and auxiliary supervisor*

……**

The Mid-Term Evaluation Committee issues the opinion/evaluation:

……***

Date of the mid-term evaluation: .....

* delete where not applicable

** please indicate the other premises on the basis of which the Committee carried out the mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student

***provide "positive" or "negative"

D. JUSTIFICATION OF THE OUTCOME OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

Detailed justification of the Committee on the result of the mid-term evaluation in relation to the criteria for evaluating the implementation of the Individual Research Plan set out in § 5 sub-s. 1 of Annex 3 to the resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS. The result of the mid-term evaluation together with the justification is open and will be published on the IEDS website for a period of twelve months from the date of the mid-term evaluation (in accordance with § 13 sub-s. 4 of the resolution of the Senate of the University of Silesia in Katowice of 26 April 2022 on determining the Rules and Regulations of the IEDS).

……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……

…… …… …… …… ……

E. SIGNATURE OF THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION	**F. SEAL OF THE IEDS**
…… (name of the Chair of the Committee, signature)	