ANNEX 1.

**Protocol**

from the meeting of the Mid-term evaluation committee of PhD students

on ………………………….

The mid-term evaluation committee composed of:

Chairman: ………………………………..

Members: ……………………………… ..

 ……………………………… ..

acting pursuant to §18 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences of the Jagiellonian University carried out the mid-term evaluation of Ms /Mr. …………………....…………………

2nd year PhD student in the doctoral programme in the discipline of science …………………………………….

During the meeting, the PhD student presented his achievements made in the course of research in the selected research topic, entitled.......................................................................................................

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

1. Questions asked during the meeting by members of the Committee.

…………………………………………….............…………

*(title, name and surname of the person asking the question)*

question ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

 *the content of the question*

Answer to question 1 - satisfactory / unsatisfactory \* *circle the appropriate answer*

…………………………………………….............…………

*(title, name and surname of the person asking the question)*

question ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

 *the content of the question*

Answer to question 2 - satisfactory / unsatisfactory

…………………………………………….............…………

*(title, name and surname of the person asking the question)*

question ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

 *the content of the question*

Answer to question 3 - satisfactory / unsatisfactory

…………………………………………….............…………

*(title, name and surname of the person asking the question)*

question ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

 *the content of the question*

Answer to question 4 - satisfactory / unsatisfactory

…………………………………………….............…………

*(title, name and surname of the person asking the question)*

question ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

 *the content of the question*

Answer to question 5 - satisfactory / unsatisfactory

…………………………………………….............…………

*(title, name and surname of the person asking the question)*

question ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

 *the content of the question*

Answer to question 6 - satisfactory / unsatisfactory

Members of the Committee express their opinion by marking the appropriate answer (satisfactory / unsatisfactory) under the given question regarding the achievements made in the course of research in the scientific topic selected by the doctoral student related to the implementation of the iIndividual research plan.

The fulfillment of the formal and individual substantive criteria is assessed by the committee in the classified part of the meeting. In the event of a disagreement within the committee, the majority of votes shall decide on the assessment of individual criteria.

Positive evaluation requires meeting all (2 out of 2) formal criteria and at least 2 out of 5 substantive criteria, with at least 1 hard criterion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Formal and substantive criteria** | **Criterion met** | **Criterion not met** |
| \*place a cross in the appropriate boxes |
| **Formal criteria** |  |  |
| 1. positive opinion of the supervisor(s) on the scientific quality of the results of the doctoral student's research |  |  |
| 2. approval of the report on the implementation of individual research plan after the 1st year of education by the Head of the PhD programme  |  |  |
| **Substantive criteria** |  |  |
| 1. hard criterion - preliminary results of the research planned in the individual research plan conducted by the PhD student (a positive assessment on the basis of the original work published in a journal from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education list or a preliminary database analysis) |  |  |
| 2.hard criterion - literature review (positive assessment on the basis of a review paper or a literature review - published in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, thematically related to the subject of the individual research plan) |  |  |
| 3. soft criterion - obtaining certificates by the PhD student necessary for research methods planned in the individual research plan, in the form of methodological courses or courses on ethical issues or statistical methods (a positive assessment on the basis of a personal certificate of completion of the course) |  |  |
| 4. soft criterion - training in techniques and methods necessary for the implementation of individual research plan, in the form of at least a 5-day research internship in a domestic or foreign unit other than the individual research plan implementation unit (positive assessment based on the certificate from the head of the unit in which the PhD student completed his research internship, listing the research techniques mastered by the PhD student) |  |  |
| 5. soft criterion - obtaining funding or a documented attempt to obtain funding for a research project thematically related to the individual research plan - as a project coordinator financed from non-university or intra-university sources (positive evaluation based on a decision to grant funding or on the basis of a complete application for funding with confirmation of its submission) |  |  |

2. Committee's discussion

The committee's discussion took place without the participation of the PhD student.

Member of the Committee ………… .…….…..... - positive, negative \* evaluation

Member of the Committee ………… .…...……… - positive, negative \* evaluation

Member of the Committee …………. ………...… - positive, negative \* evaluation

\* *circle the appropriate answer*

3. Resolution of the Mid-term evaluation committee on the implementation of the individual research plan at the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences of the Jagiellonian University.

By voting for a positive evaluation, \_\_\_ votes were cast,

\_\_\_ votes were cast for a negative evaluation.

The Committee adopted the resolution, positively / negatively assessing the implementation of the individual research plan of Ms / Mr ……………………………………..

4. The Committee presented the resolution on the implementation of the individual research plan to the PhD student.

At this point, the meeting was closed.

…………………………………………………. - Chair of the committee ………………………………...

*title / academic degree, name and surname signature*

…………………………………………………. - Member of the committee ..................................

*title / academic degree, name and surname signature*

…………………………………………………. - Member of the committee ...................................

*title / academic degree, name and surname signature*

The minutes of the meeting were registered by ………………………….