**Order no. 2/2022**

**of the Director of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences**

**from 23 February 2022**

**on: establishing the detailed requirements for admission to the mid-term assessment, assessment criteria, the schedule for the mid-term assessment and the template of the mid-term assessment committee meeting report**

Pursuant to § 2 section 1 and § 4 section 1 point 16 of the Rector of the Jagiellonian University Order No. 10 of February 14, 2019 on the establishment of doctoral schools at the Jagiellonian University, §18 sec. 8 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences, with the consolidated text attached as Annex 1 to Resolution no. 4/I/2022 of the Jagiellonian University Senate from 26 January 2022, and § 6 of Regulation no. 1/2022 of the Director of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences from 23 February 2022 on the Regulations for the mid-term assessment in the doctoral programmes of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences, I hereby order the following:

§ 1 [Scope]

The order lays down the detailed requirements for admission to the mid-term assessment, assessment criteria, the schedule for the mid-term assessment and the template of the mid-term assessment committee meeting report.

§ 2 [Detailed requirements for admission to the mid-term assessment]

1. A doctoral student of the 8-semester programme is obliged to submit the following documents to the School Office not later than on June 30 of the year in which the mid-term assessment takes place, and a doctoral student of the 6-semester programme at the latest by November 30 of the year preceding the mid-term assessment:

1) a report on the implementation of an individual research plan prepared in cooperation with the supervisor, in paper and electronic format, prepared according to the template of the form constituting Annex 1 to the Order, approved by the supervisor/supervisors, auxiliary supervisor, doctoral committee, if appointed;

2) a portfolio of numbered attachments confirming all the results of the research mentioned in the report in paper and electronic format;

3) opinion of the supervisor/supervisors, auxiliary supervisor and doctoral committee, if appointed, containing a clearly distinct assessment of the scientific quality of the presented results in paper and electronic format.

2. A portfolio is understood as a set of documents confirming the achievement of each of the effects indicated in the report and the progress of the doctoral student's research. The portfolio should include materials enabling the evaluation of the doctoral student's achievements to date in the process of implementing an individual research plan and verification of the doctoral student's compliance with the core competencies criteria:

1) original scientific publications directly related to the research topic carried out by the doctoral student, published or accepted for publication in journals from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science: full copy of the publication or manuscript with confirmation of acceptance for publication;

2) data analysis report: description of the results obtained along with the presentation of preliminary conclusions;

3) review of the literature directly related to the subject of the individual research plan: a full copy of the review article or a review of the literature published or accepted for publication in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science or a manuscript with confirmation of acceptance for publication;

4) patent application or obtained patent: full copy of the documentation, confirmation of filing for a patent application;

5) personal certificates of completed courses necessary for the research methods planned in the individual research plan, in the form of courses;

6) confirmation of training in techniques and methods necessary for the implementation of an individual research plan: certificate from the head of the unit in which the doctoral student underwent a research internship, listing the research techniques mastered by the doctoral student;

7) confirmation of obtained financing or a documented attempt to obtain financing for a research project thematically related to the individual research plan: decision to grant funding, and in the absence of a decision, a complete application for funding with confirmation of its submission;

8) presentation of research results directly related to the research topic carried out by the doctoral student, presented at a national or foreign scientific conference: confirmation of the conference organizer, excerpt from the conference program, copy of the abstract in the conference materials;

9) other achievements not directly related to the research topic (other publications, courses, conference presentations, etc.): respectively, as in points 1-8.

3. The documentation submitted by the doctoral student in accordance with the above principles is then supplemented by the School Office with the approved final version of the individual research plan and the approved report on the implementation of the individual research plan after the 1st year of education.

4. The fulfilment of the requirements for the mid-term assessment is verified by the Co-ordinator on the basis of the submitted documents. In the event of failure to submit the documents referred to in sec. 1 or finding deficiencies in the documentation, the Co-ordinator calls for the removal of the deficiencies within the prescribed period, not shorter than seven days.

5. The Co-ordinator, after verification referred to in sec. 4, forwards the documentation collected in the case to the Committee, along with the information about identified deficiencies.

§ 3 [Assessment criteria]

1. The Commission shall carry out a mid-term assessment on the basis of:

1) a report on the implementation of an individual research plan, a portfolio of numbered appendices confirming the above-mentioned results of the research and the opinion of the supervisor/supervisors, auxiliary supervisor and the doctoral committee, if appointed;

2) materials documenting the course of the doctoral student's research made available during the meeting of the Committee (individual research plan, report on the implementation of an individual research plan after the 1st year of education);

3) presentation by the doctoral student of the results of the research being carried out - in the form of slides with the doctoral student's commentary during the mid-term assessment committee meeting;

4) discussion with the doctoral student after the presentation.

2. The criteria for the mid-term assessment include three formal criteria and substantive criteria (four hard and four soft).

3. Positive evaluation requires meeting all (3 out of 3) formal criteria and at least 2 out of 8 substantive criteria, including at least 1 hard criterion.

4. The formal criteria include:

1) a positive opinion of the supervisor, auxiliary supervisor and the doctoral committee, if appointed, on the scientific quality of the results of the doctoral student's research;

2) approval by the supervisor/supervisors, auxiliary supervisor, doctoral committee, if appointed, of the report submitted in connection with the mid-term assessment;

3) approval by the Co-ordinator of the report on the implementation of the individual research plan after the 1st year of education.

5. The substantive criteria (4 hard and 4 soft) relate to activities directly involved with the implementation of an individual research plan:

1) hard criterion - preliminary results of the research planned in the individual research plan carried out by the doctoral student (evaluation based on the original article published or accepted for publication in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or the Ministry of Education and Science, approved by the supervisor as a component of the future doctoral dissertation);

2) hard criterion - a data analysis report with preliminary results and conclusions directly related to the subject matter of an individual research plan, indicating the percentage progress of work on the PhD dissertation (assessment based on the presented report);

3) hard criterion - a literature review (evaluation based on a review article or review of literature published or accepted for publication in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science, directly related to the subject matter of an individual research plan, approved by the supervisor as a component of the future PhD dissertation);

4) hard criterion - a patent application or a patent obtained, related to the subject matter of an individual research plan, approved by the supervisor as a component of the future PhD dissertation (evaluation based on a decision to obtain a patent or a patent application confirmation);

5) soft criterion - completion by the doctoral student of methodological courses, including statistical or ethical issues in the scope of research methods planned in the individual research plan (assessment based on the personal certificate of completion of the course);

6) soft criterion - completion by the doctoral student of training in techniques and methods necessary for the implementation of an individual research plan, in the form of at least a 5-day research internship (or an equivalent period of time) outside the current research institution (assessment based on a certificate from the head of the unit, where the doctoral student completed an internship, listing the research techniques mastered by the doctoral student);

7) soft criterion - obtained funding or a documented attempt to obtain funding for a research project thematically related to an individual research plan - as the coordinator of a project financed from non-university sources, or intra-university (assessment based on the decision to grant funding or on the basis of a complete application for funding with confirmation of its submission);

8) soft criterion - presentation of the results at a national or foreign scientific conference, directly related to the subject matter of an individual research plan (assessment based on confirmation from the conference organizer, excerpt from the conference program, copy of the abstract in conference materials).

6. Fulfilment of the formal and individual substantive criteria is assessed by the Committee in the closed part of the meeting.

§4 [Schedule of the mid-term assessment]

The schedule of the mid-term assessment is set out in Annex 2 to this Order.

§ 5 [Template of the mid-term assessment committee report]

The template of the mid-term assessment committee report, is set out in Annex 3 to this Order.

§ 6 [Final provisions]

The Order shall enter into force on the day of its signing.

Annex no. 1 to the Order no. 2/2022

of the Director of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences from 23 February 2022

**Report from the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (IRP) for mid-term assessment on the research topic entitled ”……………………………………………………………………………………………”**

**for the period ……………../……………..**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and surname of the PhD student:** |  |
| **Unit where the project is carried out:** |  |
| **Supervisor/supervisors/auxiliary supervisor:** |  |

1. Information about the PhD dissertation. Concise description **(300 words max.)**

|  |
| --- |
| Assumptions:  Aims:  Materials and study methodology:  Preliminary results: |

1. substantive criteria encompassing the activities **related directly to IRP implementation**:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Assessed outcome** | **Annex(es) no.** |
| **Hard 1.** | original article published or accepted for publication in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science\* |  |
| **Hard 2.** | analyses of the obtained data with preliminary results and conclusions |  |
| **Hard 3.** | review article or a review of the literature published or accepted for publication in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science\* |  |
| **Hard 4.** | patent application or obtained patent |  |
| **Soft 1.** | completed methodological or ethical courses or statistical methods with a personal certificate |  |
| **Soft 2.** | completed training in techniques and methods necessary for the implementation of IRP, in the form of at least a 5-day research internship in a unit that is not the current of research |  |
| **Soft 3.** | obtained funding or documented attempt to obtain financing for a research project thematically related to IRP - as a project coordinator; decision of awarding funds or complete funding application with confirmation of submission |  |
| **Soft 4.** | presentation of results at a national or foreign scientific conference |  |

\*enter the authors, title of the journal

\*\*enter the authors, title, name of the conference, place and date

1. Research activity **not related** directly to implementation of IRP:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of academic achievement** | **List of academic achievements**  **(JUMC affiliation required)** | **Annex(es) no.** |
| Original article published or accepted for publication in journals from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science | *authors, title, journal, year, issue, pages (if listed), article number (if listed), doi* |  |
| Review article published or accepted for publication in journals from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science and Higher Education | *authors, title, journal, year, issue, pages* |  |
| Authorship of a foreign textbook or scientific monograph | *authors, title, publisher, year* |  |
| Authorship of a Polish textbook or scientific monograph | *authors, title, publisher, year* |  |
| Authorship of a chapter in a foreign textbook or scientific monograph | *authors, title, publisher, year* |  |
| Authorship of a chapter in a Polish textbook or scientific monograph | *authors, title, publisher, year* |  |
| Patent application or patent | *name* |  |
| Case study, letters to the editor, short communications published or accepted for publication in journals from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science | *authors, title, journal, year, issue, pages* |  |
| International conference publications | *authors, title, name of the conference, place, date* |  |
| National conference publications | *authors, title, name of the conference, place, date* |  |
| Other achievements,  not mentioned above |  |  |

1. Other required attachments submitted by the doctoral student:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of attachment** | **Annex(es) no.** |
| Opinion of the supervisor/supervisors/auxiliary supervisor/doctoral committee on the scientific quality of the results of the PhD student's research (**formal criterion**) |  |

1. Attachments from the School Office of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of attachment** | **Annex(es) no.** |
| The report on the implementation of IRP after the 1st year of education, approved by the Co-ordinator of the Doctoral Programme (**formal criterion**) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ………………………… | …………………………………………………………………… |
| Date and signature of the PhD student | Signature of the supervisor/supervisors/auxiliary supervisor/doctoral committee |

Complete documentation/deficiencies found\*

………………………………………………………………………….

Date and signature of the Doctoral Programme Co-ordinator

\* strikethrough as appropriate

Annex no. 2 to the Order no. 2/2022

of the Director of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences from 23 February 2022

**Schedule for conducting the mid-term assessment**

**at the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Deadlines** | | **Supervising persons and teams** |
| 8-semester programmes | 6-semester programme |
| Proposal for the composition of the mid-term assessment Committee and obtaining the consent of the proposed persons | April 1 - May 30 of the year in which the mid-term assessment is carried out | 1 October - 30 November of the year preceding the mid-term assessment | Co-ordinator of the Doctoral Programme,  Chair of the Discipline Board |
| Appointment of the mid-term assessment Committee | by 31 May of the year when the mid-term assessment is carried out | by 30 November of the year preceding the mid-term assessment | Director of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences |
| Submission to the Doctoral Programme Co-ordinators of the final, signed paper and electronic version of the report on the implementation of the individual research plan with attachments. | by 30 June of the year in which the mid-term assessment is carried out | by 30 November of the year preceding the mid-term assessment | PhD student after consulting the supervisor/ supervisors/auxiliary supervisor/doctoral committee |
| Formal verification of documents by the Co-ordinators of doctoral programmes | by 15 July of the year in which the mid-term assessment is carried out | by 15 December of the year preceding the mid-term assessment | Co-ordinator of the Doctoral Programme |
| Providing the PhD student with information on the composition of the mid-term assessment Committee and the date of the mid-term assessment | by 31 July of the year in which the mid-term assessment is carried out | by 15 January of the year in which the mid-term assessment is carried out | School Office of the School of Medical and Health Sciences |
| Delivery of the documents received from the PhD student to the mid-term assessment Committee | by 31 July of the year in which the mid-term assessment is carried out | by 15 January of the year in which the mid-term assessment is carried out | School Office of the School of Medical and Health Sciences |
| Mid-term assessment Committee meetings | 1-14 September of the year of the mid-term assessment | 1–14 March of the year of the mid-term assessment | Mid-term assessment Committee |

Annex no. 3 to the Order no. 2/2022

of the Director of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences from 23 February 2022

Mid-term Assessment Committee Meeting

**Report**

from (date) ………………………….

Mid-term Assessment Committee members:

Chair: ………………………………..

Members: ………………………………..

………………………………..

acting on the basis of §18 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences conducted a mid-term assessment of Ms/Mr…………………………………  
a PhD student of the II year of doctoral programme …..……………..........………………..…

During the meeting, the doctoral student presented the results of the 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…………………………………………………………………………………………

*content of the question*

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

………………………………………………………

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

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

*content of the question*

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

………………………………………………………

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

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

*content of the question*

Answer to question 3 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* encircle the appropriate answer

………………………………………………………

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

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

*content of the question*

Answer to question 4 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* encircle the appropriate answer

………………………………………………………

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

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

*content of the question*

Answer to question 5 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* encircle the appropriate answer

………………………………………………………

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

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

*content of the question*

Answer to question 6 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* encircle the appropriate answer

Members of the Committee express their opinion by marking the appropriate answer (satisfactory/unsatisfactory) under the given question concerning the results of research carried out in connection with the implementation of an individual research plan.

The fulfilment of the formal and individual substantive criteria is assessed by the Committee in the closed part of the meeting. In the event of disagreement within the Committee, the majority of votes decides on the assessment of individual criteria.

Positive assessment requires meeting all (3 out of 3) formal criteria and at least 2 out of 8 substantive criteria, of which at least 1 is a hard criterion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Formal and substantive criteria** | **Criterion met** | **Criterion not met** |
| \* mark with a cross in appropriate fields | |
| **Formal criteria** |  |  |
| 1. positive opinion of the supervisor/supervisors/auxiliary supervisor/doctoral committee, if appointed, on the scientific quality of the results of the PhD student's research |  |  |
| 1. approval by the supervisor/supervisors/auxiliary supervisor/doctoral committee, if appointed, of the report submitted in connection with the mid-term assessment |  |  |
| 1. approval by the Coordinator of the doctoral programme of the report on the implementation of the individual research plan after the 1st year of education |  |  |
| **Substantive criteria** |  |  |
| 1. hard criterion - preliminary results of the research planned in the individual research plan carried out by the doctoral student (evaluation based on the original article published or accepted for publication in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or the Ministry of Education and Science, approved by the supervisor as a component of the future PhD dissertation) |  |  |
| 1. hard criterion - a report on the data obtained with preliminary results and conclusions, directly related to the subject matter of the individual research plan, indicating the percentage progress of work on the PhD dissertation (assessment based on the report) |  |  |
| 1. hard criterion - literature review (evaluation based on a review article or review of literature published or accepted for publication in a journal from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education or Ministry of Education and Science, directly related to the subject matter of the individual research plan, approved by the supervisor as part of the future PhD dissertation) |  |  |
| 1. hard criterion - patent application or obtained patent, related to the subject matter of the individual research plan, approved by the supervisor as part of the future PhD dissertation (evaluation based on a patent decision or confirmation of a patent application) |  |  |
| 1. soft criterion - completion of methodological courses by the PhD student, including statistical or ethical issues, in the scope of research methods planned in the individual research plan (assessment based on the personal certificate of completion of the course) |  |  |
| 1. soft criterion - completion by the PhD student of training on techniques and methods necessary for the implementation of the individual research plan, in the form of at least 5-day research internship (or an equivalent period of time) outside the current place of research (assessment based on a certificate from the head of the unit, where the PhD student completed an internship, listing the research techniques mastered by the doctoral student) |  |  |
| 1. soft criterion - obtained funding or a documented attempt to obtain funding for a research project thematically related to the individual research plan - as a project co-ordinator financed from non-university or intra-university sources (evaluation based on a decision to grant funding or on the basis of a complete application for funding with confirmation of its submission) |  |  |
| 1. soft criterion - presentation of results at a national or foreign scientific conference, directly related to the subject the individual research plan (assessment based on the conference organizer's confirmation, excerpt from the conference program, a copy of the abstract in conference materials) |  |  |

1. Committee discussion

Committee discussion took place without the PhD student present.

Committee member …………..…….….. - positive, negative grade\*

Committee member …………..……...… - positive, negative grade\*

Committee member ………….………… - positive, negative grade\* \*

\* encircle the appropriate answer

1. Committee recommendations for the PhD student
2. Resolution of the mid-term assessment Committee on the implementation of the individual research plan at the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences

\_\_\_ votes were cast for the positive opinion, and \_\_\_ votes were cast for the negative opinion.

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

1. The committee presented the resolution on the implementation of the individual research plan to the PhD student.

At this point, the meeting was concluded.

…………………………………. - Committee Chair ………………………………….

*title/academic degree name and surname signature*

…………………………………. - Committee Member ……………………………………

*title/academic degree name and surname signature*

…………………………………. - Committee Member ……………………………………

*title/academic degree name and surname signature*

*person responsible for taking minutes of the report………………………….*