Annex No. 3 to Order No. 2/2025

of the Director of the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences   
dated 28 February 2025

**Report**

of the Mid-term Assessment Committee Meeting

drawn on ............................... [date]

The Mid-term Assessment Committee, consisting of:

Chair: ......................................

Members: ......................................

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

acting on the basis of §18 of the Regulations for Doctoral Schools of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, annexed to Resolution No. 39/IV/2023 of the Senate of the Jagiellonian University, dated 26 April 2023, has conducted a mid-term assessment of Ms/Mr........................................, the PhD student of the second year in the doctoral programme ............................................... .

During the meeting, the PhD student presented the results of their research on the selected topic, titled:

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

1.Questions posed by Committee members during the meeting.

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

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

Question: .........................................................................................................

*content of the question*

Answer to question 1 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* *tick the appropriate box*

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

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

Question: ..........................................................................................................

*content of the question*

Answer to question 2 -satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* *tick the appropriate box*

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

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

Question: ....................................................................................................................

*content of the question*

Answer to question 3 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* *tick the appropriate box*

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

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

Question: ......................................................................................................................

*content of the question*

Answer to question 4 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* *tick the appropriate box*

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

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

Question: .........................................................................................................................

*content of the question*

Answer to question 5 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* *tick the appropriate box*

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

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

Question: .........................................................................................................................

*content of the question*

Answer to question 6 - satisfactory/unsatisfactory\* tick the appropriate box

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

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

The Committee members express their opinion by selecting either 'satisfactory' or 'unsatisfactory' in response to the question regarding the results of the research conducted as part of the implementation of the Individual Research Plan.

In the closed session, without the PhD student present, the Committee reviewed the presentation and discussion with the PhD student, deliberated on the progress of the Individual Research Plan, and determined the assessment outcome.

The Committee’s assessment of how well the plan has met its objectives, the research conducted, and its adherence to the planned timeline:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is recommended that the PhD student meet at least two of the eight merit criteria, including at least one hard criterion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Substantive criteria** | **Criterion fulfilled** | **Criterion not fulfilled** |
| \* put a cross in a relevant box | |
| 1. Hard (objective) criterion – Preliminary results of the PhD student's research as planned in the Individual Research Plan, assessed based on a published or accepted-for-publication original work in a journal listed in the registry of the Ministry of Education and Science, and approved by the supervisor as a component of the future PhD dissertation. |  |  |
| 1. Hard criterion – A data analysis report with preliminary results and conclusions, directly related to the subject of the Individual Research Plan, indicating the percentage progress of the PhD dissertation (assessed based on the submitted report). |  |  |
| 1. Hard criterion – Literature review (assessed based on an opinion or review paper published or accepted for publication in a journal listed in the registry of the Ministry of Education and Science, directly related to the subject of the Individual Research, and approved by the supervisor as a component of the future PhD dissertation). |  |  |
| 1. Hard criterion – Patent application or granted patent related to the subject of the Individual Research Plan, approved by the supervisor as a component of the future PhD dissertation (assessed based on the patent grant decision or confirmation of the patent application). |  |  |
| 1. Soft (subjective) criterion – Completion of methodological courses by the PhD student, including statistical or ethical courses on research methods planned in the Individual Research Plan (assessed based on a named certificate of course completion). |  |  |
| 1. Soft criterion – Completion of training by the PhD student in techniques and methods essential for implementing the Individual Research Plan, in the form of at least a five-day research internship (or equivalent) at an institution other than the research site (assessed based on a certificate from the head of the unit where the PhD student completed the internship, specifying the research techniques mastered). |  |  |
| 1. Soft criterion – Obtaining funding or a documented attempt to secure funding for a research project thematically related to the Individual Research Plan, as the principal investigator of a project funded from non-university or intra-university sources (assessed based on a funding decision or a complete funding application with proof of submission). |  |  |
| 1. Soft criterion – Presentation of results at a national or international scientific conference directly related to the subject of the Individual Research Plan (assessed based on confirmation from the conference organiser, an extract from the conference programme, or a copy of the abstract in the conference materials). |  |  |
| 1. Soft criterion – Publication (or acceptance for publication) of a clinical case report related to the research topic of the Individual Research Plan (IRP). |  |  |

1. Committee discussion

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

Chair of the Committee .......................... - positive assessment, negative assessment\*

Committee member ................................ - positive, negative assessment\*

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

\* please circle as appropriate

1. Committee’s recommendations for the PhD student:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Resolution of the Mid-term Assessment Committee on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan in the Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences:

There were \_\_\_ votes in favour of a positive assessment and \_\_\_ votes in favour of a negative assessment.

The Committee adopted a resolution with a positive/negative assessment of the implementation of the Individual Research Plan for Ms/Mr.............................................

1. The Committee presented the Resolution on the Implementation of the Individual Research Plan to the PhD student.

The meeting was then closed.

........................................ - Chair of the Committee........................................

*Title/degree, full name Signature*

........................................ - Committee member .............................................

*Title/degree, full name Signature*

........................................ - Committee member .............................................

*Title/degree, full name Signature*

*Recorded by...............................*