



Doctoral School

Warsaw University of Technology

Decision no. 2/SD/2024

**of the Head of the Doctoral School of the Warsaw University of Technology
of 20/05/2024**

**regarding the schedule for the mid-term evaluation of PhD students studying at the Doctoral School
of the Warsaw University of Technology in the summer semester of the academic year 2023/2024**

Based on art. 202 section 2 of the Act of 20 July 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended), in conjunction with § 15 and 16 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Warsaw University of Technology, constituting an annex to resolution no. 199/L/2022 of the Senate of WUT of 27 April 2022 on the adoption of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Warsaw University of Technology, a detailed schedule for the mid-term evaluation of PhD students studying at the WUT Doctoral School in the summer semester of the 2023/2024 academic year is established.

§ 1

1. By 24 May, 2024, the Doctoral School will inform PhD students undergoing mid-term evaluation about the schedule, detailed evaluation procedures, and the template for the mid-term evaluation report (Appendix 1). This information will be sent by email to the PhD student's contact address at pw.edu.pl and posted on the Doctoral School's website.
2. From June 10, 2024, to July 31, 2024, PhD students undergoing mid-term evaluation must submit completed and signed mid-term evaluation template to the Doctoral School, using the template provided in Annex 1 to the decision. Signed documents must be submitted in the electronic pdf version and the hard copy.
3. Failure to submit the signed documents referred to in paragraph 2 by the deadline will result in a negative outcome of the mid-term evaluation and, consequently, removal from the list of PhD students.
4. By August 29, 2024, the Doctoral School will submit the PhD student's mid-term evaluation report and the Individual Research Plan electronically to the Secretary of the relevant Mid-Term Evaluation Committee. The Secretary sends the documentation to the Chairman and Member of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee in electronic form.
5. By September 20, 2024, the Chairman and a Member of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee will send scans of completed and signed evaluation forms to the Secretary of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee, in accordance with the templates set out in Annex 2 and Annex 3 to this order. The signed



Doctoral School

Warsaw University of Technology

originals of the aforementioned documents must be delivered to the Doctoral School by September 27, 2024.

6. By 25 September, 2024, the Secretary of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee shall send the received evaluation forms by email to the PhD student, the Chairman and Member of the Committee.

7. By 27 February 2024, the Secretary of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee shall, with the Chairman and a Member of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee, set a date for the Committee meeting between 14 October and 26 October 2024 and shall inform the PhD student, and the Doctoral School by the email about the scheduled date for the Committee meeting.

8. By 1 October 2024, the Doctoral School shall prepare a collective schedule of meetings of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee and make it available to the Head of the WUT PhD students Council.

9. By October 7, 2024, the WUT PhD student Council may submit a written request to the Head of the Science Committee for PhD student representatives to participate in the public part of the meetings of individual Mid-Term Evaluation Committees. By March 7, 2024 the Doctoral School will inform the Secretaries of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committees of the nominated PhD student representatives.

10. By 9 October 2024, the supervisor may notify the Secretary of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee of his or her willingness to participate in the public part of the Committee meeting.

11. By 9 October 2024, the PhD student shall send to the Secretary of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee the presentation (in the form of a Powerpoint or PDF file) that he or she intends to present during the Committee meeting.

12. By 11 October 2024, the Secretary of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee shall inform all persons participating in the public part of the meeting by the email of the date and place of the meeting.

13. From October 14 to October 25, 2024, meetings of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee for PhD Students will be held in person, remotely using the MS Teams platform, or in a hybrid format. The Chairman of the Committee should communicate the evaluation results to the PhD student orally immediately after the meeting.

14. By 29 October 2024, the Secretary of the Committee shall send to the Doctoral School electronically a scan of the signed list of PhD students who have taken part in the mid-term evaluation, together with its result (positive or negative), in accordance with the template set out in Annex No. 5.

15. By November 7, 2024, the Secretary of the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee shall submit to the Doctoral School a paper version of the protocol prepared in accordance with Appendix 4, signed by all Committee members. A Committee member may send the Secretary a scan of their signed protocol.



Doctoral School

Warsaw University of Technology

The document is then signed by the Chairman and the Secretary of the Committee. In this form the protocol is submitted to the Doctoral School.

16. Within seven days of receiving the original protocol from the Mid-Term Evaluation Committee meeting, the Doctoral School shall send a scanned copy of the Committee's protocol to the PhD student and the supervisor by email.

17. In the case of a negative evaluation, a decision to remove the PhD student from the list of PhD students at the Warsaw University of Technology Doctoral School is issued within 7 days of receipt of the signed original protocol.

18. Following a decision to remove a PhD student from the list of PhD students at the Warsaw University of Technology Doctoral School, the PhD student has the right to submit a request to the Director of the Warsaw University of Technology Doctoral School for the case to be reconsidered within 14 days of receiving the decision.

§ 2

The decision comes into force on the day of its adoption.

PhD Student Mid-Term Evaluation Report

PhD Student data
Name and surname
Register number
The subject of the dissertation
Discipline
Implementation Doctorate Program
☐ YES ☐ NO if YES, specify where: if YES, provide the title of the dissertation thesis in compliance with the application to the Ministry of Education and Science:
Faculty/Institute/Chair/Department
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the supervisor
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the second supervisor*
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the assistant supervisor*
Date of commencing education at WUT Doctoral School
Planned date for submitting the dissertation

* if applicable

Research progress report
1. Description of the research problem being solved within the dissertation with reference to the current state of knowledge (max. 2500 characters including spaces)
2. The concept of the research problem solution, its innovative character, research hypotheses (max. 1500 characters including spaces)
3. Research methodology (ways of conducting research, methods, techniques and research tools) (max. 1500 characters including spaces)
4. Description of the research activities realized so far with reference to the IRP, main results (provide the % of implementation of milestones for semesters 1-4) (max. 3000 characters including spaces, no more than 5 pictures/photos/charts etc.)
5. Plan for further research within the dissertation (max. 1500 characters including spaces)

Scientific achievements related to the subject of the dissertation
1. List of published papers
2. List of papers submitted for publication
3. Conference speeches, seminars, etc.
4. Obtained patents and their equivalents, patent applications, utility models
5. Participation in research projects, grant applications
6. Scientific cooperation with external institutions, research internships, etc.

Additional significant information
Max. 2500 characters including spaces

Supervisor's comments
Supervisor/ supervisors' comments on PhD student's research works progress

Signatures	
PhD student	Date and signature:
Supervisor	Date and signature:
Second Supervisor*	Date and signature:
Assistant Supervisor*	Date and signature:

* if applicable

Explanatory notes:

PhD student data:

- **The subject of the dissertation**
Complete in accordance with the IRP.
- **Implementation Doctorate Program**
If you choose YES, provide the name of the institution which was a party to the trilateral agreement.
- **Date of commencing education at WUT Doctoral School**
Complete with a month and a year.
- **Planowany termin złożenia rozprawy doktorskiej**
Complete with a month and a year.

Research progress report

1. **Description of the research problem being solved within the dissertation with reference to the current state of knowledge**
Describe the problem intended to be solved basing on the latest global research findings related to the subject of the dissertation. Explain the importance and purpose of raising such a topic including its practical significance.
2. **The concept of the research problem solution, its innovative character, research hypotheses**
Provide information on what is to be proved within the dissertation, the results to be obtained during the implementation of the research topic and make research hypotheses indicating significant innovative aspects.
3. **Research methodology (ways of conducting research, methods, techniques and research tools)**
Specify and briefly describe research methods, techniques and tools applied so far or intended to be applied during further research.
4. **Description of the research activities realized so far with reference to the IRP, main results**
Describe research activities with reference to the schedule included in the IRP, indicate and clarify potential discrepancies. The purpose of the description is to introduce the reviewer with the degree of advancement of the research implementation as well as to allow the reviewer to assess whether the planned date of submitting the dissertation is realistic.
5. **Plan for further research within the dissertation**
Describe the remaining research tasks necessary to complete the dissertation with reference to the accomplished activities indicated in the previous point.

Scientific achievements related to the dissertation

1. **List of published papers**
Provide full bibliographic data with DOI numbers.
2. **List of papers submitted for publication.**
Indicate authors, title, journal, and the date of submission.
3. **Conference speeches, seminars, etc.**

Indicate authors, conference title, name, place, and date of the event (conference, seminar, etc.). Specify the range (international, national), and the form (oral, poster, etc.). This point does not refer to internal seminars conducted within the Doctoral School and Faculty where the dissertation is being realized.

4. Patents and their equivalents, patent applications, utility models

Indicate authors, name, date, and country of submission, as well as the patent number, registration number or utility model number.

5. Participation in research projects, grant applications

Provide full identification data of the project, including the title, name of competition, awarding institution, number, duration of the project or submission date, type of participation (manager, contractor, editor, etc.).

6. Scientific cooperation with external institutions, research internships, etc.

Indicate institution, type of cooperation, and the period of cooperation or research internship. This point only concerns external institutions (national or international) where dissertation-related research was conducted.

Information given in the form should only refer to the subject of the dissertation, but there are no time restrictions. Therefore, research activities concerning the subject performed before the admission to the Doctoral School may also be indicated.

Additional significant information

Provide information which was not covered in the previous points, yet may be significant in the view of the mid-term evaluation.

Supervisor's comments

Describe PhD student's progress of the realization of the dissertation as well as their compliance with time frames specified in IRP. If there is more than one supervisor, indicate the author of the comments.

PhD Student Mid-Term Evaluation Report

Person completing the form
Function in the Committee: CHAIRMAN
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname
Faculty/Institute/Chair/Department

PhD Student data
Name and surname
Register number
The subject of the dissertation
Discipline
Faculty
Implementation Doctorate Program (YES/NO)
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the supervisor
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the second supervisor *
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the assistant supervisor *

* if applicable

Progress of research works assessment

(max. 4000 characters including spaces)

--

Scientific achievements assessment

(max. 2000 characters including spaces)

--

PhD student general assessment

Proposed final assessment (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE):

--

Argumentation:

--

Date and signature

I confirm there are no factors which may have affected the objectivity of the assessment.

--

Explanatory notes:

Progress of research works assessment

Address all the categories jointly. The description should provide the PhD student with guidelines on what to change or include in further research.

Scientific achievements assessment

Address all the categories jointly. The description should provide the PhD student with guidelines on what to change or include in further research.

PhD student general assessment

- **Proposed final assessment (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE):**
Choose one type of assessment. The proposed assessment is not final and may be changed upon interviewing the PhD student and clarifying disputable issues.
- **Argumentation:**
Comment on the proposed final assessment. It is desirable to provide the PhD student with general guidelines on how to improve the quality of their work. The argumentation may be crucial in the case of negative assessment, as it allows the student to address negative aspects during the interview with the Committee. Strengths and weakness of the current state of the dissertation may be also indicated.

PhD Student Mid-Term Evaluation Report

Person completing the form
Function in the Committee: MEMBER
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname
Faculty/Institute/Chair/Department

PhD Student data
Name and surname
Register number
The subject of the dissertation
Discipline
Faculty
Implementation Doctorate Program (YES/NO)
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the supervisor
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the second supervisor *
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the assistant supervisor *

* if applicable

Research progress report assessment

1. Description of the research problem being solved within the dissertation with reference to the current state of knowledge.
(max. 1500 characters including spaces)

2. The concept of the research problem's solution and its innovative nature, research hypotheses
(max. 2000 characters including spaces)

3. Assumed research methodology (ways of conducting research, methods, techniques and research tools)
(max. 1500 characters including spaces)

4. Description of the research activities realised so far with reference to the IRP, main results
(max. 2500 characters including spaces)

5. Plan for further research within the dissertation
(max. 1500 characters including spaces)

Scientific achievements assessment

(max. 2500 characters including spaces)

PhD student general assessment

Proposed final assessment (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE):

Argumentation:

Date and signature

I confirm there are no factors which may have affected the objectivity of the assessment.

Explanatory notes:

Progress of research works assessment

Address each category separately. The description should provide the PhD student with guidelines on what to change or include in further research.

Scientific achievements assessment

Address all the categories jointly. The description should provide the PhD student with guidelines on what to change or include in further research.

PhD student general assessment

- **Proposed final assessment (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE):**
Choose one type of assessment. The proposed assessment is not final and may be changed upon interviewing the PhD student and clarifying disputable issues.
- **Argumentation:**
Comment on the proposed final assessment. It is desirable to provide the PhD student with general guidelines on how to improve the quality of her/his work. The argumentation may be crucial in the case of negative assessment, as it allows the student to address negative aspects during the interview with the committee. Strengths and weakness of the current state of the dissertation may be also indicated.

PhD Student Mid-Term Evaluation - Protocol

PhD Student data	
Name and surname	
Register number	
The subject of the dissertation	
Discipline	
Faculty	
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the supervisor	
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the second supervisor *	
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname of the assistant supervisor *	

* if applicable

Members of the Committee (academic title, academic degree, name and surname)	
Chairman	
Member	
Secretary	

Other persons present at the meeting of the Committee (academic title, academic degree, name and surname)	
Supervisor	
PhD Students representative	

On (date) the above mentioned Committee performed the PhD student mid-term evaluation of the implementation of the Individual Research Plan on the basis of submitted documents, mid-term evaluation report and presentation of achievements.

Final assessment	
PhD student's progress assessment is (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE)	
Argumentation:	

Committee members signatures	
Chairman	
Member	
Secretary	