



*Announcement no. 1/me/2025 of the Director of the Doctoral School of Cracow University of
Technology of 19 May 2025 on the 2025 mid-term evaluation procedure at the CUT DS*

Information on the 2025 mid-term evaluation (me)

1. The mid-term evaluation will be carried out at the CUT DS from 15 to 19 September 2025.
2. The time schedule of the mid-term evaluation will be published by the Director of the CUT DS on the website of the CUT DS no later than 31 May 2025.
3. The mid-term evaluation shall be carried out by a committee comprised of three individuals holding the post-doctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor, with at least two of them representing the discipline of the doctoral dissertation in question, and at least one of them employed outside of the CUT. The supervisor or co-supervisor may not be members of the committee.
4. The mid-semester evaluation committees shall be appointed by the Director of the CUT DS from among the candidates submitted by the heads of the scientific councils for relevant disciplines no later than 4 months prior to the planned date of the mid-term evaluation. The head of the committee is the representative of the discipline in the CUT DS Council or a person designated by the head of the scientific council for the relevant discipline.
5. Mid-term evaluation committees shall be appointed separately for individual doctoral students. However, different committees may have the same members in their composition.
6. An unaccounted-for failure to submit or transfer the materials listed in points 11 and 12 within the applicable time limit or to appear to present a presentation precludes carrying out the assessment and is tantamount to a negative evaluation. The explanatory note is to be submitted to the head of the relevant mid-term evaluation committee.
7. Where the explanation for the absence at the mid-term evaluation is accepted, the doctoral student is appointed another date for the mid-term evaluation committee meeting within 30 days of the day when the reason for the absence ceases to exist.
8. A committee meeting report shall be prepared specifying the outcome of the mid-term evaluation alongside the statement of reasons thereof. The doctoral student confirms that they have read and understood the content of the report within the time limit of 7 days of the announcement of the outcomes.

Mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student

9. The mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student's progress encompasses the progress they have made in their individual research plan.
10. The progress in the realisation of the individual research plan shall be evaluated in the following aspects:
 - 1) degree of advancement of the doctoral dissertation;
 - 2) the correctness of the adopted goal;
 - 3) adopted methodology;
 - 4) compliance with the time schedule (including making changes to the initial assumptions that have occurred along the course of work).



11. The doctoral student, within the time limit specified in the mid-term evaluation schedule, submits a folder (white folders preferred, with an elastic band) to the CUT Doctoral School Office. The folder shall be signed with the name and surname + the abbreviated name of the discipline in the upper left corner on outer cover, and on the inside of the cover – a glued-on form with the description of the folder (available in Teams – channel: Doctoral students 2023). The folder should contain:
 - a. the individual research plan – IPB and the submitted IPB correction (to be completed by the CUT DS Office);
 - b. a report on scientific activity for the annual evaluation of the doctoral student at the CUT Doctoral School – for year 1 (to be completed by the CUT DS Office);
 - c. a report on scientific activity for the annual evaluation of the doctoral student at the CUT DS School – for year 2, signed by the doctoral student and the supervisor(s) and the discipline representative;
 - d. a self-report prepared by the doctoral student, signed by the doctoral student and by the supervisor/supervisors containing information on the current status of the doctoral dissertation development. The information should be an extended description of the individual research plan and include a time schedule of the planned works alongside a report on the hitherto made progress in the works;
 - e. the opinion of the supervisor or supervisors, or of the supervisor and co-supervisor
 - f. the supervisor's guidance evaluation form (evaluating the performance of the supervisor or supervisors or of the supervisor and co-supervisor).
12. The documents referred to in Point 11, subpoints a.–f. shall be uploaded by the doctoral student to the assigned directory on OneDrive, within the time limit and according to the rules set out in the 2025 mid-term evaluation schedule.

Access to an individual folder on OneDrive was granted in August 2024.

Files (pdfs) should be named according to the following formula:

 - a. the individual research plan – **IRP – the doctoral student's surname_IRP** *In the event of submitting a correction to the Individual Research Plan (IPB), please ensure that both the original version and the updated version are attached. The file containing the corrected IPB should be named according to the following scheme: surname_doctoral student_IPB_correction.*
 - b. the report on scientific activity for the annual evaluation of the doctoral student at the CUT Doctoral School – for year 1 – **the doctoral student's surname_report1**
 - c. the report on scientific activity for the annual evaluation of the doctoral student at the CUT Doctoral School – for year 2 – **the doctoral student's surname_report2**
 - d. the self-report – **the doctoral student's surname_self-report**
 - e. the opinion of the supervisor or supervisors, or of the supervisor and co-supervisor – **the doctoral student's surname_opinion**
 - f. the supervisor's guidance evaluation – **the doctoral student's surname_evaluation**

Attachments to individual documents should be merged into one file with the main document.

The directory is to contain 6 files with the above-mentioned names.



13. The doctoral student is obliged to deliver a multi-media presentation on the implementation of their individual research plan before the committee.
14. Upon the motion of the doctoral student whose performance is subject to the mid-term evaluation, a representative of the UCDSA may participate as an observer in the meeting of the committee. .
15. The mid-term evaluation is based on the materials referred to in points 11 and 12 and on the multi-media presentation delivered by the doctoral student.
16. The outcome of the mid-term evaluation is agreed upon during the closed part of the meeting, without the participation of the doctoral student. A member of the evaluation committee may not abstain from voting.
17. The mid-term evaluation ends with a positive or negative outcome. The outcome and the statement of reasons thereof are open to the public.
18. A committee meeting report shall be prepared specifying the outcome of the mid-term evaluation alongside the statement of reasons thereof. The doctoral student confirms that they have read and understood the content of the report within the time limit of 7 days of the announcement of the outcomes.

Evaluation of the supervisor's guidance

19. The evaluation of the supervisor's guidance is made on the basis of the the supervisor's guidance evaluation form (available in Teams). Should there be any doubts related to the supervisor's guidance, the committee may ask the supervisor for explanations.

Information and forms on mid-term evaluation are available in Teams in the team: CUT Doctoral Students, channel: Doctoral Students 2023

**In organisational matters of me 2025 regarding a particular discipline,
please contact directly the representative of the discipline/the head of the committee.**

The CUT Doctoral School office does not have the presentation and self-report templates.

DIRECTOR

*of the Doctoral School of Cracow University of Technology
dr hab. inż. Małgorzata Cimochoicz-Rybicka, prof. of CUT*