

Regulations of mid-term evaluation at the Academia Copernicana Interdisciplinary Doctoral School

According to Art.7 of the "Regulations of the Doctoral School at the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń", the subject of evaluation is the realization of individual research plan of PhD students. The evaluation is carried out in the middle of the education period specified in the program of education on the basis of materials submitted by the doctoral students confirming the implementation of the individual research plan and their interview with the members of the Committee.

The Committee

The Committee for the mid-term evaluation is appointed by the head of the school in consultation with the chairman of the relevant scientific council. The Committees dedicated to particular disciplines shall be composed of 3 persons, including at least 1 person employed outside NCU holding the degree of doctor with habilitation or the title of professor in the field and discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared. The selection of the members of the Committee should take into account the research specialization of the doctoral students. The Chairman of the Committee is a person from outside NCU. The supervisor or supervisors and assistant supervisor cannot be the members of the Committee. The person who is a member of the Committee and is employed outside NCU is entitled to remuneration equal to 20% of the professor's remuneration. The contract is signed by the rector on the request of the head of school.

Doctoral students' materials

In accordance with the regulations of the doctoral school, doctoral students submit the following materials for evaluation:

1. Report on the realization of individual research plan (IRP) The precise and documented information about the implementation of the tasks should be described according to the individual points of the individual research plan form:
 - a. description of methodological assumptions and obtained research results/artistic achievements, including indication and justification of changes in planned research or artistic activities and methodological assumptions,
 - b. status of implementation of organisational undertakings and research/artistic tasks included in the project schedule,
 - c. information on submitted research applications,
 - d. information on participation in scientific conferences, seminars or workshops, including the name, place and date as well as the nature of participation (organizer/participant) and the form of presentation of the results (poster, report, paper);
 - e. information on cooperation with domestic or foreign scientific institutions,
 - f. apprenticeship,
 - g. classes completed as part of the educational plan,
 - h. other forms of the doctoral student's scientific activity connected with the education and implemented research project.
2. List of scientific papers (included in the list of scientific journals and peer-reviewed materials from international conferences of

the Ministry of Higher Education and Science), which were written during the education at the Academia Copernicana Interdisciplinary Doctoral School:

- published,
- accepted for publication after a positive review procedure,
- submitted for publication.

Publications produced in international collaboration should be highlighted. Doctoral students in the "Visual Arts and Art Conservation" discipline present works of art, conservation art, art projects, artistic and educational projects or workshops, design collections disseminated in the public space or approved for such dissemination.

The list should be accompanied by pdf copies of published texts and copies of documentation (certificates, correspondence, programs, catalogs, etc.) attesting to the advancement of the publishing process or exhibition preparation.

3. A list of research/artistic internships in external scientific centers, especially abroad, in which the doctoral student actively participated, i.e. conducted research or presented its results. The list should be accompanied by appropriate documentation and certificates.
4. A list of applications submitted by the doctoral student in competitions of the university or to external entities for funding of foreign travel or research/artistic activities. A copy of the sent applications and relevant decisions should be submitted as documentation.
5. A list of classes or workshops carried out outside the compulsory study plan that contributed to the development of the doctoral student's soft skills. The list should be accompanied by relevant documentation.
6. Opinion of the supervisor(s) on the progress of the doctoral student in preparing the dissertation.
7. It is possible to submit additional opinions (maximum two) on the PhD student, prepared by scholars from other research centers, especially foreign, involved in the research conducted by the PhD student.
8. Other scholarly or artistic/conservation achievements and activities not directly related to IRP. Completion of this point is optional.

The indicated materials should be submitted in digital version (pdf file), after approval of the supervisor(s), within 2 weeks before the interview date.

Interview with members of the Committee

During the interview, the doctoral student has the opportunity to substantively present their scientific or artistic achievements and explain the external circumstances that prevented them from fully implementing the IRP or caused it to be changed. The members of the Committee ask questions about the achievements and research progress of the scientific project / characteristics of the artistic project, the conditions of the project and other issues related to the doctoral student's education and scientific development.

A detailed schedule of mid-term interviews will be provided at least one month in advance. The place and date of the interview will be determined by the head of the school, who will inform the doctoral student of the interview date at least one month in advance. Interviews may be conducted remotely.

Evaluation criteria

The submitted materials and the interview will be the basis for the evaluation. The following criteria will be most important for its formulation:

- a. advancement of the realization of research project according to schedule,
- b. dissemination of the results of the project, publication of scientific papers or exhibition of works/artistic events in the public space. Publication of at least one work in a journal from the ministerial list of scientific journals is recommended. For doctoral students in the discipline of *fine arts and fine arts conservation* this requirement may be fulfilled by authorship of at least one artistic work, conservation, artistic project, artistic and educational workshop or project, design collection disseminated in public space,
- c. delivering a paper, making a presentation at a conference, workshop or seminar; the inclusion of the paper or presentation in the programme of an event that has been cancelled due to pandemic will also count towards this criterion,
- d. international collaboration. The prerequisite for meeting this criterion is the establishment of international contacts for joint publication, internship, joint research, consultation of research problems or participation in an international conference,
- e. applying for grants in a competition procedure; a sufficient condition for this criterion is the submission of an application that has passed a formal assessment, regardless of the final result,
- f. realization of the educational program, both the school's framework program of education and individual internships and courses,
- g. opinions of the supervisor(s) or other researchers.

The precondition for obtaining a positive assessment requires passing five of the seven above-mentioned criteria. In formulating the mid-term evaluation, the Committee also takes into account the individual criteria resulting from the subject, discipline and nature of conducted scientific work and implemented artistic projects. The Committee is also required to take into account constraints resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic that may have caused delays or changes in the implementation of IRP.

Evaluation

The Committee shall give a positive or negative evaluation in writing along with a justification. A positive assessment results in an increase in the minimum amount of the doctoral scholarship. The result of the evaluation together with the justification is public. The content of the assessment and justification shall be sent to the person subject to the assessment by mail with acknowledgement of receipt or in electronic form. A student may appeal against a negative assessment to the Rector within an administrative period of 14 days of receiving the decision.