

Detailed rules for mid-term evaluation at the Doctoral School of Humanities, Theology and Arts

Pursuant to § 7 of the "Regulations of the Doctoral School of Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń", the execution of the individual research plan is subject to evaluation. The evaluation is carried out on the basis of materials submitted by the doctoral students confirming the progress of the individual research plan and their interviews with members of the commission.

The Commission

The Commission for carrying out the mid-term evaluation is appointed by the director of the school in consultation with the chair of the appropriate council of scientific disciplines. Commissions for each discipline are composed of three members, including at least one person holding the degree of *doktor habilitowany* or the title of *profesor* in the field and discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared, and is not an employee of NCU. A member of the commission, who is not an employee of NCU, is entitled to a remuneration amounting to 20% of a professor's salary. The agreement is signed by the rector at the request of the director of the school. The procedure for appointing the Commission is commenced when the director of the school provides the chair of the council of a given discipline of science with the list of candidates. A supervisor (or supervisors) may send proposals for candidates for the members of the Commission to the director of the school. In the selection of members of the Commission, the research fields of doctoral students should be considered. The chair of the Commission is a person who is not employed by NCU.

Materials submitted by doctoral students

Pursuant to the Regulations of the Doctoral School, doctoral students must submit the following materials for evaluation:

- 1) a report on the execution of the Individual Research Plan (IRP). The accurate and well-documented information on the implementation of the tasks contained therein should be described in compliance with specific sections of the Individual Research Plan (IRP) form:
 - a. a description of the obtained research results/artistic achievements, including indication and justification of changes in the research questionnaire/artistic activity plan and in methodological assumptions,
 - b. the stage of implementation of organisational projects and research/artistic tasks included in the project schedule,
 - c. implementation of plans for the internationalisation of the project, in particular collaboration in the preparation of joint publications, internships at foreign research centres, participation in international workshops and seminars,
 - d. internships or research at domestic scientific institutions,
 - e. participation as a speaker or debater in conferences,
 - f. achievements in the organisation of conferences (if applicable),

- g. applying to external institutions for support of a research/artistic project,
- h. practical placements,
- i. courses carried out as part of Module Three of the "Framework education plan":
 - a foreign language for specific purposes,
 - specialist courses,
- j. other forms of research activity by the doctoral student related to education and the project in progress.

2) List of academic papers. This can include:

- published papers,
- papers accepted for publication after a positively completed review procedure,
- papers submitted for publication,
- papers rejected in the review procedure,
- publications that were developed as a result of international collaboration should be indicated.

Doctoral students in the discipline of Fine Arts and Art Conservation may present works of art, conservation works, artistic projects, educational projects or workshops, and design collections disseminated in the public space or approved for such dissemination.

The list should be accompanied by copies (in PDF format) of published texts and copies of documentation (certificates, correspondence, programmes, catalogues, etc.) confirming the stage of advancement of the preparation of the text for publication or preparation of the exhibition.

- 3) A list of research/artistic internships at external research centres, in particular those taking place/having taken place abroad, in which the doctoral student will take part or has taken an active part. Relevant documentation and certificates should be attached to the list.
- 4) A list of applications submitted by the doctoral student in university competitions or to external bodies for funding mobility or research/artistic activity abroad. A copy of the applications sent and the corresponding decisions must be submitted as documentation.
- 5) A list of courses or workshops pursued beyond the compulsory curriculum which have contributed to the development of soft skills of the doctoral student. Relevant documentation should accompany the list. Failure to fulfil this requirement will not negatively affect the evaluation.
- 6) The opinion of the supervisor(s) on the progress of the doctoral student made in preparing their doctoral dissertation.
- 7) Additional opinions (maximum two) on the doctoral student may be provided by scholars from other research centres, in particular those located abroad, who are involved in the research conducted by the doctoral student.
- 8) Other research or artistic/conservation achievements and activities not directly related to the Individual Research Plan (IRP). This section is optional.

The indicated materials should be delivered in digital (PDF) format, after the supervisor's approval, no later than two weeks prior to the interview.

Interview with commission members

During the interview, the doctoral student has the opportunity to present their research or artistic achievements and to explain external circumstances that may have prevented them from fully executing the Individual Research Plan (IRP) or caused it to change. Members of the commission ask questions about the achievements and progress of the research/the artistic project, the conditions of project completion, and other issues related to the education and research development of the doctoral student.

The interview will take place on 11-15 September 2023. A detailed schedule of mid-term interviews will be announced at least one month in advance.

Evaluation criteria

The submitted materials and the interview are the basis for the evaluation. The following criteria are the most important:

- a) the stage of advancement of the research project in accordance with the schedule,
- b) disseminating the effects of the project, publishing research papers, or exhibiting works/artistic performances in public. A prerequisite for meeting this criterion is at least one academic paper published or accepted for publication in a journal included on the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, which allocates points to recognised journals (or in academic journals abroad that are not included on the Ministry's list), university periodicals, or a work from a publishing house that is on the Ministry's list.

For doctoral students in the discipline of Fine Arts and Art Conservation, this requirement may be fulfilled by the creation of at least one work of art, a conservation work, an artistic project, an artistic and educational project, a workshop, or a design collection which are disseminated in the public space,

- c) delivering a paper or a presentation at a conference/workshop; to meet this criterion, the inclusion of a paper or presentation in the programme of the event, which was cancelled due to the pandemic, will also be taken into account,
- d) international collaboration. Establishing international contacts for the purpose of joint publications, internships, joint research, discussions on research problems, or participation in an international conference is considered a prerequisite for meeting this criterion,
- e) applying for grants to external institutions; a prerequisite for meeting this criterion is the submission of an application regardless of the final result,
- f) implementation of the curriculum, both the doctoral school's framework curriculum and individual internships and courses,

g) opinions of the supervisor(s) or other researchers.

The prerequisite for a positive result is meeting five out of the above-mentioned seven criteria. In the mid-term evaluation, the Commission also takes into account individual criteria resulting from the topic, discipline, nature of research work, and artistic projects. The Commission is also obliged to take into account certain restrictions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, which may have caused delays or changes in the execution of the Individual Research Plan (IRP).

Result

The Commission provides a positive or negative result in writing, along with its justification for said result. A positive result leads to an increase in the minimum amount of the doctoral scholarship. The doctoral student may appeal to the Rector to review a negative result within the administrative deadline of 14 days from having received the evaluation result. The result of the evaluation, along with its justification, is public. The evaluation itself and the justification will be sent to the evaluated person by post with acknowledgment of receipt.