

**CRITERIA FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF A DOCTORAL STUDENT  
IN THE SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES**

**Discipline: Linguistics and Literary Studies**

- I. Two separate Evaluation Committees for conducting the mid-term evaluation in the Doctoral School of the School of Languages and Literatures are appointed for one academic year. One Evaluation Committee conducts mid-term evaluation in the field of linguistics and the other in the field of literary studies.
- II. Each Evaluation Committee consists of 3 persons, including:
  - 1) one person - employed outside Adam Mickiewicz University - who holds a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) in the discipline or the title of professor in the field covering the discipline, in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared;
  - 2) two persons - employed at Adam Mickiewicz University – who hold a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) in the discipline or the title of professor in the field covering the discipline, in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared.

Supervisors and auxiliary supervisors of a doctoral student may not be members of the Evaluation Committee for the mid-term evaluation of a doctoral student under their supervision;

A representative of the Doctoral Student Self-Government of Adam Mickiewicz University may attend meetings of the Evaluation Committee as an observer.

- III. The mid-term evaluation - with reference to the Individual Research Plan presented by the doctoral student - focuses in particular on the following elements:
  - 1) progress in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation;
  - 2) research activity, including scientific publications, conference presentations and grant applications;
- IV. The mid-term evaluation criteria concern the following aspects of the doctoral student's achievements:
  - 1) progress of work on the research material that is the basis of the doctoral dissertation (completed library searches, conducted empirical research, compiled subject and object bibliography, completed case studies, etc.)
  - 2) measurable results of work on the dissertation in the form of an outline of the dissertation, completed chapters or coherent fragments of the dissertation, articles published or prepared for publication aimed at contributing to the dissertation (a series of articles or articles closely relating to the dissertation topic);
  - 3) theoretical foundations of the researched issue, methodological awareness, recognition of relevant scientific traditions and contemporary contexts of conducted research;
  - 4) skills in the field of developing research material, methods of scientific expression, text editing;

- 5) academic achievements of the doctoral student accumulated during the evaluation period, including, among others, publications, completed projects and submitted grant applications, participation in research teams;
  - 6) experience resulting from the doctoral student's own teaching practice, individual educational path;
  - 7) other achievements, if any (e.g. participation in the organisation of scientific conferences and cultural events, popularisation of science, work in the doctoral student self-government, initiation of doctoral students' scientific research).
- V. The mid-term evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Committee is based on:
- 1) the Individual Research Plan;
  - 2) a narrative summary prepared by the doctoral student;
  - 3) documentation confirming the progress of work on the doctoral dissertation
  - 4) documentation (portfolio) of academic achievements
  - 5) the opinion of the supervisor
  - 6) an interview with the doctoral student;
- VI. The Evaluation Committee takes minutes of the mid-term evaluation and all members of the Evaluation Committee sign them.
- VII. The result of the mid-term evaluation is determined in a closed session, without the participation of the doctoral student. The decisions of the Evaluation Committee are taken by a simple majority of votes. The mid-term evaluation may be positive or negative.
- VIII. The result of the evaluation and its justification are made public. A member of the Evaluation Committee has the right to submit a dissenting opinion and the reasons for it in writing.