

**CRITERIA FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF A DOCTORAL STUDENT
IN THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Discipline: Social and Economic Geography and Spatial Management

- I. The Evaluation Committee for conducting the mid-term evaluation in the discipline of social and economic geography and spatial management in the Doctoral School of the School of Social Sciences is appointed for one academic year.
- II. The 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.
- III. 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.
- IV. A representative of the Doctoral Student Self-Government of Adam Mickiewicz University may attend meetings of the Evaluation Committee as an observer.
- V. 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;
- VI. 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: academic achievements of the doctoral student accumulated during the evaluation period, including, among others, publications, completed projects and submitted grant applications,
 - 5) 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).

VII. 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;

VIII. The Evaluation Committee takes minutes of the mid-term evaluation and all members of the Evaluation Committee sign them.

IX. 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.

X. 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.

Discipline: Political Science and Public Administration, Communication and Media Studies and Security Studies

- I. Evaluation Committees for conducting the mid-term evaluation in each discipline in the Doctoral School of the School of Social Sciences are appointed for one academic year.
- II. The Evaluation Committee for each discipline consist 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.
 - 3) 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;
 - 4) 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;

Discipline: Law

1. Evaluation Committees for conducting the mid-term evaluation in each discipline in the Doctoral School of the School of Social Sciences are appointed for one academic year.
2. The Evaluation Committee for each discipline consist of 3 persons, including:
 - a) two employees of Adam Mickiewicz University carrying out research activities (at least 75%) in a relevant discipline, including at least 1 person holding a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor in the discipline, in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared;
 - b) one person employed outside Adam Mickiewicz University holding a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor in the discipline, in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared.
 - c) 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;
 - d) A representative of the Doctoral Student Self-Government of Adam Mickiewicz University may attend meetings of the Evaluation Committee as an observer.
3. The Evaluation Committee takes minutes of the mid-term evaluation and all members of the Evaluation Committee sign them.
4. The result of the mid-term evaluation is determined in a closed session, without the participation of the doctoral student.
5. The mid-term evaluation may be positive or negative.
6. 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.
7. The mid-term evaluation - with reference to the Individual Research Plan presented by the doctoral student - focuses in particular on the following elements, which should be discussed in the narrative summary prepared by the doctoral student:
 - a) progress in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation;
 - b) research activity, including scientific publications, conference presentations (including remotely) and involvement in the work of research teams;
 - c) other achievements of the doctoral student
8. The mid-term evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Committee is based on:
 - a) the Individual Research Plan;
 - b) documentation confirming the progress of work on the doctoral dissertation;
 - c) list of academic achievements;
 - d) the opinion of the supervisor

Discipline: Psychology

1. The Evaluation Committee conducting mid-term evaluations in the Doctoral School of Social Sciences at Adam Mickiewicz University in the discipline of psychology (hereinafter referred to as the Evaluation Committee) is appointed for one academic year.
2. The Evaluation Committee consists of 3 persons, including:
 - a. two persons holding a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor, employed at Adam Mickiewicz University, conducting research in the discipline of psychology;
 - b. one person not employed at Adam Mickiewicz University, holding a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor in psychology
3. 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.
4. A representative of the Doctoral Student Self-Government of Adam Mickiewicz University may attend meetings of the Evaluation Committee as an observer.
5. The Evaluation Committee takes minutes of the mid-term evaluation and all members of the Evaluation Committee sign them.
6. The result of the mid-term evaluation is determined in a closed session attended by all members of the Evaluation Committee, without the participation of the doctoral student. Decisions are made by the absolute majority of votes.
7. The mid-term evaluation may be positive or negative.
8. 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.
9. The mid-term evaluation is based on the following criteria:
 - a) implementation of the Individual Research Plan;
 - b) research activity, including scientific publications, conference presentations and involvement in the work of research teams
 - c) other achievements of the doctoral student
10. The mid-term evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Committee is based on:
 - a) presentation made by the doctoral student before the Evaluation Committee;
 - b) Individual Research Plan;
 - c) narrative summary;
 - d) list of academic achievements;
 - e) list of other achievements, if any;
 - f) the opinion of the supervisor

The Doctoral School of the School of Social Sciences will determine model forms (templates) to assist doctoral students in the preparation of materials for the mid-term evaluation.

Discipline: Sociology

1. Evaluation Committees conducting mid-term evaluations in the Doctoral School of Social Sciences at Adam Mickiewicz University in each discipline are appointed for one academic year.
2. The Evaluation Committee for the discipline consists of 3 persons, including:
 - a. two employees of Adam Mickiewicz University carrying out research activities (at least 75%) in a relevant discipline, including at least 1 person holding a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor in the discipline, in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared;
 - b. one person employed outside Adam Mickiewicz University holding a postdoctoral degree (*doktor habilitowany*) or the title of professor in the discipline, in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared.
 - c. 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.
 - d. A representative of the Doctoral Student Self-Government of Adam Mickiewicz University may attend meetings of the Evaluation Committee as an observer.
3. The Evaluation Committee takes minutes of the mid-term evaluation and all members of the Evaluation Committee sign them.
4. The result of the mid-term evaluation is determined in a closed session, without the participation of the doctoral student.
5. The mid-term evaluation may be positive or negative.
6. 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.
7. The mid-term evaluation – with reference to the Individual Research Plan presented by the doctoral student – covers in particular the following elements:
 - a) progress in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation;
 - b) research activity, including scientific publications, conference presentations (including remotely) and involvement in the work of research teams;
 - c) other achievements of the doctoral student
8. The mid-term evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Committee is based on:
 - a) the Individual Research Plan;
 - b) documentation confirming the progress of work on the doctoral dissertation;
 - c) list of academic achievements;
 - d) the opinion of the supervisor

Discipline: Pedagogy

- I. Evaluation Committees for conducting the mid-term evaluation in each discipline in the Doctoral School of the School of Social Sciences are appointed for one academic year.
- 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.
 - 3) 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;
 - 4) 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, scientific internships and library searches, organizational activity 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.