



**SZKOŁA DOKTORSKA  
BioMedChem**

Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego  
i Instytutów Polskiej  
Akademii Nauk w Łodzi

*"Framework Criteria for Mid- Term Evaluation" annex to Resolution No. 2/2022  
Of Council of BioMedChem Doctoral School  
of UL and Lodz Institutes of the PAS  
7 June 2022*

## **Framework Criteria for Mid-Term Evaluation of PhD students and the Stages of Evaluation Committee at the BioMedChem Doctoral School of the University of Lodz and Lodz Institutes of the Polish Academy of Sciences**

### **Framework Criteria for Mid-Term Evaluation of PhD students:**

**1. Degree of Implementation of the Dissertation Work Schedule and Its Compliance with the Individual Research Plan (IPB).**

Based on the analysis of the documentation submitted by the PhD student (Individual Research Plan – IPB and reports on progress of IPB implementation, reviewed by the supervisor(s) or the supervisor and assistant supervisor), the evaluation committee assesses the progress in preparing the doctoral dissertation. This is done by evaluating the implementation of tasks outlined in the IPB for Years 1-2 and determining whether, in their opinion, the complete execution of all tasks during the curriculum period at the Doctoral School is achievable.

**2. Evaluation Interview – PhD student's Report and Responses to the Committee's Questions.**

The committee evaluates the PhD student's ability to engage in discussion, precision and discipline in communication, knowledge in the area of research and methodological awareness, and the capacity for an adequate self-assessment of their achievements.

**3. Scientific, Teaching, and Organizational Activity of the PhD student.**

The committee primarily evaluates the execution of scientific activities planned in the IPB. The committee may also take into account achievements listed in the Doctoral Student Assessment Form (AOD).

**A positive mid-term evaluation requires the PhD student to receive a positive assessment in all three of these areas.**

### Stages (A-C) of evaluation carried out by the Committee:

**A. The Evaluation Committee conducts the mid-term evaluation of the PhD student based on:**

**1. Analysis of Documentation Submitted by the PhD student:**

- Individual Research Plan (IPB)
- Reports on the implementation of the IPB, reviewed by the supervisor(s) or supervisor and assistant supervisor

**2. Evaluation Interview with the PhD student:**

- PhD student's report and responses to the committee's questions.

**Course of the Interview:**

**1.** The PhD student presents a report on the work completed so far on the dissertation. The presentation should not exceed 20 minutes.

The report should include, among other things:

- a)** Presentation of the main research problem,
- b)** Work plan for dissertation,
- c)** Research methods employed,
- d)** Results of research produced so far,
- e)** Summary – assessment of the progress made in relation to the assumptions outlined in the IPB.

The PhD student may use a multimedia presentation to assist in presenting the report.

**2.** The committee asks the PhD student questions related to the presented report and, if necessary, other actions planned in the IPB.

*Upon the PhD student's request, a representative of the PhD students may be present as an observer during the interview.*

**B.** The Evaluation Committee may also review the Doctoral Student Assessment Form (**AOD**), along with attachments documenting the candidate's scientific, teaching, organizational, and popularization activities.

**C. The Evaluation Committee prepares a report for the mid-term evaluation of the PhD student, along with justifications, in accordance with the attached template** (Protocol No. 1 of the Evaluation Committee for the mid-term evaluation of the PhD student). This report is then submitted to the Director of the Doctoral School **within 3 days of the evaluation interview**. The committee's opinion, as presented in the report within Protocol No. 1, should include both a substantive evaluation and corrective feedback, containing recommendations to support the completion of the doctoral dissertation. If the committee asserts that the **PhD student's achievements are outstanding**, it may include this opinion in the justification of the evaluation in the report.