**Regulations of the Doctoral School**

**of the University of the National Education Commission, Krakow**

**List of terms and abbreviations**

**§ 1**

The terms used in the Regulations shall have the following meanings:

1. Office – the Office of the Doctoral School
2. doctoral student – person having the status of a doctoral student and studying at the Doctoral School;
3. Director – the Director of the Doctoral School;
4. learning outcomes at level 8 of the Polish Qualifications Framework (PRK) – the learning outcomes defined in the Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 14 November 2018 on second-level characteristics of learning outcomes for qualifications at levels 6-8 of the Polish Qualifications Framework (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 2218), achieved in the process of doctoral education, and which are a necessary condition for obtaining the degree of *doktor*;
5. IRP (IPB) – Individual Research Plan;
6. ITP (IPK) – Individual Training Plan;
7. mid-term evaluation – compulsory mid-term evaluation conducted during the study period at the Doctoral School;
8. Study Program – curriculum with a description of all planned subjects;
9. Council – the Council of the Doctoral School;
10. Discipline council – the council of a scientific or art discipline taught at the Doctoral School;
11. Regulations – the Regulations of the Doctoral School;
12. Rector – the Rector of University of the National Education Commission, Krakow;
13. Doctoral School – the Doctoral School of University of the National Education Commission, Krakow;
14. University University of the National Education Commission, Krakow – University of the National Education Commission, Krakow;
15. Act – the Act of 20 July 2018 – the Law on Higher Education and Science;
16. Deputy Director – the Deputy Director of the Doctoral School.

**§ 2**

The Doctoral School operates on the basis of: the Statutes of the Pedagogical University of Krakow and the Regulation No R/Z.0201-6/2019 of the Rector of the Pedagogical University of Krakow of 22 March 2019 on establishing the Doctoral School at the Pedagogical University of Krakow, issued based on Art. 23 sec. 2 point 9, Art. 198 sec. 1 of the Act of 20 July 2018 – the Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws item 1668 as amended) and Art. 290 point 1 of the Act of 3 July 2018 – Provisions enforcing the Act – the Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws of 2018 item 1669 as amended).

**The Director of the Doctoral School**

**§ 3**

* + - 1. The Rector appoints the Director of the Doctoral School for a four-year term of office subject to the provisions of Art. 23 sec. 5 of the Act.
1. The Director shall perform their duties with the assistance of the Deputy Director, appointed by the Rector at the Director's request.

**§ 4**

1. The tasks of the Director include managing the Doctoral School and organising its activities, in particular:
2. organising the recruitment process to the Doctoral School;
3. implementing the study programs, including appointing members of staff to teach particular classes;
4. supervising the education of doctoral students, including implementation of the Study Program;

1. monitoring the quality of education and scientific supervision at the Doctoral School;
2. supervising the manner of conducting the mid-term evaluations;
3. making decisions in matters related to the education of doctoral students after consultation with the Council of the Doctoral School;
4. cooperation with the councils of scientific disciplines and the deans of the respective faculties in matters related to the education of doctoral students and the process of appointing a supervisor or supervisors;
5. cooperation with the socio-economic environment regarding the education of doctoral students;
6. supporting doctoral students in their grant activity as well as their domestic and international mobility;
7. caring for the welfare of doctoral students;
8. supervising the doctoral studies which commenced before the academic year 2019/2020;
9. acting as the chair of the Council;
10. preparing the Doctoral School for evaluation;
11. cooperation with the Doctoral Student Council;
12. issuing decisions and otherwise deciding on the individual matters of students, save for the situation specified in § 31 sec. 1;
13. approving the IRP (IPB) of doctoral students;
14. appointing supervisors and assistant supervisors after the appropriate Discipline Council has given its opinion;
15. making decisions concerning changing a doctoral student's supervisor or assistant supervisor;
16. submitting to the Rector an annual report on the activities of the Doctoral School, assessed by the Council;
17. specifying the detailed procedures for conducting the mid-term evaluation after consultation with the Council and appointing a committee for the mid-term evaluation of doctoral students after the relevant Discipline Council has given its opinion;
18. developing, after consultation with the Council and the Doctoral Student Council, detailed criteria for the evaluation of a student's progress in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation;
19. supervising the administrative staff of the Doctoral School;
20. managing financial resources within the framework of the allocated resources and the authorisation granted, in accordance with the rules specified by the Rector;
21. specifying the scope of necessary documentation kept in Polish or English regarding the process of doctoral education and the functioning of the Doctoral School.
22. The Director cooperates with the heads of organisational units of University in matters regarding scientific research conducted by doctoral students and their teaching internships.

**Council of the Doctoral School**

**§ 5**

1. The Council is the statutory advisory and consultative body of the University in matters regarding the operation of the Doctoral School.

1. The Council shall be composed of:
2. the Director, as its chair;
3. the Deputy Director;
4. one representative from every discipline represented at the Doctoral School elected by the respective Discipline Councils; the representative may be a person who holds at least the degree of *doktor habilitowany* and who is employed in the University as the primary place of employment;
5. two persons indicated by the Rector;
6. a representative of doctoral students, indicated by the Doctoral Student Council;
7. the Council members may also include no more than two persons not affiliated with the University who hold at least the degree of *doktor habilitowany*.
8. The Council shall convene for meetings.
9. The chair convenes Ordinary Council meetings at least twice a semester.
10. The Council may perform its activities and take decisions by means of remote voting.
11. At the request of one-third of the Council members or on their own initiative, the chair shall convene an extraordinary meeting within seven days from the date the request is submitted.
12. The Council shall adopt resolutions by a simple majority of votes.
13. The Council may appoint ad hoc teams for preparing the Council's position on matters falling within its tasks.
14. The term of office of the Council shall be three years with the proviso that the term of office of the first Council shall expire on 31 August 2022.

**§ 6**

The tasks of the Council include, in particular:

1. designing the development strategy and the rules for the functioning of the Doctoral School, and then monitoring and evaluating the adopted strategy and rules for functioning;
2. taking care of the high quality of the recruitment process, in particular, expressing opinions regarding changes to the recruitment rules and criteria;

1. expressing opinions regarding the Regulations of the Doctoral School;
2. verification of the study programs at least once a year;

1. giving an opinion on requests to change the study programs;
2. developing their own projects for changes to the study programs;
3. coordinating the process of developing the study programs, in particular consultations with the relevant Discipline Councils;
4. giving an opinion on the Director's annual activity report for the Doctoral School; the opinion is approved by voting during a Council meeting;
5. giving an opinion on the detailed requirements for the IRP (IPB), including its component elements;
6. analysing the quality of education and implementation of the IRP (IPB) at the Doctoral School;
7. taking care to ensure the high standards of the education process and the high quality of doctoral dissertations prepared by students;
8. supervising the rules and practices of doctoral students' evaluation, including giving an opinion on the instructions regarding conducting the mid-term evaluation;
9. approving the teaching staff for the classes conducted at the Doctoral School;
10. expressing opinions regarding matters submitted by the Senate, the Rector or the Director.
11. in justified cases, helping to coordinate internships.

**Education at the Doctoral School**

**§ 7**

1. Recruitment to the Doctoral School shall be conducted following the rules and criteria approved by the Senate.
2. A person admitted to the Doctoral School shall:
3. acquire the rights and obligations of a doctoral student upon taking the oath, the content of which is defined in the Statutes of the University; the doctoral student confirms the taking of the oath in writing;
4. begin education at the Doctoral School and implementation of the IRP (IPB).

**§ 8**

1. Education at the Doctoral School shall prepare the doctoral student to obtain a doktor degree.
2. Proceedings for awarding a degree of *doktor* are governed by separate regulations.
3. Education at the Doctoral School lasts 8 semesters. The academic year is organized according to other internal regulations of the University.
4. Education in the section referred to in § 96 sec. 4 of the Statutes of the University of 07.09.2020 shall take place on the basis of separate regulations.
5. The Doctoral School may implement the Study Program together with other doctoral schools.

**Conditions and mode of study at the Doctoral School**

**§ 9**

1. The grading period at the Doctoral School is a semester.
2. The doctoral student shall receive ECTS credits for each subject credit in accordance with the study plan.
3. Subjects marked in the Doctoral School’s Study Program as compulsory in a given year may end with a grade.
4. Examinations provided for in the Doctoral School’s Study Program in a given year shall end with a grade.
5. The doctoral student is obliged to pass an examination in their discipline (discipline exam), the result of which is not included in the calculation for the academic year. The relevant Discipline Council determines the requirements for the examination. The examination shall take place in front of an examination board appointed by the Discipline Council after the mid-term evaluation and before the end of the 7th semester of study. .
6. The requirements for receiving a particular subject credit are specified in the subject description.
7. In the implementation of the Study Program at the Doctoral School, the following grading scale shall be used in accordance with the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System of the European Commission (ECTS grading scale):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Numerical equivalent | Letter equivalent used in the ECTS system |
| Very good | 5.0 | A |
| Good plus | 4.5 | B |
| Good | 4.0 | C |
| Satisfactory plus | 3.5 | D |
| Satisfactory | 3.0 | E |
| Unsatisfactory | 2.0 | FX, F |

1. With regard to credits and examinations included in the Study Program, , in case of receiving an unsatisfactory grade at the first sitting or in case of unexcused absence at the first sitting, the doctoral student shall be entitled to a resit.
2. In case of receiving an unsatisfactory grade or in case of unexcused absence at the first sitting of an examination referred to in sec. 5, the doctoral student shall be entitled to a resit.

**§ 10**

1. The requirements for receiving credit for a semester are the following:
2. receiving credits for the compulsory subjects provided for in the Study Program, subject to § 9 sec. 5;
3. submitting a report of the progress accompanied by the opinion of the supervisor (supervisors) and assistant supervisor, if appointed, on the progress of the doctoral dissertation and, from the third semester onwards, on the implementation of the IRP (IPB). The report for the first semester shall take the form of an oral presentation as part of "Public Reporting Session 1";

1. The Director shall give credit to the doctoral student for subjects completed at another higher education institution or scientific institution during an exchange program based on the agreement and documentation related to that exchange, provided that the Director granted prior consent for the student to go on the exchange program and complete these subjects. This provision shall not apply to the examination referred to in § 9 sec. 5.
2. The Director may give credits to the doctoral student for subjects offered at the doctoral level, equivalent to level 8 of the European Qualifications Framework, completed at a different higher education institution or a scientific institution based on the subject description and a document confirming the grade achieved. This provision shall not apply to the examination referred to in § 9 sec. 5.
3. The Director shall evaluate the doctoral student's implementation of the Study Program and give credit for completing a semester.

**§ 11**

Upon a doctoral student's justified request, the Director, in consultation with the supervisor (supervisors), may establish the student's ITP (IPK).

**Study Program at the Doctoral School**

**§ 12**

 The Senate shall approve the Study Program at the Doctoral School and its changes at the request of the Rector. The Council and Doctoral Student Council shall give an opinion on the request. The Council may also submit a request to change the Study Program.

Requests to change the Study Program or proposals for new study programs may be submitted to the Rector through the Director by:

1. members of the Council;
2. academic teachers conducting classes at the Doctoral School and supervisors;
3. Discipline Councils;
4. the Senate Commission for Research;
5. the Doctoral Student Council.

The Study Program is subject to an annual review conducted by the Council. As a result of the review, the Council may prepare a request to change the Study Program.

Any change in the Study Program regarding subjects directly related to a particular scientific discipline shall require the council's opinion of that discipline.

The Study Program may include classes which are conducted in English.

**Supervisor and assistant supervisor**

**§ 13**

1. The scientific supervision of the preparation of a doctoral dissertation shall be exercised by the supervisor (supervisors) or the supervisor and assistant supervisor.
2. A supervisor may be a person holding the degree of *doktor habilitowany* or the title of *profesor*, employed in the University as the place of primary employment.

1. A supervisor may be a person who does not meet the requirements referred to in sec. 2 who is an employee of a foreign higher education institution or a research institution if the Discipline Council considers that the person has significant achievements in the scientific field associated with their doctoral dissertation.
2. A supervisor shall not be a person who:
	1. in the last five years:
3. has been a supervisor of 4 doctoral students who were removed from the register of doctoral students due to a negative result of the mid-term evaluation,
4. has supervised the preparation of a dissertation by at least 2 persons applying for the degree of *doktor* who did not receive positive reviews as referred to in Art. 191 sec. 1 of the Act;
	1. has been punished by a disciplinary penalty of deprivation of the right to perform the tasks of a thesis supervisor as referred to in Art 276 sec. 1 point 4 of the Act.

1. In justified cases, after consultating with the relevant Discipline Council, the Director may appoint as a scientific supervisor a person who is not employed in the University.
2. Supervisor can supervise no more than four doctoral students in Doctoral School
3. An assistant supervisor may be a person holding at least a degree of *doktor*.
4. An assistant supervisor may supervise no more than two doctoral students at the Doctoral School.

**§ 14**

1. The Director shall appoint the supervisor (supervisors) at the request of the doctoral student within three months of the doctoral student taking up education at the Doctoral School. The supervisor shall be appointed after the Discipline Council has given its opinion. If a candidate for supervisor is from outside the University, information about the candidate's scientific activities and publications must be attached to the request.
2. The doctoral student shall submit a request for appointing a supervisor (supervisors) no later than 30 days before the deadline referred to in sec. 1. The request shall be accompanied by a personal statement and the consent of the candidate(s) for supervisor(s), including assistant supervisor.
3. In justified cases, an assistant supervisor shall be appointed by the Director at the request of the doctoral student, after the Discipline Council has given its opinion. If a candidate for assistant supervisor is from outside the University, information about the candidate's scientific activities and publications must be attached to the request. The request must be approved by the candidate for assistant supervisor.
4. If the request for appointing a supervisor (supervisors) is not submitted by the doctoral student within the time limit specified in sec. 2, the Director shall immediately appoint a supervisor, after the Discipline Council has given its opinion. The doctoral student shall be immediately notified about the supervisor's appointment.
5. At the justified request of the supervisor (supervisors) of the doctoral student or on their own initiative, the Director may change the supervisor (supervisors). The doctoral student shall simultaneously attach to the application for the change of supervisor (supervisors) a request for appointment of a new supervisor (supervisors) designated by themselves, together with the written consent of the supervisor candidate referred to in paragraph 2. The change in any case requires the opinion of the Discipline Council
6. At the justified request of the supervisor (supervisors), assistant supervisor, the doctoral student or on their initiative, the Director may change the assistant supervisor, without appointing a successor. The doctoral student shall at the same time attach to the application for the change of assistant supervisor or a request for the appointment of a new assistant supervisor, together with the written consent of candidate for assistant supervisor referred to in paragraph 2. The change in any case requires the opinion of the Discipline council.
7. The appointment of a supervisor (supervisors) may be preceded by the doctoral student’s presentation of a personal statement before the Discipline Council.
8. In case of change of the supervisor (supervisors), assistant supervisor at the request of the doctoral student referred to in paragraphs 5 and 6, the doctoral student’s application is in any way incomplete, including the lack of written consent of the candidate for the supervisor (supervisors or assistant supervisor ), after a prior request to complete the application within fourteen days the application shall be left unrecognized.
9. In case of changes of supervisor (supervisors), assistant supervisor at the request of the supervisor (supervisors), assistant supervisor or at the initiative of the Director, as referred to in paragraphs 5 and 6, the new supervisor (supervisors), assistant supervisor shall be appointed by the Director after having consultation with the doctoral student.

**§ 15**

1. The tasks of a supervisor (supervisors) consist of, in particular:

1. exercising scientific supervision of the preparation of a doctoral dissertation by the doctoral student, including providing the student with the necessary substantive and methodological assistance in conducting their research or artistic activities;
2. assisting the student in the development of the IRP (IPB), taking into account the possibility of financing the research or artistic activities from specific sources;
3. giving an opinion on the doctoral student's requests and applications related to education at the Doctoral School, including as regards establishing the ITP (IPK) referred to in § 11;
4. carrying out a written evaluation of the doctoral student's progress in research or artistic activities and, in particular, of the preparation and implementation of the IRP (IPB) and of the state of progress of the doctoral dissertation;
5. giving an opinion on doctoral dissertation submitted by the student;
6. cooperating with the Director of the Doctoral School in order to monitor the doctoral student's progress;
7. informing the Director about the doctoral student's lack of progress in research or artistic activities and requesting the student's removal from the register of doctoral students in the case of a negative evaluation of the progress in preparing the doctoral dissertation or implementing the IRP (IPB);
8. supervising the work of the assistant supervisor;
9. giving an opinion on the doctoral student's reports;
10. coordinating the implementation of the doctoral student's teaching internships.

2. The supervisor (supervisors) have a duty to improve their skills in the field of scientific mentoring and, in particular, to participate in training for supervisors organised by the Doctoral School (not obligatory for supervisors who have previously supervised at least one doctoral student).

**§ 16**

1. The tasks of an assistant supervisor consist of, in particular:

1. assisting in the supervision of the doctoral student, including the process of planning research, its implementation and the analysis of results;
2. giving an opinion on the IRP (IPB);
3. carrying out an evaluation of the doctoral student's progress in preparing the doctoral dissertation and presenting it to the supervisor. The opinion of the assistant supervisor shall be attached to the opinion of the supervisor.

**Individual Research Plan**

**§ 17**

1. The IRP (IPB) is prepared by the doctoral student in consultation with the supervisor (supervisors) and the assistant supervisor, if appointed. When accepting the doctoral student's IRP (IPB), the supervisor shall consider, in particular, the possibility of achieving the IRP (IPB) at the University, including organisational and financial capabilities.
2. The IRP (IPB) includes, in particular:
3. an outline of the doctoral dissertation including the following elements:
4. topic and justification of the doctoral dissertation based on a literature review;
5. aims and research hypotheses of the doctoral dissertation;
6. description of the research methods;
7. estimated budget indicating the available sources of funding;
8. indication of the form of the doctoral dissertation;
9. proposal for the structure of the doctoral dissertation;
10. bibliography;
11. external sources of research funding, including, for instance, competitions for research projects which the doctoral student is planning to apply for;
12. the research program for preparing the doctoral dissertation including the description of tasks and the schedule of their implementation for each semester;
13. the deadline for submitting the doctoral dissertation.
14. The IRP (IPB) must also include information about the plans for fulfilling other requirements during the period of education, in particular about the deadlines for the following:
	1. the discipline examination indicated in § 9 sec. 5;
	2. submitting at least one application for a research or artistic grant to an institution offering research funding through a competitive procedure, in particular the National Science Centre or the National Centre for Research and Development;
	3. to carry out at least one research and teaching, artistic or didactic internship in a foreign or domestic scientific center or cultural institution of at least 20 working days;
	4. obtaining credits/certificates from obligatory classes which are included in the Study Program, but are not assigned to specific semesters;
	5. obtaining credits/certificates from courses which are not included in the Study Program;
	6. having at least one publication accepted for printing or completion of at least one work of art of considerable importance; publication shall be understood as:
15. 1 scientific article published in a scientific journal or in conference proceedings which, in the year of publication of the article in its final form, were included in the ministerial list of scientific journals, or
16. 1 scientific monograph issued by a publishing house which, in the year of publication of the monograph in its final form, was included in the ministerial list of scientific journals, or
17. one chapter in a monograph referred to above.
	1. at least one paper presented during an international or nationwide conference or completion of an artistic project which constitutes an important contribution to culture;
	2. implementation of achievements promoting science or art.
18. After consultation with the Council, the Director shall specify the detailed requirements for the IRP (IPB), including its component elements, as well as technical instruction regarding submission of the IRP (IPB) and its approval by the supervisor.

**§ 18**

1. The doctoral student shall submit the IRP (IPB) to the Director, after obtaining the opinion of the supervisor (supervisors) and the assistant supervisor, if appointed, no later than 12 months from taking up education at the Doctoral School.
2. Submission of the IRP (IPB) shall be preceded by submission of the IRP (IPB) project no later than four months before the deadline referred to in sec. 1. The doctoral student shall submit the IRP (IPB) project, approved by the supervisor (supervisors) and the auxiliary supervisor, if appointed, to the Director, who shall send it to be assessed by two reviewers holding the degree of *doktor habilitowany* or the title of *profesor* in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared. One of the reviewers must not be an employee of the University. Within two weeks, the reviewers shall report whether the IRP (IPB) may be submitted without changes or they shall recommend changes resulting from the requirements for the IRP (IPB) referred to in § 17 sec. 2.
3. The IRP (IPB) implementation shall be subject to periodic assessment via end-of-semester reports submitted by the doctoral student.
4. The Director shall forward the reviewers' recommendations, referred to in sec. 2, to the doctoral student, the supervisor (supervisors) and the auxiliary supervisor (if appointed).
5. In the case of failure to submit the IRP (IPB) within the time limit referred to in sec. 1, the Director shall remove the student from the register of doctoral students.
6. In justified cases, during the implementation of the IRP (IPB), with the approval of the supervisor (supervisors) and the auxiliary supervisor (if appointed), the doctoral student may submit a proposal for a change in the IRP (IPB), if this change shall have significant importance concerning the form of the future doctoral dissertation. Such a change cannot be made more than once a year.

**Mid-term evaluation**

**§ 19**

1. The mid-term evaluation shall be conducted after completing the fourth semester of studies at the Doctoral School, but no later than three months from the beginning of the fifth semester. In the case of suspension of education at the Doctoral School referred to in § 23, the evaluation date shall be postponed for that period.
2. The Director shall prepare detailed rules for conducting the mid-term evaluation after consultation with the Council.
3. The detailed rules for conducting the mid-term evaluation, referred to in sec. 2, constitute Appendix A to the Regulations.

**§ 20**

1. The mid-term evaluation shall be conducted by a three-member committee appointed by the Director, composed of:
2. one person holding the degree of *doktor habilitowany* or the title of *profeso*r in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared or a related discipline, employed outside the University or employed in a recognised foreign higher education institution and holding the degree of *doktor* and documented academic experience in the area in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared;
3. two persons holding the degree of *doktor habilitowany* or the title of *profesor* in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared or a related discipline, employed in the University.
4. If possible, the Director shall appoint the persons who gave an opinion on the student's IRP (IPB) as committee members referred to in sec. 1 point 2.
5. When appointing a committee member, the Director shall be guided by the principle of avoiding conflicts of interest, in particular a direct reporting line between a committee member and the supervisor (supervisors) and an auxiliary supervisor (if appointed).
6. In justified cases, the Director, after consultation with the chair of the relevant Discipline Council, may appoint as a committee member a person holding the degree of *doktor* and with significant academic achievements in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is prepared.
7. The supervisor (supervisors) or assistant supervisor of the doctoral student undergoing evaluation shall not be committee members.
8. The Director or Deputy Director shall not be committee members.
9. A member of the committee shall not be a person who:
10. in the last five years:
11. has been a supervisor of 4 doctoral students who were removed from the register of doctoral students due to a negative result of the mid-term evaluation or
12. has supervised the preparation of a dissertation by at least 2 persons applying for the degree of *doktor* who did not receive positive reviews as referred to in Art. 191 sec. 1 of the Act;
13. has been punished by a disciplinary penalty of deprivation of the right to perform the task of a thesis supervisor as referred to in Art. 276 sec. 1 point 4 of the Act.
14. The committee shall elect a chair from among itself, who shall manage the committee's work, including communicating with the Director, the doctoral student, and the supervisor (supervisors) and an auxiliary supervisor (if appointed).

**§ 21**

1. The committee referred to in § 20 shall evaluate the implementation of the IRP (IPB) based on, in particular:
2. the doctoral student's submitted reports, as well as the report of the IPB realisation;
3. the opinions of the supervisor (supervisors) and an auxiliary supervisor (if appointed) regarding progress in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation;
4. an interview with the doctoral student as well other documents submitted by the student or the Doctoral School.
5. The interview with doctoral student referred to in sec. 1 point 3 may take the form of a videoconference. The Director may participate in the interview.

**§ 22**

1. The mid-term evaluation shall end with a positive or negative result. The evaluation shall require a justification. The result of the evaluation shall be approved by the committee by a simple majority of votes.
2. The result of the evaluation, together with the justification, shall be public.
3. In the case of a positive evaluation, the committee may offer the doctoral student recommendations concerning the further implementation of the IRP (IPB).
4. In the case of a negative evaluation, the Director shall remove the student from the register of doctoral students.
5. If there is a lack of agreement regarding the evaluation of a doctoral student's implementation of the IRP (IPB), a committee member may attach a dissenting opinion to the report.

**Suspension of education at the Doctoral School**

**§ 23**

1. At the request of a doctoral student, education shall be suspended for the period corresponding to the duration of:
2. maternity leave,
3. leave on the conditions of maternity leave,
4. paternity leave and parental leave,

– as defined by the Act of 26 June 1974 – Labour Code (i.e. – Journal of Laws of 2018, item 917, as amended).

1. A written request for the suspension of education should be submitted no later than 21 days from the date of occurrence of the circumstances making the doctoral student eligible for the leave referred to in sec. 1. Documents justifying the suspension of education should be attached to the request.
2. When accepting a request for the suspension of education for a period other than an academic year, the Director shall specify the conditions that apply to the doctoral student after the period of suspension has ended and, in particular, shall set deadlines for the fulfilment of obligations arising from the education process and the Regulations.
3. Within seven days from the date the period of suspension ends, the doctoral student shall submit to the Director a written statement on the continuation of education. Failure to submit such a statement shall constitute the basis for initiating the procedure of removing the student from the register of doctoral students due to opting out of further education.
4. The deadlines set out in the IRP (IPB) for fulfilling the doctoral student's obligations shall be extended by the period of time for which education at the Doctoral School has been suspended.
5. During the period of suspension, the doctoral student shall not implement the Study Program or the IRP (IPB), while retaining the rights of a doctoral student (the right to a doctoral student ID card, the right to a scholarship in the amount determined in accordance with Art. 209 sec. 6 of the Act).

**Admission to the Doctoral School by transfer**

**§ 24**

1. A doctoral school student studying at a different entity in a discipline which is also taught at the Doctoral School may apply for a transfer to the Doctoral School if:
2. they received a positive mid-term evaluation from the previous doctoral school;
3. they submit an application for a transfer together with documents confirming the education so far at the previous doctoral school, including:
4. a list of completed subjects together with grades,
5. the IRP (IPB),
6. a document confirming the result of the mid-term evaluation,
7. a document specifying the period and the amount of the doctoral scholarship received so far as well as the implemented learning outcomes.
8. The University will be able to ensure the continuation of the research conducted by the student so far.
9. The Director shall qualify the candidate for admission to the Doctoral School by transfer, while specifying the scope and deadlines for making up Study Program differences. The qualified person shall be entered in the register of doctoral students of the Doctoral School after submitting a decision on removal from the register at the previous doctoral school and taking the oath referred to in § 7 sec. 2 point 1.
10. The research supervision of a transferred doctoral student may be exercised by the supervisor from the previous doctoral school on the condition that the supervisor is approved by the Director after consultation with the Discipline Council.
11. For the transferred doctoral student, the period of education at the previous doctoral school completed before the transfer shall be included in the overall period of education required at the Doctoral School referred to in § 8 sec. 3.

**Extension of the deadline for submitting the doctoral dissertation**

**§ 25**

1. At the doctoral student's request, the Director may extend the deadline for submitting the doctoral dissertation. The deadline may be extended due to, in particular:
2. documented long-term illness (at least 6 months) of the doctoral student or his/her family member, which justifies an extension;
3. documented participation in a research grant or artistic project given on competitive basis by Polish or foreign research funding institution, in particular the National Science Center, the National Center for Research and Development, the National Agency for Academic Exchange (the schedule of the grant runs beyond the date of submission of the dissertation planned in IRP);
4. the doctoral student's research trip as set out in the IRP (IPB). The Director shall establish an ITP (IPK) for the duration of the trip.
5. No earlier than 6 months and no later than 1 month before the date of submission of the dissertation to IRP, a doctoral student shall submit in writing the application referred to in paragraph 1, including
6. the doctoral student's details (name, surname, student register number, year of education);
7. proposed date for submitting the dissertation (daily date);
8. justification with revised IPB work schedule (in accordance with § 18 item 6);
9. the opinion of the supervisor (supervisors) and assistant supervisor (if appointed) on the state of progress of the doctoral dissertation and progress in scientific research or artistic achievements.

3. The total time of all extension periods shall not exceed two years.

**Rights and obligations of doctoral students**

**§ 26**

1. The doctoral student shall have the right to:
2. the scientific supervision of a supervisor (supervisors), and an assistant supervisor, in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation;
3. a justified change of the supervisor (supervisors), and the assistant supervisor;
4. use the infrastructure, facilities and research equipment, as well as the library collections and IT resources of the University, to the extent necessary for the implementation of the Study Program, the IRP (IPB) and the preparation of the doctoral dissertation, on the terms set out in separate internal acts, within the capabilities of the University;
5. support in preparing grant applications through the University agencies appointed for this purpose;
6. apply for funding of scientific research or artistic projects related to the implementation of the IRP (IPB) from general university sources;
7. participate in the life of the scientific or artistic community;
8. have their personal dignity respected by every member of the academic community of the University;
9. associate in doctoral student organisations at the University
10. receive the doctoral scholarship following Art. 209 of the Act, with the stipulation that a foreign doctoral student receives the scholarship on presenting a document proving his/her legal stay in the country;
11. holiday breaks not exceeding 8 weeks per year, which should be taken in the period free from classes;
12. hold a doctoral student ID card, with the stipulation on receiving electronic chip card issued on doctoral student’s request;
13. apply for accommodation in a University student dormitory on the conditions specified in separate regulations;
14. apply for accommodation for a spouse or child in a University student dormitory on the conditions specified in separate regulations;
15. apply for a student loan on the terms specified in Art. 210 of the Act;
16. complete scientific internships and complete part of their education outside the University on the terms specified in separate internal acts of the University;
17. suspension of education for the duration of maternity leave, leave on the conditions of maternity leave, paternity leave and parental leave on the terms specified in § 23;
18. an extension, in justified cases, of the deadline for submitting the doctoral dissertation, on the terms specified in § 25;
19. social security and public health insurance on the terms specified in separate provisions.
20. to receive reduced fares in public transport on the terms specified in separate regulations.
21. In addition to the rights referred to in sec. 1, doctoral students with a certified disability shall have the right – according to the type and level of disability – to apply for the creation, to the extent possible for the University of conditions for them to participate fully in the education process and scientific research and artistic projects, in particular for:
22. individual conditions for participation in classes and obtaining subject credits,
23. individual conditions for using University infrastructure and resources,
24. the lecturer's consent to record classes or the Director's consent for the assistant of the doctoral student with disabilities or a sign language interpreter to participate in classes.

**§ 27**

1. A doctoral student shall be obliged to act following the content of the oath, the Regulations and other provisions in force at the University, and following the decisions of the Director of the Doctoral School regarding education.

1. A doctoral student shall be obliged, in particular, to:
2. obey academic laws and customs;
3. act in accordance with the ethical norms included in the Doctoral Student's Code of Ethics and the principles of community life, and take care of the University’s reputation and property;
4. obey the provisions of law in force at the University, including those concerning copyright and related rights;
5. inform the Director about the intention to opt out of further education or to extend the deadline for submission of the doctoral dissertation;
6. present the IRP (IPB) project to the Director;
7. submit the IRP (IPB) to the Director;
8. implement the Study Program and the IRP (IPB);
9. submit end-of-semester reports, referred to in § 10 sec. 1 point 2 and § 18 sec. 3, together with the opinion of the supervisor (supervisors) as well as of the assistant supervisor, if appointed;
10. submit declarations for the purpose of assessing the quality of scientific activity;
11. have an ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID);
12. immediately inform the Director about a change in personal data which are significant for the education process, in particular: name, surname, address of residence and correspondence address. In the case of failure to inform about a change of residence address or correspondence address, the delivery of a letter or decision to the previous address shall be legally effective unless delivery takes place through electronic communication;
13. immediately inform the Director about taking up employment in the position of academic teacher at another higher education institution and the number of hours worked;

12a) immediately inform the Director about taking up employment at the University, based on the employment contract, in which the salary exceeds that of a professor;

1. immediately inform the Director about obtaining the degree of *doktor* awarded by another authorised entity;

1. immediately inform the Director about taking up education at another doctoral school;
2. use the University email account in all matters related to education at the Doctoral School;
3. if the student does not have a place of residence in the Republic of Poland – indicate, to deliver administrative decisions, a delivery address in the Republic of Poland or appoint a representative for service in Poland; in the case of failure to fulfil this obligation, decisions shall be left in the doctoral student's file and deemed delivered unless the delivery takes place using electronic communication;
4. submit a certificate from an occupational medicine physician about the lack of contraindications to participation in classes during which the student will be exposed to harmful factors.
5. If the doctoral student does not have Polish citizenship, they need to submit a document confirming the legality of their stay in Poland and inform the Director about the dates of their departure from Poland.
6. The doctoral student is liable to disciplinary action under the terms specified in the Act and implementing acts.

**Completion of education at the Doctoral School**

**§ 28**

1. The basis for completing education at the Doctoral School shall be achieving the learning outcomes for qualifications at level 8 of the Polish Qualifications Framework and the submission of the doctoral dissertation.
2. A doctoral student's education ends with the submission of the doctoral dissertation in accordance with the IRP (IPB), subject to § 25.
3. Submission of the doctoral dissertation shall be understood as submitting the doctoral dissertation in the Office of the Doctoral School together with a positive opinion of the supervisor (supervisors) and the assistant supervisor, if appointed.
4. A doctoral student who has completed education at the Doctoral School shall receive a certificate confirming achievement of the outcomes of level 8 of the Polish Qualifications Framework.
5. A certificate confirming the course of education shall be issued at the request of a person who has not completed education at the Doctoral School.

**§ 29**

1. The Director shall take the decision to remove a doctoral student from the register of Doctoral School students in case of:
2. a negative result of the mid-term evaluation;
3. failure to submit the IRP (IPB) within the deadline, together with a positive opinionof the supervisor (supervisors) and the auxiliary supervisor (if appointed);
4. failure to submit the doctoral dissertation within the deadline specified in the IRP (IPB);
5. submitting written resignation from education at the Doctoral School;
6. failure to start education at the doctoral school;
7. taking up education in another Doctoral School, except requesting a doctoral student to resign from another doctoral school, within 30 days of service of the summons;
8. being punished with a disciplinary penalty of expulsion from theUniversity of the National Education Commission, Krakow.
9. The Director of the Doctoral School may decide to remove a doctoral student from the register of doctoral students in case of:
	1. unsatisfactory progress in the preparation of their doctoral dissertation,
10. conduct not following the content of the oath, the Regulations and other provisions in force at the University the National Education Commission, Krakow, as well as non-compliance with the decisions of the Director of the Doctoral School regarding education.
11. non-implementation of the Study Program.
12. Removal from the register of doctoral students shall be effected by way of an administrative decision, subject to § 32 sec. 1 and 2.

**g**

**Record-keeping at the Doctoral School**

**§ 30**

1. The documentation regarding the functioning of the Doctoral School shall include the following:
2. the process of recruitment to the Doctoral School;
3. the course of the doctoral student's education at the Doctoral School;
4. the activities of the Council;
5. the Director's performance of their duties.
6. Documentation may be conducted in paper or electronic form.
7. As regards the education of the doctoral student, the following documentation shall be conducted:
	1. a file with the doctoral student's personal records, which shall contain:
8. documents required from the candidate, in particular a copy of the documents which constitute the basis for the application for admission to the Doctoral School, certified by the University of the National Education Commission ;
9. personal data form;
10. information about entry in the register of Doctoral School students;
11. oath certificate;
12. academic achievement reports;
13. IRP (IPB);
14. individual decisions of the Director regarding the course of education of the doctoral student at the Doctoral School;
15. the doctoral student's reports on the preparation of the doctoral dissertation and the implementation of the IRP (IPB) together with the opinion of the supervisor (supervisors).
	1. Transcripts of records, stored in a separate file containing documentation of the education of doctoral students in a given year of education at the Doctoral School.
16. Documentation of the activities of the Council shall include, in particular:
17. the minutes of Council meetings;
18. resolutions of the Council,
19. documents discussed during Council sessions, including requests, motions and projects assessed by the Council.
20. Documentation of the activities of the Director shall include, in particular:

1) reports on the activities of the Doctoral School;

2) documents issued by the Director, including instructions.

**Deciding on the matters of doctoral students**

**§ 31**

1. The Director shall decide on the individual matters of doctoral students upon the written request of the doctoral student or ex officio. The Rector shall decide on the individual matters of a doctoral student whose supervisor is the Director.

1. A written request shall be submitted to the Director within seven days from the date of occurrence of the circumstances constituting the basis or subject of the request (unless the regulations applicable to the given request provide otherwise).
2. The written request should include the applicant's personal data, state the content of the request and the justification, and fulfil the other requirements specified in particular regulations.
3. An incomplete request, after the ineffective expiry of the period indicated in the summons to complete it, shall remain unconsidered.

**§ 32**

1. Decisions of the Director or the Rector regarding removal from the register of Doctoral School students shall be subject to the right to submit a motion for reconsideration to the Rector.
2. The doctoral student shall submit the motion within 14 days from the date the decision was delivered through the issuing body.
3. The provisions of sec. 1 and 2 shall apply accordingly to other decisions on the individual matters of doctoral students, for which the law provides for the form of a decision.

**§ 33**

Matters related to doctoral studies not covered by the Regulations and not regulated by other provisions shall be decided by the Rector.

**§ 34**

For deciding on doctoral students' individual matters to the extent not regulated by the Regulations or the Act, the Code of Administrative Procedure shall apply.

**Administration**

**§ 35**

1. The Office of the Doctoral School is responsible for the administration of the doctoral School.
2. The Office shall be managed by the Head of the Doctoral School Office appointed by the Rector
3. In all substantive matters, the Office is under the supervision of the Director.

*Appendix A*

**Detailed rules for conducting mid-term evaluation of doctoral students studying at the Doctoral School of the University of the National Education Commission, Krakow**

§ 1

1. the commission referred to in §20 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School uses the model provided in appendix no. 1 to appoint a commission member.

2. The committee sets a date for its meeting and immediately notifies the Doctoral School Office of the set date.

3. the Doctoral School Office shall immediately notify the doctoral student of the date of the mid-term evaluation.

§ 2

1. Not later than 30 days before the scheduled meeting of the Committee referred to in §1, para. 2, the doctoral student shall submit to the Office of the Doctoral School:

1) a report on the implementation of the individual research plan, a specimen of which is attached as Appendix 2,

2) in the case of the discipline of art and art conservation - additionally a portfolio,

3) an opinion of the supervisor(s) and assistant supervisor, if appointed, on the progress of the doctoral student in the implementation of the individual research plan (IPB), the specimen of which is specified in appendix no. 3.

2. At the Commission's request, the doctoral student must submit other documents or materials within 7 days of receiving the request.

3. The documents referred to in sections 1 and 2 shall be submitted as a scan attached to a message sent from the doctoral student's university e-mail account and as a hard copy submitted immediately to the Doctoral School Office, together with a declaration that the electronic version is consistent with the hard copy provided (appendix no. 4).

4. The documentation referred to in sections 1 and 2, together with the IPB, the doctoral student's periodic reports, and the supervisor(s) 's periodic opinions, shall be provided by the Office of the Doctoral School to the members of the Commission immediately. At the Commission's request, the Office of the Doctoral School shall make other documents collected in the doctoral student's personal file available.

5. The activities of the Commission may be stationary, remote or hybrid.

6. Following the mid-term evaluation, the Chair of the Commission shall forward the required documents to the Office of the Doctoral School without delay, but no later than within 7 working days, including:

1) the individual assessment of the implementation of the IPB from each member of the Commission (appendix no. 5),

2) the result of the mid-term evaluation together with a justification (appendix no. 6),

3) the minutes of the Commission's work (appendix no. 7).

7. An employee of the Doctoral School Office shall immediately make the assessment result available to the doctoral student and the supervisor/supervisors. The result is also made public on the Doctoral School website.

§ 3

1. In the case of a negative assessment, the doctoral student has the right to submit objections to the mid-term assessment within 7 working days of announcing the mid-term assessment result. The subject of objections may be formal issues only.

2. Objections shall be submitted on the form attached as Appendix No. 8.

3. after consultation with the Doctoral School Board, the Director of the Doctoral School Board shall immediately consider the objections referred to in paragraph 1.

4. If the legitimacy of the objections raised is acknowledged, the Head of the Doctoral School shall decide whether to re-do the mid-term evaluation. The result of the mid-term reassessment is ultimate.

*Appendix no*. 1

Kraków, ………………

**WNIOSEK O POWOŁANIE KOMISJI DO PRZEPROWADZENIA OCENY ŚRÓDOKRESOWEJ DOKTORANTA SZKOŁY DOKTORSKIEJ**

**UNIWERSYTETU KOMISJI EDUKACJI NARODOWEJ W KRAKOWIE**

Zgodnie z § 20 Regulaminu Szkoły Doktorskiej do przeprowadzenia oceny śródokresowej Pana/Pani

Imię i nazwisko doktoranta:………………………….………….…………………………

Dyscyplina naukowa: ..…….………………………………………………………………

Numer albumu: ……………….

Data rozpoczęcia kształcenia w SD: ……………….........

Tytuł przygotowywanej rozprawy doktorskiej:..........………………….…………………

………………………………………………………….........………………….…………

Promotor:…………………..…….…………………………………………………………
Promotor:…………………………….…….........………………….………………………
Promotor pomocniczy: …………………………………………………………………….

Proponowany skład komisji:
Stopień/tytuł, imię i nazwisko: …….........………………………..…….………………..

Instytut/Katedra/ …….........……………………………………....…….………………...

Uczelnia…………………………………….…….........…………………………..………

Stopień/tytuł, imię i nazwisko: …….........………………………..…….………………..

Instytut/Katedra/ …….........……………………………………....…….………………...

Uczelnia…………………………………….…….........…………………………..………

Stopień/tytuł, imię i nazwisko: …….........………………………..…….………………..

Instytut/Katedra/ …….........……………………………………....…….………………...

Uczelnia…………………………………….…….........…………………………..………

…………..........………………….…………

 *podpis Dyrektora Szkoły Doktorskiej*

**OPINIA RADY DYSCYPLINY …………………………………………………….**

|  |
| --- |
| Członek komisji śródokresowej……………………………………………………… |
|  |
| Członek komisji śródokresowej ………………………………………………………… |
|  |
| Członek komisji śródokresowej ………………………………………………………… |
|  |

Kraków, ………………… r. ……………………………………………………

 *podpis przewodniczącego rady dyscypliny*

**DECYZJA DYREKTORA SZKOŁY DOKTORSKIEJ**

Do przeprowadzenia oceny śródokresowej Pani/Pana…………………………

powołuję komisję w składzie:

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Kraków, ………………… r. ………………………………………… *podpis Dyrektora Szkoły Doktorskiej*  |
|  |

*Appendix no.2*

**REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN**

|  |
| --- |
| Doctoral Student |
| Name and Surname |  |
| Albumu numer |  |
| ORCID |  |
| Field/Discipline |  |
| The organizational unit of UKEN in which the research is conducted |  |
| The year of beginning of education at the Doctoral School |  |
| Title of dissertation  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Supervisor |
| Name, surname, academic degree/title |   |
| Home unit  |  |
| Field/Discipline |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Supervisor |
| Name, surname, academic degree/title |  |
| Home unit  |  |
| Field/Discipline |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Co-supervisor |
| Name, surname, academic degree/title |  |
| Home unit  |  |
| Field/Discipline |  |

|  |
| --- |
| self-reference |
| *Briefly describe the stage of research development you are in. What have you achieved and what challenges do you see ahead? (up to 500 words)* |

|  |
| --- |
| Implementation of research tasks (in accordance with IRP) |
| II SEMESTER  |
| TASK | DESCRIPTION | Implemented\* | RESULTS/REMARKS\*\* |
| 1. |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |
| III SEMESTER |
| TASK | DESCRIPTION | Implemented\* | RESULTS/REMARKS\*\* |
| 1. |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |
| IV SEMESTER |
| TASK | DESCRIPTION | Implemented\* | RESULTS/REMARKS\*\* |
| 1. |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |

\* Fully implemented, partially implemented, not implemented

\*\* In case of complete or partial implementation of the task, please describe the research results and explain how they will be used. In the case of partial implementation or non-implementation of the task, please explain in detail the reasons for the non-implementation or partial non-implementation of the planned research task.

|  |
| --- |
| Research fundings |
| Funds obtained for conducting research (source, amount, use) | 1) 2)3)  |
| Submitted applications for research or art grants | 1) 2) |

|  |
| --- |
| Other scientific achievements, not shown in the table *Implementation of research tasks*(i.e., not planned in IRP) |
| Acceptance for publication of at least one publication\* or realization of at least one artistic work of significant importance (more than one may be given) | 1) 2) |
| Presenting a paper at at least one international or national conference or carrying out an artistic project making a significant contribution to culture (more than one may be given) | 1)2)3) |
| Accomplishment of achievements in popularization of science or art (more than one can be given) | 1)2) |
| Others | 1)2) |

\* A publication is:

- one scientific article in a scientific journal or in the peer-reviewed materials of an international conference, which was included in the ministerial list of scientific journals in the year the article was published in its final form, or

- one scientific monograph published by a publishing house which, was included in the ministerial list of publishing houses in the year of publication of the monograph in its final form, or

- one chapter in the monograph mentioned above.

|  |
| --- |
| Concluding remarks |
|  |

………………………………………………………………

 *Daily date and doctoral student signature*

*Appendix no*. 3

# SUPERVISOR’S OPINION ON THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

## THE PROGRESS OF THE DOCTORAL STUDENT IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN

........................................,Day ……………

 *(town)*

.............................................................................................................................

*(name and surname supervisor/ co-supervisor, academic degree/title)*

.............................................................................................................................

*(organizational unit)*

CONCERNS DOCTORAL STUDENT

.............................................................................

*(name and surname of doctoral)*

.............................................................................

*(academic discipline, year and semester)*

*In particular, the Opinion should take into account the following:*

* *Timeliness of the IRP realization;*
* *Compliance of the implemented activities in accordance with the IRP;*
* *The correctness of the conducted research and the results obtained ;*
* *The degree of progress of the work that will become the basis of the doctoral dissertation;*
* *Cooperation of the doctoral student with supervisor(s)(including communication);*
* *Predictions for further implementation of the IRP.*

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…….………………………………………

 *(legible signature)*

*Appendix no*. 4

………………………………………….

*name, surname and album nr*

**DECLARATION**

**on the compatibility of the electronic version with the hard copy**

I, the undersigned, declare that the printed version of the following documents is identical to the electronic version:

- Report on the implementation of the individual research plan,

- the opinion of the supervisor(s) and co-supervisor, if appointed, on the doctoral student's progress in implementing the individual research plan (IRP),

- For the discipline of Fine arts and arts conservation - in addition, a portfolio.

……………………… …………..........………………….…

 *Daily date doctoral student signature*

*Appendix no*. 5

**INDYWIDUALNA OCENA REALIZACJI INDYWIDUALNEGO PLANU BADAWCZEGO**

**na podstawie dokumentów, o których mowa w § 2 ust. 1 i 2**

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

*Imię (imiona) i nazwisko osoby oceniającej wyniki badań doktoranta*

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

*Imię (imiona) i nazwisko doktoranta*

…………………………………………………………………………….

*numer albumu*

………………………………………..……………………………………
*dyscyplina*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lp.** | **Oceniany element** | **Ocena** **pozytywna / negatywna** | **Uzasadnienie** |
| 1. | terminowość realizacji IPB |  |  |
| 2. | uzasadnienie rozbieżności prac w stosunku do harmonogramu |  |  |
| 3. | poprawność przeprowadzenia badań i uzyskanych wyników |  |  |
| 4. | sposób upowszechniania cząstkowych wyników badań |  |  |
| 5. | inne działania związane z pracą naukową |  |  |
| 6. | współpraca doktoranta z promotorem (w tym komunikacja)  |  |  |
| 7. | rokowania co do dalszej realizacji IPB |  |  |

#### ………………………………………………..

 *data i podpis członka Komisji*

*Appendix no*.6

**WYNIK OCENY ŚRÓDOKRESOWEJ DOKTORANTA
W SZKOLE DOKTORSKIEJ UNIWERSYTETU
KOMISJI EDUKACJI NARODOWEJ W KRAKOWIE**

………………………………………………………………………………………

*Imię i nazwisko doktoranta*

………………………………………………………………………………………

*Numer albumu*

………………………………………………………………………………………

*dyscyplina*

**Komisj a w sk ła dz ie:**

**Przewodniczący Komisji:** …………………………………………………………….............
*stopień/tytuł naukowy/imię i nazwisko*

 **Członek:** ……………………………………………………………………………………..

*stopień/tytuł naukowy/imię i nazwisko*

 **Członek:** ……………………………………………………………………………………..

*stopień/tytuł naukowy/imię i nazwisko*

wystawiła Panu/Pani ……………..................................................... ocenę śródokresową: **pozytywną / negatywną**.\*

### Uzasadnienie oceny

............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

**Wskazanie pożądanych zmian w IPB i w sposobach jego realizacji**

............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

..........................................................

 *data i podpis Przewodniczącego Komisji*

\*niewłaściwe skreślić

*Appendix no*. 7

**PROTOKÓŁ**

**z prac komisji ds. oceny śródokresowej w Szkole Doktorskiej
Uniwersytetu Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie**

……………………………………………………………………………

*Imię (imiona) i nazwisko doktoranta*

…………………………………………………………………………….

*numer albumu*

Pan/Pani ………………………………………………………… przystąpił(a) w dniu …………... r. do oceny śródokresowej w Szkole Doktorskiej Uniwersytetu Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie w dyscyplinie naukowej: …………………………………………………….

w trybie zdalnym/stacjonarnym\* przed Komisją ds. oceny śródokresowej w składzie:

**Przewodniczący** **Komisji:** …………………………………………………………………

stopień/tytuł naukowy/imię i nazwisko/miejsce zatrudnienia/jednostka

**Członek:** ………………………………………………………………………………………

stopień/tytuł naukowy/imię i nazwisko/miejsce zatrudnienia/jednostka

 **Członek:** ………………………………………………………………………………………

stopień/tytuł naukowy/imię i nazwisko/miejsce zatrudnienia/jednostka

**1) Część niejawna**

Komisja zapoznała się z indywidualnymi ocenami realizacji IPB doktoranta, sporządzonymi przez członków Komisji, i przeprowadziła dyskusję.

**2) Część jawna**

Komisja przeprowadziła rozmowę z doktorantem/doktorantką. Zadano następujące pytania:

1.....................................................................................................................................................

2.....................................................................................................................................................

3.....................................................................................................................................................

**3) Część niejawna**

Przeprowadzono dyskusję, w toku której podniesiono następujące kwestie:
............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

W drodze głosowania zwykłą większością głosów komisja wystawiła ocenę śródokresową: **pozytywną / negatywną**.\*

Głosów za …………

Głosów przeciw ………

1. **Część niejawna**

##### **Ocena jakości opieki promotorskiej**

##### Przeprowadzono dyskusję na temat jakości opieki promotorskiej, w toku której podniesiono następujące kwestie:

##### ......................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

##### UWAGI

.................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

*Przewodniczący Komisji (data i podpis)* ...............................................................................

*Członek Komisji (data i podpis)* .............................................................................................

*Członek Komisji (data i podpis)* .............................................................................................

\*niewłaściwe skreślić

*Appendix no*.8

Kraków, dn. …….…….

……………………………………………………………………………

Imię (imiona) i nazwisko doktoranta

…………………………………………………………………………….

numer albumu

…………………………………………………………………………….

dyscyplina

Zgłaszam następujące zastrzeżenia formalne do przebiegu oceny śródokresowej:

1.

2.

3.

……………………………………..…………

*podpis doktoranta*