Annex No. 2
to the Terms and Conditions of the Doctoral School

Principles of mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student and evaluation of the supervision exercised over the doctoral student by the thesis supervisor in the Doctoral School of Natural and Agricultura Sciences

§ 1
General principles

1. The mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student (the "Evaluation") shall be made in the middle of education period
2. The outcome of the evaluation may be positive or negative.
3. The outcome of the evaluation, together with reasons, shall be public.
4. The evaluation shall be conducted by the committee, composed of three persons designated by the College of Directors of the Units in Charge, including one person holding the degree of doctor with a habilitation or title of professor in the field in which the doctoral thesis is prepared, employed beyond the Units in Charge.
5. A representative of doctoral students elected by the Doctoral Students' Self-Government may participate in the work of the Committee as an observer.
6. The mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student can take place on-site, in hybrid or in remote form.
7. The committee shall be appointed separately for each doctoral student; the compositions of the committees may be the same for different doctoral students.
8. The composition of the committee shall be public.
9. The committee shall be appointed not later than one month prior to the mid-term evaluation.

§ 2
Evaluation of the doctoral student

1. Not later than two weeks prior to the date of the committee meeting, the doctoral student should submit to the Secretariat of the Doctoral School a written report on implementation of the Individual Research Plan (the 'IRP"), which shall include the updated schedule of preparation of the doctoral thesis for the further terms. A template of the report is defined by the Head of the Doctoral School.
2. The supervisor within the time limit specified in item 1 should submit a written opinion on the doctoral student to the Secretary of the Doctoral School.

3. After becoming familiar with the report, the Committee shall meet the doctoral student for the purpose of conducting the substantive evaluation of the progress in implementation of IRP.
4. For the purpose of clarification of any doubts connected with implementation of the IRP or any difficulties tackled by the doctoral student, the commission may request the thesis supervisor to take part in the committee meeting.
5. A negative outcome of the mid-term evaluation is the basis for removing the doctoral student from the register of doctoral students.

§ 3
Evaluation of supervision exercised over the doctoral student by the thesis supervisor

1. At the time of the mid-term evaluation, the Committee shall also evaluate the supervision exercised over the doctoral student by the thesis supervisor.
2. The outcome of the evaluation may be positive or negative.
3. A negative outcome of the mid-term evaluation of the thesis supervisor shall result in change of the thesis supervisor, if the outcome of the evaluation of the doctoral student is positive.

§ 4
Other provisions

1. The committee shall prepare a report on the course and mid-term evaluation and the evaluation of the thesis supervisor, which shall be presented to the Head of the Doctoral School.
2. The protocol of the student's mid-term evaluation as well as the supervisor's evaluation includes:
    a. description of the course of the work of the Committee;
    b. evaluation of the doctoral student and supervisor;
    c. the rationale for the assessment.
3. The doctoral student and the thesis supervisor shall be notified of the outcome of the evaluation within not more than a week of the committee meeting.
4. The doctoral student and the thesis supervisor may file an appeal against the negative outcome of the mid-term evaluation with the Council of the Doctoral School.
5. In the event of a positive evaluation of the doctoral student and a negative evaluation of the thesis supervisor, the change the thesis supervisor should be changed within three months.