

Guidelines For Preparing a Self-Evaluation Report

A. INTRODUCTION

The guidelines for the preparation of the self-evaluation report have been prepared in conjunction with § 4(1)(1) of the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Science of 27 September 2021 on the evaluation of the quality of education at doctoral schools, hereinafter referred to as the “Regulation”. They constitute a **framework** manual for preparation of a self-evaluation report for evaluation of doctoral schools, primarily indicating the scope of information needed for the evaluation.

The guidelines, however, are not a document that is a detailed, comprehensive manual for preparing a doctoral school self-presentation. In the self-evaluation report, the entity should make a presentation in a way that shows the school's mission and characteristics. Therefore, entities are responsible for developing an individual and adequate way of presenting how the school functions, its development strategy, as well as the observed and expected learning outcomes of the school. It is emphasized that **the entity is a party to the evaluation** and bears responsibility for the operation of the doctoral school and the quality of education at the doctoral school.

The report should include the entity's **self-evaluation** of operation of the doctoral school. In each area to be evaluated, the entity should indicate at least the strengths of the school's operation and the challenges it faces.

The Guidelines also describe the structure of the ICT system form for preparing and submitting the self-evaluation report.

The entity is responsible for ensuring that the information in the report is complete. The doctoral school is evaluated solely on the basis of the information it contains and the results of the inspection, unless the evaluation team requests additional information. The evaluation team may use other sources in the scope necessary to verify the information in the report.

The self-evaluation report is prepared in two languages: Polish and English.

In addition, the document partially identifies areas that it plans to verify through inspections.

B. FORM IN THE ICT SYSTEM – General Information

The structure of the form reflects the division into statutory evaluation criteria: each criterion is assigned to a separate section of the form. In addition, the form includes:

- > PART A of the document – an automatically generated set of necessary information of a formal nature;
- > PROFILE – the section in which the entity presents the mission and specifics of the doctoral school. The “Profile” further includes a set of data automatically generated from the POLon system, describing the substantive aspects of the doctoral school's operation;
- > INFORMATION ON COOPERATION OF THE ENTITY WITH THE DOCTORAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT – the section in which the entity presents information on cooperation with the doctoral student government in the scope relevant to the educational process;
- > DECLARATIONS – the section in which the entity includes the necessary declarations referred to in § 4(2)(2) of the Regulation, i.e.:
 - > a statement that the information contained in the self-evaluation report is consistent with the factual and legal situation;
 - > a declaration that the information in Polish and English contained in the self-evaluation report

is consistent in terms of substance;

- > a declaration that the documents referred to in § 4(2)(1) of the Regulation, in Polish and English, are consistent in terms of substance, i.e. the following documents in effect during the period covered by the evaluation: the rules of recruitment to the doctoral school and the rules/regulations of the doctoral school;
- > **AUTHORISATIONS** – the section in which the entity includes the authorisation in the case of signing the self-evaluation report, the above-mentioned statements and other documents submitted in the course of the evaluation by the person authorised to do so by the person in charge of the entity;
- > **SUPPLEMENTS** – the section where the entity includes any and all the clarifications and additional information (in Polish and English) at the request of the evaluation team. A deadline for submitting them in the system of 14 days from the date of receipt of the request was indicated in the Regulation (§ 4(6)(2));
- > **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION REPORT** – the section will be active for the entity after the evaluation team of the Science Evaluation Committee (KEN) has prepared the evaluation report and made it available to the entity. In this part, in addition to the evaluation report, you will see the “Entity's comments to the evaluation report” tab, through which the entity will be able to make reasoned comments on the received report within 14 days of its receipt;
- > **EVALUATION RESULT** – the section will be active for the entity after the Science Evaluation Committee (KEN) passes a resolution on the assessment resulting from the evaluation. The following documents will be made available to the entity using this module:
 - resolution of the Science Evaluation Committee on the evaluation,
 - final version of the evaluation report,
 - file with the generated self-evaluation report prepared by the entity,

which, in accordance with § 9(3) of the Regulation, will be made available by the Minister of Education and Science and the entity in the Public Information Bulletin (BIP) on their websites within 7 days of the date on which the resolution became final.

In the “Evaluation Result” part, the “Objections to the evaluation” tab will be visible, through which an entity dissatisfied with the evaluation will be able to raise objections to the evaluation within 30 days of the date of delivery of the evaluation resolution.

In such a case, in this part, after the Science Evaluation Committee has examined the objections, the resolution of the Committee will be provided to the entity which upholds the original resolution or amends the assessment resulting from the evaluation.

Each section of the form allows to enter the content or attach the relevant files in the windows intended for the Polish and English language versions, respectively.

The system allows to record the respective stages of work on the preparation of the self-evaluation report. It is up to the entity to determine the number of people authorised to edit the report form, i.e. with the assigned function of the so-called report editor authorised to fill the form with content.

In the case of supplements to the report at the request of the evaluation team and comments on the evaluation report made available to the entity, care should be taken in each case to include relevant statements and, if necessary, authorisations.

C. PROFILE

In this part, the entity should provide general information about the doctoral school: discuss its mission, highlight its characteristics, discuss its development strategy, as well as its strengths and major achievements. The “Profile” is the first element of the report that the experts who are section

of the evaluation team will read, and will set the interpretive context for them for the information contained in the remaining parts of the report.

A limit of 7,000 characters with spaces has been introduced for this field.

To complete the characteristics of the doctoral school, this section will also show basic information and quantitative data about the doctoral school, automatically imported by the report form from the POL-on system.

The entity is obliged to verify it. In the case of objections to the generated data, it is recommended to first verify whether it is consistent with the data entered by the entity into the POL-on system. In the event of discrepancies, it is advisable to first contact the National Information Processing Institute – National Research Institute, using the tool provided for this purpose.

D. INFORMATION ABOUT THE COOPERATION OF THE ENTITY WITH THE DOCTORAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT

In this section, the entity should provide information on cooperation with the doctoral student government in the areas relevant to the educational process, including, among others, giving opinions on curricula and agreeing on the regulations of the doctoral school. The entity can describe good practices of cooperation with the student government.

A limit of 2,000 characters with spaces has been introduced for this field.

E. INFORMATION ON THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL GROUPED BY THE ISSUES TO WHICH THE STATUTORY CRITERIA APPLY

The information provided by the entity in the self-evaluation report should make it possible to carry out an evaluation of the quality of education at the doctoral school, and therefore to assess this quality by the evaluation team, taking into account the eight statutory evaluation criteria and the specific criteria referred to in the Regulation. At the stage of creating provisions, it was recognized that the areas addressed by the statutory and specific criteria best illustrate the functioning of a doctoral school, the manner and degree of implementation of which are indicative of the quality of education. When describing the respective areas of the doctoral school's operation, it should be borne in mind that the doctoral school evaluation team should acquire comprehensive knowledge primarily to the extent that it is possible to assess the level in terms of a given criterion. In order for the evaluation team to verify this level, the entity is required to provide a report that adequately and comprehensively describes the areas of operation of the doctoral school to which each specific evaluation criteria applies.

The following defines the necessary scope of information that the entity should include in the respective parts of the form corresponding to the evaluation criteria. The entity is responsible for the selection and method of presentation, if appropriate, of other information relevant to the evaluation of the Doctoral School in a given criterion.

The information should describe and explain (justify) how the school is operating, as well as include a self-evaluation (at a minimum point out the strengths and challenges the school faces).

1) Adequacy of the Curriculum and Individual Research Plans to the Learning Outcomes for Qualifications at Level 8 of the Polish Qualifications Framework (PQF) and their Implementation

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(1) of the Regulation:

- a) the adequacy of the learning outcomes specified in the curriculum to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
- b) the adequacy of the scientific or artistic work of doctoral students and the dissemination of its results, specified in individual research plans, to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
- c) the manner of implementing the curriculum and individual research plans in order to achieve learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
- d) the manner of implementing the interdisciplinarity of the education process in order to achieve learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
- e) the reliability of the process of improving the curriculum, aimed at improving its adequacy to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8.

The entity should focus on succinctly presenting the curricula and individual research plans: specifying their assumptions and principles of their structure, methods of their improvement and the process of changing them. The information should relate to the curricula and plans from the evaluated years. It is necessary to demonstrate that the curricula and plans, as well as their implementation (taking into account the scientific or artistic activity of doctoral students and the dissemination of its results) guarantee the achievement of learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8: in the areas of knowledge, skills and social competence.

Additional attention should be paid to how the interdisciplinary nature of the educational process is used to achieve these results. Interdisciplinarity should be understood not so much as the interdisciplinarity of the doctoral school itself, but as a philosophy of education involving the doctoral student in a process that, in addition to solving a specific research problem, is aimed at multifaceted discovery and understanding of the world.

Also to be discussed and supported by examples is the matter of doctoral students acquiring, in the course of their education, so-called transversal skills (i.e. qualifications concerning, for example, critical thinking, creativity, taking initiative, problem-solving skills, risk assessment and decision-making) and skills concerning the conduct of scientific activity – extremely important for the development of a researcher's career both in the academic world and outside it.

The entity may also provide other relevant information for the purpose of assessing the adequacy of curricula and plans against the PQF level 8 – if it deems it warranted.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

The curricula should be attached in the space provided, in the form of properly labeled pdf files. It is noted that it is necessary to attach files in both language versions (Polish and English).

Individual research plans will be reviewed by the evaluation team during the inspection. The plans will be selected at random.

2) Means of Verification of Learning Outcomes for Qualifications at PQF Level 8

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(2)

of the Regulation:

- a) accessibility and clarity of the rules for verifying learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
- b) transparency and reliability of the learning outcome verification process for qualifications at PQF level 8,
- c) reliability of the process of improving the manner of verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8.

The entity should present, in a comprehensive manner, the process (used in the doctoral school) of verification of learning outcomes for qualification at level 8 of the Polish Qualifications Framework. This process should be understood relatively broadly, and in addition to the mere act of verifying the learning outcomes at a certain level at a given time, it should also include the stage of creating the principles of this verification, as well as the stage of improving it, based on the experience of the doctoral school and the observation of changing socio-economic conditions or technological progress.

The entity should demonstrate and discuss the steps it is taking to ensure high standards of verification of learning outcomes and achievement of the high level of learning outcomes required for qualification at PQF level 8. Also key in this regard will be a description of the involvement of staff in the verification process and the tools used during the process.

The entity may also present other relevant information about the verification of learning outcomes achieved by doctoral students, including, for example, the presentation of verification of these outcomes outside the traditional form of credits and examinations.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

The rules of verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8 applicable at the doctoral school should be attached in the space provided, in the form of appropriately described pdf files. It is noted that it is necessary to attach files in both language versions (Polish and English). In the absence of a relevant document, the entity may provide an explanation for this – in such a case, the rules will be reviewed by the evaluation team during the inspection.

3) Qualifications of Academic Teachers or Research Staff Teaching at the Doctoral School

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(3) of the Regulation:

- a) the adequacy of the scientific or artistic achievements and professional achievements as well as scientific or artistic work and professional work of these persons to the scope of doctoral education provided,
- b) the quality of work for the professional development of these persons, in particular when acting as a supervisor or assistant supervisor, undertaken by these persons and by an entity running doctoral schools,
- c) the reliability of the actions taken by the entity to verify the qualifications of these persons.

The entity should focus on presenting the staff providing education in the doctoral school in the context of their qualifications needed to meet the learning outcomes. What needs to be discussed is the overall selection of the staff to the doctoral school, the qualifications and competencies they possess for doctoral

education in the area of the implemented curriculum.

The entity should present, in each of the disciplines in which the doctoral school is run, 5 profiles of academic teachers or researchers, teaching in the doctoral school, with the highest qualifications, taking into account their recognized scientific or artistic achievements and competence in scientific or artistic guidance, as well as adequate professional achievements and professional activity, including experience in obtaining grants and managing grant-funded projects.

Also to be discussed in the report is the issue of doctoral school staff improving their qualifications and competencies both in terms of their own scientific or artistic development and in terms of scientific or artistic supervision of doctoral students, including the so-called transversal skills. This issue should be presented both in the context of the initiatives taken by the staff individually and the conditions and opportunities created for this purpose by the entity in the doctoral school and the actual offer directed to the staff.

The entity should provide information on the principles it follows in the selection of the staff teaching at the doctoral school and on how it verifies the qualifications and competencies of these persons. What is also to be discussed is how to verify the quality and effectiveness of the education provided by the staff, including fulfillment of their duties, as well as the circumstances that disqualify staff from educating in the doctoral school.

In addition, the report should demonstrate the substance of completed and pending disputes regarding the fulfillment by the doctoral school's staff of their duties, while the detailed nature of these cases can be verified by the evaluation team during the inspection.

The entity may provide other information relevant in its opinion for assessment of the area in question.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

The materials presenting profiles of academic teachers or researchers with the highest qualifications recognized by the entity should be attached in the space provided, in the form of appropriately described pdf files. It is noted that it is necessary to attach files in both language versions (Polish and English). The potential verification of the qualifications of the remaining staff of the doctoral school may be analysed by the evaluation team during the inspection, as well as on the basis of official data collected in the POL-on system.

4) Quality of the Recruitment Process

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(4) of the Regulation:

- a) the quality and availability of information and internal legal acts concerning the operation of doctoral schools,
- b) the accessibility, unambiguity and openness of the rules of recruitment to doctoral schools and the timely publication of these rules,
- c) the manner of conducting the competition referred to in Art. 200(2) of the Act of 20 July 2018 – *Law on Higher Education and Science*,
- d) the manner of taking into account the needs of the disabled in the recruitment process,
- e) the manner of verifying the aptitude of candidates for doctoral schools to do research,
- f) reliability of measures taken by the entity to improve the recruitment process.

The entity should succinctly characterise – focusing on the aspect of quality – the respective elements that make up the process of recruiting doctoral students to the doctoral school.

The issue of the entity's rules for recruitment to the doctoral school, including solutions for recruiting candidates whose scholarships are financed from external sources (e.g. research agencies), needs to be discussed.

In addition, a description should be provided on how the entity ensures conditions of fair competition and equal treatment for doctoral school candidates, including candidates from other domestic and foreign entities, as well as persons with disabilities.

What should also be explained is, among others, the method adopted by the entity to verify the predisposition of candidates for doctoral school to conduct scientific activities.

In this section of the report, it is also advisable to describe how the entity presents the doctoral school, i.e. through what channels and what information can be accessed by potential students interested in pursuing education at the doctoral school. It is important how the entity communicates the offer of the doctoral school, also in terms of the quality of information and the methods of its dissemination.

In addition, an element that needs to be presented in the report is composition of the recruitment committees and the rationale for it in the context of guarantees to ensure a high standard of recruitment. The compositions of the committees should be attached in the space provided for this purpose in the report, in the form of properly labeled pdf files. It is noted that it is necessary to attach files in both language versions (Polish and English).

The entity should also discuss in detail the process of recruitment for the doctoral school, both in terms of form, content and organizational efficiency. The discussion should also include how the results of the doctoral school recruitment were communicated, the reasons for and scale of the submitted appeals and the entity's comments on their legitimacy. In addition, it is advisable to summarise and compare the recruitment processes over the evaluated years, which should include information on the scale of interest in entering doctoral school, a discussion of the level represented by candidates, and an overall assessment of the success of recruitment.

An essential element of the report is to indicate whether the entity is identifying elements of the overall recruitment process that require improvement or modification, and to what extent it implements solutions to improve the process.

The information presented by the entity can be supported by figures and suitable comments. The entity may also provide other information relevant, in its opinion, for the purpose of evaluating the recruitment process.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

The rules of recruitment and regulations of the doctoral school should be attached in the space provided, in the form of properly labeled pdf files. It is noted that it is necessary to attach files in both language versions (Polish and English).

5) Quality of Scientific or Artistic Guidance as well as Support in Research

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(5) of the Regulation:

- a) criteria and the manner of appointing and changing the supervisor(s) or assistant supervisor,
- b) manners of providing doctoral students with high-quality cooperation with their supervisor(s) or assistant supervisor, including resolving conflict situations between the doctoral student and the supervisor(s) or assistant supervisor,
- c) manners of providing doctoral students, including doctoral students with disabilities and doctoral students who are parents, with suitable conditions and support in the implementation

of the curriculum and individual research plans, as well as in the preparation of doctoral dissertations, including ensuring access to the necessary infrastructure,

- d) degree of involvement of outstanding specialists employed outside the entity in activities supporting doctoral students in their research, including scientific or artistic supervision of doctoral students,
- e) reliability of verification and evaluation of the work of supervisor(s) or assistant supervisor, as well as measures taken by the entity to improve the quality of their work.

The entity should provide a set of information that will allow the evaluation team to make a thorough assessment of the quality of scientific or artistic guidance provided to the doctoral student at the doctoral school. For this purpose, it is necessary for the entity to present the areas to which the specific criteria indicated above apply.

Therefore, what needs to be discussed is the method and criteria adopted in the entity for appointing and changing the supervisor(s) or assistant supervisor (hereinafter referred to as the “supervisor(s)”). The description should include a justification of whether the adopted solutions make it possible to provide the doctoral student with supervisors with sufficiently high competence in the scope of supervision, and to optimally match the supervisor(s) to the specifics of the research problem constituting the subject of the doctoral dissertation, as well as whether these solutions are conducive to building strong scientific or artistic potential to be the result of the cooperation between the supervisor and the doctoral student. Particular attention should be paid to the circumstances under which the supervisor(s) of a particular doctoral student may be changed, the solutions developed in this regard and their consequences.

The entity should indicate the scope of requirements for supervisors with regard to providing guidance for the doctoral student and supporting their scientific or artistic development. The description should also include information on what the scientific or artistic guidance provided by the supervisor(s) to the doctoral student consists of and includes, how the guidance enables the doctoral student to develop academically or artistically (including the acquisition of transversal skills), and how it supports the doctoral student in their functioning within the academic community.

An essential element of the report is information on how the entity verifies the work of supervisors and assistant supervisors, identifies areas of scientific or artistic guidance that require improvement or modification, and to what extent it implements solutions to improve this guidance and secure its high level.

In addition, the entity should describe the methods used in the doctoral school to resolve conflict situations between the doctoral student and the supervisor(s), determine the extent to which all the parties involved in the educational process are aware of these solutions, and assess what results they produce.

It is necessary to describe what conditions (including access to the necessary infrastructure) and what kind of support are provided to doctoral students in order for them to implement their curriculum, individual research plans and to prepare their doctoral dissertations at the expected high level. This issue should also be discussed with regard to doctoral students with disabilities and doctoral students who are parents and legal guardians of minors.

The entity should describe whether it invites outstanding specialists from other centers to collaborate in providing scientific or artistic guidance or to engage in activities to support doctoral students in conducting scientific activities, and to what extent these specialists enhance the potential of the doctoral school. If there is no such cooperation or if is limited, the reason for such an approach should be described and justified.

The information presented by the entity can be supported by figures and suitable comments. The entity may also provide other information relevant, in its opinion, for the purpose of assessing the quality of scientific or artistic guidance provided to doctoral students at the doctoral school.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

6) Reliability of the Mid-Term Assessment

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(6) of the Regulation:

- a) the selection of criteria and objective rules for conducting this assessment, as well as the availability and unambiguity of these criteria and rules,
- b) the composition and competences of the body carrying out this assessment,
- c) timeliness and manner of carrying out this assessment,
- d) the reliability of the measures taken by the entity to improve the process of carrying out this assessment.

The entity should comprehensively present the doctoral school's system of mid-term evaluation of doctoral students. At the outset, it is necessary to describe what the mid-term evaluation instrument is for the entity and to outline in general terms what the principles, criteria and procedures of this evaluation are. Also, it should indicate when, to what extent, and how the above information is made available to doctoral students and other interested parties.

The report should describe and justify the method of appointing committee members, indicating, among others, the number of members and the rules for selecting them (including, in particular, the participation of persons from outside the entity running the doctoral school), as well as how the entity verifies the competences of those serving on the committees.

Another aspect of the mid-term evaluation process is the timeliness of evaluations. The report should indicate whether all evaluations were carried out within the timeframe specified by the Act. If there were deviations in this regard, the report should include an explanation. It should also describe how the entity seeks to ensure transparency, impartiality and factuality in conducting the mid-term evaluation.

What needs to be discussed is how the results of the mid-term evaluation are communicated (including an explanation of how the entity complies with the provision of the second sentence of Article 202(3) of the Act, indicating the transparency of the result of the mid-term evaluation, along with the reasons for it), as well as how to deal with objections to the results of the evaluation. Comments on the scale of the appeals and their legitimacy must be presented. It is also advisable to summarise and compare the mid-term evaluation processes over the evaluated years, which should include a discussion of the determined level of progress of doctoral students' implementation of their individual research plans and an overall assessment of the success of the first half of the education process, as well as the projected effectiveness of education.

An essential element of the report is information on how the entity identifies elements of the mid-term evaluation process that remain deficient and whether it implements solutions to improve the process (and if so, what these solutions are).

The information presented by the entity should be supported by figures and appropriate commentary (e.g. on the results of the mid-term evaluation, or objections to the results of the evaluation). The entity may also provide other information relevant, in its opinion, for the purpose of assessing the reliability of conducting the mid-term evaluation.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

The internal legal acts (e.g. evaluation rules and criteria) developed in the entity for the purposes of the mid-term evaluation, should be attached in the space provided, in the form of properly labeled pdf files. It is noted that it is necessary to attach files in both language versions (Polish and English).

7) Internationalisation

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(7) of the Regulation:

- a) the degree of internationalisation of the staff, including scientific or artistic mobility and activity in the international environment of academic teachers or researchers teaching at doctoral schools,
- b) the degree of internationalisation of the education process at doctoral schools and the scientific activity of doctoral students, in particular conducted on the basis of individual research plans, including scientific or artistic mobility of doctoral students,
- c) the manner of taking into account the needs of doctoral students who are foreigners in the education process at doctoral schools,
- d) manners of increasing the recognition of doctoral schools abroad and their effectiveness.

The entity should present the degree of internationalisation of the doctoral school and the activities undertaken to internationalise the educational process at the doctoral school.

To this end, the report should describe the entity's system of incentives targeting outstanding foreign scientists or artists to undertake cooperation with the doctoral school, and summarise its effectiveness. It is advisable to present the degree of involvement of such people in the process of doctoral education and the general principles of cooperation, as well as the expected and observed results.

The entity should also discuss the international scientific or artistic activity of the other staff teaching at the doctoral school, including, among others, the level of activity in international competitions for research and project funding, involvement in the implementation of international research or artistic projects, participation in international scientific conferences or artistic events, and use of scholarships or internships pursued abroad. In addition, the report should describe its system of incentives addressed to staff to undertake international activities, and summarise its effectiveness.

The report should indicate to what extent the issues provided for in the curriculum and individual research plans take into account the element of internationalisation and what the entity's systemic solutions are in this area. In addition, information should be provided on what conditions the entity provides for doctoral students to facilitate functioning in an international scientific or artistic environment, to what extent they are used in the educational process and what effects they produce in the context of doctoral dissertations prepared by doctoral students and the achievement by doctoral students of the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8. In the case of the education of doctoral students in cooperation with a foreign scientific institution, as well as the awarding joint doctoral degrees, such practice should be briefly characterised and its effects - discussed.

What is more, information should be presented separately on how the doctoral school solicits foreign doctoral students and how effective these efforts are. It is also necessary to describe the extent of support offered in the course of education to foreign doctoral students and the level of integration of the international environment of the doctoral school.

The entity should present what activities it undertakes to increase the visibility of the doctoral school abroad, and describe the effectiveness of these activities.

The information presented by the entity should be supported by figures and suitable comments. The entity may also provide other information relevant, in its opinion, for the purpose of evaluating the internationalisation of doctoral education at the doctoral school.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

8) Effectiveness of Doctoral Education

When developing information in this regard, it should be borne in mind that the evaluation team conducts the evaluation taking into account the following specific evaluation criteria indicated in § 2(8) of the Regulation:

- a) timely completion of education at doctoral schools in accordance with the curriculum,
- b) the percentage of people who obtained a doctoral degree after completing education at a given doctoral school in the total number of doctoral students who completed their education at this doctoral school in the period covered by the evaluation,
- c) the level of scientific or artistic achievements of doctoral students, in particular those related to scientific or artistic work specified in the individual research plan,
- d) assessing the quality of education at doctoral schools by doctoral students, the results of this assessment and how the results are used by the entity to improve the education process,
- e) the manner of using the results of the monitoring of professional careers of those who completed their education at a given doctoral school and those who obtained a doctoral degree after completing education at such a doctoral school.

The entity should demonstrate the effectiveness of the educational process at the doctoral school.

To this end, the report should indicate what proportion of doctoral students completed their education, i.e. submitted their doctoral dissertation, within the deadline stipulated in the curriculum and in their individual research plans, taking into account the statutory possibility of extending their education under the terms of the regulations of the doctoral school, but by no more than 2 years. In addition, it should be reported how the situation of doctoral students who did not meet this obligation in a timely manner was resolved.

In this section of the report, the system will automatically generate information from the POL-on database on what percentage of doctoral students who completed their education at the doctoral school during the period covered by the evaluation applied for initiation of the procedure for awarding the doctoral degree, what percentage of these individuals were awarded the degree, and what percentage were denied the degree. In addition, such statistics will also be automatically generated for all doctoral students who have completed their education at the doctoral school. The entity should discuss the data presented.

The entity should present (with justification) from 3 to 5 of the scientific or artistic achievements (that it considers most important) of doctoral students in each of the disciplines in which it operates the doctoral school during the period covered by the evaluation, particularly the achievements that are related to the scientific or artistic activity specified in the individual research plan. It should be emphasized that the essence of this list should not be the scale of scientific or artistic productivity of doctoral students, but the quality and significance of these achievements.

The report should describe how the entity enables doctoral students to evaluate the quality of education at the doctoral school, the extent to which doctoral students use this opportunity, and how the entity responds to the information obtained from doctoral students. The entity should present the general conclusions of these evaluations during the period covered by the evaluation, indicating the aspects of doctoral school education appreciated by doctoral students, as well as the problems reported and ways to solve them.

The entity should describe how the results of monitoring of professional careers (referred to in Article 352, paragraphs 1-13 of the Act) of persons who have completed education at a doctoral school and persons who have received a doctoral degree after completing education at a doctoral school, are used. What needs to be clarified is the impact of the information gained through such monitoring on the operation of the doctoral school, including the verification of the quality of education and the creation of responsible development policies.

The entity may also provide other information relevant, in its opinion, for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of doctoral training at the doctoral school.

The discussion presented should end with a self-evaluation.

F. INSPECTION

The inspection which, in addition to the self-evaluation report, is the basis for assessing the quality of education at the doctoral school, is regulated by the provisions of § 6 of the Regulation. They specify the issues related to conduct of the inspection, in particular related to creation of appropriate organizational conditions for the inspection, such as agreeing on a schedule for the inspection, submission by the entity of the necessary documents, providing the experts with the premises and equipment for their work, or arranging individual or group meetings with representatives and stakeholders of the entity and the doctoral school. It should be noted that the areas which the evaluation team considers not to have found sufficient information in the self-evaluation report, may be examined more thoroughly during the inspection.