



Item 159

**RESOLUTION No. 157
OF THE SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW**

dated 29 June 2022

**on determining the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree and a
habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw**

Acting pursuant to Article 192, sections 2 and 3, and Article 221, section 14 of the Act of 20 July 2018, the Law on Higher Education and Science (a consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2022, item 574, as amended), hereinafter referred to as the Act, the Senate of the University of Warsaw resolves as follows:

§ 1

The procedure for the award of a doctoral degree and a habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw is hereby adopted.

§ 2

1. The doctoral degree is awarded by the scientific council of the discipline or by the Academic Council of the Areas of Study. The Scientific Council of the Areas of Study shall be competent to award the doctoral degree if the doctoral dissertation covers scientific issues in more than one scientific discipline contained in a particular area of science and it is not possible to identify a single discipline in which the doctoral degree is awarded.

2. A habilitated doctor degree is awarded by the scientific council of the discipline

3. The scientific councils of disciplines and the Scientific Council of the Areas of Study may set up advisory and opinion committees on the matters referred to in the resolution.

§ 3

1. The rules and regulations for the award of the doctoral degree at the University of Warsaw is set out in Appendix 1 to the resolution.

2. The rules and regulations for the award of a habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw is set out in Appendix 2 to the resolution.

3. Classified and legally protected confidential information shall be protected in the procedures referred to in sections 1 and 2 on the basis of separate provisions. The Rector may announce by means of a notice the manner of such protection.

§ 4

The procedure on award of a doctoral degree and a habilitated doctor degree initiated after 30 September 2019 shall be conducted on the basis of the provisions of the Act, except that:

- 1) the procedures initiated until 31 December 2021 to the achievements referred to in:
 - a) Article 186, section 1, point 3(a) of the Act accept also scientific articles published:
 - in scientific journals or peer-reviewed proceedings of international conferences included on a list drawn up in accordance with regulations issued under Article 267, section 2, point 2(b) of the Act, before the date of publication of that list;
 - before 1 January 2019 - in scientific journals which were included in either Part A or Part C of a list of scientific journals established pursuant to regulations issued on the basis of Article 44, section 2 of the Act repealed by Article 169, section 4 of the Act of 3 July 2018. - Provisions introducing the Act, the Law on higher education and science, and announced by the announcement of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 25 January 2017; or were included in Part B of that list, with scientific articles published therein awarded at least 10 points;
 - b) Article 186, section 1, point 3(b) and Article 219, section 1, point 2(a) of the Act also accept scientific monographs published by:
 - a publishing house included in a list drawn up in accordance with regulations issued on the basis of Article 267, section 2, point 2(a) of the Act, before the date of publication of that list;
 - the organisational unit of the entity the publishing house of which is included in the list drawn up in accordance with the regulations issued under Article 267, section 2, point 2(a) of the Act;
- 2) in the procedures on the award of a habilitated doctor degree, the achievements referred to in Article 219, section 1, point 2(b) of the Act also include scientific articles published:
 - a) in scientific journals or peer-reviewed proceedings of international conferences included on a list drawn up in accordance with regulations issued under Article 267, section 2, point 2(b) of the Act, before the date of publication of that list;
 - b) before 1 January 2019 - in scientific journals which were included in either Part A or Part C of a list of scientific journals established pursuant to regulations issued on the basis of Article 44, section 2 of the Act repealed by Article 169, section 4 of the Act of 3 July 2018 - Provisions introducing the Act, the Law on higher education and science, and announced by the announcement of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 25 January 2017; or were included in Part B of that list, with scientific articles published therein awarded at least 10 points.

§ 5

1. The doctoral and habilitation procedures initiated and not completed by 30 April 2019 shall be conducted on the basis of the current rules except that the degree shall be awarded in the areas and disciplines specified in the regulations issued pursuant to Article 5, section 3 of the Act.

2. In the doctoral and habilitation procedures initiated and not completed before the date of entry into force of the resolution:

- 1) acts carried out in accordance with the existing rules shall remain valid;

2) documentation produced in the course of previous activities, in particular conclusions, reviews and minutes, shall remain valid.

3. The doctoral procedures referred to in section 1, not completed by the date specified in Article 179, section 4, point 2 of the Act of 3 July 2018 - Provisions introducing the Act, the Law on higher education and science, shall be closed as from that date by a resolution of the relevant scientific council of the discipline or of the Scientific Council of the Area of Study, hereinafter referred to as "Scientific Councils".

4. The habilitation procedures referred to in section 1, not completed by the date specified in Article 179, section 4, point 1 of the Act of 3 July 2018 - Provisions introducing the Act, the Law on higher education and science, shall be discontinued on that date by a resolution of the relevant Scientific Council.

5. The resolutions referred to in sections 3 and 4 shall be adopted by relevant Scientific Councils within the period of 30 days from the date referred to in sections 3 and 4 respectively.

6. The existing rules and regulations shall apply to the change of a supervisor in the doctoral procedure referred to in section 1.

7. No fees for the cost of the doctoral procedures shall be charged to those who have initiated their doctoral procedures during doctoral studies at the University of Warsaw.

8. Fees for the costs of the habilitation procedures referred to in section 1 shall be charged on the existing basis.

§ 6

1. In the habilitation procedures referred to in § 5, section 1, the chairperson of the Scientific Council submits to the Scientific Council for a vote on the award of a habilitated doctor degree:

- 1) the resolution on the award of a habilitated doctor degree, provided the habilitation committee submitted a resolution containing an opinion in favour of awarding a habilitated doctor degree;
- 2) the resolution on the award of a habilitated doctor degree, provided the habilitation committee submitted a resolution containing an opinion in favour of refusing to award a habilitated doctor degree;

2. In the event that:

- 1) the resolution referred to in section 1, point 1, has not received an absolute majority of votes, then the Chairperson of the Scientific Council shall put to the vote of the Scientific Council a resolution refusing to award a habilitated doctor degree;
- 2) the resolution referred to in section 1, point 2, has not received an absolute majority of votes, then the Chairperson of the Scientific Council shall put to the vote of the Scientific Council a resolution to award a habilitated doctor degree;

3. If the resolution put to the vote in accordance with section 2 does not receive an absolute majority of votes, the provisions of sections 1 and 2 shall apply respectively. The Chairperson of the Scientific Council may postpone the vote until the next meeting of the Scientific Council.

§ 7

1. Examination boards to conduct examinations in the primary discipline corresponding to the doctoral dissertation topic, an additional discipline and a modern foreign language, as well as the doctoral and habilitation committees appointed to

conduct activities in doctoral and habilitation procedures respectively initiated up to 30 April 2019 shall operate under the existing rules.

2. The Scientific Council in the doctoral procedures initiated up to 30 April 2019 shall appoint, change or designate, under the existing rules, committees to carry out the activities in these procedures.

3. Examination boards to conduct examinations in the primary discipline corresponding to the doctoral dissertation topic, an additional discipline and a modern foreign language, as well as the doctoral and habilitation committees appointed to conduct activities in doctoral and habilitation procedures respectively initiated up to 30 April 2019 shall operate under the existing rules.

4. Administrative services related to doctoral and habilitation procedures, initiated and not completed by 30 April 2019, shall be conducted in the organisational units of the University of Warsaw where these procedures have been initiated.

5. The provisions of § 26, sections 6-9 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution shall also apply to doctoral procedures initiated and not completed by 30 April 2019.

§ 8

1. In the case of a person who started doctoral studies before the academic year 2019/2020, the procedure for the award of the doctoral degree shall be initiated at the application of that person for the appointment of a supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor or an assistant supervisor filed with the chairperson of the Scientific Council.

2. The chairperson of the Scientific Council shall submit the proposal referred to in section 1 without delay to the relevant Scientific Council. The Scientific Council shall, no later than two months from the date of the application to the chairperson of the Scientific Council, appoint a supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor.

3. The application referred to in section 1 includes a list the persons proposed to be appointed as a supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor. The application shall be accompanied by the outline of the doctoral dissertation and declarations from these persons that they are willing to supervise the doctoral student.

4. The provisions of § 8, section 6, § 9, section 4 second sentence and § 10, section 1, letter c and section 2 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution do not apply to the appointment of the supervisor referred to in section 1.

5. Sections 1 to 4 apply respectively to the change of a supervisor or an assistant supervisor. The request for a change of a supervisor shall include a justification.

6. In order to carry out further activities in the procedure for the award of the doctoral degree, the person referred to in section 1 files the documents referred to in § 12, section 2 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution.

7. For those who have completed their final year of doctoral studies at the University of Warsaw, or have submitted a dissertation during these studies, there shall be no fee charged for conducting the procedure for the award of the doctoral degree.

8. For those who started their doctoral studies before the academic year 2019/2020 and are applying for the award of the doctoral degree under the terms of

the Act, learning outcomes referring to the knowledge of a modern foreign language are confirmed on the existing basis.

9. For those who started their doctoral studies before the academic year 2019/2020, the certificate referred to in § 12, section 2, point 8 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution shall be issued by the head of doctoral studies or the head of the organisational unit organising such studies. The provision of § 12, section 3 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution shall apply, whereby the certificate shall specify the learning outcomes achieved in the course of study for the doctoral programme and the form and outcome of the verification of these learning outcomes in the course of study.

§ 9

1. The resolution No. 481 of the Senate of the University of Warsaw of 16 October 2019 on the determination of the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree and a habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw is repealed (Monitor UW of 2019, item 340, as amended).

2. Actions carried out in accordance with the provisions of the resolution referred to in section 1 shall remain in force.

3. Where an Examination Board has been set up in connection with an application submitted for the initiation of the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree, then it shall verify that the candidate meets the prerequisite for the award of a doctoral degree referred to in § 4, section 1, point 4 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution. The provisions of § 19, section 1 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution referred to in section 1 shall apply respectively.

4. If, during the examinations in the scientific discipline referred to in the resolution indicated in section 1, the candidate's knowledge of the methodology and scientific output in the discipline in which the degree is sought and the ability to critically evaluate this scientific output have been confirmed, doctoral examinations are not conducted and the prerequisite for the award of the doctoral degree referred to in § 4, section 1, point 4 of Appendix No. 1 to the resolution is deemed to have been fulfilled.

5. The resolution shall enter into force on the date of its adoption and shall apply from 1 September 2022.

Chairperson of the Senate
of the University of Warsaw
Rector: *A. Z. Nowak*

Appendix No. 1

to the resolution No. 157 of the Senate of the University of Warsaw of 29 June 2022
on determining the procedure for the award of the doctoral degree
and a habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw.

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF A DOCTORAL DEGREE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

§ 1

1. The procedure for the award of the doctoral degree at the University of Warsaw shall be carried out on the basis of the applicable rules and regulations, and in particular:

- 1) the Act of 20 July 2018 – the Law on higher education and science (a consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2022, item 574, as amended), hereinafter referred to as the Act;
- 2) The Statute of the University of Warsaw (Monitor UW of 2019, item 190, as amended);
- 3) The Rules and Regulations on the award of the doctoral degree at the University of Warsaw, hereinafter referred to as the “Rules and Regulations”;
- 4) the provisions of the Act of 14 June 1960, as applicable, - the Code of Administrative Procedure (a consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2021, item 735, as amended), hereinafter referred to as the “Code of Administrative Procedure”.

2. The rules and regulations shall apply to the award of a doctoral degree on the basis of a doctoral dissertation prepared during doctoral studies or in the extramural mode.

§ 2

Terms used in the Rules and Regulations shall mean:

- 1) BIP - the Public Information Bulletin of the University of Warsaw
- 2) a doctoral student – a male or female doctoral student at the University of Warsaw;
- 3) Director – the director of the Doctoral School;
- 4) a candidate - a person applying for the award of the doctoral degree;
- 5) PAN - the Polish Academy of Sciences;
- 6) Chairperson of the Council - the chairperson of the scientific council of the discipline, or of the scientific council of disciplines, or of the Scientific Council of the Areas of Study;
- 7) PQF - the Polish Qualification Framework;
- 8) CSE - the Council of Scientific Excellence
- 9) Scientific Council - the Scientific Council of the Discipline or the Scientific Council of the Areas of Study;
- 10) School Council - the Doctoral School Council
- 11) School Rules and Regulations - the Rules and Regulations of the Doctoral School relevant to the scientific discipline in which the degree is conferred;
- 12) POL-on System - the POL-on Integrated System of Information on Science and Higher Education
- 13) School - the Doctoral School;
- 14) University - the University of Warsaw.

§ 3

1. A doctoral degree shall be awarded in an area of science and scientific discipline.
2. A doctoral degree may be awarded in an area of science.
3. For candidates for a doctoral degree in an area of science, the provisions on a scientific discipline shall apply accordingly with reference to the discipline.

§ 4

1. A doctoral degree shall be awarded to an individual who:
 - 1) holds a master's degree, a master's degree in engineering or equivalent, or has the diploma referred to in Article 326, section 2, point 2 or Article 327, section 2 of the Act, entitling them to apply for the award of a doctoral degree in the country in the education system of which the higher education institution which issued it operates;
 - 2) achieved the learning outcomes for the qualification at level 8 of the PQF, where the learning outcomes in terms of the knowledge of a modern foreign language are confirmed by a certificate or diploma confirming the knowledge of that language at B2 level or higher;
 - 3) has a scientific track record of at least:
 - a) one 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 on a list drawn up in accordance with the provisions issued pursuant to Article 267, section 2, point 2 (b) of the Act or;
 - b) one scientific monograph issued by a publishing house which, in the year of publication of the monograph in its final form, was included on a list drawn up in accordance with the provisions issued pursuant to Article 267, section 2, point 2 (a) of the Act, or a chapter in such a monograph;
 - 4) demonstrates knowledge of the methodology and scientific output in the scientific discipline in which the degree is sought, and an ability to critically evaluate that output;
 - 5) presented and defended a doctoral dissertation;

2. In exceptional cases, justified by the highest quality of scientific achievements, the doctoral degree may be awarded to a person who does not meet the requirements set out in section 1, point 1, who completed the first-cycle studies, or who completed the third year of the long-cycle studies.

3. The Rector may determine, by means of a regulation, the certificates referred to in section 1, point 2.

4. The requirement referred to in section 1, point 3 shall also be deemed to have been met in the case of a multi-author publication, meeting the requirements set out in that provision, unless the Scientific Council specifies other requirements for a multi-author publication

§ 5

1. The doctoral dissertation demonstrates the candidate's general theoretical knowledge in a discipline or disciplines, and the ability to conduct research work independently.

2. The subject matter of the doctoral dissertation shall be an original solution to a scientific problem or an original solution for the application of the results of one's own research in the economic or social field.

3. The doctoral dissertation may be a written dissertation, including a scientific monograph; a collection of published and thematically related scientific articles; design, construction, technological, implementation or artistic work; as well as an independent and separate part of a collective work.

4. The scientific supervision of the preparation of a doctoral dissertation shall be exercised by a supervisor or supervisors or by a supervisor and an assistant supervisor.

§ 6

1. The resolutions of the Scientific Council referred to in the Rules and Regulations are signed on its behalf by the Chairperson of the Council.

2. The Chairperson of the Council may authorise in writing the Deputy Chairperson of the Council to sign resolutions of the Scientific Council, with the exception of resolutions awarding or refusing to award the doctoral degree.

§ 7

The candidate has the right to inspect their own case file, including minutes and resolutions, and to play the recordings of their doctoral examinations and the defence of the doctoral dissertation, as referred to in the Rules and Regulations.

II. THE MANNER OF APPOINTMENT AND CHANGE OF THE SUPERVISOR, SUPERVISORS OR ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR IN CASE OF DOCTORAL STUDENTS STUDYING AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL

§ 8

1. A person admitted to the School shall immediately apply to the Director for the appointment of a supervisor, together with an indication of the person proposed as a supervisor. This application may include appointment of additional supervisors or an assistant supervisor. In the event of failure to submit an application for the appointment of a supervisor within one month from the date of commencement of studies, the doctoral student shall be deemed to have applied for the appointment of the person indicated as the planned supervisor in the application for admission to the School. The person admitted to the School files an application for the appointment of a supervisor accompanied by the consent of the person proposed as a supervisor.

2. The Director shall immediately submit the doctoral student's request for the appointment of a supervisor to the School Council.

3. The School Council shall, not later than three months after the date on which the doctoral student commences their studies, appoint a supervisor or supervisors.

4. The Director shall inform the relevant Scientific Council of the appointment by the School Council of the supervisor or supervisors.

5. The provisions of sections 1 to 4 shall apply respectively to the appointment of additional supervisors or an assistant supervisor. Additional supervisors or an assistant supervisor may be appointed throughout the study period.

6. At least one of the supervisors indicated in the application referred to in section 1 has to be:

- 1) an employee of the University or
- 2) a person holding the status of Professor Emeritus of the University, or
- 3) an employee at the institution co-directing the School in the event that the Rector concludes an agreement to co-direct the School in a specific scientific discipline or

an area of science with another university, a research institute, an institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences or an international institute of recognised scientific reputation.

§ 9

1. The dissertation supervisor may be a person with a habilitated doctor degree or the title of professor, who is distinguished by recognised national or international scientific track record, in particular within five years before the appointment as a supervisor managed research projects, published the results of own research in peer-reviewed journals and scientific publications of recognised renown or cooperated with representatives of other scientific centres.

2. The function of an assistant supervisor may be performed by a person holding a doctoral degree.

3. The School Council, after consulting the competent doctoral student self-government body, may lay down detailed criteria to be met by the person appointed as a supervisor or an assistant supervisor for a doctoral student at the School, in particular as regards scientific track record and the quality of previous supervisory care.

4. A supervisor may be a person who does not meet the conditions set out in section 1 who is an employee of a foreign higher education institution or a research institution if the Scientific Council considers that the person has significant achievements in the scientific field associated with the doctoral dissertation. An application to this effect shall be made by the School Council.

§ 10

A dissertation supervisor cannot become a person who:

- 1) within the last five years:
 - a) was the supervisor of four doctoral students who were struck off the doctoral roll because of a negative mid-term evaluation referred to in the School Rules and Regulations, or
 - b) supervised the preparation of the doctoral dissertation by at least two candidates who did not receive positive reviews of the doctoral dissertation, or
 - c) has twice received a negative evaluation result during the mid-term evaluation of a doctoral student;
- 2) does not meet the other requirements set out in the School Rules and Regulations.

§ 11

1. The change of a supervisor may take place:

- 1) at the request of the doctoral student;
- 2) at the request of the supervisor;
- 3) at the request of the mid-term evaluation committee set up in accordance with the School Rules and Regulations following a mid-term evaluation which resulted in a negative assessment of the supervisor's work.

2. The request referred to in section 1 shall be addressed to the Director. The provisions of § 8 shall apply respectively.

3. In the case of an application for a change of the supervisor by a doctoral student, a justification is required together with a statement of the person proposed as a supervisor on their willingness to supervise the doctoral student.

4. In the case of an application for a change of a supervisor by a dissertation supervisor, a justification is required. The Director, in consultation with the doctoral student, shall take immediate action to appoint a new supervisor.

5. In the event of a request for a change of a supervisor by the mid-term evaluation committee, the committee requests the Director to appoint a new supervisor.

6. With regard to an assistant supervisor, the provisions of sections 1 to 5 shall apply respectively.

III. INITIATION OF PROCEDURE FOR THE AWARD OF A DOCTORAL DEGREE

§ 12

1. The procedure for the award of a doctoral degree shall be initiated upon a complete application from a candidate who meets the requirements set out in § 4, section 1, points 1-3. The application shall be submitted to the Chairperson of the Council.

2. The application referred to in section 1 shall be accompanied by:

- 1) a doctoral dissertation;
- 2) a positive opinion of the supervisor or supervisors on the doctoral dissertation in particular as regards its compliance with the conditions set out in § 5, sections 1-2;
- 3) a declaration indicating the scientific discipline or area of science in which the candidate is applying for the award of a doctoral degree, or a statement that it is not possible to indicate a single discipline in which a doctoral degree is awarded;
- 4) a scientific curriculum vitae, including information on major scientific publications, projects and research internships, in particular those funded by The European Research Council, the National Science Centre, the National Centre for Research and Development, the National Academic Exchange Agency or the Foundation for Polish Science or the minister responsible for higher education and science;
- 5) a copy of at least one publication referred to in § 4, section 1, point 3;
- 6) a copy of a certificate or diploma attesting to knowledge of a modern foreign language of at least B2 proficiency level;
- 7) a copy of the diploma showing that the candidate holds a master's degree, a master's degree in engineering or equivalent, or the diploma referred to in Article 326, section 2, point 2 or Article 327, section 2 of the Act which confers the right to apply for the award of a doctoral degree in the country in the higher education system of which the higher education institution awarding it operates;
- 8) a certificate from the body in charge of the School that the candidate has achieved the learning outcomes for the qualification at level 8 of the PQF, subject to section 6.

3. The certificate referred to in section 2, point 8 must specify the learning outcomes which the candidate has acquired during their studies at the School, and the form and outcome of the verification of these learning outcomes in the doctoral school. The content of the certificate shall show that the candidate:

- 1) knows and understands the world's scientific and creative output and the resulting implications for practical solutions;
- 2) he/she is capable of:
 - a) analysing and creatively synthesising scientific and creative output in order to identify and solve research problems related to innovative and creative activities,
 - b) create new elements of these scientific track record,
 - c) plan their own development independently, and

- d) inspire the development of others and participate in the exchange of experiences and ideas, including in an international environment;
- 3) is ready to:
- a) conduct independent research augmenting existing scientific and creative output,
 - b) undertake challenges in the professional and public sphere, taking account of their ethical dimension and responsibility for their consequences, and
 - c) shape patterns of appropriate behaviour in such situations.

4. The Scientific Council may determine the model of the application referred to in section 1 and the models of the documents referred to in section 2, points 2-4.

5. The Chairperson of the Council, on behalf of the Scientific Council, shall call upon the candidate to remedy the formal deficiencies of the application in accordance with the rules laid down in the Code of Administrative Procedure.

6. In the absence of the certificate referred to in section 2, point 8 or if its content does not comply with the requirements set out in section 3, or the learning outcomes have not been verified during the course of studies at the School in a way that confirms their achievement, the Chairperson of the Council may delegate the verification of the learning outcomes referred to in section 3 to a committee appointed by him/her. A committee may be appointed for the duration of the Scientific Council's term of office or to act on a particular application. The composition and rules for the appointment and functioning of this committee may be determined by the Scientific Council.

7. The Scientific Council, having determined that the candidate:

- 1) holds the title or diploma referred to in § 4, section 1, point 1;
- 2) achieved learning outcomes for the qualification at level 8 of the PQF referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2;
- 3) holds a certificate or diploma of completion of studies referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2;
- 4) has a scientific track record referred to in § 4, section 1, point 3;
- 5) received a positive opinion from the supervisor on the doctoral dissertation

- shall decide by resolution to initiate the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree referred to in section 1. If the candidate does not meet these requirements, the Scientific Council shall refuse to initiate the procedure providing justification. In the event that a resolution to initiate the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree does not receive an absolute majority of votes, the Scientific Council shall be deemed to have adopted a resolution refusing to initiate such procedure.

8. A resolution of the Scientific Council refusing to initiate the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree may be appealed against to the Scientific Council within seven days of its delivery. The Scientific Council shall, without undue delay, decide, by resolution, either to uphold the contested resolution or to revoke the contested resolution and to initiate the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree.

IV. MODE OF SUBMITTING THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

§ 13

1. If the doctoral dissertation is a written thesis, the candidate shall, together with the application referred to in § 12, section 1, submit it in at least one printed copy together with an electronic copy saved in PDF format.

2. The doctoral dissertation shall include an abstract in English, whereas a doctoral dissertation prepared in a foreign language – an abstract in Polish.

3. In the case when the dissertation is not in written form, its description in Polish and English shall be attached.

4. The Scientific Council may specify the detailed requirements for the dissertation abstract and the description of the dissertation, including their volume.

§ 14

1. If the doctoral dissertation is a written thesis, it is subject to checking using the Uniform Anti-plagiarism System.

2. The report confirming the verification of the doctoral dissertation using the Uniform Anti-plagiarism System shall be signed by the supervisor or supervisors, and then forwarded to the Chairperson of the Council.

3. The Chairperson of the Council shall make a copy of the report referred to in section 2 available to the Doctoral Committee.

§ 15

1. The University without delay, but no later than 30 days before the date set for the defence of the doctoral dissertation makes available in the BIP bulletin, the doctoral dissertation that is a written thesis, together with either a summary of the dissertation or a description of the dissertation that is not a written dissertation, and reviews of the dissertation, after they have been submitted to the Chairperson of the Council by all reviewers.

2. In the case of a doctoral dissertation the subject of which is confidential, only reviews shall be made available to the exclusion of the confidential content.

3. The documents referred to in section 1 shall be published in the POL-on System as soon as they are available.

4. The doctoral dissertation, together with its reviews, shall be placed in the University's Dissertation Archive in accordance with the rules set out in an ordinance of the Rector.

V. PROCEDURE FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE DOCTORAL COMMITTEE

§ 16

1. The Scientific Council may appoint doctoral committees to undertake procedures for the award of a doctoral degree, except that the degree shall be awarded by the Scientific Council. The committees may be appointed for the duration of the Scientific Council's term of office or to act in a given procedure for the award of a doctoral degree.

2. The Scientific Council, on the proposal of the Chairperson of the Council, shall determine the number of members of the Doctoral Committee, however, with no fewer than seven members but no more than 21 members.

3. The Scientific Council shall appoint a Doctoral Committee to undertake the activities in a given procedure for the award of a doctoral degree or in case of a doctoral committee appointed for the duration of the Scientific Council's term of office, the Scientific Council shall designate one of those committees to act in the particular procedure for the award of a doctoral degree.

4. The Scientific Council shall select members of a Doctoral Committee and a chairperson of a Doctoral Committee from among Committee's members. The Scientific Council may elect a Vice-Chairperson to perform the duties of the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee in their absence.

5. Members of the Doctoral Committee may be academic staff holding the position of professor or university professor, or persons holding a habilitated doctor degree or the title of professor.

6. The supervisor shall be a member of the Doctoral Committee by law after the candidate has passed the doctoral examinations. The supervisor shall not be included in the number of members of the Doctoral Committee referred to in section 2. The provision shall apply respectively to an assistant supervisor who was awarded a habilitated doctor degree or holds a tile of professor, or is employed as a university professor.

7. While selecting members of the Doctoral Committee, the Scientific Council shall take into account the scientific specialisation to which the doctoral dissertation relates.

8. Candidates for members of the Doctoral Committee shall be proposed by the Chairperson of the Council, by at least three members of the Scientific Council or by a relevant committee of the Council.

9. A member of the Doctoral Committee may not be a person whose impartiality may be in doubt, and in particular if:

- 1) the candidate or their supervisor is or was married to him/her, or is a relative or affinity up to the second degree, or is or was cohabiting with a member of the Doctoral Committee;
- 2) the candidate or their supervisor is or has been a person related to a member of the Doctoral Committee by adoption, custody or guardianship;
- 3) is the candidate's direct superior or subordinate;
- 4) there are other circumstances which may give rise to legitimate concerns about the integrity, impartiality or objectivity of the conduct of the activities undertaken by the Doctoral Committee.

10. The members of the Doctoral Committee elect a Secretary of the Doctoral Committee from among themselves. The Secretary of the Doctoral Committee organises the activities of the Doctoral Committee.

11. If the Scientific Council shall not set up a Doctoral Committee for the purpose of acting in a given procedure for the award of a doctoral degree, these activities, including the conduct of the defence of the doctoral dissertation, shall be carried out by the Scientific Council. The provisions regulating the activities of the Doctoral Committee shall then apply respectively to the activities undertaken by the Scientific Council. In the case referred to in § 28, section 4, the Council shall pass a

resolution by a two-thirds majority in the presence of at least half of the Scientific Council members entitled to vote.

§ 17

1. The Doctoral Committee:

- 1) may propose candidates to the Scientific Council as doctoral dissertation reviewers;
- 2) shall conduct the doctoral examination or examinations;
- 3) shall either adopt a resolution to admit or request the Scientific Council to decide to refuse to admit the candidate to the defence of the doctoral dissertation;
- 4) conducts the defence of the doctoral dissertation;
- 5) shall, by resolution, propose to the Scientific Council to award or refuse to award the degree of doctor;
- 6) shall, by resolution, propose to the Scientific Council with a request to reward the doctoral dissertation with distinction

2. For the purpose of conducting the doctoral examination or examinations, the Doctoral Committee, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Council, may appoint an examination board from among the members of the Doctoral Committee, consisting of not fewer than 5 members. The examination board conducts examinations in the presence of all its members. The provisions on the Doctoral Committee and the doctoral examination shall apply respectively. The examination board presents the minutes and other materials of the doctoral examination to the Doctoral Committee.

§ 18

1. The Doctoral Committee adopts its resolutions by an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least 2/3 of the members of the Doctoral Committee by secret ballot, unless otherwise specified.

2. Resolutions of the Doctoral Committee shall be signed on its behalf by the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee.

3. The Doctoral Committee sits at in-person sessions. In justified cases a meeting of the Doctoral Committee may be held remotely if so decided by its Chairperson in agreement with the Chairperson of the Council, subject to § 26, sections 6-9.

4. The meetings of the Doctoral Committee shall be minuted by a minute taker appointed by the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee. The minutes are signed by the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee and the minutes taker.

VI. REVIEWERS OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

§ 19

1. In procedures for the award of a doctoral degree, the Scientific Council shall, on its own initiative or at the request of the relevant Doctoral Committee respectively, or the committee referred to in section 3, appoint three reviewers from among persons who are not employees of the University and an academic institution, a PAN institute, a research institute or an international institute of which the candidate is an employee.

2. Candidates for reviewers may be proposed by the Chairperson of the Council, the relevant Doctoral Committee or a committee of the Council referred to in section 3, or by three members of the Council holding the position of professor or university professor or holding a habilitated doctor degree, excluding the candidate's supervisor.

3. The Scientific Council may appoint committees competent to propose candidates for reviewers.

4. The appointment of a reviewer by the Scientific Council may be made by drawing lots from a pool of reviewers in a particular specialisation determined by a resolution of the Scientific Council. The pool of reviewers is not subject to publication in the University Journal. The use of this mode of reviewers appointment shall be decided by the Scientific Council. The drawing of lots shall be made at a meeting of the Scientific Council by its Chairperson or the Deputy Chairperson designated by him/her. The Scientific Councils may, by resolution, determine the detailed manner in which the draws are to be conducted and the results determined.

5. The reviewer may be a person holding a habilitated doctor degree or a title of professor.

6. A reviewer may be a person who does not meet the conditions set out in section 5 who is an employee of a foreign higher education institution or a research institution if the Scientific Council considers that the person has significant achievements in the scientific field associated with the doctoral dissertation.

7. While selecting a reviewer, the Scientific Council shall take into account the scientific specialisation to which the doctoral dissertation relates.

8. The Scientific Council may, by resolution, determine the rules and procedures for the nomination of candidates for reviewers or for the pool of reviewers referred to in sections 2 and 4.

9. The appointed reviewers shall become by law members of the Doctoral Committee appointed to take actions in the relevant procedure for the award of a doctoral degree, after the candidate has passed the doctoral examinations. The reviewers are not included in the number of members of the Doctoral Committee referred to in § 16, section 2.

10. The Chairperson of the Council shall deliver the doctoral dissertation to the reviewer together with information on the content of the Rules and Regulations, and the University shall contract with the reviewer for the review.

§ 20

A reviewer may not be a person in respect of whom there are reasonable doubts as to their integrity, impartiality or objectivity in the preparation of the review. In particular, a reviewer cannot be a person who:

- 1) has been the supervisor of the candidate's thesis;
- 2) is the candidate's superior or is in any other employment relationship with the candidate or his/her supervisor;
- 3) is or has been married or cohabiting with the candidate or thesis supervisor;
- 4) is a relative or relative by affinity up to the second degree of the candidate or the thesis supervisor;
- 5) is or has been a person related to the candidate or supervisor by adoption, guardianship or custody.

§ 21

1. The reviewer shall prepare a review of the doctoral dissertation within two months of its submission, together with a copy of the report referred to in § 14, section 2.
2. The doctoral dissertation review is forwarded to the Chairperson of the Council.

2. The review referred to in section 1 shall contain a conclusion, together with a justification consistent with it, concerning in particular the fulfilment by the reviewed doctoral dissertation of the conditions specified in § 5 sections 1-2.

3. If the submitted review does not meet the conditions referred to in section 2, the Chairperson of the Council shall request the reviewer to supplement it immediately.

4. The conclusion referred to in section 2 may be:

- 1) positive;
- 2) conditional, indicating issues that need to be improved in the doctoral dissertation in order to fulfil the conditions set out in § 5, sections 1 and 2;
- 3) negative.

5. If the reviewer fails to meet the deadline referred to in section 1, the Chairperson of the Council shall call on the reviewer to submit the review immediately, no later than 14 days from the date of the call, under pain of termination of the review contract through the fault of the reviewer.

§ 22

1. The Chairperson of the Council shall forward the doctoral dissertation reviews to the candidate as soon as they have been received from all reviewers.

2. In the event of receiving a review with a conditional conclusion, as referred to in § 21, section 4, point 2, if the other reviews are not negative, the candidate shall submit to the Chairperson of the Council:

- 1) a revised doctoral dissertation, together with a written response to the review containing a conditional conclusion, within a maximum of six months of receipt of the review, or
- 2) a written statement of refusal to improve the doctoral dissertation; in this case, the Chairperson of the Council shall immediately refer the matter to the Doctoral Committee for a resolution as referred to in § 25, section 1.

3. The revised doctoral dissertation, together with the candidate's response referred to in section 2, point 1, shall be delivered by the Chairperson of the Council to all reviewers without delay. Thereafter, all reviewers shall, within a maximum of two months, produce reviews of the revised doctoral dissertation with either a positive conclusion or a negative conclusion only.

§ 23

Upon receipt of the reviews of the doctoral dissertation meeting the requirements referred to in § 21, section 2, the Chairperson of the Council shall forward the reviews to the appropriate Doctoral Committee.

VII. DOCTORAL EXAMINATIONS

§ 24

1. Once the Doctoral Committee has been appointed or designated, the candidate will sit the doctoral examination or examinations to verify knowledge of the methodology and scientific output of the scientific discipline in which the academic degree is sought, and the ability to critically evaluate this output, as referred to in § 4, section 1, point 4.

2. The Scientific Council shall formulate guidelines on the number, scope and form of doctoral examinations. The candidate takes one or two examinations.

3. The Doctoral Committee, in accordance with the guidelines of the Scientific Council, determines by resolution and presents to the candidate the number, scope and form of the doctoral examinations and their schedule. The Doctoral Committee, in consultation with the candidate, shall also determine the language in which the examination or examinations shall be conducted. The examination may be conducted in more than one language.

4. The candidate is informed of the date and place of the examination at least 30 days before the examination. A candidate may not take more than one examination on any given day. At the request of the candidate, the 30-day period referred to in the first sentence may be shortened.

5. The examination shall be held in the presence of at least 2/3 of the members of the Doctoral Committee.

6. The candidate's fulfilment of the prerequisite for the award of a doctoral degree, as referred to in § 4, section 1, point 4, shall be assessed. In grading the examination, the Doctoral Committee uses the following marks:

- 1) pass with distinction, or
- 2) pass, or
- 3) negative.

7. In justified cases, unless the candidate objects, the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee may decide to interrupt the meeting and set a date for the examination to be completed.

8. Passing grades or passing grades with distinction in all examinations referred to in section 1 means passing the doctoral examination and confirms fulfilment of the condition for the award of a doctoral degree referred to in § 4, section 1, point 4. A failing grade in any of the doctoral examinations means that the candidate does not meet this condition. In such a case, the Doctoral Committee shall request the Scientific Council to adopt a resolution to refuse to award a doctoral degree, subject to section 11.

9. The proceedings of the examination shall be minuted by the Secretary of the Committee, unless the Chairperson appoints another minutes taker. The minutes taker may not be a member of the Committee. The minutes include in particular the content of the questions asked and the evaluation of the answers. Once the minutes have been drawn up, the members of the Doctoral Committee or the candidate may raise objections to them in writing.

10. The examination shall be recorded by the Secretary of the Doctoral Committee, unless the candidate does not consent to it. The Secretary of the Doctoral Committee shall forward the recording to the Chairperson of the Council, who shall keep the recording for no less than three months from the date of the examination, but for no longer than one year.

11. At the request of the candidate submitted to the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee within 14 days of receiving a failing grade, a retake of the examination shall be held. The retake of the examination shall take place no sooner than three months after the previous examination. The examination may only be retaken once in connection with the respective application referred to in § 12, section 1. The provision of section 7 shall not apply.

VIII. ADMISSION TO THE DEFENCE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

§ 25

1. After reviewing all reviews of the doctoral dissertation, the Doctoral Committee shall, by resolution:

- 1) decide whether to admit the candidate to the defence of the doctoral dissertation, or
- 2) request the Scientific Council to decide not to admit the candidate to the defence of the doctoral dissertation

- if the resolution to admit the candidate to the defence of the doctoral dissertation does not receive an absolute majority of votes, the Doctoral Committee shall be deemed to have adopted the resolution on the proposal referred to in point 2.

2. A candidate who has received positive reviews from at least two reviewers and has passed the doctoral examinations may be admitted to the defence of the doctoral dissertation.

3. On the basis of the proposal of the Doctoral Committee referred to in section 1, point 2, the Scientific Council decides by resolution to admit the candidate to the defence of the doctoral dissertation. If the resolution to admit the candidate to the defence of the doctoral dissertation does not receive an absolute majority of votes, it is acknowledged that the Scientific Council has adopted a resolution refusing admission to the defence of the doctoral dissertation. The resolution includes a justification.

4. The decision on refusal to allow a person to defend their doctoral dissertation shall be subject to a complaint to the CSE within seven days of its notification.

IX. DEFENCE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

§ 26

1. Once the candidate has been admitted to the defence of the doctoral dissertation and the information referred to in § 15, section 1 has been made available in the BIP bulletin, the Doctoral Committee shall set the date, time and place of the defence of the doctoral dissertation. In addition, the Doctoral Committee may specify a language for the defence of the doctoral dissertation other than Polish if this is known to the candidate and the members of the Doctoral Committee.

2. The defence of the defence of the doctoral dissertation may not take place earlier than 30 days after the information referred to in § 15, section 1 is made available in the BIP bulletin, and earlier than 7 days from the date of the resolution on admission to the defence of the doctoral dissertation.

3. No member of the Doctoral Committee may attend more than two defences of a doctoral dissertation on the same day.

4. The Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee shall inform immediately the Chairperson of the Council and the candidate without delay of the date, time, place and language of the defence of the doctoral dissertation.

5. The Chairperson of the Council shall announce immediately on the University's website and in the usual manner:

- 1) the date, time and place of the defence of the doctoral dissertation at the University;
- 2) the title of the doctoral dissertation and the name of the author;
- 3) the supervisor, supervisors or the assistant supervisor of the doctoral dissertation;

- 4) the reviewers;
- 5) the scientific discipline or the area of study, as appropriate;
- 6) the language of the defence of the doctoral dissertation.

6. In special cases, the defence of the doctoral dissertation may be conducted remotely, providing the following:

- 1) real-time transmission of the defence for its participants,
 - 2) real-time, multi-stakeholder communication, where participants in the defence can express themselves in the course of the defence
- while observing the necessary safety rules.

7. The conduct of the defence of the doctoral dissertation remotely shall be decided by the Doctoral Committee in consultation with the Chairperson of the Council after obtaining the consent of the candidate or at the candidate's request.

8. The members of the Doctoral Committee participating remotely in the defence of the doctoral dissertation are required to have a camera on during the defence and, at the request of the Chairperson, a microphone.

9. The Rector will determine, by means of a regulation, the technical conditions for the organisation of the defence of the doctoral dissertation in remote and hybrid modes.

§ 27

1. The defence of the doctoral dissertation shall take place during a meeting of the Doctoral Committee divided into a public and a closed part. The public part is open to all interested persons, unless the subject of the doctoral dissertation is covered by a legally protected secret. The Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee may order a disruptive person to leave the defence of the doctoral degree.

2. During the defence of the doctoral dissertation:

- 1) The Doctoral Committee deliberates in the presence of at least 2/3 of the members of the Doctoral Committee as specified in § 16, section 2 and at least two reviewers;
- 2) the candidate shall be present in person at the place of the defence of the doctoral dissertation, unless the defence is conducted remotely.

3. In justified cases, the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Council may allow remote participation of a member of the Doctoral Committee in the defence of the doctoral dissertation, if technical possibilities permit (a hybrid mode). The provisions of § 26, section 6 shall apply respectively. No more than one-fifth of the Doctoral Committee may attend the defence of the doctoral dissertation under this procedure, with at least one reviewer present in person at the place of the defence. Participation in a hybrid mode shall be recorded in the minutes.

4. As part of the public part of the Doctoral Committee meeting, the defence of the doctoral dissertation consists of:

- 1) the presentation of the candidate's scientific curriculum vitae by the supervisor or another person designated by the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee;
- 2) the candidate's presentation of the doctoral dissertation, taking into account the condition specified in § 5, section 2;
- 3) the presentation of the review of the doctoral dissertation by the reviewers; in the absence of one reviewer, his/her review of the doctoral dissertation shall be presented by the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee or a member of the Doctoral Committee appointed by him/her;

- 4) the public discussion on the doctoral dissertation, in which all those present at the meeting may take part;
- 5) the candidate's response to the reviews of the doctoral dissertation presented and to the questions raised during the public discussion on the doctoral dissertation.

5. After closing the discussion of the doctoral dissertation, the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee orders the beginning of the closed part of the meeting of the Doctoral Committee, which is attended only by the members of the Doctoral Committee. An assistant supervisor who is not a member of the Doctoral Committee may take part in the closed part as an observer.

6. During the closed part of the meeting, the Doctoral Committee deliberates and adopts, by secret ballot, a resolution to apply to the Scientific Council for the award of the doctoral degree, together with its justification. The justification shall be agreed by the members of the Doctoral Committee. In the event that a resolution to apply to the Scientific Council for the award of a doctoral degree does not receive an absolute majority of votes, the Doctoral Committee is deemed to have passed a resolution to request the Scientific Council to refuse to award a doctoral degree. The resolution shall be announced after its adoption to the participants in the public part.

7. The Doctoral Committee shall request the Scientific Council to refuse the award of a doctoral degree in particular if it finds that:

- 1) the doctoral dissertation does not meet the requirements referred to in § 5, sections 1 and 2, or
- 2) the candidate has failed to defend the doctoral dissertation.

8. Where the doctoral dissertation represents a special scientific achievement, the Doctoral Committee, by a majority of at least two-thirds of the members present at the meeting, may apply to the Scientific Council with a reasoned request to reward the doctoral dissertation with distinction. The provision of section 6 shall apply respectively.

9. The defence of the doctoral dissertation is minuted. The provisions of § 24, section 9 shall apply respectively.

10. The public part of the defence of the doctoral dissertation shall be recorded by the Secretary of the Doctoral Committee, unless the candidate does not consent to this. The provisions of § 24, section 10 shall apply respectively.

AWARD OF THE DOCTORAL DEGREE

§ 28

1. The Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee shall immediately forward to the Chairperson of the Council the resolution referred to in § 17, section 1, point 5, together with its justification and the minutes of the meeting of the Doctoral Committee at which the defence of the doctoral dissertation took place.

2. The Chairperson of the Council may invite the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee and other members of the Doctoral Committee to a meeting of the Scientific Council at which the decision referred to in section 3 shall be taken in order to present the course of the work undertaken by the Doctoral Committee and the defence of the doctoral dissertation.

3. The Scientific Council, by secret ballot, by an absolute majority in the presence of at least half of the Scientific Council members entitled to vote makes a decision in the form of a resolution to award the doctoral degree. Only those holding the position of professor or university professor or holding a habilitated doctor degree are eligible to vote. A resolution to award the doctoral degree is put to the vote. In the

event that it does not receive an absolute majority of votes, the Scientific Council shall be deemed to have adopted a resolution refusing to award the doctoral degree. The resolution includes a justification. The Chairperson of the Council then delivers it to the candidate.

4. At the request of the Doctoral Committee referred to in § 27, section 8, the Scientific Council by an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the members of the Scientific Council entitled to vote may adopt a resolution to reward the doctoral dissertation with distinction

5. The Scientific Council may lay down specific rules for rewarding doctoral dissertations with distinction

§ 29

1. The decision on the refusal to award the doctoral degree may be appealed against to the CSE through the Scientific Council.

2. The time limit for lodging the appeal shall be 30 days from the date of delivering that decision.

3. The Scientific Council shall forward the appeal to the CSE, together with its opinion and the case file, within three months of the date of the appeal. The Scientific Council ask in advance for a position to be taken by the Doctoral Committee.

§ 30

If a doctoral dissertation is not accepted for defence or in the case of the decision to refuse the award of a doctoral degree, the same dissertation may not be the basis for reapplying for the award of a doctoral degree.

§ 31

Where a candidate has attributed authorship of a substantial part or other elements of another person's work or scientific finding, the Scientific Council shall declare the decision to award the degree invalid.

XI. EXTRAMURAL MODE

§ 32

1. The extramural candidate shall apply to the Chairperson of the Council for the appointment of a supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor. The application shall be accompanied by:

- 1) personal and contact details of the candidate;
- 2) an outline of the doctoral dissertation, together with a justification for the research topic;
- 3) the schedule of research work;
- 4) a statement by the proposed supervisor of their willingness to supervise the candidate and of their opinion concerning the research topic and the schedule of research work;
- 5) the documents defined under § 12, section 2 points 4 and 7.

2. The Chairperson of the Council shall submit immediately the proposal referred to in section 1 to the Scientific Council. The Scientific Council shall, no later than two months from the date of the application to the Chairperson of the Council, appoint by resolution a supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor. If the resolution does not receive an absolute majority of votes, it is acknowledged that the Scientific Council passed a resolution to refuse to appoint a

supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor, as appropriate. The refusal to appoint a supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor may be appealed against to the Scientific Council within seven days from the date of delivering the resolution.

3. The resolution on the appointment of a supervisor or supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor referred to section 2 shall be terminated by the Scientific Council after 24 months from the date of its adoption if, within this period, the extramural candidate has not submitted a complete application as referred to in § 12, section 1.

In justified cases, the Scientific Council may adopt a resolution to extend the expiry date of this resolution, but not more than 12 months in total.

4. The appointment of a supervisor as referred to in section 2 shall not be subject to § 8, section 6, § 9, section 4, second sentence and § 10 point 1, letter c and point 2.

5. The Scientific Council may determine that the supervisors appointed under the procedure referred to in section 2 shall submit an annual report to the Chairperson of the Council on the progress of the candidate's preparation of the doctoral dissertation.

§ 33

1. In the case of an extramural candidate, the Chairperson of the Council shall appoint a committee in order to verify the attainment of the learning outcomes for the qualification at level 8 of the PQF. The provisions of § 12, section 6 shall apply for the committee respectively.

2. The Scientific Council shall formulate guidelines on the scope and form of the review referred to in section 1.

§ 34

An extramural candidate may be scheduled from one to three doctoral examinations.

§ 35

1. The fee for the procedure to award a doctoral degree in the extramural mode shall be three times the minimum monthly basic salary for a professor employed at a public university, specified in the regulations issued pursuant to Article 137, section 2 of the Act, rounded down to a full amount in PLN.

2. In particularly justified cases, the Rector, at the written request of the extramural candidate, may exempt them from paying all or part of the fee for the procedure to award a doctoral degree, taking into account, in particular, the candidate's financial situation or their contribution to the University.

3. The fee referred to in section 1 shall be paid by the candidate by the date of submission of the application referred to in § 12, section 1. Proof of payment of the fee shall accompany this application. In the event that the Scientific Council adopts a resolution refusing to initiate the procedure for the award of a doctoral degree, the fee shall be refundable with a deduction in the amount of the monthly basic salary for a professor employed at a public higher education institution as specified in the regulations issued pursuant to Article 137, section 2 of the Act, rounded down to a full amount in PLN

4. The fee referred to in section 1 shall not be charged to an academic staff member employed at the University.

5. The fee referred to in section 1 shall not be charged to employees other than those referred to in section 4 who are employed full-time at the University.

XII. JOINT AWARD OF THE DOCTORAL DEGREE

§ 36

1. The Scientific Council may award a doctoral degree jointly with other entities authorised to award a doctoral degree in the discipline in which the degree is awarded.

2. The Rector shall conclude in advance, in writing on behalf of the University, an agreement with the entities with which the Scientific Council is to jointly award a doctoral degree, i.e. with universities, the PAN institutes, research institutes or international institutes in a discipline in which each of these units has a scientific category of A+, A or B+, as well as with foreign entities authorised to award a doctoral degree in the discipline in which the degree is awarded. The agreement sets out the principles of cooperation, in particular it identifies the entity responsible for entering data into the POL-on System. To the extent not covered by the agreement, these Rules and Regulations shall apply.

Appendix No. 2

to the resolution No. 157 of the Senate of the University of Warsaw of 29 June 2022
on determining the procedure for awarding the doctoral degree
and a habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw.

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF A HABILITATED DOCTOR DEGREE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

§ 1

The procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw shall be carried out on the basis of the applicable rules and regulations, in particular:

- 1) the Act of 20 July 2018 – the Law on higher education and science (a consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2022, item 574, as amended), hereinafter referred to as the Act;
- 2) The Statute of the University of Warsaw (Monitor UW of 2019, item 190, as amended);
- 3) The rules and regulations for the award of a habilitated doctor degree at the University of Warsaw, hereinafter referred to as the “Rules and Regulations”;
- 4) the provisions of the Act of 14 June 1960, as applicable, - the Code of Administrative Procedure (a consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2021, item 735, as amended), hereinafter referred to as the “Code of Administrative Procedure”.

§ 2

Terms used in the Rules and Regulations shall have the following meaning:

- 1) BIP - the Public Information Bulletin of the University of Warsaw
- 2) a candidate - a person applying for the award of a habilitated doctor degree;
- 3) PAN - the Polish Academy of Sciences;
- 4) The Chairperson of the Council - the chairperson of the scientific council of the discipline, or of the scientific council of disciplines;
- 5) Scientific Council - the Scientific Council of the Discipline or the Scientific Council of the Disciplines;
- 6) CSE - the Council of Scientific Excellence
- 7) POL-on System - the POL-on Integrated System of Information on Science and Higher Education
- 8) University - the University of Warsaw.

§ 3

A habilitated doctor degree shall be awarded in an area of science and in a scientific discipline.

§ 4

1. A habilitated doctor degree shall be awarded to an individual who:
 - 1) holds a doctoral degree;
 - 2) possesses a scientific or artistic track record that constitute a significant contribution to the development of a particular scientific discipline, including at least:
 - a) one scientific monograph issued by a publishing house which, in the year of publication of the monograph in its final form, was included on a list drawn up in accordance with the provisions issued pursuant to Article 267, section 2,

point 2 (a) of the Act, or

- b) one series of thematically related scientific articles published in scientific journals or reviewed materials from international conferences, which, in the year of publication of the article in its final form, were included in a list drawn up in accordance with the provisions issued under the Art. 267, section 2, point 2 (b) of the Act, or;
 - c) one original design, construction or technological achievement realized;
- 3) demonstrates significant research activity carried out at more than one university, research institution or cultural institution, in particular abroad.

2. The achievement referred to in section 1, point 2 may form part of a collective work if the study of a separate issue is an individual contribution of the candidate.

3. The publication obligation shall not apply to achievements the subject matter of which is protected by classified information.

§ 5

1. The resolutions of the Scientific Council referred to in the Rules and Regulations are signed on its behalf by the Chairperson of the Council.

2. The Chairperson of the Council may authorize in writing the Deputy Chairperson of the Council to sign resolutions of the Scientific Council, with the exception of resolutions awarding or refusing to award a habilitated doctor degree.

§ 6

The candidate has the right to inspect their own case file, including minutes and resolutions, and to play the recording of the habilitation colloquium referred to in the Rules and Regulations.

II. INITIATION OF PROCEDURE FOR THE AWARD OF A HABILITATED DOCTOR DEGREE

§ 7

1. The procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree shall be initiated at the request of the candidate submitted to the Scientific Council through the CSE, subject to Article 221, section 13 and Article 224, section 2 of the Act.

2. The application shall include:

- 1) the description of professional career;
- 2) the list of the achievements referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2;
- 3) the indication of the Scientific Council designated to conduct the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree;
- 4) the list of annexes.

3. The description of professional career includes, in particular, information on:

- 1) authorship or co-authorship of scientific monographs or chapters thereof, scientific publications in scientific journals or peer-reviewed proceedings of international conferences;
- 2) directing or participating in international or national research projects, in particular those financed by funds granted by the European Research Council, the National Science Centre, the National Centre for Research and Development, the National

- Academic Exchange Agency or the Foundation for Polish Science or the minister responsible for higher education and science;
- 3) presenting papers at international or national scientific conferences;
 - 4) research internships in foreign or national research centres;
 - 5) reviewing scientific publications or research projects;
 - 6) research activities other than those listed in points 1 to 5;
 - 7) awards, prizes or scholarships awarded individually or collectively in connection with academic achievements;
 - 8) membership in bodies, organisations or institutions related to science, including on the editorial boards or boards of scientific journals;
 - 9) the course of employment related to scientific activities;
 - 10) teaching and scientific dissemination activities.

4. The professional career description should include a description of the achievements referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2, making it possible to assess whether these achievements represent a significant contribution to the development of a specific discipline. The professional career description should make it possible to assess whether the candidate fulfils the condition of a significant research activity carried out in more than one university, research institution or cultural institution, in particular abroad.

5. Where a candidate has multi-authored publications, in the list of achievements referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2, and in the information on publications referred to in section 3, point 1, the candidate shall specify descriptively their individual contribution to these publications.

6. The candidate shall attach to the application:
- 1) the original or a copy of the diploma attesting to the award of a doctoral degree referred to in § 4, section 1, point 1;
 - 2) the original hard copies or copies of the publications referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2 (a) and (b), or a description of the original design, construction or technological achievement referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2 (c);
 - 3) a self-signed declaration that the information contained in the career description is true and that the candidate is aware that any misrepresentation constitutes grounds for reopening the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree;
 - 4) the proof of payment as referred to in § 19.

7. For the publications referred to in section 6, point 2, the candidate shall submit at least one hard copy of each publication and an electronic version of it saved in PDF format for the purposes of the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree.

8. The candidate may also attach to the application materials other than those indicated in section 6 which are relevant for the assessment of the fulfilment of the prerequisites referred to in § 4, section 1. The provision of section 7 shall apply respectively.

9. A member of the Habilitation Committee, through the Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee, may ask the candidate to provide explanations in relation to the information contained in the application within 14 days.

10. The Chairperson of the Council, on behalf of the Scientific Council, shall call upon the candidate to remedy the formal deficiencies of the application in accordance with the rules laid down in the Code of Administrative Procedure.

§ 8

1. The Chairperson of the Council, upon receipt of a complete application as referred to in §7, section 1, shall immediately make available to the members of the Scientific Council an electronic copy of the submitted application.

2. The Scientific Council shall, within four weeks from the date of receipt of the request from the CSE, adopt a resolution to authorise the conduct the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree. In the event that the resolution to consent to proceed with the award of a habilitated doctor degree does not receive an absolute majority of votes, the Scientific Council is deemed to have passed a resolution of non-consent to proceed with the award of a habilitated doctor degree and to return the application to the CSE. The resolution referred to in the previous sentence shall contain a justification.

§ 9

1. The candidate may, in writing, withdraw the application for the award of a habilitated doctor degree.

2. If the application referred to in section 1 is withdrawn, the Scientific Council shall adopt a resolution to discontinue the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree. The resolution shall be delivered to the CSE by the Chairperson of the Council.

III. HABILITATION COMMITTEE

§ 10

1. The CSE appoints four members of the Habilitation Committee, including the Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee and three reviewers.

2. Within six weeks of receiving the information on the members of the Habilitation Committee referred to in section 1, the Scientific Council appoints the Habilitation Committee.

3. The Habilitation Committee consists of:

- 1) four members appointed by the CSE as referred to in section 1;
- 2) two members holding a habilitated doctor degree or the title of professor, employed at the University, including the Secretary of the Habilitation Committee, selected by the Scientific Council;
- 3) a representative appointed by the Scientific Council.

4. Candidates for the members of the Habilitation Committee referred to in section 3, points 2 and 3 shall be proposed by the Chairperson of the Council or the Council committee referred to in section 5, or by at least three members of the Scientific Council. The Scientific Council shall elect members of the Habilitation Committee by an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the members of the Scientific Council.

5. The Scientific Council may appoint committees competent to propose candidates for members of the Habilitation Committee.

6. The Chairperson of the Council shall immediately make the application and its attachments available to the members of the Habilitation Committee in the form of an electronic copy and inform them of the content of the Rules and Regulations.

7. The Chairperson of the Council provides the infrastructure and administrative support for the Habilitation Committee.

8. The Secretary of the Habilitation Committee organises the activities of the Habilitation Committee.

§ 11

1. The Scientific Council shall appoint a reviewer from among persons who are not staff members of the University and who hold a habilitated doctor degree or the title of professor, and who have a recognised national or international scientific track record, in particular, who have led research projects in the five years prior to being appointed as a reviewer, have published the results of their own research in peer-reviewed journals and scientific publications of recognised repute or have collaborated with representatives from other research centres.

2. When appointing a reviewer, the Scientific Council shall take into account the scientific specialisation corresponding to the range of issues related to the candidate's scientific achievements indicated in the list referred to in § 7, section 2, point 2;

3. The appointment of a reviewer by the Scientific Council may be made by drawing lots from a pool of reviewers in a particular specialisation determined by a resolution of the Scientific Council. The pool of reviewers is not subject to publication in the University Journal. The use of this mode of reviewers appointment shall be decided by the Scientific Council. The drawing of lots shall be made at a meeting of the Scientific Council by its Chairperson or the Deputy Chairperson designated by him/her. The Scientific Councils may, by resolution, determine the detailed manner in which the draws are to be conducted and the results determined.

4. The Scientific Council may, by resolution, determine the rules and procedures for the nomination of candidates for reviewers or for the pool of reviewers referred to in section 3.

5. A reviewer may be a person who does not meet the conditions set out in section 1 who is an employee of a foreign higher education institution or a research institution if the Scientific Council considers that this person has significant achievements in the field of issues related to the candidate's scientific track record indicated in the list referred to in § 7, section 2, point 2.

6. A member of the Habilitation Committee, including a reviewer, may not be a person in respect of whom there are justified doubts as to their integrity, impartiality or objectivity in the preparation of their review. In particular, a reviewer cannot be a person who:

- 1) has, on two occasions in the last five years, failed to meet the deadline for completion of the review referred to in § 12, section 2;
- 2) was the supervisor or the assistant supervisor of the candidate's doctoral dissertation;
- 3) is the candidate's direct superior or subordinate;
- 4) is or has been married or cohabiting with the candidate;
- 5) is a relative or relative by affinity up to the second degree of the candidate;
- 6) is or has been a person related to the candidate by adoption, guardianship or custody.

§ 12

1. The University enters into a review contract with the reviewer.

2. The reviewer shall, within eight weeks of being served with the request referred to in § 7, section 1, prepare a review in writing and submit it immediately to the Chairperson of the Council. The review shall include a reasoned assessment of

whether the candidate's academic achievements meet the requirements set out in § 4, section 1, point 2;

3. If the reviewer fails to meet the deadline referred to in section 2, the Chairperson of the Council shall call on the reviewer to submit the review immediately, not later than 14 days after service of the summons, under pain of termination of the review contract through the fault of the reviewer. The Chairperson of the Council shall inform the CSE if the reviewer exceeds the deadline referred to in section 2.

4. In the event that the submitted review does not contain the reasoned assessment referred to in section 2, the Chairperson of the Council shall request the reviewer to supplement it without delay.

5. Once all reviews have been received, the Chairperson of the Council shall forward them immediately to the Habilitation Committee and the candidate.

§ 13

1. The Habilitation Committee may decide to conduct a habilitation colloquium with respect to the candidate's scientific achievements.

2. The conduct of a habilitation colloquium is mandatory for the candidate's achievements in the humanities and social sciences.

3. The Habilitation Committee, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Council and the candidate, shall determine the date of the habilitation colloquium, taking into account the provision of § 14, section 5. The Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee shall inform the candidate of the date, time and place of the habilitation colloquium at least 14 days before the date of the colloquium. The University posts information about the date and venue of the habilitation colloquium in the BIP bulletin.

4. The habilitation colloquium shall be held at the University, subject to the provision of section 11, in the presence of at least the Chairperson and Secretary of the Habilitation Committee and two reviewers.

5. The habilitation colloquium consists of two parts:

- 1) presentation by the candidate of their scientific achievements to the Habilitation Committee, in particular in the form of a presentation of a selected research problem falling within the scope of the achievements referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2;
- 2) interviews of the members of the Habilitation Committee with the candidate on their scientific achievements.

6. During the part of the habilitation colloquium referred to in section 5, point 1, as observers, members of the Scientific Council and, with the consent of the Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee and the candidate, other persons may additionally be present.

7. During the part of the habilitation colloquium referred to in section 5, point 2, only members of the Habilitation Committee, the candidate, and members of the Scientific Council as observers, may be present.

8. Following the interview, the Habilitation Committee shall hold a deliberation exclusively with its members.

9. The habilitation colloquium is minuted by the Secretary of the Habilitation Committee. The minutes are signed by the Secretary of the Habilitation Committee in consultation with the Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee. Once the minutes

have been drawn up, the members of the Habilitation Committee or the candidate may raise objections to them in writing.

10. The Habilitation colloquium shall be recorded for the purpose of making a record by the Secretary of the Habilitation Committee, unless the candidate does not consent to this. The Secretary of the Habilitation Committee shall forward the recording to the Chairperson of the Council, who shall keep the recording for no less than three months from the date of the habilitation colloquium, but for no longer than one year.

11. In special cases, the habilitation colloquium may be conducted remotely, providing:

- 1) real-time transmission of the colloquium between participants,
 - 2) real-time, multilateral communication where the participants can express themselves during the colloquium
- while observing the necessary safety rules.

12. The conduct of the habilitation colloquium in accordance with the procedure set out in section 11 shall be decided by the Habilitation Committee in consultation with the Chairperson of the Council after obtaining the consent of the candidate.

13. In justified cases, the Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Council may allow remote participation of a member of the Habilitation Committee in the habilitation colloquium, as far as technically possible (a hybrid mode). The provision of section 11 shall apply respectively. No more than two members of the Habilitation Committee, excluding the Chairperson and the Secretary, may attend the habilitation colloquium under this mode. Participation in a hybrid mode shall be recorded in the minutes.

14. Members of the Habilitation Committee participating remotely in the habilitation colloquium are required to have a camera on during the habilitation colloquium and, at the request of the Chairperson, a microphone.

15. The Rector will determine, by means of a regulation, the technical conditions for the organisation of the habilitation colloquium in remote and hybrid modes.

§ 14

1. The Habilitation Committee, in the presence of at least the Chairperson and Secretary of the Habilitation Committee and two reviewers, shall adopt by open ballot a resolution containing a reasoned opinion on the award of a habilitated doctor degree. At the request of the person applying for a degree, the commission shall adopt the resolution in a secret ballot. In the event of a resolution expressing a favourable opinion does not receive a simple majority of votes, the Habilitation Committee is deemed to have adopted a negative opinion.

2. The Habilitation Committee may decide to combine the meeting referred to in section 1 with the deliberation referred to in § 13, section 8.

3. Where the candidate's scientific track record, as referred to in § 4, section 1, point 2, constitutes an outstanding contribution to the development of a specific scientific discipline, the Habilitation Committee, by a majority of at least two-thirds of the Habilitation Committee members present at the meeting, may apply to the Scientific Council with a reasoned request to reward with distinction the achievement giving rise to the award of a habilitated doctor degree.

4. The meeting of the Habilitation Committee referred to in section 1 may be held using technical tools which allow it to be conducted remotely with simultaneous transmission of sound and images.

5. The resolution referred to in section 1 shall be adopted by the Habilitation Committee no earlier than 14 days after the date on which the information referred to in § 18, section 1, points 1-3 is made available in the BIP bulletin.

6. The Habilitation Committee shall, within six weeks of receiving the review, forward to the Scientific Council the resolution referred to in section 1 and the documentation of the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree.

7. The meeting of the Habilitation Committee referred to in section 1 shall be minuted by the Secretary of the Habilitation Committee. In the event of an open vote, the minutes shall record the votes cast by the individual members of the Habilitation Committee. The minutes are signed by the Secretary of the Habilitation Committee in consultation with the Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee. Once the minutes have been drawn up, the members of the Habilitation Committee or the candidate may raise objections to the minutes in writing within three days of the date on which they were made available.

8. Resolutions of the Habilitation Committee shall be signed on its behalf by the Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee.

§ 15

1. The opinion referred to in § 14, section 1 may be either positive or negative. The opinion cannot be positive if at least two reviews are negative.

2. The grounds for the opinion referred to in section 1 shall include in particular an indication of the reasons for which the Habilitation Committee has adopted a specific assessment of the candidate's fulfilment of each of the prerequisites for the award of a habilitated doctor degree referred to in § 4 section 1. The justification shall be agreed by the members of the Habilitation Committee.

3. The candidate may submit in writing to the Scientific Council their position on the opinion referred to in section 1.

§ 16

1. The Chairperson of the Habilitation Committee, the Secretary of the Habilitation Committee or, in justified cases, another member of the Habilitation Committee shall present the course of the habilitation procedure to the Scientific Council.

2. The Chairperson of the Council may invite the members of the Habilitation Committee to a meeting of the Scientific Council at which a resolution to award or refuse to award a habilitated doctor degree is to be taken.

3. On the basis of the resolution referred to in § 14, section 1, within one month of its receipt, the Scientific Council shall take a decision in the form of a resolution on the award of a habilitated doctor degree and shall immediately deliver it to the candidate. The adoption of this resolution shall be by secret ballot with an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the members of the Scientific Council entitled to vote. A resolution to award a habilitated doctor degree is put to the vote. In the event that it does not receive an absolute majority of votes, the Scientific Council shall be deemed to have adopted a resolution refusing to award a habilitated doctor degree. The Scientific Council shall refuse to award a degree where the opinion

referred to in § 14, section 1 is negative. Only those holding the position of professor, university professor or holding a habilitated doctor degree are eligible to vote.

4. A resolution refusing to award a habilitated doctor degree shall have a justification containing, in particular, an indication of the reasons for which the Scientific Council has accepted a particular assessment of the candidate's fulfilment of each of the prerequisites for the award of a habilitated doctor degree referred to in § 4, section 1. The justification shall additionally contain a reference to the candidate's position on the opinion of the Habilitation Committee, if presented by the candidate.

5. At the request of the Habilitation Committee referred to in § 14, section 3, the Scientific Council by an absolute majority of votes, in the presence of at least half of the members of the Scientific Council entitled to vote, may adopt a resolution to reward with distinction the achievement giving rise to the award of a habilitated doctor degree.

6. The Scientific Council may lay down specific rules for rewarding with distinction achievements giving rise to the award of a habilitated doctor degree.

§ 17

1. A resolution refusing to award a habilitated doctor degree may be appealed against to the CSE through the Scientific Council.

2. The time limit for lodging an appeal is 30 days from the date of service of the resolution with its justification.

3. The Scientific Council shall forward the appeal to the CSE, together with its opinion and the case file, within three months of the date of the appeal. The Scientific Council may request in advance a position from the Habilitation Committee.

§ 18

1. The University shall make available the following on the BIP bulletin as soon as they are received:

- 1) the candidate's application, but without the attachments referred to in § 7, sections 6-8;
- 2) information on the composition of the Habilitation Committee;
- 3) all the reviews;
- 4) a resolution of the Habilitation Committee containing a justified opinion on the award of a habilitated doctor degree;
- 5) a resolution to award a habilitated doctor degree or to refuse to award it, or a resolution to discontinue the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree.

2. The candidate's application, information on the composition of the Habilitation Committee and the reviews shall be published in the POL-on System as soon as they are made available.

IV. FEE CHARGED FOR PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING A HABILITATED DOCTOR DEGREE

§ 19

1. The candidate shall pay a fee for the procedure for awarding a habilitated doctor degree amounting to three and a half times of the minimum monthly basic salary of a public university professor, as set forth in the provisions issued based on Article 137 section 2 of the Act, rounded down to a full amount in PLN.

2. In particularly justified cases, the Rector, at the written request of the candidate, may exempt them from paying all or part of the fee for the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree, taking into account, in particular, the candidate's financial situation or their contribution to the University.

3. In the event that the Scientific Council adopts a resolution not to approve the procedure for the award of a habilitated doctor degree and returns the application to the CSE, the fee shall be refundable with a deduction in the amount of the monthly basic salary for a professor in a public higher education institution as specified in the regulations issued pursuant to Article 137, section 2 of the Act, rounded down to a full amount in PLN

4. The fee referred to in section 1 shall not be charged to an academic staff member employed at the University.

5. The fee referred to in section 1 shall not be charged to employees other than those referred to in section 4 who are employed full-time at the University.