Dear Madam/Dear Sir,

The following questionnaire is a part of a midterm evaluation in the Interdisciplinary Doctoral School at the University of Warsaw. This questionnaire aims to obtain information about the cooperation between the supervisor and the PhD candidate as well as the second supervisor.

Please complete this questionnaire following the guidelines below. The results of the questionnaire are strictly confidential. Access to the results will be restricted to the members of the evaluation committee. The results will enable the midterm evaluation committee to complete the evaluation process.

Director of the IDS and IDS Council

**Name of the supervisor**, to whom the survey applies:

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

1. **Assess the supervisor’s academic guidance in respect of**:

*(Please choose one answer between 1 and 6. 1 – very poor, 6 – excellent, 0 – I had no need for it)*

1. interdisciplinary research methods

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. Individual Research Plan preparation

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. recommendation of secondary sources

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. research planning (such as, the feasibility of the PhD candidate’s research objectives and probability of research completion within the duration of the Interdisciplinary Doctoral School programme)

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. the PhD candidate’s performance review

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. academic writing techniques

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. **Assess the supervisor’s organisational guidance in respect of**:

*(Please choose one answer between 1 and 6. 1 – very poor, 6 – excellent, 0 – I had no need for it)*

1. introducing the PhD candidate to the organisational structure of the university to facilitate the candidate’s research skills

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. introducing the PhD candidate to the university research facilities

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. introducing the PhD candidate to the research facilities offered by external institutions in terms of research funding

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. developing international and internal academic networking with other researchers and research centres

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. participation in academic conferences

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. development of competences useful in publishing academic articles (finding accredited peer-reviewed journals, explaining the process of peer review)

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. reviewing applications (relevant for the PhD candidate’s programme)

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. cooperation with the authorities of the Doctoral School

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. **Assess the supervisor’s guidance in other respects**:

*(Please choose one answer between 1 and 6. 1 – very poor, 6 – excellent, 0 – I had no need for it)*

1. motivation for doctoral work

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. solving research problems

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. solving administrative problems

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. **Assess your supervisor’s guidance in respect of your teaching practice**

*(Please choose one answer between 1 and 6. 1 – very poor, 6 – excellent, 0 – I had no need for it/I do not teach)*

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. **Assess the cooperation between your supervisors in respect of supervising your PhD dissertation**

*(Please choose one answer between 1 and 6. 1 – very poor, 6 – excellent, 0 – I can not judge it)*

1 2 3 4 5 6 0

1. **How do you assess the cooperation within the team of the supervisors and PhD candidate in respect of the PhD candidate’s progress in general, in respect of**:

*(Please choose one answer between 1 and 6. 1 – very poor, 6 – excellent)*

1. academic cooperation

1 2 3 4 5 6

1. organisational cooperation

1 2 3 4 5 6

1. building rapport

1 2 3 4 5 6

1. **How do you assess your commitment to the cooperation with the supervisors in respect of your progress towards a doctorate in general?**

*(Please choose one answer between 1 and 6. 1 – very poor, 6 – excellent)*

1 2 3 4 5 6

1. **If you have further remarks that are relevant for this mid-term evaluation, please type them below.**