SUPERVISOR'S ANNUAL REPORT

|  |
| --- |
| NAME OF THE DOCTORAL STUDY PROGRAMME |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. STUDY SUPERVISOR
 |
| 1.1. Supervisor |
| Title, first and last name | Institution, country |
|       |       |
| 1.2. Co-supervisor |
| Title, first and last name | Institution, country |
|       |       |
| 1.3. Title, first and last name of the PhD candidate |
|       |
| 1.4. Student identification number of the PhD candidate |
|       |
| 1.5. Reporting period |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. STUDY PROGRESS
 |
| 2.1. Has a work plan been drawn up and does the PhD candidate make progress according to it?(please tick the box) |
| Work plan has been drawn up | [ ]  yes [ ]  no |
| PhD candidate has made progress according to the plan | [ ]  yes [ ]  no |
| 2.2. If you ticked “no” to the previous question, explain why and suggest how this can be amended. |
|       |
| 2.3. Please rate the progress of the PhD candidate’s research on a scale from 1 to 5. (since the last report) |
| [ ]  1 – insufficient [ ]  2 – sufficient [ ]  3 – good [ ]  4 – very good [ ]  5 – excellent |
| 2.4. If you ticked 1 or 2 to the previous question, explain why and suggest how this can be amended. |
|       |
| 2.5. Comment PhD candidate’s progress since the last report.  |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. EVALUATION OF THE PhD CANDIDATE
 |
| 3.1. Please rate the following items on a scale from 1 to 5:(1 – insufficient, 2 – sufficient, 3 – good, 4 – very good, 5 – excellent) |
| PhD candidate’s preparedness for the consultation sessions | [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ] 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Planning and realization of annual research activities and professional training | [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ] 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Progress in mastering of the methodology of scientific research | [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ] 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Writing and publication of scientific papers | [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ] 1 2 3 4 5 |
| PhD candidate’s overall attitude towards the study programme | [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ] 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.2. Please rate the overall quality of the PhD candidate’s work on a scale from 1 to 5.  |
| [ ]  1 – insufficient [ ]  2 – sufficient [ ]  3 – good [ ]  4 – very good [ ]  5 – excellent |
| 3.3. If you ticked 2 to the previous question, explain why and suggest how this can be amended.(If the overall quality of the PhD candidate’s work has been rated with 1, the Faculty Board shall make an official decision on the need for increased supervision or on unsuccessful completion of the study programme.) |
|       |
| 3.4. Comment the overall quality of the PhD candidate’s work.  |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. OPINION ON THE PhD CANDIDATE’S ABILITY TO CONTINUE WITH THE STUDY PROGRAMME
 |
| * 1. Can the PhD candidate continue with the study programme?
 | 1. [ ]  yes
2. [ ]  yes, under certain conditions
3. [ ]  no
 |
| * 1. If you ticked b) or c) to the previous question, please explain.
 |
|       |
| * 1. Other comments and opinions of the supervisor(s)

(if applicable) |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| Place, date and signature |
| Rijeka, dd/mm/yyyy | Signature(first and last name of the supervisor) |
| Signature(first and last name of the co-supervisor) |