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## 5 ANNUAL MENTOR'S REPORT

|  |
| --- |
| NAME OF DOCTORAL STUDY |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **COUNSELOR/MENTOR(S)** | |
| *1.1. Mentor(s)* | |
| *Title, name and surname* | *Institution, country* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| *1.2. Co-mentor* | |
| *Title, name and surname* | *Institution, country* |
|  |  |
| *1.3. Title, name and surname of the doctoral student* | |
|  | |
| *1.4. Registration number of the doctoral student* | |
|  | |
| *1.5. The period for which the report is being submitted* | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **STATUS OF THE STUDY** | |
| *2.1. Is the work plan created and does the doctoral student progress according to that plan?*  *(please tick the appropriate box)* | |
| *Work plan created* | **yes**  **no** |
| *Doctoral student progressed accorting to the plan* | **yes**  **no** |
| *2.2. If the answer to the previous question was „no“, please explain why and write proposals for improvement* | |
|  | |
| *2.3. Please evaluate the quality of improvement of doctoral student'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 the answer to the previous question was 1 or 2, please explain why and suggest the way for improvement.* | |
|  | |
| *2.5. Comment on doctoral student's progress since the last report* | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EVALUATION OF THE DOCTORAL STUDENT | |
| * 1. *Please evaluate the next statements on a scale from 1 to 5*   *(1 − insufficient, 2 − sufficient, 3 − good, 4 – very good, 5 − excellent*) | |
| *Preparation of the doctoral student for the consultations* | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| *Planning and performance of of the annual research activities and professional development* | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| *Progress in overcoming the methodology of scientific research* | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| *Writing and publishing scientific papers* | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| *Doctoral students relationship to the study in general* | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| *3.2. Please evaluate the overall quality of doctoral student's work on a scale from 1 to 5* | |
| **1** *−* **insufficient  2** *−* **sufficient  3** *−* **good  4** *–* **very good  5** *−* **excellent** | |
| *3.3. If the answer to the previous question was 1 or 2, please explain why and suggest the way for improvement.*  *(If the overall quality of doctoral student's work is evaluated as insufficient (1), it automaticaly withdraws the action of the Faculty Council - a decision on increased monitoring or unsuccessful completion of the study.)* | |
|  | |
| *3.4. Comment on the overall quality of doctoral student's work* | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| OPINION ON THE CANDIDATE'S ABILITY TO CONTINUE HIS STUDIES | |
| * 1. *Can the doctoral student continue the study?* | 1. **Yes** 2. **Yes, with certain conditions** 3. **No** |
| * 1. *If the answer to the previous question was b) or c), please explain* | |
|  | |
| * 1. *Other mentor's notes and commets*   *(if necessary)* | |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Place, date and signature |
| *Opatija,* *Signature*  *(name and surname of the counselor)*  *Signature*  *(name and surname of the mentor)*  *Signature*  *(name and surname of the co-mentor)* |