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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)* |