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## SUPERVISOR'S ANNUAL REPORT

|  |
| --- |
| NAME OF THE POSTGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMME |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. STUDY SUPERVISOR/CO-SUPERVISOR | |
| 1.1. Supervisor | |
| Title, first and last name | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| 1.2. Co-supervisor | |
| Title, first and last name | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| 1.4. Title, first and last name of the doctoral candidate | |
|  | |
| 1.5. Identification number of the doctoral candidate | |
|  | |
| 1.6. Reporting period | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. STUDY PROGRESS | |
| 2.1. Has a work plan been drawn up and does the doctoral candidate make progress according to it?  (please tick the box) | |
| Work plan has been drawn up | yes  no |
| Doctoral 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. | |
|  | |
| * 1. Please rate the progress of the doctoral 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 doctoral candidate’s progress since the last report. | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EVALUATION OF THE DOCTORAL 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) | |
| Doctoral 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 |
| Doctoral candidate’s overall attitude towards the study programme. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.2. Please rate the overall quality of the doctoral 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 doctoral 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 doctoral candidate’s work. | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. OPINION ON THE DOCTORAL CANDIDATE’S ABILITY TO CONTINUE WITH THE STUDY PROGRAMME | |
| * 1. Can the doctoral 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   (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) |

If the grade is under 3.2. insufficient (1), the doctoral student fills in the continuation of the form.

Please comment on your supervisor's report. Continue on an extra sheet of paper as needed.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Doctoral's candidate signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_