ANNUAL STUDENT REPORT

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General information | | |
| Name of postgraduate university study programme |  | |
| Name and surname of the student |  | |
| Student ID number |  | |
| Reporting period |  | |
| E-mail |  | |
| Type of study programme (please tick the box) | full-time | part-time |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MENTOR | |
| Mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Co-mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Study advisor (only if no mentor has been assigned) | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ANNUAL REPORT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Has a work plan been developed? (please tick the box) | | | | | | | yes  no | | | | | |
| If you selected "no" in the previous question, explain why and suggest possible improvements. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Describe the progress since last report (max. 500 words) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Briefly describe the work plan for the next period (max. 500 words) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| List the difficulties that affect or may affect the course of your studies | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Participation in scientific and professional projects (in the previous academic year) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Institution | | From | | | To | | | | | Name and type of project | | |
|  | |  | | |  | | | | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |  | | | | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |  | | | | |  | | |
| Training abroad (in the previous academic year) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Country | Institution | | | From | | | | | To | | Name | |
|  |  | | |  | | | | |  | |  | |
|  |  | | |  | | | | |  | |  | |
|  |  | | |  | | | | |  | |  | |
| Participation in scientific and professional conferences (in the previous academic year) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Institution | | | From | | | To | | | | Conference name and type of announcement | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |  | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |  | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |  | | |
| Courses laid down in the syllabus | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course | | | | | | | | ECTS credits | | | | Grade |
|  | | | | | | | |  | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | |  | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | |  | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | |  | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | |  | | | |  |
| Scientific papers (attach a printout of published scientific papers from the CROSBI electronic bibliography for the previous academic year) | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MENTOR EVALUATION | |
| Please rate on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 - insufficient, 2 - sufficient, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent) | |
| Clear setting of research goals and expectations from the student | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Assistance in planning annual research activities and professional training | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Regularity of mentoring work with the student | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Encouragement to publish and assistance in publishing scientific papers | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Mentor's relationship with the student as a whole | 1 2 3 4 5 |

|  |
| --- |
| EVALUATION OF POSTGRADUATE UNIVERSITY STUDIES |
| Please rate how satisfied you are with the quality of the annual postgraduate university programme you are attending on a scale from 1 to 5. |
| 1 - insufficient  2 - sufficient  3 - good  4 - very good  5 - excellent |
| If you selected 1 or 2 in the previous question, explain and suggest possible improvements. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Place, date and signature |
| In Rijeka, dd/mm/yyyy  Signature  (name and surname of the student) |

MENTOR'S REPORT

|  |
| --- |
| NAME OF POSTGRADUATE UNIVERSITY STUDY |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MENTOR | |
| Mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Co-mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Name and surname of the student | |
|  | |
| Student ID number | |
|  | |
| Reporting period | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PROGRESS IN STUDIES | |
| Has a work plan been developed and is the student making progress according to that plan?  (please tick the box) | |
| Made a work plan | yes  no |
| Made progress towards the work plan | yes  no |
| If you selected "no" in the previous question, explain why and suggest possible improvements. | |
|  | |
| On a scale from 1 to 5, rate the quality of the student’s research dissertation progress.  (since last report) | |
| 1 - insufficient  2 - sufficient  3 - good  4 - very good  5 - excellent | |
| If you selected 1 or 2 in the previous question, explain and suggest possible improvements. | |
|  | |
| Comment on the student's progress since the last report | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| STUDENT EVALUATION | |
| Please rate on a scale from 1 to 5:  (1 - insufficient, 2 - sufficient, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent) | |
| Student's readiness for consultations | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Planning and execution of annual research activities and professional development | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Progress in mastering scientific research methodology | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Writing and publishing scientific papers | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Doctoral student's attitude towards their studies in general | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| On a scale from 1 to 5, rate the overall quality of the doctoral dissertation. | |
| 1 - insufficient  2 - sufficient  3 - good  4 - very good  5 - excellent | |
| If you selected "2" in the previous question, explain why and suggest possible improvements.  If the overall quality of the doctoral student's dissertation is rated as insufficient (1), the Expert Council of their study programme holder will decide upon intensified monitoring or a decision on unsuccessful completion of their studies. | |
|  | |
| Comment on the overall quality of the student's doctoral dissertation | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| OPINION ON THE CAPACITY OF THE CANDIDATE FOR CONTINUATION OF STUDIES | |
| Can the student continue their studies? | Yes.  Yes, subject to certain conditions.  No. |
| If you selected b) or c) in the previous question, please explain. | |
|  | |
| Other notes and opinions of the mentor (if necessary) | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Place, date, signature | |
| In Rijeka, | Signature  (name and surname of the mentor) |
| Signature  (name and surname of the co-mentor) |

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION TOPIC APPLICATION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| General and student's contact information | |
| Name and surname of the student |  |
| Study programme holder |  |
| Study programme |  |
| Student ID number |  |
| Date and place of birth: |  |
| Address |  |
| Telephone/Mobile phone |  |
| E-mail |  |

|  |
| --- |
| SUGGESTED TOPIC TITLE |
| Croatian |
|  |
| English |
|  |
| Area/field |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SUGGESTED OR POTENTIAL MENTOR | | |
| Mentor | | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country | E-mail |
|  |  |  |
| The minimum general criteria for the selection of mentors are prescribed by a Senate Decision. | | |
| Co-mentor | | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country | E-mail |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TOPIC ELUCIDATION | | | |
| Abstract in Croatian  (max. 1,000 characters with spaces) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Abstract in English  (max. 1,000 characters with spaces) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Introduction and review of previous research  (recommendation: 7,000 characters with spaces) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Aim and purpose of the research  (recommendation: 700 characters with spaces) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Materials, methodology and research plan  (recommendation: 6,500 characters with spaces) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Expected scientific contribution  (recommendation: 500 characters with spaces) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Bibliography and other sources  (max. 30 references) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Application of research results | | | |
|  | | | |
| Estimate of the total costs of the proposed research (in HRK) | | | |
|  | | | |
| Proposed sources of research funding | | | |
| Funding type: | Project name | Project Manager | Signature |
| National financing |  |  |  |
| International financing |  |  |  |
| Other types of projects |  |  |  |
| Self-financing |  | | |
| Decision of the Ethics Committee approving the research proposal  (if necessary) | | | |
|  | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED MENTOR REGARDING THE TOPIC APPLICATION |
| I hereby declare that I approve of the submitted dissertation topic.  Signature  (name and surname of the mentor)  Signature  (name and surname of the co-mentor)  In Rijeka, dd/mm/yyyy |

|  |
| --- |
| STATEMENT |
| I hereby declare that I have not submitted an identical doctoral dissertation topic application at any other university.  Signature  (name and surname of the student)  In Rijeka, dd/mm/yyyy |

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION TOPIC EVALUATION

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General and student's contact information | | |
| Name and surname of the student |  | |
| Study programme holder |  | |
| Study programme |  | |
| Student ID number |  | |
| Topic title | Dissertation language |  |
| Croatian |  |
| English |  |
| Area/field |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mentor | | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country | E-mail |
|  |  |  |
| Co-mentor | | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country | E-mail |
|  |  |  |
| Elected Doctoral Dissertation Topic Evaluation Committee | | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country | E-mail |
| 1. (Chair of the Committee) |  |  |
| Session of the competent body appointed by the Committee (name of the body and date of the session) | | |
|  | | |
| Decision of the Ethics Committee approving the research proposal (if necessary) | | |
|  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| REPORT ON THE PUBLIC DEFENCE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION TOPIC |
| Place and time of the defence |
|  |
| Duration of the presentation |
|  |
| Questions asked by the members of the Committee |
|  |
| Questions asked by the audience |
|  |
| Particularly important elements of the discussion |
|  |
| Duration of the discussion |
|  |
| End time of the doctoral dissertation defence |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DOCTORAL DISSERTATION TOPIC EVALUATION (original scientific contribution and feasibility assessment) | |
|  | |
| Opinion and proposal (explicitly state whether original scientific work on the proposed topic is possible in accordance with internationally accepted dissertation quality standards and whether the candidate is able to achieve the set goal) | |
|  | |
| Proposal to change or refine the title | |
|  | |
| Proposal to change the mentor, co-mentor and/or appoint another mentor/co-mentor(enter their title, name, surname, institution) | |
|  | |
| Dissenting opinion (only if one of the members of the Doctoral Dissertation Topic Evaluation Committee has a dissenting opinion) | |
| Signature  (name and surname of the Committee member) | |
| Note(if necessary) | |
|  | |
| Doctoral Dissertation Topic Evaluation Committee | |
| Title, name and surname, institution, country: | Signatures: |
| (Chair of the Committee) |  |
| In Rijeka, dd/mm/yyyy | |

REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION TOPIC

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General information | | |
| Name and surname of the student |  | |
| Study programme holder |  | |
| Study programme |  | |
| Student ID number |  | |
| E-mail |  | |
| Topic title | Croatian |  |
|  | English |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| NEW DOCTORAL DISSERTATION TOPIC TITLE  (Fill out this section only if you wish to change the dissertation topic. In that case, a new Form 3 (Doctoral Dissertation Topic Application) must be submitted along with this form. | | |
| Topic title | Croatian |  |
|  | English |  |

|  |
| --- |
| EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF THE TOPIC |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| MENTOR'S STATEMENT ON THE REQUEST |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| STATEMENT BY THE STUDY PROGRAMME HEAD ON THE REQUEST |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Place, date, signature | |
| In Rijeka, | Signature  (name and surname of the student) |
| Signature  (name and surname of the mentor) |
| Signature  (name and surname of the Head of Studies) |

REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF MENTOR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General information | | |
| Name and surname of the student |  | |
| Study programme holder |  | |
| Study programme |  | |
| Student ID number |  | |
| E-mail |  | |
| Topic title | Croatian |  |
|  | English |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ELUCIDATION OF THE REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF MENTOR |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| INFORMATION ABOUT THE PREVIOUS MENTOR | |
| Mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Co-mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| NEW MENTOR | |
| Mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Co-mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| STATEMENT BY THE STUDY PROGRAMME HEAD ON THE REQUEST |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Place, date, signature | |
| In Rijeka, | Signature  (name and surname of the student) |
| Signature  (name and surname of the new mentor) |
| Signature  (name and surname of the Head of Studies) |

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION EVALUATION REPORT

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General and student's contact information | | |
| Name and surname of the student |  | |
| Study programme holder |  | |
| Study programme |  | |
| Student ID number |  | |
| Doctoral dissertation title | Dissertation language |  |
| Croatian |  |
| English |  |
| Area/field |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MENTOR AND DOCTORAL DISSERTATION EVALUATION COMMITTEE | |
| Mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Co-mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Doctoral Dissertation Evaluation Committee: | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
| 1. (Chair of the Committee) |  |
| Session of the competent body and the item on the agenda within which the Committee was appointed | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DOCTORAL DISSERTATION EVALUATION | |
| Doctoral dissertation evaluation\*  (The evaluation must contain a conclusion explicitly stating the original scientific contribution and/or a new discovery) | |
|  | |
| Opinion and proposal\* | |
|  | |
| Doctoral Dissertation Evaluation Committee: | |
| Title, name and surname, institution, country: | Signatures: |
| 1. (Chair of the Committee) |  |
| Note  (if necessary) | |
|  | |
| In Rijeka, | |

\*In the event that one or more foreign lecturers are appointed to the Committee, the evaluation, opinion and proposal may be written in English.

REQUEST FOR EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC FROM THE DEFENCE AND DELAY OF PUBLICATION OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General information | | |
| Name and surname of the student |  | |
| Study programme holder |  | |
| Study programme |  | |
| Student ID number |  | |
| E-mail |  | |
| Topic title | Croatian |  |
|  | English |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MENTOR | |
| Mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Co-mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| REQUEST | |
| I hereby request the exclusion of public from the defence and delay in publication of the doctoral dissertation. This is due to the fact the research was conducted for the needs of the economy, in cooperation with a research centre in the economy sector, for the needs or in cooperation with state institutions in charge of defence and security, or the results of the research include an innovation that is eligible for the protection of intellectual property rights through the Technology Transfer Office at the University of Rijeka. In the latter case, a certificate from the Technology Transfer Office is submitted along with the request. | |
| In Rijeka, | Signature  (name and surname of the student) |
| Signature  (name and surname of the mentor) |
| Signature  (name and surname of the Head of Studies) |

PROTOCOL AND MINUTES OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION DEFENCE

The Doctoral Dissertation Defence Committee enters the lecture hall in which the defence takes place in the following order: 5th Committee member, 3rd Committee member, Chair of the Committee, 2nd Committee member, 4th Committee member. The student stands before the Committee. Committee members and the audience sit down, and the Chair reads aloud:

Distinguished Candidate, distinguished members of the Committee and others present, I find that today, on      , the student

(name and surname of the student)

will be defending their doctoral dissertation, entitled

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Doctoral dissertation title | Dissertation language |  |
| Croatian |  |
| English |  |

written under the mentorship of

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |
| Co-mentor | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
|  |  |

The Chair then reads aloud the student's Curriculum Vitae:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The Chair reads aloud the elucidation of the doctoral dissertation evaluation:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

After reading the Report, the Chair gives the floor to the student with the following words:

I kindly ask the student to present a summary of their doctoral dissertation research in no longer than 45 minutes.

At the end of the presentation, the Chair asks the members of the Committee to pose questions related to the field of research.

Finally, the Chair asks the student questions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Questions of the Doctoral Dissertation Defence Committee | |
| 2nd Committee member |  |
| 3rd Committee member |  |
| 4th Committee member |  |
| 5th Committee member |  |
| Chair of the Committee |  |

The Chair asks the audience if they want to pose questions and asks the person posing the question to introduce themselves beforehand.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Questions posed by the audience | |
| Name and surname | Question |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

The Chair concludes the defence with the words:

If there are no further questions, I declare the defence of the doctoral dissertation completed and propose that the Committee withdraw to deliberate.

\*\*\*

Upon their return, the Chair reads:

The doctoral dissertation was accepted by

(name of the competent body)

on

and at the proposal of the elected Doctoral Dissertation Evaluation Committee composed of:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Elected Doctoral Dissertation Evaluation Committee: | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country |
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |
| 4. |  |
| 5. |  |

The doctoral dissertation was defended before the Doctoral Dissertation Defence Committee consisting of       member(s):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Elected Doctoral Dissertation Defence Committee | | |
| Title, name and surname | Institution, country | Signature |
| 1. |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |

elected by the competent body

on

(Example of the Decision in the case that the student has defended their doctoral dissertation)

Following the public defence, the Doctoral Dissertation Defence Committee passed unanimously – by a majority of votes (*underline*) the following

D E C I S I O N

that

(name and surname of the student)

defended their doctoral dissertation.

At the proposal of the Doctoral Dissertation Defence Committee, the study programme holder will ask the Rector of the University of Rijeka to promote

(name and surname of the student)

to the highest academic title of a

DOCTOR OF SCIENCE

in the scientific area of       sciences,

scientific field      .

In Rijeka,       L.S.

(Example of the Decision in the case that the doctoral student has not defended their doctoral dissertation)

Following the public defence, the Doctoral Dissertation Defence Committee passed unanimously – by a majority of votes (*underline*) the following

D E C I S I O N

that

(name and surname of the doctoral student)

has not defended their doctoral dissertation.

In Rijeka,       L.S.