

RESOLUTION no. 85/2021
OF THE SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SZCZECIN
of the 29th of September 2021

regarding the detailed regulations for carrying out the proceedings
for awarding academic degrees at the University of Szczecin

Pursuant to art. 192, section 2 and art. 221, section 14 of the Higher education and
Science Act of the 20th of July 2018 (Dz.U. 2021, item 478 as amended) it is hereby ordered
as follows:

Chapter 1
General provisions

§1.

1. The resolution determines the detailed regulations for carrying out the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD and awarding the academic degree of assistant professor at the University of Szczecin.
2. Whenever provisions of the resolution indicate:
 - 1) the act - it shall be understood as the Higher Education and Science Act of the 20th of July 2018 (Dz.U. 2021, item 478 as amended);
 - 2) the Charter - it shall be understood as the charter of the University of Szczecin which constitutes attachment to resolution no. 58/2019 of the Senate of the University of Szczecin of the 30 of May 2019 regarding adopting the charter of the University of Szczecin;
 - 3) the university - it shall be understood as the University of Szczecin
 - 4) the Senate – it shall be understood as the Senate of the University of Szczecin;
 - 5) Rector - it shall be understood as Rector of the University of Szczecin;
 - 6) the Scientific Council of the institute - it shall be understood as the scientific council of an institute which is a primary organizational unit established with the goal of organizing and carrying out research activities within the framework of a specific discipline or disciplines of science;
 - 7) the Doctoral School of the US - shall be understood as the Doctoral School of the University of Szczecin;
 - 8) the doctoral commission - it shall be understood as the commission performing actions in the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD, appointed under provisions determined in the resolution;
 - 9) the habilitation commission - it shall be understood as the commission performing actions in the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor, appointed under provisions determined in the resolution;

10) the Candidate - it shall be understood as a person applying for the academic degree of PhD or assistant professor, who meets the requirements stipulated in, respectively, art. 186 of the Act or art. 219 of the Act;

11) the primary discipline - it shall be understood as the science discipline under which a Candidate applies for the academic degree of PhD;

12) a related discipline - it shall be understood as a science discipline corresponding to the subject of the doctoral dissertation remaining under the same branch of science as the primary discipline;

13) the SEC - shall be understood as the Scientific Excellence Council

§2.

1. The proceedings regarding awarding the academic degrees of PhD and assistant professor carried out at the University are consistent with the provisions of the Act and the Resolution.

2. In the affairs not regulated by the Act and the Resolution the provisions of the act of the 14th of June 1960 - Code of Administrative Procedure (Dz.U. 2021, item 735 as amended) apply accordingly to the proceedings indicated in section 1.

§3.

1. The proceedings regarding awarding the academic degrees of PhD and assistant professor are carried out by the Scientific Council of the institute engaged in research activity within the framework of a science discipline at the University which obtained the scientific category entitling the University to award the academic degree of PhD or the academic degree of assistant professor in consideration of section 2 and §16, sections 3 and 4 of the resolution.

2. The provisions of the resolution concerning a scientific council of an institute apply accordingly to a scientific council of a faculty established consistently with provisions of §36, section 3 and 3a of the Charter.

§4.

1. Works of the Scientific Council of the institute within the framework of the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD and in the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor are led by the Chairman of the Council or, in the cases stipulated in §128, section 4 of the Charter, the deputy chairman.

2. The tasks of the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute related to leading works of the Scientific Council of the institute under the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD and in the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor cover:

- 1) overseeing progress and timeliness of operations of the Scientific Council of the institute;
- 2) overseeing proper composition of the Scientific Council of the institute;
- 3) summoning sittings of the Scientific Council of the institute;
- 4) presiding over sittings of the Scientific Council of the institute;
- 5) performing other tasks determined in the Resolution.

3. In the case of the Chairman of the council being incapable of participating in the proceedings or, in the circumstances stipulated in §128, section 4 of the Charter, the deputy chairman being incapable of participating in the proceedings the Council appoints from among its members who are authorized to participate in the works of the Council within the framework of the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD or the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor a person to serve as a chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute in given proceedings.

4. In the case of absence of the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute or, in the cases stipulated in §128, section 4 of the charter, absence of the deputy chairman exceeding 14 days the provisions of section 3 apply accordingly.

5. The person appointed pursuant to provisions of section 3 performs tasks of the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute determined in the Act and in the Resolution.

§5.

1. Consistently with art. 31, section 4 of the Act the Scientific Council of the institute adopts resolutions through a secret voting by an absolute majority of votes and in the presence of at least a half of members entitled to vote.

2. In the matters of personal affairs, in particular in the case of appointing members of the doctoral commission and the habilitation commission, the Scientific Council of the institute adopts a separate resolution for each person individually.

3. Resolutions of the Scientific Council of the institute are signed by the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute.

§6.

1. Unless the resolution stipulates otherwise the doctoral commission and the habilitation commission adopt resolutions through open voting by an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least a half of members of, respectively, the doctoral or the habilitation commission.

2. The Candidate may apply for carrying out secret voting in regards to the resolution or resolutions indicated in the application. The Candidate submits the application for secret voting to the Chairman of an appropriate commission no later than prior to initiation of sitting of said commission.

3. Resolutions adopted by the doctoral commission are signed by the Chairman of the doctoral commission.

4. Resolutions adopted by the habilitation commission are signed by the Chairman and the Secretary of the habilitation commission.

§7.

1. Sittings of the Scientific Council of the institute, the doctoral commission or the habilitation commission shall be recorded. The records of a sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute and the doctoral commission are drawn up by a recording clerk and the records of a sitting of the habilitation commission are recorded by the Secretary.

2. The records of a sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute are signed by the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute and the recording clerk.
3. The records of a sitting of the doctoral commission are signed by the Chairman of the commission and the recording clerk, and the records of a sitting of the habilitation commission are signed by the Chairman and the Secretary.
4. If reviews or opinions of members of the commission are presented during a sitting of the doctoral commission or the habilitation commission the records shall include information regarding presentation of reviews and opinions and said documents are attached to the record as an attachment.

§8.

1. Rector may determine detailed requirements regarding documenting the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD and the academic degree of assistant professor, including templates for documents.
2. By way of an ordinance Rector determines specific organizational and technical requirements for sittings of scientific councils, doctoral commissions and habilitation commissions, including holding postdoctoral examinations through use of information technologies, taking into consideration the necessity of controlling progress and registration of said examinations, as well as secrecy of voting in the circumstances during which carrying out a secret voting will be required.

§9.

1. The sittings regarding the proceedings regarding awarding an academic degree as well as the proceedings regarding confirming learning outcomes for level 8 of Polish Qualification Framework, hereinafter "PQF", may be recorded.
2. Whether the sitting stipulated in section 1 will be recorded is decided by, respectively, the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute, the doctoral commission or the Learning Outcomes Verification commission.
3. If the sitting stipulated in section 1 shall be recorded consistently with the decision of the Chairman the recording of the sitting shall constitute a part of the proceedings files.

§10.

1. If during a sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute the information shall be presented which will require providing additional explanations or other circumstances preventing adopting a given resolution will arise the Chairman of the council may order a recess in a sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute no longer than seven days.
2. The provisions of section 1 apply accordingly to sittings of the doctoral commission and the habilitation commission.

§11.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute is responsible for realization of the obligations projected in the Act and related to posting specific information and resolutions in

the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute unless the resolution stipulates otherwise.

§12.

1. Without a valid justification an employee of the University cannot oppose being appointed into the composition of doctoral or habilitation commissions.
2. A member of a doctoral commission or a habilitation commission is obliged to notify the Chairman of the commission of incapacity to participate in a sitting and must provide justification. A missive regarding this matter is attached to the proceedings files.

§13.

1. The Candidate has the right to inspect proceedings files, take notes or make copies or duplicates, subject to §9, section 2 of the Resolution. The Candidate retains this right also following conclusion of the proceedings for awarding an academic degree.
2. The actions stipulated in section 1 are performed on the premises of the science section of an appropriate institute and in the presence of an employee of this section.
3. The Candidate may request authentication of duplicates or copies of the proceedings files or releasing authenticated duplicates of proceedings files provided that it is justified with valid and important interest of the Candidate.
4. The provisions of sections 1-3 do not apply to the proceedings files containing confidential information classified as "secret" or "top secret" as well as to other files which the Scientific Council of the institute will exclude due to significant public interest.
5. The matter of refusing Candidate's right to inspecting proceedings files, making notes copies or duplicates of the files, authenticating such copies and duplicates or releasing authenticated duplicates to the Candidate is decided by the Scientific Council of the institute through adopting a resolution.
6. The Candidate can appeal against the decision of the Scientific Council of the institute stipulated in section 5 to the SEC within 7 days counting from the date of delivering the resolution.

§14.

1. In the case of a document in a foreign language being submitted following initiation of the proceedings for awarding an academic degree said document must be translated into Polish language. In consideration of ensuring proper progress of the proceedings the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute decides the type of the written translation (ordinary, specialist, certified) and the form in which the translation is to be included with the proceedings files.
2. If a foreigner not speaking Polish language is to participate in the sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute or the doctoral commission or the habilitation commission regarding awarding an academic degree the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute, in consideration of the proper progress of the proceedings, has to make a decision whether an interpreter should be present during the sitting.

3. The science section of an appropriate institute is responsible for preparing a translation of the documents and providing services of an interpreter in circumstances stipulated in sections 1 and 2.

§15.

1. The administrative processing for the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD and awarding the academic degree of assistant professor is provided by the science section of an appropriate institute.

2. The Director of an appropriate institute appoints the person who will serve as a recording clerk for the doctoral commission. The recording clerk is not a part of the composition of the doctoral commission.

Chapter 2

The proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD

§16.

1. The actions in the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD are carried out by the Scientific Council of the institute or the doctoral commission, provided that such commission was appointed, subject to section 3 and 4.

2. If the doctoral commission has not been appointed the tasks of the doctoral commission determined by the resolution are performed by the Scientific Council of the institute. In such circumstances the provisions applying to the Chairman of the doctoral commission apply accordingly to the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute.

3. In the cases stipulated in art. 177, section 177, section 6 of the Act the body of the University authorized to award the academic degree of PhD in the field of science is the Senate.

4. In the case of awarding the academic degree of PhD in the field of science the tasks in the proceedings are performed by the Senate and the doctoral commission respectively. The doctoral commission is appointed and its composition is determined by the Senate. Provisions §17-33 of the Resolution apply accordingly.

§17.

1. The mode for appointing and changing a thesis supervisor or an auxiliary supervisor is determined by the Regulations of the Doctoral School of the University of Szczecin in relation to:

1) a postgraduate student of the Doctoral School of the US;

2) a person who initiated postgraduate studies prior to academic year 2019/2020

and applies for being awarded the academic degree of PhD and has not been assigned a thesis supervisor;

3) persons applying for the academic degree of PhD pursuant to the mode determined in art. 217 of the Act who were not assigned a thesis supervisor prior to academic year 2019/2020.

2. Prior to submitting the application for initiating the proceedings regarding awarding an academic degree pursuant to the mode determined in art. 217 of the act a person applying for the academic degree of PhD submits to the Director of the Doctoral School of the US, following prior positive verification of the level 8 PQF learning outcomes, the application for appointing a thesis supervisor or supervisors or a thesis supervisor and an auxiliary supervisor consistently with the mode determined in chapter 4 of the Resolution.

3. The scientific supervision over preparing a doctoral dissertation is maintained by a supervisor or supervisors, in the number no greater than two in the cases stipulated in section 5, or by a supervisor and an auxiliary supervisor.

4. A person not employed at the University can serve as a supervisor or as an auxiliary supervisor.

5. In case of writing a cross-disciplinary doctoral dissertation a second supervisor can be appointed. If a doctoral dissertation covers scientific topics from more than one science discipline the discipline in which the academic degree of PhD is awarded must be indicated. If a doctoral dissertation covers scientific issues from more than one science discipline covered under a single branch of science and indicating the science discipline in which the degree is to be awarded is not possible the degree of PhD is awarded in the branch of science instead.

§18.

1. Three reviewers are appointed in the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD.

2. The director of an appropriate institute or the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute or at least three other members of the Scientific Council of the institute carrying out the proceedings put forward the candidates for reviewers from among persons who are not employees of the University or the organizational unit in which the Candidate is employed.

3. A following person can be a reviewer:

1) a person with the academic title of professor in the branch of science to which the primary discipline or the related discipline corresponding to the subject of the doctoral dissertation belongs or

2) a person with the academic degree of assistant professor representing the primary discipline or the related discipline corresponding to the subject of the doctoral dissertation which is a part of the same branch of science as the primary discipline.

4. A person not meeting the requirements stipulated in section 3 who is an employee of a foreign university or a science institution can serve as a reviewer provided that the Scientific Council of an appropriate institute will ascertain that said person has major achievements in the field of the scientific topics to which the doctoral dissertation pertains.

5. A reviewer cannot be a person to whom justified doubts arise regarding impartiality, particularly a person who:

1) remains in such legal or factual relationship which would result in the results of the proceedings influencing rights and obligations of the reviewer or the factual situation of the reviewer;

- 2) is related to the Candidate by way of relationship or direct affinity up to the second degree;
 - 3) was a reviewer in previous proceedings if the Candidate has previously applied for awarding the academic degree of PhD;
 - 3) shares professional dependency or relationship with the Candidate;
 - 5) is a co-author of Candidate's publication;
 - 6) conducts scientific research jointly with the Candidate in scientific institutions;
 - 7) is a member of the same research teams as the Candidate.
6. The guidelines stipulated in section 5 apply accordingly also in reference to the relationships between the reviewers who additionally cannot represent the same institution of higher education or the same research institute or the same science and research institute.
7. In the case of securing an absolute majority of votes by more than three candidates for reviewers persons who received the greatest number of votes will be selected.
8. In the case of an equal number of votes the voting shall be repeated until at least one of the candidates secures a majority of votes.

§19.

1. The proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD are initiated upon application of the Candidate and pursuant to the provisions stipulated in art. 189 of the Act.
2. The date for initiation of the proceedings is the date of delivering Candidate's application stipulated in section 1 to the Scientific Council of an appropriate institute pursuant to the mode stipulated in section 3.
3. The application for initiating the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD is submitted by the Candidate to the Scientific Council of the institute along with the required documents through the science section of an appropriate institute.
4. In the application stipulated in section 1 the Candidate indicates the branch of science and the scientific discipline under which the academic degree of PhD is to be awarded. In the case defined in art. 177, section 177, section 5 of the Act the Candidate indicates the Scientific Council of the institute which is to carry out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD whereby the indication may concern only the institute appropriate for the discipline within the branch of science under which the academic degree should be awarded.
5. To the application for awarding the academic degree of PhD the Candidate attaches:
 - 1) The documents or certified copies thereof confirming meeting the requirements stipulated in art. 186, section 1, points 1 and 2 of the Act, and in the case of the documents in a foreign language - copies of the documents translated into Polish language by a sworn translator;
 - 2) the list of scientific work achievements confirming meeting the requirement stipulated in art. 186, section 1, point 3 of the Act;
 - 3) the ruling of the director of the Doctoral School of the US concerning appointing a supervisor or supervisors or a supervisor and an auxiliary supervisor, in consideration of art. 190, section 6 of the Act;

- 4) a copy of a finished doctoral dissertation along with an abstract, consistently with requirements of art. 187, section 4 of the Act, in the form of a physical copy and a PDF file on a data carrier along with the opinion of the dissertation supervisor or supervisors or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor concerning the dissertation meeting the requirements stipulated in art. 187 of the Act;
- 5) in the case of appointing an auxiliary supervisor for the doctoral dissertation - a declaration of the auxiliary supervisor regarding the scope of tasks within the framework of the scientific supervision over the doctoral dissertation;
- 6) the protocol of examination of the doctoral dissertation under the Uniform Anti-plagiarism System, signed by the supervisor or supervisors of the doctoral dissertation;
- 7) a personal questionnaire;
- 8) a permission for processing of personal data under the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD (GDPR clause);
- 9) a certificate of education in the Doctoral School of the US in the case of postgraduate students of the School or a certificate regarding progress of studies for the persons who began tertiary studies prior to academic year 2019/2020 (not applicable to extramural mode);
- 10) a declaration concerning the ORCID id number (electronic id of a scientist obtained following registration of the Candidate on the <https://orcid.org> website defined in art. 345, section 1, point 3 of the Act);
- 11) a declaration including the obligation to cover the costs of the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD in the case of the persons applying for the academic degree of PhD consistently with the mode determined in art. 217 of the Act, which constitutes a foundation for drawing up the agreement concerning covering the costs of the proceedings. The declaration regarding the obligation to cover the costs of the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD is signed by the Candidate not employed at the University or, in the case stipulated in art. 182, section 6 of the Act, by a person representing the entity employing the Candidate.

6. The Candidate applying for awarding an academic degree pursuant to the mode determined in art. 186, section 2 of the Act attaches the following to the application for initiating the proceedings for awarding an academic degree:

- 1) the documents or certified copies of the documents confirming completing short-cycle studies or the third year of a uniform Master's degree course, and in the case of documents in a foreign language - copies of the documents translated into Polish language by a sworn translator;
- 2) documents or certified copies of said documents confirming meeting the requirements stipulated in art. 186, section 1, point 2 of the Act, and in the case of documents in a foreign language copies translated into Polish language by a sworn translator;
- 3) the list of scientific work achievements confirming meeting the requirement stipulated in §186, section 1, point 3 of the Act;
- 4) the documents indicated in section 5, points 3-11;

5) the opinion prepared by at least two persons holding the scientific title of a professor or the academic degree of an assistant professor, not employed at the University, confirming the excellence of the scientific achievements of the Candidate.

7. In the case of the doctoral dissertation being an independent and separate part of a joint publication the candidate submits along with the documents stipulated in section 4 or section 6 the declaration of all co-authors of the joint publication determining the individual contribution of each co-author to creation of the publication. In case of a joint publication having more than five co-authors the Candidate submits a declaration concerning his individual contribution in creation of this work as well as declarations of at least four other co-authors. The Candidate is released from the obligation to submit this declaration in case of death of a co-author, acknowledging a co-author as deceased or in the case of a permanent injury preventing procuring said declaration.

§20.

1. The application stipulated in §19, section 1 of the Act is subject to formal verification.
2. In the case of the application not meeting the formal criteria, in particular not including the required attachments stipulated in §19, section 5 and 6 of the resolution, the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute summons the Candidate to complete the application and sets an appropriate deadline, no shorter than 7 days, for completing the application. Not completing the application within the indicated deadline results in the application not being examined. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute informs the Candidate of Candidate's application not being examined in writing.
3. Following submission of the application or its completion consistently with section 2 the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute immediately notifies the Candidate in writing of initiating the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD and delivers to the Candidate or the entity employing the Candidate the agreement concerning the amount and conditions for paying the fee for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD.
4. The Scientific Council of the institute makes a decision regarding refusing to initiate the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD by adopting an appropriate resolution in the case of:
 - 1) the University lacking the authority to award the academic degree of PhD in the discipline of science indicated by the Candidate;
 - 2) the Candidate not meeting the formal requirements stipulated in art. 186 of the Act.
5. The Candidate can appeal against the resolution of the Scientific Council of the institute indicated in section 4 to the SEC within 7 days counting from the date of delivering the resolution.

§21.

1. The Scientific Council of the institute may appoint a doctoral commission for carrying out the actions under the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD.
2. The doctoral commission stipulated in section 1 is authorized to:

- 1) adopt a resolution regarding completing a review;
 - 2) adopt a resolution regarding expressing permission for referring a doctoral dissertation to correction or refusing to express a permission for referring the doctoral dissertation to correction;
 - 3) adopt a resolution concerning allowing the Candidate to defend doctoral dissertation publicly or refusing the Candidate to defend doctoral dissertation publicly;
 - 4) carry out a public defense of a doctoral dissertation;
 - 5) adopt a resolution concerning accepting public defense of the doctoral dissertation and passing to the Scientific Council of the institute application for awarding the academic degree of PhD or the refusal to accept public defense of the doctoral dissertation and passing to the Scientific Council of the institute an application for refusing awarding the academic degree of PhD;
 - 6) adopt a resolution concerning awarding a commendation to a doctoral dissertation.
3. The director of an appropriate institute or the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute or at least three other members of the Scientific Council of the institute present candidates for the position of a member of the doctoral commission.
4. The doctoral commission consists of:
- 1) the Chairman
 - 2) a supervisor or supervisors or a supervisor and an auxiliary supervisor;
 - 3) three reviewers;
 - 4) the remaining members of the commission meeting the requirements stipulated in section 5, provided that the number of members of the commission does not exceed nine members.
5. The member of the doctoral commission stipulated in section 4, point 4 can be a person employed at the University in the post of a professor, a university professor or holding the assistant professor academic degree, representing the primary discipline or the related discipline corresponding to the subject of the doctoral dissertation, falling under the same branch of science as the primary discipline.
6. Provisions of section 5 do not apply if the doctoral commission has not been appointed and the tasks of the doctoral commission determined by the resolution are carried out by the Scientific Council of the institute.

§22.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute posts the resolutions regarding appointing reviewers and the doctoral commission in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.

§23.

Immediately following adoption of the resolution concerning assigning reviewers and appointing the doctoral commission the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute:

- 1) delivers to the reviewers a transcripts of the resolution regarding appointing reviewers to their post along with the contract for preparing a review as well as a copy of the doctoral dissertation, the list of scientific achievements of the Candidate and copies of the declarations indicated in §19, section 7 of the resolution;
- 2) notifies the Chairman and members of the doctoral commission in writing of appointing them to their post and delivers to the Chairman and members of the doctoral commission copies of the doctoral dissertation, the list of scientific achievements of the Candidate and copies of the declarations indicated in §19, section 7 of the resolution.

§24

1. The review includes a detailed justification for the assessment of the doctoral dissertation regarding the dissertation meeting the requirements stipulated in the Act. In case of the doctoral dissertation being an independent and separate part of a joint publication the review includes assessment of the individual contribution of the Candidate to creation of this publication.
2. The reviewer sends the completed review to the science section of an appropriate institute in the form of a physical copy and a PDF file on a data carrier within two months from the date of receiving the doctoral dissertation for review. The director of an appropriate institute immediately notifies the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute of submission of the review.
3. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute immediately passes the reviews to the Chairman of the doctoral commission.
4. The doctoral commission adopts the resolution concerning completing the review within a set deadline if the review:
 - 1) does not include the conclusion regarding the reviewed dissertation meeting or not meeting the requirements stipulated in art. 187 sections 1-3 of the Act or the conclusion regarding admitting the dissertation into public defense;
 - 2) includes reviewer's conclusion indicating the need completing or correcting the dissertation but without indicating the manner in which the dissertation should be completed or corrected;
 - 3) includes other formal deficiencies including lack of consistency between the review and the conclusion regarding admitting the doctoral dissertation to public defense or the refusal to admit the doctoral dissertation to public defense. On the basis of the resolution adopted by the doctoral commission the Chairman of the doctoral commission turns to the reviewer with the application for completing the review within the deadline set and to the extent defined by the doctoral commission.
5. In case of the reviewer not meeting the deadline for preparing a review indicated in art. 190, section 3 of the Act the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute summons the reviewer to present the review immediately and sets a deadline no longer than 14 days counting from the date of delivering such summons. In the case of the reviewer not meeting this deadline the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute notifies the SEC of this fact.

§25.

1. A negative review may include a conclusion regarding the need for completing or correcting the doctoral dissertation.
2. Following receiving the review indicated in section 1 the Chairman of the doctoral commission immediately summons a sitting of the doctoral commission with the goal of adopting the resolution regarding expressing a permission for referring the doctoral dissertation to correction, consistently with the conclusion included in the review or the refusal to express a permission to this request.
3. In the resolution concerning expressing a permission for correcting the doctoral dissertation consistent with the conclusion included in the review the doctoral commission sets for the Candidate a deadline for completing or correcting the doctoral dissertation no longer than 6 months counting from the day of delivering the notification regarding the adopted resolution to the Candidate.
4. The Chairman of the doctoral commission notifies in writing the Candidate and the supervisor or supervisors or the supervisor and the auxiliary supervisor of the resolution stipulated in section 3 within 7 days counting from the date of adopting said resolution.
5. The Chairman of the doctoral commission passes the resolution indicated in section 3 to the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute who publishes the resolution in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.
6. The Candidate submits the corrected doctoral dissertation to the doctoral commission within the deadline set by the doctoral commission consistently with section 3.
7. Within 14 days from receiving the completed or corrected doctoral dissertation the Chairman of the doctoral commission passes the dissertation to the reviewers who prepare a review of the completed or corrected doctoral dissertation; the review includes the conclusion concerning the doctoral dissertation meeting the requirements stipulated in art. 187, section 1-3. The review is also presented to the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute.
8. The reviewers send to the Chairman of the doctoral commission physical copies and copies in the form of a PDF file on a data carrier of the reviews stipulated in section 7 within a month counting from the date of receiving a completed or corrected doctoral dissertation.
9. The reviewers do not receive a separate remuneration for preparing the review stipulated in section 7.

§26.

1. In order to be admitted to the public defense of a doctoral dissertation a Candidate has to:
 - 1) receive three positive reviews;
 - 2) receive two positive reviews and one negative review
2. No later than 30 days prior to the designated date of the defense of the doctoral dissertation the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute posts in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute the written doctoral dissertation along with its abstract or a transcript of the doctoral dissertation which is not a written work as well as reviews of the dissertation

§27.

1. Within 14 days from receiving the last review the Chairman of the doctoral commission summons a sitting of the doctoral commission with the goal of analyzing reviews and adopting the resolution concerning admitting the Candidate into public defense of the doctoral dissertation or the refusal to admit the Candidate into public defense of the doctoral dissertation and referring the case to the Scientific Council of the institute.
2. Following analyzing the reviews the doctoral commission adopts a resolution concerning admitting the Candidate into public defense of the doctoral dissertation or the refusal to admit the Candidate into public defense of the doctoral dissertation and referring the case to the Scientific Council of the institute.
3. In the case of adopting the resolution concerning admitting the Candidate into public defense of the doctoral dissertation the Chairman of the doctoral commission settles with members of the commission the date for public defense no sooner than after lapse of 21 days counting from the date of adoption of the resolution.
4. In the case of adopting the resolution concerning the refusal to admit the Candidate into public defense of the doctoral dissertation the Chairman of the doctoral commission passes the resolution to the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute along with the proceedings documentation with the goal of the Scientific Council of the institute adopting the resolution regarding the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD.
5. The resolution concerning the refusal to admit the Candidate to the public defense of the doctoral dissertation is delivered to the Candidate.
6. The Candidate can appeal against the resolution of the doctoral commission concerning the refusal to admit the Candidate into public defense of the doctoral dissertation to the SEC within 7 days from the date of delivering the resolution.

§28.

1. The sitting of the doctoral commission covering public defense of the doctoral dissertation is open.
2. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute informs of the place and date of the public defense of the doctoral dissertation by posting appropriate information in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.
3. Public defense of a doctoral dissertation can be carried out by using technical devices enabling conducting the defense remotely through simultaneous broadcast of images and sounds.
4. The doctoral commission can conduct the public defense of a doctoral dissertation in presence of at least half of members of the commission, including the Chairman and two reviewers.
5. The public defense of a doctoral dissertation consists of non-confidential and confidential part of the sitting.
6. The non-confidential part covers:

- 1) presentation of the scientific curriculum vitae of the Candidate by the supervisor or other person appointed by the Chairman of the doctoral commission;
- 2) presentation of the first-person narrative summary of the doctoral dissertation by the Candidate;
- 3) presentation of reviews of the doctoral dissertation by reviewers or, in case of absence of the reviewers, by a member of the doctoral commission appointed by the Chairman of the doctoral commission;
- 4) a discussion concerning the doctoral dissertation;
- 5) a response of the Candidate to the presented reviews of the doctoral dissertation as well as answering questions posed during the discussion concerning the doctoral dissertation.

7. Persons present during this part of the sitting can participate in the discussion stipulated in section 6, point 4. During discussion questions substantively related to the contents of the dissertation can be asked and polemical views can be presented.

8. The scientific discussion is led by the Chairman of the doctoral commission.

§29.

1. Following conclusion of the non-confidential part of the public defense the doctoral commission performs a detailed assessment of its progress and the deliberations of the doctoral commission during this part of the sitting are confidential and closed. The assessment should in particular refer to the knowledge of the Candidate regarding the science discipline under which the degree is awarded, the answers to posed questions, the ability to formulate and defend own views and the skills related to engaging in scientific polemics. The conducted assessment constitutes a justification for the resolution of the doctoral commission regarding accepting or refusing to accept public defense.
2. Following assessment the doctoral commission adopts the resolution regarding accepting the public defense and passing to the Scientific Council of the institute the application for awarding the academic degree of PhD or the refusal to accept the public defense and passing to the Scientific Council of the institute the application for refusing awarding the academic degree of PhD.
3. Within 14 days from adopting the resolution indicated in section 2 the Chairman of the doctoral commission passes the resolution along with the documentation regarding sittings of the doctoral commission to the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute.

§30.

1. Following adopting the resolution concerning accepting public defense of the doctoral dissertation and passing to the Scientific Council of the institute the application concerning awarding the academic degree of PhD the doctoral commission may on the basis of progress of the public defense and the application for commending the doctoral dissertation included in at least two reviews adopt the resolution concerning commending the doctoral dissertation.
2. The Chairman of the doctoral commission passes the resolution indicated in section 1 along with the justification to the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute within 14 days from adopting the resolution.

§31.

1. Following receiving the resolution concerning accepting the public defense and submitting to the Scientific Council of the institute the application concerning awarding the academic degree of PhD or concerning the refusal to accept public defense and passing to the scientific council of the institute the application concerning the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD the Chairman of the scientific council of the institute immediately summons a sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute with the goal of adopting the resolution concerning awarding or the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD.
2. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute notifies in writing the Candidate and the members of the habilitation commission who are not members of the institute of the date of the sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute in.
3. The members of doctoral commission, including reviewers, who are not members of the scientific council of the institute can participate without the right to vote in the sitting of the scientific council of the institute concerning awarding or the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD.
4. Members of the habilitation commission who are not members of the Scientific Council of the institute can participate without the right to vote in the sitting of the scientific council of the institute concerning awarding or the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD.
5. The Scientific Council of the institute adopts the resolution concerning awarding or the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD.
6. The Chairman of the scientific council of the institute passes the resolution stipulated in section 5 to the Candidate and posts it in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.
7. The Scientific Council of the institute adopts the resolution concerning commending the doctoral dissertation consistently with §30, section 1 of the Act directly following adoption of the resolution concerning awarding the academic degree of PhD. This resolution is posted by the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.

§32.

1. The Candidate can appeal through the scientific council of the institute to the SEC against the resolution concerning the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD within 30 days from the date of delivering the resolution.
2. The Scientific Council of the institute passes the appeal along with its opinion and proceedings files to the SEC within three months from the date of lodging the appeal.
3. Members of the doctoral commission who are not members of the Scientific Council of the institute, including reviewers, can participate without the right to vote in the sitting of the scientific council of the institute summoned with the goal of expressing the opinion on Candidate's appeal against the resolution concerning the refusal to award the academic degree of PhD.

§33.

1. A supervisor, an auxiliary supervisor and a reviewer in the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of PhD are entitled to a non-recurring remuneration.
2. The amount of the remuneration and the regulations for paying the remuneration stipulated in section 1 are determined by the agreement concluded between the University and, respectively, a supervisor, an auxiliary supervisor and a reviewer.

Chapter 3

Regulations for awarding the academic degree of PhD jointly

§34.

1. The academic degree of PhD can be awarded by the University jointly with other universities, institutions of the Polish Academy of Sciences, research institutes and international institutes in the discipline in which each of these institutions has A+, A or B+ category, including awarding the degree jointly with foreign entities holding the right to award the academic degree of PhD in the discipline in which the degree is awarded.
2. Rector concludes a written agreement with the entity with which the academic degree of PhD is to be awarded jointly. The agreement determines the rules of cooperation, in particular the manner in which the level 8 PQF learning outcomes are to be confirmed, an appropriate procedure for the proceedings concerning awarding the academic degree, the entity responsible for entering the data into the system stipulated in art. 342, section 1 of the Act, the template for the doctoral diploma as well as the manner in which costs of the proceedings are borne, including the costs of translating documentation into a foreign language by a sworn translator.

Chapter 4

The procedure for verification of the level 8 PQF learning outcomes

§35.

1. Verification of the level 8 PQF learning outcomes pertains to persons applying for awarding the academic degree of PhD pursuant to the mode determined in art. 217 of the act, hereinafter - the extramural mode.
2. The details for organization of the proceedings for verifying the level 8 PQF learning outcomes are determined by the Senate by way of adopting a resolution.

§36.

1. The tasks related to verification and confirming of the learning outcomes are performed at the University by the learning outcomes verification commissions, hereinafter "the verification commissions".
2. The verification commissions are appointed by the director of the Doctoral School of the US for one or two disciplines, as required, in a composition consisting of at least five persons.

3. The composition of the verification commission includes: a member of the Scientific Council of the Doctoral School of the US as the Chairman, the director or the deputy director of the Doctoral School, academic teachers with the academic title of at least a professor or the academic degree of assistant professor and the manager of the Education Quality Assurance Department of the University of Szczecin or an employee of this department authorized by Rector.

Chapter 5

Proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor

§37.

1. The tasks within the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor are carried out by the Scientific Council of the institute or the habilitation commission.

2. The habilitation commission stipulated in section 1 has the right to:

- 1) adopt a resolution regarding completing a review;
- 2) carry out a postdoctoral examination;
- 3) adopt a resolution including a positive opinion regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor or a resolution including a negative opinion regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.

§38.

A person applying for awarding the academic degree of the assistant professor submits through the SEC to the University acting in the capacity of the entity carrying out the habilitation proceedings the application regarding initiating proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor; the application must meet the criteria stipulated in art. 220, section 2 of the Act and include:

- 1) a cover application;
- 2) personal details of the Applicant;
- 3) a copy of the document confirming obtaining the academic degree of PhD.
- 4) a summary of professional accomplishments presenting progress of professional career and significant scientific or arts activities realized in more than one university, scientific institution or institution of culture, in particular in a foreign institution, along with copies of documents confirming specific achievements, including the documents related to scientific internships, grants, publications created as a result of performing studies in more than one scientific unit;
- 5) a list of the scientific and art achievements, which present a major contribution to development of a particular discipline.

§39.

1. Following receiving the application for initiating the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor the Chairman of the scientific council of the institute immediately summons a sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute with the goal of adopting the resolution regarding expressing a permission for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor or the refusal to carry out the proceedings regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.
2. The scientific council of the institute adopts the resolution stipulated in section 1 within four weeks from the date of receiving the application for initiating the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.
3. The Chairman of the scientific council of the institute posts the resolution stipulated in section 1 in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.
4. In the case of the Scientific Council of the institute adopting the resolution concerning permission for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute, within the deadline indicated in art. 221, section 2 of the act, passes this resolution to the SEC and applies to the SEC for initiating the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.
5. In case of adoption of the resolution regarding the permission for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute passes to the SEC the information concerning the University undertaking to carry out the postdoctoral proceedings, notifies the candidate of the initiation of the postdoctoral proceedings and delivers to the Candidate or the entity employing the Candidate the agreement concerning the amount and the conditions for paying the fee for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.
6. In the instance of passing the application for the postdoctoral proceedings consistently with art. 221, section 3 of the act the provisions indicated in sections 1-5 do not apply and the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute immediately following receiving this application notifies the Candidate of initiation of the postdoctoral proceedings and delivers to the Candidate or the entity employing the Candidate the agreement concerning the amount and the conditions for paying the fee for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.
7. In the instance of carrying out the postdoctoral proceedings the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute posts the application stipulated in §38 of the resolution in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.

§40.

1. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute summons a sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute within the deadline of six weeks, indicated in art. 221, section 5 of the act, with the goal of selecting members of the habilitation commission, appointed into the composition of the commission by the Scientific Council of the institute, including a reviewer, and appointing the habilitation commission.

2. The candidates for the position of a member of the habilitation commission are put forward by the director of the institute or the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute or at least three other members of the Scientific Council of the institute.
3. A member of the habilitation commission cannot be a person to whom justified doubts arise regarding impartiality, particularly a person who:
 - 1) remains in a legal or factual relationship which could result in the results of the proceedings influencing rights and obligations of the reviewer or the factual situation of the member of the habilitation commission
 - 2) is related to the Candidate by way of relationship or direct affinity up to the second degree;
 - 3) was a reviewer in previous proceedings if the Candidate previously applied for the academic degree of assistant professor;
 - 4) shares professional dependency or relationship with the Candidate;
 - 5) is a co-author of a publication created by the Candidate;
 - 6) conducts scientific work in scientific institutions jointly with the candidate
 - 7) is a member of the same research teams as the Candidate.
4. The guidelines stipulated in section 3 apply accordingly also to the relationships between members of the habilitation commission who furthermore cannot represent the same university or the same research institute or the same science and research institute.
5. A reviewer cannot be a person who over the last five years missed the deadline stipulated in art. 222, section 8 of the act twice.
6. Following adopting the resolutions concerning selecting members of the habilitation commission designated by the Scientific Council of the institute the Scientific Council adopts the resolution concerning appointing the habilitation commission in its full composition.
7. The chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute posts the resolution concerning appointing the habilitation commission in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.

§41.

1. Following appointment of the habilitation commission the Candidate submits to the chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute 8 sets of documentation in a physical form and in the form of a PDF file saved on a data carrier medium.
2. The chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute:
 - 1) notifies reviewers in writing of their appointment into the habilitation commission and delivers to the reviewers the set of documentation specified in section 1, including the application specified in §38 of the resolution along with the contract for preparing a review with the goal of preparing a review;
 - 2) notifies in writing the chairman and the remaining members of the habilitation commission of their appointment and delivers to the chairman and the remaining members of the habilitation commission the set of documents specified in section 1, including the application

specified in §38 of the resolution along with the contract determining the amount and the conditions for paying the remuneration for participation in the works of the habilitation commission.

§42.

1. The review in the postdoctoral proceedings includes a detailed and justified assessment of the Candidate meeting the obligations indicated in art. 219 of the Act.
2. The reviewer sends the completed review to the science section of an appropriate institute in the physical form and in the form of a PDF file on a data carrier within eight weeks from the day of receiving the application stipulated in §38 of the resolution. The director of the appropriate institute immediately notifies the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute of submission of the review.
3. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute immediately passes the review to the chairman of the habilitation commission.
4. The habilitation commission adopts the resolution concerning completing the review, and sets for the reviewer a deadline of one month for completing the review if the submitted review:
 - 1) does not include a conclusion regarding whether the scientific achievements of the person applying for the academic degree of assistant professor meet the requirements indicated in art. 219 section 1, point 2 of the Act;
 - 2) includes other formal lapses.

On the basis of the resolution adopted by the habilitation commission the chairman of the habilitation commission turns to the reviewer with the application for completing the review within the deadline of one month counting from the day of delivering the application.

5. In the instance of the reviewer missing the deadline for preparing the review indicated in art. 221, section 8 of the Act the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute summons the reviewer to immediately present the review and sets a deadline of longer than fourteen days from the date of delivering said summons. In case of the reviewer missing also this deadline the chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute notifies the SEC of this fact.
6. In case of a delay in preparing the review by the reviewer appointed by the SEC exceeding one month the chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute may apply to the SEC for dismissing this person from the function and for appointing a new reviewer. The person dismissed is not entitled to remuneration due for preparing a review.
7. The chairman of the habilitation commission passes the received reviews to the Secretary of the commission; the Secretary posts these reviews in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.

§43.

1. Within 14 days from the date of receiving the last review the chairman of the habilitation commission summons a sitting of the habilitation commission with the goal of analyzing reviews and opinions of the remaining members of the habilitation commission.

2. The habilitation commission may carry out the postdoctoral examination regarding scientific or artistic achievements of the Candidate regardless of the character of the conclusion included in the review referring to the candidate meeting or failing to meet the requirements stipulated in art. 219, section 1, points 2 and 3 of the Act. The postdoctoral examination is obligatory in the instance of scientific achievements in the field of humanities, social sciences and theological sciences.

3. The candidate is notified of the place and date of the postdoctoral examination in writing at least 14 days prior to the planned date of the postdoctoral examination.

§44.

1. The following course for the postdoctoral examination is being set:

- 1) presentation of the scientific achievement by the candidate;
- 2) presentation of the principal theses of the reviews submitted under the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor;
- 3) questions of members of the habilitation commission;
- 4) discussion.

2. Members of the Scientific Council of the institute who are not members of the habilitation commission can participate in the postdoctoral examination as observers in addition to members of the habilitation commission.

3. The subject of the discussion in particular consist in the scientific findings of the Candidate under Candidate's scientific achievements indicated in the application for initiating the postdoctoral proceedings as well as other topical issues of the nodal character in regards to the discipline under which the Candidate applies for the academic degree of assistant professor.

4. The discussion is led by the Chairman of the habilitation commission.

5. Following the discussion the habilitation commission holds a council only for members of the commission.

§45.

No later than within 6 weeks from the date of receiving the last review the habilitation commission adopts the resolution including a positive opinion regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor or the resolution including a negative opinion regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.

§46.

1. Immediately following conclusion of the sitting of the habilitation commission the Chairman of the commission passes to the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute the resolution including the opinion regarding awarding the academic degree of assistant professor along with a justification and proceedings documentation.

2. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute posts the resolution of the habilitation commission stipulated in section 1 in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.

§47.

1. Immediately following receiving the resolution stipulated in §46 the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute summons a meeting of the Scientific Council of the institute. Within one month from receiving the resolution of the habilitation commission the Scientific Council of the institute awards or refuses to award the academic degree of assistant professor.
2. The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute notifies in writing the Candidate and members of the habilitation commission who are not members of the Scientific Council of the institute of the date of the sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute.
3. The sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute is held without presence of the Candidate. The Candidate participates only in the part of the sitting of the Scientific Council of the institute related to announcing the results of voting on the subject of awarding or the refusal to award the academic degree of assistant professor.
4. Members of the habilitation commission who are not members of the Scientific Council of the institute can participate without the right to vote in the sitting of the scientific council of the institute concerning awarding or the refusal to award the academic degree of assistant professor.

§48.

The Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute immediately delivers the resolution of the Scientific Council of the institute concerning awarding or the refusal to award the academic degree of assistant professor to the Candidate and posts the resolution in the Public Information Bulletin and on the website of an appropriate institute.

§49.

1. The Candidate can appeal against the resolution concerning the refusal to award the academic degree of assistant professor to the SEC through the Scientific Council of the institute within 30 days from the date of delivering the resolution.
2. The Scientific Council of the institute passes the appeal along with its opinion and proceedings files to the SEC within three months from the date of lodging the appeal.
3. Members of the habilitation commission who are not members of the Scientific Council of the institute can participate without the right to vote in the sitting of the Scientific Council summoned with the goal of expressing opinion on Candidate's appeal against the resolution concerning the refusal to award the academic degree of assistant professor.

§50.

1. For participation in works of the habilitation commission a member of the habilitation commission receives a non-recurring remuneration.
2. The amount of the remuneration and the conditions for payment of the remuneration of a habilitation commission member are determined by the agreement concluded between the University and a member of the habilitation commission.

Chapter 6

Fees for carrying out the proceedings for awarding an academic degree

§51.

1. The university charges fees for:
 - 1) carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD consistently with the mode stipulated in art. 217 of the Act;
 - 2) carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor.
2. The amount of the fee and the detailed conditions, including the deadline for making the payment for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD, are determined in the agreement concluded between the University and the Candidate immediately after notifying the Candidate of initiation of said proceedings. If this fee is being paid by the entity employing the Candidate the agreement stipulating the amount of the fee and the detailed conditions for making the payment is concluded between the University and this entity.
3. The amount of the fee and the detailed conditions for payment, including the deadline for making the payment for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor, are determined by the agreement between the University and the Candidate concluded immediately after notifying the Candidate of initiation of said proceedings. If this fee is being paid by the entity employing the Candidate the agreement stipulating the amount and the detailed conditions for making the payment is concluded between the University and this entity.
4. The fee stipulated in section 1 is not collected from a person applying for awarding the academic degree of PhD who:
 - 1) is employed full-time at the University;
 - 2) completed education in the Doctoral School of the US;
 - 3) realized the programme of the doctoral studies at the University of Szczecin initiated prior to academic year 2019/2020 and submitted the doctoral dissertation within the deadline consistent with the deadline stipulated in the regulations for doctoral studies.
5. Collecting the fee stipulated in section 1, point 1 can be waived in the case of a person who begun doctoral studies prior to academic year 2019/2020 and submitted the doctoral dissertation consistently with the regulations for doctoral studies even if prior to initiation of the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD such person has been expunged from the list of postgraduate students. The decision in this matter is being made by the Vice-Rector for Research upon the application submitted by the person applying for awarding the academic degree of PhD following examining the opinion of the director of an appropriate institute and an authorized representative for students' affairs.
6. A person applying for awarding an academic degree can appeal against the decision of the Vice-Rector for Research stipulated in section 5 and apply to Rector for re-examining the case within 14 days from the date of delivering the decision.

7. The person applying for awarding an academic degree can submit the application for paying the fee in installments to the Vice-Rector for Research through the director of an appropriate institute. The application must include a justification. The Vice-Rector, in making decision and taking the application into consideration, determines the number of installments and sets deadlines for making payment; the payment is paid in advance and the installment covering the costs of the remuneration for preparing reviews must be paid no later than within 14 days from the date of the Scientific Council of the institute adopting the resolutions concerning appointing reviewers for the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD or appointing the habilitation commission in the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor and the last installment must be paid no later than within 3 days prior to the date of public doctoral dissertation defense or the date of the postdoctoral examination in the postdoctoral proceedings.

8. The person applying for awarding an academic degree who is in a particularly difficult financial situation can apply to the Vice-Rector for Research through the director of an appropriate institute for redeeming a part of the fee. The application must include a justification and if the application is submitted by the person stipulated in section 5 it must also include an opinion of the authorized representative for doctoral studies. In making the decision and examining the application the Vice-Rector determines the final amount of the fee due; the Vice-rector may also agree to paying the fee in instalments without redeeming the fee in consideration of the provisions regarding making payment in advance stipulated in section 7. A combination of partial redemption and splitting the fee into installments is also allowable

9. A person applying for awarding an academic degree can appeal against the decision of the Vice-Rector for Research stipulated in sections 7 and 8 to Rector and submit the application for re-examining the case within 14 days from the date of delivering the decision.

§52.

1. The fee for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD, consistently with the mode stipulated in art. 217 of the Act, is three times the base monthly salary of a professor employed at a public university stipulated in art. 137 of the Act determined as of the date of submitting the application by a person applying for awarding the academic degree of PhD and is paid in advance within the deadlines indicated in the agreement stipulated in §51, section 2 of the Resolution.

2. The fee determined in section 1 in particular covers the costs of remuneration of the thesis supervisor, the costs of remunerations of three reviewers as well as the costs related to direct participation of persons from outside the University in the defense of the doctoral dissertation.

3. In the case of appointing an auxiliary supervisor the fee for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of PhD consistently with the mode stipulated in art. 217 of the Act is three and a half times the basic monthly salary of a professor employed at a public university stipulated in art. 137 of the Act determined as of the date of submitting the application by a person applying for awarding the academic degree of PhD and is paid in advance within the deadlines indicated in the agreement stipulated in §51, section 2 of the resolution.

4. The fee determined in section 3 covers costs of remuneration for the supervisor, the auxiliary supervisor, three reviewers as well as the costs related to direct participation of persons from outside the university in defense of the doctoral dissertation.
5. The fee for carrying out the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor is four times the basic monthly salary of a professor employed at a public university stipulated in art. 137 of the Act, determined as of the date of submitting the application through the SEC by a person applying for awarding the academic degree of assistant professor and is paid in advance within the deadlines indicated in the agreement stipulated in §51, section 3 of the Act.
6. The fee determined in section 5 covers the costs of remuneration of four reviewers, costs of remuneration of 7 members of the habilitation commission, including the Chairman and the Secretary, as well as the costs related to direct participation of persons from outside the University in sittings of the habilitation commission.
7. In the instance of a need for translating documents into Polish language or participation of an interpreter in sittings of the scientific council of the institute, the doctoral commission or the habilitation commission or under other tasks the fee stipulated in sections 1, 3 and 5 is increased by a half of the basic monthly salary of a professor employed at a public university stipulated in art. 137 of the Act determined as of the date of submitting the application by a person applying for awarding an academic degree.

§53.

1. To the proceedings for awarding an academic degree initiated and not concluded prior to this resolution coming into effect the provisions of the resolution apply in consideration of sections 2-5.
2. The resolutions of the Scientific Council of the institute, the habilitation commission and the doctoral commission as well as the actions taken by the Chairman of the Scientific Council of the institute, the chairman of the habilitation commission and the chairman of the doctoral commission adopted or taken prior to this resolution coming into effect remain binding.
3. The doctoral commission and the habilitation commission appointed prior to this resolution coming into effect continue to work in the existing composition.
4. The fees for carrying out the proceedings for awarding an academic degree initiated and not concluded prior to this resolution coming into effect are charged in the previously determined amount.
5. To the fees stipulated in section 4 the provisions of §51, sections 4-9 apply accordingly.
6. The ordinances of Rector issued on the basis of resolution no. 99/2019 of the Senate of the University of Szczecin of 11th of July 2019 concerning detailed regulations for carrying out the proceedings for awarding academic degrees remain in power in the areas not contradictory to this resolution until new ordinances are issued on the basis of this resolution.

§54.

The resolution no. 99/2019 of the Senate of the University of Szczecin of 11th of July 2019
Regarding the detailed regulations for carrying out the proceedings for awarding academic
degrees is null and void.

§55.

This resolution comes into force on the date of its adoption.