

REGULATION
OF THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE ¹⁾

of 27 September 2021

on the evaluation of the quality of education at doctoral schools

Pursuant to Art. 263 of the Act of 20 July 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws of 2021, items 478, 619 and 1630), the following is ordered:

§ 1. The Regulation specifies:

- 1) detailed criteria for evaluating the quality of education at doctoral schools, hereinafter referred to as "evaluation";
- 2) the manner of carrying out the evaluation.

§ 2. Detailed evaluation criteria in the scope of:

- 1) the adequacy of the curriculum and individual research plans to the learning outcomes for qualifications at level 8 of the Polish Qualifications Framework, hereinafter referred to as "PQF", and their implementation are:
 - a) the adequacy of the learning outcomes specified in the curriculum to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
 - b) the adequacy of the scientific or artistic work of doctoral students and the dissemination of its results, specified in individual research plans, to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
 - c) the manner of implementing the curriculum and individual research plans in order to achieve learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
 - d) the manner of implementing the interdisciplinarity of the education process in order to achieve learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,
 - e) reliability of the process of improving the curriculum, aimed at improving its adequacy to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8;
- 2) the manner of verifying the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8 are:
 - a) accessibility and clarity of the rules for verifying learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8,

¹⁾ The Minister of Education and Science manages a section of the state administration – higher education and science pursuant to § 1 sec. 2 point 2 of the Regulation of the Prime Minister of 20 October 2020 on detailed scope of the responsibilities of the Minister of Education and Science (Journal of Laws items 1848 and 2335).

- b) transparency and reliability of the learning outcome verification process for qualifications at PQF level 8,
 - c) reliability of the process of improving the manner of verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8;
- 3) qualifications of academic teachers or academic staff² working at a doctoral school are:
- a) the adequacy of the scientific or artistic achievements and professional achievements as well as scientific or artistic work and professional work of these persons to the scope of doctoral education provided,
 - b) the quality of work for the professional development of these persons, in particular when acting as a supervisor or assistant supervisor, undertaken by these persons and by an entity running doctoral schools, hereinafter referred to as the "entity",
 - c) the reliability of the actions taken by the entity to verify the qualifications of these persons;
- 4) the quality of the recruitment process are:
- a) the quality and availability of information and internal legal acts concerning the operation of doctoral schools,
 - b) the accessibility, unambiguity and openness of the rules of recruitment to doctoral schools and the timely publication of these rules,
 - c) the manner of conducting the competition referred to in Art. 200 sec. 2 of the Act of July 20, 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science, hereinafter referred to as "the Act",
 - d) the manner of taking into account the needs of the disabled in the recruitment process,
 - e) the manner of verifying the aptitude of candidates for doctoral schools to do research,
 - f) reliability of measures taken by the entity to improve the recruitment process;

² The term "academic staff" within the meaning of *the Act on Research Institutes* and *the Act on the Polish Academy of Sciences*.

- 5) the quality of scientific or artistic guidance as well as support in research are:
 - a) criteria and the manner of appointing and changing the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor,
 - b) manners of providing doctoral students with high-quality cooperation with their supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, including resolving conflict situations between the doctoral student and the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor,
 - c) manners of providing doctoral students, including doctoral students with disabilities and doctoral students who are parents, with suitable conditions and support in the implementation of the curriculum and individual research plans, as well as in the preparation of doctoral dissertations, including ensuring access to the necessary infrastructure,
 - d) degree of involvement of outstanding specialists employed outside the entity in activities supporting doctoral students in their research, including scientific or artistic supervision of doctoral students,
 - e) reliability of verification and evaluation of the work of supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, as well as measures taken by the entity to improve the quality of their work;
- 6) the reliability of the mid-term assessment are:
 - a) the selection of criteria and objective rules for conducting this assessment, as well as the availability and unambiguity of these criteria and rules,
 - b) the composition and competences of the body carrying out this assessment,
 - c) timeliness and manner of carrying out this assessment,
 - d) the reliability of the measures taken by the entity to improve the process of carrying out this assessment;
- 7) internationalisation are:
 - a) the degree of internationalisation of the staff, including scientific or artistic mobility and activity in the international environment of academic teachers or researchers teaching at doctoral schools,
 - b) the degree of internationalisation of the education process at doctoral schools and the scientific activity of doctoral students, in particular conducted on the basis of individual research plans, including scientific or artistic mobility of doctoral students,
 - c) the manner of taking into account the needs of doctoral students who are foreigners in the education process at doctoral schools,
 - d) manners of increasing the recognition of doctoral schools abroad and their effectiveness;

- 8) the effectiveness of doctoral education are:
- a) timely completion of education at doctoral schools in accordance with the curriculum,
 - b) the percentage of people who obtained a doctoral degree after completing education at a given doctoral school in the total number of doctoral students who completed their education at this doctoral school in the period covered by the evaluation,
 - c) the level of scientific or artistic achievements of doctoral students, in particular those related to scientific or artistic work specified in the individual research plan,
 - d) assessing the quality of education at doctoral schools by doctoral students, the results of this assessment and how the results are used by the entity to improve the education process,
 - e) the manner of using the results of the monitoring of professional careers of those who completed their education at a given doctoral school and those who obtained a doctoral degree after completing education at such a doctoral school.

§ 3. 1. The Science Evaluation Committee, hereinafter referred to as the "Committee", conducts the evaluation in accordance with the schedule established for a given year and published in the Public Information Bulletin, hereinafter referred to as "BIP", on the website of the minister responsible for higher education and science, hereinafter referred to as "minister".

2. The chairman of the Committee will notify the entity of the commencement of the evaluation.

3. In the notification referred to in sec. 2, the chairman of the Committee:

- 1) calls on the entity to submit the self-assessment report referred to in Art. 262 sec. 1 of the Act, within 12 weeks from the date of receipt of the notification;
- 2) indicates the planned date of the inspection referred to in Art. 262 sec. 1 of the Act, and its duration.

4. In cases justified by circumstances beyond the control of the entity, the chairman of the Committee may, at the request of the entity, extend the time limit referred to in sec. 3 point 1, or change the date of the inspection or its duration indicated in accordance with sec. 3 point 2.

5. In particularly justified cases, the chairman of the Committee may, on his/her own initiative, extend the time limit referred to in sec. 3 point 1, or change the date of the inspection or its duration indicated in accordance with sec. 3 point 2.

§ 4. 1. The self-assessment report:

- 1) must be written in accordance with the guidelines given by the Committee and published in the BIP on the minister's website;

- 2) must contain information:
 - a) enabling evaluation based on the criteria referred to in Art. 261 of the Act and the detailed criteria referred to in § 2,
 - b) about changes in doctoral schools improving the quality of education introduced after the last evaluation;
- 3) must be submitted in the ICT system indicated in the BIP on the minister's website, hereinafter referred to as the "system".

2. The following must be submitted together with the self-assessment report:

- 1) the rules of recruitment to doctoral schools and the regulations of doctoral schools in Polish and English in force during the period covered by the evaluation;
- 2) statements about:
 - a) compliance of the information contained with the factual and legal status,
 - b) factual correspondence of:
 - information contained in Polish and English,
 - documents referred to in point 1, in Polish and English.

3. In the event of discrepancies between the Polish and the English versions in the self-assessment report, the basis for the assessment of doctoral schools is English version.

4. The self-assessment report and the statements referred to in sec. 2 point 2 must be signed by the person in charge of the entity or a person authorised by him/her. The authorisation must be submitted with the self-assessment report. The authorisation may also cover the measures referred to in § 6 sec. 1 point 1 and sec. 2.

5. The entity may be requested to provide explanations or additional information regarding the self-assessment report or documents referred to in sec. 2 point 1.

6. Explanations or additional information regarding the self-assessment report or documents referred to in sec. 2 point 1 must be submitted:

- 1) in the system;
- 2) within 14 days from the date of receipt of the summons;
- 3) in Polish and English.

§ 5. 1. The chairman of the Committee:

- 1) appoints an evaluation team consisting of 4 to 7 persons referred to in Art. 259 sec. 4 of the Act;
- 2) appoints from among the members of the evaluation team:
 - a) the chairman of this team from the members of the Committee,

b) the secretary of this team.

2. Members of the evaluation team submit statements to the chairman of the Committee on:

- 1) their fluency in English;
- 2) their determination to:
 - a) act impartially in the public interest,
 - b) not to use the information obtained during the evaluation for purposes other than the evaluation and not to share such information with anyone other than members of the Committee who are not members of the evaluation team.

3. An entity may submit a request to the chairman of the Committee to exclude an indicated member of the evaluation team, providing justification.

§ 6. 1. Prior to an inspection, the chairman of the evaluation team:

- 1) arranges the schedule of the inspection with the person in charge of an entity or a person authorised by him/her;
- 2) may call the entity to share in the system the indicated documents concerning the operation of a given doctoral school, necessary to conduct the evaluation, other than those listed in § 4 sec. 2 point 1, indicating the date when they must be shared, no fewer than 7 days from the date of the call.

2. During the inspection, the person in charge of an entity or a person authorised by him/her, at the request of the chairman of the evaluation team:

- 1) shares documents concerning the operation of the doctoral school other than those listed in § 4 sec. 2 point 1 and shared in accordance with sec. 1 point 2, essential to carry out the evaluation;
- 2) provides information and explanations on matters relating to the conducted evaluation;
- 3) enables the members of the evaluation team:
 - a) to hold individual or group meetings with the bodies of the entity, persons responsible for education at the doctoral school, doctoral students and their supervisors and assistant supervisors, as well as persons responsible for the administration of a given doctoral school,
 - b) access to premises, teaching and research infrastructure used to conduct education at a given doctoral school;
- 4) provides the members of the evaluation team with premises and equipment essential to conduct the evaluation.

3. In the case of temporary:

- 1) restrictions in the education of doctoral students referred to in Art. 198a of the Act, the inspection may be carried out with the use of IT technologies ensuring control and recording of its course;
- 2) suspension of doctoral education referred to in Art. 198a of the Act, the inspection is not carried out during this suspension or it is withheld for the duration of this suspension; provisions of § 3 sec. 5 apply accordingly.

§ 7. 1. After reviewing the self-assessment report and after completing the inspection, the evaluation team prepares an evaluation report which:

- 1) includes an analysis of the quality of education at a given doctoral school on the basis of the criteria referred to in Art. 261 of the Act and the detailed criteria referred to in § 2;
- 2) may contain recommendations for the entity regarding the improvement of the quality of education at a given doctoral school.

2. The evaluation report shall be written in Polish and English. In case of discrepancies between the Polish and the English versions in the evaluation report, the basis for the evaluation of a given doctoral school is the English version.

3. The evaluation team makes the evaluation report available in the system to the entity.

4. The entity may submit comments to the evaluation report:

- 1) in Polish and English;
- 2) using the system;
- 3) within 14 days from the date of its receipt.

5. After considering the comments referred to in sec. 4, the evaluation team may introduce changes to the evaluation report.

§ 8. 1. After determining the final version of the evaluation report, the evaluation team evaluates a given doctoral school.

2. In the case of a negative evaluation of a given doctoral school, the evaluation team prepares a justification.

3. In the case of a positive evaluation of a given doctoral school, the evaluation team may prepare a justification containing a recommendation as to the date of the next evaluation, however, this period may not be shorter than 2 years from the date on which the resolution of the Committee referred to in Art. 262 sec. 2 of the Act, hereinafter referred to as the "resolution", has become final.

4. The evaluation of a given doctoral school and the justification for this evaluation must be written in Polish and English.

5. The chairman of the evaluation team submits the evaluation of a given doctoral school together with the evaluation report to the chairman of the Committee before the Committee adopts a resolution.

§ 9. 1. The Committee must adopt a resolution not later than at the second meeting convened after the date of submission by the evaluation team of the documents referred to in § 8 sec. 5.

2. The chairman of the Committee must submit the resolution to the entity together with the final version of the evaluation report.

3. Within 7 days from the day when the resolution becomes final, the minister and the entity must publish the resolution in the BIP on their websites together with the evaluation report and self-assessment report in Polish and English.

§ 10. In case of doctoral schools referred to in Art. 198 sec. 5 of the Act:

- 1) The Committee must send the notification referred to in § 3 sec. 2, to the entity entitled to receive funds for joint education at doctoral schools;
- 2) requests referred to in § 3 sec. 4 and § 5 sec. 3, must be submitted by the entity referred to in point 1;
- 3) the self-assessment report and the statements referred to in § 4 sec. 2 point 2 must be signed by the person in charge of the entity referred to in point 1, or a person authorised by him/her;
- 4) measures referred to in § 6 sec. 1 point 1 and sec. 2 point 1 and 2, must be taken by the person managing the entity referred to in point 1, or a person authorised by them;
- 5) measures referred to in § 6 sec. 2 point 3 and 4 must be taken by persons managing each of the entities jointly running doctoral schools or by persons authorised by them;
- 6) comments referred to in § 7 sec. 4 must be signed by the person in charge of the entity referred to in point 1, or a person authorised by him/her;
- 7) documents referred to in § 9 sec. 2 must be provided to each of the entities jointly running doctoral schools;
- 8) documents referred to in § 9 sec. 3 must be published by each of the entities jointly running doctoral schools.

§ 11. In the case of the first evaluation at a given doctoral school, the self-assessment report does not contain the information referred to in § 4 sec. 1 point 2 (b).

§ 12. The Regulation comes into force within 14 days from the date of its announcement.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

JUSTIFICATION

The Regulation of the Minister of Education and Science on the evaluation of the quality of education at doctoral schools constitutes the implementation of the statutory authorisation contained in Art. 263 of the Act of 20 July 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 478, as amended), hereinafter referred to as the "Act". Pursuant to the authorising provision, the minister in charge of higher education and science shall specify, by way of a regulation, detailed criteria for the evaluation of the quality of education at a given doctoral school, hereinafter referred to as "evaluation", and the manner in which it is carried out, having regard to the specific nature of education at a given doctoral school.

Evaluation is one of the key elements of the new system of higher education and science, regulated by law. Evaluation is primarily used to:

- 1) assess the conditions for scientific or artistic development that have been created for doctoral students at doctoral schools, and the manners of verifying the knowledge and skills acquired by doctoral students, as well as the social competences they have developed;
- 2) provide entities running doctoral schools, hereinafter referred to as "entities", with feedback on the operation of these schools, as well as disseminate such information in the public space;
- 3) allow to run doctoral schools only the entities which guarantee doctoral students suitable conditions for scientific or artistic development.

Due to the diverse nature of education at doctoral schools, resulting from their different organisational structure, as well as from the diversity of scientific or artistic disciplines in which this education is provided, or from different ideas for implementing the mission of doctoral schools, resulting from the autonomy of the entities - while drafting this Regulation, the focus was on creating the basis for the experts carrying out the evaluation to learn about the mechanisms and area of operation of a given doctoral school and to enable its evaluation adequately to its field. The above would not be possible by defining a uniform, quantitative evaluation framework for all doctoral schools. Therefore, the content of the Regulation does not contain detailed criteria based on quantitative indicators, but rather focuses on identifying areas that should be subject to qualitative assessment, based on international standards and expert knowledge of persons conducting the evaluation. Thanks to this, the process will present an individualised, qualitative approach and expert character, which will correlate with the specific features of education at a given doctoral school.

The provisions of the Regulation were developed with the participation of experts from the Science Evaluation Committee, hereinafter referred to as the "Committee", in particular based on its resolutions on evaluation and on guidelines on how to conduct it.

It should be emphasised that the entity, which has the appropriate qualifications to establish doctoral schools, is fully responsible for the quality of education at such schools. This entity (and not the doctoral school itself) is a party to the evaluation process and is responsible for specific elements of the operation of doctoral schools, verified under individual evaluation criteria.

The separately detailed criteria optimally exhaust the material scope of the criteria specified in Art. 261 of the Act and enable precise description and reliable assessment of the quality of education at doctoral schools.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 1 of the Act - the adequacy of the curriculum and individual research plans to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, hereinafter referred to as "PQF", and their implementation, it was assumed that this criterion is used to check whether the doctoral student curricula at doctoral schools and their individual research plans, as well as the implementation of these curricula and plans guarantee the achievement of learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) the adequacy of the learning outcomes specified in the curriculum to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, under which the curriculum will be analysed in terms of checking the consistency of the learning outcomes described therein and declared to be achieved with the requirements specified in the areas of knowledge, skills and social competences for qualifications at PQF level 8 which will be crucial from the point of view of verifying the set assumptions of education at a given doctoral school; under this criterion, it will also be verified whether the curriculum is aimed at obtaining the so-called transversal skills, i.e. qualifications related to critical thinking, creativity, taking initiative, problem solving skills, risk assessment and decision-making, and skills related to conducting scientific work which were not sufficiently highlighted within the current system of doctoral studies;
- 2) the adequacy of the scientific or artistic work of doctoral students and the dissemination of its results, specified in individual research plans, to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, under which it will be checked whether these plans are structured in such a way as to solve research problems constituting the subject of doctoral dissertations, whether it was accompanied by research or artistic work of doctoral students and the dissemination of its results to the extent that guarantees the achievement of learning outcomes specified for qualifications at PQF level 8; it is assumed that in order to assess the above, the practice adopted in the entity regarding the development of individual research plans by doctoral students, in consultation with supervisors, will be subject to verification;
- 3) the manner of implementing the curriculum and individual research plans in order to achieve learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, under which the experts

conducting the evaluation will check how the curriculum and individual research plans are implemented at the doctoral school, and whether the manners used for this purpose optimally lead to the achievement of learning outcomes specified for qualifications at PQF level 8; it is assumed that randomly selected individual research plans will be verified in order to assess the above;

- 4) the manner of implementing the interdisciplinarity of the education process in order to achieve learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8 which will verify how the doctoral school uses the interdisciplinarity of the education process to achieve learning outcomes by the doctoral student; experts will examine whether a given doctoral school - in accordance with the provisions of the Act – actually presents interdisciplinarity of education, including in relation to an individual doctoral student; experts will also assess whether the curriculum includes elements from other disciplines than the leading scientific or artistic disciplines;
- 5) reliability of the process of improving the curriculum, aimed at improving its adequacy to the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8 which will check whether a given doctoral school periodically reviews and verifies the agreed curriculum, how they proceed and what their consequences are; this is an extremely important element of the assessment as part of evaluation, because the improvement of curricula should be the key to raising their quality and attractiveness.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 2 of the Act - the manner of verifying the learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, it was assumed that this criterion is used to check whether the quality of the process of verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8 meets the highest standards. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) accessibility and clarity of the rules for verifying learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, under which experts will check whether the rules for verifying learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8 are generally available to all interested parties and precisely formulated, since the formulation of unambiguous, clear rules for verification of learning outcomes increases the guarantee of a harmonious course of this process; under this criterion, the readiness of entities to verify the learning outcomes achieved by doctoral students based on the achievements obtained by them outside the traditional form of classes will also be checked;
- 2) transparency and reliability of the learning outcome verification process for qualifications at PQF level 8, under which the experts conducting the evaluation will check whether the verification process of the learning outcomes meets these standards and whether the tools used to verify the learning outcomes do not raise doubts as to the quality and reliability of the results of this verification, and they will determine who participates in this process;

- 3) reliability of the process of improving the manners of verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, which will include checking whether the entity assesses the applicable manners of verifying learning outcomes for qualifications at PQF level 8, how such an assessment is conducted and what its consequences are; this is extremely important, because improving the manners of verification of learning outcomes aimed at securing a high level of achieved learning outcomes, but also taking into account the changing socio-economic conditions or technological progress, expresses care for raising education quality standards.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 3 of the Act - qualifications of academic teachers or academic staff working at doctoral schools, it was assumed that this criterion is used to check whether the staff of doctoral schools have been selected in an appropriate manner to achieve the objectives set out in the curriculum and whether they possess sufficient qualifications and competences to educate doctoral students. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) the adequacy of the scientific or artistic achievements and professional achievements as well as scientific or artistic activity and professional work of academic teachers or academic staff working at doctoral school as regards the scope of doctoral education provided, as part of which it will be assessed whether education at doctoral schools is conducted by appropriately selected staff, having appropriate qualifications in the area of the applicable curriculum, in particular recognised scientific or artistic achievements and competences in the field of scientific or artistic supervision, as well as adequate professional achievements and professional activity, including experience in obtaining grants and managing projects financed from grants; this is extremely important, as this aspect determines the level of quality of education provided at doctoral schools and the achievement of the goals and challenges set for doctoral schools, in particular the optimal preparation of doctoral students to obtain a doctoral degree;
- 2) the quality of measures for the professional development of academic teachers or academic staff working at doctoral schools, in particular when acting as a supervisor or assistant supervisor, undertaken by these persons and by an entity running doctoral schools, under which the experts conducting the evaluation will check whether the staff of a given school raises their qualifications and competences, both in terms of their own scientific or artistic development, as well as scientific or artistic supervision of doctoral students; it is assumed that even experienced supervisors should develop their competences, including the so-called cross-cutting skills, allowing for better and more effective performance of the function of a supervisor, and doctoral schools should encourage this by creating appropriate conditions and providing attractive training offers to the staff;
- 3) the reliability of the actions taken by the entity to verify the qualifications of academic teachers or academic staff working at doctoral schools, under which the analysis will

primarily cover the manner and principles of evaluating the work of doctoral school staff, in particular the assessment of the quality of teaching and - taking into account the specific character of education – verification of the effectiveness of this education; monitoring the fulfilment of their duties by academic teachers or researchers, also on the basis of the opinion of doctoral students, should be a permanent element of the entity's internal education quality control.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 4 of the Act - the quality of the recruitment process, it was assumed that this criterion is used to check whether the recruitment process for doctoral schools is conducted according to the highest standards, including based on a reliable verification of the skills and aptitude of candidates to do research, carried out in the form of an open competition. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) the quality and availability of information and internal legal acts concerning the operation of doctoral schools, within which it will be assessed whether an entity offers potential candidates for a given doctoral school, including candidates from abroad, a genuine opportunity to become acquainted with the documents concerning the operation of such a doctoral school, in particular with its regulations, as well as to analyse the school's offer not only in terms of the curriculum but also in terms of the staff of the doctoral school and their achievements, available infrastructure, list of conducted research and scientific or artistic cooperation with other centres, and finally in terms of the achievements of doctoral students and graduates of such a doctoral school; it is crucial that parties interested in starting a scientific or artistic career may find out about the opportunities offered by individual doctoral schools before deciding on the choice of a doctoral school where they will study and write a doctoral dissertation;
- 2) accessibility, unambiguity and openness of the rules of recruitment to doctoral schools and the timely publication of these rules, under which the experts conducting the evaluation will assess whether doctoral schools are open to candidates from various centres in the country and abroad, whether the recruitment process takes into account the conditions related to the schedule and the principles of financing projects involving research or development carried out by doctoral students and whether the scientific or artistic level represented by the candidates is the basis for recruitment; the timeliness of sharing, universality and accessibility of the recruitment rules will also be assessed; it is assumed that attention to the formulation of unambiguous and clear recruitment rules will increase the guarantee of appropriate course of this process;
- 3) the manner of conducting the competition referred to in Art. 200 sec. 2 of the Act, under which the quality of the recruitment process will be assessed based on an analysis of the degree to which standards are met, such as: transparency of the procedure, its non-discriminatory and fully competitive nature, as well as the substantive aspect; maintaining these standards in the recruitment process is a guarantee of admitting candidates with the highest qualifications to a given doctoral school and the basis for

developing a strong scientific or artistic centre; experts will also have the task of verifying whether the persons sitting on the recruitment committee have the appropriate qualifications to conduct a given competition;

- 4) the manner of taking into account the needs of the disabled in the recruitment process, under which respect for the rights of disabled persons at various stages of recruitment will be subject to verification, including by adapting the tools used for recruitment, guaranteeing friendly architectural conditions and premises and providing solutions to facilitate movement; specifying in the Regulation a criterion on taking into account the needs of disabled persons is intended to guarantee this group of candidates their due rights and is aimed at raising social awareness and sensitivity;
- 5) the manner of verifying the aptitude of candidates for doctoral schools to do research, under which the experts conducting the evaluation will check to what extent and using what techniques and tools a given doctoral school conducts such verification; it is assumed that the selection of candidates in the recruitment process with high scientific or artistic potential who show commitment and interest in development and scientific or artistic career, increases the probability of the completion of the full education process specified in the curriculum, timely preparation and submission of a doctoral dissertation and continuation of the career in academic centres;
- 6) reliability of measures taken by the entity to improve the recruitment process, under which it will be checked whether and to what extent the entity identifies the elements of this process which have not reached a sufficient level and whether and to what extent it implements solutions to improve this process; this is an important factor in supporting doctoral schools in achieving their goals.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 5 of the Act - the quality of scientific or artistic guidance as well as support in research, it was assumed that this criterion is used to check the level of quality of scientific or artistic supervision provided to a doctoral student by a given doctoral school and the level of support in solving the research problem that is the subject of the doctoral dissertation and in the course of education. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) criteria and the manner of designating and changing the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, under which the experts conducting the evaluation will assess in particular whether the process of appointing the supervisor or supervisors shows due care for: optimal matching of the supervisor to the specific character of the research problem to be the subject of the doctoral dissertation, ensuring appropriately high supervisory competences and the estimated scientific or artistic potential, which is the result of the supervisor's cooperation with the doctoral student; experts should take into account that the process of appointing and, if necessary, also changing the supervisor, may take various forms, depending on the needs and specific character of the doctoral school;

- 2) manners of providing doctoral students with high-quality cooperation with the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, including manners of resolving conflict situations between doctoral students and their supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, under which it will be verified whether a given doctoral school offers doctoral students a high level of scientific or artistic supervision involving direct and intensive cooperation with the supervisor, which should enable doctoral students scientific or artistic development as well as development in the field of the so-called transversal skills; it is assumed that, apart from support in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation, the supervisor should also support doctoral students in their functioning in the academic community, and high quality of cooperation should take into account the application of ethical principles expected from student-master cooperation; under this criterion, experts will also assess to what extent the entity seeks to provide scientific or artistic supervision from additional supervisors or assistant supervisors, which is particularly important in the case of interdisciplinary doctoral dissertations and doctorates carried out in cooperation with other scientific or artistic institutions, and also in the case of industrial PhD programmes; in addition, it will be analysed whether a given doctoral school has developed rules of conduct in the event of a conflict between doctoral students and the supervisor, what these rules are, and if there is a conflict - how it is resolved, how the developed rules were implemented, whether they turned out to be effective, and if this was not the case, whether any changes have been made in this regard; it is assumed that every doctoral student and supervisor should know where to seek help in a conflict situation and where to obtain information on procedures to be followed in such a case; this process should display a high degree of confidentiality and a reliable and objective assessment of the situation in order to prevent the conflict from escalating or involving other participants in the education process at the doctoral school;
- 3) manners of providing doctoral students, including doctoral students with disabilities and doctoral students who are parents, with suitable conditions and support in the implementation of the curriculum and individual research plans as well as in the preparation of doctoral dissertations, including access to the essential infrastructure, under which experts will examine what support and conditions for the implementation of the curriculum, individual research plans and for the preparation of doctoral dissertations at a high level, a given doctoral school provides for the doctoral students; the developed system solutions which take into account specific character of such a doctoral school and individual solutions adapted to individual research plans and the subject of doctoral dissertations, developed on an ongoing basis in relation to individual doctoral students, as needed, enabling their scientific or artistic development, will be subject to verification; experts conducting the evaluation will check whether the issue of access of doctoral students to the infrastructure necessary to achieve the goals set out in individual research plans is optimally resolved, as well as how the issue of financing research conducted by doctoral students is resolved; special attention will also be paid to the conditions created within a given doctoral school and support in the education process offered to doctoral

students with disabilities and doctoral students who are parents, including legal guardians of minors;

- 4) the degree of involvement of outstanding specialists employed outside the entity in activities supporting doctoral students in their research, including scientific or artistic supervision of doctoral students, under which experts conducting the evaluation will assess whether a given doctoral school invites outstanding specialists from other centres to cooperate and to what extent they enrich the potential of such a doctoral school; this criterion will take into account the specific situation of the entities jointly running such a doctoral school;
- 5) reliability of verification and evaluation of the work of supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, as well as measures taken by the entity to improve the quality of their work, which will check whether the work of supervisors at a given doctoral school is subject to regular assessment, how this process is conducted and what measures are taken if potential irregularities are identified; it is assumed that due to the need to provide doctoral students with scientific or artistic supervision at a high level, verification of the supervisors' fulfilment of their duties, also on the basis of the opinions of the students, should be a permanent element of the entity's internal control of the quality of education.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 6 of the Act - reliability of the mid-term assessment, it was assumed that this criterion is used to verify whether the mid-term assessment is carried out at a given doctoral school in accordance with the highest standards. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) the selection of criteria and objective rules for conducting the mid-term assessment, as well as accessibility and unambiguity of these criteria and rules, under which the experts will check whether the criteria of such an assessment, used to verify the degree of implementation of the individual research plan by doctoral students, in particular the level of advancement of the research project, and the procedure for its assessment are generally available to all interested parties and whether they have been precisely formulated on the basis of substantive assumptions and generally accepted principles of fairness; it is assumed that the formulation of unambiguous and clear rules and substantively justified criteria for conducting mid-term assessment allows doctoral students to better prepare for it, which in turn increases the probability of obtaining a positive result and smooth running of this process;
- 2) the composition and competences of the body carrying out the mid-term assessment, which will verify whether the composition and competences of the body carrying out the mid-term assessment meet the statutory requirements; experts will learn about the manner of appointing its members as well as verifying their qualifications by the entity;
- 3) timeliness and manner of carrying out the mid-term assessment, under which the experts conducting the assessment will check whether it takes place within the time limit

specified in Art. 202 sec. 2 of the Act, i.e. half-way through the education period specified in the curriculum, and in the case of education lasting 6 semesters - during the fourth semester; the manner in which the mid-term assessment is carried out will also be reviewed, including aspects such as its transparency, impartiality and factual nature, and the manner in which its results are communicated; in the assessment of transparency, the openness of the entity to allow the participation in the assessment process of observers, e.g. a representative of doctoral students, may be taken into account; it is assumed that care for high standards of mid-term assessment, its transparency and reliability guarantee the education of highly qualified doctoral students and the basis for developing a strong scientific or artistic centre; it is also assumed that a positive result of the mid-term assessment of a given doctoral student confirms that there is no threat to the successful implementation of the curriculum and individual research plan, and a reliable assessment of the level of involvement of doctoral students in the education process and in the preparation of doctoral dissertations allows for effective elimination of mediocrity and counters low motivation, thus affecting the potential doctoral school;

- 4) the reliability of the measures taken by the entity to improve the mid-term assessment process, which will check whether the entity identifies the elements of this process that are at an insufficient level and whether it implements solutions to improve this process.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 7 of the Act - internationalisation, it was assumed that this criterion is used to assess the measures implemented by the doctoral school in the field of internationalisation of the education process and its impact on individual parties of this process. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) the degree of internationalisation of the staff, including scientific or artistic mobility and activity in the international environment of academic teachers or researchers teaching at doctoral schools, within which the measures implemented by the entity aimed at internationalisation of the staff should be analysed, including the system of incentives addressed to outstanding foreign scientists or artists to cooperate within a given doctoral school and the effectiveness of these activities; experts conducting the evaluation will also check to what extent the staff teaching at such a doctoral school is involved in the implementation of international projects and whether they actively participate in competitions for European grants, including those dedicated to the education of doctoral students, whether they participate in international scientific conferences or artistic events, or use scholarships or internships abroad, or if they are otherwise internationally active in science or art; it is assumed that an academic teacher or researcher teaching at a given doctoral school should demonstrate a high degree of activity in the international environment;
- 2) the degree of internationalisation of the education process at a given doctoral school and scientific work of doctoral students, in particular conducted on the basis of individual research plans, including scientific or artistic mobility of doctoral students under which

the experts conducting the evaluation will assess to what extent the issues provided for in the curriculum and individual research plans include the element of internationalisation and what the entity's systemic approach to this problem is; the forms and scope of measures implemented by the doctoral school aimed at internationalisation of the education process, i.e. providing doctoral students with conditions to operate in an international scientific or artistic environment, supporting doctoral students - in the scope of their doctoral dissertations - in applying for European grants and engaging them in the implementation of research projects financed from European grants, activating doctoral students in the field of international scientific or artistic mobility and supporting them in access to current foreign publications and library resources of foreign research centres in order to conduct bibliographic search; under this criterion, it will also be checked how a given doctoral school seeks foreign doctoral students, e.g. whether it offers education in a foreign language, whether it has an attractive offer for them and whether it actively encourages foreigners to start education in Poland, and whether documents regarding such a doctoral school are available in foreign languages and whether it is possible to contact the doctoral school in foreign languages; the effectiveness of measures taken in this regard will be expressed in particular by the size of the group of foreign doctoral students - taking into account the specific character of a given doctoral school - and the fulfilment of their expectations as to the level of scientific work conducted there; under this criterion, the openness of a given doctoral school to the education of doctoral students in cooperation with a foreign university or scientific institution may also be verified, which enables the creation of space for the exchange of experiences; this criterion will be assessed in view of the specific character of such a doctoral school;

- 3) the manner of taking into account the needs of doctoral students who are foreigners in the education process at doctoral schools, under which experts will assess whether a given doctoral school is sufficiently attentive to the needs of this group of doctoral students, in particular whether documents, messages and materials produced in the course of education are prepared and made available on an ongoing basis in foreign languages, whether a given doctoral school offers assistance in organisational matters and whether it fosters and maintains positive relations between representatives of different nationalities who study there, and their integration in the environment of such a doctoral school;
- 4) manners of increasing the recognition of a given doctoral school abroad and their effectiveness, in which the experts conducting the evaluation will focus on analysing the measures taken by such a doctoral school to increase its recognition abroad, as well as the effectiveness of these measures; it is assumed that active building of a given doctoral school's image on the international arena translates into establishing new scientific or artistic contacts and starting international cooperation, including the implementation of international projects of prestigious significance.

When specifying the detailed criteria for the criterion referred to in Art. 261 point 8 of the Act – the effectiveness of doctoral education, it was assumed that this criterion is used to check

the effectiveness of the education process at doctoral schools. Although the effectiveness of education would be easiest to verify using quantitative criteria, it was decided to partly drop such an approach due to the diverse characters of doctoral schools and represented scientific and artistic disciplines, as well as the resulting need to maintain the expert nature of evaluation. In order to allow for a thorough analysis of the above during the evaluation, the following detailed criteria have been defined:

- 1) timely completion of education at a given doctoral school in accordance with the curriculum, under which the evaluating experts will assess the effectiveness of education, taking into account what proportion of doctoral students completed it within the time provided for in the curriculum; in accordance with Art. 204 sec. 1 of the Act, the education of a doctoral student ends with the submission of a doctoral dissertation, and the deadline for its submission is specified in the individual research plan and may be extended, however, by no more than 2 years, on the terms set out in the regulations of a given doctoral school (Art. 204 sec. 2 of the Act); expert assessment will allow to take into account justified postponements of the date of completion of education at a given doctoral school in accordance with the curriculum, resulting from, for instance, illness of a doctoral student, maternity or paternity leave;
- 2) the percentage of people who obtained a doctoral degree after completing education at a given doctoral school in the total number of doctoral students who completed their education at a given doctoral school in the period covered by the evaluation; in accordance with Art. 198 sec. 1 of the Act, the education of doctoral students prepares them to obtain a doctoral degree, takes place at such a doctoral school and - in accordance with Art. 204 sec. 1 of the Act - ends with the submission of a doctoral dissertation; although the evaluation focuses on the education process, in order to determine its effectiveness, it is necessary to check what percentage of doctoral students who completed their education at a given doctoral school applied for initiation of the procedure for conferring a doctoral degree, and what percentage were awarded this degree;
- 3) the level of scientific or artistic achievements of doctoral students, in particular those related to scientific or artistic work specified in the individual research plan, under which the assessment will not focus on scientific or artistic productivity, which can often lead to a substantial amount of low quality work, but rather on examining the level of the most important achievements of doctoral students in terms of scientific or artistic significance of these achievements; due to the need for doctoral students to focus on work related to the subject of the curriculum and the doctoral dissertation prepared by them, it was decided to evaluate mainly those achievements of doctoral students that are related to the implementation of the individual research plan and curriculum, which does not mean, however, that other achievements of doctoral students showing that they are involved in development, growing their experience and shaping them as young scientists will not be taken into account by the evaluation team;

- 4) assessing the quality of education at a given doctoral school by doctoral students, the results of this assessment and how the results are used by the entity to improve the education process, under which experts conducting the evaluation will assess how such a school addresses the comments made by doctoral students, whether it reliably solves the problems indicated by them; whether it faces criticism objectively and whether it uses the information gained in this way in a constructive manner; this criterion reflects the assumption adopted by international standards that the quality of education at any doctoral school should be assessed by doctoral students, and the information obtained as a result of this assessment should be analysed and, as a result, measures should be taken to improve the quality of education, while doctoral students should be able to express their opinion on various stages of education, also at the time of its completion, e.g. in the form of the so-called exit survey;
- 5) the manner of using the results of the monitoring of professional careers of those who completed their education at a given doctoral school and those who obtained a doctoral degree after completing education at such a doctoral school, within which the use of the results of career monitoring referred to in Art. 352 sec. 1-13 of the Act, and which enables the aggregation of data in the scope related to a given doctoral school; the manner of using the obtained information by such a doctoral school and its impact on the operation of the doctoral school, including the verification of the quality of education and the creation of a responsible development policy, will be assessed.

In its further part, the Regulation indicates the manner of carrying out the evaluation. According to Art. 259 sec. 2 of the Act, the evaluation is carried out by the Committee according to the schedule which it agrees. The Regulation proposes that the schedule should be set for annual periods. This will give the Committee sufficient planning flexibility, while ensuring that actors are informed of evaluation plans for a given calendar year well in advance. When determining the schedule, the Committee will take into account the calendar of the academic year. The schedule will be immediately published in the BIP, on the website of the minister responsible for higher education and science, enabling entities to prepare for the evaluation. Pursuant to § 3 sec. 2 and 3, the chairman of the Committee will each time notify the entity, and in the case of a jointly run doctoral school - the entity entitled to receive funds for joint education, about the commencement of the evaluation process and will call on this entity to submit, within 12 weeks from the date of receipt of the notification, a self-assessment report and will indicate the planned date and duration of the inspection. The chairman of the Committee will be able to extend these deadlines in certain justified cases. The chairman of the Committee will do so on their own initiative or at the request of the entity. In the latter case, it will have to be conditioned by the occurrence of circumstances beyond the entity's control. In addition, in order to enable the entity to prepare suitably for the inspection, before the inspection begins, the leader of the evaluation team will arrange its schedule with the entity.

The self-assessment report will be a compendium of knowledge for the experts conducting the evaluation on the education provided at doctoral schools and, in addition to the descriptive content in order to reliably illustrate the specific character of a given doctoral school, it will be able to include a number of quantitative data, e.g. pursuant to the Regulation, the guidelines for the preparation of the self-assessment report will be prepared by the Committee, specifying the optimal level of detail from the point of view of the purpose, and at the same time taking into account the role and scope of inspections and the requirement to make the report public. These guidelines will be published in the BIP on the website of the minister responsible for higher education and science.

The Regulation indicates the elements of the self-assessment report in a general manner. Pursuant to § 4 sec. 1 point 2, the self-assessment report should contain information that will enable evaluation based on the criteria referred to in Art. 261 of the Act, and the detailed criteria listed in § 2. Additionally, it was assumed that in the case of each subsequent evaluation at a given doctoral school, the self-assessment report will also contain information about changes made at this school, improving the quality of education, introduced since the last evaluation. It was considered that this would give the entity the opportunity to present the effects of the work performed, if improvements were implemented or individual aspects of the operation of a given doctoral school were improved based on conclusions from the previous evaluation or recommendations addressed to the entity. Based on Art. 262 sec. 1 of the Act, an obligation was imposed on the entity to prepare a self-assessment report in Polish and English. In principle, both language versions should be identical (which will be confirmed by the entity's statement), however, should there be any discrepancies between the information provided in Polish and the information provided in English, it was decided to recognise the English version as the governing one. The proposed solution results from the need to adapt to the statutory obligation to include in the evaluation team an expert employed at a foreign university or scientific institution, who may not be fluent in Polish. It is assumed, however, that Polish experts carrying out the evaluation will be fluent in English due to this language's widespread use in the international scientific community. Due to the need to ensure that all experts have access to basic documents concerning the doctoral school, the Regulation also indicates that the entity will submit, together with the self-assessment report, not only in Polish, but also in English, the rules of admission to a given doctoral school and the regulations of the doctoral school applicable in the period covered by the evaluation. In the case of these documents, interpretation in English will not prevail, as these are source documents originally written in Polish.

In order to reduce the risk of formal irregularities, the Regulation clearly indicates the person authorised to sign the self-assessment report and declarations on the compliance of the information contained in the report with the factual and legal status, as well as on the substantive identity of the information contained in the self-assessment report, in the recruitment rules and in doctoral school regulations in Polish and English. In order to streamline the course of the evaluation, it was also assumed that correspondence during the

evaluation would be sent using the ICT system indicated by the minister responsible for higher education and science in the BIP on his/her website.

The Regulation also assumes that the entity may be requested to submit, in Polish and English, explanations or additional information regarding the self-assessment report and documents submitted with this report. Thanks to this solution, it will be possible to supplement information about a given doctoral school that should be included in a properly prepared self-assessment report, or to verify information that has been provided imprecisely. The 14-day deadline for submitting explanations or supplementary information is optimal both for the entity and for the experts conducting the evaluation, who will need this information and explanations during the inspection at a given doctoral school.

Evaluation will be carried out by persons appointed by the chairman of the Committee to sit on the evaluation team, the composition of which is specified in Art. 259 sec. 4 of the Act. The chairman of the Committee will appoint an expert appointed from among the members of the Committee as the chairman of the evaluation team. This solution is intended to facilitate the work of the evaluation team and streamline the evaluation process. The chairman of the evaluation team, being a member of the Committee and participating in its meetings and discussions regarding evaluations carried out at other doctoral schools, will have additional knowledge useful to conduct a given evaluation. The chairman of the Committee will also appoint team secretary from members of the evaluation team.

The Regulation assumes that the number of members of the evaluation team will be from 4 to 7, depending on the specific character of a given doctoral school. It is assumed that, as a rule, each scientific or artistic discipline in which education is provided within such a doctoral school will be represented in the composition of the evaluation team by an expert in the field of science or art to which this discipline belongs.

Pursuant to § 5 sec. 2, each member of the evaluation team must submit to the chairman of the Committee a declaration of proficiency in English and a declaration stating that they would act impartially in the public interest, not use the information obtained during the evaluation for purposes other than those related to the evaluation, not make the information available to persons other than Committee members who are not members of the evaluation team. It is assumed that the statutory requirement to appoint persons with significant scientific or artistic achievements to sit on the evaluation team guarantees the selection of experts who are high-class specialists, fluent in English with experience and achievements in teaching doctoral students. In order to ensure fair, reliable and impartial conduct of the evaluation process, the regulation allows, in justified cases, for the possibility for an entity to apply to the chairman of the Committee to exclude a specific person from the evaluation team.

The provisions of § 6 regulate the issues related to the course of the inspection, in particular those related to the creation of appropriate organisational conditions for its conduct, such as agreeing on the inspection schedule, submitting the necessary documents, providing experts with premises and equipment for work, or organising individual or group meetings with the

entity's authorities, persons responsible for education at a given doctoral school, including persons who teach classes, persons participating in the mid-term assessment or members of the scientific council or the council of a discipline related to such a doctoral school, doctoral students and their supervisors and assistant supervisors, as well as persons responsible for the administrative service of the doctoral school. This will enable the inspection to be carried out in a reliable and substantive manner. In order to ensure the continuity of evaluation in the event of a temporary limitations of doctoral education referred to in Art. 198a of the Act, a provision has been introduced to the Regulation that allows inspections in such a situation with the use of information technology ensuring control and recording of its course. It was recognised that since doctoral schools will in such a case conduct their operations, even if to a limited extent, with the use of information technology, then inspections of these schools may also take place with the use of these technologies. However, in the event of a temporary suspension of doctoral education referred to in Art. 198a of the Act, the evaluation will not be carried out during this period or that it will be suspended for the duration of this suspension. In such a case, the chairman of the Committee will be able to extend the deadline for submission of the self-assessment report, change the date of the inspection or its duration on their own initiative. Pursuant to § 7 sec. 1, after reviewing the self-assessment report and after completing the inspection, the evaluation team will prepare a report on the conducted evaluation. This report will include, in particular, an analysis of whether a given doctoral school meets the criteria referred to in Art. 261 of the Act, and the detailed criteria referred to in § 2, and a conclusion as to the extent to which these criteria are met. The report may also contain recommendations for the entity aimed at identifying areas requiring improvement in terms of the quality of education at such a doctoral school. Similarly to other documents prepared in the course of evaluation, the evaluation report will be made in Polish and English. This report will be made available to the entity in the ICT system for review and possible comments. Comments, also in Polish and English, may be submitted by the entity within 14 days from the date of receipt of the evaluation report. This is the optimum date due to the need to complete the evaluation efficiently. The team will consider the comments submitted by the entity and, on this basis, will be able to make changes to the content of the evaluation report.

Subsequently, the evaluation team will evaluate a given doctoral school in accordance with Art. 262 sec. 3 of the Act. This evaluation will be in Polish and English. The justification for the evaluation will be obligatory only in the case of a negative evaluation. In the case of a positive evaluation, the justification will be optional. It is assumed that the evaluation report prepared by the evaluation team in connection with awarding the entity with a positive evaluation adequately discusses the results of the conducted evaluation. However, the evaluation team will be able to prepare a justification if it deems it advisable to recommend an deadline for the next evaluation earlier than the one resulting from Art. 259 sec. 2 of the Act. This may result, for example, from noticing shortcomings regarding the quality of education at a given doctoral school, which, however, will not be significant enough to result in the entity being awarded a negative rating, and at the same time it would be worth

examining in the near future whether and how the entity coped with eliminating them. In such a case, the recommended date for the next evaluation cannot be shorter than 2 years from the date when the Committee's resolution on the evaluation becomes final.

The result of the evaluation team's assessment will be submitted to the chairman of the Committee together with the evaluation report. The committee will review the documentation of the conducted evaluation and adopt a resolution on the evaluation of a given doctoral school no later than at the second meeting convened after the date of receipt of the above-mentioned documents from the evaluation team.

Within 7 days from the date when the Committee's resolution on the evaluation becomes final, the minister responsible for higher education and science and the entity will make it available together with the evaluation report and the self-assessment report in Polish and English in the BIP on their website. This will contribute to ensuring access to information on the operation of a given doctoral school and to maintaining the transparency of the evaluation process.

The provisions of § 10 collectively define the rights to perform individual measures in the course of evaluation in the case of doctoral schools run jointly by several entities.

It is proposed that the Regulation comes into force 14 days after its announcement.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that there is no possibility of taking alternative measures to the Regulation to achieve the intended goal.

The Regulation does not affect the activities of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, and does not affect the property rights and obligations of entrepreneurs or the rights and obligations of entrepreneurs towards public administration bodies.

The Regulation does not require submission to the competent authorities and institutions of the European Union, including the European Central Bank, for the purpose of obtaining opinions, notifications, consultations or arrangements.

The Regulation is not subject to notification in accordance with the provisions of the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 23 December 2002 on the operation of the national system of notification of standards and legal acts (Journal of Laws, item 2039 and of 2004, item 597).

The Regulation is compliant with the law of the European Union.