

**REGULATIONS OF THE PROCEDURE
FOR THE AWARDING OF THE DOCTORAL DEGREE
IN PHYSICAL CULTURE SCIENCES
AT GDANSK UNIVERSITY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
AND SPORT**

of 14 December 2024 and 28 November 2024

Consolidated text

taking into account the amendments of 14 December 2023 and 28 November 2024

Chapter I

General Provisions

§ 1

1. These Regulations specify the proceedings for the awarding of the doctoral degree in physical culture sciences at Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport, to the extent not regulated in the Act of July 20, 2018, Law on Higher Education and Science and the Statute of Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport.
2. A doctoral degree may be awarded on the basis of a doctoral dissertation prepared in the course of doctoral education at the doctoral school of Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport or in the extramural mode.

§ 2

Whenever the Regulations refer to:

- 1) University – it should be understood as Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport;
- 2) Candidate – it should be understood as a person who applies for a doctoral degree at Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport, including a person preparing a doctoral dissertation in the extramural mode or a person applying for a doctoral degree in the extramural mode;
- 3) Doctoral committee – it should be understood as a committee appointed to carry out activities in the proceedings for awarding the academic degree of doctor by the Scientific Council;
- 4) defense – it should be understood as the public defense of the doctoral dissertation;
- 5) proceedings – it should be understood as proceedings for awarding the doctoral degree in physical culture sciences at Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport;
- 6) PQF – it should be understood as the Polish Qualifications Framework within the meaning of the Act of December 22, 2015 on the Integrated Qualifications System (consolidated text; Journal of Laws of 2020, item 226);
- 7) Scientific Council – it should be understood as the Scientific Council of Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport;
- 8) CSE – it should be understood as the Council of Scientific Excellence;

- 9) Rector – it should be understood as the Rector of Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport;
- 10) Statute – it should be understood as the Statute of Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport dated 19 June 2019;
- 11) doctoral degree – it should be understood as the academic degree of doctor in physical culture sciences;
- 12) doctoral studies – it should be understood as third-cycle studies ending with obtaining third-cycle qualifications within the meaning of the Act of July 27, 2005, Law on Higher Education (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2017 item 2183, as amended);
- 13) Doctoral School – it should be understood as the Doctoral School of Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport;
- 14) Act – it should be understood as the Act of July 20, 2018, Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text: Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended);
- 15) Introductory Act – it should be understood as the Act of July 3, 2018. Provisions including the Act – Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1669, as amended).

§ 3

At the University the doctoral degree in physical culture sciences is awarded by the Scientific Council.

§ 4

1. The requirements that a candidate must meet in order to obtain a doctoral degree are specified in Art. 186 section 1 and 2 of the Act.
2. The requirements for a doctoral dissertation are specified in Art. 187 of the Act and § 20.

§ 4¹

To the extent that this has not been reserved for the competence of other bodies and unless other regulations provide otherwise, the Scientific Council may establish conditions or requirements regarding the procedure.

Chapter II

Rules for determining the costs of the proceedings, including the amount of the fee for the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree in the extramural mode and exemption from fees.

§ 5

1. A fee is charged for conducting the proceedings.
2. Fees for conducting the proceedings, including the initial fee referred to in § 12, are not collected from candidates who:
 - 1) completed education at the Doctoral School, or
 - 2) started doctoral studies at the University before the 2019/2020 academic year and Art. 179 section 9 of the Introductory Act applies to them, or
 - 3) are full-time academic teachers employed at the University.

§ 6

1. The fee for conducting the proceedings, hereinafter referred to as the “fee”, includes in particular:
 - 1) remuneration costs of the supervisor or supervisors,
 - 2) remuneration costs of the assistant supervisor,
 - 3) remuneration costs of the reviewers,
 - 4) costs of verifying the candidate’s achievements of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF,
 - 5) costs of conducting a language examination by a language committee, referred to in § 50 section 1,
 - 6) costs of verification of the quality of scientific achievements by the committee referred to in § 19 section 2 and 7,
 - 7) indirect costs.
2. The amount and conditions of remuneration payment to the supervisor, assistant supervisor and reviewer are specified in the Act.
3. The Method of determining the amount of individual costs that make up the total costs of the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree and the rules for refunding the fee in the event of discontinuation of the proceedings are determined by the Rector by an order.

§ 7

1. Before initiating the proceedings, the Director of the Doctoral School informs the candidate, who is not exempt from paying the costs of the proceedings, about the amount of the fee and the rules for determining it, including the provisions of section 3, as well as the consequences of failure to pay the fee specified in section 4 and § 11.
2. The candidate pays the fee within 30 days of the Scientific Council adopting a resolution to initiate the proceedings, subject to § 12 section 1 and 2.
3. In the event of an increase in the costs of the proceedings after its initiation, including in particular the costs resulting from the appointment of additional reviewers, the chairman of the Scientific Council summons the candidate to pay the supplementary fee within 30 days, otherwise the proceedings will be discontinued in the event of failure to pay the additional fee.
4. Until the fee is paid, including the supplementary fee, the Scientific Council or the other appointed doctoral committee does not take any action in the proceedings.

§ 8

1. In justified cases, the Rector may dismiss the candidate in whole or in part at his/her request from the fee or divide the fee into installments.
2. If the fee is divided into installments, the Rector determines the amount and payment dates of the installments.

§ 9

In the case of the candidate referred to in Art. 182 section 6 and 7 of the Act, before initiating the proceedings, the University and the relevant entity conclude an agreement specifying the amount and conditions of payment of the fee for conducting the proceedings. The template of the contract is specified by the Rector by an order.

§ 10

If the candidate loses the right to be exempt from paying the costs of the proceedings after its initiation, the candidate is obliged to pay the fee within 30 days from the date of losing this right. Provision of § 7 section 4 applies.

§ 11

1. If a candidate not subject to exemption from the obligation to pay the costs of the proceedings or a third party financing the proceedings fails to pay the fee or supplementary fee within the appropriate time and amount, despite receiving a request to pay it, the Scientific Council shall discontinue the proceedings.
2. The provision of section 1 shall apply accordingly if the Rector divides the fee into installments.
3. If the proceedings are discontinued, the University returns the fee paid to the candidate, reduced by the costs of the proceedings incurred until the date of discontinuation.

§ 12

1. The candidate is obliged to pay an initial fee if it is necessary for processing the application referred to in § 17 section 1 to carry out:
 - 1) the verification of scientific achievements according to the principles specified in § 19 or
 - 2) the verification of the candidate's achievement of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF in accordance with the principles specified in § 48 and 49, or
 - 3) a language examination in accordance with the principles specified in § 50.
2. The Director of the Doctoral School calls on the candidate to pay the initial fee within 14 days of receiving the request. The request includes information about the consequences of failure to pay the initial fee and the content of section 3.
3. Until the initial fee is paid, the Scientific Council does not undertake any activities related to this fee.
4. If the candidate does not pay the initial fee on time, the Director of the Doctoral School notifies the candidate about:
 - 1) the refusal to carry out:
 - a) the verification of scientific achievements or
 - b) the verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF or
 - c) a language examination;

- 2) the consequences of the candidate's failure to demonstrate compliance with the requirement:
 - a) having the highest quality scientific achievements or
 - b) obtaining learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF or
 - c) having required knowledge of a modern foreign language at least at the B2 language proficiency level
5. The provisions of sections 1-4 shall apply accordingly if, after initiating the proceedings, it becomes necessary for the candidate to verify whether the requirement is met:
 - 1) obtaining learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF or
 - 2) having required knowledge of a modern foreign language at least at the B2 language proficiency level .
6. If, after initiating the proceedings, the candidate fails to obtain confirmation of meeting any of the requirements referred to in section 5, the Scientific Council discontinues the proceedings.
7. When verifying the fulfillment of any of the requirements referred to in section 5, after initiating the proceedings, the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee shall not take any other actions in the proceedings.

Chapter III

The method of appointing and changing the supervisor, supervisors and assistant supervisor.

§ 13

1. The method of appointing and changing the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor is specified in the Regulations of the Doctoral School, subject to section 2.
2. The provisions of the Regulations of the Doctoral School specifying the method of appointing and changing the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor shall apply accordingly to the appointment and change of the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor in the case of candidates applying for the awarding of a doctoral degree in the extramural mode, taking into account § 14.

§ 14

1. Before initiating the proceedings under the extramural mode, the candidate submits to the chairman of the Scientific Council, through the Director of the Doctoral School, an application for the appointment of a supervisor, supervisors or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor.
2. In the application referred to in section 1, the candidate provides his/her personal and contact details. The application should be signed by the candidate.
3. To the application referred to in section 1, the candidate attaches:
 - 1) an outline of the doctoral dissertation along with a justification for undertaking the research topic and a research work schedule or a ready doctoral dissertation, approved by the candidate for a supervisor and meeting the requirements specified in Art. 187 section 4 of the Act;
 - 2) consent to serve as the candidate's supervisor or assistant supervisor, respectively;
 - 3) the opinion of the candidate for a supervisor or candidates for supervisors, or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor, respectively, regarding the research topic and the research work schedule, if a completed doctoral dissertation is not attached to the application;
 - 4) the documents specified in § 18 section 2 point 2.
4. If the candidate requests the appointment of more than one supervisor or assistant supervisor, the application referred to in section 1 should include a separate justification in this regard prepared and signed by the supervisor.
5. To the application referred to in section 1, § 24 shall apply accordingly.
6. The Director of the Doctoral School submits the complete application referred to in section 1, within 3 weeks to the chairman of the Scientific Council. The deadline referred to in the previous sentence is suspended while waiting for the candidate to correct or supplement the application or documentation.
7. Within three months of the receipt by the chairman of the Scientific Council of the complete application referred in section 1, the Scientific Council shall adopt a resolution on the appointment of a supervisor, supervisors or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor.
8. If the resolution referred to in section 7 does not obtain the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the Scientific Council has adopted a resolution

refusing to appoint a supervisor, supervisors or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor, respectively.

9. The Scientific Council appoints a supervisor, supervisors or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor in the extramural mode for a period of 48 months. If the appointment of another supervisor or assistant supervisor occurs after the appointment of a supervisor, the period of appointment of the next supervisor or assistant supervisor expires at the end of the period of appointment of the supervisor.
10. In justified cases, the Scientific Council may extend the deadline referred to in section 9, but not more than 24 months in total.
11. The Council refuses to extend the deadline referred to in section 9, if the assessment of the progress in preparing the candidate's doctoral dissertation in the extramural mode shows that the candidate is not properly implementing the research work schedule.
12. During the period referred to in section 9 or 10, the candidate is obliged to submit a complete application for initiating the proceedings for the awarding of the doctoral degree referred to in § 17 section 1, provided that the deadline for submitting the application is deemed to have been met also if the consideration of the application is subject to suspension pursuant to § 18 section 10.
13. If the candidate fails to submit a complete application to initiate the proceedings referred to in § 17 section 1 within the period referred to in section 9 or 10, or in case of the refusal by the Scientific Council to initiate the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree, the resolution appointing the supervisor, supervisors or supervisor and assistant supervisor expires.
14. The expiration of the resolution referred to in section 13 is stated by the chairman of the Scientific Council, who notifies the candidate and the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, respectively.
15. In the event of initiation of the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree, the current supervisor, supervisors or supervisor and assistant supervisor perform these functions until the completion of the procedure, unless they are previously dismissed from these functions by the Scientific Council.

1. The Scientific Council may specify in the resolution referred to in § 14 section 7, or in a separate resolution that the candidate in the extramural mode submits an annual report to the Director of the Doctoral School on the progress in preparing the doctoral dissertation.
2. The candidate referred to in section 1 submits the report referred to in section 1, approved and signed by the relevant supervisor or supervisors or supervisor and assistant supervisor referred to in section 1 within 3 months from the expiry of the first, second and third year from the adoption by the Scientific Council of the resolution referred to in § 14 section 7, and in the event of extension of the deadline for appointing a supervisor, supervisors or a supervisor and an assistant supervisor in the extramural mode beyond 48 months – also after the fourth or fifth year. The Director of the Doctoral School supervises the performance of reporting duties by the candidate in the extramural mode.
3. In the event of a change of the supervisor or assistant supervisor, respectively, during the period referred to in § 14 section 9 or 10, the candidate in the extramural mode shall submit to the Director of the Doctoral School, within one month of the dismissal of the current supervisor or assistant supervisor, a report on the progress in preparing the doctoral dissertation. The Director of the Doctoral School forwards this report to the new supervisor or assistant supervisor.
4. In the event of a change of the supervisor or assistant supervisor, the deadline referred to in § 14 section 9 or 10 is not renewed and is counted from the moment of the initial appointment of the supervisor, supervisors or supervisor and assistant supervisor.
5. The Director of the Doctoral School, based on the reports referred to in section 1, assesses the progress in preparing the candidate's doctoral dissertation.
6. If the assessment of the progress in preparing the candidate's doctoral dissertation in the extramural mode shows that the candidate is not properly implementing the research work schedule or the candidate is not fulfilling reporting obligations, the Director of the Doctoral School may request the chairman of the Scientific Council for an earlier termination by the Scientific Council of the resolution referred to in § 14 section 7.

7. The Director of the Doctoral School shall notify the candidate and the appropriately designated supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor about submitting to the chairman of the Scientific Council the application referred to in section 6. The notification includes information on the right to present a position referred to in section 8.
8. The candidate and the appropriately designated supervisor, supervisors and assistant supervisor may present in writing their position on the request of the Director of the Doctoral School referred to in section 6, within 14 days of receiving the notification referred to in section 7. A letter containing the position statement is submitted to the chairman of the Scientific Council.
9. The chairman of the Scientific Council decides to accept the request of the Director of the Doctoral School after receiving the position of the candidate and the appropriately designated supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor or after the deadline for presenting this position has expired.
10. If the chairman of the Scientific Council accepts the request referred to in section 6, he/she submits the application to a meeting of the Scientific Council, which adopts a resolution on the earlier expiry of the resolution referred to in § 14 section 7.
11. If the resolution on the early expiry of the resolution referred to in § 14 section 7 does not obtain the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the Scientific Council has adopted a resolution refusing the earlier termination of the resolution referred to in w § 14 section 7.
12. The candidate and the appropriately designated supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor are invited to the meeting of the Scientific Council, at which the resolution is adopted on the early expiry of the resolution referred to in section 6.
13. The chairman of the Scientific Council informs the candidate and the appropriately designated supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor about the content of the resolution referred to in section 10.

§ 16

The Scientific Council adopts resolutions on the matters referred to in § 14 and 15 in a secret ballot by an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the statutory number of members.

Chapter IV

Initiation of the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree.

§ 17

1. The proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree are initiated at the request of a candidate who meets the requirements specified in Art. 186 section 1 points 1-3 or section 2 of the Act.
2. The candidate submits a signed application together with a complete set of required documents referred to in § 18 to the Director of the Doctoral School.
3. The Scientific Council may determine the template of the application referred to in section 1.
4. The Director of the Doctoral School verifies the completeness of the application referred to in § 17 section 1 and undertakes the activities specified in the provisions of Chapter IV.
5. The candidate has the right to inspect the case files relating to his/her application for the initiation of the proceedings, including in particular the minutes, resolutions and recordings.

§ 18

1. In the application referred to in § 17 section 1, the candidate indicates the scientific discipline in which he/she is applying for a doctoral degree.
2. To the application referred to in § 17 section 1, the candidate attaches:
 - 1) a doctoral dissertation meeting the conditions referred to in § 20, together with the summary referred to in Art. 187 section 4 of the Act and a positive opinion of the supervisor or supervisors,
 - 2) documents confirming the fulfillment of the requirement referred to in Art. 186 section 1 point 1 of the Act, and in the case of the candidate referred to in Art. 186 section 2 of the Act – documents confirming completion of the first-cycle studies or the status of a student who has completed the third year of uniform master's studies,
 - 3) documents confirming that the candidate has achieved learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF,
 - 4) a document confirming knowledge of a modern foreign language at least at the B2 language proficiency level in the form of a certificate or diploma of

completion of studies, recognized by the Department of Foreign Languages of the University on the terms specified by the Rector by an order,

or

a declaration that the candidate does not have an appropriate certificate or diploma of completion of studies, along with an indication of a modern foreign language, the knowledge of which will be confirmed at least at the B2 language proficiency level in accordance with the principles set out in § 50,

- 5) at least 1 scientific article or 1 scientific monograph meeting the requirements specified in Art. 186 section 1 point 3 letter a and b of the Act, authored or co-authored by the candidate,
 - 6) a statement specifying the candidate's individual contribution to the creation of each of the presented publications – in the case of multi-authored publications,
 - 7) a report approved by the supervisor on checking the doctoral dissertation with the use of the Uniform Anti-plagiarism System, referred to in Art. 351 section 1 of the Act, if the doctoral dissertation is a written work,
 - 8) information on the course of the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree or the registration and conferment procedure for a doctoral degree, if the candidate has previously applied for the award of a doctoral degree.
- 2¹. The Scientific Council determines the method of verifying the candidate's fulfillment of the requirement referred to in Art. 186 section 1 point 3 letter a and of the Act, in particular in the case of multi-author publications, and may specify additional conditions that the candidate's scientific achievements should meet.
3. If the doctoral dissertation is a collection of published works and thematically related scientific articles, the candidate for the application referred to in § 17 section 1, also attaches declarations of all co-authors of each article, specifying their individual contribution, including percentage, to their creation. The candidate is exempt from the obligation to submit a declaration in the case of:
- 1) the death of a co-author,
 - 2) declaring him/her dead,

- 3) another objective obstacle, which prevents from obtaining the required declaration.
4. The Scientific Council may determine the requirements that should be met by the set of published and thematically related scientific articles referred to in section 3, including in particular the minimum individual contribution of the candidate to the creation of the set of articles and the method of verifying the fulfillment of these requirements.
5. A candidate who has completed education at the Doctoral School or doctoral studies at the University in order to meet the condition referred to in section 2 point 3 must attach to the application referred to in section 1 a certificate issued by the Director of the Doctoral School confirming the achievement of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF. The template of the certificate is specified by the Rector by an order.
6. The certificate referred to in section 5, should specify the learning outcomes that the candidate achieved during education at the Doctoral School or during doctoral studies at the University.
7. In case the candidate has not submitted the certificate in question in section 5, or the content of the certificate submitted by the candidate, referred to in section 5, does not meet the requirements specified in section 6 and also in the case of a candidate in the extramural mode, verification of the candidate's achievement of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF is carried out in accordance with the principles specified in § 48 and 49.
8. The provisions of section 5-7 shall apply mutatis mutandis to candidates who submit a certificate issued by the competent authority of another university or a duly authorized person regarding completion of education at a doctoral school or doctoral studies at another university.
9. If the candidate submits the declaration referred to in section 2 point 4, the confirmation of knowledge of a modern foreign language at the B2 language proficiency level is carried out on the terms set out in § 50.
10. Consideration of the application referred to in § 17 section 1, shall be suspended for the period of:
 - 1) verification of the candidate's achievement of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF in accordance with the principles specified in § 48 and 49
or

- 2) confirmation of knowledge of a modern foreign language at the B2 language proficiency level in accordance with the principles set out in § 50,
 - 3) verification of scientific achievements in accordance with the principles set out in § 19.
11. If the supervisor is not an academic teacher of GUPES, a designated GUPES employee checks the doctoral dissertation with the use of the Uniform Anti-plagiarism System referred to in Art. 351 section 1 of the Act and submits a report to the supervisor for approval and signature.

§ 19

1. The candidate referred to in Art. 186 section 2 of the Act, attaches to the application, referred to § 17 section 1, scientific achievements and opinions confirming the highest quality of the candidate's scientific achievements in the field of physical culture sciences, prepared by at least two persons holding the academic title of professor or the academic degree of habilitated doctor, not employed at the University.
2. The candidate referred to in Art. 186 section 2 of the Act, in the application referred in § 17 section 1, may instead of presenting the opinions referred to in section 1, request the appointment of a committee to verify the quality of scientific achievements.
3. The committee referred to in section 2 is appointed by the chairman of the Scientific Council, at the request of the Director of the Doctoral School. The committee consists of at least 3 members, including the chairman who manages its activities.
4. A member of the committee referred to in section 2, may be a person holding the academic title of professor or the academic degree of habilitated doctor.
5. The committee referred to in section 2, evaluates the scientific achievements submitted by the candidate and issues a written opinion on the quality of the candidate's scientific achievements justifying the initiation of the proceedings.
6. The opinion referred to in section 5 is signed by all the committee members. The chairman of the committee shall immediately submit the opinion to the Director of the Doctoral School.

7. The chairman of the Scientific Council, at the request of the Director of the Doctoral School, may appoint the committee referred to in section 2, also in the event that the opinions referred to in section 1, raise doubts.

§ 20

1. To the application referred to in § 17 section 1, the candidate attaches one paper copy of the doctoral dissertation along with an electronic copy saved in PDF format on an external data carrier.
2. A paper copy of the doctoral dissertation should be:
 - 1) bound in a cardboard or soft binding and permanently glued or sewn,
 - 2) have the inscription “doctoral thesis” or “doctoral dissertation” or another equivalent inscription in a foreign language on the title page,
 - 3) have the signature of the supervisor, supervisors or supervisor and assistant supervisor, respectively, on the title page or the page immediately following the title page.
3. The Scientific Council may determine detailed requirements that the doctoral dissertation should meet, including editorial or editing requirements, as well as requirements regarding the summary of the doctoral dissertation.

§ 21

The supervisor or supervisors prepare an opinion on the doctoral dissertation prepared in an extramural mode within 2 months from the date of its submission for review.

§ 22

1. Within 30 days of appointing the doctoral committee or upon request of the chairman of the Scientific Council, the candidate shall submit three additional paper copies of the doctoral dissertation for reviewers.
2. The candidate is obliged to submit additional copies of the doctoral dissertation, apart from the copies referred to in section 1, also at the request of the chairman of the Scientific Council, the Director of the Doctoral School or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee.

§ 23

1. The documents referred to in § 18 section 2 points 2-4, not prepared in Polish or English require their translation into Polish or English.
2. The translations referred to in section 1, may be made by:
 - 1) a person entered by the Minister of Justice on the list of sworn translators, or
 - 2) a person registered as a sworn translator in a Member State of the European Union (EU), a Member State of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) – a party to the Agreements on the European Economic Area or a Member State of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), or
 - 3) the consul of the Republic of Poland competent for the country in the territory of which the document was issued, or
 - 4) a diplomatic representation or consular office accredited in the Republic of Poland of the country on the territory of which the document was issued, or
 - 5) another entity or institution whose credibility is beyond question, based on the consent of the chairman of the Scientific Council.

§ 24

1. If the application referred to in § 17 section 1, or the documentation referred to § 18 contains deficiencies, errors or raises doubts, the Director of the Doctoral School calls on the candidate to correct or supplement the application or documentation within a period of not less than 7 days under pain of negative consequences of failure to complete the application, including leaving the application unprocessed.
2. If the application referred to in § 17 section 1 is left unprocessed, the Director of the Doctoral School will notify the candidate about it.

§ 25

1. The Director of the Doctoral School, after verifying the completeness of the application referred in § 17 section 4, in particular whether the candidate meets the requirements referred to in Art. 186 section 1 points 1-3 or section 2 of the Act, forwards the application to the chairman of the Scientific Council and provides information on the completeness of the application.

2. The application referred to in § 17 section 1, is considered complete if it meets the conditions specified in § 18-19, § 20 section 1 and 2, as well as § 23.
3. Based on the information from the Director of the Doctoral School about the completeness of the application referred to in section 1, the Scientific Council adopts the resolution referred to in section 4, or the resolution referred to in section 6.
4. The Scientific Council, based on the complete application referred to in § 17 section 1, and after determining that the candidate meets the requirements referred to in Art. 186 section 1 points 1-3 or section 2 of the Act, adopts a resolution on initiating proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree.
5. If the resolution referred to in section 3 has not obtained the required majority of votes, it is deemed that a resolution refusing to initiate proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree has been adopted.
6. The Scientific Council refuses to initiate proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree in the form of a decision if:
 - 1) the candidate does not meet the requirements specified in Art. 186 section 1 points 1-3 or section 2 or the requirements referred to in the second sentence of section 1 of the Act;
 - 2) the candidate in the application referred to in § 17 section 1, did not indicate the field of physical culture sciences as the scientific discipline in which he/she is applying for a doctoral degree;
 - 3) the application submitted by the candidate, referred to in § 17 section 1, is incomplete in other respects.
7. The resolution refusing to initiate the proceedings includes a justification.
8. The chairman of the Scientific Council shall immediately deliver to the candidate the resolution referred to in section 4 or 6, and if the decision to initiate the proceedings is negative – together with the justification referred to in section 6, as well as information on the candidate's right to lodge a complaint from the decision and the rules for its submission in accordance with section 9.
9. The candidate may lodge a complaint against the decision refusing to initiate the proceedings to the CSE. The complaint must be submitted via the Scientific Council within 7 days from the delivery date of the resolution in refusing to initiate the proceedings to the candidate.

Chapter V

Conducting the procedure for the awarding of a doctoral degree

§ 26

1. The procedure for awarding a doctoral degree is conducted by the Scientific Council.
2. To carry out activities in the procedure for the awarding of a doctoral degree, the Scientific Council may appoint a doctoral committee composed of:
 - 1) at least seven academic teachers of the University, holding the academic title of professor or the academic degree of habilitated doctor, for whom the University is their primary place of work and who have submitted declarations of representing at least 75% of physical culture sciences,
 - 2) a supervisor or supervisors.
3. Candidates for members of the doctoral committee referred to in section 2 point 1, shall be submitted by the chairman of the Scientific Council or at least three members of the Scientific Council.
4. When selecting members of the doctoral committee, the Scientific Council takes into account the scientific specialization covered by the doctoral thesis.
5. The Scientific Council appoints the chairman of the doctoral committee from among its members referred to in section 2 point 1.
6. The Scientific Council may appoint a deputy chairman of the doctoral committee from among its members referred to in section 2 point 1, who performs the duties and powers of the chairman of the doctoral committee during his/her absence.

§ 27

1. The member of the doctoral committee referred to in § 26 section 2 point 1, cannot be a person:
 - 1) to whom the candidate, his/her supervisor or assistant supervisor is or was married;
 - 2) who is a second-degree relative or relative by affinity of the candidate, his/her supervisor or assistant supervisor;
 - 3) with whom the candidate, his/her supervisor or assistant supervisor is or has been in cohabitation;

- 4) with whom the candidate, his/her supervisor or assistant supervisor is or was related by virtue of adoption, guardianship or custody;
 - 5) who is the candidate's direct superior or subordinate;
 - 6) who is a co-author of a scientific article included in a doctoral dissertation in the form of a set of published and thematically related scientific articles or who is a co-author of the publication referred to in § 18 section 2 point 5;
 - 7) in relations to whom there are other circumstances that may give rise to justified concerns as to his/her reliability, impartiality or objectivity when conducting activities in the proceedings.
2. The chairman of the Scientific Council may oblige a candidate for a member of the doctoral committee to submit a declaration regarding the occurrence of the circumstances referred to in section 1.
 3. The Scientific Council shall immediately dismiss a person from the committee in case of any of the circumstances mentioned in section 1, and appoints a new member of the committee in his/her place.
 4. The Scientific Council invalidates the activities of the doctoral committee which included the person referred to in section 1, unless when these activities were undertaken, there was no basis for dismissing the committee member specified in section 1, or the participation of this member in the activity had no influence on its result.
 5. If a member of the doctoral committee is a member of the Scientific Council, he/she does not participate in the vote of the Scientific Council on the resolution regarding dismissal from the committee.

§ 28

1. The chairman of the doctoral committee organizes the work of the Committee.
2. Resolutions of the doctoral committee are signed by the chairman of the committee.
3. The doctoral committee meets at stationary or remote meetings.
4. Meetings of the doctoral committee are recorded in minutes by a person designated by the chairman of the doctoral committee.
5. The person preparing the minutes of the meeting of the doctoral committee does not have to be its member.

6. The minutes of the meeting of the doctoral committee are signed by the chairman of the doctoral committee and the minutes clerk.
7. If resolutions are adopted at the meeting in a secret ballot, the cards on which the votes were cast are attached to the minutes, or a printout from the electronic secret voting system documenting the voting result.

§ 29

1. The Scientific Council adopts resolutions in the proceedings referred to in section 2 and 3, and the appointed doctoral committee – the resolutions referred to in section 4, in a secret ballot, by an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the number of members entitled to vote.
2. Activities in the proceedings end with resolutions of the Scientific Council regarding:
 - 1) the initiation of the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree,
 - 2) submitting a doctoral dissertation for review,
 - 3) the appointment of reviewers,
 - 4) admission to defense,
 - 5) the acceptance of defense,
 - 6) the awarding of a doctoral degree.
3. During the proceedings, the Scientific Council may also take the following actions in the form of resolutions on:
 - 1) changing the supervisor or supervisors,
 - 2) changing the assistant supervisor,
 - 3) appointing the doctoral committee,
 - 4) refusing admission to defense, without appointing reviewers,
 - 5) dismissing the reviewer,
 - 6) supplementing the review,
 - 7) sending the doctoral dissertation for supplementation or correction,
 - 8) awarding the doctoral dissertation,
 - 9) discontinuing the proceedings.
4. In the proceedings, the doctoral committee appointed by the Scientific Council may perform activities referred to in section 2 points 2, 4-5 and section 3 points 4, 6-7.

5. Unless the provisions of the Act, the Statute or the Regulations provide otherwise, the Scientific Council and the doctoral committee may take other necessary actions in the proceeding in the form of resolutions in an open vote, by a simple majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the number of members entitled to vote.
6. A resolution adopted in violation of the principle of secrecy of voting is invalid.

§ 30

1. Before appointing reviewers, the Scientific Council or the doctoral committee performs a preliminary verification of the doctoral dissertation, including its title, in terms of the used methodological techniques, in particular the correctness of the hypotheses, research questions and the used research methods, techniques and tools, as well as in terms of meeting the requirements specified in § 20 section 2 and 3.
2. During the initial verification, the Scientific Council or the doctoral committee may refer the doctoral dissertation for supplementation or correction.
3. If the doctoral dissertation is referred for supplementation or correction, the resolution specifies the scope requiring correction or supplementation, the reasons for which it has to be corrected or supplemented and the deadline for supplementing and correcting the doctoral dissertation is no longer than 6 months from the date of delivery of the resolution to the candidate. At the candidate's request, the deadline for supplementing or correcting the dissertation may be extended, but not more than by 3 months at a time.
4. A completed or corrected doctoral dissertation along with a written response to the reasons for submitting the doctoral dissertation to correct or supplement specified in the resolution referred to in section 3, the candidate shall submit in four paper copies together with an electronic copy saved on an external data carrier to the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively. Provision of § 22 section 2 shall apply accordingly.
5. If the Scientific Council or doctoral committee deems it necessary, it may re-submit the doctoral dissertation for further supplementation or correction. The provision of section 3 and 4 shall apply accordingly.

6. A completed or corrected written doctoral dissertation does not require the submission of a new report on verification with the use of the Uniform Anti-plagiarism System referred to in Art. 351 section 1 of the Act.
7. Instead of supplementing or correcting the doctoral dissertation, the candidate may submit a written statement about the refusal to supplement or correct the doctoral dissertation to the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively.
8. If, as a result of the initial verification, the Scientific Council or doctoral committee decides that the doctoral dissertation does not require supplementation or correction, or when it considers that the doctoral dissertation has been duly completed or corrected, or if the candidate refuses to supplement or correct the doctoral dissertation, the Scientific Council or doctoral committee adopts a resolution to refer the doctoral dissertation for review.
9. If the resolution to refer the doctoral dissertation for review does not obtain the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the Scientific Council or doctoral committee, respectively, refused to refer the doctoral dissertation for review.
10. The chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee shall immediately inform the candidate about the refusal to refer the dissertation for review.
11. If the resolution to refuse to refer the dissertation for review has been adopted by the Scientific Council, it shall immediately adopt a resolution to refuse to allow the dissertation to be defended, without appointing reviewers.
12. If the resolution to refuse to refer the dissertation for review was adopted by the doctoral committee, its chairman requests the scientific Council to refuse to allow the candidate to defend, without appointing reviewers.

§ 31

1. In the proceedings, the Scientific Council appoints at least 3 reviewers:
 - 1) who are not employees of the University or a university, an institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences, a research institute or an international institute of which the person applying for a doctoral degree is an employee,
 - 2) meeting the requirements referred to in Art. 190 section 4 or 5 of the Act,

- 3) at least two of whom have a habilitated doctor's degree in the field of physical culture sciences.
2. Candidates for reviewers in the proceedings are nominated by the chairman of the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee.

§ 32

1. The reviewer of a doctoral dissertation cannot be a person in relations to whom there are justified doubts as to his/her impartiality. Provision of § 27 section 1 shall apply accordingly.
2. In the case referred to in section 1, the Scientific Council shall immediately dismiss the reviewer and appoint a new one in his/her place.
3. The chairman of the Scientific Council before submitting the application for a meeting of the Scientific Council regarding the reviewer's dismissal, notifies the reviewer of the disclosed circumstances justifying doubts to the impartiality of the reviewer and calls on him/her to present his/her position within 14 days of receiving the notification.
4. The chairman of the Scientific Council after receiving the position of the reviewer, referred to in section 3, or after the deadline for presenting this position has expired, submits a motion to dismiss the reviewer to a meeting of the Scientific Council.
5. The chairman of the Scientific Council shall notify of the submission of the application referred to in section 4 the reviewer concerned by the application, the candidate and the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee.
6. The reviewer concerned by the application is invited to a meeting of the Scientific Council, where a resolution on the reviewer's dismissal is adopted.
7. If the resolution regarding the reviewer's dismissal does not obtain the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the Scientific Council has adopted a resolution refusing to dismiss the reviewer.
8. The chairman of the Scientific Council informs the reviewer, the candidate and the appointed doctoral committee about the content of the adopted resolution regarding the reviewer's dismissal.

§ 33

If the reviewer performs his/her duties improperly, in particular he/she fails to prepare the review on time, the Scientific Council may dismiss the reviewer. The provisions of § 32 shall apply accordingly.

§ 34

Reviews are prepared in Polish, unless the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee specifies a different language for preparing the review, if it is known to the candidate, reviewers and members of the doctoral committee.

§ 35

1. The reviewer prepares a review of the doctoral dissertation within 2 months from the date of its delivery and submits it to the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively.
2. The review should include a detailed justified assessment of whether the doctoral dissertation meets the conditions specified in Art. 187 section 1-3 of the Act.
3. If the doctoral dissertation is an independent and separate part of a collective work, the review shall include an assessment of the individual contribution of the person applying for the doctoral degree to the creation of this work.
4. The review may include proposals to supplement or improve the doctoral dissertation.
5. The Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee may refer the doctoral dissertation for supplementation or correction to the extend indicated in the review.
6. A completed or corrected written doctoral dissertation does not require the submission of a new report on verification with the use of the Uniform Anti-plagiarism System referred to in Art. 351 section 1 of the Act.
7. If the doctoral dissertation is referred for supplementation or correction, the resolution specifies a deadline for supplementing or correcting the doctoral dissertation, no longer than 6 months from the date of delivery of the resolution to the candidate. At the candidate's request, the deadline for supplementing or correcting the dissertation may be extended, but not more than by 3 months at a time.

8. The completed or corrected doctoral dissertation along with a written response to the reviews containing proposals for supplementing or correcting the doctoral dissertation the candidate shall submit in four paper copies together with an electronic copy saved on an external data carrier to the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively, who refers the doctoral dissertation after supplementation or correction for reassessment by the same reviewers. . Provision of § 22 section 2 shall apply accordingly.
9. The reviewer prepares a review of the supplemented or corrected doctoral dissertation within one month from the date of its delivery and submits it to the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively.
10. Instead of supplementing or correcting the doctoral dissertation, the candidate may submit a written statement about the refusal to supplement or correct the doctoral dissertation to the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively. In such a case, the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively, refers the case to adopt a resolution on admission to defense.
11. If the review contains deficiencies, the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee, respectively, may adopt a resolution to supplement the review. The resolution specifies the scope and deadline for completing the review, no longer than one month.
12. The reviewer prepares a completed review in the manner and within the deadline specified in accordance with section 9 and submits it to the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee, respectively.
13. The reviewer is not entitled to additional remuneration for performing another review or supplementing the review.

§ 36

The reviewer submits the review referred to in § 35 in the form of:

- 1) a paper copy with a handwritten signature together with an electronic copy saved on an external data carrier, or

- 2) an electronic document bearing a qualified electronic signature or a trusted signature.

§ 37

1. A candidate is admitted to the defense when the doctoral dissertation has received positive reviews from at least 2 reviewers and has met the requirements specified in Art. 187 section 1, 2 and 4 of the Act and § 20 section 2 and 3.
2. The Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee decides in the form of a resolution to admit the candidate to the defense.
3. The resolution on admitting the candidate to the defense shall specify the date, time, place and language of the defense.
4. The defense of the doctoral dissertation takes place in Polish, unless the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee determines that the language of defense will be a language other than Polish, if it is known to the candidate and the members of the doctoral committee.
5. The chairman of the doctoral committee immediately after adopting the resolution referred to in section 2, notifies the chairman of the Scientific Council and the candidate about the date, time, place and language of the defense.
6. A change of the date, time, place or language of the defense takes place in the form of a resolution in accordance with the principles specified in § 29 section 5.
7. If the resolution on admitting the candidate to the defense does not receive the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the Scientific Council has adopted a resolution refusing to allow the candidate to defend, and in the case of the doctoral committee that a resolution has been adopted to submit an application to the Scientific Council to refuse the candidate admission to the defense.
8. Based on the request of the doctoral committee referred to in section 7, the Scientific Council decides in the form of a resolution to allow the candidate to defend himself/herself.
9. The resolution refusing admission to the defense includes a justification.

10. The chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee shall immediately deliver to the candidate the resolution on admitting the candidate to defend, and if the decision on admitting the candidate to defend is negative, also the justification referred to in section 9, as well as information about the candidate's right to lodge a complaint against the decision and the rules for filing it in accordance with section 11.
11. The candidate may appeal against the decision to refuse admission to the defense to the CSE. The objection must be submitted via the Scientific Council within 7 days from the date of delivery of the resolution refusing the candidate admission to the defense.

§ 38

The University makes available in BIP (Public Information Bulletin) on its website, no later than:

- 1) 30 days before the scheduled date of the doctoral dissertation defense:
 - a) a doctoral dissertation that is a written thesis along with its summary or a description of a doctoral dissertation that is not a written thesis,
 - b) reviews;
- 2) 10 days before the scheduled date for defense of the doctoral dissertation – information about the date, place and method of its conduct.

§ 39

1. The defense is public, with the exception of the defense of the doctoral dissertation referred to in Art. 188 section 2 of the Act, and takes place at an open meeting of the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee in the presence of at least half of the members of the Scientific Council or doctoral committee, the candidate, the supervisor or supervisors and at least 2 reviewers.
2. The defense of a doctoral dissertation may be carried out outside the seat of the University with the use of electronic means of communication, ensuring in particular:
 - 1) real-time defense transmission between its participants,
 - 2) real-time multi-party communication, in which defense participants can express their views during the communication

– while observing the necessary safety rules.

3. The defense may be conducted in a hybrid mode, which means that some of the persons, referred to in section 1, take part in defense using electronic means of communication. The participation of the persons referred to in section 1, in a hybrid mode, shall be recorded in the minutes.
4. The decision to conduct the defense in the manner specified in section 2 or 3 shall be made by the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee with the consent of the Director of the Doctoral School, after obtaining the consent of the candidate or at his/her request.
5. The members of the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee participating in the defense using electronic means of communication are obliged to have their cameras and, at the request of the chairman, microphones turned on during the defense.
6. The candidate is obliged to be present in person at the place of defense, unless the defense is carried out in the manner specified in section 2 or 3.
7. Technical conditions for organizing a defense in the manner referred to in section 2 and 3, shall be determined by the Rector by an order.
8. The defense takes place during a meeting consisting of a public and closed part.
9. From the course of the public part of the meeting, referred to in section 1, a recording is made and constitutes an annex to the minutes. The course of the closed part may be recorded only for the purpose of preparing the minutes. The recording from the closed part is kept until the minutes are prepared and signed, but no longer than 3 months from the end of the meeting. The chairman of the Scientific Council may decide to extend the storage period of the recording of the closed part of the meeting.
10. The chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee may order a break in the meeting referred to in section 1, specifying the date, time and place of the continuation of the meeting. The persons present at the interrupted meeting and whose presence is necessary for the continuation of the meeting are obliged to appear on the new date without separate notice.
11. The public part of the meeting referred to in section 8, consists of:
 - 1) the supervisor presenting the candidate's profile,

- 2) the candidate presenting the main assumptions and results of the doctoral dissertation,
 - 3) the reviewers presenting the most important elements of the review or reading the review in its entirety in the absence of the reviewer,
 - 4) a public discussion, including the candidate's response to the reviews submitted in the procedure and answering questions asked to the candidate.
12. After the defense is completed, the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee orders the closure of the public part of the meeting and the commencement of the closed part.
13. The closed part of the meeting is attended only by:
- 1) the persons entitled to vote on the resolution accepting the defense, including reviewers,
 - 2) a clerk,
 - 3) an assistant supervisor – as an observer, without the right to vote.
14. During the closed part of the meeting, the Scientific Council or the appointed doctoral committee, after consultation, adopts a resolution on accepting the defense.
15. If the resolution on accepting the defense does not obtain the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the resolution refusing to accept the defense has been adopted.
16. In the event of refusal to accept the defense, the doctoral committee shall prepare a detailed justification for the resolution referred to in section 14.
17. The resolution, referred to in section 14, is announced by the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee to the participants of the public part of the meeting after its adoption. If the candidate is not present when the resolution is announced, the chairman of the Scientific Council or the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee notifies him/her about the content of the adopted resolution.
18. The chairman of the doctoral committee, after the doctoral committee has adopted a resolution on accepting the defense, submits a request to the chairman of the Scientific Council regarding:
- 1) the awarding of a doctoral degree – if the doctoral committee has adopted a resolution to accept the defense;

- 2) the refusal to award a doctoral degree – if the doctoral committee has adopted a resolution refusing to accept the defense.
19. The application referred to in section 18 is accompanied by:
- 1) a copy of the resolution referred to in section 14,
 - 2) a justification for the resolution referred to in section 16 – if a resolution refusing to accept the defense has been adopted,
 - 3) the minutes of the meeting referred to in section 8.

§ 40

If the candidate fails to appear at the defense without justified reasons or does not take an active part in the defense or leaves the defense site before its completion, the candidate is deemed to have failed to defend his/her doctoral dissertation.

§ 41

1. Immediately after adopting a resolution on accepting or refusing to accept a defense, the Scientific Council shall make a decision in the form of a resolution on awarding or refusing to award a doctoral degree. If the resolution on awarding the degree is adopted at the request of the doctoral committee referred to in § 39 section 18, the Scientific Council adopts the resolution specified in the application.
2. The Scientific Council refuses to award a doctoral degree if the candidate has not defended his/her doctoral dissertation.
3. If the resolution on awarding the doctoral degree does not obtain the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the Scientific Council has adopted a resolution refusing to award the doctoral degree.
4. The chairman of the Scientific Council may invite the chairman of the appointed doctoral committee and other members of the doctoral committee to a meeting of the Scientific Council at which the decision referred to in section 1 will be made, in order to present the course of work of the doctoral committee and defense.
5. The resolution on awarding or refusing to award a doctoral degree is signed by the chairman of the Scientific Council. If the Scientific Council adopts a resolution refusing to award a doctoral degree, it shall include a justification.

6. The resolution of the Scientific Council on awarding or refusing to award a doctoral degree constitutes an administrative decision within the meaning of Art. 178 section 1 of the Act.
7. The chairman of the Scientific Council shall immediately deliver to the candidate the resolution referred to in section 1, and if the decision to award the doctoral degree is negative – also the justification referred to in section 5, second task, as well as information about the candidate's right to appeal against the decision and the rules for filing an appeal in accordance with § 43.

§ 42

1. A doctoral dissertation may be distinguished if at least two reviewers have requested it.
2. In the case referred to in section 1, the doctoral committee in the application for awarding a doctoral degree referred to in § 39 section 18 point1, applies to the Scientific Council for the distinction of the doctoral dissertation.

§ 43

1. The candidate may appeal against the decision of the Scientific Council to refuse to award a doctoral degree to the CSE.
2. The appeal is submitted through the Scientific Council.
3. The deadline for filing the appeal is 30 days from the date of delivery of the decision.
4. The Scientific Council submits the appeal to the CSE together with its opinion and case files within three months from the date of submitting the appeal.
5. Before submitting the files to the CSE, the Scientific Council may request a position on the appeal filed to the doctoral committee.

§ 44

In proceedings for awarding a doctoral degree, to the extent not regulated in the Act and the Regulations, the provisions of the Code of Administrative Procedure shall apply accordingly.

§ 45

1. If a doctoral dissertation is not allowed to be defended or a decision is made to refuse to award a doctoral degree, the same doctoral dissertation cannot be the basis for re-applying for a doctoral degree.
2. If the candidate has claimed authorship of an important fragment or other elements of someone else's work or scientific finding, the Scientific Council shall declare the decision to award a doctoral degree invalid.

§ 46

1. The proceedings may be discontinued at the candidate's request or in the cases specified in the Regulations. The proceedings are discontinued in the event of the candidate's death.
2. If the resolution discontinuing the proceedings does not obtain the required majority of votes, it is deemed that the Scientific Council has adopted a resolution refusing to discontinue the proceedings.
3. The Scientific Council refuses to discontinue the proceedings at the candidate's request if the public interest is against it, in particular under the circumstances referred to in § 45 section 2.
4. The resolution to discontinue the proceedings or refuse to discontinue the proceedings shall include a justification.
5. The chairman of the Scientific Council shall immediately deliver to the candidate and the supervisor, supervisors or assistant supervisor, respectively, a resolution discontinuing the proceedings or refusing to discontinue the proceedings. The resolution to discontinue the proceedings adopted in the case referred to in section 1, the second sentence, is not subject to delivery.

§ 47

The candidate has the right to inspect the files of his/her own proceedings, in particular the minutes, resolutions and recordings.

Chapter VI

The verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF and knowledge of a modern foreign language.

§ 48

1. In the case of a person applying for a doctoral degree in the extramural mode, the verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF is carried out by the qualifying committee.
2. The qualifying committees are appointed by the chairman of the Scientific Council, at the request of the Director of the Doctoral School.
3. The Scientific Council determines the composition and operating principles of the qualifying committees.
4. The supervisor or supervisors may participate in the verification of the learning outcomes referred to in section 1, without voting rights.
5. The verification referred to in section 1, is made on the basis of documents submitted by the candidate, confirming achievement of the learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF, in particular based on:
 - 1) documents regarding:
 - a) the implementation of the educational program at the Doctoral School,
 - b) the implementation of the doctoral study program,
 - c) the implementation of a postgraduate study program enabling obtaining qualifications at level VIII of the PQF,
 - d) scientific achievements, including publications, participation in scientific projects or conference presentations,
 - e) a professional career
 - 2) results of examinations in the discipline referred to in § 49.
6. To the documents referred to in section 5 point 1, § 23 shall apply accordingly.
7. When verifying the learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF, the chairman of the qualifying committee may call on the candidate to provide additional explanations or submit additional documents.
8. From the course of verification referred to in section 1, a report is prepared containing a description of activities related to the verification of the learning outcomes obtained by the candidate for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF.

9. The report of the verification, referred to in section 1, shall be signed by all members of the qualifying committee.
10. The Scientific Council may determine the template of the verification report referred to in section 1.
11. The Scientific Council may establish guidelines regarding the scope and form of verification of learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF and the scope and form of examinations in the discipline.
12. After preparing the report, the qualifying committee adopts a resolution in a secret ballot, by an absolute majority of votes in the presence of at least half of the members entitled to vote, confirming that the candidate has achieved learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF.
13. If the resolution confirming that the candidate has achieved learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF has not obtained the required majority of votes, it is deemed that a resolution has been adopted stating that the candidate has not demonstrated that he/she has achieved learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF.
14. The chairman of the qualifying committee shall immediately inform the candidate about the result of the verification referred to in section 1 and provide him/her with a copy of the resolution referred to in section 12.
15. The chairman of the qualifying committee shall immediately submit to the Director of the Doctoral School the report referred to in section 8, as well as the resolution referred to in section 12.

§ 49

1. The verification of learning outcomes referred to in § 48 section 1, in the form of an examination in the field of physical culture studies, hereinafter referred to as the “discipline examination”, is conducted for candidates who have completed the first or second cycle of studies other than in the field of medical sciences, health sciences or physical culture sciences, or when the qualifying committee deems it necessary. A candidate in the extramural mode may be assigned up to three exams in a discipline.
2. The discipline examination is conducted in Polish, unless the qualifying committee specifies a different language for the discipline examination, if it is known to the candidate and the members of the qualifying committee.

3. The chairman of the qualifying committee sets the date and place of the discipline examination and notifies the candidate about it. The notification indicates the scope of topics covered by the examination.
4. At the candidate's request, the discipline examination may be conducted outside the seat of the University using electronic means of communication under the technical conditions specified by the Rector by an order.
5. A report is prepared on the course of the discipline examination. The recording clerk may not be a member of the qualifying committee. The report should include, in particular, the content of the questions asked by the members of the qualifying committee and the evaluation of the candidate's answers.
6. The Scientific Council may determine the template of the record for the discipline examination.
7. The members of the qualifying committee or the candidate may submit written objections to the content of the record.
8. The report on the course of the discipline examination is signed by all members of the qualifying committee and the recording clerk.
9. The course of the discipline examination may be recorded in order to prepare a report. The recording is kept for no longer than 3 months from the date of the exam completion.
10. The discipline examination ends with a positive or negative result.
11. A negative result in any of the discipline examinations assigned to the candidate means that the candidate did not achieve the learning outcomes for qualifications at level VIII of the PQF in the field of physical culture sciences.
12. At the candidate's request, submitted to the chairman of the qualifying committee within 14 days from the date of obtaining a negative result in the discipline examination, a re-take examination is conducted. The re-take examination in the discipline takes place no earlier than three months after the end of the previous examination. The examination may be retaken only once in connection with a given application referred to in § 17 section 1.

§ 50

1. In the case of a candidate who does not have an appropriate certificate or diploma confirming knowledge of a modern foreign language at least at the B2 language proficiency level, the chairman of the Scientific Council, at the request of the Director

of the Doctoral School, appoints a committee to conduct an examination confirming knowledge of a modern foreign language at the B2 language proficiency level, hereinafter referred to as the “language committee”.

2. The language committee consists of at least three persons, including the chairman, at least one of whom teaches the language chosen by the candidate, and the others have at least a doctoral degree and appropriate knowledge of this language.
3. The chairman of the language committee sets the date and place of the language examination and notifies the candidate about it.
4. At the candidate's request, the language examination may be conducted outside the seat of the University with the use of electronic means of communication under the technical conditions specified by the Rector by an order.
5. A report is prepared on the course of the language examination and signed by all members of the language committee.
6. The Scientific Council may determine the template of the language examination report.
7. The chairman of the language committee shall immediately inform the candidate about the result of the examination confirming knowledge of a modern foreign language at the B2 language proficiency level.
8. The chairman of the language committee shall immediately submit to the Director of the Doctoral School the report referred to in section 3.
9. At the candidate's request, submitted to the chairman of the language committee within 14 days from the date of announcement of the examination results, a re-take examination is conducted. The re-taken language examination takes place no earlier than three months after the previous examination. The examination may be re-taken only once in connection with a given application referred to in § 17 section 1.
10. The Scientific Council defines the rules and conditions for confirming knowledge of a modern foreign language at least at the B2 language proficiency level.

§ 51

If the candidate fails to appear for the discipline examination or language examination without justified reasons or does not take an active part in the examination or leaves the examination before its completion, the candidate is deemed to have obtained a negative result in the examination.

§ 52

The documentation of the verification process referred to in § 48 and the confirmation of knowledge of a modern foreign language at the B2 language proficiency level, referred to in § 50, shall be attached to the case file regarding the candidate's application referred to in § 17 section 1.

Chapter VI

Organizational Provisions

§ 53

1. If the provisions of the Regulations provide for the transmission or delivery of resolutions, notifications or other documents to the candidate, the Scientific Council or its chairman, the Director of the Doctoral School, reviewers or supervisors by the doctoral committee or its chairman, the Scientific Council or its chairman or by the qualifying or language committee, these activities are carried out through the organizational unit handling the proceedings for the awarding of a doctoral degree.
2. The notifications referred to in § 37 section 5, § 49 section 3 and § 50 section 3, shall be made at least 7 days in advance. The notice shall indicate the language in which the activities in the proceedings will be carried out.

Chapter VII

Joint Awarding of a Doctoral Degree

§ 54

1. The Scientific Council may award a doctoral degree jointly with other entities authorized to award a doctoral degree in the discipline in which the degree is awarded, provided that the agreement referred to in section 2 is concluded beforehand.

2. The Rector concludes an agreement in writing on behalf of the University with entities with which the Scientific Council is to jointly award a doctoral degree, i.e. universities, institutes of the Polish Academy of Sciences, research institutes or international institutes in a discipline in which each of these units has scientific category A+, A or B+, as well as with foreign entities authorized to award doctoral degrees in the discipline in which the degree is awarded.
3. The agreement referred to in section 2, defines the principles of cooperation, in particular indicates the entity responsible for entering data into the POL-on system (the Integrated Information system on Higher Education and Science).
4. To the extent not regulated in the agreement referred to in section 2, the provisions of the Regulations shall apply.
5. Before concluding the agreement referred to in section 2, the Rector requests the Scientific Council to express its opinion on the principles of cooperation.