ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MENTOR

|  |
| --- |
| NAME OF THE DOCTORAL STUDY |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. MENTOR
 |
| 1.1. Mentor |
| Title, first name and surname | Institution, country |
|       |       |
| 1.2. Co-mentor |
| Title, first name and surname | Institution, country |
|       |       |
| 1.3. Student's name and surname |
|       |
| 1.4. Student registration number |
|       |
| 1.5. Academic year for which the report is submitted |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. PROGRESSION TO STUDY
 |
| 2.1. Has a work plan been drawn up and is the student making progress in implementing this plan?(please tick) |
| Drafted the work Plan | Yes, no. |
| Made progress towards the work Plan | Yes, no. |
| 2.2 If you ticked “no” in the previous question, please explain why and suggest how this should be improved. |
|       |
| 2.3 On a scale of 1 to 5, assess the quality of the student's research progress on the proposed research topic and/or the accepted topic of the doctoral thesis (since the last report) |
| 1 - insufficient 2 - enough 3 - good 4 - very good 5 - excellent |
| 2.4 If you chose 1 or 2 in the previous question, please explain why and suggest how this should be improved. |
|       |
| 2.5. Comment on student progress since last report |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. STUDENT EVALUATION
 |
| 3.1. Please assess on a scale of 1 to 5:(1 - insufficient, 2 - sufficient, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent) |
| Student preparedness for consultation |  1 2 3 4 5 |
| Planning and conducting annual research and further training activities |  1 2 3 4 5 |
| Progress in mastering the methodology of scientific research |  1 2 3 4 5 |
| Writing and publication of scientific papers |  1 2 3 4 5 |
| The relationship of the doctoral candidate to studies in general |  1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3.2. On a scale of 1 to 5, assess the overall quality of doctoral research work |
| 1 - insufficient 2 - enough 3 - good 4 - very good 5 - excellent |
| 3.3. If you have selected 2 in the previous question, please explain why and suggest how this should be improved. |
|       |
| 3.4. Commenting on the overall scientific research quality of doctoral students |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. OPINION ON CANDIDATE ABILITY TO CONTINUE STUDIES
 |
| * 1. Can a student continue his/her studies?
 | 1. Yes.
2. Yes, under certain conditions.
3. No.
 |
| * 1. If you have chosen b) or c) in the previous question, please explain why.
 |
|       |
| * 1. Other comments and opinions of the mentor

(if applicable) |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| Place, date and signature |
| In Opatija, dd/mm/year | Signature(name of the mentor)  |
| Signature(name of the co-mentor) |