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) |