

Brno, 8 December 2010  
Ref. No. 10086/2010-491

## **FFWT Dean's Decree 6/2010**

### **Course of Doctoral Study**

#### **1. Introductory Provisions**

1. This directive is based on Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on higher-education institutions (Sections 47 and 47a), and on the Study and Examination Rules for study in the Bachelor's, Master's and doctoral programmes of the Mendel University in Brno (hereinafter referred to as the MENDELU SER) dated 15 March 2007 (Part Three: Study in Doctoral Programmes).
2. The directive shall regulate doctoral study at the Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology of the Mendel University in Brno (hereinafter referred to as the FFWT of the MENDELU).

#### **2. Rules of Procedure of Subject-Area Board**

1. Activities and meetings of a subject-area board (hereinafter referred to as SAB) shall be managed by its chairperson and, in his/her absence, by its vice-chairperson.
2. The chairperson and vice-chairperson shall be elected by the SAB by secret ballot at the first regular meeting of a newly accredited SAB, which shall be convened and chaired until the election of a new chairperson by its present chairperson or by a person authorised by the Dean; it is usually the head of the relevant department at which the relevant doctoral programme (hereinafter referred to as DP) or the doctoral field of study (hereinafter referred to as DFS) is implemented. If the SAB repeatedly fails to elect a chairperson at its meeting, the Dean shall propose a change in the composition of the SAB to the Research Board of the FFWT of the MENDELU.
3. The SAB has a quorum if at least two thirds of all the SAB members are present. The election of a chairperson and vice-chairperson and the adoption of a resolution require the affirmative approval of an absolute majority of all the SAB members.
4. The Subject-Area Board shall meet as necessary at least once a year, usually in November. It is necessary to convene a regular meeting in the event of:
  - a. election of a chairperson,
  - b. election of a vice-chairperson,

- c. discussion of the ISP of new students commencing their studies,
  - d. defences of so-called minimum requirements for doctoral students,
  - e. consideration of a proposal for the termination of study of a doctoral student by reason of failure to perform study obligations.
5. The SAB chairperson may ask for voting by correspondence in all cases not listed above but only in the event that none of the SAB members raises an objection. If any SAB member objects, it is necessary to call a regular meeting of the SAB. Voting by correspondence is valid if at least two thirds of the SAB members participate therein. A resolution is adopted if there is affirmative approval of an absolute majority of all the SAB members. Voting by correspondence may be applied particularly in the following cases:
- a. proposal of external examiners for the defence of a DP,
  - b. proposal of supervisors,
  - c. proposal of members of examination boards for state doctoral examinations and the defence of dissertations,
  - d. discussion of proposals of topics of dissertations,
  - e. in other activities associated with the organisation and course of doctoral study.
6. Minutes shall be drawn up of all SAB meetings; if there is a resolution by correspondence, it is necessary to name members who took part in the voting and how they voted.

### **3. Supervisors**

1. The position of a supervisor is regulated by Art. 26 of the MENDELU SER.
2. A supervisor must demonstrate publication activity that corresponds in a five-year assessment period to a minimum of 50 non-reduced points pursuant to RECTOR'S DECISION 25/2007 in Category A1-A14. For biological and ecological fields of study, publication and a citation index at the Web of Science (hereinafter WoS) shall be a binding condition. Individual fields may further adjust their requirements beyond the framework of this basic requirement. At the request of the Dean or, where appropriate, the chairperson of a SAB, a supervisor is obliged to prepare an evaluation report.
3. The qualification pre-requisites for proposed supervisors shall be the responsibility of the chairperson of the SAB concerned.
4. A supervisor shall be responsible for the basic provision of materials for an announced topic of the doctoral thesis.
5. If a supervisor fails to perform his/her duties, the SAB chairperson may propose a change of supervisors to the Dean. A change of a supervisor may also be initiated by the Faculty Dean.

#### **4. Admission Procedure**

6. Conditions relating to the admission procedure are published together with Conditions for the admission procedure concerning Bachelor's and Master's programmes usually in November of the preceding year.
7. Offered topics of doctoral theses are published at the website of the FFWT of the MENDELU in the "doctoral study" section until 31 March of the current year. The topics are proposed by supervisors, who shall submit their proposed topics to SAB chairpersons by the end of February of the current year. The proposed topics are discussed on the SAB, SAB chairpersons shall inform respective heads of departments at which the DP/DFS is implemented and, thereafter, they shall pass proposed topics on to the Project Department (hereinafter PMO). The right of a doctoral student to propose his/her own topic of a doctoral thesis shall remain unaffected.
8. The admission procedure usually takes place in the period of 1-15 June of the current year. The deadline for the acceptance of applications is 30 days before the announced dates of the admission procedure. The Dean may also set dates of the admission procedure outside this period.
9. Application requirements:
  - a curriculum vitae (a structured, suitable EUROPASS form),
  - a higher-education diploma,
  - an overview of specialised activities hitherto,
  - a list of publications and other creative activities,
  - a general draft of the topic of the thesis (objective, hypothesis, general overview of the issues – a basic literature review of the issues; all to the extent of one A4 format page)
  - average results for Master's (M.Sc.) study,
  - proof of payment of the administrative fee,
  - where appropriate, other recommending documents (references of employer, references of an expert in the field, proof of undergoing study stays and work experience abroad etc.),
  - in the case of foreign applicants: 2 letters of recommendation from experts in the field.

An application shall be submitted to the PMO within the set dates. If the materials are incomplete, the application is not accepted and the applicant is invited to complete it. If he/she fails to do so, his/her application is rejected.

5. The Dean shall appoint an Admission Board of the relevant doctoral programme / field of study. As a rule, the chairperson or vice-chairperson of the relevant SAB is the chairperson of the Admission Board.
6. The SAB chairperson shall receive all background materials relating to the admission procedure from a relevant PMO female officer.
7. During the entrance examination, the Admission Board shall verify the pre-requisites for scientific work of the applicants and shall compile a ranking of the applicants, which it shall pass on to the PMO. In cases worthy of consideration, the Board may assess the quality of the applicant on the basis of materials supplied without the applicant being present. The SAB chairperson shall forthwith notify potential supervisors of successful applicants of the results of the entrance examination. The potential supervisor must agree to the admission of the doctoral student.
8. The PMO in cooperation with a designated Vice-Dean shall process the results of the admission procedure and submit them to the Dean for discussion on the Admission Board.
9. In justified cases, the Dean may waive the taking of an entrance examination.

### **5. Individual Study Plan**

1. An individual study plan (hereinafter ISP) shall be drawn up by a doctoral student in cooperation with his/her supervisor in the relevant UIS application by 31 October of the current year. Specialist examinations and a language examination must be proposed in the study plan in such a way that they are passed by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year. In justified cases (e.g. a long-term stay abroad related to doctoral study), the SAB may permit passing the examinations in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year. It is recommended to schedule a PhD viva voce by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year.
2. The heads of relevant departments shall enter, without delay, into the UIS their opinions on the ISP of doctoral students at the departments they manage. Above all, they shall comment on the provision of materials for dealing with the topic and its compliance with the priorities of the department etc.
3. SAB chairpersons shall discuss individual plans within the Subject-Area Boards and shall enter the opinion of the chairperson of the Subject-Area Board into the UIS by 30 November of the current year; if a SAB chairperson does not agree with an ISP, he/she shall return it to the supervisor and doctoral student for completion. A SAB chairperson together with the SAB are obliged to assess whether or not a supervisor meets qualitative requirements for supervisors, i.e. requirements concerning publication or possibly other creative outputs under Article 3 Supervisors, par. 2.

4. After a favourable opinion of the SAB chairperson is entered into the UIS, the doctoral student shall print the individual plan in 3 copies, sign it and cause the supervisor and head of the department to sign it and submit it to the SAB chairperson.
5. The chairpersons of the Subject-Area Boards shall sign the ISP and pass it on by 15 December of the current year to the PMO, who shall prepare the ISP for the Dean for signature.
6. If an ISP does not meet any of the requirements, the ISP shall be returned for revision. The SAB chairperson is obliged, in cooperation with the doctoral student, to remedy the deficiencies identified in the ISP.
7. In justified cases, a doctoral student may apply to the Dean of the FFWT of the MENDELU during his/her study for a change in the ISP. The supervisor and SAB chairperson must give their opinions on the proposed change. The application shall be filed to the PMO; the change shall be approved by the Dean or by a Vice-Dean designated by the former.
8. The change may only be approved in justified cases provided that the doctoral student fulfils other duties arising from the ISP. All proposals shall be filed to the PMO in a form (Annex 2).

## **6. Evaluation of the Course of DP Study**

1. The evaluation shall be made once a year, before enrolment for the next year.
2. The evaluation shall be submitted by a DP student and, in his/her absence, by the supervisor, through a completed form "Evaluation of a Student in DP" (hereinafter the Evaluation) by delivering two copies to the PMO by 31 August of the relevant year. Upon request, a DP student is obliged to support data stated in the Evaluation.
3. By 5 September of the relevant year, the Evaluations shall be presented to the chairpersons of relevant Subject-Area Boards or to representatives designated by the chairpersons, as the case may be, who shall process the evaluations, check the correctness of inclusion of reported results and shall hand them back to the PMO by 16 September of the relevant year. The correctness of data in the Evaluation shall be the responsibility of the DP student and supervisor as well as the SAB chairperson.
4. If a SAB chairperson or the Vice-Dean for Scientific and Research Activities finds deficiencies in an Evaluation, the student is obliged to rectify them without delay.
5. A completed Evaluation is a condition for enrolment for the next year of the DS; however, it shall not constitute entitlement to enrolment if other conditions are not met.
6. The SAB and the Dean may lay down further conditions for the minimum performance of a DP student for advancement to the next year.

7. Furthermore, Evaluations shall be discussed by the Subject-Area Board of the DP concerned by the end of November of the current year.
8. If a student does not meet the conditions of the ISP and the duties of a student in the DP, the supervisor or SAB may propose the termination or interruption of study in the Evaluation. Based on the Evaluation, the SAB shall propose further continuation of study or, where appropriate, further measures.
9. Failure to draw up the Evaluation shall be a reason for the interruption or termination of study.

### **7. Minimum Requirements for Doctoral Students**

1. Upon entering the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of study, doctoral students shall demonstrate their abilities for scientific work by drawing up and defending a Review and methodology of their dissertation (hereinafter the Review)
2. By 30 September, they shall submit the Review in written form to the PMO in a structure corresponding to a scientific work:
  - a. Introduction
  - b. Hypothesis, objectives
  - c. Review of the issues being dealt with, drawn up on the basis of processing literature data in the form of a literature review
  - d. Draft methodology, including draft time schedule of the work
  - e. Overview of workplaces in the Czech Republic and abroad where such issues are dealt with
  - f. Bibliography
  - g. Doctoral student's publications (if any)

It is also possible to submit the Review in the form of a scientific monograph or in the form of a set of articles closely related to the topic of the dissertation already published by the author in fully reviewed periodicals which prove his/her scientific capacity.

3. The submission of the Review is a condition for advancing to the 2<sup>nd</sup> year; if doctoral students fail to meet this requirement, their studies will be forthwith interrupted.
4. The Reviews shall be submitted to SAB chairpersons, who shall discuss them by 30 November at a regular meeting of the SAB in the form of a defence of such materials in the presence of the doctoral students. In cases worthy of consideration (a study stay abroad, ...), a SAB may discuss submitted Reviews even without the presence of the doctoral students or, where appropriate, propose a new date for discussion to the doctoral student.

5. If a SAB finds basic deficiencies in a Review, it shall invite the doctoral student to rectify them and shall set a maximum time limit of 3 months for revising it. If such revised version of the Review is not accepted, the studies of the doctoral student shall be interrupted until the rectification of the deficiencies.

## **8. General Conditions for Advancement to the Next Year of DP students**

1. **Advancement to the 2<sup>nd</sup> year:** 1. Fulfilment of the ISP, 2. Minimum requirements for doctoral students, 3. Positive annual evaluation by the SAB, 4. Meeting of specific conditions laid down by the relevant SAB.
2. **Advancement to the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years:** 1. Fulfilment of the ISP, passing of all examinations unless the ISP states otherwise. 2. Positive annual evaluation by the SAB, 3. Meeting of specific conditions laid down by the relevant SAB, 4. Comprehensive assessment of the progress of work on the dissertation and feasibility of the completion thereof.
3. If a doctoral student does not fulfil the conditions of study, the SAB may propose:
  - a. conditional interruption of study for a maximum period of 3 months for the rectification of deficiencies,
  - b. interruption of study until the rectification of deficiencies,
  - c. termination of study.
4. A supervisor is obliged to propose to the SAB chairperson, without delay, the interruption of study or the termination of study if a doctoral student is not fulfilling his/her duties arising from the ISP and is not continuing to deal with the topic of the dissertation.

## **9. Interruption and Termination of Study**

1. The Dean shall decide on the interruption or termination of study of a DP student.
2. A doctoral student may apply to the Dean for the interruption or termination of study without giving reasons for his/her application.
3. Interruption or termination shall be proposed by a supervisor or SAB chairperson after discussing the matter on the SAB particularly in the following cases:
  - a. no ISP is prepared within the set deadline,
  - b. ISP conditions are not being fulfilled,
  - c. generally applicable regulations have been seriously violated,
  - d. failure to submit a Review, negative evaluation of the result of the Minimum requirements for doctoral students,
  - e. failure to submit an Evaluation, insufficient activities arising from the Evaluation,

- f. failure to fulfil a SAB resolution,
- g. in other cases worthy of consideration.

## **10. Commencement of the Procedure for Defending the Dissertation**

1. For the commencement of the procedure for defending the dissertation, doctoral students shall present to the PMO:
  - a. Dissertation (4 copies).
  - b. Accompanying sheet for commencing the procedure for defending the dissertation, filled in Parts A and B by the doctoral student and the supervisor (see Annex 1, Parts A and B).
  - c. Copies of publications that prove the fulfilment of requirements for publication outputs under the conditions laid down by the SAB, Dean's Decree and the Study and Examination Rules (hereinafter the Requirements). In the event that a publication has not been issued so far, it is necessary to furnish confirmation of acceptance thereof by an editorial department for publication.
  - d. An outline (20 copies) with the following structure
    - 1) Title pages (Annex 4)
    - 2) Table of contents
    - 3) Introduction
    - 4) Methodology
    - 5) Results
    - 6) Discussion
    - 7) Conclusion
    - 8) Summary
    - 9) Overview of literature cited in the outline
    - 10) Curriculum vitae and a list of author's publications
2. The PMO shall inform forthwith the chairperson of the relevant SAB and ask him/her for an Opinion on the commencement of the procedure for defending the dissertation (see Annex 1, Part C; hereinafter the Opinion). Following discussion on the SAB, the SAB chairperson shall send the Opinion to the PMO address, in which he/she shall express his/her view on:
  - a. the fulfilment of requirements concerning publication outputs of the doctoral student; if deficiencies are found, the SAB chairperson shall invite the doctoral student and his/her supervisor to complete them; the procedure shall be suspended until these requirements have been fulfilled,
  - b. formal correctness of the dissertation,
  - c. meeting of conditions set forth in the ISP,

- d. he/she shall propose 3 external examiners in accordance with the SER of the Mendel University of Agriculture and Forestry; the external examiners shall be active in terms of publishing in the scientific field of the submitted dissertation or in a field close to it. In exceptional cases, a practitioner recognised in the field of the submitted dissertation may be appointed external examiner with the Dean's consent.
  - e. a completed Opinion report is processed at the PMO; if a check finds out formal and material deficiencies, the doctoral student is invited to rectify them and, at the same time, the SAB chairperson and supervisor shall be notified.
3. After all the conditions have been met, external examiners are appointed by the Dean and the dissertation is sent to them with a letter of appointment and request for a report. An external examiner has a maximum time limit of 30 days for drawing up a report. If he/she is unable to draw up a report within the set time limit, he/she shall return the thesis without delay.
  4. After two favourable external examiner's reports on a dissertation are obtained, a notice of a defence of the dissertation shall be posted. The notice must be posted at least 1 calendar month before the planned defence. The date of a defence shall be set by the SAB chairperson in conjunction with members of a committee for state doctoral examinations, external examiners of the dissertation, the doctoral student, his/her supervisor and with the PMO.
  5. Once the date of the defence is set, the PMO shall send a written invitation with the notice, outline and copies of external examiner's reports to members of the committee, external examiners, doctoral student and his/her supervisor.
  6. A defence requires a written statement of the supervisor; the supervisor shall enter such statement into the UIS or submit it to the PMO before the defence takes place.
  7. An applicant shall enter his/her dissertation and additional data into the UIS at least 2 weeks before the date of the defence.

### **11. Course of PhD Viva Voce**

1. The date of a PhD viva voce is set by a SAB chairperson after discussion with SAB members and the examination board. This date shall be announced to all students that have passed all examinations stipulated by the ISP. The date of a PhD viva voce must be known sufficiently in advance in order that the students can register; however, no later than 1 month prior to the expected date of the PhD viva voce.
2. Students shall register for the examination with a relevant female officer of the PMO.

## **Accompanying Sheet for the Commencement of the Procedure for Defending the Dissertation**

### **A. Doctoral student's application for defence**

**DP student:**

**Supervisor:**

**DP subject-area:**

**SAB chairperson:**

**Dissertation topic:**

### **Publications meeting the condition for publishing results of work pursuant to Section 47 par. 1:**

1. Publications in impacted periodicals (Web of Science)
2. Publications in fully reviewed field-specialised periodicals except the WoS, registered in the Scopus database
3. Monographs (recognised by the Scientific and Research Board)
4. Publications in collections kept in the ISI Proceedings

Date

Signature of DP student

### **B. Supervisor's opinion on the commencement of the procedure for defending the dissertation:**

The doctoral student **has fulfilled - has not fulfilled** the conditions set forth by the ISP, the publications stated by him/her and inclusion thereof **correspond - do not correspond**.

Statement in the event of a negative opinion:

Date

Signature of supervisor

**C. Opinion of the SAB chairperson on the commencement of the procedure for defending the dissertation**

a. The quality of submitted publication outputs **conforms - does not conform** to the requirements of the SER and to the SAB standards.

b. From a formal point of view, the dissertation **meets - does not meet** the conditions imposed on this type of final thesis.

The doctoral student **has met - has not met** the conditions laid down by the ISP.

Statement in the event of a negative opinion:

I. The proposal was discussed on the SAB on . See minutes dated .

II. The proposal was discussed by correspondence.

An approving opinion was expressed by:

A disapproving opinion was expressed by:

The SAB agrees to the proposal of the external examiners:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Date

Signature of SAB chairperson.

**Statement of the Vice-Dean for Scientific and Research Activities**

The data given tallies – does not tally

Date:

Signature of Vice-Dean for  
Scientific and Research Activities

## Application for Change in the ISP

**DP student:**

**Supervisor:**

**DP subject-area:**

**Year:**

**SAB chairperson:**

### Subject of application

Supervisor's statement:

Date

Signature of supervisor

Statement of SAB chairperson:

Date

Signature

Statement of Vice-Dean for Scientific and Research Activities

Date

Signature

Prof. Dr. Ing. Petr Horáček  
Faculty Dean





**Overall evaluation**

	1 <sup>st</sup> year	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	total	Verification <sup>12</sup>
<b>A. Creative activity</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>B. Study</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>C. Other activities</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

**Subjects for which a transfer of the date to the next year is requested due to the non-fulfilment of a study requirement according to the ISP – an application for a change in the ISP forms an annex to this evaluation.**

<b>Subjects</b>	<b>Date acc. to ISP</b>	<b>Change requested</b>	<b>Justification</b>

Date: 12/12/2010

Signature of DP student:

-----

## II. Supervisor's evaluation

I agree to the abovementioned evaluation **Yes-No**  
I recommend that the study continue **Yes-No**  
Changes in the ISP will be proposed; if yes, see the annex **Yes-No**

### Oral evaluation by the supervisor (mandatory item)

Date:

Signature of supervisor:

---

## III. Opinion of the Subject-Area Board

Evaluation discussed on the Subject-Area Board

Subject-Area Board

**Agrees – Disagrees**

ISP conditions

**Fulfilled – Not fulfilled**

Enrolment for next year

**Recommended – Not recommended**

### Oral statement of the SAB

Date:

Signature of Subject-Area Board Chairperson:

---

## III. Statement of the Vice-Dean for Scientific and Research Activities

Enrolment for next year

**Recommended – Not recommended**

Date:

Signature of Vice-Dean for  
Scientific and Research Activities

Annex 4 Specimen of Title Pages of Outline

**MENDEL UNIVERSITY IN BRNO**  
**FACULTY OF FORESTRY AND WOOD TECHNOLOGY**

DEPARTMENT

**Title of the Dissertation in Czech**  
**Title of the Dissertation in English**

Author

Outline of Dissertation

FIELD OF STUDY: FIELD NUMBER, FIELD NAME

SUPERVISOR: DEGREES NAME SURNAME

**BRNO 2010**

The dissertation has been written within the framework of the full-time doctoral study of the field NAME OF FIELD.

Candidate: Degree Name Surname  
Department/unit at which the DP was completed  
Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology of the MENDELU in Brno

Supervisor: Degree Name Surname  
Department/unit at which the DP was completed

External examiners: Degree Name Surname  
Workplace of external examiner

Degree Name Surname  
Workplace of external examiner

Degree Name Surname  
Workplace of external examiner

The outline was sent out on: .....

The defence of the dissertation takes place on ..... before a committee for defending of dissertations in the field NAME OF FIELD in the conference room of the Dean's Office of the Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology of the Mendel University in Brno, Zemědělská 3, 613 00 Brno.

It is possible to familiarise oneself with the dissertation at the Department of Scientific Research of the Dean's Office of the Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology of the Mendel University in Brno.

SAB chairperson: Degrees Name Surname  
Department/unit of SAB chairperson  
Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology of the MENDELU in Brno

### **Recommended structure of the outline**

- 1) Title pages (Annex 4)
- 2) Table of contents
- 3) Introduction
- 4) Methodology
- 5) Results
- 6) Discussion
- 7) Conclusion
- 8) Summary
- 9) Overview of literature cited in the outline
- 10) Curriculum vitae and a list of author's publications