UNIVERSITY
OF ŽILINA

AMENDMENT No. 5 TO DIRECTIVE No. 110

Study Regulations for the Third Degree of the University Study at the University of Žilina

Discussed by: -

Approved by: UNIZA Academic Senate on 12 May 2025

Effective from: the date of publication

Article 1
Introductory Provisions

The purpose of issuing this Amendment No. 5 to Directive No. 110 Study Regulations for the Third Degree of University Study at the University of Žilina is to align the internal regulations with Act No. 131/2002 Coll. on Higher Education Institutions and Amendments to Certain Acts, as amended, with the Standards for Habilitation Proceedings and Inauguration Proceedings of the Slovak Accreditation Agency for Higher Education and the Methodology for the Evaluation of SAAHE Standards, as amended.

Article 2
Subject of the Amendment

1. In Part II, Article 2(4), in the fourth sentence, after the words “part-time”, the words “and the annotation of the dissertation thesis are indicated. It is also recommended to indicate the name and number of the project within which the dissertation thesis will be solved,” shall be added. At the same time, the following sentence is added after the fourth sentence: "The training workplace shall also publish the deadline for the submission of applications and the date of the admission procedure."
2. In Part II, Article 2(5)(a) reads as follows:
   “a) name and surname, maiden name, titles, birth identification number, date and place of birth, place of permanent residence, gender, photo, nationality, electronic mail address; telephone number if provided by the student; in the case of a foreigner, the place of residence in the Slovak Republic; birth identification number, if assigned by the Ministry of the Interior,”
3. In Part II, Article 2(5), point (b) is deleted. The former points (c) to (e) are renumbered as points (b) to (d).
4. In Part II, Article 2(6)(b) reads as follows:
   “(b) certified copies of evidence of the highest level of education completed; for applicants who have completed the second degree of university study abroad, a document confirming the recognition of their education by the relevant higher education institution in the Slovak Republic or by the Centre for Recognition of Diplomas of the Ministry of Education, Research, Development and Youth of the Slovak Republic (does not apply to the Czech Republic),”
5. In Part II, Article 2, a new paragraph 10 is inserted after paragraph 9, which reads:
   "10. In justified cases, with the approval of the dean/in the case of university-wide study programmes, the rector, the entrance examination may be conducted by videoconference or other means of information and communication technology without the physical presence of the applicant and/or a member of the admissions committee."
   The former paragraphs 10-14 are renumbered as paragraphs 11-15.
6. In Part II, Article 2, paragraph 13, the following sixth and seventh sentences shall be inserted after the fifth sentence and read as follows:
   “The rector shall change the decision if it was issued in violation of the legislation, otherwise he/she shall reject the request and confirm the original decision. In the case of university-wide study programmes, if the rector issued the decision on non-admission to study, he/she may grant the request if he/she finds that the decision was issued in violation of the legislation, otherwise he/she shall forward the request to the UNIZA Academic Senate. The UNIZA Academic Senate shall change the decision if it was issued in violation of the legislation, otherwise he/she shall reject the request and confirm the original decision.”
7. In Part II, Article 3(7), the words “6 weeks” are replaced by “30 working days”.
8. In Part II, Article 5(3)(c) reads:
   "(c) pedagogical activity in the full-time form of study in the scope of no more than four hours per week on average per academic year in which the teaching takes place; in the part-time form of study, the obligation to conduct elective lectures and to perform other professional activities,"
9. In Part II, Article 5 and Article 9, in the reference in footnote 8(a), the words “as amended” shall be inserted after the word “study”.
10. In Part II, Article 6(1) reads:

"(1) The function of a supervisor for a given field of study at the faculty/university-wide workplace at which doctoral studies are carried out may be performed by a teacher of a university (in the functional position of professor or in the functional position of associate professor) and by another expert from a workplace outside the university after approval by the Scientific Board of the faculty or, in the case of university-wide study programmes, by the UNIZA Scientific Board. The supervisor of the dissertation thesis may also be a university researcher who has obtained a scientific qualification level I or IIa[9)]."

11. In Article 6(4)(f) of Part II, the words “after the statement of the study programme guarantor” shall be inserted after the word “rector”.
12. In Part II, Article 6, in the reference in footnote 9), a comma and the words "criterion SP 6.5.2 of the SAAHE Methodology for the Evaluation of Standards, as amended" are inserted after the words "of the Higher Education".
13. In Part II, Article 7(6), the second sentence reads: "The doctoral student's study plan shall include the obligation to publish in at least one impacted journal that has an assigned quartile of at least Q3 in WoS or at least Q2 in SCOPUS, with at least 25% of the doctoral student's share in the relevant publication."
14. In Article 7(7) of Part II, the words “two months” are replaced by “one month”, and the words “or one semester” are deleted.
15. In Part II, Article 8 reads:
    "The supervisor submits to the dean, in the case of university-wide study programmes to the rector, an annual evaluation of the doctoral student's fulfilment of his/her study plan with a statement as to whether or not he/she recommends the doctoral student's continuation of his/her studies, no later than 31 August of the relevant academic year, after the statement of the study programme supervisor. In doing so, the supervisor assesses the status and level of fulfilment of the doctoral student's study plan, compliance with deadlines, awards credits and, if necessary, submits a proposal for modification of the doctoral student's individual study plan. Based on the doctoral student's annual evaluation, the dean (or, in the case of university-wide study programmes, the rector) shall decide whether the doctoral student may continue his/her studies, as well as on any changes to the doctoral student's study plan."
16. In Part II, Article 9(1), the first sentence reads:
    "A doctoral student in the full-time form of doctoral degree studies registers for the dissertation examination generally within 12 months but no later than 18 months from the date of enrolment in doctoral degree studies; a doctoral student in the part-time form generally within 18 months but no later than 24 months from the date of enrolment in doctoral degree studies."
17. In Article 9(3) of Part II, the following third sentence is inserted:
    "The opponent of the written thesis for the dissertation examination must meet the same qualification requirements as the opponent of the dissertation thesis pursuant to Article 14(2)."
18. In Part II, Article 9(5) reads:
    " (5) The dissertation examination is held before the examination committee, the chairman and members of which are appointed by the dean or, in the case of university-wide study programmes, the rector, based on the proposal of the chairman of the field committee, or chairman of the working group or the joint field committee (SOK). The committee shall have at least four members, at least one of whom shall not be from the training workplace where the doctoral student works. At least one member of the committee must hold the functional position of professor and have the academic title of professor, or must hold the functional position of professor and have the academic title of associate professor, or must hold the position of visiting professor, or have the academic title of doctor of sciences, or must be a researcher with a recognised scientific qualification level I. The other members of the committee must have an academic degree, a PhD, or its older equivalent. All members of the committee must meet the legal requirements to sit for the state examinations. The supervisor of the doctoral student is a member of the committee and participates in the dissertation examination without the right to vote on the outcome of the examination. If the opponent submitted a negative review, his/her participation is a condition for holding the dissertation examination. If the topic was listed by an external educational institution, one member of the committee must be from that external educational institution, who must meet the legal requirements to examine in state examinations."

19. In Part II, Article 9(13) reads:
"In justified cases, with the approval of the dean/in the case of university-wide study programmes, the rector, the dissertation examination may be conducted via video conference or other means of information and communication technology without physical presence."
20. In Part III, Article 10(2)(i), the words “on the use of a school work” are deleted.
21. In Part III, Article 10, the reference under footnote 9c) reads:
“[9c)] UNIZA Directive No. 215 – On Final, Rigorous and Habilitation Theses under the Conditions of the University of Žilina”.
22. In Part III of Article 11, a new paragraph 5 is inserted after paragraph 4, which reads:
"(5) If a doctoral student submits a dissertation thesis that, due to his/her own fault, is not at least in part the result of his or her own and independent activity, he/she commits academic fraud. This does not affect the doctoral student's right to use information, materials and other objects whose origin or source he/she indicates in the dissertation thesis. In case of suspicion of academic fraud, it is recommended to proceed according to the provisions of Article 4 of Directive No. 226 – On Copyright Ethics and the Elimination of Plagiarism under the Conditions of the University of Žilina."
The former paragraph 5 shall be renumbered as paragraph 6.
23. In Part III, Article 13(1), a comma and the words “usually two weeks before the date of submitting the application for permission to defend the dissertation thesis” are inserted after the word “workplace”.
24. In Part III, Article 13, a new paragraph 3 is inserted after paragraph 2 which reads as follows:
“(3) At the time of submitting the application for permission to defend the dissertation thesis, the doctoral student must submit a published article or a confirmation of its acceptance, and at the same time, the journal must have a current quartile of at least Q3 in WoS or at least Q2 in SCOPUS.”
The former paragraphs 3 to 10 shall be renumbered as paragraphs 4 to 11.
25. In Part III, Article 13(6), in the second sentence, after the word “must”, the words “hold the functional position of professor and” are inserted, and the words “and at least two opponents” are deleted.
26. In Part III, Article 14(2) reads as follows:
“(2) The dissertation thesis is assessed by at least two opponents. At least one opponent must hold the functional position of professor and have the scientific-pedagogical title of professor, or he/she must hold the functional position of professor and have the scientific-pedagogical title of associate professor, or must have the scientific title of Doctor of Sciences or must be a researcher with a recognised scientific qualification level I. Other opponents must hold the functional position of associate professor and have the scientific-pedagogical title of associate professor or have an academic title corresponding to the completed 2nd level of higher education and hold the functional position of associate professor. They may be prominent experts holding the functional position of visiting professor, employees with the academic title of PhD (or its older equivalent), employees-researchers with a recognised scientific qualification level IIa, or significant experts from practice with the academic title of PhD (or its older equivalent). Opponents may be members of the commission, but they must meet the legal conditions for examining in state examinations.”
27. The third sentence of Article 15(8) of Part III reads as follows: "The committee shall decide by secret ballot whether to propose the award of an academic degree to a doctoral candidate."
28. In Part III, Article 15(8), under the column “Word classification and its definition”, the word “only” shall be inserted before the word “meet” for classification level E.
29. In Part III, Article 15(8), under the column “Word classification and its definition”, for the FX grade, it reads: “Insufficient (results do not meet even the minimum criteria)”.
30. In Part III, Article 15(16) reads as follows:
“(16) In justified cases, with the consent of the dean/in the case of university-wide study programmes, the rector, the dissertation thesis defence may be conducted via video conference or other means of information and communication technology without physical presence.”
31. In Part IV, Article 19(4) reads as follows:
“ (4) Doctoral study ends with the defence of the dissertation thesis[12)], or by abandoning study, failure to complete study within the set deadline, expulsion from studies, entry into force of a

decision on the invalidity of a state examination or its part within a lower degree of study, renunciation of the academic title awarded after completing a lower degree study programme, cancellation of a study programme in a field of study, or death of the student[13)]. ”

32. In Article 20(3) of Part V, the third and fourth sentences read as follows:
“At least one of the members of the committee must hold the functional position of professor and have the scientific-pedagogical title of professor or the scientific title of doctor of sciences or be a researcher with the scientific qualification level I or IIa. Other members may be university teachers holding the functional position of associate professor with the academic title of associate professor, university teachers holding the functional position of visiting professor, staff members holding the academic title of PhD (or its older equivalent), or qualified professionals from practice who have been awarded this academic title (or its older equivalent).”
33. In Part V, Article 21(2) reads as follows:
“ (2) For the relevant faculty/university-wide workplace, the members of the joint field committee (SOK) are nominated by the dean or, in the case of university-wide study programmes, by the rector, on the proposal of the faculty scientific board or, in the case of university-wide study programmes, by the UNIZA Scientific Board, so that at least one of the members in this proposal holds the functional position of professor and has the scientific-pedagogical title of professor or the scientific title of doctor of science or must be a researcher with a recognised scientific qualification level I or IIa. Other members may be university teachers holding the functional position of associate professor with the academic title of associate professor, university teachers holding the functional position of visiting professor, staff members with the academic title of PhD (or its senior equivalent), or qualified professionals from practice who have been awarded this academic title (or its senior equivalent). If the doctoral study is provided in cooperation with an external educational institution, that institution shall be adequately represented in the field committee[14)].”

Article 3
Final Provisions

1. The provisions of Directive No. 110 not affected by this Amendment shall remain in force as initially enacted.
2. Amendment No. 5 was approved by the Academic Senate of UNIZA on 12 May 2025, when it enters into force. It takes effect on the date of its publication.

Prof. Ing. Branislav Hadzima, PhD.	Prof. Ing. Ján Čelko, CSc.
Chairman of the Academic Senate	Rector