Procedure for the Evaluation of the RESEARCH PLAN or ANNUAL DEFENCE
PhD Program on Information and Communications Technology of the University of Vigo

Academic year 2019-2020
Approved by the Academic Committee (CAPD)

General Considerations:
1. This activity is compulsory for all the students enrolled in the academic year.
2. The working language is English.
3. A rubric for evaluation is approved by the Academic Committee of the PhD program (CAPD). This rubric will be used for all students. Nevertheless, evaluation committees will take into consideration the actual dedication of the students: Full- time students, Part-time students, etc. This rubric is in Annex 1.
4. This rubric will be completed by the Evaluation Committee, and by the advisor(s) of the thesis. In case of more than one advisor, all advisors must agree on a single rubric.
5. The Evaluation Committee will propose a Score to the Academic Committee of the PhD Program. CAPD will be in charge of delivering the final score.
6. There will be four Evaluation Committees:

   Committee no 1
   - Antonio Pena Giménez
   - Rebeca Díaz Redondo
   - Manuel Caeiro Rodríguez

   Committee no 3
   - Eduardo Rodríguez Banga
   - Pedro S. Rodríguez Hernández
   - Inés García-Tuñón Blanca

   Committee no 4
   - María Soledad Torres Guijarro
   - Manuel Fernández Veiga
   - Martín López Nores

7. Each student will be assigned to one of the evaluation committees. This assignment is made by the CAPD.

Evaluation procedure and calendar:

a. All students must prepare a poster. The pdf file of the poster must be uploaded to the faitic server by **14:00 (CET) of July 6, 2020, Monday.** DocTIC will be in charge of the printing of the poster for those students who will attend the session.

b. Those students unable to attend the workshop will contact the DocTIC coordinator (doc_tic@uvigo.es) by **July 6, 2020, Monday** explaining the reason for his/her absence. Upon acceptance, one member of the corresponding evaluation committee will contact the student in order to set up an appointment by Skype. The students will receive the instructions about how the evaluation will be conducted. These students do not have to send the slide.

c. The advisors must upload one rubric by **July 6, 2020, Monday** to the faitic server.

d. Students attending the evaluation day must send one slide of the poster presentation (just 1 page in landscape orientation) by **14:00 (CET) of July 13, 2020, Monday.**

e. The evaluation by the committees will take place during the poster sessions of the workshop (**July 17, 2020, Friday**).

f. The evaluation committees will deliver the score by **July 27, 2020**, **Monday**. Those students who fail will be granted with a two-week period to correct the observed deficiencies.

Instructions for the preparation of the material

POSTER LAYOUT

- Poster orientation should be portrait (vertical).
- Poster size should be A0 (841 mm x 1189 mm).
- The title should be ideally in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS, 72 pt. font. Author, Thesis Advisor(s) and affiliation should be in 42 pt. font
- Use colour for highlighting and to make your poster attractive.
- Use pictures, diagrams, figures, etc., rather than only text wherever possible.
- Minimum font size for all text: 24 pt.
- Sections to be included:
    - Motivation of the work
    - Thesis Objectives
    - Research Plan
    - Results & Discussions (if available yet)
    - Next Year Planning
    - References

POSTER SPOTLIGHT PRESENTATION

At the beginning of each Poster session, the students will have the opportunity to show 1 (ONE) slide in landscape orientation MAXIMUM to focus attention on the topic of their poster. Please note that this slide is not meant to cover the whole research, BUT ONLY HIGHLIGHT THE MAJOR GOALS OF THE THESIS WORK.

This slide (in a pdf file) must be uploaded to the faitic server.

Annex 1

Academic year 2019-2020
EVALUATION RUBRIC
PhD Program on Information and Communications Technology of the University of Vigo

Objective: Evaluation of the research activities carried out and defence of the research plan for the coming year. Precisely, it will be assessed the ability to effectively communicate scientific concepts and ideas to a scientific audience. The evaluation committee evaluates this requirement for all PhD candidates annually. This rubric will be completed by the evaluation committee and by the advisor(s)

Name of student: _____   **Date of exam**:_____

Name(s) of reviewers: _____   **Signatures:**

Criteria	Good	Fair	Poor	SCORE
General (Layout of the poster) Poster Format	**Poster is organized correctly and clearly written**. Appropriate content is in each section of poster.	**Majority of poster is organized correctly.** Appropriate content found in majority of sections, but some information is misplaced. Some sections require additional clarification.	**Poster is not organized properly.** Majority of the information is placed in wrong section or missing.	
Data Presentation in Tables and Figures	Data are presented clearly and accurately in tables & figures	Data presentation may be incomplete or lacking clarity.	Data presentation in tables and figures is incomplete and lacks clarity.	
References	Appropriate references and format	Some inappropriate citations and Format.	Few/zero citations listed.	

Motivation of the work Background & Technical Need Putting research in the context of the field	Clear description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.	Fair description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.	Poor description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.	
Objectives & Expected Significance	Clear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.	Vague/unclear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.	Statement of the question(s) that will be addressed is absent.	
Research Plan Description of experimental/theoretical approach and analysis Next year planning Planning of publications (conference and journal papers)	Clear description of the research strategy	Fair description of the research strategy	Poor or absent description of the research strategy	
Analysis/interpretation of (preliminary) results Plan for placing results obtained into current state of the field Analyzed and interpreted research results/data effectively	Clear description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results	Fair description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results	Poor or absent description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results	
Critical Thinking: Demonstrated capability for independent research in the area of study, significant expertise in the area, and ability to make original contributions to the field	Good	Fair	Poor	
Quality of Communication(*): Communicated research results and implications clearly and professionally in both (a) written and (b) oral form.	Good	Fair	Poor	

(*) The advisors should only take into account the quality of written communication

Overall Assessment: The assessment of the overall performance of the student based on the evidence provided in items above.

Research Plan Unacceptable NOT PASS (One or more Poor Scores)	Research Plan Acceptable PASS

Provide comments and/or suggestions mandatory in cases of poor grading, highly recommended in fair grading:

Please, indicate if you consider that a poster session evaluation will be needed next year

Date	Agent	Task
July 6, Monday	Students	Uploading the poster describing the research plan to faitic
July 6, Monday	Supervisors	Upload evaluation (rubric) to faitic
July 6, Monday	Students	Notice of no attendance to the poster session
July 13, Monday	Students attending the poster session	Upload of the slide
July 17, Friday	All	Poster session
July 27, Monday	Committees	Delivery of evaluation (rubrics)