

LISTA DE ASISTENTES

Membros da Comisión:

Carmen García Mateo (presidenta)
Manuel García Sánchez (secretario)
Rebeca P. Díaz Redondo
José Ramón Fernández Bernárdez
Alberto Gil Solla
Martín Llamas Nistal
Cristina López Bravo
Roberto López Valcarce

Acta da sesión da Comisión Académica do Programa de Doutoramento DocTIC da Universidade de Vigo, de trece de xullo de dous mil dezaoto, reunida ás 11:00h na sala A010 (acristalada) da EE de Telecomunicación.

O Venres, **día 13 de xullo de 2018**, ás 11:00 horas, comezou a sesión da Comisión Académica do Programa de Doutoramento DocTIC, cos asistentes que figuran á marxe, sendo presidida pola catedrática Carmen García Mateo, e actuando como secretario o catedrático Manuel García Sánchez

Outros asistentes:

A orde do día contén os seguintes puntos:

Desculpan asistencia:

- 1.- Informe da coordinadora
- 2.- Aprobación, se procede, de actas anteriores
- 3.- Avaliación anual dos Plans de Investigación.
4. - Valoración priorizada das bolsas de mobilidade para 2018 e proposta de asignación.
- 5.- Asuntos de trámite
- 6.- Rogos e preguntas

Punto 1. Informe da coordinadora

A coordinadora informa de que:

- Está publicada a convocatoria de matrícula para o curso 2018/19. O alumnado que deposite a Tese antes do 7/10/2018 non terá que pagar matrícula no curso 18/19.
- Foi concedida a axuda Erasmus+ con Vietman que solicitara DocTIC, sendo concedidas un total de oito mobilidades para toda a UVigo.

Punto 2. Aprobación, se procede, de actas anteriores.

Apróbanse por asentimento as actas de datas 7/6/2018 e 29/6/2018.

Punto 3. Avaliación anual dos Plans de Investigación.

Apróbanse os Plans de Investigación (de ser requirido), a actividade formativa “Defensa do Plan de Investigación” do curso 2017-18, e a correspondente avaliación anual favorable do alumnado relacionado no Anexo 1.

Non se aproba nin o Plan de Investigación nin a actividade formativa “Defensa do Plan de Investigación” do curso 2017-18 dos seguintes alumnos:

Curso de acceso	Nome
2014-2015	Egas Acosta, Carlos
2015-2016	Namaziesfanjani, Mina
2015-2016	Teles Vagarinho, João Paulo

polos motivos recollidos nas rúbricas do director de Tese e do tribunal de avaliación da actividade formativa. Estas rubricas axúntanse no Anexo 2 e foron enviadas ao alumno e ao seu director

Non se aproba nin o Plan de Investigación nin a actividade formativa “Defensa do Plan de Investigación” do curso 2017-18 dos seguintes alumnos:

<u>Curso de acceso</u>	<u>Nome</u>
2017-2018-2C	Vilar Gómez, Pablo
2017-2018-2C	Sa Moreira Fernandes, Bruno

por non ter rematado o proceso de avaliación.

Non se aproba nin o Plan de Investigación nin a actividade formativa “Defensa do Plan de Investigación” do curso 2017-18 dos seguintes alumnos:

<u>Curso de acceso</u>	<u>Nome</u>
2014-2015	Castro Jul, Fátima
2015-2016	Boric Miran
2016-2017	Goyanes de Miguel, Vicente
2014-2015	Rodríguez González, Francisco Javier
2017-2018-2C	Viamontes Martins, José Manuel
2016-2017	Rodríguez Fernández, Javier

por non terse presentado o proceso de avaliación.

Punto 4. Valoración priorizada das bolsas de mobilidade para 2018 e proposta de asignación.

Apróbase o seguinte:

ACORDO DA COMISIÓN ACADÉMICA

A Comisión Académica do Programa de Doutoramento en Tecnoloxías da Información e as Comunicacions pala Universidade de Vigo, reunida con data 29 de xuño de 2018, tendo en conta a Resolución Reitoral de 25 de abril de 2018 pola que se convocan bolsas de desprazamento para estudantes de doutoramento da Universidade de Vigo durante o curso 2017/18, revisadas e avaliadas as solicitudes presentadas polo alumnado, **ACORDA** propor a seguinte listaxe de valoración dos solicitantes:

- **Lista priorizada de candidatos/as:**

<u>Apelidos e Nome.</u>	<u>DNI</u>	<u>Puntuación</u>	<u>Duración</u>	<u>Tipo</u>
Ferreira Pires, Orlando	8094840	90	3 días	C
Romualdo Carvalho, Antonio	N374834	70	1 semana	C
Álvarez López, Tamara	53195713W	60	3 meses	(A+B)/2
Oya Díaz, Simón	15491384X	60	3 meses	(A+B)/2
Álvarez Outerelo, David	53192586A	60	1 semana	B
España Villegas, Carmelo	A664090	55	3 meses	B

Dado o empate a puntos dos estudantes Álvarez López, Tamara e Oya Díaz, Simón a CAPD solicita que compartan unha bolsa tipo A e unha bolsa tipo B, concendéndoselles a cada un deles unha bolsa por un importe de 875 €

O detalle da valoración xunto cos criterios aplicados recóllense no Anexo 3.

Punto 5. Asuntos de trámite

Apróbase a solicitude de baixa definitiva do alumno Jose Luis Otero Pena.

Apróbanse as baixas de Laura Pedrosa Rodríguez e Ignacio Jáuregui Novo por abandono do programa.

Apróbase a solicitude de adicación a tempo parcial do alumno Fernando García Novo, con efectos do 1/10/2017.

Apróbase a segunda solicitude de prórroga de Mateo Ramos Merino.

Apróbase a solicitude de matrícula en dúas materias do Mestrado Universitario en Enxeñaría de Telecomunicación, “Sistemas Avanzados de Comunicación” e “Procesado Estatístico do Sinal” do alumno Khawar Hussain.

Punto 6. Rogos e preguntas

Non hai.

Sen mais asuntos que tratar remata a sesión cando son as 11:26h.

O Secretario,

Manuel García Sánchez

VºBº
A Presidenta,

Carmen García Mateo

Anexo 1

Alumnado que supera la evaluación (61)

Curso de acceso	Nome
2013-2014	Cerezo Costas, Hector
2013-2014	Fernandes Caiña, Miguel
2013-2014	González Figueroa, Damián
2013-2014	Magariños Iglesias, María del Carmen
2013-2014	Mera Iglesias, Moisés
2013-2014	Valladares Rodríguez, Sonia María
2014-2015	Arriba Pérez, Francisco de
2014-2015	Bravo Quezada, Omar Gustavo
2014-2015	El Haj Ahmed , Ghofrane
2014-2015	García Vélez, Roberto Agustín
2014-2015	Hmila , Mariem
2014-2015	Meira Ferrao Luis, Ricardo Manuel
2014-2015	Mhiri , Saber
2014-2015	Moure Fernández, María del Rocío
2014-2015	Oya Díez, Simón
2014-2015	Pedrouzo Ulloa, Alberto
2014-2015	Pérez Cabo, David
2014-2015	Ramos Merino, Mateo
2015-2016	Álvarez López, Tamara
2015-2016	Cabrera Mejía, Javier Bernardo
2015-2016	Castro Lopes Martins Pinto Ferreira, Maria Isabel de
2015-2016	España Villegas, Carmelo Branimir
2015-2016	Esposito Espinoza, Juan Eloy
2015-2016	Expósito Pérez, Isabel
2015-2016	Fernández Domingos, Elías
2015-2016	García Novo, Fernando
2015-2016	Parada Loira, Francisco
2015-2016	Román Portabales, Antón
2015-2016	Sánchez López, Sheila Lucero
2015-2016	Santana Mancilla, Pedro César
2015-2016	Santos Domínguez, David
2015-2016	Tato Arias, Anxo
2016-2017	Abdullah Rady, Ewies Daif
2016-2017	Álvarez Outerelo, David
2016-2017	Costa Pazo, Artur
2016-2017	Dahroug , Ahmed Tarek Abdelfattah Mohamed
2016-2017	Fernández Nandín, Abel
2016-2017	Garcia Davalos, Alexander
2016-2017	García Méndez, Silvia
2016-2017	Gomez Villaverde, Marcos Jose
2016-2017	Guerrero Vasquez, Luis Fernando
2016-2017	Halawa , Mohamed
2016-2017	Klaina , Hicham
2016-2017	Maged Moustafa Kamel, MennaAllah

2016-2017	RamosMuguerza, Eduardo
2016-2017	Romualdo Carvalho, António Aristides
2017-2018	Alaa El-Deen Ahmed, Rana
2017-2018	Araque Gallardo, José Antonio
2017-2018	Barba Seara, Óscar
2017-2018	Ferreira Pires, Orlando
2017-2018	Mohamed Hafez, Manar
2017-2018	Nieto Díaz, José Manuel
2017-2018	Ramírez Parracho, Tomás
2017-2018	Serpa Andrade, Luis
2017-2018	Soto Rodríguez, Eduardo Antonio
2017-2018	Varela Brea, Borja
2017-2018	Vidal Vidal, Antonio
2017-2018-2C	Adel, Amr
2017-2018-2C	Elgeddawy, Yasser Hosny Hussein
2017-2018-2C	Hussain, Kwar
2017-2018-2C	Mohamed Naguib Ibrahim Hussein Elawadi , Radwa

Academic year 2017-2018 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: Carlos Egas Acosta

Date of exam: 19/06/2018

Name(s) of reviewers: Cristina López Bravo
Eduardo Rodríguez Banga
Juan Carlos Burguillo Rial

Signatures:

LOPEZ BRAVO
CRISTINA -
10078778V

Firmado digitalmente por LOPEZ BRAVO
CRISTINA - 10078778V
Nombre de reconocimiento (DN): c=ES,
serialNumber=IDCES-10078778V,
givenName=CRISTINA, sn=LOPEZ BRAVO,
cn=LOPEZ BRAVO CRISTINA - 10078778V
Fecha: 2018.06.21 15:25:58 +02'00'

RODRIGUEZ
BANGA
EDUARDO -
34969880J

Firmado digitalmente
por RODRIGUEZ
BANGA EDUARDO -
34969880J
Fecha: 2018.06.20
11:27:53 +02'00'

BURGUILLO
RIAL JUAN
CARLOS -
36086935G

Firmado digitalmente por BURGUILLO
RIAL JUAN CARLOS - 36086935G
Nombre de reconocimiento (DN):
c=ES,
serialNumber=IDCES-36086935G,
givenName=JUAN CARLOS,
sn=BURGUILLO RIAL, cn=BURGUILLO
RIAL JUAN CARLOS - 36086935G
Fecha: 2018.06.21 11:21:02 +02'00'

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

	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.	Fair
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.	Fair
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	Fair
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	Fair
Critical Thinking:	Good	Fair	Poor	Fair

Demonstrated capability for independent research in the area of study, significant expertise in the area, and ability to make original contributions to the field				
Quality of Communication(*): Communicated research results and implications clearly and professionally in both (a) written and (b) oral form.	Good	Fair	Poor	Fair

(*) 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
X	

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

- The evaluation committee considers that the poster must be resubmitted after improving the following aspects:
 - The poster is almost the same as the previous year, please include and remark the new contributions. Progress from last year must be shown.
 - Be more precise about future contributions.
- Oral communication in English must be improved

**Academic year 2017-2018
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: Carlos Egas Acosta

Date of exam: 14-15/06/2018

Name(s) of reviewers: Felipe Gil Castiñeira & Enrique Costa Montenegro

Signatures:

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

<p>Motivation of the work Background & Technical Need</p> <p>Putting research in the context of the field</p>	<p>Clear description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Fair description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Poor description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Good</p>
<p>Objectives & Expected Significance</p>	<p>Clear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.</p>	<p>Vague/unclear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.</p>	<p>Statement of the question(s) that will be addressed is absent.</p>	<p>Good</p>
<p>Research Plan Description of experimental/theoretical approach and analysis</p> <p>Next year planning</p> <p>Planning of publications (conference and journal papers)</p>	<p>Clear description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Fair description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Poor or absent description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Good</p>
<p>Analysis/interpretation of (preliminary) results Plan for placing results obtained into current state of the field</p> <p>Analyzed and interpreted research results/data effectively</p>	<p>Clear description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Fair description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Poor or absent description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Good</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>Poor</p>	<p>Good</p>

Quality of Communication(*): Communicated research results and implications clearly and professionally in both (a) written and (b) oral form.	Good	Fair	Poor	Good
---	------	------	------	------

(*) 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
	X

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

**Academic year 2017-2018
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: Mina Namaziesfanjani

Date of exam: June 15th, 2018

Name(s) of reviewers: Soledad Torres Guijarro, Manuel Fernández Veiga, Martín López Nores

Signatures:

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

Background & Technical Need Putting research in the context of the field	term technical goals will this work serve.	technical goals will this work serve.	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.	Fair
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	Poor
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	Poor
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	Poor
Quality of Communication (*):	Good	Fair	Poor	Good

Communicated research results and implications clearly and professionally in both (a) written and (b) oral form.				
--	--	--	--	--

(*) 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
X	

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

The contents of the poster were not accessible for the audience expected at this evaluation exercise, with many participants who are not deeply familiar with the domain of genetic data protection and cryptography. Notwithstanding the technical jargon, the plans for next year are posed in very vague terms, but still some of the goals mentioned on the poster sound unrealistic given the current status. The intended contributions were not properly clarified by the student, who did neither demonstrate capability for independent research, nor significant expertise in the area as expected in third year. In terms of results, the thesis seems to have made no significant progress and yielded no contributions since the article published in the 2016. We strongly recommend performing a critical revision of the work done so far, in order to re-steer the research and not miss the opportunities raised by the very interesting topics addressed.

**Academic year 2017-2018
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: _____ Joao Vagarinho _____

Date of exam: ___ Skype _____

Name(s) of reviewers: _____ Martín Llamas Nistal _____

Signatures:

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

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.	GOOD
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	GOOD
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	FAIR
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	FAIR

Quality of Communication(*): Communicated research results and implications clearly and professionally in both (a) written and (b) oral form.	Good	Fair	Poor	FAIR
---	------	------	------	------

(*) 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
	PASS

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

**Academic year 2017-2018
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: _____Mina Namazi_____

Date of exam: _____June 2018_____

Name(s) of reviewers: _____Fernando Pérez González_____

Signatures:

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

<p>Motivation of the work Background & Technical Need</p> <p>Putting research in the context of the field</p>	<p>Clear description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Fair description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Poor description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Poor</p>
<p>Objectives & Expected Significance</p>	<p>Clear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.</p>	<p>Vague/unclear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.</p>	<p>Statement of the question(s) that will be addressed is absent.</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p>Research Plan Description of experimental/theoretical approach and analysis</p> <p>Next year planning</p> <p>Planning of publications (conference and journal papers)</p>	<p>Clear description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Fair description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Poor or absent description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Poor</p>
<p>Analysis/interpretation of (preliminary) results Plan for placing results obtained into current state of the field</p> <p>Analyzed and interpreted research results/data effectively</p>	<p>Clear description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Fair description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Poor or absent description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Poor</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>Poor</p>	<p>Poor</p>

Quality of Communication(*): Communicated research results and implications clearly and professionally in both (a) written and (b) oral form.	Good	Fair	Poor	Fair
---	------	------	------	------

(*) 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
X	

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

After three years working on this thesis, the achieved results are much below expected. Only one conference paper was published in 2006 and that only after a considerable work from one of the advisors (Dr. Troncoso-Pastoriza). One paper on paternity testing was submitted this year to a major conference and rejected. Requests from the advisors to solve the technical flaws contained in the paper went unaddressed by the student, who despite of this keeps stating in the poster that “we developed a method for paternity genomic testing with malicious parties”. The advisors totally disagree with such statement (if by “develop” we understand, as we should, “successfully developed”). Unfortunately, the advisors had virtually no time to ask the student to correct her poster due to her very late submission. The so-called “entropy based” analysis that the student claims to have developed is, at its best, at a very preliminary and vague stage, and it is debatable that will bring any fruit in the months to come. Finally, the temporal planning is overly imprecise, regrettably so considering the fact that the thesis is about to reach its third and last year.

**Academic year 2017-2018
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: João Paulo Vagarinho

Date of exam: June 13th, 2018

Name(s) of reviewers: Soledad Torres Guijarro, Manuel Fernández Veiga, Martín López Nores

Signatures:

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

<p>Motivation of the work Background & Technical Need</p> <p>Putting research in the context of the field</p>	<p>Clear description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Fair description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Poor description of the long-term technical goals will this work serve.</p>	<p>Poor</p>
<p>Objectives & Expected Significance</p>	<p>Clear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.</p>	<p>Vague/unclear statement of the question(s) that will be addressed.</p>	<p>Statement of the question(s) that will be addressed is absent.</p>	<p>Poor</p>
<p>Research Plan Description of experimental/theoretical approach and analysis</p> <p>Next year planning</p> <p>Planning of publications (conference and journal papers)</p>	<p>Clear description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Fair description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Poor or absent description of the research strategy</p>	<p>Poor</p>
<p>Analysis/interpretation of (preliminary) results Plan for placing results obtained into current state of the field</p> <p>Analyzed and interpreted research results/data effectively</p>	<p>Clear description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Fair description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Poor or absent description of the expected results and plan for evaluating the results</p>	<p>Poor</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>Poor</p>	<p>Poor</p>

Quality of Communication (*): Communicated research results and implications clearly and professionally in both (a) written and (b) oral form.	Good	Fair	Poor	Fair
--	------	------	------	------

(*) 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
X	

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

The student failed to motivate a topic with a minimum potential to render research contributions to any area known to the evaluators, leaving the ultimate impression that this could hardly yield a doctoral thesis. The purported analysis of standards for e-learning and quality assessment is purely descriptive, shallow and of very little practical value, given the many consolidated criteria, rankings and procedures that are already used worldwide. The objectives are presented in bulk, with no clues about their relevance or significance, which overall sound at least questionable. The methodological approach appears to be awkward, and the outputs thus far seem irrelevant in the context of the doctoral program. The student's presentation lacked any clarity or insight, with no attempts at all to look at the work done so far from a critical perspective (rather the opposite, indeed). In this sense, the student has largely ignored most of the recommendations made in the evaluations of the preceding years. The intention to deliver the thesis within the next year sounds hazardous and unrealistic.

Anexo 3

Solicitante	Tipo	Otros datos	Scopus	Lugar	Importancia	CV	Interese	Total	Prioridade
Álvarez López, Tamara	A	Estancia 3 meses		Francia	30	10	20	60	3
Álvarez Outerelo, David	B	Estancia 7 días		Holanda	30	10	20	60	3
España Villegas, Carmelo	A	Estancia 3 meses		USA	30	5	20	55	4
Ferreira Pires, Orlando	C	Congreso CSEDU. 15-17 marzo 2018	Si	Portugal	50	10	30	90	1
Oya Díaz, Simón	A	Estancia 3 meses		Suiza	30	10	20	60	3
Romualdo Carvalho, Antonio	C	Estancia de, al menos, 1 semana		Vigo	50	0	20	70	2

Crterios de Valoración

- **Méritos curriculares dos/as solicitantes: 10 puntos**
 0 puntos se non ten congresos nin publicacións internacionais
 5 puntos se ten congresos internacionais
 10 puntos si ten congresos e publicacións internacionais ou ten dous mestrados
- **Interese do desprazamento proposto para o programa formativo: 40 puntos**
 - a) Congresos
 0 puntos se xa cumpre o requisito de presentación dunha comunicación no período de doutoramento
 30 puntos se non cumpre o requisito anterior requisito pero ten informe favorable do titor
 40 si ademais espera o depósito da Tese este ano
 - b) Cursos
 20 se é un curso de doutoramento
 10 se non o é, pero conta co informe favorable do titor
 - c) Estadías
 20 si es en una Universidade o centro de investigación
- **Calidade do centro de destino ou importancia do congreso/curso.50 puntos**
 - a) Os congresos deberán ser internacionais e estar recollidos no Scopus. 50 puntos si o congreso é Scopus
 - b) No caso de estancias ou cursos de investigación
 - a. Se a estadía é en Vigo e supón un cambio de residencia 50 puntos
 - b. Se a estadía/curso es nunha Universidade ou Centro de Investigación estranxeiro e supón un cambio de residencia: 30 puntos
 - c. Se a estadía é noutro tipo de centro estranxeiro: 20 puntos.