LISTA DE ASISTENTES

Membros da Comisión:
Carmen García Mateo (presidenta)
Manuel García Sánchez (secretario)
Manuel Caeiro Rodríguez
Mónica Fernández Barciela
Cristina López Bravo
Artemio Mojón Ojea
José J. Pazos Arias

Outros asistentes:

Aana Fernández Vilas
Manuel Ramos Cabrer

Acta da sesión da Comisión Académica do Programa de Doutoramento DocTIC da Universidade de Vigo, de vinte un de xullo de dous mil dezasete, reunida entre as 11:30 h na sala A021 da EE de Enxeñaría de Telecomunicación.

O Venres, **día 21 de xullo de 2017**, ás 11:30 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

A orde do día contén os seguintes puntos:

1. Informe da coordinadora
2. Aprobación, se procede, de actas anteriores
3. Avaliación anual dos Plans de Investigación
4. Admisión a trámite, se procede, da Tese de Doutoramento de Hector Rieiro Tomé, aprobación, se procede, da proposta de tribunal e outros trámites relacionados.
5. Asuntos de trámite
6. Rogos e preguntas

Punto 1. Informe da coodinadora

A coordinadora informa da celebración esta mesma semana dunha reunión do Comité de Dirección da EIDO no que se trataron os seguintes asuntos:

- Seguimento do programa de doutoramento pola ACSUG: Non se prevé o informe da ACSUG até finais de setembro ou outubro.

- Aprobouse o Manual de Calidade da EIDO

- Aprobouse o procedemento de renovación das CAPD e elección de coordinador/a.

A coordinadora informa da renovación do persoal administrativo asignado ó programa de doutoramento

Punto 2. Aprobación de actas

Apróbase, por asentimento, a acta de 13 de xuño de 2017.

Punto 3. Avaliación anual dos plans de investigación.

Apróbase o Plan de Investigación de Anxo Tato Arias.

Apróbase a actividade formativa "Defensa do Plan de Investigación" do curso 2016-17 dos alumnos relacionados no Anexo 1.

Non se aproba nin o Plan de Investigación nin a actividade formativa "Defensa do Plan de Investigación" do curso 2016-17 do alumno Juan Luis Casierra Cavada 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 a actividade formativa "Defensa do Plan de Investigación" do curso 2016-17 do alumno Helder Rodrígo Soares Pinto polos motivos recollidos nas rúbricas do director de Tese e do tribunal de avaliación da actividade formativa. Estas rubricas axúntanse no Anexo 3 e foron enviadas ao alumno e ao seu director.

O alumno Helder Rodrígo Pinto ten solicitado o cambio de titor e director(es) da súa tese. Acórdase pedir un informe o titor e director(es) que dea resposta á solicitude do alumno. Asemade a coordinación iniciará pesquisas para atopar eventuais investigadores da liña Arquitectura e Servicios Telemáticos que se podan candidatar a titorizar e dirixir sta tese.

O alumno Hector Rieiro Tomé é avaliado positivamente pois a súa tese de Doutoramento é admitida a trámite pola CAPD tal como se reflicte no seguinte punto da orde do día.

Punto 4. Admisión a trámite, se procede, da Tese de Doutoramento de Hector Rieiro Tomé, aprobación, se procede, da proposta de tribunal e outros trámites relacionados.

Apróbase habilitar á Secretaría de Alumnado para a creación da avaliación anual definitiva por lectura de tese e decídese que esta avaliación sexa favorable.

Despois de comprobar o cumprimento dos requisitos establecidos na memoria do programa, aprobase a admisión a trámite da Tese de Hector Rieiro Tomé titulada "Study of temporal vision and brain blood flow regulation" dirixida polos profesores Stephen L. Macknik e José Luis Alba Castro.

Apróbase a proposta de tribunal formado por:

1	Rocío Leal Campanario	U. Pablo de Olavide	Presidente
2	Andrés Catena Martínez	U. de Granada	Secretario
3	Xoana Troncoso	University College of London	Vogal
4	Leandro Luigi di Stasi	U. de Granada	Suplente
5	Julio Martín Herrero	U. de Vigo	Suplente
6	Jorge Otero Millán	U. Johns Hopkins	Suplente

Punto 5. Asuntos de trámite

Autorizase a estancia de Alberto Pedrouzo Ulloa na Aarhus University (Dinamarca) do 1 de outubro ó 23 de decembro de 2017.

Apróbase o cambio de adicación de Luis Fernando Guerrero Vasquez de tempo completo a tempo parcial por motivos laborais, condicionado a que complete os trámites administrativos necesarios para o cambio.

Punto 6. Rogos e preguntas

A profesora Ana Fernández Vilas indica que non se puido reflectir nas actas as cualificacións dos alumnos con complementos de formación por non existir as devanditas actas. En particular refire a situación dos alumnos:

- Antonio Soto (DTEC, ADA y TSI).
- Orlando Pires (al menos ADA).

Non habendo máis asuntos que tratar, levántase a sesión.

O Secretario,

Manuel García Sánchez

VºBº
A Presidenta,

Carmen García Mateo

Anexo 1

1. Abdullah Rady, Ewies Daif
2. Álvarez López, Tamara
3. Álvarez Outerelo, David
4. Arriba Pérez, Francisco de
5. Boric Miran
6. Bravo Quezada, Omar Gustavo
7. Cabrera Mejía, Javier Bernardo
8. Castro Jul, Fátima
9. Castro Lopes Martins Pinto Ferreira, Maria Isabel de
10. Cerezo Costas, Hector
11. Cordeiro Leonor, Nuno Ricardo
12. Costa Pazo, Artur
13. Dahroug , Ahmed Tarek Abdelfattah Mohamed
14. Domínguez Martínez, María Jesús
15. Egas Acosta, Carlos
16. El Haj Ahmed , Ghofrane
17. España Villegas, Carmelo Branimir
18. Espozo Espinoza, Juan Eloy
19. Expósito Pérez, Isabel
20. Fernandes Caiña, Miguel
21. Fernández Domingos, Elías
22. Fernández Nandín, Abel
23. Freire Bastidas, Diego Mauricio
24. Garcia Davalos, Alexander
25. García Méndez, Silvia
26. García Novo, Fernando
27. García Rois, Juan
28. García Vélez, Roberto Agustín
29. Gomez Villaverde, Marcos Jose
30. González Figueroa, Damián
31. Goyanes de Miguel, Vicente
32. Guerrero Vasquez, Luis Fernando
33. Halawa , Mohamed
34. Hmila , Mariem
35. Klaina , Hicham
36. Lomba Malta, Silvestre
37. Magariños Iglesias, María del Carmen
38. Maged Moustafa Kamel, MennaAllah
39. Maradiaga Chirinos, Jorge Raul
40. Meira Ferrao Luis, Ricardo Manuel
41. Mera Iglesias, Moisés
42. Mhiri , Saber
43. Moure Fernández, María del Rocío
44. Mouriño García, Marcos Antonio
45. Namaziesfanjani , Mina
46. Nocelo López, Rubén
47. Ordóñez Morales, Esteban Fernando
48. Oya Díez, Simón
49. Parada Loira, Francisco

50. Pedrouzo Ulloa, Alberto
51. Pérez Cabo, Daniel
52. Pérez Cabo, David
53. Ramos Merino, Mateo
54. RamosMuguerza, Eduardo
55. Rodríguez Fernández, Javier
56. Rodríguez González, Francisco Javier
57. Román Portabales, Antón
58. Romualdo Carvalho, António Aristides
59. Saiáns Vázquez, José Víctor
60. Sánchez López, Sheila Lucero
61. Santana Mancilla, Pedro César
62. Santos Domínguez, David
63. Severiche Maury, Zurisaddai de la Cruz
64. Silva Leal, Fátima Manuela da
65. Tato Arias, Anxo
66. Teles Vagarinho, João Paulo
67. Valladares Rodríguez, Sonia María

Academic year 2016-2017
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: Juan Casierra **Date of exam**: June 22 - 23, 2017

Name(s) of reviewers: Alberto Gil Solla **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.	Fair
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.	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.	Poor
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	N/A
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	N/A

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

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

The motivation is quite simple, there is not enough justification for the interest of the work.

There are no clear objectives in the work, only the intention to achieve some undefined contribution in the field.

The quality of writing is not satisfactory enough. The expressed ideas are rather vague and ambiguous. The figures don't serve to clarify or support the ideas of the text.

Academic year 2016-2017
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: Juan Luis Casierra Cavada

Name(s) of reviewers: Pedro S. Rodríguez Hernández
Inés García-Tuñón Blanca
Manuel Ramos Cabrer

Date of exam: July 20th, 2017

Signatures:

Firmado digitalmente por

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.	Good
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.	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	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	NA
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	NA

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

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

- The reviewers consider that the student must improve a lot his English skills for appropriate accomplishment of tasks of this PhD program.
- In the current version of the poster, the next year planning is wrong: it includes "Publication in the journal" (in next year, contributions will not yet be identified) and "Writing thesis". This task appears in the fourth year in his general research plan. Also, the student intends to first develop a prototype and then identify the contributions, which does not seem logical for a PhD work.
- The objectives of the thesis and the proposed approach should be more concrete and focused. To achieve this, the student must submit to the supervision of his advisors.

Anexo 3

Academic year 2016-2017
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:_____HELDER RODRIGO SOARES PINTO_____   **Date of exam**:_____

Name(s) of reviewers:_____Martín Llamas Nistal & Fernando A. Mikic Fonte_____   **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.	FAIR
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.	POOR
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	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(*): 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
NOT PASS	

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

The two major issues are:
- The only task for the beginning of this year 2017 (as can be seen in the research plan of the last year 2016) was the "state of the art", and this task has not been done. Even the work done until now in this task is clearly insufficient.
- The objectives of the PhD have been changed, without any motivation or justification.

We think that the student has a poor performance this year.

Academic year 2016-2017
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: Helder Rodrigo Soares Pinto   **Date of exam**: July 18th, 2017

Name(s) of reviewers: Edita de Lorenzo, Carlos Mosquera, Juan Carlos Burguillo   **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.	FAIR
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.	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.	POOR
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	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
X	

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

The work programme proposed by the student during the evaluation days and the subsequent additional review does not display the required merits to be endorsed by this committee. Notwithstanding the potential interest of the proposed learning app to be used in a platform such as Facebook, no significant elements have been found in the research plan to be considered as topics to pursue in the framework of a PhD thesis. This committee has found no research perspective in a possibly well motivated innovative tool for learning in social networks. This, together with a lack of progress during the last two years, compromises the goal of defending a sounding PhD thesis in the allocated period of time.