LISTA DE ASISTENTES

Membros de la Comisión:
Carmen García Mateo (presidenta)
Manuel García Sánchez (secretario)
Mónica Fernández Barciela
José Ramón Fernández Bernárdez
Martín Llamas Nistal
Roberto López Valcarce
Cristina López Bravo
José J. Pazos Arias

Outros asistentes:

Acta da sesión da Comisión Académica do Programa de Doutoramento Doc_TIC da Universidade de Vigo, de vinte dous de abril de dous mil dezaseis, reunida de 10:30h a 13.30h no foro de Doc_TIC.

O venres, **día 22 de abril de 2016**, ás 10:30 horas, comezou a sesión da Comisión Académica do Programa de Doutoramento Doc_TIC, 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.-Aprobación, se procede, da data, procedemento e criterios de avaliación dos Plans de Investigación.
2.-Asuntos de trámite.

Punto 1. Aprobación, se procede, da data, procedemento e criterios de avaliación dos Plans de Investigación.

Apróbase o programa da xornada (anexo 1), que se celebrará o 13 de xuño de 2016.

Apróbanse os criterios de avaliación (anexo 2)

Punto 2. Asuntos de trámite.

ALUMNADO CURSO 2013-14:

1. Apróbase o recoñecemento das seguintes actividades:

    - Mera Iglesias

        Un artigo en revista internacional

    - Robles Bykbaev

        Realización dunha ponencia nun congreso internacional

        Dous artigos en revistas internacionais

    Non se recoñecen as seguintes actividades de Robles Bykbaev por non corresponder con actividades formativas de Doc_TIC:

        Comunicacions a congresos

        Chairman en sesión de congreso

        Miembro de comité de edición de revista

2. Apróbase a solicitude de baixa temporal de Damián González Figueroa con efectos de 18/3/2016.

3. Apróbase a avaliación do curso 2014-15 de Moisés Mera

4. Apróbase a avaliación do curso 2015-16 de Cháves Diéguez

5. Apróbanse as solicitudes de prórroga de:

    - Mohamed Ben Khalifa

    - Nuno Ricardo Cordeiro Leonor

    - Kais Dai

    - María del Carmen Magariños Iglesias

    - Azzeddin Naghar

- Rubén Nocelo López
- Fátima Manuela da Silva Leal
- Moisés Mera Iglesias

-ALUMNADO CURSO 2014-15:

6. Apróbase o Plan de Investigación, versión 1.1 de Mouriño García.

7. Apróbase o recoñecemento das seguintes actividades:

- Arriba Pérez:

Un artigo en revista internacional

Realización de dúas ponencias en congresos internacionais

-ALUMNADO CURSO 2015-16:

8. Apróbanse os Plans de Investigación de.

- Álvarez López
- Miran Boric
- España Villegas
- Expósito Pérez
- Godoy
- Sanchéz López
- Santos Domínguez
- Severiche Maury

No caso de Santos Dominguez a liña de investigción única é "Procesado do Sinal".

9. Apróbase a solicitude de codirección de Milagros Fernández Gavilanes da tese de Tamara Álvarez López

Non habendo máis asuntos que tratar, levántase a sesión.

O Secretario,

Manuel García Sánchez

VºBº
A Presidenta,

Carmen García Mateo

Workshop on Monitoring PhD Student Progress
PhD Program on Information and Communications Technology (Doc_TIC)
University of Vigo

Date: Monday, June 13, 2016
Place: "Salón de Grados" – EE de Telecomunicación

Program

9:00-9:15	Opening: Prof. Carmen Garcia-Mateo, Coordinator of Doc_TIC PhD Program
9:15-10:30	Poster Session 1 with spotlights Chairperson:
10:30-11:45	Poster Session 2 with spotlights Chairperson:
11:45-12:15	Coffee break
12:15-13:15	Lecture by Invited Speaker Prof. Bipin Indurkhya, Visiting Professor, Department of Computer Science, AGH University of Science and Technology, Kraków (Poland) Chairperson: Prof. Juan C. Burguillo Rial
13:15 -14:30	Poster Session 3 with spotlights Chairperson:
14:30 – 14:40	Closing

Anexo 2

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

Academic year 2015-2016
Approved by the Academic Committee

General Considerations:
1. This activity is compulsory for all the students enrolled in the academic year 2015-2016.
2. The working language is English.
3. A rubric for evaluation is approved by the Academic Committee of the PhD program (CA-Doc_TIC). 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.
   CA-Doc_TIC 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 2
   - Edita de Lorenzo Rodríguez
   - Carlos Mosquera Nartallo
   - Juan Carlos Burguillo Rial
   Committe no3
   - Pedro S. Rodríguez Hernández
   - Inés García-Tuñón Blanca
   - Manuel Ramos Cabrer
   Committe no4
   - Cristina López Bravo
   - María Soledad Torres
   - Manuel Fernández Veiga

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

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 Monday, June 6, 2016**. Doc_TIC 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 Doc_TIC coordinator (doc_tic@uvigo.es) by **Monday, May 16, 2016** 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 **Monday, June 6, 2016** to theor faitic server.

d. Students attending the evaluation day must send one slide of the poster presentation (just 1 page in portrait orientation) by **14:00 (CET) of Thursday, June 9, 2016**

e. The evaluation by the committees will take place during the poster session of the workshop (**Monday, June 13, 2016**).

f. The evaluation committees will deliver the score by **June 23, 2016 to the CA-Doc_TIC**. Those students who fail will be granted with a two-week period to correct the observed deficiencies. Final scores will be delivered to the CA-Doc_TIC by **July 15, 2016**.

g. There will be 1 Best Poster Award that will be selected based on student voting.

Instructions for the preparation of the material

POSTER LAYOUT
- Poster orientation should be portrait.
- 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

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.

Universida_de_Vigo

Annex 1

EVALUATION RUBRIC: RESEARCH PLAN

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	High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	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.	

Criteria	High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	SCORE
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	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	

Criteria	High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	SCORE
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.

CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE RATINGS			
	Research Plan Unacceptable NOT approved	**Research Plan Acceptable APPROVED**		
OVERALL	Poor (One or more Low Scores) Provide explanation and/or suggestions	Acceptable (0-2 High Scores)	Very Good (3-5 High Scores)	Excellent (6-7 High Scores)

Provide comments and/or suggestions: