

## LISTA DE ASISTENTES

### **Membros da Comisión:**

Carmen García Mateo (presidenta)  
Manuel García Sánchez (secretario)  
Rebeca P. Díaz Redondo  
José Ramón Fernández Bernárdez  
Martín Llamas Nistal

Acta da sesión da Comisión Académica do Programa de Doutoramento Doc\_TIC da Universidade de Vigo, de vinte tres de febreiro de dous mil dezasete, reunida as 10:00h na sala A010 da EE de Enxeñaría de Telecomunicación.

### **Outros asistentes:**

O Xoves, **día 23 de febreiro de 2017**, ás 10:00 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. Informe da coordinadora.
2. Aprobación, se procede, de actas anteriores.
3. Admisión definitiva de estudantes no programa de doutoramento para o curso 2016/17.
4. Aprobación, se procede, do procedemento de avaliación anual dos Plan de Investigación para o curso 2016/17
5. Asuntos de trámite.
6. Rogos e preguntas.

### **Punto 1. Informe da coordinadora**

A coordinadora informa de:

- Tense recibido as enquisas feitas pola área de calidade ós alumnos de doutoramento.
- Vaise facer unha reunión cos titores dos alumnos de novo ingreso
- O EIDO aprobou a acción formativa proposta dende DocTIC

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

Apróbanse por asentimento a acta de data 16/2/2017

### **Punto 3. Admisión definitiva de estudantes no programa de doutoramento para o curso 2016/17.**

Acordase denegar a admisión ó alumno Joao José Fernandes Bento porque o Máster que ten cursado non se adecúa ó perfil establecido na Memoria do programa de doutoramento Doc TIC.

Acordase denegar a admisión á alumna Ana María Ferreira Lopes Oliveira Pinto porque o Máster que ten cursado non se adecúa ó perfil establecido na Memoria do programa de doutoramento Doc TIC.

### **4.- Aprobación, se procede, do procedemento de avaliación anual dos Plan de Investigación para o curso 2016/17**

Apróbase o procedemento recollido no Anexo 1.

**5.- Asuntos de trámite.**

Non hai.

**7.- Rogos e preguntas.**

Non hai.

Non habendo máis asuntos que tratar, levántase a sesión.

O Secretario,

Manuel García Sánchez

VºBº  
A Presidenta,

Carmen García Mateo

**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 2016-2017  
Approved by the Academic Committee (CAPD)

**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 (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 2**
    - Edita de Lorenzo Rodríguez
    - Carlos Mosquera Nartallo
    - Juan Carlos Burguillo Rial
  - Committee no3**
    - Pedro S. Rodríguez Hernández
    - Inés García-Tuñón Blanca
    - Manuel Ramos Cabrer
  - Committee 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 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 Moday, June 5, 2017**. 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](mailto:doc_tic@uvigo.es)) by **Friday, May 5, 2017** 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 **Moday, June 5, 2017** 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 Thursday, June 15, 2017**
- e. The evaluation by the committees will take place during the poster sessions of the workshop (**Thursday, June 22 and Friday, June 23**).
- f. The evaluation committees will deliver the score by **Friday, June 30, 2017**. Those students who fail will be granted with a two-week period to correct the observed deficiencies. Final scores will be delivered to the CAPD by **Monday July 17, 2017**.
- 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 (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 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:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of exam:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name(s) of reviewers:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signatures:**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
<b>General (Layout of the poster)</b> Poster Format	<b>Poster is organized correctly and clearly written.</b> Appropriate content is in each section of poster.	<b>Majority of poster is organized correctly.</b> Appropriate content found in majority of sections, but some information is misplaced. Some sections require additional clarification.	<b>Poster is not organized properly.</b> 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.	

<b>Motivation of the work</b> 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.	
<b>Objectives &amp; Expected Significance</b>	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.	
<b>Research Plan</b> 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	
<b>Analysis/interpretation of (preliminary) results</b> 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	
<b>Critical Thinking:</b> 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	

<b>Quality of Communication(*):</b> 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.

<b>Research Plan Unacceptable NOT PASS</b> (One or more Poor Scores)	<b>Research Plan Acceptable PASS</b>

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

Task	Agent	Due date	Time	Notes
First session	All	Thursday April 6	12:00-14:00	4 groups
Second session	All	Thursday May 4	12:00-14:00	4 groups
Notice of not attendance to the workshop	Student	Friday, May 5		
Uploading of the poster file to FAITIC	Student	Monday, June, 5		
Uploading of the rubric to FAITIC	Advisor/s	Monday, June, 5		
Sending of the slide	Student	Thursday, June 15		
Workshop Day1	All	Thursday, June 22		
Workshop Day 2	All	Friday, June 23		
Delivery of rubrics	Committees	Friday, June 30		
Final scores delivering	Committees	July,17		