

LISTA DE ASISTENTES

Membros de la Comisión:

Carmen García Mateo (presidenta)
Manuel García Sánchez (secretario)
Nuria González Prelicic
Mónica Fernández Barciela
José Ramón Fernández Bernárdez
Manuel Fernández Veiga
Martín Llamas Nistal
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 vintaseis de marzo de dous mil quince, reunida ás 12:00 horas na sala de reunións A010 da E.E. Telecomunicación.

O Xoves, **día 26 de marzo de 2015**, ás 12:00 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. Nomeamento das comisións avaliadoras do seguimento do Plan Anual de Investigación
4. Aprobación, se procede, do procedemento e criterios de avaliación do Plan Anual de Investigación.
5. Aprobación, se procede, dos tipos, perfil e criterios de valoración das axudas de mobilidade para o ano 2015.
6. Aceptación de actividades formativas realizadas no curso 2013/2014.
7. Asuntos de trámite.
8. Rogos e preguntas

Punto 1. Informe da Coordinadora

A coordinadora informa de que:

- O presuposto do programa de doutoramento para este ano é de 10.805 €
- A semana anterior celebrouse unha reunión do comité de dirección do EIDO, onde se informou de que se está a traballar na modificación da normativa dos premios extraordinarios de doutoramento e no sistema de garantía de calidade.

Punto 2. Aprobación, se procede, de actas anteriores

Apróbanse por asentimento as actas dos días 9 de febreiro de 2015 e 13 de febreiro de 2015.

Punto 3. Nomeamento das comisións avaliadoras do seguimento do Plan Anual de Investigación.

Infórmase de que hai unha incidencia nas comisións nomeadas pola CAPD ó 9 de febreiro de 2015, xa que Juan Carlos Burguillo non pode asistir á xornada de seguimento. A coordinación do doutoramento buscará un substituto.

Punto 4. Aprobación, se procede, do procedemento e criterios de avaliación do Plan Anual de Investigación.

Infórmase de que a xornada de seguimento do Plan Anual de Investigación será o 16 de xuño próximo. Apróbanse o procedemento e os criterios de avaliación que figuran no Anexo 1. Infórmase de que se necesitan propostas para un conferenciante na xornada de seguimento.

Punto 5. Aprobación, se procede, dos tipos, perfil e criterios de valoración das axudas de mobilidade para o ano 2015.

Apróbase solicitar a convocatoria de 12 bolsas de tipo B co perfil indistinto: estancia de investigación, asistencia a curso o escola de verán, asistencia a congreso para a presentación dunha comunicación, cos criterios de valoración do Anexo 2.

Punto 6. Aceptación de actividades formativas realizadas no curso 2013/2014.

Acórdase aceptar unicamente as actividades formativas que correspondan co recollido na memoria do programa de doutoramento:

- Realización de estadías de investigación
- Preparación de publicacións científicas internacionais
- Presentación de comunicacións en congresos científicos internacionais
- Cursos de formación transversal de outros programas de doutoramento nacionais ou internacionais.
- Cursos de formación avanzada de outros programas de doutoramento nacionais ou internacionais.

Punto 7. Asuntos de trámite.

Non hai.

Punto 8. Rogos e preguntas

Non hai.

Non habendo máis asuntos que tratar, levántase a sesión.

O Secretario

VºBº
A Presidenta

Manuel García Sánchez

Carmen García Mateo

ANEXO 1

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

Academic year 2014-2015
Approved by the Academic Committee on XX

General Considerations:

1. This activity is compulsory for all the students enrolled in the academic year 2014-2015.
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 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 three Evaluation Committees:
 - Committee no 1**
 - Antonio Pena Giménez
 - Cristina López Bravo
 - Juan Carlos Burguillo Rial
 - Committee no 2**
 - Carlos Mosquera Nartallo
 - Edita de Lorenzo Rodríguez
 - Manuel Fernández Veiga
 - Committee no3**
 - Pedro S. Rodríguez Hernández
 - Inés García-Tuñón Blanca
 - Manuel Ramos Cabrer
7. Each student will be assigned to one of the evaluation committees. This assignment is made by the CA-Doc_TIC. The list is in Annex 2.

Evaluation procedure and calendar:

- a. All students should prepare a poster. The pdf file of the poster must be sent by **14:00 (CET) of Wednesday, June 10, 2015** to the address doc_tic@uvigo.es. Doc_TIC will be in charge of the printing of the poster for those student who will attend the session.
- b. Those students unable to attend the workshop will contact the Doc_TIC coordinator (doc_tic@uvigo.es) by **Wednesday, June 10, 2015** 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 should send one rubric by **Friday, June 12, 2015** to the address doc_tic@uvigo.es
- d. Students attending the evaluation day should send one slide of the poster presentation (just 1 page in portrait orientation) by **14:00 (CET) of Monday, June 15, 2015**
- e. The evaluation by the committees will take place during the poster session of the workshop (**Tuesday, June 16, 2015**).
- f. The evaluation committees will deliver the score by **June 23, 2015 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 10, 2015**.
- g. There will be 1 Best Poster Award that is going to 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 portrait 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 sent to the address doc_tic@uvigo.es

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: _____
exam: _____

Date of

Name(s) of reviewers: _____

Signatures:

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

Criteria	High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	SCORE
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	
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	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent

	Low Scores) Provide explanation and/or suggestions	(0-2 High Scores)	(3-5 High Scores)	(6-7 High Scores)

Provide comments and/or suggestions:

ANEXO 2 ANEXO I

Programa de doutoramento:

Crédito asignado: 9.000

Bolsas convocadas: 12

Nº Id. (1)	Tipo (2)	Perfil ⁽³⁾	Nº de bolsas
	B	Indistinto: estancia de investigación, asistencia a curso o escola de verán, asistencia a congreso para a presentación dunha comunicación	12
Criterios de Valoración ⁽⁴⁾			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Méritos curriculares dos/as solicitantes 10 • Interese do desprazamento proposto para o programa formativo 40 • Calidade do centro de destino ou importancia do congreso/curso. Os congresos deberán ser internacionais e estar recollidos no Scopus. No caso de estancias de investigación, darase prioridade a que o centro de destino estea no extranxeiro e supoña un cambio de país de residencia do estudante. 50 			

(1) Será cuberto pola EIDO

(2) Indicar se é A,B,C ou D. A: 1000 € B: 750 € C: 500 € D: 250 €

(3) Describir a actividade formativa de que se trate: estadía de investigación, asistencia a congreso, asistencia a curso, etc. Para actividades de distinta natureza deberán usarse liñas e descrições diferenciadas.

(4) Detallar ou concretar os criterios de selección e baremo, indicando a distribución dun máximo de 100 puntos. Como mínimo deberá conter os apartados indicados no apartado VI:

Méritos curriculares dos/as solicitantes

Interese do desprazamento proposto para o programa formativo

Calidade do centro de destino ou importancia do congreso/curso