

Anexo 1

**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 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018

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

**Signatures:**

Criteria	Good	Fair	Poor	SCORE
<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.	Poor
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.	

<p><b>Motivation of the work</b> Background &amp; 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><b>Objectives &amp; Expected Significance</b></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><b>Research Plan</b> 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><b>Analysis/interpretation of (preliminary) results</b> 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><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</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>Poor</p>	<p>Poor</p>

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

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