# Annex 1

**Academic year 2020-2021 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:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **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. |  |
| **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  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 |  |
| **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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research Plan Unacceptable NOT PASS**  (One or more Poor Scores) | **Research Plan Acceptable PASS** |
|  |  |

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

In case of poor grading, please indicate if minor or major changes are required.

Please, indicate also if you consider that a poster session evaluation will be needed next year