

# EVALUATION PROCEDURE OF THE PROGRESS OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, UAB

## Introduction

After admission to the Doctoral Program, PhD students are submitted to a yearly evaluation of the progress of their doctoral thesis, which consists of the presentation by the PhD student of the work carried out so far to an advisory committee. Passing this evaluation is a prerequisite for proceeding with the registration of the following year.

The purpose of this evaluation is to suggest the pace and dedication to the doctoral thesis on behalf of the doctoral students to ensure the quality of the resulting thesis.

## Calendar of the assessment

The evaluation of academic progress takes place once a year, at a set date between June and September. At the beginning of each year, the coordination of the doctoral program determines the composition of the Advisory Committees (tribunals), as well as the dates of the evaluation and the date of submission of the progress reports of the doctoral students/as (at least one week before the test) and sends its decision to the Doctoral School. The coordination of the doctoral program confirms these dates with the members of the Advisory Committees.

Once the dates, places and time slots are set, the coordination determines the order of presentation of the doctoral students and communicates the call for the assessment to the doctoral students, their PhD supervisors and the committee members (at least one month before the tribunals).

## Characteristics and conditions of the assessment

### *Type of assessment*

In general, the *first-year* evaluation of the thesis advancement involves the oral presentation and defense of the thesis project according to the established guidelines. The evaluation of the *second year (and the third and fourth in case the student is registered part time)* involves the presentation of thesis advances, also according to a pre-established template. The *last-year* evaluation involves the presentation of the results of the thesis in the form of a presentation for a scientific seminar, also following a specific model.

The assessment is in all cases *attendance-based*, but in exceptional cases justified by the purposes of research, the evaluation in the second and subsequent years may not be face-to-face. If needed, the PhD students can request authorization of the Academic Committee of the Doctoral Program well in advance. To obtain authorization, the student is asked to write a message to the coordinator

([Mirandajessica.Lubbers@uab.cat](mailto:Mirandajessica.Lubbers@uab.cat)) with a copy to his or her thesis advisor, at least one month before the examination date, explaining the motives of the request. Subsequently, the thesis advisor should confirm his or her agreement with the student's absence. If the student cannot present his or her advances, the last year report needs to be presented using the same template as the template for the report of the second-year evaluation.

PhD students who are on a medical or voluntary leave from the program must also participate in it if they have not been on a leave during the entire academic year; in that case, they can contact the coordinator to determine the format of the assessment.

### ***Documentation to be presented and criteria of evaluation***

The PhD candidates who participate in the evaluation must submit their reports of the progress of the thesis (see above) *before* the closing date and time to be determined by the coordination for the submission (see the end of this document). The templates for the reports are available in Catalan, Spanish and English on the website of the Department; <http://www.uab.cat/web/la-docencia/doctorat-en-antropologia-enllac-i-documents-1275458348012.html>), and can be completed in any of these languages. The template of the report varies according to the year of assessment (whether it is the first, the/an intermediate or the final assessment; see above). In each case, the student will attach an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae (CV), and in the case of the second and later years, (s)he will also attach the report submitted in the previous round of assessment. If the student has a PhD grant, (s)he may alternatively submit the report for the funding institution as assessment report, with the updated curriculum vitae attached.

In the case of the first evaluation a hard copy, signed by the thesis advisor, should be handed in, in duplicate, at the Secretariat of the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, and the documentation should be sent by email on the same date in Word or rtf format to the coordination of the doctoral program ([Mirandajessica.Lubbers@uab.cat](mailto:Mirandajessica.Lubbers@uab.cat)) as well as to the Secretariat of the Department ([d.antropologia@uab.cat](mailto:d.antropologia@uab.cat)), in a single message with the header "SEGUIMENT DOCTORAT". In the case of the subsequent tests, all documentation can be sent in digital format by e-mail, including the CV and the progress reports from previous courses (all in a single email with the header "SEGUIMENT DOCTORAT"), to the Secretariat of the Department ([d.antropologia@uab.cat](mailto:d.antropologia@uab.cat)) with a copy to the coordination of the doctoral program ([Mirandajessica.Lubbers@uab.cat](mailto:Mirandajessica.Lubbers@uab.cat)).

The thesis advisor(s) also sends a report of approximately one page to the coordination of the doctoral program and the Secretariat of the Department, about the training activities that have been performed and the progress made by the PhD student (please see the template "Model d'informe del director del seguiment anual RD 99/2011 (18/07/2013)" on the intranet of the UAB).

The fundamental criterion of evaluation is based on the scientific quality of the research plan (first year) or advances (following years) that can be deduced from the presented report and, where appropriate, from the oral presentation. The evaluation will also take into account any research results (participation in conferences, publications, etc.), resulting from the doctoral research project during the year assessed, which are included in the CV and the research project (first year) or progress report (subsequent years).

### ***Structure and evaluation of the test***

The Advisory Committee that evaluates the progress of the thesis is in each case composed of three members, who must be doctors and who are not necessarily members of the teaching staff of the Doctoral Program that convenes the assessment, as long as they meet the same requirements as the members of a thesis committee. The third member is ex officio the Coordinator of the Doctoral Program. The other two members should undertake the tasks of President and Secretary, while the coordinator undertakes the task of Committee Member.

In all attendance-based cases, the assessment is structured as follows:

- 1) Presentation by the PhD student (the student can use presentation software such as PowerPoint): max. 10 minutes.
- 2) Assessment of the committee: max. 10 minutes per member.
- 3) Reply of the PhD student: max. 5 minutes.

In case the evaluation is not face-to-face, the committee deliberates on the written progress reports submitted by the candidates and their thesis advisors. The thesis advisor(s) can be present during the assessment (if the evaluation is not face-to-face, it is better to indicate this prior to the assessment to the committee members).

After the evaluation, the Advisory Committee drafts the minutes of the assessment on the forms previously distributed by the coordinator, which contains an evaluation report and a decision. The report is singular (i.e., collective) and confidential. Its content should be concise, accurate and consensual, written by the Secretary of the Committee and signed by all three members. The decision about the progress can be "positive evaluation", "positive evaluation with observations", "negative evaluation" or "not assessable". The committee proceeds as follows.

a) *the candidate passes the test*: the report contains a brief assessment, and where appropriate, relevant research suggestions that have been made. In the minutes, the box "positive evaluation" must be checked, which means that the PhD student has passed the test and is allowed to enroll in the next course, following the calendar of the Doctoral School.

b) *the candidate does not pass the test*. In case the Committee deems it appropriate to reevaluate the student, the report must contain the changes that the Committee considers necessary and the Committee communicates to the candidate what must be corrected in order to be reevaluated. In this case, the box "positive evaluation with observations" must be checked, and the PhD student must pass a new test, with a new committee, within six months' time. In case the candidate does not pass the test and the Committee and the thesis advisor(s) do not advise continuation in the doctoral studies, the box "negative evaluation" is checked and the committee members and the thesis advisor(s) will jointly meet with the doctoral student to communicate the decision with respect to the continuation of the doctoral studies. In this case, the report must inform about the reason for this decision.

c) The student has not presented him/herself: The box “not assessable” must be checked in the report and it must be specified that the student has not presented him/herself to the tribunal.

The Secretary of the Advisory Committee shall then deliver the minutes of the assessment duly completed to the coordination of the doctoral program for it to be archived. The coordinator shall write a list of where for each year group the relation between the enrolled students and their qualification is specified. This list needs to be approved by the Doctoral Program Committee and signed by the coordination of the doctoral program and shall then be transmitted to the Doctoral School before September 30th of each year. Moreover, the coordination also presents a document “Proposal for the Non-Continuation in the Doctoral Program” for the students who have not passed the test or have not presented their progress to the committee. The resolution of the test will also be communicated to the students. The students can consult their reports (and only their own reports) at the Secretary of the Department of Anthropology after having received a message from the coordinator.

### **Progress assessment of the course 2020-2021**

The committees for the course 2020/21 are composed of the following members: Montserrat Clua, Virginia Fons, Sílvia Álvarez, Josep Lluís Mateo, Dan Rodríguez, José Luis Molina, Silvia Carrasco y Miranda Lubbers (coordinator), and as substitutes: Teresa Tapada, Diana Marre, Jorge Grau, Hugo Valenzuela, Anna Piella, Pepi Soto, Montserrat Ventura and Aurora González Echevarría.

The distribution of the members over the different committees and the students per committee will take place in the month before the assessment.

For the academic year 2020-21, the progress assessments are planned on the **28th and 29th of June 2021** and the necessary documentation should be submitted **before Monday the 14th of June, 2021, at 1pm CET** (see above for details of how to submit).