

Guidelines on the mid-term evaluation, 2013-09-20, updated 2016-05-09, 2019-02-11.

Background:

The board decided at its meeting 2011-11-22 that all Ph.D. students who begin their doctoral studies after 2011-07-01 shall undergo a mid-term evaluation as an alternative to a licentiate. We have several research subjects at MMK. The layouts of the mid-term evaluations should be similar for the different subjects. We shall use the mid-term evaluation as a check and evaluation of how the work is progressing and if the overall timetable is followed. We will try to give as clear feedback as possible. The evaluation is particularly important when performance is not so good; if all goes well, it 's just to wish the best of luck with future work.

If major problems are detected the person responsible for Ph.D. studies jointly with the person responsible for undergraduate teaching will make a plan for regular follow-ups, including meetings with the student as well as with the main supervisor.

Suggestions:

- Mid-term evaluation consists of several parts: an oral seminar, a written summary report and a meeting where both the student's performance and the amount of tutoring and quality are assessed.
- The student summarizes her/his work in writing on five to ten pages. This will be sent at least one week before the mid-term evaluation to the dissertation advisors within the research subject. The report shall contain a project description (ca 5 pages long), a brief summary of the work performed (approximately 1-2 pages), a description of future plans and a synopsis of the dissertation (approximately 1-2 pages) and a page where the student reflects on their own doctoral studies, emphasizes what goes well and what could be improved and suggest changes / improvements. A person among the dissertation advisors is appointed to examine the report, along with the latest study plan and publication if available.
- The mid-term evaluation is led by the person responsible for the research subject, except when she/he is the supervisor. In such a case, another senior scientist will lead the seminar and the subsequent evaluation discussion.
- The evaluation begins with the student giving a 30 min long scientific presentation of the work done and future plans. At least 15 minutes are set aside for questions from the dissertation advisors and the audience about the scientific content of the presentation.
- After the research presentation, the discussion continues in a smaller group. The Ph.D. student starts by giving a 10 min long presentation that describes and reflects on how her/his doctoral studies are progressing and presents plans for future work. During this discussion there will also be a session when the supervisor leaves the room and a session when the PhD student leaves the room, this has been added because some PhD students feel uncomfortable to express their opinions about the supervision when the supervisor is present.
- The mid-term evaluation will result in a written opinion evaluation, regarding the progress of the doctoral studies, according to the three main headings of the learning outcomes for a PhD, as seen below. This review should also include a brief recommendation of any changes in both the student's work and the tutorial quantity and quality. The Chairperson is responsible for the evaluation of this report.

Key questions:

How did the work go? Is the performance so far sufficient or does it have to be improved, in order to achieve the goal (dissertation on schedule)?

Has the supervision been good?

Has the student's performance been sufficient or it needs to be improved?

Excerpts from the learning goals for doctoral degree, Higher Education Ordinance (SFS 2006:1053)

Knowledge and Understanding

- Demonstrate broad knowledge and systematic understanding of the research area, together with deep and up-to-date knowledge in a limited part of the research area, and
- Demonstrate knowledge of the scientific method in general and with methods within the specific research area in particular.

Skills and Abilities

- Show ability to scientific analysis and synthesis and independent, critical assessment of new and complex phenomena, issues and situations;
- Demonstrate the ability to critically, independently and creatively, and with scientific rigor to identify and formulate issues and to plan and use appropriate methods to conduct research and other advanced tasks within specified time frames and to review and evaluate such work;
- Through a doctoral thesis, demonstrate an ability to use their own research to contribute significantly to the development of knowledge,
- Demonstrate an ability to – in both national and international contexts – both orally and in writing, with authority to present and discuss research and research results in dialogue with the scientific community and society in general,
- Demonstrate the ability to identify the need for further knowledge and
- Demonstrate the ability to both research and education and in other professional contexts contribute to social development and to support the learning of others.

Judgment and approach

- Demonstrate intellectual independence and scientific integrity and an ability to make ethical judgments, and
- Demonstrate a deep insight into the possibilities and limitations of science, its role in society and the responsibility for its use.