

NATIONAL JOINT PH.D. PROGRAMME IN NAUTICAL OPERATIONS

Template for the mid-term evaluation seminar assessment report

The mid-term evaluation seminar is based on a 30-45 min presentation of the research progress in the first half of the PhD project and the updated PhD plan. The presentation is followed by a discussion led by the evaluators and with participation of all attendees.

This template is to be filled out by the evaluators at the PhD status seminar.

The main purpose of the mid-term evaluation seminar is to evaluate

- a) Whether the progress is at the level to be expected after 1,5 (for 3-year PhD projects) or 2 years (for 4-year PhD projects) of studies.*
- b) Whether the plan for the remaining 1,5-2 years is feasible, the scientific level of the proposed research is adequate, and will likely lead to a successful completion of the PhD study within the designated time.*

Any remarks to the above must be included in the mid-term evaluation seminar assessment report.

Text written in italic are explanations to the template and should be deleted by the evaluators when completing the evaluation. Red text should be substituted by the appropriate information by the evaluators.

Status seminar assessment of PhD student name:

Working title of the thesis: thesis title

Belonging to research programme: National Joint PhD Programme in Nautical Operations

The mid-term seminar evaluators (appointed by the Head of the Doctoral Programme and approved by the Head of Department) is

- Evaluator 1: Title and name, affiliation (place of employment), and E-mail.
- Evaluator 2: Title and name, affiliation (place of employment), and E-mail.

Main supervisor for the thesis: title, name, affiliation.

Co-supervisor (-s) for the thesis (if applicable): title, name, affiliation.

Evaluation of the half of the PhD studies (1,5 or 2 years)

Description of the work already completed

Fill out evaluation of work already completed (5-10 lines). Address especially objectives and scientific level. Is this what we would expect after 1,5-2 years of studies? Is the work completed in accordance with the original PhD plan?

Publications already submitted and/or published

Brief assessment of publications (5-10 lines). Evaluate the PhD student's publications (drafts, abstracts, manuscripts, submitted full papers and published papers). Discuss the quality and progress with publications and note the status as well as the below information for the papers being discussed in the status seminar. It must be concluded whether the PhD student follows the publication plan as stated in the preliminary PhD plan.

- Paper 1: Title, authors, name of journal/conference, and status (raw manuscript, submitted, in press or printed).
- Paper 2: Title, authors, name of journal/conference, and status (raw manuscript, submitted, in press or printed).
- Paper 3: Title, authors, name of journal/conference, and status (raw manuscript, submitted, in press or printed).
- ...

Cooperation with the supervisors

Evaluate whether the supervision works satisfactorily for both supervisor(s) and the PhD student. Possible needs for changes must be identified (3-5 lines).

Evaluation of the plan for the remaining 1,5-2 years

Plans for future research and publications

Evaluate whether the plans are feasible and the scientific level is adequate (5-10 lines). The PhD plan must include project objectives in the form of main hypotheses and/or research questions. Does the PhD plan have thorough and clear descriptions of project objectives, methodology and deliverables? Suggestions for directions for research and venues for publication are encouraged.

Time schedule

Evaluate the time schedule and address necessary editions and changes to be implemented in the final PhD plan (app. 5 lines). Is the time schedule feasible and likely to lead to a successful completion of the PhD study within the designated time?

PhD courses

Evaluate whether the PhD course plan is appropriate and is being followed (for the part related to the period up to the mid-term evaluation seminar). Which courses have been taken, which are pending? Are changes of PhD courses foreseen? (3-5 lines).

Plans for stays abroad:

Evaluate whether the plans for stays abroad can give added value to the project.

Oral presentation and discussion

The evaluators briefly address oral presentation techniques and language (2-3 lines).

Overall evaluation of the PhD students' progress

A summing up of the above elements of the PhD study leading to a single statement, which can be:

- *Yes, the PhD student follows the PhD plan and the scientific level is adequate after 1,5-2 years. The plan for the remaining time is satisfactory.*
- *Partly, the PhD student does not follow the PhD plan in (specified sections) or the plan for the remaining time is not satisfactory.*
- *No, the PhD students' progress is not satisfactory, the PhD plan is not being followed in (specified sections) and (if applicable) the scientific level is not as to be expected for a PhD student having studied for 1,5-2 years. A re-establishment plan must be considered.*

Any actions to be included in the final PhD plan must be identified and stated.

Dated and signed by the evaluators.

Date Full name and signature of evaluator 1.

Date Full name and signature of evaluator 2.