**PhD Program – 1st Year Examination Record**

Graduate School for Health Sciences

**Aim of the 1st Year Examination -**

is to evaluate the PhD candidate’s comprehension and competence in conceptual and methodological project matters.

* The PhD candidate should be able to
	+ scientifically discuss the selected scientific approach and to assess the strengths, limitations and potential pitfalls of the methodologies chosen
	+ Discuss critically the approach and methods (e.g. systematic literature review, analysis of questionnaire data, controlled experiment, meta analysis, …) applied or planned in the research project.

**Examination**

The examination:

* takes place in a formal setting
* it usually takes place at the candidate’s institute in the presence of at least one examiner
* the format is a two-hour written examination on a query formulated by the Thesis Advisor
* is performed without aids. As an auxiliary resource, only a dictionary is admitted. The use of textbooks or a cell phone are not permitted, nor is the use of the candidate's own laptop/computer
* is independently assessed by two examiners.

**OLD REGULATIONS (PhD candidate enrolled before May 2023):**

* + Examiners can be: Candidate’s Thesis Advisor or Co-thesis advisor, Co-referee, a member of the Expert Committee or an independent lecturer of the involved Faculties

**NEW REGULATIONS: (PhD candidate enrolled after May 2023):**

* Examiners can be: Candidate’s Thesis Advisor or Co-thesis advisor and Co-referee
* The evaluation of the examination is recorded on this GHS protocol form.
* the form must be signed by the examiners and submitted to the GHS Coordinator directly following the examination.

**Protocol form**

**Name:**

**Matriculation no.:**

**Thesis Advisor:**

**Co-referee:**

**Place, date:**

**Theme of presentation:**

**Scientific evaluation:**

The examiners agree on the evaluation of the criteria.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **insufficient** | **sufficient** | **good** | **excellent** |
| **Quality of scientific writing** |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Knowledge on the topic** |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Convincing argumentations** |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Methodological knowledge** |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Knowledge of relevant literature** |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

**Questions**

**1.**

**2.**

**3.**

**Summary and conclusions**

Summary of main comments on the performance:
*(state of research, strengths,...)*

Objectives for improvement

(*weaknesses, advices on necessary changes,…)*

**Examiners**

If the thesis advisor and co-thesis advisor participate as examiners, they should agree on one grade.

**Name** **Signature Grade**

**Grading Scheme:** 6.0 = excellent; 5.5 = very good; 5.0 = good; 4.5 = satisfactory;
4.0 = sufficient; below 4.0 = failed.
**The highest mark should be reserved for extraordinary work.**