**PhD Program – 2nd Year Examination Record**

Graduate School for Health Sciences

**Aim of the 2nd Year Examination**

* to test the candidate’s knowledge of the research field and evaluate her/his capacity to succeed with a PhD
* to discuss and evaluate the progress of the research project and its feasibility for publication in peer-reviewed journals
* to define the goals for the remaining period of doctoral studies

**Formal setting**

* 30-40-min public talk e.g. in the setting of an Institute or Department Seminar Series
* Public discussion of 15 to max. 60 min, during which examiners and audience ask critical questions and involve the candidate in a scientific discourse
* Following the public part, the candidate and the examiners thoroughly discuss the state of the research project, its strengths and weaknesses.
* During this closed meeting, the candidate also presents his/her outlook on the project, so that his conceptual understanding of the project can be assessed.
* The closed discussion must include explicit advice on the further course of the project including the importance of being able to publish at least three articles (one as a first author and two as first or co-author) until the thesis defense.
* The exam is independently assessed by three examiners.
* **OLD REGULATIONS (PhD candidate enrolled before May 2023):**
* Examiners can be: thesis advisor and or Co thesis advisor, co-referee and an independent lecturer or member of the Expert Committee
* **NEW REGULATIONS: (PhD candidate enrolled after May 2023):**
* Examiners can be: Candidate’s Thesis Advisor and/or Co-thesis advisor, Co-referee and an independent lecturer

**Protocol form**

**Name:**

**Matriculation no.:**

**Thesis Advisor:**

**Place, date:**

**Theme of presentation:**

**Scientific evaluation: presentation/discussion and research progress**

The examiners agree on the evaluation of the criteria.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **insufficient** | **sufficient** | **good** | **excellent** |
| **Quality of scientific work** |  |  |  |  |
| **Methodological knowledge** |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge of relevant literature** |  |  |  |  |
| **Results / data interpretation /creativity** |  |  |  |  |
| **Competence in answering to the scientific questions** |  |  |  |  |
| **Presentation skills** |  |  |  |  |

**Summary of conclusion and outlook**

1. Summary of main comments on the performance:  
   *(state of research, strengths,...)*
2. Objectives for improvement

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

1. Is the Project on track? Goals for the remaining period

**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.**