

PhD Program – 1st Year Examination Record

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: The Thesis advisor or the Co-thesis advisor (if both the Thesis advisor and the Co-thesis advisor participate, they express one common grade). The second examiner must be chosen from the following options: the Co-referee, a member of the Expert Committees (FKs) 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 (if both the Thesis Advisor and the Co-thesis advisor participate, they express one common grade) and the 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge on the topic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Convincing argumentations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methodological knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge of relevant literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.