

PhD Program – 2nd Year Examination Record

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 (if both the Thesis advisor and the Co-thesis advisor participate, they express one common grade). The second examiner must be Co-referee and the third examiner must be chosen from the following options: an independent lecturer or a member of the Expert Committee (FK).
- **NEW REGULATIONS: (PhD candidate enrolled after May 2023):**
 - Examiners can be: Candidate's Thesis Advisor and/or Co-thesis advisor (if both the Thesis Advisor and the Co-thesis advisor participate, they express one common grade). The second examiner must be the Co-referee and the third examiner must be 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	<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"/>
Results / data interpretation /creativity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Competence in answering to the scientific questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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,...)

3. 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.