



University of Ljubljana  
Faculty of Computer and  
Information Science

Prof. First and Last Name, Institution  
Prof. First and Last Name, Institution  
Prof. First and Last Name, Institution

### **Committee for Research and Doctoral Studies**

University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Computer and Information Science  
Večna pot 113, 1000 Ljubljana

## **ASSESSMENT OF THE RELEVANCE OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION PROPOSAL**

**Candidate: First and Last Name**

**Title (eng): Doctoral thesis title**

**Title (slo): Doctoral thesis title**

### **1 A short presentation of the problems researched**

Briefly describe the specialised research area the candidate is working on, with an emphasis on the problems the candidate intends to address in the dissertation (max. 200 words).

### **2 Assessment of the existing research in the field**

Rate the extent of research already conducted in the planned research area. Decide on the appropriateness and the actuality of the research field, especially from the point of view of possible new research directions and original contributions to science. Also decide on the appropriateness of the listed references (max 200 words).

### **3 Evaluation of the adequacy of the proposed research questions, objectives and methods**

Decide on the suitability of the proposed research hypotheses or research questions and objectives. Are these research questions or goals clear and relevant? Evaluate the proposed methods. Are the planned methods sensible, is the planned methodology solid enough? Can the planned work lead to the envisioned goals and to the expected contributions to science? (up to 200 words)

### **4 Evaluation of the adequacy of the expected contributions to science**

Decide on the suitability of the expected contributions to science which the candidate has stated in the proposed doctoral dissertation proposal. Indicate up to three most important contributions, each of which is separately assessed in terms of originality, feasibility, possibility of evaluation, possibility for the independent contribution to science and the persuasive quality of its argument. You can also suggest to merge a rather inappropriate formulation of more than one contribution into one contribution (max. 400 words).

The contributions to science should be original methods and approaches developed by the candidate that contribute to the development of the chosen scientific field. An individual contribution is an integral work, which can be published in a reputable scientific journal.

Please note that the below-listed contributions do **not** qualify as contributions to science:

- Implementation of known methods.
- Solving a practical problem with known methods.
- The programme developed by the candidate to implement the suggested methods (it is only a supporting work needed to demonstrate the feasibility and practicality of the proposed method).
- Evaluation of the proposed methods and approaches.

Interdisciplinary doctoral students are expected to have most of the contributions in the field of computer and information science.

### **5 Description of the doctoral dissertation proposal presentation**

Provide the date and location of the public presentation of the dissertation proposal. Briefly describe and evaluate the quality of the candidate's presentation and sovereignty in answering questions. Minutes of the presentation should also be kept, in which the questions asked by each member of the committee are stated, as well as the expressed opinions, exposed dilemmas and possible comments and suggestions that are also forwarded to the candidate. Only the main points are mentioned in this assessment. If, after the presentation, you asked the student to improve the doctoral dissertation proposal, state this here, together with the main reasons for this requirement. You can also indicate here whether your comments have been taken into account. The overall assessment should refer to the updated version (max. 200 words).

### **6 Assessment of the adequacy of the proposed title**

Verify that the suggested Slovenian and English titles are appropriate in terms of the research topic content, are grammatically correct and of the same meaning. If this is not the case, please suggest a new title. If you already discussed the new title during the dissertation proposal presentation, also indicate the candidate's opinion (max. 100 words).

### **7 Assessment of the suitability of the Data Management Plan draft**

Provide an assessment of the suitability of the Data Management Plan draft. Verify if it contains adequate answers to the questions provided in the DMP draft template. At this stage, a detailed DMP is not required; however, the student must be aware of the importance of the data management and should know how the data will be handled during the research and after the completion of the doctoral dissertation.

### **8 Assessment of the suitability of the proposed mentor (and co-mentor)**

Provide an assessment of the suitability of the mentor and potential co-mentor. For the mentor (and separately for the co-mentor), list three to five most important publications in the field of the doctoral dissertation proposal, the SICRIS code of researcher, and the collected SICRIS points for the last five years. In addition to the basic criteria, the minimal requirement for demonstrating the mentor's and co-mentor's research activity is to achieve at least 150 SICRIS Z points in the last five years and to have the indicator of significant achievements  $A^{1/2}$  larger than 0 points.

### **9 Decision**

Clearly present the opinion of the members of the KSDŠ on whether the proposed proposal of the doctoral dissertation is set in such a way that an independent and original contribution to the scientific field can be expected.

The KSDŠ must clearly:

- state that the dissertation proposal is suitable and the assessment of the committee is positive, or
- set a deadline for the doctoral student by which the proposed proposal should be amended, supplemented or otherwise taken into account as required by KSDŠ; in this case KSDŠ will assess the new version of the proposal and write a new assessment report, or
- reject the dissertation proposal in the case of a negative assessment.

If it is required by the research methodology, the assessment shall also provide an opinion on the necessity of the consent of the research ethics committee.

If at least one member of the committee is a foreigner who does not understand the Slovene language, in addition to the assessment in Slovene, also an assessment in English shall be submitted, signed by a foreign member of the committee. The assessment of a foreign committee member does not have to be identical to the assessment in the Slovene language.

Committee to monitor the doctoral student:

Prof. First and Last name (president)

Prof. First and Last name (member)

Prof. First and Last name (member)

Ljubljana, .....