

### SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE EVALUATION TABLE

*Evaluation of the three year period (2008/2010): for each row please specify a score from 1 to 5 (1= unsatisfactory, 2 =Satisfactory, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent)*

*Follow-up of the previous evaluation of the Scientific Committee: for each row specify a score from 1 to 3 (1=suggestions have not been implemented; 2=suggestions have partly been implemented, 3= suggestions have completely been implemented)*

	<i>Evaluation of the three year period (2008/2010)</i>	<i>Follow-up of the previous evaluation*</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	<i>score 1 -5 (min 1 – max 5)</i>	<i>score 1-3 (min 1 – max 3)</i>	
<b>Quality of the training aims</b>	5	2	<i>In my previous evaluation report, I appreciated that the training approach is strongly interdisciplinary, being enforced with a first year where students are required to apply on basic courses and are prepared to face whatever research problem in the field of Information Engineering. In the same time, I liked there were several curricula. Now the curricula have become only two (Bioengineering and ICT). This is unexpected to me: at a first glance, my feeling is that the ICT curriculum is too wide as compared to the other. However, I don't exclude this is an even better way to implement the interdisciplinary character of the School, so I am inclined to encourage the current solution and wait for checking feedback in a few years. Eventually, this choice might result in another evidence of the pioneering role that the Padua School has taken so far.</i>
<b>National and international collaborations with Academic partners</b>	5	3	<i>The figures reported in the new self-evaluation report give evidence that cooperation with national and international academic partners is maintained at very good levels.</i>
<b>National and international collaborations with non Academic partners</b>	5	3	<i>In 2010, the number of collaborations with non-academic partners is significantly increased. This confirms that the asset of the School is innovative as compared to PhD Schools in many other universities (at least in Italy) where the natural tendency is preparing students for a future (unlikely!!!) work in the academy.</i>
<b>Research funds of the teaching staff</b>	4	3	<i>In the last year, the resources derived from the research funds available to the teaching staff has not varied much as compared to the recent past (they are just slightly decreased). Following the comments raised by the reviewers in the previous evaluation report, a valuable effort has been made by the School Administration to identify the expenditures directly related with the support of PhD students.</i>

<b>School funds availability</b>	3	3	<i>In my previous evaluation report, I stressed this was the most critical issue in the asset of the School, especially when comparing these funds to the ones coming from the projects coordinated by members of the teaching staff. In the new self-assessment reported it is shown that, year by year, the School is going to improve its spending capacity as regards the specific financial resources transferred from the University Central Administration. This is a very good sign in the direction of overcoming this weakness.</i>
<b>Spaces and instruments of the School</b>	5	3	<i>During my new visit to the Labs I could check that instrumentation devices, supporting services, and spaces have even improved as compared to my first visit, when I already found an excellent asset in terms of resources and facilities available to the PhD students.</i>
<b>Relevance of the research areas</b>	5	3	<i>The itemized list of the research topics offered to the PhD students in 2010 confirms that the coverage of the subject areas is satisfactorily wide and fits the interdisciplinary goals of the School.</i>
<b>Teaching staff publications</b>	5	3	<i>The data provided confirm that the scientific production of the teaching team is one of the major strength factors of the School.</i>
<b>PhD students publications</b>	5	3	<i>The histogram of publications produced by PHD students graduated in 2010 is in line with I already remarked in my previous evaluation report: on one side, it confirms the very good statistics of the previous years, on the other it confirms that a few students reach the end of the doctorate with an unsatisfactorily low number of publications.</i>
<b>Quality of the courses/seminars of the School</b>	4	2	<i>In my previous evaluation report I said that the quality of the courses was very good, but in the same time I suggested to make efforts to increase the number of lectures taken by instructors from foreign universities. The figures being reported (5 in 2008, 4 in 2009, 3 in 2010) seem to be not aligned with this goal.</i>
<b>PhD students training activities outside the University of Padova</b>	5	3	<i>The figures provided allow me to confirm the evaluation I already gave in my previous report: the network established by the School for the mobility exchange programs of PhD students is excellent.</i>
<b>Vocational and academic recruiting</b>	4	3	<i>In my previous evaluation report I expressed serious concerns about the statement that "approximately 20% of the Doctors will find positions in academia, while the rest will be employed in research centers, industries, or public and private research organizations". The new self assessment report seems to prove I was wrong: all Doctors graduated in the last three years found a job position just one year after the PhD program conclusion! Although I guess that these positions are likely temporary, this is a very good outcome.</i>

*\*Do not fill in the third column if you did not provide any comment or suggestion to improve the quality of the PhD programs on the corresponding item of the first column. However, you are kindly requested to evaluate whether or not [rating scale: min 1 – max 3] the School accepted the suggestions you provided.*