

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>	
Quality of the training aims			<i>I could not evaluate the Aims (no Aims provided). The structure of the programme is very good</i>
National and international collaborations with Academic partners	4		
National and international collaborations with non Academic partners	3		
Research funds of the teaching staff	3		
School funds availability	1		<i>The school funds are way too low!</i>
Spaces and instruments of the School	4		
Relevance of the research areas	4		
Teaching staff publications	3		<i>I would need another measure to evaluate the publications, e.g. number of papers in top 10 journals of the respective field</i>
PhD students publications	4		
Quality of the courses/seminars of the School	4		
PhD students training activities outside the University of Padova	4		
Vocational and academic recruiting	4		

**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.*