**Annex 5**

**Internal Evaluation Report**

**Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors**

**Tashkent, 8 – 9, February 2018.**

**Hosted by** Tashkent Chemical-Technological Institute

***Main purposes of the event were*** to contribute to the development, implementation and adaptation of innovative quality assurance mechanisms and support structures by raising the capacity of the participating Uzbek HEIs in implementing quality assurance standards in doctoral education.

The evaluation report consists of three parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants (produced by the ELTE-team); (ii) evaluation by UGR-team responsible for WP2; (iii) conclusions by the ELTE-team responsible for WP3

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 33 participants are as follows**:**

The 70 % (n=23) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the Seminar received before the event fully satisfactory and 30% (n=10) satisfactory.(Mean: 3.7)

The **58%** (n=19) of the participants found the **professional content of the Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors as a whole** veryuseful and 42% (n=14) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. .(Mean: 3.6)

As to the components of the **Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors,** evaluation by theparticipants is as follows

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  1. **Joint session: Sharing views on doctoral supervision**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 58% (n=19) | Useful42% (n=14) | Only partly useful | 3.5 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  2. **Joint session: Priorities and expectations**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 55% (n=18) | Useful45% (n=15) | Only partly useful | 3.5 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  3. **Plenary talk on publications**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 70% (n=23) | Useful24% (n=8) | Only partly useful6% (n=2) | 3.6 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  4. **Case studies - publications** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 70% (n=23) | Useful30% (n=10) | Only partly useful | 3.7 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Plenary talk on research integrity and ethics**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 64% (n=21) | Useful36% (n=11) | Only partly useful | 3.7 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| 6. **Case studies - research integrity and ethics** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 58% (n=19) | Useful42% (n=14) | Only partly useful | 3.6 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  7. **Session on “*My action plan*”** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 48% (n=16) | Useful52% (n=17) | Only partly useful | 3.5 |

The 65% (n=20) of the participants were fully satisfied and 35 (n=11) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Training. (Note: This question was answered by 31 participants)

Among the participants there were 14 doctoral students, 15 supervisors and 4 participants working in university administration. We also analysed the evaluation by students and supervisors separately.

***Evaluation by doctoral students***

The 57 % (n=8) of the doctoral students found the **preliminary information** concerning the Seminar received before the event fully satisfactory and 43% (n=6) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.6)

The 50% (n=7) of the doctoral students found the **professional content of the Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors as a whole** veryuseful and 50% (n=7) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.5)

As to the components of the **Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors,** evaluation by thedoctoral students is as follows

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  1. **Joint session: Sharing views on doctoral supervision**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 57% (n=8) | Useful43% (n=6) | Only partly useful | 3.6 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  2. **Joint session: Priorities and expectations**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 57% (n=8) | Useful43% (n=6) | Only partly useful | 3.6 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  3. **Plenary talk on publications**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 43% (n=6) | Useful57% (n=8) | Only partly useful6% (n=2) | 3.4 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  4. **Case studies - publications** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 50% (n=7) | Useful50% (n=7) | Only partly useful | 3.5 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Plenary talk on research integrity and ethics**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 57% (n=8) | Useful43% (n=6) | Only partly useful | 3.6 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| 6. **Case studies - research integrity and ethics** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 64% (n=9) | Useful36% (n=5) | Only partly useful | 3.6 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  7. **Session on “*My action plan*”** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 43% (n=6) | Useful57% (n=8) | Only partly useful | 3.4 |

The 57% (n=8) of the participants were fully satisfied and 43% (n=6) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Training.

***Evaluation by supervisors***

The 73 % (n=11) of the supervisors found the **preliminary information** concerning the Seminar received before the event fully satisfactory and 27% (n=4) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.7)

The 53% (n=8) of the supervisors found the **professional content of the Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors as a whole** veryuseful and 47% (n=7) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.5)

As to the components of the **Quality Assurance Seminar,** evaluation by thesupervisors is as follows

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  1. **Joint session: Sharing views on doctoral supervision**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 47% (n=7) | Useful53% (n=8) | Only partly useful | 3.5 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  2. **Joint session: Priorities and expectations**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 40% (n=6) | Useful60% (n=9) | Only partly useful | 3.4 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  3. **Plenary talk on publications**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 88% (n=13) | Useful6% (n=1) | Only partly useful6% (n=1) | 3.8 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  4. **Case studies - publications** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 80% (n=12) | Useful20% (n=3) | Only partly useful | 3.8 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Plenary talk on research integrity and ethics**  |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 67% (n=10) | Useful33% (n=5) | Only partly useful | 3.7 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| 6. **Case studies - research integrity and ethics** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 47% (n=7) | Useful53% (n=8) | Only partly useful | 3.5 |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  7. **Session on “*My action plan*”** |

 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | MEAN |
| Very useful 47% (n=7) | Useful53% (n=8) | Only partly useful | 3.5 |

The 53% (n=8) of the participants were fully satisfied and 47% (n=7) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Seminar.

***Evaluation by the ELTE-team***

The Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors proved to be successful from the perspective of supervisors and doctoral students as well. The timing (time slots allocated to different activities) could have been more sensitive to the content and other requirements of the particular issue.

It is supposed that those who are fully satisfied marked the “very useful” and the expectations of those who marked the “useful” have not been fully met. As the share of the “very useful” answers (50% of the doctoral students and 53% of the supervisors) was lower that in the case of the other two events, it seems desirable the make a deeper evaluation of the possible weaker points and consider the lessons for the second training activities.

It seems desirable to devote more time for well-designed case studies / group work and less for plenary presentations

From an evaluator’s perspective it can be mentioned that the technical facilities for presentations were not the most appropriate and it may hinder the understanding of the presentations. The lack of Wifi connection also caused difficulties for some lecturers.