

UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED

DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN OF THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL

The quality assurance and quality improvement plan of the Doctoral School of Education (DSE) is in accordance with the

- ESG 2015 quality assurance principles and standards,
- the strategic objectives and recommendations of the European Higher Education Area,
- the *Quality Assurance Guidelines for Doctoral Training and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree at the University of Szeged* and the strategic plans of the University of Szeged,
- the *Regulations Governing the Doctoral Training Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree* of the University of Szeged,
- the recommendations of the Hungarian Doctoral Council and the Hungarian Accreditation Committee.

Procedures

The present quality assurance and quality improvement plan of the DSE is organised by (1) defining the principles, criteria, and standards of quality assurance; (2) supporting their realisation; (3) monitoring their attainment; and (4) feedback and dissemination. *The Training and Research Curriculum and the Academic and Exam Regulations* and the quality assurance and quality improvement system are developed and revised by the Council of the Doctoral School of Education (CDSE) at least every five years. The members of the CDSE are responsible for quality assurance of the DSE, and they fulfil the role of Quality Assurance Officer together. The composition, the tasks, and the authority of the Council of the Doctoral School of Education are defined in the *Operational Regulations* of the DSE (see Appendix 1; it is also available on the DSE homepage and in the doktori.hu database).

The Council of the DSE discusses problems related to quality improvement, to developments in scientific norms, and to the consequences of these on the doctoral programme at almost each of its meetings. Special attention is paid international rankings and considering how the DSE can contribute to improving the indicators. If necessary, the CDSE amends the regulations concerned. The meetings of the supervisors discuss the problems emerging in processes of regulation, quality assurance, and information management and the CDSE defines the steps to take to address them.

The head of the DSE, together with the members of the CDSE prepares a report on the realisation of the quality assurance plan every year and submits it to the University Doctoral Council (UDC). (One printed copy of the report is archived among the documents of the DSE

in the Office of the Institute of Education.) Furthermore, the realisation and the results of the quality assurance plan is presented to the PhD students, the academic staff, the announcers of research topics, and the supervisors of the Doctoral School at the ceremony marking the beginning of the new academic year every September. The annual quality assurance report is accepted by the CDSE with a majority vote of its members. The report includes, in addition to the topics mentioned above, the reflection of the admission process. The annual quality assurance report of the DSE is reviewed by the UDC. The UDC informs the Senate of the results of the review in writing.

The general considerations and principles of quality assurance

In accordance with the related regulation of the University of Szeged, the quality control of the theoretical and practical instruction and of research is implemented primarily by

- a) consistent control over the quality of publications required for the submission of doctoral dissertations,
- b) the involvement of independent and recognised experts in the review process,
- c) the appraisal of PhD students at double blind peer reviewed national and international conferences, and
- d) following the career of those earning their degree in the programme.

The elected representative of the PhD students is a permanent member of the CDSE with the right of consultation. The representative voices the quality related expectations and interests of their peers and communicates the PhD students' requests to supervisors and academic staff members, as well as their critical observations.

In order to maintain and further improve the excellent quality of the disciplinary and scholarly knowledge of the supervisors, announcers of topics, academic staff members and researchers, as well as to secure its competitiveness, the DSE facilitates their participation in national and international academic life and strengthens existing cooperations.

Expectations of core members, supervisors, announcers of research topics, and staff members of the Doctoral School of Education

The training programmes of the Doctoral School are led by representatives distinguished in their field and possessing outstanding research achievements. All academic staff members of the DSE are expected to carry out research resulting in documented, excellent quality. The scientific and teaching activities of the academic staff members (teaching staff, announcers of research topics, and supervisors) of the Doctoral School are regularly evaluated by the Council of the DSE according to accepted academic norms.

Among the major indicators of scientific activity, determining weight is given to scientific publication activity, participation in research grants, activities in national and international academic organisations, work to promote science, contributing to projects as experts, and membership or leading positions in distinguished national and foreign/international societies and organisations as well as recognitions by such bodies (honorary membership or honours). An emphatic criterion in the evaluation is the number and quality of joint publications with supervised PhD students.

The evaluation of the quality of instructional activities takes place primarily on the basis of teaching activities in the DSE. The most important component of this is supervision and the quality of dissertations produced under the supervision of the supervisors. Of great significance are the quality of the courses and consultations provided in the doctoral programme and the support given to the scientific career of the PhD students (engaging them in research, supporting them in conference participation, helping with publication, and establishing academic connections).

The DSE expresses its expectations of core members, supervisors, announcers of research topics, and academic staff in quantitative terms as well, indicated by the impact of their work, the number of their citations. The quantitative expectations are implemented for new core members, supervisors, announcers of research topics, and academic staff on the basis of the citations recorded in MTMT. Accordingly:

- a) a core member must have at least 200 independent citations and a Hirsch index of 8,
- b) a supervisor must have at least 100 independent citations and a Hirsch index of 5,
- c) a member of the teaching staff must have at least 50 independent citations and a Hirsch index of 4.

In the case of young supervisors and academic staff members, if they have outstanding publications refereed in Web of Science, the DSE may accept fewer citations in a process of individual consideration.

The termination of academic staff membership status. Members of the DSE staff undertake to announce at least one PhD course in six semesters for doctoral students. If this is not accomplished, they step down from this position in the DSE.

Supervisors are such announcers of research topics who have active PhD students. If a supervisor does not have an active PhD student or one in the course of the procedure to obtain the doctoral degree, then their status changes to that of an announcer of a research topic. The DSE monitors the scientific output of the announcers of research topics. Such status of those who do not comply with the minimum criteria (five publications in the last five years and another five from preceding years) will be terminated by the CDSE.

Expectations of the PhD students of the Doctoral School

The admission procedure

The admission procedure of the Doctoral School of Education is based on the rules laid down in the *Regulations Governing the Doctoral Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree* of the University of Szeged and includes supplementary requirements. The university call for application and the information necessary for the application are available on the homepage of the university Doctoral Institute. The principles of the admission procedure are detailed in the *Regulations Governing the Doctoral Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree*. The marking system applied by the DSE in the admission process is detailed in its Operational Regulation (Appendix 1), which is available on the DSE homepage <http://www.edu.u-szeged.hu/phd/?q=hu> as well as in the doktori.hu database, both in Hungarian and in English.

The focus of the admission procedure is the examination whether the previous knowledge of the candidate is appropriate for the successful beginning of studies in the

programme, and whether this previous knowledge can provide a solid basis for subsequent learning which is conducive to working in the chosen research field. When beginning their studies, applicants must have an active knowledge of the English language (appropriate for reading the literature, understanding conference presentations, and for engaging in professional communication), which they must prove with a state-recognised intermediate level proficiency exam or an equivalent exam. For self-financing PhD students in the Hungarian programme, in exceptional and justified cases, the CDSE can allow a one year extension to present proof of their English proficiency. (At the latest, the proficiency exam must be passed before beginning the second academic year.)

The admission procedure has four steps.

1. The evaluation of the documents submitted by the applicants. At this step, depending on the previous studies of the applicants, members of the DSE with corresponding expertise may also be involved.
2. Admission interview. Depending on the composition of the qualifications of the applicants, the CDSE appoints an admission committee to conduct the interviews. The interview primarily assesses the abilities, the aptness for research, and the scientific commitment of the applicants. Content knowledge is targeted only to the extent to which it facilitates the preliminary estimation of what supplementary studies the applicant would need for advanced studies and successful research in specific areas.
3. Based on the previously submitted documents and the outcome of the admission interview, the admission committee ranks the applicants.
4. Based on all the available information, the Doctoral School Council makes the decision to accept or to turn down the applicants.

Regarding the principles, the admission procedure of international students is the same as that of Hungarian nationals, with the necessary adaptation of the steps defined above. In the case of those applying for a Hungarian state scholarship (e.g. Stipendium Hungaricum), the steps required by the scholarship program are fitted into this procedure. In the admission process, the submitted documents of the applicant are evaluated first, a plagiarism check is run on the research plans, then the admission interview takes place, usually via an on-line video-communication system.

The committee interviewing the Hungarian or the international applicants has at least two members. In the case of the Hungarian applicants, one member must be either the head of the DSE or the head of the training programme the applicant would like to belong. In the case of international applicants, one of the members of the committee is a prospective supervisor for the applicant and the other is a supervisor or announcer of the DSE who is also an expert in the field or the topic identified in the research plan of the applicant.

Comprehensive examination

The general principles of the comprehensive examination are defined in V.4–5 of the Regulations Governing the Doctoral Training Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree of the University of Szeged.

“4. The comprehensive exam consists of two main parts: in the first part, the theoretical competence of the candidate is assessed (‘theoretical part’); in the second part, candidates shall

demonstrate their scientific/arts progress ('dissertational part'). In the theoretical part of the comprehensive examination, candidates shall take exams in at least two subjects / areas, with the list of subjects / areas included in the training scheme of the doctoral school. The theoretical exam may also involve a written part. In the second part of the comprehensive examination, candidates demonstrate their insight into the scholarly literature in a presentation, provide an account of their research results, and present their research plan for the second phase of the doctoral training and for the scheduling of the preparation of the doctoral thesis and of the publication of results.

5. The supervisor provides a written assessment of the examinee beforehand and / or assesses the examinee's performance at the exam. When the examinee prepares for the exam independently, the board of the given doctoral school may call upon the assigned supervisor or one of the school's teachers to prepare a preliminary assessment."

The specific requirements of the DSE are the following.

As for the theoretical part, each training programme of the DSE defines the topics they consider the most relevant for that programme (at least seven topics per programme). In agreement with their supervisor, each PhD student selects two topics from the full list of the DS that they hold most important for their own work. At the examination, the PhD student demonstrates the knowledge they have acquired in these two (selected) areas. The format is an oral presentation, without notes and illustrated with slides. The examination committee may ask questions related to the presentation. The committee evaluates the PhD student's domain specific knowledge and their ability for synthesising knowledge. In addition, the committee also evaluates the how problem-centred the presentation is and the extent to which it features the most recent literature.

As for the dissertational part, the examinee presents their research outcomes. The format is an oral presentation, without notes and illustrated with slides. The structure follows that of the prospective dissertation. The examinee outlines the findings of their literature review, presents the methods of the research conducted (or to be conducted), including the participants/samples, the instruments developed/adapted, also the data collected, the prepared/published studies, and a research plan for the next two years with a timeline. Before the exam, the PhD student summarises this information in writing for their supervisor to evaluate. The supervisor evaluates the research endeavours and the knowledge of the PhD student, and also states their opinion whether the dissertation can be completed by the deadline. The supervisor communicates their opinion to the committee. The committee evaluates the research done by the PhD student as well as the work proposed, and judges whether, based on the available information, it is probable that the dissertation will be completed by the deadline.

The examination can be taken in Hungarian or in English. The PhD student chooses the language of the examination. The detailed description is in the DSE's *Comprehensive Examination* document (Appendix 2). The three member exam committee is selected according to the university level regulations. The DSE proposes the members to the committees of the comprehensive examination.

The procedure to obtain the doctoral degree

The quality of the Doctoral School is primarily expressed in the quality of the scientific publications and presentations of the PhD students. Output requirements can be satisfied in the six following ways. (Publications denote publications categorised as scientific in MTMT.)

- a) one D1 and four further publications,
- b) one Q1 and one English language and three further publications,
- c) two Q2 and three further publications,
- d) one Q2 and two English language and two further publications,
- e) one Q3 and three English language and one further publications,
- f) altogether five publications, of which at least one has been published in English in a peer reviewed journal or by a national/international publisher; if there is no such publication, the presentation of the candidate's own findings in English at two prestigious international peer reviewed conferences.

The PhD student decides on which requirement option to satisfy. One publication can be used only in one person's procedure to obtain a degree. The candidate must be the first author in at least half of the publications considered in the procedure. The publications considered in the procedure must be related to the topic of the dissertation. In addition, the publications must satisfy the current university and disciplinary levels requirements (at present, five publications presenting the candidate's own findings related to the topic of the dissertation).

PhD students may participate in university instruction. The staff of the Doctoral School help them to hone their instructional skills in their work with undergraduate students.

Internal defence

The protocol of the internal defence of the thesis is detailed in the DSE regulation of the internal defence (Appendix 3).

The main purpose of the internal defence is to lower the probability of unsatisfactory outcomes at the public defence. Furthermore, it helps candidates to improve their work and to formulate the final version of their dissertation. Feedback is also given regarding the oral presentation of the results and findings. Minutes are taken of the internal defence. The candidate will correct, improve, and develop the dissertation based on the comments and suggestions documented in the minutes.

DSE doctoral students, academic staff, other invited staff and researchers can participate in the internal defence. When organising the internal defence, the goal is to have at least five participants present with PhD degrees (in addition to the candidate and the supervisor). Two of them act as reviewers, one as chair, and two as invited discussants.

The two reviewers are asked to take on this role by the supervisor. Whenever possible, the Reviewers will be former graduates of the DSE, who are familiar with the formal requirements and professional standards of the DS. On the one hand, this process provides further help for the candidates to improve their work and, on the other hand, it presents an opportunity for former graduates to contribute to the quality control and the prestige of the degree awarded by the DS.

The internal defence is chaired by a full professor asked by the head of the DSE. The two invited discussants (who can come from outside the University of Szeged) are asked to take on

this role by the supervisor. The head of the DSE can ask further staff and researchers to participate.

First the reviewers check whether the candidate fulfils the publication requirements. In establishing the quality of the publications, the opinions of the supervisor and the reviewers carry weight.

Second, the reviewers check whether the dissertation satisfies the requirements regarding content and form. They have a *Reviewer's Checklist* to help them in this. Third, they summarise their opinion about the dissertation in a few pages and suggest a thorough revision, minor revisions, or the submission of the dissertation as it is. They state whether the quality of the dissertation meets the standards of the DSE.

A plagiarism check is compulsory for all dissertations submitted in the DSE. The procedure is performed in collaboration with the Klebelsberg Library. The results are forwarded to the candidate, the supervisor and the head of the DSE. Based on its results, the candidate prepares a list each flagged section surpassing 200 words and, if necessary, makes the necessary changes. The procedure and the requirements of the internal defence are revised at least once in every five years by the CDSE.

Public defence

The process and the objective quality criteria of the requirements of the public defense at the DSE are those defined in the *Regulations Governing the Doctoral Training Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree* of the University of Szeged. In addition, the DSE aims at the following. Each member of the committee should satisfy the DSE criteria for supervisors (at least a PhD degree, at least 100 independent citations, at least Hirsch index 5). Additionally, reviewers possibly need to have teaching experience at the doctoral level (e.g. a former doctoral student who has earned their degree, or a current active supervisor status).

The defence can be conducted in English. All staff at the DSE are active in the international research community, thus communicate in English with appropriate proficiency. Therefore it is possible to conduct the defence in English. The process of the English language public defence is the same as the Hungarian one. The process and the requirements of the public defence are revised by the CDSE at least once in every five years.

The permanent improvement of quality and the factors supporting the high quality training at the Doctoral School of Education at the University of Szeged

The aim of the quality improvement of the DSE is to reach the quality of PhD training quality at leading European universities. To achieve this aim, the DSE strives to have the highest possible number of internationally distinguished professors to teach courses in the Doctoral School. The main directions of quality improvement are the raising of research, publication, and citation requirements of the academic staff, and strengthening the expectations regarding international publications.

The emphatic direction of quality improvement regarding PhD students is the continuous raising of publication requirements and support provided for publishing in international journals. One of the main means to implement this is prioritised support given to conference participations and study trips abroad, and the extension of the possibility of part-

time training in high quality training/research institutes abroad. The EDS supports publishing in Q1 and Q2 journals. If this cannot be realised relying on university resources, the EDS can, as far as its budget allows, cover open access costs for manuscripts submitted to Q1 or Q2 journals.

In addition to university level opportunities, the DSE itself aims to improve the learning environment, too. The DSE has a PhD room with all types of infocommunication equipment (high performance computers, projector, printer, scanner, and WiFi). PhD students can work here independently or in groups and the room is appropriate for conducting PhD courses as well. The Institute of Education has classrooms with up-to-date ICT equipment which can also be used for PhD training. The equipment includes interactive boards, videoconference systems, computers, projectors, and WiFi. In addition to conducting classes, the rooms are appropriate for microteaching, experimental teaching, and observation, supporting the work of PhD students in several ways. The DSE and the research groups affiliated with it own the licenses of the most important statistical software programs. Several special analysis programs are at the disposal of the PhD students (e.g. IRT, HLM, SEM, CFA analyses). They can also use the high capacity server and the eDia online test platform of the Center for Research on Learning and Instruction. eDia is ready to be used to administer assessment in any language and with any media, thus it is an appropriate tool for data the collection needs of the empirical quantitative (international) research projects in the DSE.

The research groups affiliated with the DSE maintain a network of 1200 schools for their national surveys and the use of the eDia system. These schools can be contacted for the research projects of the doctoral students as well.

The DSE runs an internal, password-protected communication platform, the PhD Forum, which can only be accessed by the academic staff, supervisors, announcers of research topics, and PhD students of the DSE. This internal forum hosts doctoral students' electronic portfolios and, in addition to conducting review processes here, it provides space for a variety of cooperations. The same forum is appropriate for announcing statements regarding quality improvement as well. The Hungarian and English Language public documents of the DSE (especially regulations, forms, etc.) are available on the PhD forum.

At the DSE, on Tuesdays there is a Research Seminar, currently with two two-hour sessions per week. PhD students present the results of their research. In the first two semesters, when the presentation is of a research plan and a literature review, two PhD students from higher years review it. In all semesters, the presentation is followed by an open discussion, which is summarised and closed by the presenter's supervisor. The program of the Research Seminar is organised by the PhD students themselves, following a set of principles. The research seminar provides feedback, supports solving problems in research, and creates an opportunity for leaning the roles of reviewer and peer reviewer. When the CDSE makes a decision that directly effects the PhD students, its announcement is made in the Tuesday Research Seminar, too.

The high quality of theoretical training is provided by foundation or overview courses on the one hand and courses related to particular research problems within the training programmes on the other. The high quality of practical training is provided by research methodology courses, which are primarily quantitative, in accordance with the profile of the DSE. The courses of the DSE are reviewed by the CDSE at least once in every five years. The development of the particular research plans and the realisation of studies as supported by the

supervisors, however, the advanced methods of analysis are most effective to be learnt in methodological seminars. There is a course dedicated to helping publishing papers and preparing for international conference presentations.

The academic staff of the DSE come from among the leading researchers of Hungarian education. They are pioneering new instructional and assessment methodologies. Consequently, the DSE sees its role to support teaching primarily by creating opportunities for exchanging experiences and information on supervising, most recent instructional trends, and methods and tools of assessment.

At the end of the academic years the developments of the year are reviewed. The head of the DSE announces the most important modifications at the beginning of the next academic year and also defines the most important developmental tasks of the current year. This is also the occasion to review the publications of PhD students refereed in Scopus and to give a public mention to the authors of the best publications (and their supervisors).

There is no regular questionnaire-based evaluation, as the PhD programme is research based, and learning primarily takes place individually and from the literature. However, from time to time, either as a research methodology task or related to the Research Seminar, there is information gathered on the satisfaction of the PhD students and the problems they perceive. At the meetings of the supervisors, the perceived problems in the development of PhD students as well as possible DSE level solutions are regularly discussed.

A wide variety of courses are offered in the programme. PhD students consult their supervisor to select the ones they take. Staff primarily consider the needs of the current population when developing their syllabi. The Research Seminar and the conference presentations of the PhD students show the changes of their attitudes. The DSE regularly monitors the development of research fields and PhD students' needs, responding to them by revising the announced research topics and aligning them to recent research needs and trends every year.

The work of the PhD students and the management of their studies and research are assisted by four coordinators, chosen for a year from among them. The coordinators' tasks are set in lists revised every year corresponding to emerging needs by the Secretary of the DSE, who also directs their work. Information on the coordinators and their tasks are published in the annually updated *Student Manual* of the DSE. One coordinator is responsible for general issues, another for academic issues, the third for conference issues and the fourth for helping with publication databases (MTMT and the SZTE repository).

The monitoring of the progress of PhD students takes place at several points. In the first semester they have the compulsory course Research Plan and in the second, the compulsory course Literature Review. They present their work for these courses in the Research Seminars, and it is evaluated by their supervisors. Between semesters two and eight they can take 10 credit Research Work units that serve to register research activities, monitored and evaluated by the supervisors. At the end of the fourth semester, the comprehensive examination is a key point of control of progress. The internal defence is also a possibility for monitoring the progress of the candidate, performed by the supervisor and two reviewers. At this point, the publications of the candidate necessary for the public defence are also reviewed by them.

Quality control and indicators

The quality of the programme can be examined by following the career of PhD students who have earned their degree. It is the aim of the DS that its graduates have successful careers primarily in higher education and research institutions. The quality of the work of the DS is indicated by the ratio and the progress of its graduates working in institutions of higher education. The DS regularly analyses the indicators of its graduates' publications and their citations based on MTMT data.

Code of Ethics and the Institutional Review Board

The PhD students of the Doctoral School developed a Code of Ethics to summarise the ethical principles of training and research, which was approved by the Doctoral School Council. At the beginning of their studies, the PhD students of the DS become familiar with the principles of the Code of Ethics and accept to follow them.

The Doctoral School Council established the Institutional Review Board (IRB), which is tasked with the ethical evaluation of research in the Doctoral School, and with issuing institutional ethical approval. The approval is to verify that the submitted research plan conforms to the ethical principles of research in the Social Sciences.

Formal options for appeal and grievance proceedings

Appeals or grievances regarding the operation of the DSE can be made verbally or in writing to any of the following persons, individually or through the PhD student representative; if needed, anonymously:

- the head of the DSE,
- the members of the CDSE,
- the programme directors,
- supervisors,
- the head of the Disciplinary Doctoral Council.

The CDSE examines every complaint. If necessary, the CDSE makes decisions and implements them. In cases that effect the student status the head of the DSE has competence.

Appendices

Appendix 1. SZTE DSE Operational Regulations

Appendix 2. SZTE DSE Regulations of the Comprehensive Examination

Appendix 3. SZTE DSE Regulations of the Internal Defence

UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

THE OPERATIONAL REGULATIONS OF THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Doctoral Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree of the University of Szeged, operation of the Doctoral School of Education is based on the following.

1. The leading and, at the same time, the representative body of the Doctoral School (DS) is the Doctoral School Council (DSC), of which the permanent members are:

- a) the head of the Doctoral School (the chair of the DSC, Doctor of Science, core member);
- b) the deputy head of the Doctoral School (core member);
- c) the directors of the training and research programmes;
- d) the representative of the Doctoral School of Education in the University Doctoral Council (UDC) and the Disciplinary Doctoral Council (DDC) (if different from those mentioned in a), b), or c));
- e) the secretary of the Doctoral School;
- f) the associate secretary of the Doctoral School responsible for international affairs;
- g) an elected representative of the PhD students with consultation rights.

2. The Doctoral School Council have regular meetings, usually every two months, but it can convene for an emergency meeting, too. The head of the Doctoral School, or, when necessary, the deputy head chairs the Doctoral School Council and its meetings. By the initiation of the head of the Doctoral School, invited persons can also participate in the meetings of the Council. The meeting needs a minimum quorum of two thirds of the permanent members (with voting right) present, and the presence of the head or the deputy head of the Doctoral School.

3. The *authority* of the Doctoral School Council:

- a) announcing and supervising training courses;
- b) annually evaluating the work of PhD students;
- c) nominating the chair and the members of the admissions committee, and ranking the applicants based on the report of the committee;
- d) defining the topics of the admissions procedure;
- e) the assessment of the academic habitus of those who initiate the procedure to obtain the doctoral degree; the evaluation of the outcomes of previous studies and the evaluation of publications;

- f) proposing to initiate the procedure to obtain the doctoral degree and to define the subjects of the Comprehensive Examination;
- g) nominating the members of the Comprehensive Examination Committee, the official reviewers of the PhD dissertation, and the members of the Committee of Assessors for the public defence;
- h) proposing the awarding of the doctoral degree on the basis of the outcome of the Comprehensive Examination and the public defence of the dissertation;
- i) making professional decisions regarding the requests made by PhD students on issues of training and defence.

4. The tasks of the Doctoral School Council regarding *economic* issues:

- a) proposing the sum of tuition fees and deciding on the use of revenue from tuition fees;
- b) financially controlling the training related requests at the Doctoral School level.

5. It is the task of the Doctoral School Council to define the *requirement-setting authority* delegated to Doctoral Schools by the Regulations Governing the Doctoral Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree of the University of Szeged, that includes, among others:

- a) the definition of the subjects, and the approval of their topics for the Comprehensive Examination;
- b) the publication requirements for obtaining the doctoral degree;
- c) the foreign language requirements;
- d) prescribing the language and the formal requirements of the dissertation;
- e) defining the circle of those to whom it is obligatory to invite for the defence of the doctoral dissertation;
- f) defining the criteria by which to evaluate doctoral candidates and to perform the evaluation based on these criteria.

6. The Doctoral School Council is actively involved in the organisation of Comprehensive Exams and the public defence of doctoral dissertations.

7. The Doctoral School Council defines the criteria for the quality improvement of the Doctoral School of Education and exerts continuous control over meeting the quality requirements.

8. The closed electronic consultation forum of the Doctoral School is the PhD Forum. The PhD students of the Doctoral School upload their manuscripts and materials related to their training for evaluation here. The members of the DS make their documents used in training accessible on the Forum.

Admission Procedure

University level rules

The admission procedure of the Doctoral School of Education is based on the rules laid down in the *Regulations Governing the Doctoral Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree* of the University of Szeged and includes supplementary requirements.

The university call for application and the information necessary are available on the homepage of the university Doctoral Institute. The principles of the admission procedure are detailed in the *Regulations Governing the Doctoral Programmes and the Awarding of the Doctoral Degree*.

The marking system of the admission procedure of the Doctoral School of Education

Points for previous studies (maximum 15 points)

1. The overall grade of the diploma

a) for those who graduated within one year:

- from 4.51 to 5.00: 5 points
- from 4.01 to 4.50: 4 points
- from 3.51 to 4.00: 3 points
- in other cases: 0 point

b) for those who graduated within five years:

- from 4.51 to 5.00: 5 points
- from 4.01 to 4.50: 4 points
- from 3.51 to 4.00: 3 points
- in other cases: 0 point

c) for those who graduated earlier than five years:

- from 4.51 to 5.00: 3 points
- from 4.01 to 4.50: 2 points
- from 3.51 to 4.00: 1 point
- in other cases: 0 point

2. Readiness to carry out research

a) for those who graduated within one year (max. 10 points):

- Research achievements
 - prestigious publication or paper awarded at the National Student Scholarly Conference (OTDK): 5 points
 - other publication or Student Scholarly Conference (TDK) paper: 4 points
- Further qualifications (max. 5 points)
 - diploma in relevant discipline: 3 points
 - accredited in-service training programme: 2 points
- Second or further language proficiency exams (max. 4 points)

One intermediate level (oral and written) language proficiency exam is not awarded any points. Points are awarded only for proficiency exams in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish or Russian.

- intermediate level: 2 points
- advanced level: 3 points

b) for those who graduated within five years (max. 10 points):

- Research achievements
 - prestigious publication or paper awarded at the National Student Scholarly Conference (OTDK): 4 points
 - other publication or Student Scholarly Conference (TDK) paper: 3 points
- Further qualifications (max. 5 points)
 - diploma in relevant discipline: 3 points
 - accredited in-service training programme: 2 points
- Second or further language proficiency exams (max. 4 points)

One intermediate level (oral and written) language proficiency exam is not awarded any points. Points are awarded only for proficiency exams in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish or Russian.

- intermediate level: 2 points
- advanced level: 3 points

c) for those who graduated earlier than five years (max. 12 points):

- Research achievements
 - prestigious publication or paper awarded at the National Student Scholarly Conference (OTDK): 3 points
 - other publication or Student Scholarly Conference (TDK) paper: 2 points
- Further qualifications (max. 5 points)
 - diploma in relevant discipline: 3 points
 - accredited in-service training programme: 2 points
- Second or further language proficiency exams (max. 4 points)

One intermediate level (oral and written) language proficiency exam is not awarded any points. Points are awarded only for proficiency exams in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish or Russian.

- intermediate level: 2 points
- advanced level: 3 points

Performance at the admission interview: maximum 15 points

The admission principles of the Doctoral School of Education

The Doctoral School aims to train researchers in Educational Science, therefore when selecting applicants, aptness to carry out research, identifying and solving problems independently, interests, creativity, and a commitment to scientific endeavours are the elementary criteria. Members of the Doctoral School consider it essential that they contribute to the research in, the scientific knowledge base of, and the methodological diversity of, Educational Science by being open to applicants with diverse previous academic qualifications. The admission procedure is

uniform in its format, and also uniform in judging commitment, scientific excellence and aptness for research. At the same time, just as the whole training is personalised, the assessment of the concrete components of previous disciplinary knowledge takes into consideration individual characteristics and the differences in research fields. The focus of the admissions procedure is the examination of whether the previous knowledge of the candidate is appropriate for the successful launching of the training programme, and whether it can provide a solid basis for subsequent learning which is conducive to working in the chosen research field.

The Doctoral School counts on PhD students with great capacity for hard work and with outstanding learning potential, therefore it is open to applicants from any university degree programme. The training programme is primarily rooted in previous knowledge that can be accumulated in Education, Psychology, Medicine, and teacher training, but diplomas in any science targeting humans, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences (e.g. Sociology or Communication) can be useful previous qualifications. The Doctoral School welcomes PhD students who earned their diploma in other disciplines, provided that their research field conforms with the training goals and research possibilities of the School.

When beginning their studies, applicants must have an active knowledge of the English language (appropriate to read the literature, to understand conference presentations, and to engage in professional communication), which they must prove with a state-recognised intermediate level proficiency exam or an equivalent exam. For self-financing PhD students, in exceptional, justified cases, the Doctoral School Council can allow a one year extension to present proof of their English proficiency. (At the latest, the proficiency exam must be passed before beginning the second academic year.)

The admission procedure has four steps.

1. The evaluation of the documents submitted by the applicants. At this step, depending on the previous studies of the applicants, members of the Doctoral School with corresponding expertise may also be involved.

2. Admission interview. Depending on the composition of the qualifications of the applicants, the Doctoral School Council appoints an admission committee to conduct the interviews. The interview primarily assesses the abilities, the aptness for research, and the scientific commitment of the applicants. Content knowledge is targeted only to the extent to which it facilitates the preliminary estimation of what supplementary studies the applicant would need for advanced studies and successful research in specific areas.

3. Based on the previously submitted documents and the outcome of the admission interview, the admission committee ranks the applicants.

4. Based on all the available information, the Doctoral School Council makes the decision to accept or to turn down the applicants.

The admission procedure of international students

Regarding the principles, the admission procedure of international students is the same as that of Hungarian nationals, with the necessary adaptation of the steps defined above. In the

case of those applying for a Hungarian state scholarship (e.g. Stipendium Hungaricum), the steps required by the scholarship program are fitted into this procedure.

In the admission process, the submitted documents of the applicant are evaluated first, then the admission interview takes place, usually via an on-line video-communication system.

Forms of training

State scholarship

The applicant shall have a student status, and shall devote full working hours to satisfying training, research and teaching requirements as prescribed by the regulations.

Self-financing

PhD students who do not receive a state scholarship pay a tuition fee. The amount of the tuition fee for the PhD students of the Doctoral School of Education is the minimum sum defined by the University. Admission, training and research requirements are the same as for state scholarship holders in all respects.

Individual preparation

When satisfying all the general prerequisites of the university regulation, applicants wishing to obtain their degree within an individual preparation programme can apply to the Doctoral School of Education, if they satisfy the exit requirements of aptness, foreign language proficiency, and scientific work (publications). Those wishing to follow an individual preparation programme apply for the Comprehensive Examination and they sit for it in the examination period following the acceptance of their application. The Doctoral School appoints a supervisor for the writing (or completion, or revision to meet the standards of the Doctoral School) of the dissertation and provides opportunities for consultations according to the individual training programme. The recommended length of this is at least two semesters, which can be shorter depending on the candidate's professional knowledge and the completeness of the dissertation.

Complex exam (2023)

University regulations <https://u-szeged.hu/download.php?docID=64259>
REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE DOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAMMES AND THE AWARDING OF THE DOCTORAL DEGREE (from Sept 2016) Chapter V

4. The comprehensive exam consists of two main parts: in the first part, the theoretical competence of the candidate is assessed ('theoretical part'); in the second part, candidates shall demonstrate their scientific/arts progress ('dissertational part'). In the theoretical part of the comprehensive examination, candidates shall take exams in at least two subjects / areas, with the list of subjects / areas included in the training scheme of the doctoral school. The theoretical exam may also involve a written part. In the second part of the comprehensive examination, candidates demonstrate their insight into the scholarly literature in a presentation, provide an account of their research results, and present their research plan for the second phase of the doctoral training and for the scheduling of the preparation of the doctoral thesis and of the publication of results.
5. The supervisor provides a written assessment of the examinee beforehand and / or assesses the examinee's performance at the exam. When the examinee prepares for the exam independently, the board of the given doctoral school may call upon the assigned supervisor or one of the school's teachers to prepare a preliminary assessment.'

Complex Examination at the Doctoral School of Education

The general rules of the complex examination are given in the Regulations of the Doctoral Programmes of the University of Szeged. The Doctoral School of Education amends sections 4 and 5 as follows:

1. Theoretical part

Each study programme of the DS defines the topics they consider the most relevant for that programme (at least seven topics per programme). In agreement with their supervisor, each PhD student selects two topics from the full list of the DS that they hold most important for their own work. At the examination, the PhD student demonstrates the knowledge they have acquired in these two (selected) areas. The format is an oral presentation, without notes and illustrated with slides. The examination board may ask questions related to the presentation. The board evaluates the PhD student's domain specific knowledge and their ability for synthesising knowledge. In addition, the board also evaluates the how problem-centred the presentation is, and the extent to which it features the most recent literature.

2. Dissertational part

The examinee demonstrates their research outcomes. The format is an oral presentation, without notes and illustrated with slides. The structure follows that of the prospective dissertation. The examinee outlines the findings of their literature review, presents the methods

of the research conducted (or to be conducted), including the participants/samples, the instruments developed/adapted, also the data collected, the prepared/published studies, and a research plan for the next two years with a timeline. Before the exam, the PhD student summarises this information in writing for their supervisor to appraise. The supervisor evaluates the research endeavours and the knowledge of the PhD student, and also states their opinion whether the dissertation can be completed by the deadline. The supervisor communicates their opinion to the board. The board evaluates the research done by the PhD student as well as the work proposed, and adjudges whether, based on the available information, it is probable that the dissertation will be completed by the deadline.

The examination can be taken in Hungarian or in English. The PhD student chooses the language of the examination.

Complex examination topics

Learning and Instruction

1. Conceptions of knowledge
2. Progressive methods of instruction
3. The role of feedback in instruction, types, and instruments of feedback
4. Understanding and the transfer of knowledge
5. Research base of assessment and teaching of 21st century skills
6. Content-based methods of developing general skills
7. Visualization and simulation in education
8. Peer-learning, peer tutoring, and collaborative learning.
9. Learning styles and learning strategies

Social and Emotional Education

1. Social and emotional development
2. Theories of motivation
3. Self-concept, self-regulation, and self-determination theory
4. Family relations and cultural differences
5. School and classroom context, teacher and peer relations
6. Social and motivational factors in learning
7. Individual differences, atypical development, and behavior problems
8. Motivation and social measures
9. Translation research and intervention opportunities

Educational Assessment

1. The role of educational assessment in the teaching-learning process (assessment of learning, assessment for learning, assessment as learning)
2. Basics of classical and probabilistic test theory (measurement error, objectivity, reliability, validity, the Rasch-model)
3. Assessment tools in educational research (standardized tests and questionnaires for the assessment of cognitive, affective and socio-cultural factors)
4. Development and use of tests (item writing, item types, test construction, paper-based and computer-based tests, test analysis)
5. Development and use of questionnaires (item types, scoring scales, closed and open-ended items, paper-based and computer-based questionnaires)
6. Assessment of student achievement (summative, formative, and diagnostic evaluation, quantitative and qualitative methods, grading and its alternatives)
7. Psychological problems of student assessment (cognitive and affective factors, motivation, test anxiety, exam situation, etc.)
8. Exams and exam systems (entrance exams, final exams, language exams, competence assessment, standardized and online assessment)

9. Assessment of educational systems (assessment of curriculums, programs, schools, countries, international student assessment programs)

Digital Technologies in Education

1. Assessment and enhancement of ICT literacy
2. The impact of ICT on education and the methods of instruction
3. ICT in special education
4. E-learning as a means of promoting knowledge integration
5. Design, development, and use of digital curriculum materials
6. Technology-based assessment: possibilities and challenges
7. Computerized adaptive testing and the development of item banks
8. Educational data mining and logfile analyses
9. Game-based assessment and development of knowledge, skills and abilities

Health Education

1. Health promotion and health education; concepts of health
2. Culture, lifestyle, health attitudes and health behavior
3. Challenges of adolescence, Youth problem behavior syndrome
4. Importance of stress concept in health education
5. Levels and sources of prevention
6. Social Learning Theory, group processes, group effects and peer education
7. Risk perception, locus of control and behavior regulation
8. Appliance of Health Belief Model in health education
9. Theory of Reasoned Action and Theory of Planned Behavior in health education

Cognitive Neuroscience and Psychology in Education

1. The development of cognitive and affective abilities before adolescence
2. Problems of adolescence: coping with stress, planning – decision making, self, self evaluation
3. The problem and research of learning in psychology, with an outlook on recent developments
4. The problem and research of memory in psychology, with an outlook on recent developments
5. Theoretical approaches to perception and research paradigms
6. The issue of intelligence and related debates in psychology
7. The study of social interactions in psychology – methods and research results
8. The methods of cognitive neuroscience, its significance, and remaining questions
9. Research questions and major findings in social neuroscience

Content-Pedagogy

1. Propositional knowledge (the development and changes of the conceptual system; misconceptions; naive beliefs) and its characteristics related to domain specific curricular content
2. Procedural knowledge (skills and abilities)
3. The role of comprehension in learning school subjects (facilitating the acquisition of knowledge, conceptual development and conceptual change)
4. Possibilities for content-based ability development in school subjects (types of developmental interventions and developmental experiments)
5. The objectives and methods of instruction (instructional planning; instructional strategies and methods)
6. Instructional materials in the process of instruction (types, analysis, and development of instructional materials)
7. The knowledge base of teaching; teachers' beliefs and the effects of these on instruction
8. Main issues in the research on learning and instruction in one major domain (mother tongue and reading; mathematics; science; foreign language learning)
9. School-based and out-of-school learning experiences

Supervisor's evaluation for the Committee of the complex examination

Name of PhD student:

Name of supervisor:

Has the PhD student accumulated the required 90 credits?	
--	--

(If the answer is negative, the PhD student cannot take the comprehensive exam.)

1. Has the PhD student explored the literature in appropriate depth?	
2. Has the literature review been published?	
3. Is the review appropriate for being incorporated in the dissertation?	
4. Has the PhD student acquired the research skills necessary in their field?	
5. Has the PhD student begun exploring (recruiting) the participants or organising the sample?	
6. Has the PhD student developed instruments themselves?	
7. Has the PhD student completed the necessary pilot studies?	
8. Has the PhD student got a body of analysable data?	
9. Has the PhD student got a (valid and feasible) plan for the research to be conducted for the dissertation?	
10. Has the PhD student got the competence level in written composition necessary for producing the dissertation?	

A short, written evaluation with an explicit estimation whether the PhD student's work would probably result in a dissertation that can be submitted and defended or not (approx. half a page):

Date:

Signature of supervisor:

The Internal Defence of the PhD Dissertation

The function of the internal defence of the doctoral dissertation

Prior to the official public defence, the Doctoral School of Education (hereafter DSE) organizes an internal defence as a final measure of quality control. The main purpose of the internal defence is to lower the probability of unsatisfactory outcomes at the public debate. Furthermore, it helps Candidates to improve their work and to formulate the final version of their dissertation. Feedback is also given regarding the oral presentation of the results and findings. Minutes shall be taken at the internal defence; Candidates can correct or amend their dissertation based on the comments and suggestions recorded in them.

Participants of the internal defence

Participants of an internal defence may include students and members of the academic staff of the DSE as well as other lecturers and researchers who have been invited. Efforts should be made to ensure that besides the Candidate (and their Supervisor), at least five lecturers or researchers holding at least a PhD degree are present at each internal defence. Two of them shall act as Reviewers, one of them shall act as Chair, and the remaining two participants of the internal defence shall act as Consultants who are invited to express their opinion on the Candidate's work.

It is the responsibility of the Supervisor of the Candidate to ask two Reviewers to take on this role. Whenever possible, the Reviewers will be former graduates of the DSE, who are familiar with the formal requirements and professional standards of the DSE. On the one hand, this process provides further help for the Candidates to improve their work and, on the other hand, it presents an opportunity for former graduates to contribute to the quality control and the prestige of the degree awarded by the DSE.

The Chair of the internal defence shall be a full university professor asked by the Head of the DS to take on this role. The Supervisor shall be responsible for inviting two Consultants (who may be "external" consultants in the sense that they are not employed by the University of Szeged). In addition, the Head of the DSE may invite further lecturers and researchers to participate at the internal defence.

The initiation of the internal defence

An internal defence should be initiated by the PhD Candidate, by e-mail to the Secretary of the DSE at least two months before its planned date, so the Secretary can plan the program of the DSE accordingly. The Secretary of the DSE chooses a date for the internal defence in collaboration with the Candidate, the Reviewers, the Professor chairing it, and the two invited Consultants. The Candidate should submit the following to the Secretary of the DS at least one month prior to the debate:

1. the digital version of the dissertation (in a .pdf and in a .docx version; the latter is necessary for the plagiarism check);
2. the names and e-mail addresses of the Reviewers (who had been asked to act as such previously by the Supervisor);

3. the Supervisor's completed Checklist (Appendix 1);
4. the Candidate's publication list;
5. the Candidate's professional resume;
6. the doctoral abstract in the language of the dissertation; and
7. a summary of maximum 2000 characters (if the dissertation is in Hungarian, the summary is in English; if the dissertation is in English, the summary is in Hungarian).

In the tradition of peer reviewing, the Secretary of the DS discusses the details of the debate with the previously appointed Reviewers, and provides them with the documents necessary for the review. The Candidate shall upload the (1) submitted version of the dissertation, (2) the doctoral abstract and (3) the summary in .pdf format to the PhD Forum, so that those interested may read them it before the internal defence.

The review

The Reviewers must have a minimum of four weeks to formulate their opinions about the dissertation. In addition to reviewing the dissertation, they shall evaluate whether the Candidate possesses the prerequisites for publications of a doctoral defence or not. This evaluation shall be based on the scientific publications recorded in MTMT. Please check the credibility of potential journals and publishers using Beall's list¹. Manuscripts published in predatory journals or with predatory publishers will not be considered as prerequisites for publication. The prerequisites can be satisfied in the following ways:

- a) one D1 publication and four other publications of any ranking;
- b) one Q1 publication, one other publication of any ranking in English, and three further publications of any ranking;
- c) two Q2 publications and three further publications of any ranking;
- d) one Q2 publication, two other publications of any ranking in English, and two further publications;
- e) one Q3 publication, three other publications of any ranking in English, and one further publication of any ranking;
- f) five publications of any ranking of which at least one has been published in English in a peer-reviewed journal or by an international/national publisher; or, if there is no such publication, the presentations of the Candidate's own findings in English at two prestigious peer-reviewed international conferences, (one of them should be a conference of a well-known international scientific association, e.g., EARLI).

In assessing the quality of the Candidate's publications, the opinion of the Supervisor and those of the Reviewers of the internal defence shall apply. A specific publication shall be used only in one defence procedure as a fulfilment of prerequisites for publication. The Candidate shall be the first author of at least half of the publications that are used for fulfilment of prerequisites for publications. The publications used for fulfilment of prerequisites for publications shall relate to the topic of the dissertation. Besides the above listed prerequisites, the Candidate's publications shall also fulfil the current requirements of the University of Szeged as well as the requirements of the Disciplinary Doctoral Council (the current requirements are to have five publications).

¹ <https://beallslist.net/>, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7237319/>

The Reviewers shall check whether the dissertation is in compliance with requirements as to content and form or not. This task is helped with a Checklist for Reviewers (Appendix 2). The Reviewers prepare a summary of their evaluation in a few pages. They may suggest major revisions, the improvement of a few problematic issues, or the submission of the dissertation without any changes. They state whether the academic quality of the dissertation meets the standards of the DSE or not.

The progression of the internal defence

The Reviewers deliver their assessment and the Checklist to the Candidate, their Supervisor, as well as to the Secretary of the DSE at least three days prior to the internal defence.

The Candidate summarizes the main goals and findings of the dissertation in a 20-25-minute PowerPoint presentation. Then the two Reviewers present their evaluation of the dissertation. The Candidate responds to their questions and comments. After this exchange, the internal defence continues with a debate in which all audience members may participate. During this debate, the opinions and suggestions of the two invited Consultants shall be prioritized.

Minutes (Appendix 3) shall be taken either by the Supervisor or the Programme Director. The aims of taking minutes are twofold. On the one hand, it proves that all required participants have formulated their opinion on the work of the Candidate. On the other hand, recording all the questions and recommendations helps the Candidate in correcting, amending, and finalizing their thesis.

Steps following the internal defence

1. Based on the feedback from the Reviewers and the debate at the internal defence, the Candidate revises the dissertation. The revisions should be summarized by listing (a) what has been changed in the dissertation, and (b) justification for rejecting issues raised in the reviews, if there are any. The Candidate sends the final version of the dissertation, the doctoral abstract, the summary, and the revision list electronically to the Secretary of the DS.
2. Both Reviewers study the final version of the dissertation and the revision summary. They then make a statement, which comprises of a short justification of their stance (a few sentences) whether they support the formal submission of the final version of the dissertation or not. They send their statement electronically to the Secretary of the DS.
3. Based on the above, the DS decides whether the formal submission of the dissertation is supported. The decision is communicated to the Candidate by the Secretary. Only following a positive decision can the Candidate submit the dissertation for public defence.
4. The doctoral dissertation and the other required documents shall be submitted to the SZTE FHSS Dean's Office to the registrar for doctoral affairs.

Plagiarism check

Using the plagiarism check system of the Klebelsberg Library, all dissertations submitted for internal defence are subjected to a plagiarism check procedure. Based on its results, the Candidate prepares a list of the sources of each flagged section surpassing 200 words, which may be from their own previous publications (there is no action to be taken regarding these), or

from other publications. In the latter case, the Candidate explains how they addressed the problem. Before the public defence, on request from the Supervisor, a repeated plagiarism check can be run. The results of the plagiarism check are forwarded to the Candidate, the Supervisor, the Director of the Programme, and the Head of the DS. Running the plagiarism check requires the dissertation in .docx format.

Internal defence of a PhD dissertation – The Supervisor’s Checklist

Candidate:

Title of dissertation:

PUBLICATIONS

- a) one D1 publication and four other publications of any ranking;
- b) one Q1 publication, one other publication of any ranking in English, and three further publications of any ranking;
- c) two Q2 publications and three further publications of any ranking;
- d) one Q2 publication, two other publications of any ranking in English, and two further publications;
- e) one Q3 publication, three other publications of any ranking in English, and one further publication of any ranking;
- f) five publications of any ranking of which at least one has been published in English in a peer-reviewed journal or by an international/national publisher; or, if there is no such publication, the presentations of the Candidate’s own findings in English at two prestigious peer-reviewed international conferences.

DISSERTATION

Content

Introduction	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Literature review	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Research questions	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Research methodology	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Results	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Discussion	major issues//minor issues//appropriate

Format

Structure	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Style and grammar	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Formatting and layout	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Figures	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Tables	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Citations and references	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Bibliography	major issues//minor issues//appropriate

ENGLISH SUMMARY

HUNGARIAN ABSTRACT

major issues//minor issues//appropriate
major issues//minor issues//appropriate

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Do you support the submission of the dissertation for internal defence? Yes / No

Supervisor:

Date:

Internal defence of a PhD dissertation – The Reviewer’s Checklist

Candidate:

Title of dissertation:

PUBLICATIONS

- a) one D1 publication and four other publications of any ranking;
- b) one Q1 publication, one other publication of any ranking in English, and three further publications of any ranking;
- c) two Q2 publications and three further publications of any ranking;
- d) one Q2 publication, two other publications of any ranking in English, and two further publications;
- e) one Q3 publication, three other publications of any ranking in English, and one further publication of any ranking;
- f) five publications of any ranking of which at least one has been published in English in a peer-reviewed journal or by an international/national publisher; or, if there is no such publication, the presentations of the Candidate’s own findings in English at two prestigious peer-reviewed international conferences.

DISSERTATION

Content

Introduction	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Literature review	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Research questions	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Research methodology	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Results	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Discussion	major issues//minor issues//appropriate

Format

Structure	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Style and grammar	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Formatting and layout	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Figures	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Tables	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Citations and references	major issues//minor issues//appropriate
Bibliography	major issues//minor issues//appropriate

ENGLISH SUMMARY

major issues//minor issues//appropriate

HUNGARIAN ABSTRACT

major issues//minor issues//appropriate

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Do you support the submission of the dissertation for internal defence? Yes / No

Reviewer:

Date:

Minutes²
of internal defence
University of Szeged, Doctoral School of Education

Location: online

Candidate:

Title of dissertation:

Supervisor

Name:

Institute:

Reviewers:

Name:

Institute:

Name:

Institute:

Other participants holding a PhD degree:

Name:

Institute:

Name:

Institute:

Name:

Institute:

Name:

Institute:

Name:

Institute:

Questions and recommendations:

Attachments:

1. Opinion of Reviewer 1.
2. Opinion of Reviewer 2.
3. Opinions and comments submitted in writing

Date:

Name:

(Name of person taking the minutes; Supervisor or Programme Director)

² The aims of taking minutes are twofold. On the one hand, it proves that all required participants have formulated their opinion on the work of the Candidate. On the other hand, recording all the questions and suggestions helps the Candidate in correcting, amending, and finalizing their thesis.