# PE&RC

# PhD Performance and Development Evaluation Form

1. **General information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Full name of the PhD candidate: |  |
| Period of appointment (mm/yyyy - mm/yyyy): |  |
| Engagement (full time – part time in fte) |  |
| PhD Type1. ***Research Assistant****: PhD candidate temporarily employed as a PhD candidate at a PE&RC institute\**
2. ***Sandwich PhD****: PhD candidate with a fellowship whose research is performed in the country of origin and who resides at the PE&RC institute\* at the beginning and end of the PhD*
3. ***Guest PhD****: Foreign PhD candidate with a fellowship grant who resides at the PE&RC institute\* for all or most of the PhD*
4. ***Staff PhD****: PhD candidate with a permanent staff employment at the PE&RC institute\**
5. ***External PhD****: PhD candidate who has no formal relation with the PE&RC institute\*, except via the promoter (principal supervisor). (S)he is embedded in an organisation outside the PE&RC institute\* and has no working space at the PE&RC institute\*.*

*\* Wageningen University, Utrecht University, Netherlands Institute of Ecology, Naturalis Biodiversity Center, University of Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, or Radboud University.* |  |
| Name of supervisors present during the Performance and Development Meeting | 1: |
| 2: |
| 3: |
| Evaluation period (tick the appropriate): | * 0 – 12 months
* 12 – 24 months
* 24 – 36 months
* 36 – 48 months
* > 48 months
 |
| Date of evaluation meeting: |  |
| Date of intended next evaluation meeting: |  |

**Signatures:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Put a cross:  | Date & Signature:  |
| PromotorName: |  Agree with content and wording |  |
| Co-promotor / supervisorName:  |  Agree with content and wording |  |
| Co-promotor / supervisorName:  |  Agree with content and wording |  |
| PhD candidate: |  Agree with content and wording |  |
|  Seen, but disagree with... |  |
| (please add explanation if signed for seen, but disagree with...): |

1. **Evaluation and planning of PhD research**
2. **Progress table about the PhD thesis**

|  |
| --- |
| Tentative title of the PhD thesis (when available): |
|  |

Please fill in the following table about the state of the PhD thesis. Progress can be noted in terms of *Planned*, *In progress*, or *Done*. The number of chapters generally ranges from 3 to 5 chapters (excluding Introduction and Synthesis). Output can be stated as *manuscript*, *thesis chapter*, *part of larger manuscript*, *etc*.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter | Topic/title: | Data collection: | Literature review: | Data analysis: | Writing: | Output: |
| Introduction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chapter 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chapter 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chapter 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Chapter 4* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Chapter 5* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Synthesis |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional comments by the PhD candidate about plans for the PhD thesis: |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is the current progress of the PhD in line with finishing within the time planned? | YES / NO |

**If NO, please answer the questions below:**

|  |
| --- |
| What are the reasons for the delay ? |
|  |
| How will the issues be addressed? E.g., by adjusting planning, improving focus, adjusting supervision, following courses, improving communication, extension of contract etc. |
|  |

1. **Overall conclusion of supervisors on PhD candidate’s research performance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall conclusion (descriptive) | Overall conclusion (qualitative) |
|  |  excellent very good good sufficient moderate weak |
| Response of PhD candidate to overall conclusion of supervisors |
|  |

1. **Evaluation of PhD Training and Education**
2. **Progress**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Are training and education activities going according to the original plan as defined in the submitted/approved TSP?  | YES / NO |

**If NO, please answer the questions below:**

|  |
| --- |
| Why is the PhD Training and Education not progressing according to plan? |
|  |
| How will the issues be addressed in the coming year?  |
|  |

1. **Participation in teaching**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Has the PhD candidate participated in teaching activities in the past period?  | YES / NO |

**If YES, please fill in the table below and answer the questions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Teaching Activity: | Time investment (in hours): |
| Lecturing |  |
| Supervising student(s) |  |
| Assisting in practical lessons |  |

|  |
| --- |
| In case total teaching time exceeds 10% of the total working hours (1744 working hours per year, with full time contract), please indicate the agreements that were made to compensate for the additional work load: |
|  |
| Comments on teaching / reflection on learning goals as formulated in the TSP: |
|  |

1. **Overall conclusion of supervisors on PhD candidate’s in Training and Education**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall conclusion (descriptive) | Overall conclusion (qualitative) |
|  |  excellent very good good sufficient moderate weak |
| Response of PhD candidate to overall conclusion of supervisors |
|  |

1. **Working environment**
2. **Working environment of the PhD candidate**

Please indicate in the table below how you feel about the following working environment elements

*1 = very bad / very unhealthy*

*2 = bad / unhealthy*

*3 = OK / neither good or bad*

*4 = good / healthy*

*5 = very good / very healthy*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Element: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | If lower than 4, please elaborate:  |
| Overall happiness in your work |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work Pressure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stress |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working atmosphere |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social safety (e.g. respect/integrity/equality) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working conditions (i.e. lab/office/fieldwork) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physical health |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mental health |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other working environment element, namely: ... |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Remarks on working conditions (workplace, work atmosphere, social safety) |
|  |

1. **Agreements between PhD candidate and supervisors on working environment**

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements made on working environment (workplace, social safety, health, pressure, other ….) |
|  |

1. **Career Perspectives**
2. **Career plans of the PhD candidate**

|  |
| --- |
| Do you already have a clear plan what you want to do after your PhD? * If yes, please elaborate and indicate what activities (courses, training) you want to do to strengthen yourself to pursue your goal
* If no, please elaborate what you will be doing the coming year to orientate on your future.
 |
|  |

1. **Agreements between PhD candidate and supervisors on career planning**

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements made on career planning |
|  |

1. **PhD candidate’s view on supervision**
2. **PhD candidate’s evaluation of supervision**

Please evaluate the whole supervisory team, including your promotor. The evaluation is intended as feedback for your supervisors. The intention is that the points addressed below form the basis for a constructive discussion as a team. This gives the opportunity to draw up agreements between all members of the team.

Score each element from 1 = very low, or very bad, to 5 = very high, or very good. Any further remarks may be added in the box below the table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Element: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | If lower than 4, or if you experience large differences between individual supervisors, please elaborate:  |
| Clarity of supervisors on the expected deliverables and their quality |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity of supervisors on the expected competences and skills required to complete the PhD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity of supervisors on your responsibilities as a PhD candidate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity of supervisors on their responsibilities as supervisors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisors’ effort on making you feel part of the research group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisors’ effort on stimulating cooperation within the research group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communication with your supervisors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approachability of your supervisors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of feedback from your supervisors  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frequency of supervision  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Further remarks on supervision |
|  |

1. **Agreements between PhD candidate and supervisors on supervision**

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements made on supervision |
|  |

1. **Supervisors’ evaluation of the PhD candidate**

This table is the same as the table in the go/no-go evaluation form and can thus be compared to follow development over the entire PhD trajectory.

1. ***Unsatisfactory****: on the whole, the PhD candidate has not complied with the job requirements (substantive requirements and competencies, including behaviour and attitude) and/or has not realised the performance objectives at all.*
2. ***Reasonable****: on the whole, the PhD candidate has complied with some job requirements (substantive requirements and competencies, including behaviour and attitude) and/or has realised some performance objectives (including development).*
3. ***Good****: on the whole, the PhD candidate has complied with the job requirements (substantive requirements and competencies, including behaviour and attitude) and has realised all performance objectives (including development).*
4. ***Very good****: on the whole, the PhD candidate has complied with all job requirements (substantive requirements and competencies, including behaviour and attitude) and has exceeded multiple performance objectives (including development).*
5. ***Excellent****: on the whole, the PhD candidate has complied with all job requirements (substantive requirements and competencies, including behaviour and attitude) and has significantly exceeded all performance objectives.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Element: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | n/a | If lower than 4, please elaborate:  |
| 1 | Fluency in English (oral and written) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Knowledge level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Rate at which knowledge is assimilated and put into scientific practice (learning curve) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Capacity to place one’s own research in a wider scientific framework |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Interpretation of information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Planning, management and organization of project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Study of literature |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Productivity / output |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Teaching duties |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Documentation of results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Oral presentations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Problem-solving capacity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Independence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Creativity and inventiveness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Capacity to synthesize concepts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Involvement in the group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | Professional relationship with colleagues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Overall evaluation of the PhD candidate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Further remarks with respect to the PhD period under evaluation |
|  |