**Confidential**

**The Go / No-Go Evaluation form for PhD Candidates**

**Note:** Once completed, the supervisor or promotor informs the Graduate School of the outcome ([inka.bentum@wur.nl](mailto:inka.bentum@wur.nl)) including the date that the evaluation was done. Given the fact that this is a confidential evaluation form, this must not be sent to the Graduate School.

|  |
| --- |
| Tick, if applicable |
| 🗌 Contract of employment WU |
| 🗌 Contract of employment DLO |
| 🗌 No contract of employment:  🗆 Sandwich PhD candidate  🗆 Guest PhD candidate  🗆 External PhD candidate |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. General |
| Name PhD candidate: |
| Chair / department: |
| Professor (promotor): |
| Daily Supervisor(s): |
| Evaluation period: |
| Date of the Go / No-Go Evaluation meeting: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2. Go / No-Go Evaluation done by: | |
| Name Professor (promotor): | Contact: Daily / Regularly / Occasionally |
| Name Daily Supervisor(s): | Contact: Daily / Regularly / Occasionally |

|  |
| --- |
| 3. Prerequisites for the Go / No-Go Evaluation to take place[[1]](#footnote-1): |
| 1. **Starting date of the PhD trajectory:** - - 20 |
| 1. **TSP approved by the graduate school:** yes / no / not applicable |
| 1. **Project proposal approved by the graduate school:** yes / no / not applicable |
| 1. **MSc degree of Wageningen University or another Dutch university:** yes / no |
| 1. **If “NO” for “3.d”, then please answer the following questions:**  * **Has the MSc degree been approved by the Academic Board?** Yes / no * **Was a Qualifying Examination (QE) required?** yes / no * **If a QE was required: has the PhD candidate passed the QE?** yes / no |
| 1. **Proof of proficiency in the English Language [[2]](#footnote-2):** yes / no / not applicable |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Preliminary remarks (e.g., circumstances that influenced the candidate’s performance) | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| 5. Evaluation of elements in the progress of PhD research   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. | | | | | | | | |
| **Elements** | | **Evaluation code** | | | | | | |
|  | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **n/a** | |
| 1. Fluency in English (oral and written) | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Knowledge level | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Rate at which knowledge is assimilated and put into scientific practice (learning curve) | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Capacity to place one’s own research in a wider scientific framework | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Interpretation of information | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Planning, management and organization of project | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Study of literature | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Productivity / output | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Teaching duties | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Progress education activities as stipulated in the TSP | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Documentation of results | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Oral presentations | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Problem-solving capacity | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Independence | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Initiative | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Creativity and inventiveness | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Capacity to synthesize concepts | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Involvement in the group | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Professional relationship with colleagues | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 1. Any other relevant remarks: | |  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6. Evaluation of the PhD period as a whole(Evaluation code: 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5) | | |
| **Conclusion:** | | |
| 7. Decision Professor (Promotor) and supervisor(s): |
| **Does the candidate meet all the prerequisites (see 3.) for the Go / No-go decision to be taken?** yes / no \*  *\* If no, please clarify:*  **Conclusion:** **Go / No-Go** (strikethrough what is **not** applicably)  ***Note:*** *Read the notification on page 4, and inform the graduate school about the decision* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 8. Signatures | | |
| **Position** | **Name** | **Signature and date** |
| Professor (Promotor)  Daily Supervisor(s) |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 9. Comments of the PhD candidate on the outcome of the evaluation |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10. PhD candidate has taken notice of the content of this document | |
| **Name** | **Signature and date** |
|  |  |

**In case the PhD candidate has a contract of employment with WU or DLO, questions 11 and 12 also need to be answered.**

|  |
| --- |
| 11. Finalization by review authority (Managing Director of Science Group) |
| Name:  Function:  Date:  Signature: |

|  |
| --- |
| 12. Decision by review authority (Managing Director of Science Group) |
| Contract of employmentrenewed: **yes / no** |
| Otherwise: |

**Notification**

The Go / No-Go decision is obligatory to take for all PhD candidates registered at Wageningen University. **Once completed, the outcome of the Go / No-go evaluation, in combination with the date that the decision was taken, must be communicated by the promotor to the Graduate School at which the PhD candidate is registered.** The Go / No-Go decision has to be taken within 18 months after the start of the PhD trajectory, but preferably within 6-12 months. It is one of the obligatory steps required for formal admission to the WU PhD programme. The PhD candidate needs formal admission in order to receive contract extension for the rest of the PhD.

**The conditions for formal admission are:**

* A positive MSc diploma evaluation or a positive result of a qualifying examination
* Proof of proficiency in English
* Approval of the PhD Project Proposal
* Approval of the Training and Supervision Plan (TSP)
* A positive Go / No-Go decision taken by the supervisory team

**Recommended Sequence:**

1. The Promotor formulates the Go / No-Go decision by using this evaluation form.
2. A. Employed PhD candidate: The Promotor sends the form to the Personnel Department for the final decision of the review authority (questions 12 and 13 on the form) **and informs the Graduate School about the outcome of the evaluation and the date that this decision was taken.** Note that the Graduate School should not receive a copy of the Go / No-Go evaluation form, as this is a confidential document between the candidate and its team. We do expect the chair group to store a copy of the form in their own administration.  
   B. Sandwich, guest, or external PhD candidate: The Promotor informs the Graduate School about the outcome of the evaluation and the date that this decision was taken. Note that the Graduate School should not receive a copy of this form, as this is a confidential document between the candidate and its team. We do expect the chair group to store a copy of the form in their own administration.
3. **The Graduate School registers the GO or NO-GO Decision for all its PhD Candidates (regardless of their PhD type) in PROMIS.**
4. PhD Services checks whether all necessary conditions for formal admission to the PhD programme are completed.
5. The PhD candidate receives a formal admission letter written by the Dean of Science of Wageningen University.

1. For PhD candidates with a contract of employment at WU or DLO, a performance review has to be considered in concordance with the Collective Labour Agreement NU or DLO. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. English language requirements:

   * TOEFL: internet-based 90, with minimum sub-score 23 for speaking
   * IELTS: 6.5, with minimum sub-score 6.0 for speaking
   * Cambridge Certificate of Advanced English (CAE): minimum grade B
   * Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English (CPE): any grade

   *Submitted test results must be dated within 24 months prior to an application to the PhD Programme.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)