**The Graduate School for Production Ecology and Resource Conservation (PE&RC)**

**Training and Supervision Plan (TSP)**

*For more detailed information on the TSP see:* [*www.pe-rc.nl/TSP*](http://www.pe-rc.nl/TSP)

The Training and Supervision Plan (TSP) describes a PhD candidate's planned training and teaching activities, as well as agreements on supervision and evaluation of performance and progress. Although the TSP has a formal function, it should primarily be seen as a structure that **facilitates** the planningof activities related to personal development and the frequency, format and responsibilities of supervision. The candidate should use the TSP to discuss these matters with the supervisors so that both parties agree on the PhD candidate’s training and supervision.

The TSP:

* Must be submitted by the PhD candidate within the first three months of the project, but preferably within two months after the start of the project.
* Is signed by (co)-promotor(s) and supervisor(s), and is officially approved by the Graduate School. Therefore, rights and obligations are formalised through this document.
* Can be altered in the course of the PhD period. The PE&RC office must be informed on changes with respect to supervision, but does not need to be informed about specific changes in the training components.

**Before submitting the final signed version of the TSP to PE&RC, please send a draft version by email to the PE&RC PhD Programme Coordinator with whom you had an intake meeting, so (s)he can check whether all requirements have been met. Accordingly, send the final signed version of the TSP to Claudius van de Vijver (claudius.vandevijver@wur.nl), who is the head of the PE&RC PhD programme and who will formally evaluate and approve the TSP.**

Once signed and approved by the Graduate School the PhD candidate gets:

* Access to a financial rucksack to cover training and education activities (€ 3.500,-). Supervisors are responsible to make this budget available and thus it does not come from PE&RC.\*
* A reduction (~50%) in the fee of courses and activities organised by PE&RC and by the Wageningen Graduate Schools (WGS).
* Free participation in all PE&RC weekends.

At the end of the PhD programme, the performed training and education activities are evaluated. The evaluation is based on the Training and Education Statement Form (TESF) that the candidate submits to PE&RC after submission of the reading version of the thesis. Note that no specific proof of participation in activities is required. The PhD candidate and supervisor sign the TESF to acknowledge that it has been filled in truthfully. An approved TESF results in a PE&RC Training and Education Certificate which is awarded to the young doctor during the public defence (in case of a defence at Wageningen University) or will be sent by regular mail.

**Personal details of PhD candidate:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **First name:** |  |
| **Family name:** |  |
| **Date of birth (day-month-year):** |  |
| **Email address:** |  |

**\*For PhD candidates of the Department of Ecological Sciences at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,** the text at this bullet is replaced by the following: “By signing this Training and Supervision Plan, the promotor declares that sufficient budget is available to support the training and education activities of the PhD candidate proposed in this plan.”

**A. THE PHD TRAINING PROGRAMME**

The PhD training programme focuses on obtaining T-shaped skills:

* Vertical bar of the T: - In-depth knowledge and insight in the research topic
* Developing/strengthening competences and skills to work in academia
* Horizontal bar of the T: - Broadening of scientific knowledge and insight

 - Developing/strengthening competences and skills at large

 - Placing research in a societal perspective

 - Exploring future career options

Moreover, it is essential for PhD candidates to be able to perform in a scientific forum and to obtain a strong profile in an international network of peers. Hence, scientific interaction with peers is given a central position in PhD training and education and is noted as a separate category in the TSP.

Similarly, teaching activities are placed in a separate category. The benefit of teaching in strengthening T-shaped skills in the PhD programme lies both in the realm of increasing scientific knowledge and insight as well as in strengthening didactical skills.

To facilitate formulating activities to acquire T-shaped skills, the training section of the TSP (below) has been set up in four main categories:

* Category 1: Scientific knowledge, insight and overview
* Category 2: Skills, competences and career development
* Category 3: Scientific exposure/interaction
* Category 4: Teaching

To comply with the PE&RC criteria, and to obtain the Training and Education Certificate, PhD candidates must perform at least 22 weeks of education and training activities. The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) has been adopted as crediting system (1 ECTS = 28 hours) and thus a total of at least 30 ECTS must be obtained.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Time | ECTS(1 credit = 28 hours) |
| 1 days | 0.3 |
| 2 days | 0.6 |
| 3 days | 0.9 |
| 4 days | 1.2 |
| 5 days | 1.5 |

Besides obtaining a minimum of 30 ECTS in total, credits must be spread out evenly over the various categories. Therefore, some categories have a minimum number of credits, shown in brackets per category. Please note that a summation of the minimum credits per subcategory does not lead to the minimum total required.

**CATEGORY 1: SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE, INSIGHT AND OVERVIEW**

**a. Review of literature / writing of project proposal** **(4.5 ECTS)**

* *Each PhD has to write a literature review which also should be presented to a peer audience. This is credited with 4.5 ECTS.*
* *An additional 1.5 ECTS can be obtained when the candidate has written, or substantially contributed to writing the PhD project proposal.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of review / title project proposal (when applicable)** | **ECTS** |
|  |  |

**b. Postgraduate courses**

* *Postgraduate courses have a higher level than MSc-levelled courses, which belong in Category 1c.*
* *Postgraduate courses can be followed anywhere in the world.*
* *When desired courses are not available or unknown, indicate subject of interest and year in which one hopes to follow a course on this subject.*
* *Two types of postgraduate courses are distinguished:*

**b1. In-depth / Topical / On-site Postgraduate Courses (3 ECTS)**

* *Online courses (co-)organised by PE&RC can be credited in this category.*
* *Other online courses must be checked by the PE&RC PhD Programme Coordinator.*
* *At least one course should be offline*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course title** | **Organisers** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |

**b2. Methodological / Statistical Postgraduate Courses (no minimum ECTS)**

* *Online courses are credited in this category as long as the course is on postgraduate level. By signing this document supervisors agree that the course is of sufficient level and quality for the PhD candidate*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course title** | **Organisers** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |

**c. Deficiency, Refresh, Brush-up courses (no minimum ECTS)**

* *These courses are not at postgraduate level (e.g., MSc courses).*
* *Online courses that don’t fit in category 1b are also credited in this category*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course title** | **Organisers** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |

**d. Laboratory training and working visits (no minimum ECTS)**

* *This involves training or visits to universities/institutes other than the candidate’s affiliated institute(s).*
* ***Regular fieldwork or lab work are not credited.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic under investigation** | **Institute** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |

**e. Invited review of journal manuscripts (no minimum ECTS)**

* *Credits are obtained when the PhD candidate reviews a submitted manuscript on request of a journal.*
* *One can obtain 1 ECTS per reviewed manuscript.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Journal** | **Topic** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |

**CATEGORY 2: SKILLS, COMPETENCES AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT**

**a. Competence, Skills and Career-oriented activities (2 ECTS)**

* *These courses and activities are part of:*
	+ *Development and strengthening of skills and competences needed as a scientist (e.g., writing and presenting skills, time planning and project management, communication skills) and beyond.*
	+ *Obtaining clear career perspectives, e.g., courses or orientation activities.*
* *Online courses are also credited in this category*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of the activity** | **Organisers** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |
| 4) |  |  |  |
| 5) |  |  |  |

**b. Scientific Integrity/Ethics in science activities (0.3 ECTS)**

* *This should be an activity on ethics alone or a course element with a clear focus on ethics in science. Altogether, these course elements should at least add up to 0.3 ECTS.*
* *When no alternative is available, online courses can be followed.*
* *PhD candidates of* ***VU Amsterdam*** *must have a minimum of* ***2 ECTS*** *by following the* ***VU Scientific Integrity course***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of the activity** | **Organisers** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |

**c. PE&RC Weekend, PE&RC Day, and other PE&RC events (1 ECTS)**

* *A PE&RC day or a one-day symposium is credited with 0.3 ECTS, the PE&RC weekend for first years with 0.9 ECTS and the PE&RC weekend for midterm and last years with 0.6 ECTS.*
* *Besides the PE&RC day and the PE&RC weekend, other seminars, symposia, or meetings in which PE&RC is involved may be listed.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the meeting** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |

**CATEGORY 3: SCIENTIFIC EXPOSURE/INTERACTION**

**a. National scientific meetings, local seminars, and discussion groups (4.5 ECTS)**

* *Main aims are to stimulate scientific interaction and networking beyond your own specific field of expertise and beyond your existing scientific network.* ***Hence, chair group/research department meetings may not be listed as they do not meet these aims.***
* *Listed activities can take place anywhere in the world, but are generally targeted towards a local audience.*
* *International conference attendance may be listed under this heading too, but only if you did not present a poster or talk in that conference (otherwise, list that conference in 3b).*
* *To stimulate scientific interaction, PE&RC also facilitates and acknowledges a number of discussion groups that are generally run by and for PhDs. For a non-inclusive list, see* [*www.pe-rc.nl/discussion-groups*](http://www.pe-rc.nl/discussion-groups)*.*
* *Consider ± 0.1 ECTS for a 2-hour meeting and 1.5 ECTS per year for active participation in a discussion group.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the discussion group, local seminar or other scientific meeting** | **Years** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |
| 4) |  |  |
| 5) |  |  |

**b. International symposia, workshops and conferences (3 ECTS, at least 2 meetings)**

* *Credits can only be obtained when the candidate presents a poster or a talk at the meeting.* ***Participation without presentation is credited in category 3a.***
* *Credits: 1 ECTS is obtained for the presentation or poster, which is added to the ECTS obtained for attendance (0.3 ECTS per day). So, a two-day meeting results in 1.6 ECTS.*
* *When an international meeting on a subject of interest is not scheduled yet, indicate subject of interest and year in which you hope to participate. To aid this, one can think of the annual meeting of societies that cover the field.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of international symposium, workshop, or conference** | **Location** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |
| 4) |  |  |  |
| 5) |  |  |  |

**c. Societally relevant exposure (no minimum ECTS)**

* *Credits can be obtained for any kind of societally relevant outreach activity. Examples include: TV/radio interview, newspaper/press article, popular science magazine article, blog, guest lecture at primary or secondary school, etc.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the activity** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |

**d. Committee work (no minimum ECTS)**

* *Credits can be obtained for committee work that contributes to your academic development, e.g. work for the PE&RC PhD Council.*
* *For one year of active participation in a committee 1 ECTS is credited.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the committee** | **Year** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |

**CATEGORY 4: TEACHING**

In the Netherlands, PhD candidates are not obliged to teach. We do however encourage PhD candidates to take up some teaching activities (i.e., lecturing, supervising BSc/MSc theses). Given the value of teaching skills and experience, teaching activities are credited if personal learning outcomes are defined a-priori and can be demonstrated a-posteriori.

Teaching activities that are credited are:

* Lecturing: The PhD candidate prepares and gives lectures (guest lecture or lecture series). This also includes preparation of lectures and/or teaching material.
* Supervision of practicals/tutorials, provided that the PhD candidate is involved in the organisation and development of sessions and material.
* Supervision of **BSc and MSc theses**, provided that the PhD candidate is the daily supervisor.

**a. Lecturing/Supervision of practicals/tutorials (no minimum ECTS)**

* *0.3 ECTS per lecture or day of practical/tutorial supervision (includes preparation time)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course title** | **Year** | **No. of days** | **ECTS** |
| 1) |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |
| ***Personal learning outcomes related to didactics:*** |

**b. BSc/MSc thesis supervision (no minimum ECTS)**

* ***3 ECTS*** *can be obtained for the* ***first*** *6-month BSc/MSc project, and* ***1 ECTS*** *for each* ***subsequent*** *6-month BSc/MSc project*

**Will you be supervising BSc/MSc students? YES / NO**

*If yes, what arrangements have been made with PhD supervisors with respect to:*

|  |
| --- |
| *Who determines whether the students will work with you:* |
| *If known, specifications on what topics the students will work on:* |
| *Agreement of authorship and data ownership:* |
| *Who is responsible for the examination of the students:* |
| ***Personal learning outcomes related to supervision:*** |
| *Expected time investment:* | *weeks* |  *ECTS* |

By signing this document, PhD candidate and supervisors agree that teaching activities by the PhD candidate will not exceed 10% of the PhD employment time. When teaching activities do exceed 10% of the employment time, supervisors agree to (financially) compensate the additional time the PhD candidate spends on teaching. When teaching activities (e.g., MSc thesis supervision) are clearly beneficial to the PhD project the candidate and supervisor must agree on the time that will be registered as “teaching” time. PE&RC suggests to register 90 hours for supervising a major thesis, 60 hours for a minor thesis and 30 hours for an internship.

**Total Credits**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total credits (ECTS) for education, training, and teaching activities****(Sum of category 1-4. Minimum required = 30 ECTS)** |  |

**B1. SUPERVISION ARRANGEMENTS**

*This section is not only meant for the supervisors to say what they want and think with respect to supervision but also what the PhD candidate wants. Therefore, the PhD candidate must discuss these issues in detail with the supervisor(s) before filling in the section. Involvement and tasks/responsibilities of supervisors can change during the PhD track, provided that they are discussed with the PhD candidate. More specifically, the* ***frequency*** *(avg. hours per week or days per month),* ***format*** *(i.e. weekly/monthly meetings based on appointments or more on an ad hoc basis) and responsibilities of supervisors (who does what) are described. When research is (partly) conducted abroad please elaborate (under Additional) on supervision when abroad and if/how often the supervisor(s) from the Netherlands will visit the PhD candidate.*

***Principal Supervisor/Promotor [[1]](#footnote-2)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |
| Frequency |  |
| Format / Type |  |
| Field of expertise relevant for the project |  |
| Additional: |  |

***Supervisor 2***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |
| Task / Position 1 |  |
| Frequency |  |
| Format / Type |  |
| Field of expertise relevant for the project |  |
| Additional: |  |

***Supervisor 3***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |
| Task / Position 1 |  |
| Frequency |  |
| Format / Type |  |
| Field of expertise relevant for the project |  |
| Additional: |  |

***Supervisor 4***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |
| Task / Position 1 |  |
| Frequency |  |
| Format / Type |  |
| Field of expertise relevant for the project |  |
| Additional: |  |

**Evaluation of progress and process, and the Go/No-Go**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How often will the entire project team meet for a general progress and process evaluation (we advise to do this at least once every 3-6 months)? |  |
| The Go/No-Go evaluation (approx. 12 months after start) is mandatory for PhDs of various PE&RC partner universities. More details regarding the Go/No-Go evaluation can be found at: [www.pe-rc.nl/go-no-go](http://www.pe-rc.nl/go-no-go). **Have the Go/No-Go procedure, the evaluation criteria, the timeline, and the consequences of a Go or a No-Go been discussed for this project?** | **YES / NO** |

**B2. AGREEMENT ON (CO-) AUTHORSHIP**

*Doing a PhD involves writing scientific publications. As part of this process, the PhD candidate and the supervisory team will need to discuss who qualifies for co-authorship, and based on which criteria, but also on the ranking of the author list. To aid this process and to provide a general guideline (co)authorship guidelines are given below.* ***PE&RC specifically asks the project team to take note of the following guidelines*** *and to indicate whether the team plans to deviate from these guidelines.*

**General advice regarding the publication process**

* Make an agreement about the criteria for first authorship and the ranking of co-authors very early in the research process and also about the required tasks and activities to meet the criteria for author- and co-authorship.
* Decide on authorship and the ranking of the co-authors collectively.
* In case of disagreement or doubts about authorship or ranking of authors, feel free to consult the PhD Programme Coordinators of PE&RC.

**Authorship and co-authorship**

Starting point should be that all authors of a paper have contributed *substantially* to the paper, have reviewed the final version of the manuscript, approve it for publication, and take public responsibility for the content of the paper.

Someone’s contribution is substantial if he/she contributed to at least two of the following four aspects:

* Problem definition, design of the experiment or research project, planning. This may include acquisition of the project, writing of the project or research proposal, designing the experimental setup.
* Practical execution of the lab or field work. Production of data.
* Analyses and interpretation of the results.
* Writing of the manuscript.

The contribution to two of these four aspects must really have made a difference. This does not necessarily mean that the contribution took much time. Consequently, someone who supplies data can only be a coauthor if he/she also contributes to one of the other three aspects. It may help to be clear about this in an early stage, for instance when you ask someone for data.

People who contributed to a paper, but whose contribution does not meet the above-mentioned criteria for a co-author should be mentioned in the acknowledgements of a paper. Finally, the author who submits a manuscript for publication accepts the responsibility of having included as co-authors all persons appropriate and none inappropriate. The submitting author should have sent each living co-author a copy of the manuscript and have obtained the co-author’s assent to submit it as such.

**Author Ranking**

* The ‘first author’ is always the person who has made the most important integrating contribution.
* All other authors are ranked in accordance with the general rules or customs of the specific discipline. Authors may be ranked in order of decreasing importance of their integrating contribution, or a special position may be assigned to the 2nd author and last author, unless the editorial board of a scientific journal has determined other rules for author ranking explicitly.
* Keep in mind the tasks and competences of the author in order to balance the importance of their “substantial individual contributions”.

**Team statement on authorship arrangements:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is the project team planning to adhere to the PE&RC authorship guidelines?** | **YES / NO** |
| *If no, on which aspects is the team planning to deviate from the above-mentioned guidelines?* |

**C. APPROVAL / SIGNATURES**

Adjustments with respect to supervision are possible, as it is almost impossible to foresee every development that occurs during the four-year appointment. The agreed plan however, is an essential part of the file of every PhD candidate. Both the PhD candidate and the supervisors derive rights and obligations from it. Therefore, it is necessary to hand in the form as soon as possible.

**By signing this Training and Supervision Plan, the promotor declares that a budget of at least € 3.500,- (for the 4-year period) is available to support the training and education activities of the PhD candidate.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PhD candidate | Principal Supervisor / Promotor | Supervisor 2 |
| Name: | Name: | Name: |
| Date: | Date: | Date: |
|  |  |  |
| Supervisor 3 | Supervisor 4 | Other |
| Name: | Name: | Name: |
| Date: | Date: | Date: |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Head of Research Group |
| Name: |
| Date: |
|  |

Signature of approval by the head of the PE&RC PhD Programme:

Dr C. van de Vijver

Date:

**Before submitting the final signed version of the TSP to PE&RC, please send a draft version by email to the PE&RC PhD Programme Coordinator with whom you had an intake meeting, so (s)he can check whether all requirements have been met. Accordingly send the final signed version directly to Claudius van de Vijver (****claudius.vandevijver@wur.nl****).**

1. ***Promotor:*** *professor or academic staff member with ius promovendi who formally promotes a PhD candidate to doctor.*

***Co-promotor / Daily supervisor:*** *a scientist who has a PhD degree with special expertise in the field in which the PhD candidate writes its dissertation. Often, the co-promotor acts as daily supervisor and carries out many of the daily supervising activities.*

***Advisor****: a scientist who is involved in the project but not on a regular and formal basis.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)