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

|  |
| --- |
| Tick, if applicable |
| 🗌 Contract of employment UvA |
| 🗌 No contract of employment:  🗆 Bursary PhD candidate  🗆 Guest PhD candidate  🗆 External PhD candidate |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. General |
| Name PhD candidate: |
| Research 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 a Dutch university:** yes / no |
| * **If “NO” for “3.d” have you received an exemption from the educational requirement** yes / no |

|  |
| --- |
| 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**  *Inform graduate school PE&RC and Saskia Heijboer 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 PhD candidate:  Date:  Signature: |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)