

CTNR Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

Evaluation of the 3rd Annual Report

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Doctoral candidate: | <input type="text"/> |
| First supervisor (chair of the TAC): | <input type="text"/> |
| Second supervisor: | <input type="text"/> |
| Third supervisor: | <input type="text"/> |
| Other attendees: | <input type="text"/> |
| Start of PhD thesis (according to contract): | <input type="text"/> |
| Date of TAC meeting: | <input type="text"/> |

Overall assessment

In case a severe problem is identified in the 3rd Annual Report meeting, a follow-up meeting needs to take place within 3 months in order to resolve the situation.

- Satisfactory** (Handing in the thesis)
 Not satisfactory (Follow-up TAC meeting required: within 3 months)

1) Evaluation of the PhD student's performance

The TAC is asked to evaluate the performance of the PhD student and inform him/her about the result. The judgment must represent the opinion of the majority of the TAC members.

| | <i>outstanding</i> | <i>very good</i> | <i>good</i> | <i>satisfactory</i> | <i>not satisfactory</i> | <i>cannot be judged</i> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Written report | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Research performance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Motivation/Commitment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Creativity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Specific comments on the performance of the PhD student:

2) Suggestions for additional training of the PhD student

In case the TAC has identified deficiencies in theoretical and/or practical skills, please make specific suggestions for additional training (e.g. additional lab training, extended reading, participation in Journal Clubs/lectures).

3) Theoretical knowledge relevant for thesis work

The TAC is asked to evaluate the theoretical knowledge of the researcher in the scientific fields that have been defined on occasion of the previous TAC meetings.

Scientific fields:

| | <i>outstanding</i> | <i>very good</i> | <i>good</i> | <i>satisfactory</i> | <i>not satisfactory</i> | <i>cannot be judged</i> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Theoretical knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

4) Publications resulting from thesis work

Parts of the thesis work have already been published/submitted YES: NO:

Data for publication is complete/manuscript is in preparation YES: NO:

If no: Please specify the work to be completed for publication (including a time frame):

5) Evaluation of the proposed project

The TAC evaluates the quality of the proposed PhD thesis project in regard on (i) its suitability as a high-quality PhD thesis project, (ii) its scientific impact (competitiveness) and (iii) its publication perspectives. If appropriate, suggestions for improvement or modifications of the project should be made.

| | <i>outstanding</i> | <i>very good</i> | <i>good</i> | <i>satisfactory</i> | <i>not satisfactory</i> | <i>cannot be judged</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Quality of thesis project | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Scientific impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Publication perspectives | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Specific comments on the proposed project:

6) Evaluation of the experimental outline

The TAC is asked to evaluate the experimental outline of the proposed project. The judgement should represent the opinion of the majority of the TAC members.

7) Recommendations for finishing experimental and/or numerical work and handing-in the thesis

Specify the tasks to be completed in order to be able to write up the thesis:

8) Discussion of future plans

On a routine basis, the TAC shall discuss future plans of the doctoral researcher and provide mentoring.

Discussion of future plans took place YES: NO:
Is specific mentoring towards the next career step required? YES: NO:

If yes, please recommend how to proceed:

9) Reviewers

The thesis shall be reviewed by:

First reviewer:

Second reviewer:

Third reviewer:

10) Discussion in absence of 1st supervisor

On a routine basis, the first supervisor leaves the room to allow discussion of any additional items with the second and third TAC member only.

Discussion without the 1st supervisor took place: YES: NO:

11) Signatures

1st supervisor

2nd supervisor

3rd supervisor