

## Annual report to the « Comité de Suivi Individuel » ('CSI')

### Introduction

- This file, completed by the doctoral student at the end of each academic year, must be sent to the CSI members no later than 48 hours before the date of the interview.
- The institute referees (<https://ed562.u-paris.fr/csi-nouveau/>) may be copied on this initial submission.
- After the CSI interview, the committee members will complete the parts of the report that concern them and will give their opinion on the doctoral student's re-registration.
- The CSI members will submit the completed and signed reports directly to the dedicated submission link: <https://forms.gle/uWosh4rdArFTQUUx5>
- The doctoral school will send the reports to the doctoral students and to the supervisor.

Please remember that the CSI is mandatory for all re-registrations, even when applying for a special 4th-year registration.

**Re-registration cannot proceed without a CSI report.**

### Deadlines

The deadlines for submitting the CSI report to the ED:

- D1 and D2: **October 15th.**
- D3 requesting a 4th year with a new type of funding: **End of July** to ensure salary payment in October.
- D1, D2, D3 with visa renewal requests: **End of July**, as prefecture procedures can be very lengthy.

*These deadlines should guide the schedule of the interview.*

Place an 'X' on the year of the CSI:

CSI Year 1 (for re-enrolment in 2nd year)	CSI Year 2 (for re-enrolment in 3rd year)	CSI Year 3 (for re-enrolment in 4th year)

### Doctoral student information

Family name and First name of the doctoral student:

Date of 1st registration in PhD:

Type of thesis funding : (Doctoral contract, EPST, Region, CIFRE, ANR, full-time employee, part-time employee, other to be specified) :

If Doctoral contract, specify any additional work carried out during the past year :

Thesis title :

Doctoral student's research unit

Title : UMRS 1148  
 Acronym : Role de l'hypertension  
 N° : Miaou  
 Name director unit : Elio  
 Title of host team : Nicoletti  
 Name of host team leader :

Thesis supervisor :

Thesis co-supervisor (if applicable) :

### CSI members

- The CSI committee must include at least two members, who must be external to the doctoral student's institute and hold an HDR.
- An additional 'expert' member can be invited; they do not necessarily need to hold an HDR. They can change during the course of the thesis. They can be part of the institute but will not sign the CSI report nor participate in phases II and III of the meeting.
- They should not have co-authored articles with the student's host team in the past 5 years.
- The list of BioSPC HDRs is available at this address : <https://edbiospc.fr>.

Names of the CSI members	University of affiliation	Mail
Member 1 of the board UPCité, Member of BioSPC	UPCité	
Member 2 of the board External to BioSPC <u>and</u> UPCité		
Additional 'expert' member		

### Report by the doctoral student

**Please provide an update on your thesis progress.** This should include a summary (up to one page) of the rationale, main research directions, and their advancement. Also, identify any challenges encountered, along with solutions that have been implemented or are being considered.

800  
750  
700  
650  
600  
550  
500  
450  
400  
350  
300  
250  
200  
150  
100  
50

### Doctoral training courses attended

Total accumulation for the entire doctorate:

Type of modules	Titles of the modules	Total hours
Scientific		
Cross-disciplinary		
Professional integration and career development		
	Grand Total	

## Report on scientific and technical productions and outreach activities

\* Poster presentation (specify title, dates and place of the conference as well as the title and authors of the posters) :

\* Papers presented at conferences with proceedings (title, dates, place, authors and references) :

~~\* Publications in peer-reviewed journals (specify title, authors, references) :~~

\* General public communication activities (specify title, dates and place of the meeting as well as your type of action) :

Date :

[illegible]

## Feedback of the « comite de suivi individuel »

NAME of the doctoral student :

We, the undersigned,

Name of board member 1 :

Name of board member 2 :

Name of the additional 'expert' member :

After the interview with the doctoral student and the supervisor, and based on the submitted form, the members of the doctoral student's "" provide the following feedback :

Questions	Feed-back			Comments
	-	±	+	
<b>Advances in research</b>				
1 Has the research question been clearly and adequately defined?				
2 Does the doctoral student have a comprehensive understanding of the research process and the tasks to be completed prior to the defense?				
3 Is the research progressing as expected?				
If not, would an extension of the thesis preparation period allow for a successful defense?				
Otherwise, has the option to terminate the doctoral project been contemplated (either by the doctoral student or the thesis director)?				
<b>Training conditions</b>				
1 Have all the scientific, material, and financial requirements necessary for the doctoral project been fulfilled?				
2 If the doctoral student is preparing his/her thesis within a collaborative framework (interdisciplinary, international or with a company), are the conditions of this collaboration satisfactory? Is there effective collaboration between the parties involved?				
3 How effectively are the thesis director or co-directors managing the supervision of the thesis? Do the supervision methods need to be adjusted or revised?				
4 Is the communication between the doctoral students and supervisors satisfactory?				
5 Is the doctoral student well-integrated into the research team or unit? Does he/she feel isolated?				
6 How motivated and determined is the doctoral student to progress with his/her work?				
7 Are there any signs of demotivation or discouragement from the doctoral student?				
8 Is the doctoral student at risk of psychosocial stress?				
<b>Skill development and future preparation</b>				
1 Written output (progress report, bibliography review, article, conference abstract)?				
2 Has the doctoral student been educated on research ethics and scientific integrity, in terms of both conducting experiments and handling issues related to publication, authorship, and copyright of scientific works?				

800

750

700

650

600

550

500

450

400

350

300



250

200

150

100

50

							
3	Are the doctoral student's presentation skills up to par? Consider factors such as clarity, ability to synthesize information, quality of supporting materials, oral fluency, and teaching skills.						
4	Do the doctoral student has opportunities to broaden his.her scientific culture in his.her field of research and international perspective (seminars, thematic schools, congresses, ED forum)?						
5	How is the training portfolio progressing?						
6	How is the preparation for the doctoral student's future career progressing?						

**The members of the 'CSI' commit to ::**

- Upholding confidentiality and discretion.
- Preventing conflicts, avoiding discrimination, moral or sexual harassment, sexist behavior, breaches of research ethics or scientific integrity, and promptly addressing any conflict of interest situations they may encounter.
- Remaining vigilant in identifying any form of conflict, discrimination, moral or sexual harassment or sexist behaviour, any breach of research ethics or scientific integrity, or any conflict of interest.
- Alerting the ED if such a situation is identified.

The Monitoring Committee does not evaluate the doctoral student or the thesis director. Instead, it assesses the student's training conditions and the progress of the research. It provides recommendations and gives feedback on re-registration.

- **In case of difficulties, the CSI alerts the ED but is not in charge of resolving the encountered issues.**
- **The ED takes any necessary measures concerning the doctoral student's situation and the progress of his/her doctorate.**

**CONCLUSION (MANDATORY):**

**Therefore (Check the choice) :**

	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The committee approves the re-registration	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The committee disapproves of the re-registration	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The committee supports the request for an exemption for an additional registration.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The committee issues an unfavourable opinion on the request for a derogation for additional registration	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The committee advises scheduling a new meeting with the CSI (please provide reasons and the timeframe in the comments).	

Done at....., on .....

Signature of one of the members of the ED BioSPC board