

Go/No Go Decision

Meeting attendees

The meeting must be attended by:

- A. The doctoral candidate;
- B. The intended promotor;
- C. The committee members:
 - C.1 independent professor(s) or assistant/associate professor holding a doctorate from outside the research group;
 - C.2 another committee member, who may be another intended promotor or daily supervisor of the doctoral candidate;
 - C.3 another committee member, who may be another intended promotor or daily supervisor of the doctoral candidate;
- D. Optional: additional support e.g. external supervisor, HR advisor or FGS employee.

A. Full name doctoral candidate:	TUD ID Number:
Date Go/No Go review meeting:	Start date Doctoral Programme:
Working title dissertation:	

B. Full name intended promotor:

C. Committee members:				
	Title and name:	Position:	Faculty / Department / Section:	Supervising this candidate:
C.1:				Yes No
C.2:				Yes No
C.3:				Yes No
D:				Yes No

Preparations

The intended promotor is responsible for planning the GNG meeting and submitting the completed form to the Faculty Graduate School.

The doctoral candidate submits the following documents at least 2 weeks in advance to the meeting attendees:

- an overview of results achieved in the first year, including proof of competence (paper, technical report);
- perspective on the next three years (project plan), including a time schedule, Research Data Management Plan and the expected scientific findings (e.g. papers and dissertation chapters);
- the PhD agreement and an updated version of the Doctoral Education Plan;
- on this form: Self assessment by the candidate on their performance, skill levels and future development goals.

Meeting agenda

- Reflection on the preceding period with respect to research, Doctoral Education Programme and personal development.
- Evaluation of supervision (frequency, content, etc.).
- Perspective for the coming three years (including time schedule).
- Reasons for either 'Go' or 'No Go' decision and motivation and feedback by the promotor.

Instructions

- Before the meeting the candidate's supervisors discuss and record their feedback on the candidate's competences and skills on the form.
- The committee members articulate their evaluation as a Go or No Go advice to the intended promotor and the intended promotor records it on this form.
- The intended promotor takes a Go or No Go decision, records it on this form and communicates it to the doctoral candidate.
- In case of a Go-decision, new work agreements are recorded on the last page. Independent committee members do not have to contribute to these.
- The doctoral candidate receives a copy of the form.
- The completed original Go/No Go form is sent to the Faculty Graduate School by email with the documents listed under 'preparations'.
- **If the meeting results in a Go, please include Form A.**
- The documents will be uploaded in DMA by the Faculty Graduate School.

Development of competences and skills

The doctoral candidate briefly identifies his or her performance in relation to these competences and last year's agreements and indicates where and how improvements can be made. Discuss each competence during the meeting.

The supervisor(s) give(s) feedback and indicate(s) how improvements can be made. Record any new agreement on the last page of this form.

Definition of skills' levels

1 = needs further development; 2 = at requested professional level; 3 = exceeds requested professional level

Doctoral Candidate		Competences		Supervisors	
Self assessment	Level	Competency Development Guide	Level	Feedback	
Discipline related skills					
	1	D.1 Scientific Knowledge	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	D.2 Engineering & Design	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
Research skills					
	1	R.1 Research Management: Designing, Project management, Problem solving, Valorization	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	R.2 Academic Thinking: Conceptual thinking, Analytical thinking, Synthetic skills, Critical thinking, Creativity & Innovation	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	R.3 Academic Attitude: Societal context, Ethics	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	R.4 Research Data Management	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	Skills development by learning-on-the-job activities (LOJ)	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
Transferable skills					
	1	T.1 Effective communication: Presenting, Writing skills, Story telling, Language Skills	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	T.2 Working with others: Networking, Collaboration, Negotiation, Leadership	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	T.3 Teaching, Supervising & Coaching: Teaching, Supervising students /Coaching	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
	1	T.4 Self-management: Autonomy, Time management, Flexibility, Perseverance, Dealing with risk and uncertainty, Entrepreneurship, Personal development	1		
	2		2		
	3		3		
<div> <div>Research Data Management Plan present:</div> <div>Yes No</div> </div>					
Notes about DMP:			Intended promotor's signature:		

C.1 Committee member's decision: Go No Go

Feedback (and motivation in case of a No Go advice):

Signature:

C.2 Committee member's decision: Go No Go

Feedback (and motivation in case of a No Go advice):

Signature:

C.3 Committee member's decision: Go No Go

Feedback (and motivation in case of a No Go advice):

Signature:

D. Committee member's decision: Go No Go

Feedback (and motivation in case of a No Go advice):

The topic of Taylan's PhD project is interesting and I can see that he has the potential to advance the state of the art here. I'm afraid that for me this potential was not reflected in his GNG document and the presentation, both of which were supposed to be my windows into his research. For the future, I recommend the following to Taylan:

(A) Invest more time into concretely defining and/or planning at least the (first) major milestones for your PhD. You will most certainly deviate from this plan, but it nevertheless gives you a baseline to judge your pace/progress/plan-revisions against. Also, note that this planning is not necessarily incompatible with a curiosity-driven project.

(B) It is difficult to write a document that is meant to be interesting to people from two different research fields. Here it is important to be precise and vague with the right parts, if you don't balance it properly you lose your audience. It will come with practice but I missed this balance from your report. (If you want very specific pointers, let me know, I'd be happy to discuss.) I would also pay more attention to weeding out the easy mistakes (typos/missing words/half sentences) from your report.

Signature:

B. Intended promotor's response to the committee members' advice:

B. Intended promotor's decision: Go No Go

Feedback (and motivation in case of a No Go advice):

Signature:

A. Doctoral candidate's feedback:

Signature:

In case of a **Go decision**, please include agreements and goals for the coming period:

It is possible to lodge an objection to this decision within six weeks after the date of this decision by emailing a letter (PDF-document) to: jz@tudelft.nl. The letter of objection must be signed. The letter of objection must at least contain: name and address, date, the decision (copy) to which you are objecting and the reasons for your objection.

Full name **head of department**:

Faculty & Department:

Date & signature:

Please fill in this form and email it to your Faculty Graduate School within 12 months after start date, as you cannot upload the form in DMA yourself.