

---

PhD student name

PhD advisor:

Sciper

Co-PhD advisor (if)

Date of enrolment

**PhD advisor(s): Appendix A-Mentor: Appendix B-PhD Student: Appendix A and B**

**List the current overall goals and specific aims of thesis**

**Write a few sentences describing which of your specific aims are completed, which are not, and whether there are unforeseen challenges**

**List Publications (Title/Authors; in preparation /submitted /accepted/published; short description of student's contribution if not first author)**

**Conference Proceedings (Title/Authors; submitted/accepted/published; indicate if poster or oral presentation)**

**Progress**

**Are there any problems that may hinder the success of the PhD project? If yes explain**

**Appendix A:**

filled out by the advisor(s) and PhD student separately before meeting, then discuss and sign a common final version. Note: the rationale for this is to ensure that the PhD student knows how the performing is seen overall, strengths and weaknesses towards completing a PhD, and what needs to be improved. We suggest the analyzis from 1 to 5 (5 being the best).

- to identify differences in how PhD student advisor(s) considers the PhD student's progress, skills and weaknesses
- to identify areas where the PhD student needs more input from the PhD advisor(s).
- to allow the PhD student to communicate to the PhD advisor(s) where more attention or help is needed.

**Motivation****Work ethic/hardworking****Initiative****Experimental skills****Literature****Analytical abilities****Experimental design****Critical thinking****Organization/lab notebook**

**Timelines:research**

**Responsability**

**Participation lab meetings**

**Presentation skills**

**Scientific writing skills**

**Ability to work in a team**

**English level**

**Communication with PI**

**Comments**

**Signature PhD advisor**

**Signature co-PhD advisor (if any)**

**PhD advisor (s)** : I discussed the questions addressed on page 2 and 3 with the PhD student, and explained my expectations for improvement. I have also discussed a plan for Appendix B: discussion between the mentor and PhD student, together.

**Signature PhD student**

**PhD student:** Your PhD advisor(s), as your “coach” in many ways, is responsible for guiding you through your thesis research work and also helping you reach the mature scientific level of a PhD. The critical feedback of your advisor is invaluable not only to improve your progress towards a PhD, but also your continued success beyond this. Sign when you have discussed the questions addressed on page 2 and 3 with your advisor, indicating that you understand the expectations for improvement in the areas identified in the list above, and have agreed on an action plan.

---

## Appendix B

The job of the mentor is to provide the PhD student yearly contact. This is not to provide scientific advice, but instead to have an external ‘check’ on the PhD student to ensure proper stages of development are being met and to help resolve any potential conflicts that may arise between the PhD student and PhD advisor(s).

The mentor and PhD student meet at least once per year, and discuss briefly the overall well-being of the PhD student. It is imperative that confidentiality is respected, and only if / until the PhD student specifically asks the mentor to discuss any potential problems with a third party (e.g., EDCH director) in case of any serious concerns. It is also important to differentiate between serious problems and minor complaints. While it’s almost human nature to complain about one’s boss, the point of the mentor-PhD student relationship is not necessarily that of a friend – instead it is a professional relationship where advice and guidance can be given, and also serves as a checkpoint for when serious issues do arise. Furthermore, minor conflicts are common in any workplace and often arise from differences in personality, work habits, work hours, inherent messiness/organization, priorities, etc. Therefore the PhD student should not hash out things they don’t like about their PhD advisor to the mentor, but instead only discuss issues that have to do with hindering the progress of the PhD, or affecting the future career.

## Potential questions for the mentor discussion

- Do you have lab meetings and if so how often do you present your research?
- Does your advisor encourage you to attend scientific conferences on occasion?
- Do you feel that you can freely discuss problems with your advisor?
- Do you feel that you are progressing well in your PhD? If not, why not? Have you discussed with your PhD advisor?
- Are there any professional conflicts between you and your PhD advisor, or you and your co-workers? these might include authorship issues, or doing too many side-projects that are tangential to the thesis etc
- How often do you meet with your advisor? Do you feel this is too little, too much, or just right?

**Mentor's signature**

I have discussed with the PhD student aspects of well-being in the PhD project, and when relevant, suggested ways to resolve issues before they become serious. In the case of any serious problems, I have or will transfer the problem to the relevant person (EDCH director), with the consent of the PhD student.

**PhD student's signature**

Your PhD advisor(s), as your “coach” in many ways, is responsible for guiding you through your thesis research work, helping you reach the mature scientific level of a PhD. The critical feedback of your advisor is invaluable not only to improve your progress towards a PhD, but also your continued success beyond this. Sign means you have discussed these, indicating that you understand the expectations for improvement in the areas identified in the list above, and have agreed on an action plan and milestones/assessment mechanisms.

**Validation EDCH program**