

### **1<sup>st</sup> Thesis Advisory Committee Meeting**

**attending 1 chairperson, 1 supervisor, 2 additional TAC members, 1 PhD candidate**

*(to take place approx. 6 to 9 months after the beginning of the student's working contract)*

#### General Notes

The Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC) will act as the review panel and also allows for any problems, scientific or otherwise, to be aired and discussed as appropriate. The purpose of this 1<sup>st</sup> TAC is to ensure that the student has understood the aim and scientific background of the PhD project and has already made initial progress with experimental work.

At the UniVie the PhD candidate writes a research proposal ('exposé') describing the background, aims and experimental plan of their future work as requested by the University of Vienna, followed by a presentation at the faculty ('FÖP') and the conclusion of the doctoral thesis agreement. The 1<sup>st</sup> TAC should take place before the submission of the research proposal (but not mandatory).

#### Meeting format:

- PhD candidate gives 'public presentation' of project (max. 20 minutes): including introduction, key proof-of-principle experiments and results, timeline and resources. The presentation should focus on key points the committee needs to assess the project
- Discussion about the project (max. 10 minutes)
- Thesis committee meeting with PhD candidate only (10 minutes)/with supervisor only (10 minutes)
- The TAC will
  - Assess the match PhD candidate <-> project
  - Check the PhD candidate-supervisor relationship
  - Assess the PhD candidates' skills
- Finalizing and signing of all forms (meeting summary and completed research proposal)

#### 2 Weeks before the meeting:

- The PhD candidate must have completed the research proposal (exposé) as a draft version to be sent to the supervisor and cc to Sigrid Hager (SH).
- The research proposal as draft version will be distributed to the Thesis Advisory Committee by SH.

#### During the meeting:

- The chairperson shall complete the TAC meeting summary and guide the committee through the discussion points the following skills should be accessed:
  - Think and communicate clear
  - General knowledge on the topic
  - Experimental approaches
  - Critical thinking and insights
  - Motivation and project ownership
- The committee and supervisor will decide if the PhD candidate meets the expectations and communicate this adequately

#### After the meeting:

- Submission of the finalized research proposal, registration for the public presentation of the research project by the PhD candidate (<https://ssc-lebenswissenschaften.univie.ac.at>), cc to SH.
- Signing of the doctoral thesis agreement, cc to SH.

## 1<sup>st</sup> THESIS COMMITTEE MEETING – PHD CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT

PhD Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ PhD contract start date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of presentation: \_\_\_\_\_ Expected PhD Completion date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor I: \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor II: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of research project: \_\_\_\_\_

Please assess the PhD candidates' skills (pls. tick where appropriate):

	Does not meet expectations	Needs improvement	Meets expectations
Communication			
General knowledge on the topic			
Experimental approach			
Critical thinking and insight			
Motivation			
Independence			

1. Is the PhD candidate pursuing an appropriate question?

No  Yes

2. Do you recommend the current PhD project to be continued?

No  Yes

3. Please comment in case of a negative assessment.

For a positive assessment, what specific recommendations were made to the PhD candidate?

I have attended this meeting and agree with the Evaluation (please sign):

Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ PhD candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee member: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee member: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee member: \_\_\_\_\_

**2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Thesis Advisory Committee Meeting:**  
**attending 1 chairperson, 1 supervisor, 2 additional TAC members, 1 PhD candidate**  
*(to take place approx. 12 and 24 months respectively, after signing the doctoral thesis agreement)*

General Notes

At the UniVie the PhD candidate writes an annual progress report where changes need to be documented. For many funding schemes (e.g. dissertation completion fellowship) studying according to the UniVie regulations is required, including the submission of annual progress reports. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> TAC should take place before the submission of the annual progress report (but not mandatory).

Within the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> TAC there will be discussion and assessment of:

- What are the PhD candidate goals/achievements/problems?
- Is the PhD candidate on a good track to become an independent scientist?
- Is the proposed plan realistic?
- The TAC will check that:
  - Expectations and progress perception of PhD candidate and supervisor are aligned
  - Regular meetings are happening
  - Resources and support are in place or targeted
- Schedule next meeting

The 3<sup>rd</sup> TAC will check in addition:

- Resources and support are in place, including funding for the remainder of the PhD (and a potential extension if needed)
- Proposed plan for publication(s) and/or the PhD thesis writing and defense
- Is there a need for another meeting (note that another meeting is required if an extension to a fifth year is proposed)? If yes, schedule next meeting.

Meeting format for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> TAC:

- The project presentation (20 min.) should start with a brief introduction, covering a review of the last meeting (outcomes/report) and an updated assessment of the relevance of the project (i.e. how relevant and promising is the project today?)
- The presentation should avoid technical details and focus on the key points needed to assess the project and/or for which advice is wanted.
- The TAC will offer:
  - Monitor project progression: what is the major progress and what are potential bottlenecks?
  - Outlook: what are the goals for the next year?
  - Feedback on the proposed outlook, keeping in mind the timeline
  - If needed propose/advise revision to the original proposal
  - Finalizing and signing of all forms (TAC meeting summary and completed annual progress report)

2 Weeks before the meeting:

- The student must have completed the annual progress report as a draft version to be sent to the supervisor and cc to SH.
- The annual progress report as a draft version will be distributed to the committee by SH.

During the meeting:

- The chairperson shall complete the TAC meeting summary and guide the committee through the discussion points, the following skills should be accessed:
  - Think and communicate clear
  - General knowledge on the topic
  - Experimental approaches
  - Critical thinking and insights
  - Motivation and project ownership
- The committee and supervisor will decide if the PhD candidate meets the expectations and communicate this adequately

After the meeting:

- Submission of the finalized annual progress report (<https://ssc-lebenswissenschaften.univie.ac.at>), cc to SH.

## 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> THESIS COMMITTEE MEETING – PhD CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT

PhD Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ PhD contract start date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of presentation: \_\_\_\_\_ Expected PhD Completion date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor I: \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor II: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of research project: \_\_\_\_\_

Please assess the PhD candidates' skills (pls. tick where appropriate):

	Does not meet expectations	Needs improvement	Meets expectations
Communication			
General knowledge on the topic			
Experimental approach			
Critical thinking and insight			
Motivation			
Independence			

1. How do you assess the **project's progress**?

Good  \*Needs further discussion

2. Are **resources and support** (e.g. funding) in place and/or targeted?

Yes  \*Needs further discussion

3. Is the **proposed plan for publications** aligned with the supervisor?

Yes  \*Needs further discussion

*\* If one of these options is selected, an additional Thesis Committee meeting MUST be scheduled within 6 months.*

4. What specific recommendations were made to the PhD candidate? Have there been any changes to the research proposal that could affect the estimated PhD completion date?

I have attended this meeting and agree with the Evaluation (please sign):

Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ PhD candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee member: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee member: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee member: \_\_\_\_\_