**Individual Follow-up Committee Report**

**(to be sent to** [**sec-edsmre@univ-lille.fr**](mailto:sec-edsmre@univ-lille.fr) **no later than 15 days after the committee meeting)**

PhD student :

Thesis supervisor :

Co-supervisor :

Co-management (*if applicable*) :

Thesis title :

Type of funding :

Funding dates (*start - end*) :

Full-time ou part-time thesis ? (*if part-time, % of time devoted to thesis*) :

Hosting laboratory/lab(s):

Registration institution(s) (*in the case of joint PhD thesis, please indicate the partner institution*) :

Date of 1st enrolment in the doctoral program:

1st meeting 2nd meeting 3rd meeting or more (please specify) of the follow-up committee\*

\*From the 3rd meeting onwards the presence of a DED id compulsory

Date of the committee meeting: Place :

List of members (including guests[[1]](#footnote-1) – Add as many lines as mecessary) :

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Last name, first name | Grade (PR, DR, Assistant Prof., Researcher, doctor…) | Acting as[[2]](#footnote-2) | Lab/ Team | University/organisation | Email adress |
|  |  | specialist member |  |  |  |
|  |  | Non-specialist member |  |  |  |
|  |  | invited |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Chair of the committee[[3]](#footnote-3)**:

**Individual Follow-up Committee Report**

*The members of the ISC undertake to respect the confidentiality of the scientific (and non-scientific) information resulting from the interviews. They undertake to conduct a one-to-one interview with the doctoral student (without the supervisory team), and then with the supervisory team (without the doctoral student).*

**Progress of research work**

Quality of the doctoral student's presentation or report:

Scientific knowledge and understanding of the subject:

Technical skills:

Management of the thesis project (specify, for example, the stages followed and completed, results obtained, difficulties encountered, etc.):

Can the thesis deadlines be met?

*(If not, specify the minimum extension required and the potential source of funding. The committee must clearly indicate whether the PhD student is in a position to defend his/her doctorate within the allotted time. If difficulties of any kind have been mentioned, are they detrimental to the progress of the thesis?)*

**Scientific output/valorisation** *(The following data should be updated in the ADUM account by the doctoral student)*

Participation in an international conference: have the results been presented at an international symposium/conference in the past year: oral communication, poster *(indicate the international symposium/conference, place and date)?*

In terms of production, has a publication already been produced or is one planned between now and the end of the thesis? How are the results being published *(the committee should indicate whether an article has been published/reviewed/submitted/drafted)*?

Other type of output (*e.g. patent*) :

**Training and skills development:**

Has the PhD student received training in ethics and scientific integrity? If so, which one?

Has the PhD student been made aware of the challenges of open science and the dissemination of research work in society in order to strengthen relations between scientists and citizens?

What training courses have been taken (courses, thematic schools, seminar cycles, etc.) to enhance his/her scientific culture? (Specify if the PhD student has additional needs):

Has the doctoral student taken one or more training courses, workshops or meetings to prepare for a career in the public or private sector?

What professional skills remain to be developed for the thesis project?

Prospects and career paths envisaged after the thesis *(Has the professional project been defined? Description of after-thesis project and/or alternative project. Has the doctoral student been helped to formalise his/her career plan? Has he/she sought information?)*

Has the doctoral student done any teaching during the past year?

 No  Yes (*specify level and number of hours*)

**Doctoral training environment and conditions** *(this part will be discussed with the doctoral student without the thesis supervision and management team):*

Quality of supervision:

Quality of the doctoral student's integration into the laboratory (participation in seminars, advice, etc.) :

Opportunity to develop his/her scientific culture:

International openness (possibility of mobility, collaborations, etc.) :

Relational difficulties or issues, material needs, possible environmental problems :

**Discussion and recommendations:**

Research progress:

 Satisfactory  Unsatisfactory

General assessment *(indicate the positive points and those to be consolidated, including the training plan)*:

Progress of the project and general assessment:

Recommendations from the committee members for the continuation of the thesis[[4]](#footnote-4) :

The monitoring committee would like to draw attention to any particular points of concern regarding the continuation of the thesis:

 No  Yes (specify)

The committee alerts the doctoral school[[5]](#footnote-5):  No  Yes

**Conclusion of the committee :**

Opinion on the continuation of the thesis into ….. year

 favorable  reserved\*

*\* Details on committee reserves*

**Date et Visas :**

Chair of the committee:

PhD student: Thesis supervisor : Head of the laboratory: Director of Doctoral Studies:

Director of Doctoral School :

**Reminder:**

- The Order of 26 August 2022 stipulates that the committee must make recommendations and send a report to the doctoral school management, the doctoral student and the thesis director.

- The report is drawn up under the responsibility of the Chair of the Committee.

- The report must follow the standard report (template) proposed by the doctoral school. All sections must be documented.

- For applications for registration in 4th year or more, a detailed report is compulsory, specifying the planned date for the defence.

- The report will be submitted to the doctoral school management once the chair of the committee, the doctoral student, the thesis director, the unit director and the Director of Doctoral Studies has approved it.

- The doctoral school then distributes the signed report to all parties.

1. Committee members do not participate in the PhD student's work. They may not act as reviewers. The thesis supervisor attends the committee as a guest [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Indicate in acting as :

   - Specialist member in the discipline or field of the thesis (from outside the institutions and laboratories of the doctoral school),

   - non-specialist member from outside the field of the thesis (doctoral speciality different from that of the doctoral student, from outside the laboratory),

   - doctoral school referent (DED),

   - guest (member of the supervisory team and others).

   At least one of the two external members must be an HDR.

   Except in special cases, the committee will be chaired by a member from outside the hosting niversity. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Except in special cases, the committee will be chaired by a member from outside the hosting university. He/she is responsible for drafting the final committee report and signs it. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In the event of a derogatory application to enrol in the 4th year, does the committee propose any recommendations for staggering the end of the thesis until the defence? In the case of an exceptional application for enrolment in 4th year, the committee should check and mention the planned funding. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The committee must be particularly vigilant in identifying any form of conflict, discrimination, moral or sexual harassment or sexist behaviour, breach of research ethics or scientific integrity, or any conflict of interest. In the event of difficulties being identified, they undertake to immediately alert the doctoral school management, taking care to ensure the confidentiality of what may have been discussed during the interviews, in order to initiate mediation. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)