

#### Go / No Go assessment – Cover sheet This version is from October 3, 2022

*Save this entire cover sheet as Word document with docu­ment name “1CoverSheet.docx” (when de­livered in Adobe Acrobat portable document format, use pdf as extension)*

##### Date, supervisory team, project

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of submission: |  |

Supervisory team

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Email |
| PhD candidate: |  |  |
| Supervisor 1: |  |  |
| Supervisor 2: |  |  |
| Supervisor 3: |  |  |
| Supervisor 4: |  |  |

Project

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of Project:  |  |
| Date of start PhD research: |  |
| Date of proposed completion of PhD research (i.e. submission to the supervisors and the doc­toral examination committee):  |  |

##### GNG product (see explanation in Part 2)

The PhD candidate is free to choose between two general formats of GNG product: 1) a full research proposal, or 2) a (revised) brief research proposal in combination with one draft chapter of the dis­sertation.

Please report and explain any deviations from these requirements below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Document name  | Mark with ‘X’ when attached |
| Full research proposal | 21Fullresearchproposal.docx |  |
| (Revised) brief research proposal | 22Briefresearchproposal.docx |  |
| Pre-registration of research | 23Preregistration.docx |  |
| Chapter: Introduction to the PhD research | 24ChapterIntroduction.docx |  |
| Chapter: Literature review | 25ChapterLiteraturereview.docx |  |
| Chapter: Empirical chapter | 26ChapterEmpiricalchapter.docx |  |
| Chapter: Other (specify) | 27ChapterOther.docx |  |

*Submitting a draft chapter assumes that the supervisors have approved the chapter as it is or with minor revisions to be made for inclusion in the dissertation.*

Explanation (required when there is a deviation from the suggested formats; otherwise not re­quired):

##### Review

Prior external review (leave blank If not applicable)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Submitted to (e.g. name journal or funding agency) | Document name  | Mark with ‘X’ when attached |
|  | 27ExternalReview.docx |  |

*Sometimes the GNG product or part of it has already been reviewed by another entity. Please report this. Whether this review can be used in the GNG procedure is decided by the GSSS director.*

Proposed reviewers of the GNG product

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name (with titles) | Position (e.g. substantive field, name of chair, affiliation) | Email |
| 1. External |  |  |  |
| 2. External |  |  |  |
| 3. External |  |  |  |
| 4. FSS internal |  | Not necessary | Not necessary |
| 5. FSS internal |  | Not necessary | Not necessary |

*Reviewers must have obtained a PhD degree. A FSS-reviewer is preferable from another scientific de­partment. Proposed reviewers are invited by the GSSS without any further notice to the candidate or supervisors. The GSSS may approach additional reviewers.*

Explanation (not required):

##### Time schedule including milestones (see explanation in Part 4)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Topic | Due date | Date completed | Comments |
| 1 | Go / No Go assessment |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |

Explanation (not required):

##### Budget plan (in €)

*This part may be delivered as separate document, e.g. in Excel format or in the format from a funding organization*

| *Year* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Research and PhD trajectory costs* |
| Data collection, field work |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Literature |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Publication fee (e.g. in cases of open access) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Translation and editing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attendance scientific conference, workshop (including accommodation, meals, travelling) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summer school or other doctoral training, not organized by the GSSS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other research related visits (to VU, Amster­dam, within the Netherlands, to abroad), in­cluding travelling and housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other travel costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Computer and other technical equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lay-out and printing thesis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Costs of graduation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel costs and accommodation opposition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tuition fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Coverage* |
| The main grant, subsidy or benchfee of your research  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The FSS-department |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Graduate Fund \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A specific scholarship, grant or subsidy from an external party |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your employer |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your own means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| After graduation VU pays €500 as royalty for your dissertation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Total coverage* |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*\* Note. Graduate Fund: In order to support PhD candidates to orientate themselves internationally and to promote a broad academic development, the GSSS provides financial support through the Graduate Fund. After their first year a PhD candidate can apply for various international activities, for instance for attending a summer school, presenting a paper at an international conference or work­shop, participation in training abroad, or conduct of fieldwork or a research stay at a foreign univer­sity. Deadlines are twice a year. Calls will be sent out approximately one month before the deadline.*

Explanation (not required):

##### Data management plan (see explanation in Part 6)[[1]](#footnote-1)

*When a GNG product is submitted that is based on data collection and the plan is that further data collections will be organized in the project, it is sufficient to only perform an ethical review and sub­mit a data management plan for the data collection on which the GNG product is based.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Document name  | Mark with ‘X’ when at­tached | Mark with ‘X’ when approved in the course RIRS |
| 6DataManagementPlan.docx |  |  |

Explanation (required when no Data management plan is submitted or when a plan has been made earlier and has been approved by an external organization):

##### Data accountability for the GNG product

*Accountability means that you, as the author, take responsibility for what you do (have done) with research data. This allows others to replicate your study, for example. A second goal is for research data to be reused by other researchers, with different research questions. You must take appropriate action and keep records to demonstrate compliance. The ‘FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship’[[2]](#footnote-2) were designed to improve the Findability, Accessibility, Interopera­bility, and Reuse of digital assets. The principles address three types of entities: data (or a digital ob­ject), metadata (information about that digital object), and infrastructure.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is the GNG product (the re­search proposal and/or draft chapter) based on empirical data? | Yes / NoIf ‘no’ proceed to the next section |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FAIR principles | Answer (or explain exception[[3]](#footnote-3)) |
| How are entities findable? Report a globally unique and persistent identifier such as a DOI or weblink to the metadata and data.[[4]](#footnote-4) |  |
| How are entities accessible? For example, report whether data and metadata are open and free to access, or whether authentica­tion and authorization are required. |  |
| Describe whether the entities are interoper­able? Report whether it is necessary to inte­grate the data with other data. This includes applications or workflows for analysis, stor­age and processing.[[5]](#footnote-5) |  |
| Describe whether the entities are reusable? Report whether (meta)data are described in such a way that they can be replicated and/or combined in different environments. This includes data use license, detailed prov­enance of research units and instruments. |  |

##### Ethics test of research (see explanation in Part 8)

*In a research project it may be necessary to carry out several tests, for example when a series of ex­periments is planned. Usually only the first ethical review is available at the time of the GNG assess­ment. When data are analyzed that are available in an archive, it can often be assumed that the ethi­cal review has already taken place.*

*The candidate and the supervisors may find it desirable to include the ethical aspects of the research in the GNG review. In that case, an additional document is sent to the reviewers.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Document name  | Mark with ‘X’ when result is attached |
| FSS Self-test | 8EthicsTestST.docx |  |
| Review by FSS Research Eth­ics Review Committee(only if required as result of the self-test) | 8EthicsTestRERC.docx |  |
| Review by other committee (e.g. METC) | 8EthicsTestOther.docx |  |
| Document to be sent to the GNG reviewers | 8EthicsElaboration.docx |  |

Explanation (required when no self-test is conducted or when the research has been reviewed by an external organization):

##### Authorship – compliance with rules for the research

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please explain and justify the authorship of the re­search proposal[[6]](#footnote-6) |  |
| Please explain and justify the authorship of the draft chapter of the dissertation[[7]](#footnote-7) |  |
| The candidate is first author of all work directly related to the PhD project[[8]](#footnote-8) | Yes / No |

##### Plagiarism check of GNG product

*The purpose of using a tool such as plagiarism scanner of a dissertation is to make the PhD candidate more aware of scientific integrity, prevent plagiarism, and if it occurs, recognize it as early as possi­ble. The check becomes mandatory from January 1, 2023 for the GNG product and for the thesis as a whole. [[9]](#footnote-9)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Has a plagiarism scan been per­formed? | Yes / No |
| If not, please provide an explana­tion. |  |
| If yes, write a report (a fill-in document is available on the GSSS web­site) and respond to the following items |  |
| 1. The test provided con­vincing evidence that plagiarism is un­likely
 | Yes / No  |
| 1. The results of the scan are stored in your personal folder, in a durable and accessible manner.
 | Yes / No  |
| 1. The report of the procedure is sent to ithenticate.fsw@vu.nl.
 | Yes / No |
| 1. This report was submitted with this document (10Plagiarismcheckreport.docx)
 | Yes / No |

##### Plan for doctorate training

*At the time of the GNG assessment 10 EC in doctorate training should be completed (and registered and approved in Hora Finita) in case of a four-year project. There may be deviations from this re­quire­ment if so decided in agreement with the GSSS program manager.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course or activity | EC | Approved by GS | Starting date | Mark with ‘X’ if com­pleted | Mark with ‘X’ if registered in Hora Finita |
| Induction | 1 | yes |  |  |  |
| Research Integrity and Responsible Scholarship | 3 | yes |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Exemptions granted by the GSSS (if applicable):

Further explanation (not required):

##### Statement of the supervisors that the candidate and the project are in good stand­ing

*This statement is provided to the PhD candidate by the supervisors. The PhD candidate may deliver the statement on behalf of the supervisors*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Short description of evidence | Mark with ‘X’ if ap­pli­ca­ble |
| Candidate has sufficient capacities for PhD research |  |  |
| Research progress and results are convincing and promising |  |  |
| Candidate is on track |  |  |
| Candidate is expected to finish in time (nominal is normal) |  |  |
| Candidate is on route to become an independent re­searcher |  |  |
| The frequency of contact between candidate and supervisors is at least once in two or three weeks; or less if so agreed upon (explain in next column) |  |  |
| The supervisors provide feedback based on which a candidate is able to improve his/her work |  |  |
| When giving feedback, the supervisors write down their comments |  |  |

Statement delivered by (name supervisor):

Explanation (not required):

##### ‘Annual’ consultation between candidate and supervisors

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date of meeting | Who were present? | Main conclusions |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*Candidates and supervisors have regular conversations about how the project is going. For good co­operation, optimal performance and growth of the candidate, it is important that the candidate and the supervisors have regular discussions with each other. This involves a discussion of those topics that may be less likely to come up in the day-to-day hectic. Through discussion and feedback, the can­didate knows what is expected of her or him and the candidate and supervisors can tighten agree­ments, organize tasks differently or set other priorities in time. It can also be discussed whether the frequency and nature of the supervision meets the needs of the candidates, and whether cooper­ation in the team is optimal. The career wishes of the candidate are also discussed. Work pressure, social well-being and social safety, and working conditions are also topics of discussion. This conver­sation takes place at least once a year, in the first year it is before the GNG submission. For employed candi­dates, this conversation takes place as part of the 'annual interview'.*

Explanation (required where no annual consultation has taken place):

##### Delayed submission of GNG product

*At the start of the project, a commitment was made to perform the project work and to present the results at agreed upon times. These moments are the GNG date (at 8/48 of the project time) and the date of completion of the PhD portfolio and the manuscript. There may be weighty reasons or cir­cumstances to deviate from the GNG date. Often we can understand the choices made within the project team, or see that the circumstances that led to the late submission were beyond your control. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the original agreements were not kept. That is why the GSSS reg­isters a later hand-in of the GNG as a delay[[10]](#footnote-10), and why the GSSS always asks for an adjusted plan­ning, possibly including the cancellation of parts of project work. We also ask about the measures taken to prevent recurrence of delay. This revision of the plan and the measures are discussed as early as pos­sible[[11]](#footnote-11) with the candidate and the supervisors. The working method will be elaborated.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is the submission of the GNG product later than the date agreed upon during intake? | Yes / No |
| If ‘yes’, what was the reason for delayed submission? | Yes / No / n.a. |
| If ‘yes’, is it plausible that this will not result in a later submission of the manuscript than agreed upon at the start of the pro­ject? | Yes / No / n.a. |
|  | If ‘yes’, please give an explanation |  |
|  | If ‘no’, calculate the expected duration of the delay (see below). (-) Provide an adjusted schedule as an Excel sheet. (-) Explain in the box on the right what has been adapted (see H below) |  |

n.a. = not applicable

Calculating of the expected duration of the delay[[12]](#footnote-12)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Date | Months |
| A | When was the start of the project (as recorded in Hora Finita) |  |  |
| B | What was the date agreed upon at intake for submission of the GNG product |  |  |
| C | What was the date of return of the GNG product |  |  |
| D | What was the intended date of submission of the manuscript (as recorded in Hora Finita) |  |  |
| E | Based on A-D, calculate the delay of submission of GNG product; E = C-B |  |  |
| F | Based on A-D, calculate the possible delay of submission of the manuscript; F = (C-B) / (B-A) \* (D-A) |  |  |
| G | Result of F (formatted as date) |  |  |
| H | Indicate1. How the schedule will be adjusted so that [F] months less work will be done than origi­nally intended, while still allowing for a rating of the thesis track as satisfactory[[13]](#footnote-13);
2. How other activities of the candidate (such as teaching) will be given less priority;
3. How the working method within the project team will be changed.
 |

##### Finally

Do you have any suggestions to make the GNG procedure or this form more user-friendly? Please help the Graduate School and your future colleagues with suggestions:

1. For matters on data management, ethics and privacy you can contact Koen Leuveld (k.leuveld@vu.nl). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/
Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., ... & Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific data*, *3*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. If data cannot be made available due to confidentiality or other concerns, then this should be stated, together with a description of how and under which conditions others could potentially access the data. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Entities shall be deposited in repositories that meet accepted criteria as trustworthy digital repositories. Personal websites, links to subscription-based online storage facilities (Dropbox, Google Drive, SURFdrive, et cetera), and other repositories that do not ensure persistence are not acceptable. In general, acceptable code and data repositories provide persistent identifiers, such as digital object identifiers (DOIs) or accession numbers, and maintain robust long-term archives. For example, the Open Science Framework includes the ability to generate a permanent archive with DOI. Authors are encouraged to cite the used repositories as part of the references or otherwise in the manuscript. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Examples are experiment protocols and code that has been used to select and edit data (also known as syntax). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This is not a formal requirement, but given the importance of authorship, we would like to have it documented. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. According to the VU Doctorate Regulations paragraph 16.5. If there is more than one author, give a full and sufficiently detailed account of each author's contributions. For examples see the GSSS document 'Authorship in a PhD project'. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. According to the FSS regulations, approved by the Faculty at March 22, 2021 and the College of Deans, and following the VU Doctorate Regulations paragraph 16.2. Please visit <https://vu.nl/en/about-vu/more-about/the-graduate-school-of-social-sciences> > Requirements for the dissertation > Rules for the PhD thesis. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Freely accessible software is available, for example, at https://www.grammarly.com/plagiarism-checker. However, we require a check using VU licensed software from iThenticate. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This is administered by the GSSS in its own archive (and not in Hora Finita). It is also included in the decision letter received by the candidate, supervisors, reviewers, and department head. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. That is shortly after the receipt of this GNG form – we hope within three weeks. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Please use the Excel sheet for the calculation. The sheet is available at <https://vu.nl/en/about-vu/more-about/the-graduate-school-of-social-sciences> > Assessments during your PhD trajectory > VU-GSSS Go No Go assessment - calculation of delay.xlsx [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Read about Rules for the PhD thesis: <https://vu.nl/en/about-vu/more-about/the-graduate-school-of-social-sciences> > Requirements for the dissertation; Read about the assessment criteria: <https://vu.nl/en/about-vu/more-about/the-graduate-school-of-social-sciences> > Completion of the PhD trajectory: from dissertation to defense > Assessment of the quality and scope of the PhD thesis. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)