Dear ILLC staff and PhD candidates,

As most of you know, the ILLC annually evaluates its status as a working environment for PhD students by means of the PVC (Promotievoortgangscommissie, or PhD Progress Committee). Herewith I would like to present to you the report of the PVC 2013. This report, and the response of the ILLC Management Team to it, have already been discussed at the ILLC Current Affairs Meeting of 13 September 2013; the aim of this message is to briefly record our response in writing.

First of all, I would like to thank the members of this year's PVC, Paul Dekker (chair), Marijn Koolen, Cheryl Moolhuijzen (secretary), Peter van Ormondt (support), Leen Torenvliet and Henk Zeevat, for their efforts. We think of the PVC as an important instrument for our PhD students to provide qualitative information about their situation, and for the ILLC management to maintain a high quality of our PhD programme. We intend to continue with the PVC talks, following the same set-up as in past editions.

Second, as announced already at various occasions, the ILLC intends to restructure its PhD training programme. For this purpose, a committee headed by Sonja Smets, has written a plan, in coordination with the ILLC Management Team and the PhD council. We are now entering the stage of discussing this document with the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Science, and will widely announce the plans once they have been agreed on with these parties.

Finally, concerning the concrete recommendations of the PVC 2013, let me inform you of the following response of the ILLC Management Team.

1. The ILLC MT agrees that preferably every PhD student has two supervisors.
2. We agree that it should be clear to PhD students what their rights, responsibilities and duties are, and what kind of supervision they can expect. Clearly the OBP is the primary document for writing this down, but on the other hand, it is not realistic to expect that the OBP is totally comprehensive.
3. It is the explicit policy of the ILLC to establish as much uniformity for all PhDs as possible. In fact, one of the main goals of the new PhD plan is to work towards this.
4. We appreciate it when PhD candidates do the BKO, and they are free to do so. However, students should realise that this training can be rather time-consuming. The ILLC MT will not acknowledge the BKO training as replacing the general teaching obligations.
5. We intend to address the issue of supplementary courses in the plan for the new ILLC PhD training programme.
6. We support the idea of changing the name of the Logic Tea, but it is up to the organisers of the Logic Tea to decide on this.
7. It has been agreed already last year that the members of the PVC act as confidants, to which PhD candidates can turn to with complaints, worries or problems. The names of the PVC members are mentioned on the ILLC website.

Best wishes,
Yde Venema
Director, ILLC