

Framework and guidelines for PhDs at CEMO

Table of Contents

Framework and guidelines for PhDs at CEMO.....	1
1. A culture of mutual trust and respect	2
2. Expectations and responsibilities	3
3. Recommendations for meeting routines	3
4. Other requirements	3
5. (Co-) authorship of papers.....	4
6. A brief note on ethical conduct in research at CEMO.....	6
7. Required duties.....	6
8. Conference participation	7
9. Mobility	8
10. Support and funding	8
11. The training component.....	9
12. The public defense of the thesis	11
13. Milestones	14
Appendix A: Midway Assessment and Final Review	15
PhD Midway Assessment.....	15
PhD Final Review	18
Appendix B: Individual Development Plan	19
Appendix C: Declaration of Co-authorship and PhD candidate's contribution	21
Appendix D: Documentation of conference contribution	22

These guidelines fully apply to PhD candidates employed at CEMO from 2018 and onwards. For those who started earlier individual adjustments have to be made that take into account the stage of their PhD.

Oslo, May 3rd, 2021

Faculty of Educational Sciences

For reasons of quality assurance and a joint understanding of the PhD process, the main supervisors and PhD candidates from CEMO are encouraged to discuss and mutually agree regarding how to work with each other. This document describes in some detail the internal procedure for how a PhD-project should be initiated, established and maintained. Furthermore, the document describes expectations and responsibilities for both the candidate and supervisor(s).

Supervision of a PhD candidate needs to seek a balance between support by the supervisor and independent development of the candidate. CEMO complies with the guidelines defined by the Faculty of Education:

<http://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/supervision/duties-and-rights/>.

Both the candidate and the supervisor should be well informed about these guidelines and other formalities of the program listed in the regulations of the PhD programme to be found at <https://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/>. This document specifies additional or more specific guidelines, recommendations and expectations for the PhD candidate and the supervisor at CEMO.

In the following reference is given to Stage 1 and Stage 2 PhDs. PhDs in their first two years are regarded as Stage 1 PhDs. Stage 2 PhDs have completed their midterm evaluation and started with their last two years. The document ends with a section listing specific milestones in a PhD project with a normal progression. In addition, the document contains three helpful appendixes.

1. A culture of mutual trust and respect

Being a PhD is not like any other job:

- The major milestone - the thesis defence - is for most of the time very distant (and there will be moments, days and even weeks when it is hard to imagine how it is possible to proceed in order to finalize and deliver the thesis). This creates uncertainty and unpredictability. Working hours may also vary substantially from one period to the next.
- Being a PhD involves relationships with seniors where the power balance often is perceived to be skewed. Some PhDs at CEMO have previous experiences from countries where this relationship is much more top-down. In general, the Norwegian society is characterised by being egalitarian. This implies that although the supervisor and PhD candidate have different roles and function, both are regarded as having equal value in the organisation, and both should exercise their freedom to speak and raise critique – without fear of negative consequences.
- A PhD position involves a high degree of autonomy. This autonomy is executed within constraints. Such constraints are for instance the rules and regulations for the degree of PhD, economic or other resource limitations, ethical standards, and not the least the core values and standards for research as implemented for instance through peer-review. Hence, with the autonomy also comes responsibility.

Given these characteristics for the PhD, CEMO seeks to build and continuously maintain a culture characterised by mutual trust and respect, curiosity and openness to new ideas, and a sense of community where everyone experiences that his/her efforts also are important for reaching the joint goals set for the organisation. The following sections specify in more details how these overarching characteristics of CEMO and the PhDs should be realised.

Faculty of Educational Sciences

2. Expectations and responsibilities

Supervisors are expected to provide guidance in terms of reading suggestions, constructive feedback, progress monitoring, classes and professional development, introducing the candidate to the international community, career advice and keeping track of the timeline (including mid-term and final evaluations).

In the first weeks and months of their employment, PhD candidates are expected to develop the specific research topics they want to work on in agreement with their supervisors. In addition, the PhD-candidates need to work continuously on developing, maintaining and revising a timeline and a “to-do”-list, which is regarded as vital for a timely and successful outcome. The candidates are expected to prepare for meetings with their supervisor and to work steadily towards the dissertation defence (including asking actively for support if needed).

Furthermore, PhD candidates are requested to follow the PhD program at the Faculty of Education (see more in section 11). Specifically, candidates should deliver part A and B of the “Application form and admission agreement” to the Faculty of Educational Sciences within four weeks after starting the position. It is recommended that they prioritise taking classes in the beginning of the contract because it will be helpful in the process of writing scientific articles later. A more specific outline for recommended courses is provided below.

To support and document the joint work of supervisor and PhD candidate, the Individual Development Plan (IDP) should be used as a tool, in particular during the first year (see Appendix B). The first draft IDP should be completed and delivered to the supervisor and CEMO’s PhD coordinator within the first three months. Furthermore, a complete project description should be delivered to the supervisor within six months

3. Recommendations for meeting routines

In line with the walk-in-door policy in place at CEMO, supervisors should be available for quick questions when they are in their office and the door is open.

Short update meetings about progress of the PhD work should take place roughly every month during the semester (this may be more frequent in the beginning and less frequent at the end of a contract).

Extended meetings with discussions of specific work packages of a PhD candidate and his/her progress should happen about once a semester (i.e., approximately every six months; this may be more frequent in the beginning and less frequent at the end of a contract). The individual development plan enclosed (see Appendix B) may help in preparing for these meetings.

In addition, some PhDs are associated with a larger project with regular project meetings. Moreover, work meetings will be organised among co-authors of papers, posters or conference presentations with specific focus on issues relating to the analysis of data and writing of the paper.

4. Other requirements

PhD candidates should use the opportunity to present their work at informal seminars to receive feedback from colleagues. For Stage 1 PhDs this activity is organized as part of the compulsory Research Seminar within the PhD program of the Faculty of Education. This seminar requires that all candidates must present and receive feedback on their project plan in their first

Faculty of Educational Sciences

semester and that the candidates act as opponents for another candidate's project plan once throughout the Research Seminar. The presentation should happen well within the first 6 months to ensure active use of the feedback before the project description is delivered to the supervisor (see section 2).

In addition, it is expected that all PhD-candidates contribute gradually more in our internal biweekly brown bag seminar. It is expected that towards the end of stage 1, PhDs should be able to present and discuss results from ongoing work in their project. For Stage 2 PhDs it is expected that specific work is presented once every semester.

Once every year (November) the candidate and the supervisor(s) are asked to deliver a brief progress report through a web-form. As a follow-up of this report, a feedback meeting (*medarbeidersamtale*) is organised in December every year between the PhD candidate and the PhD coordinator¹ regarding progress, relation to the supervisor and job duties not related to the thesis ("arbeidsplikt"; see section 6 for more details).

Halfway through the contract, the midway evaluation takes place, and some time prior to delivery of the final thesis (2-3 months) a 90 % evaluation with feedback is organised. For more information about internal routines at CEMO in this respect, see Appendix A.

The Faculty of Education provides information about the final evaluation:

<http://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/thesis-evaluation/index.html>

5. (Co-) authorship of papers

As a general principle, it is recommended to deliver a paper-based thesis in English. This increases the visibility of the candidate's work to the community of researchers. Furthermore, learning to write papers, react to reviews and resubmit is an important generic competence, and being able to document experience with publications is very helpful for qualifying candidates for future careers in academia. Depending on the specific context of the thesis, there may however be situations where a monography is the best choice, and/or where the thesis is delivered (partly) in Norwegian (for instance in the case of a "Offentlig sector/Næringslivs PhD")

Normally, a thesis consists of three papers. In addition, an extended abstract (kappe) is delivered as part of the thesis. For more specific requirements for paper-based theses see https://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/thesis-evaluation/thesis_guidelines/. At the time of delivery, it is recommended that at least one paper is published, one is accepted with major/minor revisions and the third one is submitted.

CEMO strives to follow the Vancouver rules. All the following four criteria have to apply before a co-authorship is awarded:

- a. Substantial contributions to the work published in terms of conception, design, data acquisition, analysis, OR interpretation;
- b. Active participation in the writing process in terms of drafting OR critically revising the manuscript for important intellectual content;
- c. Final approval of the version to be published;
- d. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

¹ If both the PhD-coordinator is the supervisor, the Centre Director steps in. If both are joint supervisor for a candidate, one of the other (associate) professors at CEMO should replace them.

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Collaboration within research projects or in terms of supervision typically means that intellectual work from all sides goes into a paper. This justifies a co-authorship under the condition that project members or supervisors have also taken part actively as specified above. In addition, it is recommended that authors agree at the beginning of the collaboration on how disagreement with regard to authorship will be handled.

All potential authors and co-authors should agree upon their role in the writing process and the expected order of authorship before the process starts. Adjustments can be made during the process until the very end but they have to be justified by strong arguments and should be based upon rules set beforehand. It is a requirement that all co-authored papers submitted as part of a PhD-thesis at the Faculty of Educational Sciences are accompanied by a Declaration of Co-authorship. In addition to declaring that all authors have made a significant contribution to the paper (generally expressed in terms as stated in a - d above) this document should pay close attention to documenting the PhD-candidate's specific contribution in the paper. Appendix C is a form which should be delivered with the thesis, one form for each of the papers. The form should be completed and signed prior to or immediately after submitting the paper. Please do not postpone completing this form until the thesis is to be delivered. Co-authors may have moved or may otherwise be unavailable at that time.

The four principles of the Vancouver declaration are generic guidelines for co-authorship. In the PhD/supervisor context, it is relevant to note the "OR" in criterion b: It is recommended that supervisors normally restrain from drafting a substantial amount of the text, but that they satisfy this criterion mainly by critically revising the manuscript. This would help facilitate a process whereby all co-authors would agree that the PhD-candidate is the natural first author of the paper. There may still be situations where the final manuscript is not of a sufficient quality and would require a more active participation from the supervisor or one of the other co-authors. This should be reflected in the scoring of the criteria in the declaration form.

Since it is natural for a PhD candidate to have supervisors and other project members as co-authors, s/he may want to include one independent article. In addition, it should also be noted that variation in co-authors supports further career aspirations, including building networks and collaboration outside a particular project. However, such activities should not come at the expense of the actual PhD thesis (for example, by taking up too much time).

There may be situations where the above stated recommendations would not be the optimal solution. In some cases, a thesis will only consist of co-authored papers, and moreover, it may happen that the thesis includes one or more papers where the PhD-candidate is not the first author. This would typically be relevant in situations where PhD candidates are attached to a larger overarching project where the supervisor is the principle investigator. In such cases, it is recommended that the thesis include four papers, where the candidate is the first author of at least two. Otherwise, the candidate will risk that the adjudication committee will conclude that the amount of independent contribution from the candidate is not adequate. The guidelines for assessing PhD-thesis has a clear statement that this is an aspect the committee should consider carefully.²

² <https://www.uio.no/english/about/regulations/research/doctoral-degree/drgrbedeng.html>

«The committee shall assess whether the doctoral candidate's specific efforts on the works in question can be identified and whether the doctoral candidate is wholly responsible for a sufficiently large portion of the dissertation».

Faculty of Educational Sciences

In order to increase readability and quality, all CEMO team members with another first language than English are encouraged to use a language-editing service before they submit their papers. CEMO has a list of recommended services based on prior positive experiences. PhD candidates' costs for these services are covered by the research group FREMO.

6. A brief note on ethical conduct in research at CEMO

There are general ethical guidelines for supervision at the University of Oslo. The candidate and supervisor should read these carefully, and if there are issues or questions coming up from reading these guidelines, this should be brought up explicitly in a supervision meeting. See <https://www.uio.no/english/about/regulations/ethical-guidelines/ethical-guidelines-supervisors/index.html>

Declaration of co-authorship is one example of a routine to ensure that PhDs and other researchers at CEMO conduct their research in line with accepted guiding principles for ethics in the research community. In addition, the following rules should be followed:

- All published papers should be self-archived in Cristin. As a minimum a post-print version of the manuscript should be uploaded to the Cristin system. The library will make this available according to the copyright rules for the publisher.
- All researchers collecting and storing data are required to have a Data Management Plan³.
- There are a range of laws and regulations regarding consent and storing/sharing of data containing (i) information which can be used to identify persons, or (ii) person sensitive information. As a rule, all PhD's should run the self-check available at the homepage of NSD⁴, and act accordingly.

This section should not be perceived as exhaustive regarding ethical conduct in research. The course on Research Ethics is a compulsory component of the training component, and this will give all PhDs the possibility to reflect further on the wide range of ethical aspects of their research⁵.

7. Required duties

PhD candidates at CEMO are usually offered a four-year position. 75% of the time is devoted to work on the thesis and the course program while 25% should be filled with other duties at the Centre. This 25% time for other duties offers possibilities to gain experience from core tasks involved in academic positions at a university beyond research. Decision about this work is made by the CEMO director who should confer with the MAE-coordinator and the supervisor. In general, CEMO should harmonise the amount and types of duty work with the practice at the other institutes at the faculty. It should also be noted that taking part in seminars, project meetings and joint meetings at CEMO is not regarded as duty work.

First and foremost, the PhD-candidate should be given the opportunity to (co-)teach and to (co-)supervise students in the CEMO MAE program, but s/he can be included in other types of relevant research, teaching, committee work and administration activities at CEMO as well. Documentation of experience with teaching, supervision and other administrative tasks are vital

³ This page is a collection of useful information regarding data management <https://www.uio.no/english/for-employees/support/research/research-data-management/index.html> .

⁴ See <https://www.nsd.no/en>

⁵ See <https://www.uio.no/english/for-employees/support/research/ethics/> for more on research ethics at UiO

Faculty of Educational Sciences

components in a CV to be evaluated in future job applications. Possible duty work activities are listed below:

- Each PhD would normally be associated with (at least) one of the courses given in the MAE each semester
- The teaching would for the most part consist of organising/helping with labs/workshops/seminars and evaluating exams
- In Stage 2 it is expected that the candidate also contribute with lecturing of a few selected topics in a course (2-4 lectures). Also, in stage 2 candidates should aim at (co-) supervising one thesis
- The ambition is that each candidate will be allocated duties in the same course over time – thus supporting a gradually increased potential to contribute more independently over time
- If a PhD candidate follows the course as part of his/her training, the person should not have duties related to the course
- If possible or necessary, the duties will be reduced during the start-up and finishing phase of the PhD
- Some duties may be related to planning and organising the bi-annual FREMO conference

The duties will as far as possible be in accordance with the candidate's interests. Duties should consist of well-organised and planned activities. The yearly appraisal conversations (medarbeidersamtale) should include an agreement of duties for the next year.

In addition to the already mentioned general PhD duties, individual duties can be assigned that may vary widely and can include so different tasks as maintaining websites, administrating project activities that go beyond one's own PhD project or marketing CEMO activities. The CEMO directors and supervisors will strive for a distribution that is as fair as possible.

8. Conference participation

Presentations in terms of posters and lectures at national and, in particular, international conferences are supported from the beginning of the PhD contract. Participation at conferences makes a PhD candidate's work known in the community, provides important feedback about the work, and supports network building. In agreement with the supervisor, each PhD candidate should try to take part in one conference each year. As a general recommendation, one specific conference should be identified and visited at least twice during the PhD. This aspect is important in order to develop a professional identity. Taking part in the same conference regularly also is key to build and maintain personal relationships and network.

The candidate's individual CEMO budget can be used to cover travel, accommodation and other fees if the PhD candidate presents something or takes part in a professional development activity. Candidates in their first semester may still participate in a conference without having a contribution. It is recommended though that a poster is delivered to the first conference. For subsequent conferences, the candidate should normally submit proposals for oral presentations, either as individual contributions or as part of a larger symposium. The presentation at the conference should be regarded as a stepping stone towards the final paper to be submitted to a journal. Increasingly, conferences also include new and innovative formats (Peca Kucha, ignite presentations etc.) and we encourage candidates to explore and evaluate whether these are effective formats for communicating their work. Note that participation in conferences may be rewarded credits in the training component (see below)

Faculty of Educational Sciences

9. Mobility

CEMO is in itself already a highly internationalized work environment with team members from all over the world. However, an extended visit to another institution offers the chance to build a scientific network and to gain additional support and help with scientific writing. Such a visit also exposes the PhD candidate to other views on scientific and organisational practice. It is recommended that such stays should not be shorter than two months and the visit should preferably not include the institution's respective summer break unless the institution offers specific summer internships.

Candidates are advised to select a place in agreement with their supervisors and closely in line with their research work. Furthermore, the host must agree to take on the responsibility to support the PhD candidate while they are at their institution. The stay abroad should be planned and prepared carefully and early. As a general rule, planning should start at least half a year before the actual stay abroad takes place. Years 2 or 3 would be the most convenient time to have the exchange. Note that the stay has to take into account the needs of the training component (see below point 9). It is also of vital importance to involve the host in the planning from the beginning, leading to a final agreement put on paper.

The visit should normally give support to one specific paper with the host committing to participate according to the rules set up for co-authorship identified above. It is also relevant to use the exchange to participate in courses offered by the host institution. As a general rule, CEMO will not accept claims of tuition fees from the host. Note that the work contract at CEMO will not be extended by the time abroad which means that the work on the thesis has to be continued as efficiently as if the candidate were at home.

The Faculty of Education provides financial support up to 50 000 NOK to cover part of the costs for travelling and accommodation. For more information see:

<https://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/research-abroad/index.html>

The Research Council of Norway (NFR) provides gracious scholarships for candidates working on an NFR grant. See <http://www.forskningsradet.no>.

When these opportunities are not applicable it may be possible to apply for funding from the research group FREMO, and in cases where the candidate is attached to an externally funded project, funds may be available through the project budget. The candidate may also use their own yearly budget for expenses related to the mobility.

10. Support and funding

The PhD candidates at CEMO have the following financial resources available:

- The yearly annum is currently set to 25 000 NOK. This may be used for all well-argued expenses. When in doubt, confer with the supervisor and/or the head of the administration.
- The research group FREMO may support expenses directly related to research activities (e.g. salaries for assistance etc.) and language checks of papers.
- If the research group does not have such funding available, CEMO also has an account for expenses and PhDs may apply for necessary funding of expenses. A short application is sent by e-mail to the Director.
- The UV-faculty has a specific fund for mobility arrangements as detailed in section 9 above

Faculty of Educational Sciences

- CEMO covers fees for open access in gold open access journals and for a few cases every year CEMO will also cover buy-outs from journals with a citation index above 1 or journals classified as level 2 in the Norwegian classification of journals⁶ (see <https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside>). A short application should be sent to the Director well in advance so that it can be clarified how many papers are to be expected over the course of the next months and a well-balanced decision can be made. Please note that for several of the large publishing companies there exists an agreement where Norwegian researchers can publish for free (see XXX...).
- The money given to CEMO for publications are transferred to the personal account up to 100.000 NOK/year.

The personal account is available throughout the contract period, but the account is closed when the contract terminates.

It should be noted that as public employees we are required to be modest in our spending. We should always select the cheapest relevant option for hotels, flight travels etc. Please also note that there are rules and regulations regarding how to buy products and services. For many product categories, UiO have centrally negotiated deals with one or a few specific companies, and the administrative person at CEMO with this function should in such case handle the order through the UiO system.

For travels to be paid by us, you should always use one specific travel agency. You will therefore need to establish a profile with this company. Our admin staff may help if you have questions.

All PhDs at CEMO receive a laptop when they start. This should normally last for the whole PhD period. When the PhD period is finished this machine has virtually no value any longer and the PhD may keep this when the contract ends. For IT equipment you should always order through our local IT support. Please be aware that two times a year (before Christmas and before the summer break) there will be particularly good prices for some selected computers/laptops.

11. The training component

For general information on the training component we refer to the description of the PhD program at the Faculty of Educational Sciences, see https://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/resources-tools/phd-programme-plan_01.06.2018.html

In general, candidates should deliver the application form for the UV PhD program within the first month of employment. In this document, you should also list your planned course activities. When this application form is delivered to the Faculty of Education, the head of Office should be included as CC.

In the following, some specific recommendations are given for the training component (30 credits)⁷:

- Complete most of the training before entering Stage 2.

⁶ Please note that all employees at CEMO are required to store a post-print copy of all papers through the Cristin/Duo system.

⁷ Candidates who started earlier than Aug. 2018 are formally part of the old PhD-program. However, transfer to the new program may be granted. Agreements about this should be made with the PhD coordinator.

Faculty of Educational Sciences

- Follow the compulsory introductory methods course *UV9030 – Research Designs* (2 credits) and *UV9101A – Basic Course in Qualitative Research Methodology. General part* (3 credits). In addition CEMO offers a range of general courses in quantitative methodology that are recommended for most candidates as early as possible: *UV9290 – Data Science* (5 credits), *UV9218 – Linear Models* (3 credits), and *UV9291 – Principles of Measurement* (5 credits).
- Follow the compulsory course *UV9010 – Research Ethics* in the first semester of the second year.
- Follow the compulsory course *UV9001 – Philosophy of Science* (5 credits) by the end of year two or beginning of year three.
- The Faculty course on *Introduction to quantitative methods* should normally not be part of the training component for a PhD at CEMO.
- Depending on the thesis topic, follow further courses in quantitative methods from the CEMO MAE program, most of which have parallel course codes in the doctoral program.
- Candidates who will work with Mplus is recommended to follow the course *UV9210 – Path analysis and structural equation modeling* (5 credits)⁸. A good alternative is also the web-based course organised by the Mplus developers. However, no credits can be given for the latter since there is no exam.
- Candidates who have already covered major parts of the training offered at CEMO, in particular relevant for PhDs being recruited from the CEMO MAE program, should already at an early stage make plans for how the training component may be filled with other components (see below).
- For most candidates external courses (e.g. courses at other universities or workshops at conferences) are good options. Remember that the course content (description of aims/outcome, syllabus or reading lists, number of hours of teaching, format and result of evaluation/documentation) has to be delivered to the PhD coordinator for approval (see Appendix E). It is highly recommended that this is done as soon as the relevant documentation is available. In case of overlaps with other courses, this will affect the credits given. The course has to be documented through some kind of compulsory activity given feedback in the form of a grade (pass/fail).
- A range of other activities may also be awarded credits in the training component (internal reading seminars, extended visits to other institutions, conference contributions). All these credits will also need to be documented and approved by the local PhD coordinator. A form to be used for the conference contributions is attached as Appendix D to this document, and a form for approval of credits for specific reading courses is provided in Appendix F.

In addition to courses and activities rewarded credits, there is a requirement that PhD candidates should document that they are able to present their research to a wider audience. Stage 2 PhDs will be offered training/workshops where this is a specific focus. The documentation is usually in the form of a tangible product, e.g. a newspaper chronicle, carefully worked out news posts on our own web-page, organisation of a seminar series, talks/lectures to a wider audience (for instance at “faglig-pedagogisk dag” – a UiO outreach activity for teachers) or a range of other (social) media activities. In general, the UV Faculty guidelines specify that the activity should be equivalent to 15-20 hours of work. For candidates with a particular keen interest to develop such skills there are also regular courses offered at the University of Oslo. Fill in and deliver the form in appendix G when the task is completed

⁸ A good alternative is the web-based course organised by the Mplus developers. However, no credits can be given for the latter since there is no exam.

Faculty of Educational Sciences

CEMO is in addition striving for supporting PhD candidates' careers after their contract ends by opening doors to relevant employers, providing opportunities to practice application interviews, and having short seminars on how to build a CV. It is important that candidates take initiative regarding the next position well in advance of delivering the thesis. Keep in mind that the public defence typically takes place some months after the contract has ended (see also section 12 below). In order to support the future career, it is important that the Individual Development Plan is continuously revised. This plan should over the last two years focus strongly on the next step after the PhD. The yearly appraisal talks will address this explicitly one year before the final delivery of the thesis. It is also important that this topic is properly addressed and discussed in the regular supervision.

Six months prior to submitting the final thesis, the training component should be approved. An e-mail will be sent to the candidate from the Head of Office to initiate this process.

12. The public defense of the thesis

Unlike in many other countries, the defence of the PhD is public and it is a rather big event. The Faculty of Educational Sciences regulates the procedure in detail - see <https://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/thesis-evaluation/>

In brief, these are the crucial steps in the procedure:

- The PhD is responsible for delivering the thesis. Given the worst-case and very severe consequence of non-approval of the thesis (see below), a good advice is to NOT deliver the thesis before the supervisor(s) agree that it is ready to be submitted.
- The candidate and supervisor should be aware of the fact that the delivered thesis will be subject to a check for plagiarism. This is done administratively and in the unlikely event that this check results in concerns being identified, the Faculty of Education will take the issue for further review. The committee will not be directly involved in this process.
- Although the committee is formally appointed by the Faculty of Education, supervisors are well-advised to select, informally recruit and make initial agreements with the two external opponents and the third internal committee member. If this is not done, the review process will risk being at least 1 month delayed. It is recommended that committee members are recruited after completing the Final Review, assuming that this review makes it possible for the supervisor/candidate to agree on a tentative date for delivering the final thesis. In selecting members for the adjudication committee, keep in mind that:
 - the internal and external members should not have any conflict of interest or have any close relation to either the supervisor or the candidate;
 - the committee has to have both genders represented;
 - the third member normally would have to come from one of the three departments at the UV-Faculty;
 - the third member, has an important function as the coordinator (and whip) for the process to run smoothly, timely and according to the regulations – see <https://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/phd/thesis-evaluation/evaluation-committee/>;
 - when the thesis is delivered, the supervisor and candidate formally have no function in the adjudication process.
- When the thesis is delivered, the Faculty of education formally appoints an adjudication committee with two external and one internal member. This committee delivers their

Faculty of Educational Sciences

report and the outcome of their evaluation within 3 months after delivery. There are three possible outcomes:

- The thesis is accepted as appropriate to be publicly defended.
- The thesis needs to be revised and delivered again within 6 months. In this case, the committee will give a specific list of revisions/improvements.
- The thesis is not found worthy of being publicly defended. In this case, a revised version can be resubmitted earliest six months later. In the case that this revised version also is evaluated negatively, the same material cannot be used in a future PhD-thesis. However, it should be pointed out that this outcome is very rare. Usually, a thesis with an unacceptable quality is in the end not submitted.
- Well before receiving the final report from the committee, the supervisor should communicate with the internal member of the committee to fix the date for the defence.
- The report from the adjudication committee varies in length and detail from case to case, but it should in general help the candidate to identify some possible issues to be brought up in the Q&A section of the defence.
- 14 days (10 work days to be correct) before the defence the candidate will receive a topic for a trial lecture from the committee. This lecture is given prior to the public defence on the same day.
- The defence is organised in two sections:
 - One of the external members of the committee is appointed to act as the first opponent. This person first introduces the thesis to the audience (15-30 mins). This is immediately followed by a discussion between the first opponent and the candidate. This should take the form of a Q&A, discussing mostly the major aspects of the thesis, but also minor details can be brought up
 - After a break, the other external committee member acts as the second opponent with a new Q&A session. In many cases, the two opponents represent somewhat different aspects of the candidates work, and the two Q&A sessions will usually reflect this.
 - The defence normally lasts for three to four hours, including the break.
- Immediately after the defence, CEMO hosts a reception with light food/snacks and refreshments. At this event, the CEMO Director is expected to say a few words of welcome to the guests and to the candidate.
- In the evening on the same day, it is customary practice for the candidate to host a dinner. Having completed a PhD is a huge event, and marking this transition or life-changer is highly recommended. This is a private event, organised by the PhD-candidate, and it should be emphasised: You are free to organise this as you like. Although not very common, you are also free to choose not having a dinner. In the case you would like to organise such an event, the following points may be helpful:
 - The expenses for this is carried by the candidate, but be aware that as a tax payer in Norway, these expenses can give you a relief in taxation through a so-called "særfradrag" (special deduction), which effectively means that you will get a "cash-back" from the government for parts of your expenses⁹.
 - Although the dinner is a private event, the following statement is found in the regulations: "The chair of the public defence, the committee members and supervisor(s) are invited to the dinner. The chair and the third opponent, representing UiO and the committee respectively, should be prepared to say a few words."

⁹ <https://www.skatteetaten.no/en/person/taxes/get-the-taxes-right/employment-benefits-and-pensions/education/deduction-for-phd-expenses/>

Faculty of Educational Sciences

- The by far most common format is a rather big event (30+ guests), including the committee, the closest colleagues, family and friends. The Norwegian tradition is also that a range of persons will hold (formal) speeches: In addition to the ones mentioned above, it is expected that also the main supervisor and the candidate say a few words. In most cases, someone representing the PhD colleagues, family and friends also gives speeches.
- Although not as common, a completely accepted alternative to cater for the full meal, is to invite people to bring some food and drink to the event.
- Given the private nature of the event, candidates can opt for simpler solutions (e.g. inviting the committee and supervisors to a restaurant).
- In conclusion: there are strong traditions, but no requirements or rules for such dinners.
- Having defended the thesis, the candidate will receive an official transcript testifying that the candidate is rewarded the status of a PhD. This document can be used to apply for positions etc. The final diploma is handed out later in an official ceremony organised centrally by the University of Oslo. This takes place in the main hall of the old university building downtown several times every year.

Faculty of Educational Sciences

13. Milestones

The months given below are based on a 4-year contract, are approximate and should be fitted to the specific context.

Month	Task/product	Comments
1	Application form to the PhD program is delivered to the Faculty of Education	Only parts A and B need to be filled out (part C is for candidates with external funding). Remember to include the Head of Office as cc when submitting the documents
3	A first draft of the Individual Development Plan is delivered to the supervisor and the PhD coordinator	This is a dynamic document where other parts are filled in at later stages. See appendix B
3	An outline of the tentative project is presented as part of the Research Seminar	The final plan is delivered, discussed and approved by the supervisor(s)
6	A text detailing the first paper is developed (research question(s), condensed literature review, data to be analysed, methods to be used, anticipated results, potential journal(s), potential risks). In addition a brief text identifies how subsequent papers may be focused to follow up this initial paper with first draft of possible research questions	To be discussed and worked out in cooperation with the supervisor(s)
Nov/Dec every year	Progress report, Feedback/appraisal dialogue with the PhD coordinator, Individual Development Plan is updated and extended	The CEMO administration will notify the candidate and the supervisor(s) when the progress report should be delivered. If the PhD coordinator is the supervisor, the Director conducts the appraisal dialogue. If both are supervisors, one of the other (associate) professors conducts this meeting on behalf of the Centre
24	The major part of the training component should be completed	Remember to ensure documentation of all external courses or other activities that may be credited. See details of credited activities in the PhD program plan
24	Midway assessment and completion of Stage 1	See Appendix A for details
18-36	International mobility	If applicable. Dates are tentative. See section 8 above for details
30/42	PhD candidate has presented his/her work at CEMO's Brown Bag seminar	This is a chance to receive constructive feedback from a wider range of expertise available at CEMO.
36	Completed the Science Philosophy course	
42	The training component is approved	The Head of Office will send an invitation for a meeting to prepare all the documents needed.
45	Final evaluation (90 % evaluation)	See Appendix A for details.

Appendix A: Midway Assessment and Final Review

PhD Midway Assessment

A structured formative evaluation is carried out halfway through the funding period. The Midway Assessment has three purposes: The main purpose is to give the candidate detailed feedback with emphasis on a forward-looking perspective. Although the starting point is the written work produced by the candidate, the assessment should devote substantial attention and time to discuss the next steps towards successfully finalising the thesis. The other important function of the Midway Assessment is to provide a quality assurance of the process leading up to this point, and as such these events inform CEMO about the quality of the training, supervision and other support that we are responsible for providing to our PhD candidates. Lastly, the Midway Assessment is the formal end-point and final documentation of the PhD Course UV9040 Research Seminar, and marks the transition into Stage 2 of the PhD.

The main participants in this evaluation include the candidate, a discussant, and the main supervisor. Co-supervisors, the PhD-coordinator, the person responsible for the Research Seminar and the research administration at CEMO are also involved in the process of planning and/or conducting the Midway Assessment.

The detailed routines and practices for the Midway Assessment varies a bit between the units at the Faculty of Educational Sciences. While some departments mostly engage internal resources as the discussant, CEMO would also frequently invite external persons with a specific background given the candidates substantial topic and/or methodological approach. The person invited to be the discussant may also be reengaged for the 90 % reading towards the end of the funding period. However, please note that the same person cannot be appointed to the final evaluation committee.

The event can count as one of the seminars of the Research Seminar, and accordingly all other PhD-candidates at the seminar are typically invited to take part and to ask questions to the candidate. In addition, all employees at CEMO will be informed about the event and invited to take part. Lastly, if the candidate has no objections, the event will be made completely open. The candidate is expected to submit the so far completed work of the thesis. The expectation is that a first paper is already submitted, and a draft exist of the second paper. In addition, a brief outline of further work expected to be part of the final thesis should be made available. This also includes a brief statement/reflection (2-3 pages) on how the separate papers can be joined together into one thesis. Include also specific questions that you would like the midway discussant to respond to. The candidate should submit all the material to the discussant at latest two weeks before the Midway Assessment takes place.

Procedure

The event consists of two parts: The first part is an open event as described above. Supervisors are expected to be passive participants in this part of the event. The second part is a closed event where only the candidate, the opponent, the supervisor(s) and the PhD-coordinator is present.

- *Part I (up to two hours):*
 - The PhD coordinator welcomes and gives a very brief introduction to the event
 - The candidate then provides a condensed presentation (max 20 minutes):
 - The main focus: Work completed so far (including work in progress)
 - Brief outline(s) of remaining paper(s) not started, including a rough time-line

Faculty of Educational Sciences

- A reflection on how the separate papers relate to each other and/or to one overarching aim
 - Specific challenges encountered with the thesis work
- The discussant may start with some introductory comments or general assessment of the texts submitted - before turning into a regular Q&A session, preferably orchestrated so that the opponent/candidate enters into an active dialogue. The Q&A session should focus on the larger issues, but obviously important details should also be identified and discussed (max 1h 30 minutes)
- The other participants are invited to ask questions to the candidate (10 minutes)
- *Part II (approx. 30 minutes):*
 - The candidate presents the progress in the training component (courses already taken/followed and a plan for the remaining parts of the organised training). The PhD coordinator gives a brief statement evaluating how the training meets the requirements stated in the PhD program.
 - The supervisor(s) are invited to provide a brief statement regarding Part I in the session. This includes the opportunity to ask follow-up questions to the discussant, and/or to invite the candidate to provide a more detailed account of issues that may not have been covered adequately in Part I.
 - Discuss possible remaining issues

To follow up the event, the supervisor/candidate organise a meeting a few days later to discuss learning points from the event. Specific future steps identified should be written into the Individual Development Plan.

Roles and responsibilities

In addition to the functions at the event identified above, the following roles/responsibilities apply:

- *The discussant:*
 - Prepare for the event by carefully reading the material.
 - The Q&A session may work even better with some prepared slides with questions or other material to support the dialogue with the candidate.
 - Be mindful about the time during Part I to ensure that all identified issues are covered.
 - In case the event is organised through Zoom (or other similar platforms), make sure that the camera, microphone, screen sharing etc. works properly.
 - If there are written notes suitable for being shared with others, the candidate would surely appreciate to receive these after the event.
 - A remuneration will be offered amounting to 10 hours (including the time spent in the meeting), and all expenses relating to travel and living will of course be covered. The Head of Office will provide the support needed for all practical and formal issues
- *PhD-coordinator:*
 - A tentative date/week/month is agreed in the last appraisal conversation prior to the event (these conversations are normally conducted in December).
- *The main supervisor:*
 - The person with the main responsibility for getting the process started and to follow up the implementation - if needed

Faculty of Educational Sciences

- Identify and invite a possible discussant. Inform the discussant briefly about the nature of the event and what is expected of him/her. Keep in mind that the person chosen as the discussant may not be part of the evaluation committee of the final thesis.
- Set a date and time in agreement with the candidate, discussant, PhD coordinator and Research Seminar leader. Preferably, a date should be agreed two months before the event or earlier.
- Send an e-mail with the relevant information to the administrative Head of Office at CEMO as soon as possible: Date and time of the event; name, position, e-mail address and affiliation of the discussant
- Give help and guidance to the candidate in preparing for the event
- Initiate the debriefing meeting after the event
- In case of a physical event with a discussant travelling in: Consider if it possible to combine with a high-profile talk or other event. In this case, the CEMO Director should be involved.
- *The candidate:*
 - When a tentative agreement on the Midway Assessment has been made with the PhD coordinator, immediately inform the supervisor.
 - Decide for a completely open event or not (and communicate this to the Administrative Head of Office).
 - Finalise the texts and submit to the opponent at least two weeks prior to the event.
 - Prepare for the event.
 - Update the Individual Development plan after the debriefing with the supervisor.
- *The Research Seminar leader:*
 - Inform the seminar participants about the event through Canvas
 - Replace the function of the PhD coordinator in case that is needed
- *The Head of Office (in collaboration with CEMO web editor):*
 - Based on the information received from the supervisor, book a room (or create a virtual room).
 - Create an event in Outlook and invite the candidate, the discussant, the supervisor(s), the PhD coordinator and the Research Seminar leader.
 - Announce the event – in agreement with the candidate as to how open the invitation should be.
 - The event is always announced by e-mail to everyone at CEMO and a public announcement at CEMO's web pages (including a link to Nettskjema, see below).
 - If the event is open to everyone, the room is included in the announcement – or in the case of an open virtual event, a link to a form for registering (Nettskjema) is included in the web announcement.
 - If the event is open to everyone, an announcement is placed in the corresponding UV-nytt from the Faculty of Education, and it is also announced through CEMOs Facebook page (brief text, picture of the candidate and link to the web announcement).
 - One day prior to the event, the relevant link to the virtual event is sent by e-mail to those registering.
 - Communicate with the discussant:

Faculty of Educational Sciences

- Send the initial Outlook event (see above)
- Send the document with the procedure for the event
- Make sure that a contract with the relevant information for remuneration is signed
- If relevant, book flights and hotel

PhD Final Review

The Final Review involves the same procedures and roles as specified for the Midway Assessment. It is conducted 2-3 months before the thesis is due to be submitted. The duration of the event is 2-3 hours. Participants in this evaluation include the candidate, a discussant and the supervisor(s). The discussant should be an external person with specific expertise in the field of the candidate. If convenient and regarded as useful, the same person used for the Midway Assessment may be reengaged. The supervisor is responsible for selecting the discussant, but should keep in mind that the reviewer is automatically disqualified as part of the final adjudication committee. The event is normally open to everyone.

The candidate should submit a complete draft of the thesis approximately one month before the event. This would normally include two complete papers and one which is in a draft stage prior to submission. In addition, an outline of the Extended Abstract (kappe) should be included. The procedure is outlined below:

- If the training component is not yet complete and approved, the candidate must give an overview of the missing pieces and give a specific plan for how this may be completed before the thesis is delivered.
- The candidate starts by giving a verbal account of what kinds of challenges and problems he/she faces and what aspects in particular he/she would like to be assessed.
- The opponent presents a prepared critical but constructive opposition, starting with a general assessment of the text material presented by the candidate, followed by a Q&A session where the candidate answers the opponent's questions and arguments.
- The evaluation in the final phase concludes with a verbal recommendation, advising how the candidate should carry out the thesis work in the final phase.
- The supervisor follows this up together with the candidate depending on the final conclusion of the review:
 - If the review leads to the conclusion that the thesis with certainty will be completed in time, the supervisor immediately starts to informally seek for candidates to be in the adjudication committee, including finding a suitable date.
 - If the review leads to the conclusion that there are risks for a delay, a detailed plan for how these risks may be solved should be worked out immediately after the review.
 - If the review concludes that it is not likely that the thesis will be submitted in time, the supervisor should include the PhD-coordinator in a follow-up meeting where a detailed plan for the completion of the thesis is agreed.
- The administrative staff will document that the final evaluation has been conducted

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Appendix B: Individual Development Plan

This should be revisited and revised every year. The candidate makes a first draft to be discussed at a meeting with the supervisor. The final version is stored and delivered to the administrative staff and the PhD coordinator. The short term goals should in addition be revisited by the PhD candidate also every half-year.

The plan separates between short- (six months to a year), mid- (two to four years), and long-term (beyond the PhD contract) goals. In Stage 1, the emphasis should be on the short-term goals. During Stage 2 the focus should shift towards the mid- and long-term goals emphasising the final phase of the PhD, generic skills development and long-term career goals. Please also note that as the candidate gets closer to delivery, the time plan becomes less and less abstract and flexible. Rather, the dates set for the various milestones becomes fixed deadlines with very little room for adaptations.

Instead of having a specific form, we would rather like PhD-candidates to write an open text summarising the reflective process supported by the set of questions below.

Use the guiding questions as a starting point to evaluate your progress and short- (six months to one year). Ask actively for meetings with and advice from your supervisor. Be active during the discussions with your supervisor. This is your opportunity to get feedback and guidance on your progress.

I. Self-Assessment

- Which of your **past accomplishments** will contribute to the success of your PhD position?
 - In Stage 1: Primarily experiences and personal resources you bring in from prior to starting the PhD. If you are moving in a different professional direction, consider how your past experience can be a resource for your future development
 - In Stage 2: Consider also the experiences you have added during your time as a PhD. Project work/research, teaching, other duties, outreach and contact with the “outside”, and other relevant experiences which has been important for your personal development.
- **Short-term goals:** In which areas would you like to develop in the next year?
 - Please be specific and consider how you will know if you are successful.
- **Mid-term goals:** What are the overarching accomplishments that you expect to achieve during your PhD experience? Are there specific substantive/discipline or methodological areas that you want to develop? What other professional experiences do you hope to have during your PhD experience?
 - This can include learning, teaching, advising, service/outreach, or other goals.
- **Long-term goals:** Where do you see yourself in 5 or 10 years?
 - This should help orient you and envision your future. What are your first and second choices of long-term careers? Please be specific in your description.
- **Support:** What support in terms of classes, funding, time, or other resources do you need to succeed in any of these goals?

II. Action plan

- What activities could help you achieve the goals that you described above?

Faculty of Educational Sciences

- Please describe at least one or two activities for each goal period (short-, mid- and long-term) as well as for each area (research, professional development & duties including service) and a reasonable timeline for completion.
- Stage 1: Give priority to the short term goals (but do not forget completely about the long term),
- Stage 2: Focus on completion of PhD and the long-term career goals.

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Appendix C: Declaration of Co-authorship and PhD candidate's contribution

(Please scan the finally signed version of the form and submit to the Head of Office)

List authors in the same sequence as in the paper (PhD candidate's name in bold types):

Paper title:

Submitted to:

Write the initials for all authors into one cell for each row. For some papers the different topics may not be relevant (e.g. for a theoretical paper). If so, collapse the cells in that row and write Not applicable

	Not involved	Somewhat involved, but another author had the main responsibility	Equally distributed among the authors	I had the main responsibility with contributions from other authors	I had exclusive responsibility while other authors gave feedback/commented
Concept of the article					
Searching for literature					
Test development					
Data collection					
Data management					
Data analysis					
Interpretation of the results					
Writing the manuscript					

The co-authors declare that the above description of the candidate's contribution is accurate.

The co-authors also declare that all authors of the paper have followed the principles defined by the Vancouver rules. All authors have:

- Substantial contributions to the work published in terms of conception, design, data acquisition, analysis, or interpretation
- Active participation in the writing process in terms of drafting OR critically revising the manuscript for important intellectual content;
- Final approval of the version to be published;
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Sign Author 1

Sign Author 2

Sign Author 3

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Appendix D: Documentation of conference contribution

According to the PhD program, PhDs receive 1 credit for each conference contribution (max 3 credits). This form is the documentation to be delivered to Siri Heslien when the conference contribution has been completed.

Name of PhD candidate:

Name of conference:

Place and date for the conference:

Title of the conference contribution:

Format of the conference contribution:

Link to conference program, or if applicable, to a page where your contribution is listed/described:

Abstract: (copy-paste from existing material)

(Sign PhD-candidate)

(Sign main supervisor)

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Appendix E: Application for approval of credits for an external course

According to the PhD regulations, a candidate can have a maximum of 10 credits with this format. Please note that the course has to include an evaluation with a grade. This form, with the documentation listed below, is the documentation to be delivered to Siri Heslien when the conference contribution has been completed

Name of PhD-candidate:

Title of course:

Course provider (institution and lecturer(s)):

Detailed description of the course (if possible, provide a link to a formal web-page announcing the course):

Syllabus (reading list + assignments):

Nature of documentation: Please note that in order to receive credits for the course, you need to have some form of exam with grading (pass/fail or more detailed grading)

Possible overlap with other courses at the UV PhD program: The candidate seek to describe this in cooperation with their supervisor, and then the PhD coordinator will verify credits granted for the course, with specification of possible overlaps

Sign PhD-candidate

Sign main supervisor

Sign PhD coordinator

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Appendix F: Application for approval of credits for reading course

According to the PhD regulations, a candidate can have a maximum of 3 credits with this format. This form is the documentation to be delivered to Siri Heslien when the conference contribution has been completed.

Course code: Filled in by the person who registers the course in FS

Name of PhD-candidate:

Supervisor responsible for defining the course:

Credits¹⁰: See below for guiding principles

Teaching format: Self studies

Evaluation format:

Description of the course content (minimum 100 words):

Reading list:

Sign PhD-candidate

Sign main supervisor

Sign PhD coordinator

¹⁰ Textbooks 50 pages (excluding refs) = 1 credit

Journal papers/book chapters equivalent to journal papers 30 pages (excluding refs) = 1 credit

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Appendix G: Application for approval of outreach activity

According to the PhD regulations, candidates should document that they have completed a specific task with the aim to inform a wider audience than the academic community. Usually, this would be in the form of either a tangible product (e.g. a newspaper chronicle, a blog-post, a pod-cast or similar) or it may relate to a seminar/conference directed to teachers, policy makers or others in a wider group. It should amount to 15-20 hours of work

Name of PhD candidate:

Name of supervisor:

Description of product (please include a link or copy of the product if possible):

Signature PhD candidate

Signature supervisor