

Guidelines for third semester evaluation of Ph.D.-candidates at the Department for Informatics (IFI)

According to the Supplementary Regulations at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences to the Regulations for the Degree of Ph.D. at the University of Oslo, all Ph.D.-candidates must complete a third semester evaluation. A third semester evaluation must take place no sooner than twelve months and no later than fifteen months after admission to the Ph.D.-programme¹. Results achieved in this period must be presented to an evaluation committee and the Ph.D.-candidate must clarify deviations, if any, from the progress plan.

The purpose of the evaluation is first and foremost to give the candidates the opportunity to present their work, to get external input and new ideas for further research, rethink their project, and ultimately increase their confidence in own work and their job satisfaction. It also provides an opportunity for the candidate, their supervisors, and the IFI Ph.D.-committee, to identify challenges with the project and take appropriate actions. The expectation for the evaluation is not for the candidate to show a significant academic production, but rather to ensure that the project is developing as planned.

1. Coordination

The principal supervisor is responsible for appointing the evaluation committee. The Ph.D.-secretary will inform the supervisor when there is a Ph.D.-candidate who needs to complete an evaluation.

It is the responsibility of the principal supervisor to coordinate the evaluation meeting and to make sure that the evaluation committee receives the original plan, the status report, and the template for the status report in due time and no later than one week before the presentation.

2. Composition of the evaluation committee

The composition of the committee should promote an independent and relevant evaluation. The committee shall be composed of two external members, and at least one of them must be external to the research group of the Ph.D.-candidate.

3. Status Report

The evaluation will be based on the original PhD-project proposal (part of the application for admission to the Ph.D.-programme) and a status report written by the Ph.D.-candidate. The report should not be more than 10 pages (references and front page not included) and accompanied by

¹ <http://www.mn.uio.no/english/research/phd/regulations/regulations.html>



any relevant paper(s) written by the Ph.D.-candidate. The status report will give the committee an overview over:

- The candidate's current understanding of the project and its challenges
- Changes and deviations from the original plan
- The project implementation plan

The following outline should be used for the status report:

1. *Introduction*

- Main research aims and objectives
- Project and scientific background

2. *Research questions and scientific challenges*

- Scientific challenges
- Research questions
- Status regarding reaching beyond the state-of-the-art

3. *Scientific method*

- Theoretical framework
- Research methodology and research methods

4. *Ethics*

- Discussion of relevant ethical issues and how they have been dealt with

5. *Changes in the project*

- Deviations from the plan

6. *Project plan*

- Detailed project implementation plan
- Overview of publications that are accepted, submitted, or in progress.
- Will the project be completed as (now) planned and on time?

7. *References*

4. Presentation

The candidate shall give a 30 minutes presentation to the evaluation committee, based on the submitted status report. The committee is expected to ask questions and engage the candidate in a discussion on relevant topics. The presentation and discussion shall be public. The supervisors are expected to be present.

5. Meeting

After the public presentation, the candidate's current progress and relationship with supervisors are discussed in a separate meeting with the two external evaluators only (without supervisor(s)). The aim of this meeting is to reveal any challenges affecting working relations, like issues related to teamwork and colleagues; issues related to supervision and co-authorship and/or improper

attention or behavior by supervisors or colleagues.

6. Reporting and follow-up

On the basis of the status report, the presentation, and the separate meeting, the committee write a report according to the evaluation form template. The committee submits the evaluation form to the Ph.D.-Coordinator at IFI. Reports that do not suggest any concrete actions are summarily reported to the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences.

The Head of the Ph.D.-committee at IFI will consider any special measures suggested in the progress report and immediately take adequate action. The Ph.D.-secretary, the departmental Ph.D.-committee, and the Ph.D.-council at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences will be involved in this process whenever necessary.

--

19.03.2018

Petter Nielsen
Head of Ph.D.-Committee

Mohzdeh Harat
Ph.D.-Coordinator