

Progress report procedure for PhD students at ITEM

The most fundamental foundation of a successful PhD study is good cooperation between a PhD student and his/her main supervisor, including a well functioning and professional supervision process. The main objective of the following procedure is not to replace or weaken the supervision process, but to strengthen it and contribute to a timely progress of the study and even higher quality research results for the PhD students.

1. Every PhD student is allocated to one of ITEM's research areas, normally the one his/her main supervisor belongs to.
2. The project description for the PhD study must be sent to and accepted by ITEM's member of the FU (on behalf of IME's "Forskningsutvalg") within six months after acceptance as a PhD student, in accordance with § 5.2 of the PHIKT program regulations. This project description should be presented at a research area meeting shortly after it has been accepted. Feedback can be expected from members of the research area.
3. A PhD student is expected to present his/her progress reports and ideas for continued research to the research area meetings frequently during his/her study to get feedback from other members of the research area, and actively participate in giving feedback to other PhD students.
4. In accordance with § 9 of the PHIKT program regulations, both the PhD student and his/her main supervisor must prepare yearly status reports where progress of the PhD study is related to the existing project description. ITEM's member of the FU will collect these reports and report back to the head of department and the FU.
5. Two years after formal acceptance (not including leave of absence), a PhD student must present a "Thesis proposal" in a research area meeting. A written version of this Thesis proposal is to be formally evaluated by the research area leader and one other faculty, appointed by the research area leader. A PhD student's main supervisor can not be one of the two evaluators. If the research area leader is also the PhD student's main supervisor, both evaluators will be appointed by the head of department. The evaluators will produce a written review report to ITEM pointing out strengths and weaknesses of the Thesis proposal. The evaluators may if needed consult both the PhD student and his/her main supervisor for clarifications during the evaluation. A PhD student may be asked to revise the Thesis proposal within a given (short) time frame if it is considered too weak to realistically result in an acceptable thesis within the remaining time frame of the PhD study.

This procedure will be implemented immediately, in accordance with the IME faculty's local addendum to § 9 ("Reporting") for the PHIKT program (in Norwegian):

"PhD-kandidat og veileder skal begge levere årlig rapport på standardisert format.

Kandidaten kan pålegges utvidet rapportering etter 2 år for å kvalitetssikre at studieprogresjon og veiledning fungerer tilfredsstillende. Instituttene forestår evalueringen. Når et institutt innstiller på at en kandidat bør utelukkes fra doktorgradsutdanningen på dette grunnlaget oppnevner fakultetet en uavhengig nemnd på 3 personer for å vurdere framdriften. Kandidaten gis anledning til å uttale seg om instituttets innstilling. Utvalg for forskning og forskerutdanning fatter beslutning om hvor vidt kandidaten skal utelukkes eller ikke."

The "Thesis proposal" part of the procedure (5 above) will only be mandatory for PhD students formally accepted as PhD students after 01-07-2005.

ITEM, 01-06-2007, Norvald Stol