

# Supplementary guidelines for the PhD programme in Child and Youth Participation and Competence Development (BUK)

The guidelines are based on, and supplement, the following overarching regulations and guidelines at INN University:

- Regulations for the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Degree at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences
- PhD Handbook
  
- Regulations for the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Degree at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences  
<https://lovdata.no/dokument/LTI/forskrift/2017-12-19-2396>
- PhD Handbook

The guidelines have been adopted by the dean at the Faculty of Social and Health Sciences on 07.09.2018 with immediate effect.

The guidelines follow the PhD regulations' outline and numbering. Only the points in the PhD regulations and the PhD handbook that are lacking for BUK's purposes are included in these guidelines.

## **1 Scope**

1-1 The guidelines apply to PhD candidates enrolled in the PhD programme.

## **3 Responsibility for the PhD programme**

The guidelines are developed and administered by the PhD committee at the faculty. The dean has delegated the responsibility for the following tasks to the head of the PhD programme:

- Appoint co-supervisors
- Approve courses and trainings from external institutions
- Approve the training / taught component
- Approve the correction of formal errors in the thesis (errata sheet)
- Adopt decisions concerning public defence of theses based on unanimous committee recommendations
- Decide on permission to revise the thesis on the recommendation of the evaluation committee, provided the recommendation is unanimous. In cases where more than 3 months is recommended for revision, a discussion is held by the PhD Committee prior to taking a final decision

- Decide on permission to resubmit the thesis in revised form based on the evaluation committee's recommendation, provided the recommendation is unanimous. Where the PhD candidate has remarks on the recommendation, a discussion is held by the PhD Committee prior to taking a final decision
- Approve the report of the evaluation committee
- Assess the possibility for extension of the appointment period, or alternatively, the reduction of compulsory work duties on the basis of a short, properly documented leave of absence, to the extent necessary to complete the doctoral thesis.

## 5 Admission

### 5-3 Infrastructure

5-3 (1) PhD candidates employed at the INN University / BUK receive operating funds of up to 120.000 NOK during the course of their PhD studies. For PhD candidates who do not complete their entire PhD programme at INN University/ BUK, the funding will be calculated proportionally to the actual time spent at the institution. The PhD candidates are responsible for having an overview of the use of their funds. The funds are only to be used for expenses tied to the doctoral work, and all purchases of goods and services must be executed in accordance with INN University's financial regulations and the state procurement regulations. For more information see:

<https://innafor.inn.no/Forskning/For-stipendiater/Driftsmidler>

5-3 (3) PhD candidates may use the operating funds to print extra copies of the PhD thesis, over the number of copies funded by the faculty. It is not permitted to use operating funds to pay for the "disputas dinner".

5-3 (4) BUK expects all PhD candidates to be available on a daily basis and actively participate in the research environment. Appointed PhD candidates with a workspace at INN university are expected to be present a minimum of three days a week. BUK practices need-based distribution of work spaces. This means that PhD candidates who use the office space often and on a regular basis are prioritized when office spaces are distributed. PhD candidates in their final work phase will be offered private offices, if those are available. The final phase is generally considered to be the last six months before the submission of the PhD thesis.

### 5-5 The contract period

5-5 (1) In addition to a strong justification, the application for extension of the admission period must include estimates of the number of working hours and supervision hours required to complete the PhD programme. A detailed progress plan for the extension period must be included with the application as well.

5-5 (2) PhD candidates who are granted an extension for their admission period must report on their progress six (6) months after the decision regarding their extension has been made.

## 7 Supervision

7-1 (1) PhD candidates in doctoral research fellow positions at INN University shall be offered academic guidance for their application for admission. It is preferred that the person providing this guidance is also the person appointed as the main supervisor upon admission, but the case may be that another person is appointed as the main supervisor.

7-1 (2) PhD candidates employed as doctoral research fellows at INN University/ BUK will normally be assigned a main supervisor affiliated with BUK and employed at INN University. There should be strong academic reasons for appointing external main supervisors. The exception to this are PhD candidates with external funding. These candidates may have an external main supervisor, if the supervisor is affiliated with the institution/enterprise that funds the candidate's PhD education.

7-1 (3) When a PhD candidate has an external main supervisor, an internal co-supervisor shall be appointed. In such case, the internal co-supervisor will have the reporting and follow-up responsibilities, which are normally the responsibilities of the main supervisor.

7-1 (4) In accordance with paragraph 3, the head of the PhD programme has the authority to appoint co-supervisors.

7-1 (5) When PhD candidates are admitted to the PhD programme, they will enter an agreement with their supervisors regarding the division of the supervision hours between the main supervisor and the co-supervisors. At BUK, the rule is that 240 hours shall be divided between the supervisors, over the entire course of the PhD programme, including time allocated for reworking material. The supervision hours will cover conversations with the PhD candidate, reading, administration and meetings, among other related work. Usually, the co-supervisor(s) is assigned 1/3 of the supervision time, while the main supervisor is assigned 2/3 of the time. The PhD candidate may, in coordination with the main supervisor and head of the PhD programme, agree upon a different time distribution between the main supervisor and the co-supervisors.

7-1 (6) Programme start-up meeting. Shortly after the PhD candidate has been appointed to/ has been admitted to the PhD programme and assigned supervisors, the PhD programme shall invite the candidate and the supervisors to a start-up meeting. The following topics should be discussed during the meeting:

- The use of supervision hours during the course of the PhD
- Expectations in regard to the role and function of the supervisor(s)
- Expectations from the candidate
- How frequently reports and drafts should be submitted to the supervisors
- Supervisors' comments on submitted drafts
- Expectations regarding the PhD candidate's drafting process
- Expectations in terms of how many times the supervisor shall read a text, between the draft version and the finished version
- Evaluation of the supervisory relationship along the way
- Follow-up and possible revision of the education and progress plan submitted by the PhD candidate as part of the application for admission to the programme

7-3 (1) Travel and meeting expenses related to supervision shall be covered by the PhD candidate. BUK only covers travel expenses for external supervisors related to midway evaluations and public defence of theses.

7-3 (2) PhD candidates may use their operating funds to cover travel expenses related to external supervisors and compulsory seminars such as start-up/end-of-programme seminar.

## **8 Training / taught component**

### **8-1 Purpose, content and scope**

8-1 (1) The project description is the cornerstone of the PhD process. The description shall include a progress plan, as well as a plan of the implementation of the training/taught component. The progress plan is operationalized through three compulsory milestones, distributed over the course of studies: start-up seminar, midway seminar and end-of-programme seminar. The seminars provide training in dissemination, and all milestones include an evaluation of the PhD candidates' progress and work-quality.

The purpose of the presentations is:

- To stimulate a good writing progress by establishing milestones, thus enhancing the candidates' productivity
- To provide the candidates with a close follow-up along the way, through comprehensive and systematic feedback on their thesis-work during pivotal moments, while there is still time to take into account comments and critiques before the final submission
- To provide the candidates with training on how to present their research to a wider audience
- To ensure that questions concerning quality and progress are a shared responsibility embedded in the research environment

### **Guidelines for start-up seminar**

- a) The start-up seminar is normally arranged within three months after admission to the programme.
- b) The PhD programme suggests a time for the seminar and an opponent. The opponent is normally a PhD candidate enrolled in the programme who has completed the midway evaluation.
- c) The start-up seminar is based on the project description and other possible material for presentation. The texts must be sent to the opponent and the head of the PhD programme no later than a week before the seminar.
- d) The start-up seminar's duration is up to 60 minutes. The PhD candidate shall present for 20 minutes and the opponent for 15-20 minutes. Afterwards, a debate between the PhD candidate and the opponent, with questions from the audience, will take place.

### **Guidelines for midway seminar and evaluation**

- a) The mid-way seminar is normally arranged in the third or fourth semester of a three-year PhD programme, or the fourth or fifth semester of a four-year programme. The PhD programme decides on the time for the seminar.
- b) The midway seminar's duration is up to two hours (120 minutes). The candidate presents for 45 minutes, after which the opponent presents and conducts a discussion with the PhD candidate for 45 minutes. The last 30 minutes are set aside for questions from the audience.
- c) The project work by the PhD candidate up to that point forms the basis for the midway seminar. The candidate will present an overview of the project and its development, detailing the progress thus far and a timeline for the remaining work. The candidate shall also relay which courses she/he has attended, and what parts of the PhD education remain to be completed. At this stage, the candidate will have normally finished 2/3 of the taught/

training component (20 credits) and data collection should be completed. For candidates who write article-based theses, it is expected that a draft of a minimum of one article should be completed. For those writing monographs, a draft of at least 50 pages is expected to be completed at this stage. The text must be sent to the opponent and the PhD programme via the head of the programme and programme coordinator no later than two weeks before the midway seminar.

- d) The opponent in the midway seminar can be an internal or external person holding a PhD. In accordance with § 9-2 of the PhD regulations, the PhD programme appoints the opponent. The task of the opponent is to assess the quality and progress of the PhD work.
- e) In accordance with § 9-2 of the PhD regulations, an evaluation must be conducted halfway in the PhD process. This evaluation shall be conducted as a conversation following the midway seminar. The meeting shall feature the PhD candidate, the head of the PhD programme (or another representative), the main supervisor and co-supervisor, who will assess the academic status and progress of the PhD work based on material submitted by the PhD candidate and the midway seminar. The purpose of the evaluation is to discuss any challenges that may prevent the PhD project from being concluded within the stipulated period. The conversation shall also contribute towards identifying measures that will help the timely completion of the PhD process. If the PhD candidate has an external main supervisor, the internal co-supervisor can partake in this evaluation meeting instead of the main supervisor.
- f) If the midway evaluation raises doubt in regard to whether the candidate will manage to conclude the PhD project on time, this can form the basis for involuntary termination in accordance with § 5-6 of the PhD regulations. If the midway seminar and evaluation are not completed within the timeframes mentioned in section a), this may also form a basis for involuntary termination of the PhD project.

### **Guidelines for end-of-programme seminar / reading**

- a) The seminar/reading is scheduled within the final 3-5 months of the PhD project. The PhD programme decides on the exact time together with the PhD candidate and the main supervisor.
- b) The person conducting the seminar/reading (“sluttleser”) may be an internal or external person holding a PhD. The opponent is appointed by BUK. The task of the sluttleser is to provide the candidate with critical and constructive feedback for the thesis draft, as well as provide suggestions for improvements prior to submitting the thesis.
- c) The feedback may be presented as one of the following:
  - a. A written document sent to the PhD candidate and the PhD programme, or
  - b. An end-of-programme seminar/trial public defence that lasts up to two and a half hours (150 minutes). The candidate will use 45 minutes for presentation, and approximately 60 minutes will be dedicated for the opponent’s comments and discussion with the PhD candidate. The remaining time will be set aside for comments and questions from the audience.
- d) The basis for the lecture should be an overview of the entire project, including completed and un-completed chapters. This should make up a total of at least 80% of the scope of the thesis. The material must be sent to the sluttleser and the PhD programme via the head of the programme and the coordinator no later than four weeks before the scheduled feedback.

8-1 (2) The training / taught component must include courses with a scope of no less than 30 credits. 20 credits are covered by the compulsory courses, whereas the remaining credits will be taken as internal or external elective courses.

Compulsory courses:

- Course in philosophy of science and research ethics (10 credits). This course is jointly offered annually for the PhD programmes BUK, INSEPP and AUD.
- Theoretical course in child and youth participation and competence development (5 credits). This course is offered every other year.
- Methodological approaches to research within child and youth participation and competence development (5 credits). This course is offered every other year.

8-1 (3) Up to three credits can be granted for presentation of research papers at conferences. One credit can be granted for participation in national conferences and two credits can be granted for participation in international conferences. One credit can be granted for presenting poster in national conferences. In order to get these credits approved, the candidate must follow the procedure for approval of external courses, in which an application must be sent along with the course documentation.

8-1 (4) Elective courses must be recommended by a supervisor. In accordance with paragraph 3 above, the head of the PhD programme has the authority to approve external and elective courses, as well as approve the training / taught component.

## **9 Evaluation and reporting**

9-1 (1) The main supervisor has the responsibility for filling in and sending the annual progress report to the head of the PhD programme and to the programme coordinator. If the PhD candidate has external supervisors, the internal co-supervisor is responsible for acquiring the necessary information from the external supervisors concerning the evaluation and progress. If there are any significant disruptions to the PhD progress, possible measures must be discussed in the PhD committee.

9-1 (2) The progress report shall identify whether any existing conditions may be an obstacle to the completion of the PhD project within the stipulated timeframe. The head of the PhD programme, together with the PhD candidate and the main supervisor, shall endeavour to find solutions that can contribute to the candidate completing the project on time.

9-1 (3) The PhD candidate will normally have an annual conversation with the head of the PhD programme, in which results from the progress report will be discussed.

9-2 (1) At BUK, the midway evaluation is included in the PhD candidates' compulsory midway seminar, cf. 8.1. (1).

## **10 The PhD thesis**

A deviation from these guidelines must be academically justified and approved by the main supervisor and the head of the PhD programme.

10-1 (1) Requirements for a monograph:

A thesis written as a monograph will normally have a scope of a minimum of 200 pages, bibliography not included.

#### 10-1 (2) Requirements for an article-based thesis:

A collection of shorter scientific works is called here an article-based thesis, even if the projects are not necessarily presented as journal articles. In addition to the provisions stipulated by legislation and national and local regulations, the following applies:

- a) The articles must be at a level required for peer-reviewed scientific publications. A minimum of one article must be published, or be considered for publication, when the thesis is submitted.
- b) The thesis must have a scope of at least three academic papers.
- c) If single authorship is normal practice within the discipline, the PhD candidate must be the sole author of at least one of the articles.

In addition to the articles, the thesis must include a chapter that explains how the articles are connected.

##### a) This chapter must adhere to the following rules:

- I. The candidate must be the sole author of this chapter.
- II. The chapter must clarify the connection between the articles and ensure that the thesis is presented as a comprehensive product of the PhD project. The various issues and conclusions presented in the articles must therefore not only be summarized, but also connected, so that the inherent link between them emerges, and so that the thesis' contribution to the research field(s) is made clear.
- III. If the thesis includes published articles containing academic content that requires updating, the chapter must also include these so that the thesis is academically up-to-date.
- IV. Key concepts should be presented in the chapter, while elaborations and discussions of them should be found in the articles.

##### b) Guiding principles:

- I. The chapter should include the necessary theoretical and methodological assessments in the thesis work, as there is often no room for this in the articles.
- II. The complexity and nuances of the findings should be discussed in light of methodological, scientific and theoretical questions.
- III. The chapter should identify and discuss ethical issues concerning the research.
- IV. The chapter should normally not exceed 100 pages. References, tables and figures come in addition to these pages.
- V. The chapter should include the following:
  - a. Introduction
  - b. Literature review
  - c. Theoretical framework
  - d. Methodology
  - e. Brief summary of each paper
  - f. Discussion
  - g. Conclusion
  - h. Bibliography (interview guides and questionnaires must be included as appendices at the end of the thesis, following the papers)

### 13-1 Submission the thesis

The PhD thesis is normally tested using INN University's plagiarism detection software (Ephorus or Urkund) before submission. This mainly applies to monographs and parts of article-based theses that have not yet been published.

### **16 The evaluation committee's recommendation**

In accordance with paragraph 3 above: in the event of a unanimous recommendation, the head of the PhD programme has the authority to make the decision that the PhD thesis is worthy of public defence.

### **20 Approval of the doctoral examination**

In case of unanimous recommendation, the head of the PhD programme has the authority to make decisions regarding the approval of the doctoral examination on the basis of the evaluation committee's recommendation.

**These guidelines can be revised based on changes in key regulations and guidelines from superior authorities. The PhD committee has the authority to adopt changes to these guidelines.**