Program for the Faculty of Humanities' welcome meeting for new PhD fellows and their supervisors, 18 March 2024
Course leader: Hanne Hagtvedt Vik
Venue: Niels Treschows hus, 12th floor

All sessions in English.

DAY 1

9:00 The PhD program at UiOs Faculty of Humanities by Professor Hanne Hagtvedt Vik. Roles and responsibilities in the PhD program. Formal requirements for a PhD degree. Monograph and article-based formats for a PhD thesis.

09:30-10:15 Open research and data management. Anne Sæbø, Digital Scholarship Center, and Stine Marie Borsjø, Open Research, University Library. Introduction of Lisa Nordick, HF Faculty Administration

10:30-12:00 The University Library - Signe Marie Brandsæter leads a team of university librarians. Meet your librarian and learn about the resources, individual assistance, and training the library offers to PhD fellows at the Faculty of Humanities.

12:00-12:45 Lunch

12:45-13:15 The PhD program at UiOs Faculty of Humanities by Professor Hanne Hagtvedt Vik. The educational component.

13:15-14:15 The advisory relationship by Hanne Hagtvedt Vik. Formal and informal requirements of the candidate/advisor relationship and role relations.

Group discussions of model cases of advisor/candidate challenges. **Cases included below, please read them before the course.**

14:30-15:30 Ethics in the research team: Due credit, co-authorship, plagiarism by Professor Bjørn Ramberg, IFIKK

15:30-16:00 Closing plenary and evaluation

17:00 Dinner

Cases for the module on supervision

Case A: A writing problem

Candidate X and supervisor Y have been teamed up for one and a half years of a three-year PhD. In the first year, things seemed to be going well, they had mutually interesting conversations and both shared a strong interest in the PhD project's

research area. The candidate found it hard to get from the note-taking stage to writing thesis text, however. The supervisor reacted by requesting more frequent supervisory sessions and also asked to read any text, including very unfinished writing. At the half-way mark this had not resulted in more efficient text production and also made the candidate quite anxious. The time for a mid-way evaluation was coming up and the candidate felt too far from having reached half way, while the supervisor leaned toward going though with the mid-way evaluation, hoping that it would kickstart the writing better than advisory efforts had done.

1. What initiatives do the supervisor and/or candidate need to take?
2. Is it a good idea to go ahead with the mid-way evaluation?

Case B: Absent supervisor, anxious candidate

Candidate Z initially felt lucky to have supervisor W, who was an internationally prominent expert in the thesis' research field. It was a known thing that supervisor W was extremely busy, but candidate Z was of an independent cast of mind and thought s/he would be able to do without that much time. In the second year, however, the candidate had experienced some harsh feedback in seminars and was beginning to have some doubts about whether the thesis was viable. Candidate Z had tried to voice these doubt in a hasty corridor encounter with the supervisor in September, but came away with a feeling of having been politely brushed off. The candidate wrote a mail expressing worries requesting an advisory session. After two weeks the candidate had received no answer, nervously wrote a reminder and then received a mail in October where the supervisor apologised for the delay, but also informed the candidate that s/he would be travelling and extremely busy that semester. The supervisor restated that s/he did not believe the thesis was in major jeopardy and suggested an advisory session in January, at which point one year would remain of the stipend.

1. What initiatives do the supervisor and/or candidate need to take?
2. How should their collaboration change?