

MEETING: WORK PACKAGE 2 (DEVELOPMENT- JOINT FRAMEWORK FOR HARMONIZATION OF PHD STUDY PROGRAMS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CURRICULUM DRAFT)

Minutes of the meeting held on 10-11 June 2019 in Podgorica regarding WP2

During the meeting, answers of all partner institutions (PIs) to the Questionnaire on management and tutoring of the PhD study program were analysed and discussed, both for harmonization of the existing PhD programs at PIs and for Joint PhD program that should be developed in the project. The meeting was led by WP leaders Vili Harizanova and Jelena Latinović.

Participants analysed together all answers (one by one) to questions prescribed in the Questionnaire, which were provided previously to team leaders. Concerning Question 1: Do you have a special university structure dealing with the PhD students? – it is concluded that at each partner University there is a special university structure that manages PhD study program (Board, Council, Committee); for Joint PhD program there should be a Council comprised by one person from each partner university.

For questions 2 and 3 concerning rule and procedure for enrolment and approval of the applicant at the PhD program, each PIs manage this issue according to the approved national laws and institutional rules; for Joint PhD program it is agreed that the call should be announced and the candidates should hold a master degree; the selection must be done based on approved and specified criteria.

Concerning questions 4 and 5 about a procedure for appointing the supervisor and who meet the requirements to be a supervisor, PIs have their own rules of the University; usually mentor decides based on a conversation or an interview if it is appropriate to supervise the candidate in his/her PhD work (informal) but some universities require to have formal exams. For Joint PhD program: all academic and research positions who meet the requirements (qualification requirements to be established). For Joint PhD program there must be (at least)

Co-Funded by the European Union

two supervisors from two partner institutions of the project. Mentor must have adequate publications – mentors can be of any of the academic titles (full professor, associate professor or assistant professor) but who fulfils the requirements in publications. In case of need, beside mentor, also co-mentor can be appointed for the specific PhD theme.

About the question 6: How the research topic of the PhD thesis is being chosen? - participants agreed that mutual agreement between the PhD student and the supervisor must be achieved.

PIs representatives agreed related to question 7 that it is not compulsory but it is desirable for research topic to be chosen in line with national or regional research priorities.

Discussion on Question 8: Do you have a scholarship for the PhD student and if YES - who is paying and for how long? – revealed that in PIs it depends on the rules of the university where the student is enrolled, he/she can get a scholarship and it depends mostly of the government. For Joint PhD program certain number of scholarships can be provided through the project and cofinanced by the universities/government; also opportunities such as Erasmus program etc. should be taken into account.

The status of the PhD student, his /her rights and obligations, which are already harmonized among the PIs, should be written in guidelines for Joint PhD program (question 9).

Special attention is given to the question 10 about a mandatory period for PhD student to spend abroad. Among PIs there is no mandatory period for PhD student to spend abroad, but it is highly recommended. However, for Joint PhD program, it is agreed that the PhD student must spend at least six months in another partner university (therefore, PhD student will have at least 2 supervisors from 2 partner institutions).

The procedure for annual evaluation of the PhD student (Question 11) is in compliance with institutional rules at each PIs. For Joint PhD program the procedure for annual evaluation of the PhD student should include at least annual report on his/her research activities.

In regard to questions 12 and 13 on number of papers that must be published by the student before the final defence and what kind of journals, in PIs this issue is in accordance with national/institutional rules but not less than one paper in journals indexed by Web of Science/SCOPUS database. However, for Joint PhD program it was agreed that the PhD student must publish at least one paper in journal indexed by Web of Science database before the final defence. Similar, for Question 14, the conclusion is that it is highly recommended for PhD student to be the main author of the paper.

Concerning Question 15: What kind of final written work must be presented (several compiled published papers or the thesis - monography), the conclusion made at the meeting is that the final written work presented by the PhD student could be both - monography or compilation of scientific publications.

Discussion on Questions 16, 17 and 18 about the number of people included in the Board/Commission for evaluation of the PhD thesis and their competences was diverse. Current situation in PIs is that the Board/Commission for evaluation of the PhD thesis should consist of at least three people competent in the respected field of science. In some PIs supervisor can not be a member of the Board/Commission while in some PIs supervisor is a Board member. Regarding Joint PhD program general conclusion is that the Board/Commission for evaluation of the PhD thesis should consist of at least three people competent in the respected field of science approved by the Advisory Scientific Board of the project (the Advisory Scientific Board of the project should have 12 members - one from each partner university, balanced in field of competences). The supervisor can propose up to 5 members for the Board and the decision is made by the Advisory Scientific Board. The supervisor can not be a member of the Board/Commission.

Finally, joint degree between two institutions (Doctor Europaeus) is acceptable (question 19).

It is highly recommended to accept the unique glossary (for example: Board or Commission for evaluation, discipline, course...) in order to avoid

misunderstanding. Mentor or supervisor can be used while tutor is not suitable for university.

At the end of the meeting it was agreed that WP2 should propose the learning outcomes for joint PhD study program for the forthcoming meeting in Tirana.

Minutes prepared by: Vili Harizanova and Jelena Latinović