

# Regulations for the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Degree at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences

Please note that the English translation is for information purposes only. For all legal purposes, the original regulations and guidelines in Norwegian are the authoritative versions.

## Part I. Preliminary Provisions

### § 1. *Applicability of these guidelines*

These guidelines apply to all education culminating in the Doctor of Philosophy degree (PhD) at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences.

These guidelines recommend provisions for admission to, participation in, and completion of doctoral training, including joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements.

### § 2. *Scope, content and objectives of the PhD education*

The objective of doctoral education is to qualify candidates for conducting research of international quality and for performing other types of work in society that require a high level of scientific expertise and analytical thinking, in accordance with sound scientific practice and established standards for research ethics.

The doctoral education aims to provide the candidate with knowledge, skills and expertise in keeping with the third cycle of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education.

Doctoral education normally consists of three years of full-time study, and includes compulsory coursework comprising a minimum of 30 credits.

The key component of the doctoral education is an independent research project carried out under close academic supervision.

The PhD degree is conferred on the basis of:

- an approved doctoral thesis
- approved completion of the required coursework, and any other approved educational qualifications or expertise
- an approved trial lecture on an assigned topic
- an approved public defence of the doctoral thesis (disputas)

### § 3. *Responsibility for PhD education*

The Board of Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences (hereinafter, INN University or the Institution) has the overall responsibility for doctoral education offered at the Institution.

This responsibility is managed by the Rector on behalf of the Board.

Each PhD programme shall have its own PhD committee. The Rector determines the mandate for, and composition of the PhD committees.

#### **§ 4. Quality assurance**

Doctoral education must follow the Institution's quality assurance system for educational activities.

## **Part II. Admission**

#### **§ 5. Admission**

##### *§ 5-1. Conditions for admission*

To be eligible for admission to doctoral training, applicants must normally hold a master's degree (120 credits), cf. the provisions of the second cycle of the National Qualifications Framework. The applicant must have a strong academic background from her/his previous studies; the average grade from the master's degree or equivalent education should normally be B or better. The calculation of the average grade should be weighed against the credits for each subject and for the master's thesis.

In cases where the education is approved using a pass / fail grading system, admission is granted following individual assessment.

The PhD committee may, after special assessment, approve other kinds of equivalent education as the basis for admission.

##### *§ 5-2. Application*

The application should include:

- documentation of the educational qualifications to serve as the basis for admission;
- a project description that includes:
  - academic account of the research project (project description)
  - documentation of special needs for academic and material resources
  - any plans for an academic stay at another institution, including foreign ones
  - plans for academic dissemination
  - information regarding any intellectual property rights restrictions intended to protect the rights of others
  - plan for the training component, including training aimed at general competence in accordance with the National Qualifications Framework
  - proposal for at least one supervisor as well as indication of affiliation with an active research environment
  - an account of any legal and ethical issues that the project raises and how these can be addressed. It shall be stated in the application whether the project is dependent on permission from research ethics committees, other authorities, or from private actors (informants, patients, parents, etc.).

The Institution is responsible for determining the content of the application form.

The candidate and the main academic supervisor should – as soon as possible, and no later than three (3) months after admission – jointly review the project description and assess any need for adjustments. The project description should provide an explanation of the research theme, research questions, and the choice of theory and methodology.

##### *§ 5-3. Infrastructure*

The infrastructure necessary for carrying out the research project must be placed at the disposal of the candidate. It is the responsibility of the PhD committee and the relevant faculty to decide what infrastructure is necessary for executing the project. For candidates with external funding or an external workplace, an agreement must be entered into between the Institution and the external party in connection with the research project concerned. As a general rule, the agreement must be signed prior to the official admission of the candidate, or immediately thereafter.

#### § 5-4. *Decision on admission*

The decision to grant admission is made by the dean based on the recommendation of the PhD committee. The decision is made based on an overall assessment of the application and the relevant PhD programme's admission capacity.

The formal admission letter will appoint at least one academic supervisor, assign responsibility for dealing with other needs outlined in the application, and establish the start and end dates of the agreement period. The programme start date will be the same as the date on which the candidate starts receiving funding.

Any extension of the agreement period must be examined in light of the rights of employees pursuant to Norwegian legislation, and must be clarified in particular in relation to the candidate's funding basis.

Admission will be denied if

- agreements with external third parties prevent publication and public defence of the doctoral thesis;
- the agreements on intellectual property rights that have been entered into are so unreasonable that the Institution cannot be involved in the project;
- there is the potential of less than one (1) year of full-time work on the research project at the time of application

#### § 5-5. *Agreement period*

Doctoral education normally consists of three (3) years of full-time studies. If the candidate's training is interrupted for approved reasons, the agreement period will be extended correspondingly.

The faculty may, upon justified application, extend the agreement period. Upon granting an extension, the faculty may stipulate further conditions for the extension. The maximum duration for the PhD studies outside of approved leave and compulsory work is six (6) years.

When the period of admission expires, the rights and obligations of the parties in connection with the PhD agreement terminate. This means that the PhD candidate may lose her/his right to receive academic supervision, participate in courses, and have access to INN University's infrastructure. The candidate may, however, apply for permission to submit her/his doctoral thesis for evaluation for the PhD degree after the admission period and/or the maximum duration for PhD studies has expired.

#### § 5-6. Termination prior to expiry of the agreement period

## Voluntary termination

The candidate and the faculty may agree that the PhD training will conclude prior to the original agreed date. In the event of voluntary termination, all questions regarding the terms and conditions of employment, funding, rights to the use of the research results, etc. must be settled in a designated termination agreement.

In case of voluntary termination due to the candidate's desire to transfer to another project or to transition to another programme, the candidate shall apply for new admission on the basis of the new project.

## Involuntary termination

The Rector may decide on involuntary termination of the PhD education when a candidate does not fulfil her/his obligations under the doctoral agreement in a material way, cf. the Act Relating to Universities and University Colleges § 4-13 (2). When one or more of the following conditions are fulfilled, the Rector may, upon the recommendation of the dean of relevant faculty, decide on the involuntary termination of the candidate's PhD education:

- a significant delay in completion of the required coursework;
- repeated or material breaches of the candidate's obligations to provide information, follow-up, or meet reporting obligations, including failure to submit progress reports, cf. § 9;
- a delay in the progress of the research project that is of such a nature as to create a reasonable doubt regarding the candidate's ability to complete the project within the agreed time period

Appeals on decisions pursuant to this paragraph shall be processed by INN University's Appeals Committee.

### *§ 5-7. Involuntary termination in the event of cheating on examinations or tests during the PhD studies*

In case of cheating on examinations or tests during the course of the PhD studies, the Institution may decide to annul such examinations and tests, cf. § 4-7 of the Act Relating to Universities and University Colleges. If the circumstances are so serious as to constitute scientific misconduct, cf. § 4-13 (1) of the same Act, cf. § 5, second paragraph, of the Research Ethics Act, the Institution may decide to impose involuntary termination, cf. § 5-8 below.

### *§ 5-8. Involuntary termination in the event of scientific misconduct*

If a PhD candidate is found guilty of scientific misconduct, cf. § 4-13 (1) of the Act Relating to Universities and University Colleges, cf. § 5, second paragraph of the Research Ethics Act, the Institution may decide to impose involuntary termination.

## **§ 6. The PhD Agreement**

Admission to doctoral training must be formalised in a written agreement signed by the PhD candidate, the academic supervisor(s), and the faculty to which the candidate has received admission. The agreement regulates the rights and obligations of the parties during the period of admission and is intended to ensure that the candidate participates on a regular basis in an active research environment and that she/he is able to complete the training within the agreed time period.

For PhD candidates with funding from, employment at, or other ties to an external party, a separate agreement must be signed between the candidate, the faculty and the external party, in keeping with the established guidelines.

In the event that the PhD candidate will be affiliated with an institution abroad, INN University's guidelines for such cooperation must be followed, and a separate agreement must be entered into using a standard agreement form. As a general rule, the signed agreement must be attached to the admission agreement.

## **Part III. Implementation**

### **§ 7. Academic supervision**

The work revolving the doctoral thesis must be carried out under individualised academic supervision. The faculty, the PhD programme and the supervisors are to work together to ensure that the PhD candidate participates in an active research environment.

#### *§ 7-1. Appointment of academic supervisors*

As a general rule, the PhD candidate will have at least two academic supervisors, of which one will be designated as the main supervisor. The main supervisor should be appointed at the time of admission.

*The main supervisor* has the primary academic-related responsibility for the candidate, and should ordinarily be an employee of INN University.

*Co-supervisors* are scholars within the relevant academic discipline who provide supervision and share the academic-related responsibility for the candidate with the main supervisor.

Provisions on impartiality in §§ 6 to 10 of the Public Administration Act regarding disqualification apply to the academic supervisors.

All academic supervisors must hold a doctoral degree or equivalent qualification in the relevant research field and be working actively as researchers. At least one of the appointed supervisors should have previous experience or training in serving as a supervisor for PhD candidates.

The PhD candidate and/or academic supervisor may ask the faculty / PhD programme to appoint a new supervisor for the candidate. The supervisor may not withdraw from the supervisory role before a new supervisor has been appointed. The parties may bring any disputes regarding the academic-related rights and obligations of the supervisor and candidate for the review and a final decision by the PhD committee.

#### *§ 7-2. Duties of the academic supervisors*

The supervisor is responsible for monitoring the candidate's academic development. Candidates and supervisors should have regular contact. The contact frequency should be stated in the progress report, cf. § 9.

The supervisors are required to monitor the progress of the candidate's work and evaluate it in relation to the project description, cf. § 5-2.

The supervisors are required to follow up on academic circumstances that may lead to delayed completion of the research education, so that it can be completed within the stipulated period.

The supervisors are to provide advice on the formulation and framing of themes and research questions, discuss and assess hypotheses and methodology, discuss the results and their interpretation, discuss the structure and implementation of the thesis, including outline, choice of language, documentation, etc. and provide guidance on the academic literature and data available in libraries, archives, etc. The supervisors must also advise the candidate on research ethical questions related to the thesis.

## **§ 8. Required coursework**

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

Doctoral education must be organised such that candidates are able to complete their training within the stipulated time frame.

The Institution is responsible for ensuring that the required coursework and the work involved in the doctoral thesis constitute an education at a high academic level in accordance with international standards. Doctoral training must include the completion of a research project, training in research dissemination and an introduction to research ethics, philosophy of science, and scientific methodology. The coursework, together with the research project, must be designed to achieve the anticipated learning outcome in accordance with the National Qualifications Framework.

Together with the research work, the coursework should contribute to the achievement of expected learning outcomes in accordance with the National Qualification Framework.

In cases in which INN University cannot offer the entire required coursework, arrangements should be made for the candidate to receive equivalent training at other institutions.

In subjects where there is no suitable course offer, independent learning study credits can be approved as part of the required coursework.

The coursework must consist of at least 30 credits, of which 20 credits must be completed following admission to the programme. Exceptions may be granted if special academic reasons warrant doing so.

Doctoral-level courses completed at another institution must be approved in accordance with the provisions of § 3-5, first paragraph, of the Act Relating to Universities and University Colleges.

Examinations that are a part of the required coursework portion are regulated by the provisions on examinations in the [Universities and University Colleges Act](#) as well as chapter 6 of the [Regulations for Admission, Programmes of Study and Examinations at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences](#).

### *§ 8-2. The candidate's rights in the event of leave of absence*

PhD candidates on maternity/paternity leave from the doctoral programme may attend classes and sit examinations in courses that will be included as part of the candidate's required coursework during the leave period, pursuant to chapter 14 § 14-10, fourth paragraph, of the National Insurance Act and the circular from the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration regarding § 14-10, fourth paragraph, of 18 December

2006.

**§ 9. *Reporting and midterm evaluation***

### § 9-1. *Reporting*

During the term of the agreement, the PhD candidate and supervisors shall provide independent annual written reports directly to the PhD committee. Progress reports are to be written on standard forms and should be treated confidentially when information so requires.

The candidate and the supervisor hold equal responsibility for submitting the required reports. A lack of, or inadequate progress reports from the candidate may result in involuntary termination of the candidate's participation in the doctoral programme prior to the expiry of the period of admission, cf. § 5-5. Supervisors who fail to comply with the reporting requirements may be relieved of her/his supervisory duties.

### § 9-2. *Midterm evaluation*

A midterm evaluation of the research project should normally be carried out in the third or fourth semester. The candidate must present her/his work and shall be evaluated by a person or a group appointed by the PhD committee. The evaluating person or group must provide an opinion of the academic status and progress of the research project, providing feedback to the candidate, supervisor and PhD committee.

If the evaluating party finds major weaknesses in the research project, measures to rectify the situation must be implemented.

## **§ 10. *The doctoral thesis***

### § 10-1. *Thesis requirements*

A doctoral thesis must be an independent research project or research and development project that meets international standards with regard to ethical requirements, academic level and methodology used in the field of research.

The thesis must contribute to the development of new knowledge and achieve a level meriting publication or public disclosure in a suitable format as part of research-based knowledge development in the relevant discipline.

The thesis may consist of a monograph or a compendium of several shorter manuscripts. If the thesis consists of several shorter manuscripts, an explanation of how these are interrelated must be included.

The main component of the thesis may consist of a new product, a systematised collection of data or another form of presentation (e.g. sound, pictures, video, electronic form of presentation), in which the theoretical and methodological basis is not apparent from the product itself. In such cases, the thesis, together with the presentation of the product itself, must have an additional component comprised of a written description of the research problem, choice of theory, and the method and assessment of the results in keeping with international standards and the academic level within the relevant discipline.

It is the responsibility of the PhD committee to decide whether a doctoral thesis produced by more than one author may be submitted for evaluation. In such case, it must be possible to identify the distinct contributions of the individuals involved.

If the thesis or parts of the thesis have been produced in cooperation with other authors or cooperating partners, the PhD candidate must follow the norms for co-authorship that are generally accepted within the discipline and in accordance with



international standards. If the thesis consists mainly of articles, the candidate must ordinarily be listed as the lead author on at least half of the articles.

A thesis containing articles written by more than one author or cooperating partners must include a signed declaration describing the candidate's contribution to each of the articles.

The doctoral thesis must ordinarily be written in Norwegian, Swedish, Danish or English. If the candidate wishes to write in another language, special permission must be sought upon admission.

The name of the supervisor(s) must be stated in the preface to the doctoral thesis.

#### § 10-2. *Manuscripts that may not be submitted*

Manuscripts or parts of manuscripts that have been approved as the basis for previous examinations or degrees may not be submitted for evaluation as part of the doctoral thesis unless they comprise a minor part of a thesis consisting of several interrelated manuscripts. However, data, analyses and methodologies from previous degrees may be used as the basis for the doctoral research project.

Published papers will not be approved for use in the doctoral thesis if more than five (5) years have passed from the date of publication to the date of admission. The PhD committee may allow an exception to this rule in extraordinary cases.

The doctoral thesis may be submitted for evaluation to only one educational institution, cf. § 13-1

#### **§ 11. *Obligation to report research results that have potential for commercial exploitation***

The rights between cooperating institutions must be regulated in a written agreement.

When a PhD candidate is employed at INN University, INN University's relevant regulations at the time must form the basis of the PhD candidate's obligation to report research results with potential for commercial exploitation that he/she produced during the employment relationship.

When a PhD candidate has an external employer, the corresponding obligation to report must be stipulated in a written agreement between INN University, the PhD candidate and the external employer.

For PhD candidates without an employer, the corresponding obligation to report must be stipulated in the admission agreement between INN University and the PhD candidate.

## **Part IV. Completion**

### **§ 12. *Evaluation***

#### § 12-1. *Basis for evaluation*

The PhD degree is conferred on the basis of:

- an approved doctoral thesis

- approved completion of the required coursework
- an approved trial lecture on an assigned topic
- an approved public defence of the doctoral thesis (disputas)

#### § 12-2. Time from submission to public defence

INN University endeavours to ensure that the time between submission of the doctoral thesis for evaluation and the public defence of the thesis is as short as possible. Normally, this period should not exceed five (5) working months.

It is the responsibility of the main academic supervisor to notify the responsible party at the faculty that the doctoral thesis is about to be submitted, so that the necessary preparations can commence.

### **§ 13. Submission**

#### § 13-1. *Submission of the doctoral thesis*

The application for evaluation of the doctoral thesis should be addressed to the PhD committee, and may only be submitted after the required coursework has been approved.

The following documents must be attached to the application:

- the doctoral thesis prepared in the approved format and in accordance with the Institution's guidelines regarding the required format and number of copies
- documentation of approved required coursework
- required written permissions, cf. § 5-2
- declarations from co-authors, when applicable, pursuant to § 10-1
- statement regarding whether the doctoral thesis is being submitted for evaluation for the first or second time
- statement that the doctoral thesis has not been submitted for evaluation at another institution

The PhD committee may, at its own discretion, reject an application for the evaluation of a doctoral thesis if it is obvious that the thesis is not of a sufficiently high scientific standard, and will be rejected by an evaluation committee.

The doctoral thesis should be made publically available no later than two weeks prior to its public defence cf. § 18-2.

#### § 13-2. *Processing of the application*

The PhD committee is in charge of processing the application for the evaluation of the doctoral thesis. An application that does not meet the requirements of § 13-1 will be rejected.

### **§ 14. Appointment of the evaluation committee**

When the PhD committee has approved an application for evaluation of a doctoral thesis, the dean appoints, based on the recommendation of the PhD committee, an expert committee comprised of at least three members, who will evaluate the thesis and its public defence. Committee members are subject to the provisions of § 6 of the Public Administration Act regarding impartiality.

The composition of the evaluation committee should normally be decided by the time of submission of the doctoral thesis.

The evaluation committee will normally be comprised so that:

- both genders are represented
- only one of its members is an employee at INN University
- The majority of the members of the evaluation committee are external members
- at least one of the members is not employed in her/his main position at a Norwegian institution
- all the members hold a doctoral degree or equivalent expertise

If these criteria are not met, an explanation must be provided.

The PhD committee is responsible for establishing procedures for the appointment of evaluation committees. The proposal for the composition of the evaluation committee must explain the reasoning behind the selection of the members, and how the committee as a whole covers the discipline(s) addressed in the doctoral thesis. The dean appoints, based on the recommendation of the PhD committee, one of the evaluation committee members to serve as the committee's chairperson – usually the internal member.

The appointed supervisor and others who have contributed to the doctoral thesis may not serve as a member of the evaluation committee nor its chairperson.

When required, the dean may appoint an alternate to sit on the evaluation committee.

The candidate will be notified of the proposal for the composition of the committee, and she/he may submit written comments on the matter no later than one week after the proposal has been made known to the candidate.

### **§ 15. *Duties of the evaluation committee***

#### **§ 15-1. Gathering of supplementary information**

The evaluation committee may ask to review the PhD candidate's primary data and any additional or clarifying information.

The evaluation committee may ask the academic supervisor to provide information about the supervision carried out and the work involved in the doctoral thesis.

#### **§ 15-2. Reworking of a submitted doctoral thesis**

The evaluation committee may, on the basis of the submitted doctoral thesis and any additional material, cf. § 15-1, recommend that the PhD committee permits the candidate to make minor revisions to the thesis before the evaluation committee submits its final report. The committee must provide a written list of the specific elements that the candidate must rework.

If the PhD committee allows minor revisions to the thesis, a deadline that should ordinarily not exceed three (3) working months will be set for completing such revisions. A new deadline for submission of the committee's final report will also be set. The PhD committee's decision pursuant to this paragraph may not be appealed by the PhD candidate.

If the committee finds that extensive changes related to the theory, hypotheses, material or methodology used in the thesis are needed in order to deem the thesis adequate for public defence, the committee must reject the thesis.

#### § 15-3. *Report by the evaluation committee*

The evaluation committee determines whether the thesis is worthy of being defended for the PhD degree. The decision presented in the report and any dissenting views must be justified as part of the report.

The committee's report must be submitted no later than three (3) months from the date on which the committee received the thesis for evaluation. If the committee allows reworking of the thesis, a new three-month period commences upon resubmission of the thesis.

The evaluation committee's report is submitted to the PhD committee, which forwards the report to the PhD candidate. The candidate is given ten (10) working days during which she/he may submit written comments to the report. If the candidate does not wish to submit comments, she/he must notify the PhD committee of this in writing as soon as possible.

Any written comments by the PhD candidate must be sent to the PhD committee, which is responsible for reaching the final decision on the matter in accordance with § 16.

#### § 15-4. Correction of formal errors in the doctoral thesis

A thesis which has been submitted may not be withdrawn before the evaluation committee has determined whether it is worthy of being defended for the PhD degree.

After the PhD candidate submits the doctoral thesis for evaluation, she/he may apply for permission to correct formal errors in the thesis. A comprehensive overview of the errors that the candidate wishes to correct (an errata list) must be attached to the application. The application to correct formal errors may be submitted only once, and no later than four (4) weeks prior to the committee's deadline for submission of its final report.

### **§ 16. Institutional procedures related to the evaluation committee's report**

On the basis of the report by the evaluation committee, the PhD committee determines whether the doctoral thesis is worthy of a public defence.

#### *Unanimous evaluation committee decision*

If the evaluation committee's decision is unanimous and the PhD committee finds that the evaluation committee's report should be used as the basis for its final decision, the PhD committee shall make its final decision in accordance with the evaluation committee's report.

If the PhD committee finds that there are grounds to doubt whether the evaluation committee's unanimous decision should be used as the basis for its final decision, the PhD committee must request further clarification from the evaluation committee and/or appoint two new expert reviewers who will submit individual evaluations of the thesis.

Such additional clarification or individual evaluations must be presented to the PhD candidate, who will be given the opportunity to offer comments on the matter.

The PhD committee is to make the final decision on the matter on the basis of the evaluation committee's report and the subsequent reviews.

#### Non-unanimous evaluation committee decision

If the evaluation committee's decision is not unanimous and the PhD committee finds that there are grounds to use the majority's opinion as the basis for its final decision, the PhD committee will reach its final decision in accordance with the majority's view. If the committee's decision is not unanimous and the PhD committee finds there are grounds to consider using the minority's opinion as the basis for its final decision, the PhD committee may request further clarification from the evaluation committee and/or appoint two new expert reviewers who will submit individual evaluations of the thesis. Such additional clarification or individual evaluations must be presented to the PhD candidate, who will be given the opportunity to offer comments. If both of the new reviewers agree with the majority's opinion in the original report by the evaluation committee, the majority's opinion must be followed.

The candidate will be informed of the outcome after procedures related to the evaluations by the new reviewers have been completed.

### **§ 17. Resubmission**

A doctoral thesis that is not found to be worthy of a public defence may be resubmitted in revised form no sooner than six (6) months after the initial rejection. A doctoral thesis may be re-evaluated only once.

In the event of resubmission, the PhD candidate must clearly state that the doctoral thesis was evaluated previously and was not found to be adequate for public defence.

### **§ 18. Public availability of the doctoral thesis**

#### *§ 18-1. Requirements related to the printed doctoral thesis*

When the doctoral thesis is found worthy of a public defence, the PhD candidate must submit the thesis to the PhD committee in the approved format and in accordance with the rules of the Institution, cf. § 13-1.

The PhD candidate must submit a brief summary of the doctoral thesis in English and Norwegian. If the thesis is not written in either English or Norwegian, the candidate must also submit a summary in the language in which the thesis is written. Like the thesis itself, the summary must be made available to the public.

#### *§ 18-2. Public access*

The doctoral thesis must be made available to the public no later than two (2) weeks prior to the date of its public defence. The thesis should be made available in the form in which it was submitted for evaluation, and include any possible necessary revisions made on the basis of the evaluation committee's preliminary comments, cf. § 15-2.

There can be no restrictions imposed on a doctoral thesis being made publicly available, except in the event that a prior agreement has been reached concerning a delay in public access. Such a delay may be allowed so that the Institution and any

external parties that have partially or wholly funded the candidate's PhD studies can take action in regard to potential patenting. An external party may not require that all or parts of a doctoral thesis be withheld from the public domain, cf. § 11.

In the event of publication of the doctoral thesis, the candidate must follow the applicable guidelines on the crediting of institutions. This also applies to other works and presentations held on the basis of the PhD work. As a general rule, INN University's address must be listed as the candidate's address in a publication if the Institution has made a necessary and substantial contribution or laid a foundation so that the author could produce the published manuscript. The candidate must also list other institutions if these, in each case, fulfil the requirement related to contributing institutions.

## **§ 19. The doctoral examination**

### **§ 19-1. Trial lecture**

The trial lecture is an independent part of the doctoral examination and must revolve around an assigned topic. The purpose is to test the candidate's ability to acquire knowledge beyond the topic of the thesis, and the ability to convey it in a lecture setting.

The trial lecture must be held in the language in which the doctoral thesis is written, unless the PhD committee approves the use of another language.

The topic of the trial lecture is determined by the evaluation committee and must be announced to the PhD candidate ten (10) working days prior to the lecture. The trial lecture must be held after the thesis has been submitted, but before its public defence. The committee must approve the trial lecture before the public defence can be held.

The evaluation committee issues a recommendation to the PhD committee regarding whether the trial lecture has been approved or not approved. If the trial lecture is not approved, a justification for this must be given.

### **§ 19-2. Public defence of the doctoral thesis (*disputas*)**

The public defence of the doctoral thesis must take place after the trial lecture has been held and approved.

The time and location of the public defence must be announced at least ten (10) working days before it is to be held.

The committee that has originally evaluated the doctoral thesis must also evaluate the public defence. The dean may, when necessary, appoint an alternate member to the evaluation committee cf. § 14. The public defence must be held in the language used in the thesis, unless the PhD committee, based on the recommendation of the evaluation committee, approves the use of a different language.

There will ordinarily be two opposing speakers, or discussants, at the defence. These two speakers must be members of the evaluation committee.

Other attendees wishing to participate as opposing speakers *ex auditorio*, must report this to the disputes chair during the event, within the stipulated time frame.

The public defence will be chaired by the Rector, or a person appointed by the Rector.

The evaluation committee shall submit its report to the PhD committee in which it shall explain how it has assessed the public defence of the thesis. The report must

conclude with whether the defence was approved or not approved. If the defence is not approved, the report must provide a justification for this.

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

The PhD committee reaches a decision on approval of the doctoral examination on the basis of the evaluation committee's report.

If the PhD committee does not approve the trial lecture, a new trial lecture must be held on a new topic no later than six (6) weeks following the first lecture. A new trial lecture may only be held once. The lecture must be evaluated, to the extent to which this is possible, by the same committee that evaluated the first lecture, unless the PhD committee stipulates otherwise.

If the PhD committee does not approve the public defence, the PhD candidate may defend the doctoral thesis once more only. A new defence can be held no sooner than six (6) months from the first public defence, and must be evaluated to the extent to which this is possible, by the same committee that evaluated the first defence.

### **§ 21. Conferral of the degree and diploma**

Based on the report stating that the required coursework, doctoral thesis and doctoral examination have been approved, the Doctor of Philosophy degree will be conferred on the candidate.

The diploma is issued by INN University, and provides information about the academic training in which the candidate has participated. The Institution determines what additional information is to appear on the diploma.

### **§ 22. Diploma Supplement**

The Institution will issue a Diploma Supplement to the PhD diploma in keeping with the applicable guidelines for Diploma Supplement.

## **Part V. Appeal, entry into force and transitional provisions**

### **§ 23. Appeals**

*§ 23-1. Appeal of a rejection of an application for admission, appeal of a decision to terminate a student's admission rights, and appeal of rejection of an application for recognition of parts of the required coursework*

Rejection of an application for admission, a decision to terminate a student's admission rights, and rejection of an application for recognition of parts of the required coursework may be appealed pursuant to the provisions of § 28 and following of the Public Administration Act. The appeal should be sent to the PhD committee. If the rejection is not overturned, the appeal is sent to INN University's Appeals Board for a final decision.

*§ 23-2. Appeal of an examination which constitutes a part of the required coursework*

Examinations taken as part of the required coursework may be appealed pursuant to section § 5-3 "Complaints regarding marks awarded - right to explanation" and § 5-2 "Complaints against procedural errors in connection with examinations" of the Act Relating to Universities and University Colleges of 1 April 2005 no.15.

### *§ 23-3. Appeal of a rejection of an application for evaluation, and rejection of a doctoral thesis, trial lecture or public defence*

Rejection of an application for evaluation of a doctoral thesis and a decision of non-approval of a doctoral thesis, trial lecture or public defence may be appealed pursuant to § 28 and following of the Public Administration Act.

A detailed appeal should be sent to the PhD committee. If the rejection is not overturned, the appeal is sent to the Appeals Board for a final decision.

If the PhD committee or the Appeals Board find grounds for this, individual experts or a committee may be appointed to conduct an assessment of the evaluation that was carried out and the criteria on which the evaluation was based, or to conduct a new or supplementary expert evaluation.

## **§ 24. Joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements**

### *§ 24-1. Joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements*

The Institution may enter into agreements with one or more Norwegian or foreign institutions for cooperation on joint degrees or cotutelle agreements.

With regard to cooperation agreements on joint degrees and cotutelle agreements, an exception may be made to the other provisions in these guidelines, if it is necessary in order to comply with the regulations of the cooperating institutions.

### *§ 24-2. Joint degrees*

The term “joint degree” is defined as a collaboration between two or more institutions in which the cooperating institutions are all jointly responsible for admission, academic supervision, the conferral of the degree and other elements as described in these guidelines. The collaboration is normally organised in the form of a consortium and is regulated by a contract between the parties to the consortium. For a completed joint degree, a joint diploma is issued in the form of: a) a diploma issued by the all institutions party to the consortium, b) an individual diploma issued by each of the Institutions party to the consortium, or a combination of a) and b).

An agreement to issue a joint degree is normally only entered into if there already exists an established, stable academic collaboration between INN University and at least one of the other institutions party to the consortium. The Board is responsible for establishing detailed guidelines for cooperation on a joint degree, including templates for cooperation agreements, cf. first paragraph.

### *§ 24-3. Cotutelle agreements*

The term “cotutelle agreement” is defined as the joint academic supervision of PhD candidates and cooperation on doctoral training for PhD candidates, between INN University and another institution within Norway or abroad. A cotutelle agreement must be entered into for each individual candidate and should be based on established, academic institutional cooperation.

### *§ 24-4. Requirements related to joint degrees and cotutelle agreements*

In the case of agreements on joint-degree cooperation and cotutelle, the Rector may deviate from these regulations if it is necessary in order to comply with the regulations at



the cooperating partner institution. Such exceptions must be fully justified on the basis of the academic qualification requirements for a corresponding PhD degree at INN University. Qualification requirements for admission, requirements for thesis public availability, and requirements for the evaluation of the public defence of the thesis by an impartial committee cannot be waived.

Agreements on joint degrees and cotutelle must, as a minimum requirement, regulate admission, funding, training, supervision, status at the institutions, reporting obligation, the language of the thesis, thesis format, evaluation, degree conferment, diploma, and rights to research results. The agreement must be signed by the Rector.

The PhD education at the cooperating partner institution must have a scope of three years of standard study time. The candidate must be admitted to both institutions.

### **§ 25. *Supplementary provisions***

The Rector may stipulate additional provisions to these regulations.

### **§ 26. *Entry into force***

These regulations have entered into force on 01.01.2018. From the same date the Regulations for the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Degree at Hedmark University of Applied Sciences of 16 December 2009 no. 4921 and the Regulations for the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Degree at Lillehammer University College of 29 April 2016 no. 501, have been repealed.