

Regulations on the degree of philosophiae doctor (PhD) at Kristiania University College – the Ernst G. Mortensen Foundation

Statutory basis: These Regulations was adopted by the Board of Kristiania University College at the board meeting on (insert new date) in pursuance of sections 3-3, 3-9 (7) and 4-13 of Act no 15 of 1 April 2005 relating to universities and university colleges (the Universities and Colleges Act).

Part I. Introductory provisions

Section 1. The scope of the Regulations

These Regulations apply to all education that leads to the degree of *philosophiae doctor* (PhD). The Regulations provide rules on admission to, participation in and completion of doctoral education, including joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements.

Integrated PhD education is a specially designed form of study leading to a PhD degree at Kristiania University College. The specific provisions for this course of study are set out in separate guidelines on integrated PhD education.

Regulation no. 813 of 1 June 2018 relating to admission, studies, degrees and examinations at Kristiania University College governs examinations in the training component of the PhD programmes insofar as it is not contrary to the PhD Regulations. The School of Doctoral Studies is responsible for following up the candidates during the training component, in accordance with the routines described in the PhD handbook.

For other provisions that regulate the terms and conditions of the doctoral degree, reference is made to the Norwegian Act relating to universities and university colleges (2005), the Norwegian qualifications framework for lifelong learning (NKR 2011), the Regulations concerning terms and conditions of employment for the posts of postdoktor (post-doctoral research fellow), stipendiat (research fellow), vitenskapelig assistant (research assistant) and spesialistkandidat (resident) (2006), the Regulations relating to degrees and vocational training, protected titles and nominal length of study at universities and university colleges (2005), the Ministry's Regulations concerning quality assurance and quality development in higher education and tertiary vocational education (Ministerial Regulations) (2010), the Norwegian Agency of Quality Assurance and Education's (NOKUT) Regulations concerning supervision of the educational quality in higher education (Academic Supervision Regulations) (2017), the Norwegian Act on ethics and integrity in research (2017), and the European Charter for Researchers & Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers (2005).

Section 2. Terminology

The degree philosophiae doctor (PhD) is hereinafter referred to as doctoral degree or PhD.

The term *doctoral work* is used to refer to the results of the work that the candidate does during the agreed period from start to completion, not including the required coursework (i.e. the training component).

The term *academic thesis* or *thesis* refers to the results of the academic doctoral work (cf. section 11-1).

Section 3. Scope, content and objectives of doctoral education

Section 3-1. The objective of the doctoral education is to qualify candidates to conduct research of a high international standard and perform other types of work requiring a high level of academic insight and expertise in accordance with good academic practice and established standards on academic and research ethics. The doctoral education must provide the candidate with knowledge, skills and expertise in keeping with the Norwegian Qualifications Framework. It shall contribute to the internationalisation of research, the academic community, and the individual candidate. The doctoral education has a normal duration of three (3) years of full-time study and includes a training component comprising required coursework with a minimum scope of 30 credits.

The most important component of the doctoral education is an independent research project carried out under active academic supervision.

Section 3-2. A PHD is awarded on the basis of

- an approved academic thesis (cf. section 11-1)
- approved completion of the required coursework (the training component)
- an approved trial lecture on an assigned topic
- an approved public defence of the academic thesis (disputation).

Section 4. Responsibility for doctoral education

The Board of Kristiania University College has the overall responsibility for the doctoral education. The education is organised in programmes of study managed by the School of Doctoral Studies (SDS).

Section 5. Quality assurance

The doctoral education is covered by Kristiania University College's quality assurance system. The quality assurance shall be based on the University College's common standard for doctoral education.

Part II. Admission

Section 6. Admission

Section 6-1. Criteria for admission

To qualify for admission to a doctoral programme, applicants must normally have a master's degree (see the descriptions in the Norwegian Qualifications Framework). After special assessment, the University College may approve other equivalent education as part of the basis for admission. A Norwegian experience-based master's degree (90 credits) alone does not constitute sufficient grounds for admission.

Further qualification requirements may be set based on criteria that are publicly available and in line with Kristiania University College's recruitment policy and academic profile.

Applicants must have a strong academic background from their previous studies and have a weighted average grade for the last two years of their master's degree programme or equivalent education equal to a B or higher on Kristiania University College's grading scale. Applicants without letter grades from their previous studies must have an equally good academic foundation. Applicants with a weaker academic background in terms of grades may be admitted if they can document that they are particularly well-suited to doctoral studies.

Section 6-2. Application

Kristiania University College determines the content of the application form. Applications are submitted through the institution or department to the Programme Committee and must normally include:

- documentation of the education on which admission is to be based
- a project description, including an academic outline of the project and progress plan
- documentation of funding
- documentation of special needs for academic and material resources
- plans for periods to be spent at another institution
- a plan for academic dissemination
- information about any intellectual property restrictions to protect others' rights
- a plan for the training component
- proposed main academic supervisor and co-supervisors, indicating their affiliation with an active academic community for research
- an account of any legal and/or ethical issues raised by the project and how they can be resolved. The application must state whether the project is dependent on permissions from research ethics committees or other authorities or from private individuals (informants, patients, parents, etc.). Where possible, this kind of permission should be obtained in writing and submitted with the application.

The School of Doctoral Studies may set requirements regarding further documentation.

Applications for admission to a doctoral programme must normally be submitted within three (3) months of the start of the research project that will lead to the PhD degree. If less than one (1) year of full-time work remains on the research project at the time of application, the application will be rejected (cf. section 6-5). There are separate rules for applicants with a background from research training programmes and other equivalent programmes of study.

The candidate and main academic supervisor must review the project description at the first opportunity and assess any need for adjustments. The complete project description must normally be available no later than three (3) months after admission, and must provide an account of topics, the research questions, theory, and methods and an assessment of the risk associated with the project.

Section 6-3. Residency requirement

Candidates with external funding or an external workplace must normally spend a total of at least one year of their doctoral education in a good, relevant academic community at Kristiania University College (residency). The length of the required residency may be reduced, but the proposed scheme must meet the requirements for academic supervision and high quality in the academic community.

Section 6-4. Infrastructure

The candidate must be given access to the necessary infrastructure to be able to perform their doctoral work. The Programme Committee decides what constitutes necessary infrastructure for execution of the project. For candidates with external funding or an external workplace, an agreement is entered into between the University College and the external party in connection with the individual project. As a general rule, this kind of agreement must have been entered into before the candidate in question is formally admitted.

Section 6-5. Admission decision

Decisions on admission are made by the doctoral degree committee and are based on an overall assessment of the application. The doctoral degree committee can set criteria for the ranking of qualified applicants and limit admission if the number of applicants exceeds the capacity.

The formal decision letter must include the appointment of the main academic supervisor and co-supervisors, assignment of responsibilities for dealing with other needs outlined in the application, and specification of the start and completion dates of the agreement period. The start date must be the same as the start date for the funding. Any extension of the agreement period must be related to employees' rights and must be clarified in relation to the candidate's basis for funding.

Admission will be denied if:

- agreements with external third parties will impede the doctoral work being made available to the public and its public defence
- the intellectual property agreements entered into are so unreasonable that the institution ought not to be involved in the project
- the applicant will not be able to fulfil the requirement that a minimum of one year of the project must normally be carried out after the candidate has been admitted to the doctoral programme (cf. section 6-2).

Section 7. The PhD agreement

Section 7-1. The parties to the agreement

Admission to Kristiania University College's doctoral programme is formalised in a written agreement signed by the PhD candidate, the academic supervisors and the University College. The agreement governs the parties' rights and obligations during the admission period. It shall ensure that the candidate participates regularly and contributes actively to the academic community and help ensure that the candidate completes their doctoral education within the agreed time frame. Kristiania University College determines the content of the agreement form.

For PhD candidates with funding from, employment at or other contributions from an external party, a separate agreement must be entered into between the candidate, the institution and the external party.

In cases where the PhD candidate is going to be affiliated with an institution outside Norway, Kristiania University College's guidelines for this kind of collaboration must be followed, and separate agreements must be entered into. These kinds of agreements must normally be appended to the PhD agreement.

Section 7-2. Agreement period

The doctoral education has a nominal duration of three (3) years of full-time study. In the event of interruptions due to compulsory duties or statutory leaves of absence, the agreement period will be extended accordingly.

After the expiry of the agreement period, the parties' rights and obligations pursuant to the PhD agreement cease, such that the PhD candidate may lose their right to academic supervision, participation in courses and access to the institution's infrastructure.

The University College may extend the agreement period on the basis of a valid application. If an extension is granted, the University College may set additional terms and conditions.

The maximum study period is six (6) years from the start date to submission of the doctoral work for evaluation. Any interruptions due to compulsory duties or statutory leaves of absence are not included in the six years. If the maximum study period is exceeded, the candidate loses the right to defend their thesis. The doctoral degree committee decides whether the maximum study period has been exceeded. Candidates may apply to have their doctoral work evaluated for a PhD degree after the maximum study period has been exceeded. The doctoral degree committee decides whether to grant the application.

Section 7-3. Voluntary early termination

The candidate and the University College can agree on discontinuation of the doctoral education before the agreed time. In the event of this kind of discontinuation of the doctoral education, it must be specified in writing how issues related to employment, funding, rights to results, etc. are to be resolved.

In the event of voluntary termination because the candidate wishes to change project or transfer to another programme, the candidate must submit a new application for admission based on the new project. Any external funding source must approve the change of project.

Section 7-4. Forced termination

The doctoral degree committee may decide to discontinue a candidate's doctoral education before the agreed time against the candidate's will (forced termination). Forced termination can be decided if one or more of the following conditions exist:

- Significant delay in the completion of the training component, due to factors within the candidate's control.
- Repeated or serious violations of the candidate's obligations to provide information, follow-up or reports, including failure to submit a progress report (cf. section 10).
- Delay in the progress of the research project to such an extent that there is reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate will be able to complete the project within the agreed time frame. To be valid grounds for forced termination, the delay must be due to factors within the candidate's control.
- Conduct by a candidate that violates the trust that must exist between the University College and a candidate during the PhD period, including criminal offences related to the execution of the doctoral education.

Section 7-5. Forced termination due to cheating on examinations or tests

If it is found that a PhD candidate has cheated on examinations or tests during the course of the programme, the institution may decide to annul the examinations or tests (cf. section 4-7 of the University and University Colleges Act). If the matter is so serious that it can be regarded as scientific dishonesty (cf. section 4-13 (1) of the same Act and section 8, second paragraph, of the Act on ethics and integrity in research), the institution may decide to impose forced termination (cf. section 7-6 below).

Decisions pursuant to the first sentence are made by Kristiania University College's Appeals Committee. Appeals are handled by the Joint Appeals Committee for Student Affairs (cf. section 5-1 of the Universities and University Colleges Act and appurtenant regulations).

Section 7-6. Forced termination due to scientific dishonesty

If a candidate is guilty of scientific dishonesty (cf. section 4-13 (1) of the University and University Colleges Act and section 8, second paragraph, of the Act on ethics and integrity in research), the institution may decide to impose forced termination.

Decisions on forced termination on grounds of scientific dishonesty are made by the doctoral degree committee. Appeals of these kinds of decisions are handled by the Ministry or a special appeals committee appointed by the Ministry.

Section 7-7. Termination and dismissal

A candidate's employment as a PhD candidate can be terminated when there are valid grounds in circumstances relating to the undertaking or candidate (cf. chapter 15 of the Working Environment Act).

The doctoral degree committee may decide to impose forced termination of the right to study if the candidate has had their contract terminated or been dismissed.

Part III. Execution

Section 8. Academic supervision

The work on the doctoral project must be performed under individual academic supervision. Together, the School of Doctoral Studies, institution, department and supervisors shall ensure that the PhD candidate participates in an academic community with active research.

Section 8-1. Appointment of academic supervisors

The School of Doctoral Studies itself appoints academic supervisors. As a general rule, PhD candidates shall have at least two academic supervisors, one of whom must be designated as the main supervisor.

The main academic supervisor has the primary academic responsibility for the candidate. If the doctoral degree committee appoints an external main academic supervisor, a co-supervisor must be appointed who is an academic employee of Kristiania University College.

Co-supervisors are experts in the field who provide guidance and who share the academic responsibility for the candidate with the main academic supervisor.

The impartiality provisions in chapter II of the Public Administration Act "Concerning disqualification" (sections 6 to 10) apply to the academic supervisors and any appointed supporting supervisors.

All academic supervisors must have a PhD or equivalent qualification in the relevant field and be active in their field. At least one of the appointed academic supervisors must have previous experience of supervision of PhD candidates, normally until completion of the PhD.

In addition, the University College may appoint one or more supporting academic supervisors who do not meet the formal qualification requirements for academic supervisors, but who have specific competencies that are essential for the execution of the project. Competencies and relevance must be specified in the application for appointment.

The PhD candidate and the academic supervisor can ask the doctoral degree committee to appoint a different academic supervisor for the candidate. The academic supervisor cannot cease supervising the candidate until a new academic supervisor has been appointed. Any disputes regarding the academic rights and obligations of the academic supervisor and the candidate can be reported by either party to the University College for review and decision.

Section 8-2. Content of the academic supervision

Academic supervisors shall advise candidates on the formulation and delimitation of topics and research questions, discuss and assess methods and results, discuss arrangements, execution, forms of documentation and presentation, and advise the candidate in the relevant academic discourse. The candidate must receive academic supervision in academic and research-ethical issues related to the doctoral work.

The candidate and the academic supervisors must have regular contact. The frequency of contact must be indicated in the annual progress report (cf. section 10-1).

The candidate and the academic supervisors have a mutual obligation to keep each other informed about the progress of the work and to assess it in relation to the project description.

The supervisors have a duty to follow up on academic issues that may result in a delay in the doctoral education such that it can be completed within the standard time frame.

Section 9. The training component

Section 9-1. Purpose, content and scope

The doctoral education shall be set up such that it can be completed within the standard time frame.

The programme committee is responsible for ensuring that the training component, together with the project, provides education at a high academic level in accordance with international standards. The training component must include training in academic dissemination and an introduction to academic and research ethics, the philosophy of science and methodology. Together with the doctoral work, the training component, must contribute to the achievement of the expected learning outcomes in accordance with the Norwegian Qualifications Framework.

The training component must correspond to at least 30 credits, of which at least 20 credits must generally be completed after admission. At least 20 credits must comprise courses at PhD level specified in the programme description. In order for a master's degree course to be included in the training component, the candidate must achieve a grade equal to a B or higher on Kristiania University College's grading scale.

Elements that are to be included in the training component may not have been completed more than two (2) years prior to the date of admission. Exemptions may be granted if there are valid special academic grounds. Special rules apply to PhD candidates with a background from research training programmes.

The University College determines which elements can and must be included in the training component, the requirements regarding documentation, and the criteria for achieving a pass grade in examinations.

Courses at doctoral level at another institution must be approved if they meet the academic requirements for the training component in accordance with the rules in section 3-5 of the Universities and University Colleges Act.

As part of the doctoral education, the PhD candidate must receive guidance on future career opportunities within and outside academia, including information about the competencies that the candidate has acquired through their doctoral work.

Section 9-2. Affiliation with an academic community

It is a prerequisite that the candidate can contribute to the institution's academic community, for example through academic activities such as seminars, workshops and dissemination tasks. The institution and the academic supervisor must systematically follow up these kinds of activities so that the candidate's contact with the academic community is planned and realised.

Section 9-3. The candidate's rights in connection with a leave of absence

PhD candidates who have parental leave from the doctoral education may nevertheless follow teaching and sit examinations in subjects and courses that are going to be included as part of the candidate's required coursework (training component) during their period of leave, in accordance with chapter 14, section 14-10, fourth paragraph, of the National Insurance Act and the circular from

the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration (NAV) on section 14-10, fourth paragraph, of 18 December 2006.

Section 10. Reporting

Section 10-1. Annual reporting

During the agreement period, the PhD candidate must report to the University College each year, describing their progress in the doctoral education. The academic supervisors must report to the University College on the candidate's progress each year. The reports must be submitted using the prescribed forms and will be treated as confidential when warranted by the information therein.

The candidate and the academic supervisor have equal responsibility for reporting. Failure to submit a progress report or inadequate progress reporting from the candidate may result in forced termination of the research education before the end of the agreement period (cf. section 7-4). Academic supervisors who fail to follow up on the reporting requirements may be relieved of their supervision responsibilities.

If necessary, the University College may require special reporting.

Section 10-2. Compulsory seminars, mid-term evaluation

As part of the quality assurance of the doctoral studies, the candidate must conduct two seminars. Evaluation of the doctoral work shall be carried out as a mid-term seminar where the candidate presents their work and is evaluated by a group of at least two persons appointed by the University College. The evaluation group must consider the candidate's academic status and progress and will provide feedback to the candidate, the academic supervisor and the institution.

If the evaluation group reports significant weaknesses in the doctoral work, steps must be taken to rectify the situation.

Section 11. Requirements for the thesis

Section 11-1. Requirements for academic theses

An academic thesis must be an independent piece of research work or research and development work that meets international standards in terms of ethical requirements, academic level and methodology in the discipline.

The thesis must contribute to the development of new academic knowledge and must be at a level that merits publication or presentation to the public in an appropriate format as part of the research-based development of knowledge in the discipline.

The thesis can consist of a monograph or a compendium of several smaller works. If the thesis consists of several smaller works, an account must be provided of how they are related.

An academic thesis may also consist of a written component in combination with a permanently documented product or production. In these kinds of cases, the works must together meet the requirements for an independent piece of research work for the degree of PhD in accordance with international standards in the discipline. The University College may set additional requirements regarding the proportionate share made up by the product or production in terms of scope or content.

The thesis can be submitted in English, Norwegian or another Scandinavian language.

Section 11-2. Joint work

Doctoral work produced by several people jointly can be submitted for evaluation provided it is possible to identify the individual contributions.

For works that have been created in collaboration with several partners or co-authors, the PhD candidate must follow the norms for crediting contributions that are generally accepted in the academic community, in accordance with international standards.

If an academic thesis consists mainly of articles, the candidate must normally be the lead author of at least two of the articles.

Doctoral work including contributions from other people must be accompanied by a signed declaration describing the candidate's input in each piece of work. Both the PhD candidate and the other contributors must sign the declaration.

Section 11-3. Works that will not be accepted

Works or parts of a work that the candidate has had approved as the basis for previous examinations or degrees may not be submitted for evaluation unless they are included as a minor part of the thesis. However, data, analyses and methodologies from previous degrees may be used as a basis for the work on the project.

Previously published works 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 University College may grant exemption from this rule in extraordinary cases (cf. section 11-1).

The thesis may only be submitted to one educational institution for evaluation (cf. section 13-2).

[Section 12. Obligation to report research results with commercial potential](#)

The intellectual property rights of the collaborating institutions must be regulated in a separate agreement.

PhD candidates employed at Kristiania University College must report research results with commercial potential that are produced during the employment relationship in accordance with the University College's applicable regulations.

For PhD candidates with an external employer, a corresponding obligation to report must be stipulated in an agreement between the institution, the PhD candidate and the external employer.

For PhD candidates without an employer, a corresponding obligation to report must be stipulated in the PhD agreement.

[Part IV. Completion](#)

[Section 13. Submission and application for evaluation](#)

Section 13-1. Basis for evaluation

The requirements for awarding a PhD are set out in section 3-2.

A candidate applies for evaluation by submitting an academic thesis (cf. section 13-2).

The main academic supervisor is responsible for notifying the responsible unit that submission or an application for evaluation is imminent, so that the necessary preparations can be made.

Section 13-2. Application for evaluation of an academic thesis

An application for evaluation of a thesis may only be submitted after the required coursework (the training component) has been approved.

The following documents must be submitted with the application:

- The academic thesis in accordance with the University College's provisions, in the form and the number of copies stipulated by the University College.
- Documentation of the necessary permissions (cf. section 6-1).
- Declarations from co-authors where required (cf. section 11-2).
- Statement specifying whether the thesis is being submitted for evaluation for the first time or the second time.
- Declaration that the thesis has not been submitted for evaluation at another institution.
- Statement from the main academic supervisor.

The University College must ensure that the time between submission of the thesis and its defence is as short as possible, normally no longer than five (5) months.

Section 13-3. Processing of the application

The University College processes the application to have an academic thesis evaluated. Applications that do not fulfil the requirements defined in section 13-2 will be rejected. The institution can, on an independent basis, reject an application for evaluation of doctoral work if it is obvious that the work is not of a high enough standard and will be rejected by a committee.

Section 14. Appointment of an evaluation committee.

Once the institution has approved an application for evaluation of an academic thesis, it must appoint an expert committee consisting of at least three members who will evaluate the thesis, the examination on an assigned topic and the public defence (disputation). The impartiality rules in section 6 of the Public Administration Act apply to the committee members.

The evaluation committee must normally be composed such that

- both sexes are represented
- at least one of its members is not affiliated with Kristiania University College
- at least one of the members does not have their main position at a Norwegian institution
- all members have a PhD or equivalent qualifications in the discipline
- the majority of the evaluation committee are external members
- if possible, one of the members is from a relevant overseas institution

If these criteria are departed from, an explanation must be provided stating the grounds for this.

The institution or department nominates candidates for the evaluation committee. The proposal must include an explanation of the reasoning behind the composition of the committee in terms of how the committee as a whole covers the fields included in the doctoral work. The University College appoints either one of the committee members or another person to serve as the chair of the committee.

Appointed academic supervisors and others who have contributed to the doctoral work may not be members of the evaluation committee or involved in its administration.

When required, the University College may appoint an alternate to sit on the evaluation committee. The candidate must be notified of the proposed composition of the committee and be given the opportunity to submit written comments no later than one week after the proposal has been made known to the candidate.

Section 15. The work of the evaluation committee

The evaluation committee must be made familiar with Kristiania University College's PhD regulations and guidelines for evaluation.

Section 15-1. Evaluation of an academic thesis

The evaluation committee may require presentation of the candidate's source material and additional information to supplement or clarify the doctoral work.

The evaluation committee may ask the academic supervisor to provide an account of the academic supervision and work on the project.

On the basis of the submitted thesis and any additional material, the evaluation committee may recommend that the institution permit the candidate to make minor revisions before the committee submits its final report. The committee must provide a written list of the specific items that the candidate must rework.

If Kristiania University College permits minor revisions to the thesis, a deadline normally not exceeding twelve (12) months must be set. A new deadline for submission of the committee's final report must also be set. The candidate may not appeal the institution's decision pursuant to this subsection.

If the committee finds that extensive changes related to the theory, research questions, material or methodology are necessary before the thesis can be deemed worthy of public defence, the committee must reject the thesis.

Section 15-2. The evaluation committee's report

The evaluation committee submits a report stating whether the doctoral work is worthy of defence for the PhD degree and explaining the reasoning behind its decision. All parts of the submitted or presented documentation must be discussed in relation to the criteria defined in section 11-1. The report ought to be discursive and end with a clear conclusion regarding whether or not the work should be approved. Any dissenting opinions or individual statements by committee members must be included in the report, with an explanation of the reasons.

The evaluation committee submits its report to the University College.

The committee's report must be ready no later than three (3) months after the committee received all the parts of the doctoral work for evaluation. If the committee permits minor revisions to an academic thesis, a new deadline runs from the date the work is re-submitted.

The committee's report is submitted to the University College, which then presents it to the candidate. The candidate is given ten (10) working days within which to make written comments on the report. If the candidate does not wish to make any comments, the University College should be informed of this in writing at the first opportunity.

Any comments from the candidate should be sent to the institution. The institution makes the final decision on the matter (cf. sections 16).

Section 15-4. Correction of formal errors

A doctoral work that has been submitted or presented may not be modified or withdrawn until a final decision has been made on whether it is worthy of defence for the PhD degree.

However, the candidate may correct formal errors after submission or presentation of the work. The candidate must attach a complete list of errata that have been corrected. Correction of formal errors must take place before the work is made public.

Section 16. Processing of the evaluation committee's report

Based on the evaluation committee's report, the institution decides whether the doctoral work is worthy of defence.

Unanimous committee decision

If the committee's submits a unanimous recommendation and the University College adopts the committee's recommendation as the basis for its assessment, the institution will make a decision in accordance with the unanimous recommendation.

If the institution finds that there are valid grounds to doubt whether the committee's unanimous recommendation should be used as the basis for its decision, the institution must request further clarification from the committee and, if necessary, appoint two new experts to make individual evaluations of the doctoral work. These kinds of additional statements or individual evaluations must be presented to the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to make comments.

The institution makes the final decision in the case on the basis of the committee's recommendation and the statements obtained.

Non-unanimous committee decision

If the committee submits a non-unanimous recommendation and the University College chooses to adopt the majority's opinion as the basis for its assessment, the institution will make a decision in accordance with the majority's recommendation. If the committee's submits a non-unanimous recommendation and the University College chooses to adopt the minority's opinion as the basis for its assessment, the institution may request further clarification from the committee and, if necessary, appoint two new experts to make individual evaluations of the doctoral work. These kinds of additional statements or individual evaluations must be presented to the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to make comments. If both of the new experts concur with the majority of the evaluation committee in the original report, the committee's recommendation must be followed. The candidate will be informed of the outcome after the statements from new experts have been processed.

Section 17. Application for resubmission

A doctoral work that has been found not worthy of defence can be resubmitted for evaluation in a revised form no earlier than six (6) months after the University College has made its decision. The institution then appoints a new evaluation committee, including at least one of the members of the original committee. A doctoral work can only be resubmitted for evaluation once.

The final deadline for submitting an application for re-evaluation is two (2) years after the institution decided not to approve the original results.

A candidate who submits a new application for evaluation must state that the work has previously been evaluated and was found not worthy of defence (cf. section 13-2).

Section 18. Public availability of the doctoral work

Section 18-1. Requirements related to making the doctoral work public

The academic thesis must be made public. There are special requirements concerning the publication of academic theses (cf. section 18-2).

The candidate must submit a brief written summary or presentation of the thesis in English and Norwegian. This presentation must be made public.

Section 18-2. Availability

The academic thesis shall be publicly available no later than two (2) weeks prior to the date of the public defence. The thesis must be made available in the form in which it was submitted for evaluation, with any revisions made on the basis of the committee's preliminary comments (cf. section 15-1).

No restrictions may be placed on the publication of the doctoral work, except in the event of a prior agreement concerning a delay in the date of publication. The purpose of this kind of delay is to enable the institution and any external party that has fully or partially funded the candidate's doctoral education to consider possible patenting, etc. External parties cannot demand that all or part of the thesis be withheld from the public domain (cf. section 6).

In connection with publication or public presentation, candidates must follow the applicable guidelines on the crediting of institutions. The main rule is that an institution must be mentioned if it has made a necessary and substantial contribution to or laid a basis for the work being made publicly available. Other institutions must also be credited if they meet the requirements regarding participation.

Section 19. The doctoral examination

Section 19-1. Trial lecture or other examination on an assigned topic

After the academic thesis has been submitted for evaluation, the candidate must hold a trial lecture on an assigned topic. This is an independent part of the doctoral examination. The objective is to test the candidate's ability to acquire knowledge outside their area of specialisation and their ability to convey this knowledge in a lecture situation or other relevant form of dissemination.

The evaluation committee sets the assignment and undertakes the evaluation. The PhD candidate is to be notified of the title of the examination ten (10) working days before it is due to take place. The topic must not be directly related to the topic of the doctoral work.

The evaluation committee determines whether the candidate passes the examination on the assigned topic or not. If the candidate is assessed as not passing the examination, the evaluation committee must justify its decision.

The examination on an assigned topic must be passed before the public defence can be held.

Section 19-2. Public defence (disputation)

The public defence of the doctoral work must normally take place within two (2) months of the University College finding the work worthy of defence.

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

The committee that originally evaluated the doctoral work also evaluates the public defence. The public defence takes place in English or Norwegian unless the University College approves another language.

There must normally be two opponents. The two opponents must be members of the evaluation committee and are appointed by the institution.

The public defence is chaired by the dean or another person authorised by the institution. The chair of the defence gives a presentation of the submission and evaluation of the doctoral work and the result of the examination on an assigned topic (cf. section 19-1). The PhD candidate then provides an account of the purpose and findings of the doctoral work.

The first opponent starts the questioning of the candidate, and the second opponent concludes the questioning. The University College may decide on a different distribution of the tasks normally assigned to the opponents and between the candidate and the first opponent. After both opponents have concluded their questioning, members of the audience will have the opportunity to comment *ex auditorio*. The chair of the defence concludes the public defence.

The evaluation committee makes a recommendation to the institution, in which it provides an account of its assessment of the defence of the doctoral work. In its report, the evaluation committee assesses the level of the doctoral work in relation to international standards in the discipline, culminating in a conclusion stating whether the defence ought to be approved or not.

Section 20. Approval of the doctoral examination

The University College makes the final decision on approval of the doctoral examination on the basis of the evaluation committee's report.

If the committee does not approve the result of the trial lecture or the examination on the assigned topic (cf. section 19-1), a new examination must be held on a new topic, no later than six (6) months after the first attempt. A new examination on an assigned topic may only be sat once. As far as possible, the new examination must be assessed by the same committee that assessed the original examination, unless the University College decides otherwise.

If the institution does not approve the public defence, the candidate may defend the doctoral work one more time. A new defence can be held at the earliest after six (6) months and must be assessed, as far as possible, by the same committee that assessed the original defence.

Section 21. Conferral of the degree and diploma

Section 21-1. Conferral of the degree

Based on the University College's decision that the training component and all parts of the doctoral examination have been approved, the degree of philosophiae doctor (PhD) will be conferred on the candidate.

Section 21-2. Certificate and diploma

PhD certificates are issued by the University College. The certificate contains information about the academic training the candidate has participated in, the title of the thesis, the examination on an assigned topic, and the academic supervisors. The certificate is signed by the rector.

In addition to the certificate, the doctor will receive a PhD diploma signed by the rector.

Section 22. Diploma supplement

Kristiania University College will issue a PhD diploma supplement in accordance with the applicable guidelines in force.

Part V. Appeals

Section 23. Appeals

Section 23-1. Appeal against rejection of an application for admission, a decision to terminate a candidate's right to study, or rejection of an application for approval of part of the required coursework

Rejection of an application for admission, a decision to terminate a candidate's right to study, or rejection of an application for approval of part of the required coursework may be appealed under the provisions of section 28 f. of the Public Administration Act. The appeal, including a description of the grounds for the appeal, must be sent to the University College. If the decision is upheld, the appeal must be sent to the Central Appeals Committee at Kristiania University College for final decision.

Section 23-2. Appeal against grades or procedural errors in examinations in the required coursework

Examinations taken as part of the required coursework (training component) may be appealed pursuant to Act no. 15 of 1 April 2005 relating to universities and university colleges, section 5-3 "Appeals regarding a student's grade" and section 5-2 "Appeals regarding procedural errors in connection with examinations".

Suspected cheating or an attempt to cheat will be handled in accordance with Kristiania University College's established routines for this.

Section 23-3. Appeal against rejection of an application for evaluation, rejection of a PhD thesis, trial lecture or other examination on an assigned topic, or public defence

Rejection of an application for evaluation of doctoral work and a decision not to approve doctoral work, a compulsory examination or public defence may be appealed under the provisions of section 28 f. of the Public Administration Act.

The appeal, including a description of the grounds for the appeal, must be sent to the doctoral degree committee. The doctoral degree committee may annul or amend the decision if it finds the appeal justified. If the doctoral degree committee dismisses the appeal, the appeal is sent to Kristiania University College's central appeals committee for a final decision. The body handling the appeal can investigate all aspects of an appealed decision.

If the University College or the body handling the appeal finds it necessary, individuals or a committee may be appointed to undertake an assessment of the evaluation and the criteria on which it was based, or to undertake a new or supplementary expert assessment.

Part VI. Joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements

Section 24. Joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements

Section 24-1. Joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements

Kristiania University College may enter into an agreement with one or more Norwegian or foreign institutions regarding collaboration in the form of joint degrees or cotutelle (joint supervision).

Agreements on collaboration on joint degrees or cotutelle (joint supervision) may stipulate exemption from other provisions in these Regulations, if this is necessary due to the collaborating institutions. These kinds of exemptions, both individually and together, must be justifiable.

Section 24-2. Joint degrees

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

An agreement to issue a joint degree is normally only entered into if there is already an established, stable academic collaboration between the institution and at least one of the other consortium members.

Section 24-3. Cotutelle agreements

The term “cotutelle agreement” is defined as the joint academic supervision of PhD candidates and collaboration on the training of PhD candidates. A cotutelle agreement must be entered into for each individual candidate and must be based on stable, academic collaboration between the institutions.

Section 24-4. Requirements in connection with joint degrees and cotutelle agreements

In connection with agreements on joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) arrangements, the rector or person authorised by the rector may grant exemption from these Regulations, if this is necessary due to the regulations of the collaborating institutions. These kinds of exemptions, both individually and together, must be justifiable in respect of the requirements concerning academic quality that apply to equivalent PhD degrees at Kristiania University College. The provisions concerning the qualifications required for admission, the requirement that the PhD thesis must be made available to the public, and the requirement for a public defence assessed by an impartial evaluation committee may not be departed from.

As a minimum, agreements on joint degrees and cotutelle (joint supervision) must regulate admission, funding, required coursework, academic supervision, requirements concerning residency at the institutions, reporting requirements, the language and structure of the thesis, evaluation of doctoral work, conferral of the degree, the diploma, and the intellectual property rights to the results. The agreement must be signed by the rector or a person authorised by the rector.

The doctoral education at the collaborating institution must also have a scope of three years of full-time study. The candidate must be admitted to both institutions.

[Entry into force](#)

[Section 25. Entry into force](#)

These Regulations enter into force on 18 August 2022. (New date)