

This English translation is for information only. For all legal purposes the [original document](#) in Norwegian is the authoritative version.

Regulations for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) at the University of Bergen.

Date	FOR-2018-11-29-1869
Ministry	Ministry of Education and Research
Entry into force	29.11.2018
Consolidates	FOR-2013-06-20-862
Applies to	Norway
Statutory basis	LOV-2005-04-01-15-§3-3 , LOV-2005-04-01-15-§3-9 , LOV-2005-04-01-15-§4-13
Announced	11.12.2018 3:25 pm
Abbreviated title	Regulations for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) at the University of Bergen.

Chapter overview:

- [Part I. Introductory provisions \(sections 1 - 4\)](#)
- [Part II. Admission \(sections 5 - 5-5-3\)](#)
- [Part III. Implementation \(sections 6 - 10-5\)](#)
- [Part IV. Completion \(section 11 - 21\)](#)

Statutory basis: Adopted by the Board of the University of Bergen on 29 November 2018 pursuant to Sections 3-3, 3-9 and 4-13 of Act No. 15 of 1 April 2005 15 relating to universities and university colleges.

Part I. Introductory provisions

Section 1. *Scope of the regulations*

The regulations apply to all education leading to the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree.

For other provisions that govern matters related to the doctoral degrees, see the Universities and University Colleges Act, Regulations on the Norwegian Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning to the European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning, the Regulations concerning terms and conditions of employment for the posts of postdoktor (post-doctoral research fellow), stipendiat (research fellow), vitenskapelig assistent (research assistant) and spesialistkandidat (resident), the Regulations relating to degrees and vocational training, protected titles and nominal length of study at universities and university colleges, the

Regulations of the Ministry of Education and Research on quality assurance and quality enhancement in higher education and vocational education, NOKUT's Regulations concerning supervision of the educational quality in higher education, the Act concerning the organization of work on ethics and integrity in research, the European Charter for Researchers & the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers and the Faculties' individual programme descriptions and supplementary rules.

Section 2. Scope, content and objectives of the PhD education

Section 2-1. Objectives for the PhD education

The PhD education is intended to qualify for research of an international standard, and for other work in society where great demands are made to academic insight and analytical thinking, in accordance with good academic practice and standards on research ethics.

The PhD education will provide the candidate with knowledge, skills and competence in line with the Norwegian Qualification Framework.

Section 2-2. Content of the PhD education

The training includes independent research which must be documented by an academic thesis of an international standard at a high level. Additionally, the candidate must undergo a training component, providing training in the disciplinary context, methods and theories that provide a disciplinary breadth and depth in their field, and that also contextualises the discipline within a broader framework. The PhD training is to train candidates in the dissemination of academic work to colleagues, students and the general public.

Section 2-3. Scope of the PhD education

The PhD education is organised in programmes with a stipulated length of three years' full-time study.

The most important part of the PhD training is an independent research project completed under active supervision.

The PhD degree is awarded on the basis of:

1. An approved academic thesis
2. An approved completion of the training component, alternatively another approved disciplinary training or competence
3. An approved trial lecture on an assigned topic, and
4. An approved public defence of the thesis.

Section 3. Responsibility for the PhD education

The University Board has the overall responsibility for PhD education at the University of Bergen. The University Board establishes and discontinues the PhD programmes within the PhD education at the individual faculty.

The rector may determine the rules on the design of programme descriptions. The faculty itself determines and modifies the programme description for the individual PhD programme. "The faculty itself" refers to bodies at faculty level.

The faculty itself may stipulate supplementary regulations to this document concerning admission requirements, decisions regarding admission and admission period, mid-way evaluation, training component, progress reporting, PhD thesis, language, documentation upon submission, correction of formal errors, trial lecture and public defence.

The faculty itself makes decisions regarding admission to PhD programmes, appointment of supervisors, approval of the training component, enforced termination, whether a submitted thesis is worthy of defence, appointment of assessment committee, correction of formal errors in the thesis and whether the trial lecture and public defence can be approved.

Interdisciplinary PhD education at the University of Bergen must be facilitated, where candidates must be enrolled in a PhD programme at one of the university's faculties.

Section 4. Quality Assurance

The faculties shall assure quality of the PhD education in keeping with the quality assurance system of education activities at the University of Bergen.

Part II. Admission

Section 5. Admission

Section 5-1. Admission requirements

For admission to the PhD education at the University of Bergen, the applicant is required to hold a five-year master's degree or equivalent, in accordance with descriptions in the second cycle of the Qualifications Framework. The faculty may, following a separate assessment, approve another equivalent education as the basis for admission.

The application should contain a project description and progress plan. The faculty itself stipulates which documentation must be attached to the application besides this.

The faculty itself may ask for additional qualifications according to criteria that are publicly available and in line with the University of Bergen's recruitment policy and academic profile.

Section 5-2. Admission decision

Applications for admission are to be submitted to the relevant faculty that has the subject area for which admission is sought. Interdisciplinary candidates normally apply for admission at the faculty where the main supervisor is affiliated.

Decisions regarding admissions are made by the faculty itself. The decision must be based on a comprehensive evaluation of the application. The faculty may rank qualified applicants when the number of applicants exceeds the programme capacity.

The decision regarding admission shall specify the agreement period.

Admission shall be refused if:

- a) agreements with an external third party impede publication and a public defence of the thesis
- b) the intellectual property agreements that have been entered into are so unreasonable that the institution should not participate in the project, or
- c) the applicant will be unable to fulfil the requirement that at least one year of the research project must be completed after the applicant has been admitted to the PhD programme.

Exceptions can be made to letter c) for applicants from student research programmes (forskerlinjer) and similar arrangements.

Section 5-3. *Agreement period*

The standard length of the PhD education is three (3) years of full-time studies.

It is not acceptable to plan to complete the PhD education at a rate of progress that leads to an agreement period that is longer than six (6) years. The exception is candidates who participate in organised dual competence programmes (dobbeltkompetanseutdanning). Here, the faculty that offers dual competence programmes can provide its own rules for the agreement period.

In supplementary regulations, the faculty may impose stricter progress requirements for the course of study.

In the event of statutory leave, the agreement period is extended correspondingly. The candidates are responsible for reporting and documenting such interruptions.

On application, the agreement period may also be extended on other grounds. The application must include an explanation of what has been accomplished/published and what remains of the work towards the PhD degree. A comprehensive assessment shall be made to determine whether a completion of the project is feasible within the extended period. An affirmation from the supervisor and the basic academic unit about supervision during the period of extension must be presented. In the event that an extension is granted, the faculty itself may specify additional terms and conditions.

Even if the agreement period has ceased, the PhD candidate may apply to submit the thesis for assessment for the PhD degree. This requires that the training component has been completed.

Semester registration is compulsory for candidates during the agreement period.

Section 5-4. *The PhD agreement*

Admission to the University of Bergen's PhD programme must be formalized in a written agreement. The PhD agreement is to be signed by the candidate, supervisor(s), department and the faculty the PhD candidate has been admitted to. The PhD agreement contains provisions on the parties' rights and obligations during the agreement period and is intended to ensure that the candidate regularly participates in an active research environment, and is to facilitate the completion of the PhD education within the agreed-upon time.

Significant changes in the PhD agreement that affect the completion of the research project or the training component must be presented to the faculty itself for approval.

The necessary infrastructure for carrying out the research project is to be available for the candidate. The decision about what is considered necessary infrastructure for completion is to be made by the faculty and must be stated in the PhD agreement.

For candidates with external funding or employment, an agreement must be made between the University of Bergen and the cooperating party in connection with the research project concerned. Such agreements are a part of the PhD agreement and must normally be presented at the time the admission decision is made for the PhD candidate in question, or shortly thereafter.

Section 5-5. *Termination before the agreed end date*

Section 5-5-1. *Voluntary termination*

The candidate and the faculty may agree to terminate the PhD education before the stipulated date. In the event of a voluntary termination of the PhD education, a separate agreement shall stipulate how the parties handle questions regarding any employment, funding, equipment and rights to results (intellectual property rights and similar).

Section 5-5-2. *Enforced termination in event of delay or lack of progress*

When one or more of the following conditions are met, the faculty itself may decide on an enforced termination of the education:

- a) A significant delay in the implementation of the training component.
- b) Repeated and grave violations by the PhD candidate of their information, follow-up or reporting obligations, including failure to submit progress reports, cf. section 9.
- c) Delay in the progress of the research project that is of such a character that there is great likelihood that the PhD candidate will be unable to complete the project within the agreed-upon time.

Enforced termination according to the rules here can only be adopted if the lack of progress or delay is due to circumstances that the candidate has influence over.

Decision pursuant to this paragraph are made by the faculty board. Appeals are handled by the Central Appeals Committee.

Section 5-5-3. Enforced termination upon dishonesty or cheating at examinations or tests

Decisions on enforced termination on the basis of cheating are made by the faculty itself following a recommendation by the basic academic unit. The decision may be appealed to the Central Appeals Committee.

Decisions on enforced termination on the basis of dishonesty are made by the faculty itself following statements from the Research Ethics Committee.

Part III. Implementation

Section 6. Supervision

Work on the PhD thesis is to take place under individual supervision. The faculty, institution and the academic supervisors must jointly ensure that the candidate participates in an active research environment.

Section 6-1. Appointment of academic supervisors

The candidate should as a rule have two supervisors. Normally, one main supervisor and one or more co-supervisors are appointed. The supervisors are appointed by the faculty itself and the main supervisor should be appointed at the time of admission.

The supervisors must have a doctoral degree or equivalent academic competence within the subject area, and be an active researcher. At least one of the appointed supervisors should normally have previous experience of supervision of candidates at the PhD level.

The main supervisor should normally be employed at the faculty to which the candidate has been admitted. The faculty itself may appoint a main supervisor who is not employed at the faculty to which the candidate is admitted. In such cases, the co-supervisor should be employed at the faculty to which the candidate has been admitted.

The rules on impartiality in the Public Administration Act, Chapter II (sections 6 to 10), apply to the academic supervisors.

The candidate and the main supervisor may individually ask the faculty to appoint a new main supervisor for the candidate. The main supervisor may not withdraw until a new supervisor has been appointed.

Section 6-2. Content of the supervision

The main supervisor is to be the candidate's primary contact. The candidate and supervisors should be in regular contact. The University of Bergen's ethics guidelines shall be the basis for the supervisory relationship. The supervisor is responsible for following up on the candidate's academic development and is to give advice on the training component. Contact frequency should be stated in the annual progress reporting.

The supervisors are obliged to keep informed on the progress of the candidate's work and assess this in relation to the project description's progress plan. The supervisors are obliged to follow up on academic conditions that may incur delayed completion of the PhD education, so that it can be completed within the standard time.

Supervisors are to give advice on formulating and delimiting the research topic and research questions, discuss and assess hypotheses and methods, discuss results and their interpretation, discuss the structure and completion of the presentation (including outline, linguistic form, documentation), and provide guidance on the academic literature and data. Supervisors must give the candidate guidance in matters of research ethics related to the thesis.

Disagreements between the supervisor and candidate related to access to or to have disposal of collected data, dispute about the size of contributions to joint article projects, and disputes between copyrights etc., can be brought in for consideration and ruling at the faculty itself. The decision of the faculty may be appealed to the Central Appeals Committee.

Section 6-3. Mid-way evaluation

Each doctoral candidate must be subject to a mid-way evaluation. As a main rule, the mid-way evaluation will include academic input from researchers within the candidate's field and/or related fields. The main purpose of the mid-way evaluation is to help the candidate identify issues that entail a risk for the project to stop or being delayed, as well as providing input that may increase the quality of the work. The faculty, supervisor and candidate are actively obliged to follow up conditions that may lead to a risk of a delay in the completion or non-completion of the PhD education, so that the education, as far as possible, can be completed within the standard time frame.

Section 7. Training component

Section 7-1. Purpose of the training component

The faculty is responsible for ensuring that the training component, in combination with the thesis, provides an education at a high academic level in accordance with international standards. The training component must provide training in academic dissemination and introduction to research ethics, theory of science and methods. Together with the research, the training is to help achieve the expected learning outcome in accordance with the Norwegian Qualifications Framework.

If the faculty does not itself offer the entire training component, conditions shall be put in place to ensure that the PhD candidate receives equivalent training from other faculties and/or institutions.

Section 7-2. Scope of the training component

The training component must correspond to at least 30 credits, of which 20 credits should be submitted after admission. Elements that are to be included as part of the training component may not have been completed more than five (5) years prior to the date of admission. The faculty itself may make exceptions to this for applicants who have a background from student research programmes (forskerlinjer) and similar arrangements.

The training component must be completed and approved before the thesis is submitted. All elements included in the training component must be documented.

Section 7-3. Content of the training component

The training component must include theory of science and ethics with a scope of at least five (5) credits.

The faculty itself makes decisions on the approval of the training component. The faculty can approve that courses and other academic activities conducted outside of the University of Bergen are included in the training component.

Section 8. The candidate's rights in the event of a leave of absence

Candidates with statutory leave of absence from the PhD education may still attend classes and take examinations in courses that will be included as part of the training component, in accordance with section 14-10, fourth paragraph of the National Insurance Act and the circular from the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration regarding section 14-10, fourth paragraph of 18 December 2006.

The candidate must ensure that the faculty is informed of leave of absence granted by the employer, if these two are not the same.

Section 9. Reporting

During the agreement period, the candidate and main supervisor must submit each year separate and independent reports on the progress of the PhD education in the prescribed manner and within prescribed deadlines. The faculty reviews the progress reports.

The candidate and supervisor have equal responsibility for submitting the required progress reports. A lack of, or inadequate progress reports, may lead to enforced termination of the PhD education before the end of the agreement period. Supervisors who fail to comply with this duty may be relieved of their supervisory duties.

In connection with the progress reporting, the candidate and main supervisor shall review the plan for the project, and assess the need for adjustments. Significant changes should be approved by the faculty itself.

The faculty may require special reporting, if needed.

Section 10. *The doctoral thesis*

Section 10-1. *Thesis requirements*

The thesis must be an independent, academic work that meets international standards, and must be at an advanced academic level in respect of the formulation of the research topic, conceptual clarification and methodical, theoretical and empirical rationale, as well as in respect of the documentation of sources and formal presentation. The thesis must be able to develop new knowledge in the chosen field and must be of such quality as to qualify for publication as a part of the academic literature in the field.

Several works may be approved as portions of a thesis if their content constitutes a whole. In addition to the individual parts, a summarising article/component accounting for the thesis as a whole must then be prepared.

A work or parts of a work that the candidate has previously had approved for a doctoral degree at a Norwegian or foreign university or university college may not be accepted for assessment even when the work is submitted in re-written form.

Section 10-2. *Co-authorship*

Joint work is accepted for assessment provided the PhD candidate's contribution represents an independent effort that can be identified to the extent necessary for the assessment.

If a written work has been produced in collaboration with other authors, the PhD candidate must follow the norms for co-authorship that are generally accepted in their academic community and University of Bergen's guidelines for co-authorship and in accordance with international standards.

In theses that include work with multiple authors, a signed declaration that describes the candidate's input in each work must be enclosed.

Section 10-3. *Work not eligible for assessment*

Work that has been approved as the basis for previously completed exams or degrees may not be accepted for assessment unless the work is included as a smaller section of a thesis that consists of multiple interrelated works. Data, analyses or methods from previous degrees may nevertheless be used as the basis for the work on the PhD project.

Published works may not be accepted as part of the thesis if they, at the time of admission, are older than five (5) years from the date of publishing. The faculty itself may grant exemptions from this requirement if this is warranted by rather extraordinary circumstances.

The thesis can only be submitted for assessment at one higher education institution.

Section 10-4. *Language*

The faculty itself decides which languages can be used in a thesis.

Section 10-5. *Duty to report work results with potential for commercial exploitation*

Candidates who are employed by the University of Bergen are obliged to report work results covered by the University's Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) regulations, see Regulations regarding the handling of employee rights to research and work results at the University of Bergen

For candidates with an employer other than the University of Bergen, a corresponding obligation to report such results must be stipulated in a PhD agreement between the University of Bergen, the candidate, and the external employer.

Regulation of rights between collaborating institutions is to be formalised in a written agreement.

For candidates without an employer, a corresponding obligation to report results must be stipulated in the PhD agreement between the University of Bergen and the candidate.

Part IV. Completion

Section 11. *Application for assessment and the activities of the assessment committee*

Section 11-1. *Submission of application for assessment*

Applications for the assessment of PhD theses must be addressed to the faculty itself.

The application can only be submitted after the training component has been approved.

The faculty decides on the application for the assessment of the thesis. The faculty itself may on an independent basis reject applications for the assessment of a thesis if it is evident that the thesis is not of a sufficiently high academic quality and will be rejected by a committee.

A submitted work cannot be withdrawn before a final decision has been made about whether it is worthy of being defended for the PhD degree. The thesis will be evaluated as submitted.

Section 11-2. *Appointment of the assessment committee*

When the faculty itself has approved the application for thesis assessment, the faculty itself shall appoint an expert assessment committee of at least three (3) members which shall evaluate the thesis. The rules on impartiality contained in section 6 of the Public Administration Act apply to the members of the committee.

The basic academic department shall propose the composition of the assessment committee. The candidate will be notified of the proposal for the composition of the committee, and they may submit written comments no later than five (5) days after the basic academic unit has sent the proposal to the faculty. The faculty itself decides whether such comments shall be taken into account.

Normally the committee should be appointed no more than four (4) weeks after approval of the candidate's application for thesis assessment.

The composition of the assessment committee is normally to be such that:

- both genders are represented
- the majority have no association with the University of Bergen
- one of the members, if possible, is from a relevant foreign institution
- all the members hold doctoral degrees or equivalent qualifications.

Specific reasons must be supplied if these criteria are not complied with. The appointed supervisor may not be a member of the committee. The faculty appoints one of its representatives as chair of the committee.

Section 11-3. *Resubmission*

A doctoral thesis that has not been found worthy of defence by the faculty itself, may be re-evaluated in a revised version. A new assessment can only be made once.

In the event of resubmission, the candidate must clearly state that the work has been assessed previously at the University of Bergen and not found worthy of a public defence.

If a thesis is submitted in a revised version for a new assessment, at least one member of the original assessment committee should participate in the work of the new committee.

The new assessment committee shall conduct its assessment on an independent basis, but shall nevertheless have opportunity to see the previous assessment.

Section 11-4. *The assessment committee's recommendation and the candidate's remarks*

The assessment committee delivers its reasoned recommendation as to whether the thesis is worthy of being defended for the PhD degree. The recommendation of the committee should normally be provided within three months of the committee having received the thesis.

The assessment committee may require presentation of the candidate's source material and additional information for the purpose of supplementation or clarification.

The recommendation of the assessment committee and any dissenting opinions must be sent to the faculty, and must be forwarded to the PhD candidate as soon as possible. The candidate is given a deadline of ten (10) days to present written remarks to the recommendation.

If the candidate's remarks may have an impact on whether or not the thesis can be approved, the remarks should be submitted to the assessment committee before the faculty makes a final decision in the case.

The assessment committee's recommendation, along with any remarks, will be considered by the faculty itself.

Section 12. *The faculty's procedures relating to the assessment committee's recommendation*

On the basis of the recommendation by the assessment committee, the faculty itself decides whether or not the PhD thesis is worthy of a public defence.

If the faculty itself finds that there are reasonable doubts as to whether the committee's recommendation should be endorsed, or if the committee delivers a split recommendation, the faculty itself shall seek further clarification from the assessment committee or appoint two new experts to give individual statements on the thesis.

Any additional or individual statements must be presented to the PhD candidate, who must be given the opportunity to comment.

The faculty board shall adopt a decision in the event of a non-unanimous or negative recommendation

Section 13. *The thesis*

Section 13-1. *Thesis format*

Once the thesis has been found worthy of defence, the candidate shall submit the thesis to the faculty in the standardised format and in accordance with the provisions stipulated by the faculty.

The PhD candidate must submit an abstract of the thesis in English and a press release in Norwegian.

Section 13-2. *Correction of formal errors in the thesis*

After submission, the candidate may apply once to the faculty for permission to correct formal errors in the thesis to be made public. The application must include an errata list showing the corrections the candidate wishes to make in the dissertation. Neither the corrected version of the thesis nor the errata list shall be submitted to the assessment committee. The deadline for applying for correction of formal errors is one week after the candidate has received the recommendation. The errata list is added as an insert to the thesis which is available during the public defence.

Section 13-3. *Publication*

The thesis must at the latest be publicly available two (2) weeks before the public defence is held. The thesis must be made available in the form in which it was submitted for assessment, alternatively as revised pursuant to Section 13-2.

No restrictions may be placed on publication of the PhD thesis, with the exception of a previously agreed postponement of the public release date. Such a postponement may be permitted to allow the institution and any external party that has provided full or partial funding for the PhD education to decide on any commercialisation including patents. Neither the University of Bergen nor the external party may require that the thesis in whole or in part can be withheld from the public domain.

Upon publication of the thesis, candidates must comply with applicable guidelines for crediting institutions. The general rule is that an institution must be listed as the address in a publication if it has provided a necessary and significant contribution to, or basis for, an author's contribution to the published work. The same author must also list other institutions as an address if these in each instance satisfy the requirements for co-authorship.

Section 14. *Trial lecture and public defence*

The PhD education concludes with:

- a) An approved trial lecture on an assigned topic, and
- b) Public defence.

Section 14-1. *Trial lecture*

The candidate must give a trial lecture after the thesis has been submitted, but before the public defence is held. The trial lecture is an independent part of the examination for the PhD degree. The purpose is to test the candidate's ability to acquire knowledge beyond the topic of the thesis, and the ability to communicate it in a lecture setting. The trial lecture must be on an assigned topic and should have a duration of 45 minutes. The topic of the trial lecture is set by the Faculty and advised to the candidate ten (10) working days before the lecture.

The trial lecture is generally held at the University of Bergen and the faculty itself determines which language can be used.

The trial lecture must be assessed by an assessment committee. The committee shall report to the faculty whether the trial lecture merits a pass. The committee's recommendation must be substantiated if the committee recommends a fail.

If the faculty does not approve the trial lecture, a new trial lecture must be held. The new trial lecture must be given on a new topic, and no later than six (6) months after the first attempt. A new trial lecture may be held only once. To the extent possible, the lecture should be assessed by the same committee that assessed the first lecture, unless the faculty decides otherwise.

The trial lecture must be passed before the public defence may take place.

Section 14-2. *Public defence*

The PhD candidate must give a public defence of the scientific work in the thesis. The public defence must be an academic discussion between opponents and the PhD candidate regarding the formulation of the research topic, methodical and theoretical rationale, as well as in respect of the documentation of sources and formal presentation. The public defence of the thesis shall normally take place within two (2) months of the faculty's decision to find the thesis worthy of defence.

The time and place of the public defence shall be announced at least ten (10) working days in advance.

The public defence of the thesis shall normally be held at the University of Bergen.

The faculty decides which languages can be used during the public defence.

There are normally to be two opponents. The two opponents must be members of the assessment committee and be appointed by the faculty itself. In special cases, opponents who have not been members of the committee may be appointed.

The public defence is chaired by the Dean, or the person authorised by the Dean. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to defend the thesis. Members of the audience shall be given the opportunity to comment *ex auditorio*.

The assessment committee delivers its recommendation to the faculty as to whether the defence should be approved. The committee's recommendation must be substantiated if the committee does not recommend approval of the public defence.

If the public defence is not approved, a new public defence may be held once. A new public defence as far as possible must be assessed by the original committee.

The public defence must be approved before the degree can be conferred.

Section 15. *Conferment and diploma*

The University Board confers the Philosophiae Doctor degree on the PhD candidate on the basis of the report that the trial lecture and public defence have been approved.

The diploma is issued by the University of Bergen.

Section 16. *Diploma supplement*

An enclosure to the diploma shall be issued in accordance with applicable guidelines for the Diploma Supplement.

Section 17. *Appeal*

Section 17-1. Appeal against rejection of an application for admission, decision on the termination of the right to study, appeal against a rejection of an application for the approval of elements in the training component

Rejections of applications for admission, decisions on the termination of the right to study and rejections of applications for approval of elements of the training component may be appealed in accordance with section 28 and following of the Public Administration Act. The appeal must be sent to the faculty itself. If the rejection is upheld, the appeal must be sent without undue delay to the Central Appeals Committee for a decision.

Section 17-2. Appeals against exams in the training component

Examinations taken during the training component may be appealed pursuant to Sections 5.3 “Complaints regarding marks awarded” and 5.2 “Complaints against procedural errors in connection with examinations” of the Act relating to universities and university colleges.

Section 17-3. Appeals against rejection of an application for assessment, rejection of a thesis, trial lecture or defence

A rejection of a thesis, trial lecture or defence may be appealed in accordance with the provisions of Section 28 and following of the Public Administration Act. The appeal must be sent to the faculty. After the case has been presented to the assessment committee, the faculty may set aside or amend the decision if it finds the appeal to have been substantiated. If the faculty does not allow the appeal, the appeal is sent on to the Central Appeals Committee for a decision. The Appeals Committee may test all aspects of the appealed decision.

If the subsidiary body or the appeals body finds reason to do so, a committee or a number of individuals may be appointed to evaluate the assessment that has been made and the criteria the assessment was based on, or to perform a new or supplementary expert assessment.

Section 18. Joint degrees and cotutelle agreements

Section 18-1. Joint degrees and cotutelle agreements

The institution may enter into a collaboration with one or more Norwegian or foreign institutions to collaborate on joint degrees or cotutelle agreements.

In joint degree and cotutelle agreements, exceptions from the provisions can be made if necessitated by the collaborating institutions' regulations. Such exceptions must, both individually and jointly, be fully justifiable.

Section 18-2. Joint degrees and joint degree agreements

“Joint degree” is understood as a collaboration between multiple institutions in which they all have joint responsibility for admission, supervision and the awarding of degrees. The

collaboration is normally organised in a consortium and regulated by an agreement between the consortium members. For completed joint degrees, a joint diploma is issued in the form of:

- a) a diploma issued by all consortium members, or
- b) a diploma from each consortium member, or
- c) a combination of a) and b).

Joint degree agreements shall normally only be entered into if there is an already established and stable academic collaboration between the university and at least one of the other consortium members. The Board in the consortium adopts guidelines for joint degree collaborations, including templates for collaboration agreements.

Section 18-3. Cotutelle agreements

“Cotutelle agreement” is understood as a joint supervision of candidates and collaboration on the training of PhD candidates. A cotutelle agreement is entered into for each candidate and should be built on a stable, academic institutional collaboration.

Section 18-4. Joint degree and cotutelle requirements

No exemptions may be made from qualification requirements for admission, requirements that the thesis shall be publicly available, and requirements regarding a public defence with an impartial assessment committee.

Section 19. Delegation

Faculty authority pursuant to these Regulations cannot be delegated to the departmental level, unless explicitly stated in the Regulations.

Section 20. Entry into force

The Regulations enter into force immediately, and the Regulations for the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree at the University of Bergen adopted by the University Board on 20/06/2013 (number 862) are simultaneously repealed.

Section 21. Transitional provisions

Whosoever is admitted to the University of Bergen in accordance with the Regulations for the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree at the University of Bergen adopted by the University Board on 20/06/2013 (number 862) at the time these Regulations come into force, maintains the rights that follow from the previous Regulations when this is advantageous.