

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

This is an unofficial translation of the Norwegian version of the Regulations and is provided for information purposes only. Legal authenticity remains with the Norwegian version. In the event of any inconsistency, the Norwegian version shall prevail.

Adopted by the Board of the University of Stavanger 13 June 2019, pursuant to the Norwegian Act relating to universities and university colleges of 1 April 2005, No. 15, § 3-3, § 3-7, § 3-9 and § 4-13. Replaces *the Regulations for Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) Degree at the University of Stavanger*, adopted by the Board of the University of Stavanger on 28 April, 2016.

PART 1. INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

§ 1-1 Scope of the Regulations

The regulations apply to all education culminating in the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree at the University of Stavanger. These regulations outline the provisions for admission to, participation in and completion of doctoral training, including joint degrees and cotutelle agreements.

§ 1-2 Definitions

The following definitions apply within these regulations:

- a) Doctoral degree: The Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree.
- b) Candidate: The PhD candidate to whom the provisions of the regulations apply. Also known as the doctoral candidate.
- c) Doctoral work: The academic work carried out by the candidate within the agreed period.
- d) Thesis: The result of the academic doctoral work.

§ 1-3 Scope, content and objectives of the doctoral education

The education shall qualify the candidate for research of an international standard and for other work that requires advanced academic insight and analytical thinking, in accordance with sound academic practice and established standards on research ethics.

The education shall provide the candidate with knowledge, skills and expertise in keeping with the National Qualifications Framework.

The PhD education normally is set to three years of full-time study, and includes a training component comprising a minimum of 30 credits.

The most important component of the education is an independent research project or combined research and development project carried out under close academic supervision.

The PhD degree is conferred on the basis of an:

- approved academic thesis
- approved completion of the training component
- approved trial lecture on an assigned topic
- approved public defence of the thesis (disputation)

The doctoral education should be designed so that it can be completed with submission of the thesis within the stipulated timeframe.

§ 1-4 Responsibility for the doctoral education

The University Board has the overall responsibility for the PhD education.

The faculty itself may establish supplementary regulations to these regulations concerning

admission requirements, admission decisions, agreement periods, mid-term evaluations, the training component, progress reporting, the thesis, language, documentation upon submission, correction of formal errors, the trial lecture and public defence.

The faculty makes the decision on admission to the doctoral programme, appointment of supervisors, approval of the training component, forced termination, appointment of the assessment committee, correction of formal errors in the thesis, whether the submitted thesis is worthy of defence, and whether the trial lecture and public defence may be approved.

Interdisciplinary doctoral education should be facilitated, in which candidates will be connected to a doctoral programme at one of the university's faculties.

§ 1-5 Responsibility for the quality assurance of the doctoral education

The doctoral education is covered by the institution's quality system. The faculties should ensure the quality of the doctoral education in accordance with this quality system at the University of Stavanger.

PART 2. ADMISSION, ADMISSION PERIOD AND EARLY TERMINATION

§ 2-1 Admission requirements

For admission to the doctoral education, the applicant should have a five-year master's degree or equivalent education, in accordance with the descriptions in the second cycle of the Norwegian Qualification Framework, which the faculty has approved as a basis for admission. The faculty may, upon a separate assessment, approve other equivalent education as a basis for admission. The faculty itself may, in supplementary regulations, establish additional requirements for admission.

§ 2-2 Application

The application for a doctoral scholarship as advertised by the university is an application for admission to the doctoral education. The employed may be asked to supplement the application.

Applicants with funding other than scholarships, where the university is the employer, should send their application to the faculty. The application is submitted with the stipulated application form.

Depending on the requirements of the advertised doctoral scholarship and/or application form, the application should include:

- a) Documentation of the education that will serve as the basis for admission.
- b) Description of the doctoral project, if required by the advertisement, which includes:
 - an academic description of the project, which includes thematic area, research questions, theory and methodology
 - progress plan
 - funding plan
 - plan for the training component, including training that is aimed at achieving general competence in accordance with the qualifications framework
 - any plans for studying abroad/stay at another institution
 - plan for academic dissemination
 - documentation of any special needs for academic and material resources
 - information about any restrictions on intellectual property rights intended to protect the rights of others
- c) Proposal of at least one academic supervisor as well as a statement of association with an active research group.
- d) An account of any legal and ethical issues raised by the project.
- e) Information on whether the project relies on permissions from research ethical committees or other authorities, or from private persons (informants, patients, parents, etc.). Such permissions should be attached to the application if possible.

The description in the preceding section should be reviewed by the candidate and supervisor no later than three months after admission to assess the need for adjustments.

For applicants who are not fully funded through scholarship, documentation is required that at least 50% of the working hours during the programme can be used for organised research training and that at least one year can be devoted to full-time studies.

§ 2-3 Admission decision

The faculty's decision on admission must be based on a total assessment of the application. The faculty may rank qualified applicants when the number of applicants exceeds the enrolment capacity.

Any conditions should be outlined by the admission decision.

In the decision at least one supervisor should be appointed and the admission period should also be determined, cf. § 2-4. Requirements for the residency obligation should be outlined by the admission decision.

Admission should be refused if:

- agreements with an external third party impede publication and a public defence of the thesis
- At the time of application, less than one year's full-time work on the research project remains.

§ 2-4 Admission period

The standard length of the education is three years of full-time studies. The maximum duration of the education is six years, not including statutory leave and compulsory duties.

In the event of statutory interruptions, the admission period is extended correspondingly. The faculty may extend the admission period after a justified application. Upon granted extension, the faculty may set additional terms.

Even if the admission period has expired, the candidate may apply to submit the thesis for assessment for the degree, cf. the Norwegian Act relating to universities and university colleges § 3-10.

§ 2-5 Agreement for admission to the education (the PhD agreement)

Admission to the doctoral education at the university is formalised by having a written agreement signed by the candidate and academic supervisor(s), as well as the unit and faculty that the candidate is affiliated with. The agreement regulates the rights and obligations of the parties during the admission period.

In accordance with established guidelines, candidates with funding from, appointment at, or other contributions from an external party should enter into a separate agreement between the candidate, the university and the external party in accordance with the university's guidelines for such collaboration. Such an agreement is part of the agreement concerning admission to the education, and should, as a rule, exist at the time the admission decision for the relevant candidate is made, or immediately thereafter.

In cases where the candidate is to be affiliated with foreign institutions, separate agreements in line with the university's guidelines for such cooperation should be entered into. The agreement should normally be made in conjunction with the agreement concerning admission to the education.

§ 2-6 Voluntary termination before the stipulated date

The candidate and the institution may agree to terminate the education before the

stipulated date. In the event of a voluntary termination of the education, questions regarding how any terms of employment relationship, funding, rights to results, etc. are to be handled must be established in writing.

§ 2-7 Forced termination due to delay of work or lack of progress

The faculty itself may choose the forced termination of the education before the stipulated date if one or more of the following circumstances arise:

- Significant delay in the carrying out of the training component.
- Repeated and serious violations by the candidate of their information, follow-up or reporting obligations, including failure to submit progress reports, cf. § 5-1.
- Delays in the progress of the research project that are of such a nature as to raise founded doubts about the candidate's ability to complete the project within the stipulated time period.

Forced termination according to this provision may only be decided if the delay or lack of progress is due to conditions for which the candidate himself/herself has control over.

Appeals are handled by the institution's appeals committee.

§ 2-8 Forced termination due to cheating on examinations or tests during the PhD education

In case of cheating on examinations or tests during the course of the PhD programme, the institution's appeals committee may decide on an annulment, cf. the Act on universities and university colleges § 4-7.

If the matter is so severe that it is considered misconduct, cf. § 4-13 first paragraph of the Universities and Colleges Act, cf. § 5, second paragraph of the Research Ethics Act, the faculty may decide on forced termination, cf. § 2-9 of these regulations.

§ 2-9 Forced termination due to misconduct

If a candidate has committed scientific misconduct, cf. Uhl. § 4-13 first paragraph, cf. section 5 second paragraph of the Research Ethics Act, the faculty, by opinion of the Research Committee, may choose the forced termination.

PART 3. ACADEMIC SUPERVISION

§ 3-1 Academic supervision

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

§ 3-2 Appointment of academic supervisors

The candidate should have at least two academic supervisors, where one is appointed as the main supervisor. Academic supervisors are appointed by the faculty. The main supervisor should be appointed at the time of admission.

The main supervisor has the primary academic responsibility for the candidate, and must normally be employed at the University of Stavanger. If the faculty appoints an external main supervisor, a co-supervisor from the University of Stavanger must be appointed.

Co-supervisors are academics who provide guidance and who share the academic responsibility for the PhD candidate with the main supervisor.

All academic 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 must have previous experience of supervision of at least one candidate through the duration of a PhD cycle, from the start of the project to the public defence. The requirement under the first subparagraph may in exceptional cases be waived. If the requirement of the first subparagraph is waived, all appointed supervisors are required to conduct training as a supervisor of PhD candidates during the first two years of the supervision.

The provisions on impartiality in §§ 6 to 10 of the Public Administration Act apply to the supervisors.

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

Any disputes regarding the academic rights and obligations of the supervisor and of the candidate are to be referred by these parties to the faculty for processing and a final decision.

§ 3-3 Content of the supervision

The candidate and academic supervisors should be in regular contact. The supervisor is responsible for following up on the candidate's academic development. The frequency of the contact should be outlined in the reporting to the faculty, cf. § 5-1.

Supervisors are required to keep up-to-date on the progress of the candidate's work and assess it in relation to the project description's work plan.

Supervisors are required to follow up on academic issues that may lead to a delay in the completion of the education, so as to ensure that it can be completed within the prescribed time.

The supervisors are to give advice on formulating and delimiting the thematic area and research questions, discuss and assess hypotheses and methodology, the results and the interpretation of these, the structure and implementation of the thesis, including the outline, choice of language, documentation, etc., and provide guidance on the academic literature and data available in libraries, archives, etc. The supervisors should also advise the candidate on issues of research ethics related to the thesis.

PART 4. THE TRAINING COMPONENT

§ 4-1 the training component's purpose, content and scope

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, including the completion of a research work, training in academic dissemination and introduction to research ethics, academic theories and methods. Together with the research, the training is to help achieve the anticipated learning outcomes in accordance with the Norwegian Qualifications Framework.

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

The training component should correspond to at least 30 credits. The training component should include scientific theory and research ethics. Beyond this, the faculty stipulates which elements should be included in the training component of each individual study.

In courses where there is no suitable offer, individually selected syllabi may be approved as part of the training component. For all courses, and for individually selected syllabi, there must be tests with grades in accordance to the university's examination regulations.

The faculties maintain a catalogue of approved subjects. Such subjects are approved according to the current rules for the approval of offers of study at the university.

At least 20 credits of the training component should be completed after admission. Elements that are to be included as part of the training component may not have been completed more than two years prior to the date of admission. The faculty may grant an exemption from the provision in the preceding point if special academic reasons apply.

Courses at the doctoral level at a different institution should be approved in accordance with the regulations in the Act on universities and university colleges § 3-5, first paragraph.

§ 4-2 Stays abroad

The candidate should normally spend at least three months of study time at a recognised foreign education or research institution where it is possible to work with the research question in the thesis. A stay at an equivalent Norwegian educational or research institution may replace studying abroad if this is deemed to be academically relevant.

PART 5. REPORTING AND MID-TERM EVALUATION

§ 5-1 Reporting

The candidate and the academic supervisor both have an independent responsibility for reporting. The reporting should take place at times established by the faculty and in the prescribed manner. Insufficient or incomplete reporting by the candidate, including progress reporting, may result in the forced termination of the education prior to the expiration of the admission period, cf. § 2-7. Supervisors who fail to comply with the reporting requirements according to this provision may be relieved of their supervisory duties.

In connection with the reporting, the candidate and principal supervisor should review the project's schedule and assess the need for adjustments. Significant changes must be approved by the faculty.

The faculty may establish special reporting requirements, if needed.

§ 5-2 Mid-term evaluation

A mid-term evaluation of doctoral work should normally take place in the third or fourth semester. During the mid-term evaluation, the candidate must present their work and be evaluated by a group of at least two persons appointed by the faculty. The evaluation team should assess the academic quality and project progress of the PhD work, and should provide feedback to both the candidate, the academic supervisors and the faculty. If the evaluation team reports significant academic weaknesses or delays, measures must be taken to correct the situation.

PART 6. THE THESIS

§ 6-1 Thesis requirements

The thesis must be an independent piece of academic work that meets international standards with regard to ethical requirements, academic levels and methodologies.

The thesis must contribute to the development of new knowledge and present an academic level meriting publication in a suitable format as part of the discipline's research-based knowledge development.

The thesis may consist of a monograph or a compendium of several shorter scientific or academic papers.

If the thesis consists of several shorter papers, clarification about how they are interrelated must be included in a synopsis of the thesis ("kappe"). This introductory section should, from a holistic perspective, summarise and compile the issues and conclusions that are presented in the works, documenting the context of the thesis. The introductory section must also account for the choice of theory and methodology and assessment of the results according to international standards and academic standards within the subject area. The candidate must be the sole author of the introductory section.

The main component of the thesis may consist of a new product or a systematised collection of material or another form of production (e.g. audio, image, video, electronic forms of production) in which its theoretical and methodological basis is not shown by the product itself. In such cases, the thesis, in addition to presenting the product itself, must have a synopsis ("kappe").

The faculty decides which language may be used in a thesis.

§ 6-2 Co-authorship

If the thesis or parts of it has been produced in collaboration with other authors, the candidate must follow the norms for co-authorship that are generally accepted in their academic community and in accordance with international standards.

A thesis containing papers written by more than one author or collaborative partners must include a signed declaration that describes the contribution of the candidate and the co-authors of each of the papers.

§ 6-3 Works not eligible for evaluation

Work or parts of work that have 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 research project.

Previously published works may not be accepted as part of the thesis if they at the time of admission are older than five years from the date of publishing. This requirement may be disregarded by the faculty if extraordinary circumstances arise.

The thesis may not be submitted for assessment at other education institutions, cf. § 7-10.

§ 6-4 Obligation to report on research results with commercial potential

Regulation of rights between cooperating institutions must be established in an agreement.

The institution's most current regulations, as well as the university's rules and guidelines, should form the basis of the candidate's obligation to report on the research results with commercial potential that they produce during their employment at the university.

For candidates with an external employer, a corresponding obligation to report such results must be stipulated in an agreement between the University of Stavanger, the candidate, and the external employer, cf. § 2-5.

PART 7. SUBMISSION AND ASSESSMENT ETC.

§ 7-1 Basis for the assessment

The requirements for conferring the degree Philosophiae Doctor are stated in § 1-3, fifth paragraph.

§ 7-2 Time from submission to public defence

Normally, no more than five months must pass between submission of the thesis and public defence.

§ 7-3 Submission of the application for assessment of the doctoral thesis

It is the responsibility of the main supervisor to alert the faculty to an imminent thesis submission, in order that the necessary preparations can begin.

The application for assessment of the doctoral thesis should be sent directly to the faculty.

The following must be enclosed with the application:

- Seven (7) copies of the thesis in the approved format.
- Documentation of completion and approval of the training component.

- A concise summary in Norwegian and English.
- Documentation of necessary permits, cf. § 2-2.
- Declarations from co-authors where required, cf. § 6-2.
- Statement on whether the thesis is submitted for assessment for the first or second time.
- Declaration that the thesis has not been submitted for assessment at any other institution.

The faculty 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.

§7-4 Appointment of the assessment committee

The composition of the assessment committee should normally be decided at the time of submission of the thesis, cf. § 7-3.

When the faculty has approved an application for assessment of a PhD thesis, an expert committee is appointed of at least three members who are to assess the thesis and the public defence.

The provisions on impartiality in §§ 6 to 10 of the Public Administration Act apply to the members of the committee.

The subject unit proposes the assessment committee. The composition of the committee must be justified and demonstrate how the committee as a whole covers the field(s) addressed in the thesis. The candidate will be notified of the proposal for the composition of the committee, and may submit written comments to the composition of the committee no later than one week after the proposal has been made known to the candidate.

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

- different genders are represented
- at least one of the members are from outside the university
- at least one of the members has a main position at a foreign institution
- all the members hold doctoral degrees or equivalent qualifications, the majority in the assessment committee are external members.

If these criteria are not met, an explanation stating the grounds for this must be provided. The appointed academic supervisors and others who have contributed to the thesis may not be members of the assessment committee or administrate its activities.

The faculty designates a chairperson from among the committee members or in addition to the committee members.

The faculty may, if required, appoint one substitute member to the assessment committee.

§7-5 Gathering of supplementary information

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

The assessment committee may ask academic supervisors to provide information about the supervision carried out and the work involved in the thesis.

§ 7-6 Revision of a submitted doctoral thesis

Before producing its final recommendation, and based on the submitted thesis and any basic materials and additional information it has required, the assessment committee may recommend that the faculty permits a minor revision of the thesis. The committee is to provide a written list of the specific items that the candidate must revise.

If the faculty allows minor revisions to the thesis, a deadline normally not exceeding three months is to be set for completing such revisions. A new deadline must also be set for submission of the committee's final recommendation. The faculty's decision pursuant to this

provision may not be appealed by the candidate.

If the committee finds that profound changes regarding the theory, hypothesis, material or method are necessary for the thesis to be found worthy of being defended for the degree, the committee should instead submit a recommendation that the thesis is not worthy of being defended for the degree, cf. § 7-8.

§ 7-7 Correction of formal errors in the thesis

A submitted thesis may not be withdrawn before a final decision has been reached as to whether it merits a public defence.

The candidate may apply to the faculty for permission to correct formal errors in the thesis after submission. The application must include a complete overview of the errors (errata) which the candidate wishes to correct. Applications to correct formal errors must be submitted no later than four weeks before the committee's deadline for submitting its recommendation, and may only be done once.

§ 7-8 Recommendation of the assessment committee

The assessment committee delivers its recommendation as to whether the thesis is worthy of being defended for the degree. The recommendation and any dissenting opinions must be substantiated.

The assessment committee must deliver its recommendation within three months of receiving the thesis. If the faculty allows rework of the thesis, the new deadline runs from the date the thesis is delivered again.

The assessment committee's recommendation is delivered to the faculty, which presents this to the candidate. The PhD candidate is given a deadline of ten working days to present written comments to the recommendation. If the PhD candidate does not wish to comment, the PhD candidate must inform the faculty of this as soon as possible in writing.

Any comments by the candidate must be submitted to the faculty.

§ 7-9 The university's procedures relating to the assessment committee's recommendation

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

If the faculty finds that there are grounds to doubt whether the assessment committee's unanimous recommendation should be used as the basis for its decision, the faculty must request further clarification from the assessment committee and/or appoint two new experts to make individual statements about the thesis. Such additional clarification or individual statements must be presented to the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to make comments.

The faculty is to make the final decision on the matter on the basis of the recommendation and the statements obtained, in addition to any possible comments from the candidate.

If the committee's recommendation is non-unanimous, the faculty can either use the majority's or minority's recommendation as the basis for their decision.

If the faculty considers using the recommendation of the minority as the basis for its final decision, the faculty may seek further clarification from the assessment committee and/or appoint two new experts to give individual statements about the thesis. Such individual statements must be presented to the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to make comments. If both the new experts agree with the recommendation of the majority, this recommendation is to be followed.

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

§ 7-10 Application for a new assessment

A thesis which is not approved for public defence may be assessed in a revised form no earlier than six months after the faculty made this decision. 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 Stavanger or different institution and not found worthy of a public defence.

The faculty appoints the assessment committee pursuant to § 7-4. The appointed assessment committee should make its assessment on an independent basis, but should, upon request, receive the recommendation from the original assessment committee.

§ 7-11 Public availability

When the thesis is found worthy of being defended, the candidate should deliver a concise summary of the thesis in English and Norwegian. If the thesis is not written in English or Norwegian, the candidate must also submit a summary in the language in which the thesis is written. The summary should be made public.

The thesis must be made available to the public no later than two weeks prior to the date of the public defence.

No restrictions may be placed on a thesis being made publicly available, with the exception of a previously arranged delay in the date of public access. Such a delay may be permitted to allow the institution and any external party that has provided full or partial funding for the education to consider potential patents. Neither the university nor an external party can require that all or part of the thesis be prevented from being placed in the public domain.

When publishing the thesis, the candidate must follow the applicable guidelines on the crediting of institutions. As a general rule, an institution must be listed as the address in a publication if the institution has made a necessary and substantial contribution or laid a foundation for an author's contribution to the published work. The same author must also list other institutions as the address if, in each case, these fulfil the requirement related to the institution's contribution.

PART 8. THE DOCTORAL EXAMINATION

§ 8-1 Trial lecture

After the thesis has been found worthy of being defended, and before the public defence, cf. § 8-3, the candidate must hold a trial lecture. The trial lecture is an independent part of the examination for the PhD degree and is held on an assigned topic. The purpose is to test the candidate's ability to acquire knowledge beyond the topic of the thesis and to impart this knowledge in a lecture setting.

The topic of the trial lecture will be announced to the candidate ten working days before the trial lecture. The topic of the lecture must not have a direct connection to the topic of the thesis.

If the faculty choose to hold the trial lecture in connection with the public defence, the assessment committee will issue a topic for the trial lecture and conduct the assessment themselves. If the two lectures are held separately, the faculty may appoint a separate lecture committee which also establishes the topic of the trial lecture. At least one of the members of the assessment committee must take part in the assessment.

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

§ 8-2 Assessment of the trial lecture

The faculty makes a decision on the basis of the committee's recommendation, cf. § 8-1. The faculty is responsible for determining whether the trial lecture is passed or not passed.

A justification must be given if the trial lecture is assessed as not passed. The trial lecture must be passed before the public defence may take place.

If the trial lecture is assessed as not passed, the candidate may register for a new trial lecture. The new trial lecture must be held on a new topic, as soon as possible, and not later than 6 months after the first trial lecture. As far as possible, the lecture must be assessed by the same committee that assessed the original lecture, unless the faculty decides otherwise. The candidate may hold a new trial lecture only once.

§ 8-3 Public defence of the thesis (disputation)

The public defence of the thesis should normally take place within two months after the faculty has found the thesis worthy of being defended.

The time and location of the public defence must be announced at least ten working days in advance.

The committee that originally assessed the PhD thesis must also assess the public defence. The public defence is held in the language in which the thesis is written, unless the faculty approves the use of another language.

Normally, there are to be two opponents. The two opponents must be members of the assessment committee and are appointed by the faculty.

The public defence will be chaired by the dean, or by the person authorised by the dean. The candidate should be given the opportunity to defend the thesis. Others present at the public defence should be given the opportunity to comment *ex auditorio*.

The assessment committee submits its recommendation to the faculty explaining how it has assessed the public defence of the thesis. The recommendation must conclude with a statement as to whether the public defence is assessed as approved or not approved. If the defence is assessed as “not approved”, the recommendation must provide a justification.

§ 8-4 Approval of the public defence

The faculty takes the decision about the approval of the public defence on the basis of the assessment committee's recommendation.

If the faculty does not approve the public defence, the candidate may defend the thesis once more. A new public defence should be held at the latest within six months and as far as possible, be assessed by the same committee that assessed the original public defence, unless the faculty has decided otherwise.

§ 8-5 Conferral of the degree and certificate/diploma

On the basis of the faculty's report that the training component, the thesis and the doctoral examination are approved, the degree of Philosophiae Doctor is conferred to the candidate by the Rector.

Certificates and diplomas are issued by the University of Stavanger.

§ 8-6 Diploma Supplement

The faculty must issue a diploma supplement in accordance with applicable guidelines for Diploma Supplement.

PART 9. JOINT DEGREE AND COTUTELLE AGREEMENTS

§ 9-1 General terms of the agreements

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

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

§ 9-2 Joint degrees

The term joint degree is defined as a collaboration between multiple institutions in which they all have joint responsibility for admission, supervision, awarding of degrees and other elements described in the regulations. For a completed joint degree, a joint diploma is issued in the form of: a) a diploma issued by the consortium members as a group, b) a diploma issued by each of the consortium members, or a combination of a) and b).

Joint degree agreements must normally only be entered into if there is an already established and stable academic collaboration between the University of Stavanger and at least one of the other institutions.

§ 9-3 Cotutelle

The term cotutelle is defined as the joint academic supervision of candidates and cooperation on doctoral education for candidates. Cotutelle agreements are entered into for each individual candidate.

PART 10. APPEALS

§ 10-1 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 § 28 and following of the Public Administration Act. The reasoned appeal must be sent to the faculty. The institution's appeals committee is an appeals body.

§ 10-2 Appeals against exams in the training component

Examinations taken during the training component may be appealed pursuant to the Act on universities and university colleges § 5-2 Complaints against procedural errors in connection with examinations, and § 5-3 Complaints regarding grades awarded. The reasoned appeal must be sent to the faculty. The institution's appeals committee is the appeals body concerning complaints against procedural errors according to the Act on universities and university colleges § 5-2.

§ 10-3 Appeals against rejection of an application for assessment, and rejection of a PhD thesis, trial lecture or public defence

Rejection of an application for assessment of a PhD thesis and a decision not to approve a PhD thesis, trial lecture, or public defence may be appealed under the provisions of § 28 and following of the Public Administration Act. The reasoned appeal must be sent to the faculty. The institution's appeals committee is an appeals body, cf. The universities and university colleges act § 4-13 fourth paragraph.

Should the faculty or appeals body find grounds to do so, it may appoint individuals or a committee to undertake an evaluation of the assessment made and the criteria underlying it, or to undertake a new or supplementary expert assessment.

PART 11. CONCLUDING PROVISIONS

§ 11-1 Delegation of authority

The faculty's authority pursuant to the regulations may not be delegated to the Department/unit unless explicitly stated in the provisions of the regulations.

§ 11-2 Entry into force

The regulations take effect on 1 January 2020.

At the same time, the regulations of 28 April 2016 No. 889 concerning the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree at the University of Stavanger are annulled.

§ 11-3 Transitional provisions

Candidates enrolled on the PhD education according to the regulations of 28 April 2016 No. 889 for the Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D.) degree at the University of Stavanger retain the rights arising from the regulations that applied at the time of enrolment should this favour the candidate.