

Regulations relating to the degrees of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) and Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) in artistic research (PhD in Artistic Research) at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

Adopted by the Board of the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) on 3 February 2026, pursuant to [Section 13-1, fourth paragraph](#) of Act No. 9 of 8 March 2024 relating to Universities and University Colleges.

This English version of the PhD regulations at NTNU adopted by the Board of NTNU on 3 February 2026 may differ from the authoritative version, which is in Norwegian. If so, the authoritative version is to be consulted: [Forskrift for gradene philosophiae doctor \(ph.d.\) og philosophiae doctor i kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid \(ph.d. i kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid\) ved Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet \(NTNU\)](#), fastsatt av NTNUs styre 3. februar 2026.

Part I. Introductory provisions

Section 1. *Scope of the Regulations*

These Regulations apply to all study programmes that culminate in the two degrees of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) and Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) in artistic research (PhD in Artistic Research). The Regulations set forth rules regarding admission to, completion of, and graduation from the PhD education, including integrated PhD programmes, joint degrees, and cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements. The [Academic Regulations for the Norwegian University of Science and Technology \(NTNU\)](#), which were adopted by the Board on 6 March 2025, apply to examinations in the coursework component of the PhD programme insofar as they do not conflict with the PhD Regulations.

Section 2. *Terms*

These two degrees are hereinafter collectively referred to as *doctoral degrees* or, individually as *PhD* and *PhD in Artistic Research*.

The term *doctoral work* is used for both degrees to refer to the work the candidate performs during the agreed period from start to completion, *not* including the coursework component.

The term *doctoral thesis* or *thesis* refers to the results of the scientific doctoral work, cf. [Section 11-1](#).

The term *artistic doctoral work* encompasses both the performative or creative artistic result and the *material that documents critical reflection*, which is also described as the reflection component, cf. [Section 11-2](#).

The term *artistic result* refers only to the performative or creative artistic result.

Section 3. *Scope, content, and objectives of the PhD education*

Section 3-1. *Scope, content, and objectives of the PhD education*

The objective of the PhD education is to qualify candidates to conduct scientific or artistic research of a high international standard and for other types of work in society requiring a high level of scientific or artistic insight and expertise, in accordance with good academic practice and established standards for disciplinary and research ethics. The PhD education is designed to provide the candidate with knowledge, skills, and general competence in accordance with the Norwegian Qualifications Framework.

The PhD education has a nominal duration of three (3) years of full-time study and includes a coursework component with a minimum scope of 30 ECTS.

The most important component of the PhD education is an independent scientific or artistic research project carried out under active supervision.

Section 3-2. Differences between the degrees

When the requirements for a PhD and a PhD in artistic research differ, this will be specified. This particularly applies to admission requirements (cf. [Section 6-1](#)), requirements for the doctoral work, cf. [Section 11-1](#) and [Section 11-2](#), elements of the doctoral examination (cf. [Section 19](#)) and procedures for evaluation, cf. [Section 13](#) and [Section 15](#), as well as matters arising therefrom.

Section 3-3. Awarding of a PhD degree

A PhD degree is awarded on the basis of

- an approved doctoral thesis, cf. [Section 11-1](#)
- approved completion of the coursework component,
- approved trial lecture on a prescribed topic,
- approved public defence of the thesis (disputation).

Section 3-4. Awarding of a PhD degree in Artistic Research

A PhD in artistic research is awarded on the basis of:

- approved artistic result, cf. [Section 11-2](#)
- approved reflection component, cf. [Section 11-2](#)
- approved completion of the coursework component,
- approved examination on a prescribed topic,
- approved public defence of the artistic doctoral work (disputation).

Section 4. Responsibility for the PhD education

The Board of NTNU has the overarching responsibility for the PhD education. The education is organised into programmes.

The Rector establishes PhD programmes based on proposals from the faculties while also determining which faculty will administer and be responsible for the programme (the host faculty). PhD programmes may be established in collaboration between multiple faculties and with national or international research institutions.

The programme council for the PhD programme is established by the host faculty. When a PhD programme is established in collaboration between multiple faculties, a programme council shall be appointed with representatives from the participating

faculties. The programme council shall assist in ensuring the quality of the PhD programme in accordance with NTNU's quality assurance system for education.

The faculty administering the PhD programme approves the curriculum and course descriptions.

Section 5. *Quality assurance system*

The PhD education is subject to NTNU's quality assurance system for education, cf. Section 3-5 of the Universities and University Colleges Act.

Part II. Admissions

Section 6. *Admissions*

Section 6-1. *Admission requirements*

To qualify for admission to a PhD programme, applicants must normally hold a master's degree that includes a major independent project (minimum 30 ECTS) equivalent to a master's thesis, cf. the descriptions in the Norwegian Qualifications Framework Level 7. Following a special review, the faculty may approve other equivalent education as a basis for admission. Equivalent artistic expertise may also be considered for the PhD in Artistic Research. A Norwegian experience-based master's degree (90 ECTS) does not alone constitute sufficient grounds for admission.

The faculty may impose additional qualification requirements based on criteria that are publicly available and consistent with NTNU's recruitment policy and academic profile. This includes the option to require qualifying courses when the applicant holds a master's degree of shorter duration, or to enhance the applicant's academic qualifications to qualify for completing the planned doctoral work.

Applicants must have a strong and relevant academic background from their previous studies, and a weighted average grade in the last two years of their master's programme or equivalent education that is equivalent to a B or higher on NTNU's grading scale. Applicants who do not have letter grades from previous study programmes must have an equivalent level of academic proficiency. Applicants with weaker academic records may be admitted if the faculty determines that the candidate has demonstrated exceptional suitability for a PhD education, for example, through relevant work experience and/or peer-reviewed academic works.

Section 6-2. *Application for admission*

NTNU provides the application form. The application is reviewed by the faculty and should normally include:

- documentation of the education required for admission,
- project description that includes
 - academic outline of the project
 - plan for progress and academic dissemination,
 - an assessment of the ethical and legal issues raised by the doctoral work and how these can be addressed,

- documentation of funding for the entire duration of the PhD period, including academic and material resources and other necessary operating funds,
- plan for the coursework component,
- proposed main academic supervisor and co-supervisors, including statement of affiliation with an active academic community for scientific or artistic research,
- candidates who are not employed at NTNU must demonstrate compliance with the residency requirement.

Applications for admission to the PhD education must be submitted as soon as possible and no later than three (3) months after the start of the work that will culminate in the doctoral degree. If less than one (1) year of full-time work on the doctoral project remains on the application date, the application will be rejected. Separate rules apply to applicants with backgrounds in student research programmes and equivalent study programmes.

Section 6-3. Residency requirement

Candidates who are not employed by NTNU must spend a total of one year or more of their PhD education in a strong and relevant academic community at NTNU. A plan for the residency requirement must be developed in consultation with the department, the main supervisor, and the external employer. The length of the required residency may be reduced in special cases; however, the proposed arrangement must meet the requirements for academic supervision and high quality in the academic community, as well as NTNU's expectation that the candidate will contribute to the institution's academic development and community. An application for reduced residency requirement must be endorsed by the main supervisor and the department. The faculty will then make the final decision on the application.

Candidates employed by NTNU are subject to the terms of their employment contract regarding place of work.

Section 6-4. Infrastructure

The candidate must have access to the necessary infrastructure to complete the doctoral work. The decision regarding what constitutes necessary infrastructure for completion is made by the faculty. For candidates with external funding or place of work, an agreement regarding access to and funding for the use of necessary infrastructure is entered into between the faculty and the external party in connection with the individual project, cf. [Section 7-2](#). As a general rule, such an agreement must be in place at the time the admission decision for the candidate in question is made.

Section 6-5. Admission decision

Decisions concerning admissions are made by the faculty itself and are based on an overall assessment of the application. The faculty may establish criteria for ranking eligible applicants and limiting admissions when the number of applicants exceeds capacity.

The decision must include the appointment of the main supervisor and co-supervisors, assignment of responsibilities for addressing other needs outlined in the application, and specification of the start and completion dates of the admission period. The start date corresponds to the start of the funding period.

Admission shall be denied if:

- agreements with external third parties prevent the publication and public defence of the doctoral work,
- the intellectual property agreements that have been entered into are so unreasonable that the institution should not participate in the project,
- the applicant is unable to meet the requirement that at least one year of the project must be completed after the applicant has been admitted to the PhD programme, cf. [Section 6-2](#).

Section 7. Admission period

Section 7-1. Admission period

The PhD education has a nominal duration of three (3) years of full-time study. The admission period is equivalent to the period in which the candidate has funding and is specified in the admission decision.

Where career-enhancing work entitles the candidate to an extension of the fixed-term period pursuant to [Section 3-17 of the Regulations to the Universities and University Colleges Act \(the Higher Education Regulations\)](#), or where statutory leave is granted, the admission period shall be extended accordingly. The faculty may, upon a reasoned application, grant a further extension of the admission period. If an extension is granted, the faculty may impose additional conditions.

Upon the expiration of the admission period, the parties' rights and obligations pursuant to the Regulations formally cease, thus entailing that the PhD candidate may lose their right to supervision, teaching, examinations, and access to the institution's infrastructure. The maximum admission period is a net period of six (6) years. The faculty itself decides whether the maximum admission period has been exceeded.

The candidate loses the right to defend their doctoral work if the maximum admission period has been exceeded. The candidate may nevertheless apply to have their doctoral work evaluated for the PhD degree after the admission period has expired, provided that the coursework component has been completed. This application must include all relevant attachments, equivalent to an application for evaluation of doctoral work pursuant to [Section 13](#). The faculty decides whether to approve the application. The right to apply for evaluation of the doctoral work does not apply in cases of enforced termination pursuant to [Section 7-4](#) or [Section 7-6](#).

Section 7-2. Agreements

A separate agreement regarding academic supervision is entered into between the candidate, the supervisors, and the faculty to govern the supervisory relationship. The agreement is entered into using the standard template.

For PhD candidates who receive funding from, are employed by, or receive other contributions from an external party, a separate agreement must be entered into between the candidate, the institution, and the external party in accordance with established guidelines.

If the PhD candidate will be affiliated with foreign institutions, NTNU's guidelines for such collaboration must be followed, and separate agreements entered into. Any such

agreements must normally be included with the other agreements required under this section.

Section 7-3. *Voluntary termination before the agreed date*

The candidate and the faculty may agree to terminate the PhD education before the agreed date. Upon such termination, it must be established in writing how matters relating to rights to results and similar issues are to be settled. To the extent that this concerns the employment relationship, matters related to employment and funding are clarified with the employer.

In the event of voluntary termination on the grounds that 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.

Section 7-4. *Enforced termination*

The faculty itself may decide on enforced termination of the PhD education before the agreed date if the PhD candidate has materially failed to meet their obligations, for example:

- Significant delay in completing the coursework component due to circumstances within the candidate's control
- Repeated or material breaches on the part of the candidate of their obligations to provide information, follow up, or report, including failure to submit a progress report, cf. [Section 10](#)
- A delay in the progress of the doctoral project of such a nature that it raises reasonable doubt as to whether the candidate will be able to complete the project within the agreed timeframe. In order to be valid grounds for enforced termination, the delay must be due to factors within the candidate's control
- Conduct that violates the trust that must exist between the university and a candidate during the PhD education, including criminal offences related to the completion of the PhD programme
- Loss of funding due to circumstances within the candidate's control.

Appeals against decisions regarding enforced termination are heard by the Joint Appeals Committee.

Section 7-5. *Cheating on examinations or mandatory activities*

In the event of cheating on examinations or mandatory activities during the course of the education, NTNU's Appeals Committee may decide on annulment, cf. [Section 12-4 of the Universities and University Colleges Act](#).

Appeals are handled by the Joint Appeals Committee.

Section 7-6. *Enforced termination due to misconduct*

If a candidate has engaged in academic misconduct pursuant to [Section 13-2, first paragraph, of the Universities and University Colleges Act](#) and [Section 8, second paragraph of the Research Ethics Act](#), the faculty itself may impose enforced termination.

Appeals shall be heard by the Ministry.

Part III. Implementation

Section 8. *Supervision*

Section 8-1. *Supervision*

The doctoral work must be conducted under individual supervision. The faculty, department, and supervisors shall jointly ensure that the PhD candidate participates in an academic community that is engaged in active scientific or artistic research.

Section 8-2. *Appointment of supervisors*

The faculty itself appoints supervisors. As a general rule, a PhD candidate must have at least two supervisors, one of whom is designated as the main supervisor.

The main supervisor has primary academic responsibility for the candidate and must normally be employed by NTNU. If the faculty appoints an external main supervisor, a co-supervisor who is employed as scientific or artistic staff at NTNU must be appointed.

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

All supervisors must hold a doctoral degree or possess equivalent competence in the field and be actively engaged within their field. At least one of the appointed supervisors, normally the main supervisor, must have prior experience in supervising PhD candidates, typically through to the completion of their doctoral degree. Main supervisors must have completed NTNU's basic training programme for doctoral supervision or do so at the earliest opportunity.

The faculty may also appoint one or more supporting supervisors who do not meet the formal qualification requirements for supervisors, but who possess specific expertise that is essential for the successful completion of the project. Qualifications and relevance must be specified in the application for appointment.

The impartiality provisions in Chapter II of the *Public Administration Act* "Concerning disqualification" ([Sections 6 to 10](#)) apply to all supervisors and appointed supporting supervisors.

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

Section 8-3. *Content of the supervision*

Supervisors shall advise candidates on the formulation and delimitation of topics and research questions, discuss and assess methods and results, discuss the progress plan, implementation, forms of documentation and presentation, and contribute to orienting the candidate in the relevant academic discourse. The candidate must receive supervision on disciplinary and research ethics issues related to the doctoral work.

The candidate and supervisors should maintain regular contact. The frequency of contact must be specified in the annual progress report, cf. [Section 10-1](#).

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

The supervisors have a duty to follow up on academic issues that may result in delayed completion of the PhD programme to ensure that it can be completed within the standard time frame.

Section 9. Coursework component

Section 9-1. Purpose, content, and scope

The PhD education must be structured in such a manner that it can be completed within the standard time frame.

The faculty is responsible for ensuring that the coursework component, together with the project, provides education of a high academic level in accordance with international standards. The coursework component must include training in academic dissemination and an introduction to disciplinary and research ethics, the philosophy of science/theory of artistic research and methodology. Together with the doctoral work, the coursework component must contribute to the achievement of the expected learning outcomes in accordance with Level 8 of the Norwegian Qualifications Framework.

The coursework component must correspond to a minimum of 30 ECTS, of which at least 20 ECTS as a general rule must be completed after admission. At least 20 ECTS must comprise courses at PhD level specified in the study programme description. In order for a master's degree course to be included in the coursework component, it must be of particular relevance to completion of the PhD project, and the candidate must achieve a grade equal to a B or higher on NTNU's grading scale.

Elements that are to be included in the coursework 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. Courses that are part of a previously completed degree may not be included in the coursework component. Special rules apply to PhD candidates with a background from student research programmes.

The faculty itself determines which elements can and must be included in the coursework component, the requirements regarding documentation, and the criteria for achieving a passing grade in examinations. If NTNU does not organise the entire coursework component itself, the faculty shall facilitate equivalent training for the candidate at other institutions.

Courses at doctoral level at another institution must be approved if they meet the academic requirements for the coursework component in accordance with [Chapter 9 of the Universities and University Colleges Act](#).

As part of the PhD education, PhD candidates must receive guidance on future career opportunities both within and outside academia, including developing an understanding of the skills they have acquired through their doctoral work.

Section 9-2. The candidate's rights in connection with a leave of absence

PhD candidates who are on parental leave from their PhD programme may, during their period of leave, attend classes and sit examinations that are to be included as part of the candidate's coursework component, cf. [Section 10-6 of the Universities and University Colleges Act](#).

Section 10. Reporting and mid-term evaluation

Section 10-1. Annual reporting

During the admission period, both the PhD candidate and the main supervisor must separately submit annual reports to the faculty on the progress of the PhD education. 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 supervisor have equal responsibility for reporting. Failure to submit a progress report or inadequate progress reporting from the candidate may result in enforced termination of the PhD education before the end of the admission period, cf. [Section 7-4](#). Supervisors who fail to follow up on the reporting requirements may be relieved of their supervision responsibilities.

The faculty may require additional reporting if necessary.

Section 10-2. Mid-term evaluation

The mid-term evaluation of the doctoral work must normally take place within the first half of the programme. The faculty shall establish guidelines for the content and format of the mid-term evaluation.

Section 11. Requirements for the doctoral thesis or artistic doctoral work

Section 11-1. Requirements for the doctoral thesis

The doctoral thesis shall constitute an independent piece of research or research and development work that meets international standards in terms of ethical requirements, academic standards and methodology in the field.

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

The thesis can consist of a monograph or a compendium of several shorter works. If the thesis consists of several shorter works, an account of the relationship between them must be provided.

The doctoral thesis may also consist of a written component in combination with a permanently documented product or production. In these instances, the works must collectively meet the requirements for an independent piece of research for the degree of PhD in accordance with international standards within the field. The faculty may impose additional requirements regarding the scope or content of the product or production component.

For the thesis to meet the requirements for independent research, the candidate must demonstrate academic integrity and methodological independence. Among other things, this involves accounting for the tools and resources used in the research process, including any use of language models and other forms of artificial intelligence.

Such use must be described and justified in a manner that is ethically sound and ensures reproducibility and academic transparency.

The faculty determines which languages may be used in the thesis.

All theses must include an abstract in both Norwegian and English.

Section 11-2. Requirements for the artistic doctoral work

The artistic doctoral work must consist of an artistic result as well as material documenting critical reflection. The artistic doctoral work must be an independent piece of work that meets international standards in terms of academic quality and ethical requirements within the field.

The artistic doctoral work must be of a level that enables it to contribute to the development of new knowledge, insight, and experience within the field.

The artistic result can consist of one or more parts, or of a collection of works that make up a whole. If the artistic result consists of several smaller works, the candidate must account for the relationship between them.

Normally, only works produced after admission to a doctoral programme may be included; however, in exceptional circumstances, earlier works may be used if this has been a prerequisite in the project description.

The artistic result must be a work of high artistic quality in terms of originality, expression, coherence, and communication. The artistic result must be presented publicly, cf. [Section 18-2](#).

The critical reflection must be documented in the form of submitted material, particularly with regard to:

- process regarding artistic choices and turning points, the use of theory and methodology, dialogue with various networks and academic communities, etc.,
- positioning and description of the candidate's own artistic perspective and work in relation to the relevant field, both nationally and internationally,
- contributions to development of the field, including any academic innovations.

The candidate chooses the medium and format for the reflection component and for any other documentation.

In order for the artistic doctoral work to meet the requirements for independent work, the candidate must demonstrate academic integrity and methodological independence. Among other things, this involves accounting for the tools and resources used in the research process, including any use of language models and other forms of artificial intelligence. Such use must be described and justified in a manner that is ethically sound and ensures reproducibility and academic transparency.

The faculty determines which languages may be used for reflection and documentation. The reflection should include a summary of the doctoral work in both Norwegian and English.

The artistic doctoral work must be documented in a permanent format.

Section 11-3. *Joint work*

Articles produced jointly by several candidates can be included as a component in several doctoral theses, provided that the individual candidate's contribution is substantial and has been identified. An account of this must be provided in connection with the submission of all theses involved. For article-based theses, the chapter binding the articles together must be an individual contribution. A monograph may not be written jointly with others.

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

For a doctoral thesis consisting primarily of articles, the candidate must normally be the main contributor of at least two of the articles.

Doctoral work that includes contributions from multiple people must be accompanied by a signed declaration describing the candidate's contribution to each individual work. Both the candidate and other contributors must sign the declaration.

Section 11-4. *Work that will not be accepted*

Works, or parts of works, that have been 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 or the artistic result, or they have been approved as activity in the coursework component and are in a revised form. Data, analyses and methods from previous degrees may be used as a basis for the work on the project. Use of published works older than five (5) years at the time of admission may not be accepted. The faculty may grant an exemption from this requirement if exceptional circumstances so warrant, cf. [Section 11-2](#).

The thesis or artistic doctoral work may only be evaluated by one educational institution, cf. [Section 13-2](#) and [Section 13-3](#).

Section 11-5. *Plagiarism checks*

Courses in the coursework component and submitted doctoral work may be subject to plagiarism checks. The Rector may establish specific guidelines for conducting plagiarism checks of doctoral work.

Section 12. *Duty to disclose results with potential for commercialisation*

Regulation of rights between collaborating institutions must be established in a separate agreement in accordance with NTNU's applicable policy on intellectual property rights.

NTNU's current rules shall serve as the basis for determining the duty to disclose work results with potential for commercialisation that PhD candidates employed by NTNU produce in the course of their employment.

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

For PhD candidates without an employer, the corresponding duty to disclose must be stipulated in a separate agreement.

Part IV. Completion

Section 13. *Submission and application for evaluation*

Section 13-1. *Basis for evaluation*

The requirements for awarding a scientific or artistic doctoral degree are set forth in [Section 3-3](#) and [Section 3-4](#).

A candidate applies for evaluation by submitting a doctoral thesis, cf. [Section 13-2](#), or by applying for evaluation of an artistic doctoral work, cf. [Section 13-3](#).

Section 13-2. *Application for evaluation of doctoral thesis*

An application for evaluation of a thesis may only be submitted when the coursework component has been approved.

The following must be submitted with the application:

- The doctoral thesis in the format specified by the faculty
- Documentation of required research ethics approvals and legal permits
- Declarations from co-authors where required, cf. [Section 11-3](#)
- 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
- Declaration from the supervisor confirming that they are aware that the thesis is being submitted for evaluation.

The faculty must ensure that the period from submission of the thesis to the public defence is as brief as possible, normally not exceeding five (5) months.

Section 13-3. *Application for the evaluation of artistic doctoral work*

The following must be submitted with the application:

- An account of what is to form the basis for the evaluation, including a plan specifying where, when and how the artistic result is going to be publicly presented
- An account of the choice of medium, language, and format for the reflection component, and the submission date, cf. [Section 15-1](#)
- Description of how the coursework component has been fulfilled, and of any other academic training or qualifications
- Documentation of required research ethics approvals and legal permits
- Plan for approved documentation and archiving of the entire doctoral work in a permanent format
- Declaration from collaborating partners, where required, cf. [Section 11-3](#)
- Statement specifying whether the work is being submitted for evaluation for the first time or the second time

- Declaration that the work has not been submitted for evaluation at another institution
- Declaration from the supervisor confirming that they are aware that the work is being submitted for evaluation.

The application must be submitted to the faculty no later than three (3) months before the scheduled date of the public presentation of the artistic result.

Materials documenting critical reflection must be submitted no later than three (3) weeks after the public presentation of the artistic result.

The faculty must ensure that the period from when the entire doctoral work is available for evaluation and the public defence is as brief as possible, normally not exceeding five (5) months.

Section 13-4. *Processing of the application*

The faculty processes applications for evaluation of a doctoral thesis or artistic doctoral work. Applications that do not meet the requirements specified in [Section 13-2](#) or [Section 13-3](#) shall be rejected. The faculty may, on its own initiative, reject an application for evaluation of the doctoral work if it is evident that the work is not of sufficient quality and would be rejected by an evaluation committee.

Section 14. *Appointment of an evaluation committee*

Once the faculty has approved an application for evaluation of a doctoral thesis or artistic doctoral work, the faculty itself shall appoint an expert committee of at least three members who will evaluate the doctoral work, the examination on a prescribed topic and the public defence (disputation). The rules of impartiality in [Sections 6 to 10 of the Public Administration Act](#) apply to the committee members. Co-authorship with the candidate is always considered a conflict of interest.

The evaluation committee must normally be composed so that:

- at least two genders are represented
- at least two of the members have no affiliation with NTNU
- at least one of the members holds a primary position at a foreign institution
- all members hold a doctoral degree or possess equivalent qualifications
- the majority of the evaluation committee consists of external members.

If these criteria are to be deviated from, this must be specifically justified.

The department shall propose the composition of the evaluation committee. The composition of the committee must be justified in terms of how it collectively covers the field of the doctoral work. The faculty appoints an administrator from among the committee members or in addition to the committee members.

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

The candidate shall be notified of the proposed composition of the committee and shall have the opportunity to submit written remarks no later than one week after the proposed composition of the committee has been made known to the candidate.

In the event of a vacancy, the faculty may appoint a substitute member to the evaluation committee.

Section 15. *The work of the evaluation committee*

Section 15-1. *The work of the evaluation committee*

The evaluation committee must be made aware of NTNU's PhD Regulations and guidelines for evaluation.

The evaluation committee may, where necessary, require the candidate to submit source material and any supplementary or clarifying information.

The evaluation committee may also request that the supervisor provide an account of the supervision and the work on the project.

For the evaluation of the artistic doctoral work, the committee shall receive the candidate's account of the basis for the evaluation, including a plan specifying where, when, and how the artistic result will be presented publicly, cf. [Section 13-3](#), and when and in what format the reflection component will be submitted.

If the public presentation of the artistic result takes place in the form of a concert, exhibition, performance, or other presentation with a specific time and location, the entire evaluation committee must be present.

Section 15-2. *The evaluation committee's recommendation*

The evaluation committee shall issue a reasoned recommendation stating whether the doctoral work is worthy of a defence for the PhD degree. All parts of the submitted or presented documentation must be discussed in relation to the criteria defined in [Section 11-1](#) or [Section 11-2](#). The recommendation should be discursive and end with a clear conclusion regarding whether the work should be approved. Any dissenting opinions or individual statements by committee members must be included in the recommendation, with an explanation of the reasons.

The evaluation committee submits its recommendation to the faculty.

The committee's recommendation must be submitted no later than three (3) months after the committee has received all parts of the doctoral work for evaluation.

The committee's recommendation shall be forwarded to the faculty, which shall present it to the candidate. The candidate is given a deadline of ten (10) working days to submit written remarks on the recommendation. If the candidate does not wish to submit remarks, the candidate must notify the faculty of this in writing without delay.

Any remarks that the candidate may have must be submitted to the faculty. The faculty shall make a decision on the matter, cf. [Section 16](#).

Section 15-3. *Minor revisions and rejection of thesis*

Based on the submitted doctoral work and any additional material, the evaluation committee may recommend that the faculty permit the candidate to make minor revisions to the thesis or the reflection component before the committee submits its final recommendation. The committee must provide a written overview of the specific revisions that the candidate should make.

If the faculty permits minor revisions to the doctoral work, a deadline that is normally no longer than three (3) calendar months must be set. A new deadline for submission of the committee's final recommendation must also be set. The candidate may not appeal the faculty's decision regarding minor revisions pursuant to this section.

If the committee finds that substantial changes regarding theory, research questions, material or methodology are necessary before the doctoral work can be deemed worthy of public defence, the committee must reject the work.

The committee shall not recommend minor revisions if the work only contains minor ambiguities that can be clarified within the framework of the public defence.

Section 16. *Consideration of the evaluation committee's recommendation*

Section 16-1. *Consideration of the evaluation committee's recommendation*

Based on the recommendation of the evaluation committee, the faculty shall decide whether the doctoral work is worthy of a public defence.

Section 16-2. *Unanimous recommendation*

If the committee submits a *unanimous* recommendation and the faculty adopts the committee's recommendation as the basis for its deliberations, the faculty itself shall decide in accordance with the unanimous recommendation.

If the faculty finds that there is reasonable doubt as to whether the committee's unanimous recommendation should be accepted as the basis for its decision, the faculty itself shall seek further clarification from the committee and may appoint two new experts who will issue individual statements on the doctoral work. Such additional or individual statements must be presented to the candidate, who must be given the opportunity to submit remarks.

The faculty shall decide on the matter based on the recommendation and any additional statements obtained.

Section 16-3. *Non-unanimous recommendation*

If the committee submits a *non-unanimous* recommendation and the faculty decides to adopt the majority's opinion as the basis for its deliberations, the faculty shall decide in accordance with the majority's recommendation.

If the committee submits a non-unanimous recommendation and the faculty considers adopting the minority's opinion as the basis for its deliberations, the faculty may seek further clarification from the committee and may appoint two new experts who will issue individual statements on the doctoral work. Such additional or individual statements must be presented to the candidate, who must be given the opportunity to submit remarks. If both the new experts concur with the majority in the original recommendation, the committee's recommendation must be followed.

The faculty shall decide on the matter based on the recommendation and any additional statements obtained.

Section 17. *Application for new evaluation*

A doctoral work that has been found not worthy of a public defence may be resubmitted for evaluation in a revised form no earlier than six (6) months after the faculty has made its decision. The faculty shall then appoint a new evaluation committee, in which at least one member of the original committee should be reappointed. A doctoral work can only be resubmitted for evaluation once.

The final deadline for submitting an application for a new evaluation is two (2) years after the faculty made its original decision.

A candidate who submits a new application for evaluation must state that the work has previously been evaluated and was found not worthy of a public defence, cf. [Section 13-2](#) and [Section 13-3](#).

Section 18. *Publication*

Section 18-1. *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 a public defence for the doctoral degree.

However, the candidate may correct typographical and formatting errors following submission or presentation. For a PhD in artistic research, this applies only to the reflection component. The candidate must attach a complete list of errors to be corrected (errata list). The faculty must approve the errata list prior to publication.

Section 18-2. *Publication requirement*

The doctoral thesis or the artistic doctoral work must be made publicly available. There are specific requirements concerning the publication of doctoral theses and the artistic doctoral work respectively, cf. [Section 18-3](#).

The candidate must submit a brief written summary or account of the thesis or doctoral work in both English and Norwegian. The summary must be made publicly available.

Section 18-3. *Availability*

The doctoral thesis must be publicly available no later than three (3) 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 minor revisions, cf. [Section 15-3](#).

The artistic doctoral work must be presented publicly. The reflection component and any other material included in the evaluation must be publicly available no later than three (3) weeks prior to the date of the public defence. The material must be made available in the form in which it was submitted for evaluation, with any minor revisions, cf. [Section 15-3](#).

The artistic result must be documented in a permanent format and archived together with the reflection component.

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 form of delay is to enable the institution and any external party that has fully or partially funded the candidate's doctoral education to consider potential patenting or

similar measures. External parties may not require that all or part of the thesis or artistic doctoral work be withheld from publication, cf. [Section 6-5](#).

When publishing or making work publicly available, candidates must follow the applicable guidelines for crediting institutions. The main rule is that an institution must be credited 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 for contribution in each individual case.

Section 19. *Doctoral examination*

Section 19-1. *Trial lecture or other examination on a prescribed topic*

After the doctoral thesis or artistic doctoral work has been found worthy of public defence, the candidate must complete a trial lecture or equivalent artistic presentation, both on a prescribed topic. This is a separate component of the doctoral examination. The objective is to test the candidate's ability to acquire knowledge beyond their area of specialisation and their ability to communicate this knowledge in a lecture setting or other relevant form of presentation.

The evaluation committee assigns the topic and undertakes the evaluation. The candidate must 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 examination must normally be conducted in the language of the doctoral work, unless the faculty approves another language.

The evaluation committee determines whether the candidate has passed the examination on the prescribed topic. Grounds must be provided if the conclusion is that the candidate has not passed the examination.

The examination on a prescribed topic must be passed before the public defence can be held.

Section 19-2. *Public defence*

The public defence of the doctoral work must normally take place within two (2) months of the faculty having found the work to be worthy of a public defence.

The time and venue 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 shall also evaluate the public defence. The public defence is normally conducted in the language of the doctoral work, unless the faculty approves another language.

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

The public defence is chaired by the Dean or another person authorised by the faculty. The chair of the public defence provides an account of the submission and evaluation of the doctoral work and the result of the examination on a prescribed topic

(cf. [Section 19-1](#)). The doctoral candidate then presents the purpose and findings of the doctoral work.

The first opponent opens and the second opponent closes the opposition. The faculty may, where appropriate, determine a different division of responsibilities among the opponents and between the doctoral candidate and the first opponent. After both opponents have concluded their opposition, members of the audience shall have the opportunity to comment *ex auditorio*. The chair closes the public defence.

The evaluation committee issues a recommendation to the faculty stating how the committee assessed the defence of the doctoral work. In its recommendation, 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 public defence should be approved or not approved.

Section 20. *Approval of the doctoral examination*

Based on the recommendation of the evaluation committee, the faculty decides whether to approve the doctoral examination.

If the committee does not approve the trial lecture or the examination on the prescribed topic, cf. [Section 19-1](#), a new examination on a new topic must be held no later than six (6) months after the first attempt. A new trial lecture or examination on a prescribed topic may only take place once. Unless the faculty decides otherwise, a new examination must, insofar as possible, be evaluated by the same committee that assessed the original examination.

If the faculty does not approve the public defence, the candidate may defend the doctoral work one more time. A new public defence must normally be held within six (6) months and, insofar as possible, be evaluated by the same committee that assessed the original defence.

Section 21. *Degree awarded*

Section 21-1. *Conferral*

On the basis of an approved coursework component and doctoral examination, the faculty itself confers the degree of Philosophiae Doctor or Philosophiae Doctor in Artistic Research on the candidate by issuing a diploma.

Section 21-2. *Diploma*

Diplomas are issued by the faculty. The diploma must include information about the academic training the candidate has participated in, the title of the thesis or artistic doctoral work, the examination on a prescribed topic, and the supervisors.

Diplomas for candidates who have completed an inter-faculty PhD programme are issued by the faculty to which the candidate was admitted.

In addition to the diploma from the faculty, the doctor shall receive a doctoral diploma signed by the Rector and the Dean.

Section 21-3. *Diploma Supplement*

The faculty issues a standardised English diploma supplement together with the diploma.

Part V. Appeals

Section 22. Appeals

Section 22-1. Appeals against rejection of an application for admission, a decision to close the admission period, and rejection of an application for approval of elements of the coursework component

Rejections of applications for admission, decisions to close the admission period, and rejection of applications for approval of elements of the coursework component may be appealed in accordance with the provisions in [Section 28 et seq. of the Public Administration Act](#). The appeal, including a description of the grounds for the appeal, must be submitted to the faculty. If the decision is upheld, the appeal shall be forwarded to NTNU's Appeals Committee for a final decision.

Section 22-2. Appeals against grading or formal errors in the examinations in the coursework component

Grades awarded in examinations taken as part of the coursework component may be appealed pursuant to [Section 11-10 of the Universities and University Colleges Act](#). [Section 11-9](#) applies to appeals against formal errors in the examination.

Suspected cheating or attempted cheating shall be handled in accordance with NTNU's established procedures for such matters.

Section 22-3. Appeals against rejection of an application for evaluation, a decision that a thesis or artistic doctoral work, trial lecture or other examination on a prescribed topic, or public defence has not been approved

Rejection of an application for evaluation of doctoral work and a decision not to approve a doctoral work, a compulsory examination, or public defence may be appealed pursuant to [Section 28 et seq. of the Public Administration Act](#).

The appeal, including a description of the grounds for the appeal, must be submitted to the faculty. The faculty may annul or amend the decision if it finds there are valid grounds for the appeal. If the faculty dismisses the appeal, the appeal shall be forwarded to NTNU's Appeals Committee for a final decision.

If the faculty or the appeals body deems it necessary, individuals or a committee may be appointed to review the evaluation that has been conducted and the criteria upon which it is based, or to conduct a new or supplementary expert assessment.

Part VI Integrated PhD education and collaborations

Section 23. Integrated PhD education

Section 23-1. Integrated PhD education

The integrated PhD education is a specially designed study arrangement that culminates in a PhD degree at NTNU. The faculty itself shall decide which study programmes will be covered by this arrangement.

Integrated PhD education is an arrangement in which candidates may combine completion of the final year of their master's degree at NTNU with the first year of their doctoral education. The specialisation course and master's thesis are geared towards the subsequent doctoral thesis.

This period of up to two (2) years is referred to as Part I of the integrated PhD education. In Part I, the candidate shall devote 50% of their time to their master's degree and 50% to their doctoral work.

Part II of the integrated PhD education is contingent upon the completion of the master's degree in Part I and consists of the final two years of the doctoral education.

The standard duration of the PhD education is a net total of three (3) years.

Section 23-2. Admission to the first period of the integrated PhD education

Applications for admission to the first period must be prepared in collaboration with the intended main supervisor. The standard application form must be used and any specific requirements set by the faculty must be met. Supervision, the coursework component, and funding for the entire PhD period must be in place, but a project description is not required. In Part I, candidates are normally expected to complete the coursework component of the doctoral education, as well as any other educational requirements in the relevant PhD programme.

Admission is based on grades achieved after the first year of the master's programme or the fourth year of a five-year master's programme. Applicants must have a weighted average grade of B or higher on NTNU's grading scale. The faculty sets the deadline for admission, but the application must be submitted no later than the end of the second semester of the master's programme or the eighth semester of the five-year master's programme.

The faculty itself decides on admission following a recommendation from the department. Upon a decision on admission to Part I, an agreement must be entered into in accordance with Section 7.

Section 23-3. Admission to the second period of the integrated PhD programme

Candidates who have completed the first period in accordance with Section 23-1 and meet the other requirements for admission to the PhD education in accordance with these Regulations are automatically entitled to admission to the second period.

An application for admission to the second period includes a revised version of the application for the first period and must be prepared in collaboration with the main supervisor. Applications for the second period must include a project description in accordance with the faculty's guidelines.

The faculty itself decides on admission following a recommendation from the department.

Section 23-4. Withdrawal from the arrangement

Candidates who withdraw from an integrated PhD education may complete the study programme to which they were originally admitted, provided they meet the requirements of that study programme.

Section 24. Joint degrees and cotutelle agreements

Section 24-1. Joint degrees and cotutelle agreements

NTNU may enter into agreements with one or more Norwegian or foreign institutions regarding collaboration in the form of joint degrees or cotutelle agreements.

The Rector may establish separate guidelines for joint degrees and cotutelle arrangements.

Section 24-2. *Joint degrees*

Joint degrees refer to a collaboration between several institutions, in which the partner institutions are jointly responsible for the PhD programme: admission, academic supervision, conferral of the degree and other matters described in these Regulations. The collaboration is normally organised as a consortium and regulated by an agreement between the members of the consortium. Upon completion of a joint degree, a joint diploma is issued in the form of: a) a single diploma issued by all consortium members, b) individual diplomas 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, long-term academic collaboration between the institution and at least one of the other consortium members.

Section 24-3. *Cotutelle agreements*

Cotutelle agreements refer to the joint supervision of PhD candidates and collaboration on the education of PhD candidates. A cotutelle agreement is entered into between the institutions for each individual candidate and must be founded on a stable and long-term academic collaboration between the institutions.

Section 24-4. *Requirements for joint degrees and cotutelle agreements*

For agreements on joint degree collaboration and cotutelle arrangements, the Rector may grant exemptions from these Regulations if this is necessary in view of the applicable rules at the collaborating institutions. Such exemptions, both individually and collectively, must be fully justifiable in respect of the requirements concerning academic quality that apply to equivalent PhD degrees at NTNU.

The qualifications required for admission, the requirement that the thesis must be made publicly available, and the requirement for a public defence before an impartial evaluation committee may not be waived. At a minimum, agreements on joint degrees and cotutelle arrangements must regulate admission, funding, the coursework component, 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, diplomas, and rights to results. The agreement shall be signed by the Rector.

The PhD education at the collaborating institution must also have a standard duration of three (3) net years. The candidate must be admitted to both institutions.

Part VII Delegation, entry into force and transitional provisions

Section 25. *Delegation*

Authority that, pursuant to these Regulations, is to be exercised by the faculty itself may not be delegated to the department.

Section 26. *Entry into force*

These Regulations shall enter into force immediately. Simultaneously, Regulations No. 1878 of 5 December 2018 relating to the degrees of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) and Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) in artistic research at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), adopted by the Board, are repealed.

Section 27. *Transitional provisions*

Candidates who, on the date these Regulations enter into force, have been admitted to the PhD education under a previous version of the regulations for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) at NTNU shall retain the rights granted under those regulations if doing so is in their best interest.