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**Faculty of Natural Sciences**

**Assessment of PhD Thesis**

# Deadline:

# The report must be submitted to the Faculty no later than five (5) weeks before the planned defence.

# Address:

# Faculty of Natural Science

# NTNU Realfagbygget,

# NO-7491 Trondheim

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PhD candidate:** | Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **PhD programme:** | Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of thesis:** | Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |

**Assessment Committee: *(name, title and workplace)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1st opponent:** | Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **2nd opponent:** | Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **NTNU member & administrator:** | Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |

**Evaluation of thesis**

|  |
| --- |
| **Short description of the format of the thesis (monograph/ collection of papers) and the type of work involved (i.e. theoretical/empirical).** Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **Consider whether the thesis is an independent and comprehensive piece of work of high academic standard:**Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **Consider the methodical, theoretical and empirical bases, documentation, treatment of literature and form of presentation in the thesis. Consider whether the material and methods applied are relevant to the issues raised in the thesis, and whether the arguments and conclusions are tenable:**Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **Does the thesis contribute to new knowledge to the discipline?**Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **Consider to what extent the candidate’s contribution to joint publication can be identified and whether the candidate is solely responsible for a sufficient part og the thesis**Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |
| **Other comments *(reasons for dissent among the committee members must be stated here)*:**Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ ]  | 1. **The thesis is worthy of defence without changes.**
 |
| [ ]  | 1. **The thesis is worthy of defence, but the quality would be improved if some minor changes were made (see box below). No re-assessment is necessary.**
 |
|[ ]  1. **The committee recommends that the candidate makes minor revisions to the thesis within three months after the candidate receives the evaluation report. The committee will submit a final report on basis of a revised version of the thesis. A written list of the specific items that the candidate must revise is included in the box below.**
 |
|[ ]  1. **The thesis has not been found worthy of public defence, but may be resubmitted for assessment in revised form no earlier than six (6) months.**
 |
|[ ]  1. **The thesis or the scientific work is not worthy of public defence, and six months will not be sufficient to achieve the quality required on this level.**
 |
|  |  |

**Suggested revisions *(c.f. § 15.2 in the PhD Regulations)*:**

|  |
| --- |
| Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst. |

**Signatures**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **1st opponent** |  | **2nd opponent** |  | **Administrator** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *(Date & Place)* |  | *(Date & Place)* |  | *(Date & Place)* |

|  |
| --- |
| **3. The committee's assessment report (from the “Guidelines for the Assessment of Candidates for Norwegian Doctoral Degrees”)***3.1 Description of the thesis* The committee's report must contain a short description of the format of the thesis (monograph/ collection of papers), the type of work involved (i.e. theoretical/empirical) and the length of the thesis. The report must also include a discussion of the academic significance of the thesis and central factors concerning its theoretical framework, hypotheses, material, methodology and findings. *3.2 Assessment of the thesis* A Norwegian doctoral degree is awarded as proof that the candidate's research qualifications are of a certain standard. Degrees *with* a specified schedule and an organized research training programme (PhD) and degrees *without* such requirements (Dr. philos.) are regarded as being of an equal standard. This principle of equivalence refers to the academic *standard* and *quality* of the work submitted, not merely its *scope*. In the organized research training programmes, qualifications may be documented through tests and participation in various activities within the training programme. Since the degree of Dr. philos. does not include an organized research training programme, the preparatory work (e.g. the collection of data) and the thesis itself are expected to be more extensive than that required in degrees with an organized research training programme. Irrespective of the kind of degree, the candidate must satisfy the *minimum requirements to qualify as a researcher* – demonstrated through requirements related to the formulation of research questions, precision and logical stringency, originality, a good command of current methods of analysis and be able to reflect on their possibilities and limitations. He/she must also demonstrate knowledge of, understanding of and a reflective attitude towards other research in the field. When assessing a doctoral thesis, special consideration should be given to whether the thesis is an independent and comprehensive piece of work of high academic standard with regard to the formulation of research questions. The assessment should also consider the methodological, theoretical and empirical bases, documentation, treatment of the literature and form of presentation in the thesis. It is especially important to consider whether the material and methods applied are relevant to the issues raised in the thesis, and whether the arguments and conclusions posited are tenable. The thesis must contribute new knowledge to the discipline and be of an academic standard appropriate for publication as part of the scientific literature in the field. If the thesis consists of several interrelated minor pieces of work, the candidate must document the integrated nature of the work and the assessment committee must decide whether the content comprises a coherent entity. In such cases, the candidate must compile a separate part of the thesis that not only summarizes but also compares the research questions and conclusions presented in the separate pieces of work. This summarizing part of the thesis is to provide a comprehensive overview to document the coherence of the thesis. This summarizing part of the thesis is of great importance for the doctoral candidate and for the committee's assessment of the work submitted. If the thesis includes one or more joint publications, the doctoral candidate must obtain declarations from his/her co-author(s), including their consent to use the work as part of the thesis. The committee must consider to what extent the candidate's contribution to the joint publication can be identified and whether the candidate is solely responsible for a sufficient part of the thesis. The summarizing part of the thesis must be written solely by the candidate. If the documentation submitted by the candidate is insufficient, the committee may take steps to obtain further information. In special cases, the committee may require the submission of source material and supplementary or clarifying information. If the thesis is submitted as a joint publication, it is reasonable to expect the scope of the research project and/or thesis to be more extensive than that of the work of an individual. Each of the doctoral candidates must, as far as possible, be assessed and tested in accordance with the requirements for the assessment of work submitted by one person. A thesis for the degree of philosophiae doctor (PhD) cannot be submitted by two or more joint candidates.1 *3.3 The conclusion* The conclusion of the committee's report should comprise an assessment and a discussion of the strong and weak points of the thesis. This assessment leads to a conclusion as to whether the committee finds the thesis worthy for public defence, or whether the committee recommends that the thesis is to be rejected. If there is dissent among the members of the committee, the reasons for dissent must be stated.  |