



## Evaluation of PhD Thesis in Science of Professions

<b>Candidate:</b>	
<b>Title of thesis:</b>	
<b>Date of submission:</b>	
<b>Affiliated faculty:</b>	
<b>Principal Supervisor:</b> (name, title and workplace)	
<b>Co-supervisors:</b> (name, title and workplace)	

**The following assessment committee was appointed** (name, title and workplace)

<b>First Opponent:</b>	
<b>Second Opponent:</b>	
<b>Committee Chair:</b>	

Approved by the Dean 9 May 2025

**For background information, please see the [programme description](#) and [Regulations regarding the philosophiae doctor \(PhD\) degree at Nord University with supplementary guidelines for the PhD in Science of Professions](#).**

## **Recommended outline for the assessment committee's evaluation of the thesis.**

The aim is to achieve a critical assessment on a par with an assessment of a manuscript by international referees.

Short description of the thesis including data source(s), thesis format (monograph/collection of works) and length, and the candidate's contribution based on authorships and declaration of independent work

Consider whether the thesis is an independent and comprehensive piece of work of high academic and international standard.

## **Evaluation based on thesis format**

### **Evaluation of thesis consisting of several works and an extend abstract / kappe**

**If the thesis consists of several interrelated works, please give a short evaluation of each work.**

The assessment of each work should begin with a full title, list of authors and status of the work ("published" - publication channel, year, volume and page numbers), "accepted" (- publication channel, year), "submitted" (- publication channel, year) or "in preparation").

**For each work, please evaluate:**

Is the aim clear?

Have the methodologies been described in detail?

Have the results been clearly described?

Is the discussion exhaustive?

Is the work satisfactory overall?

Conclusion: assess how the work contributes to the thesis as a whole?

Please fill in evaluation and details under each section

Consider the extent to which the candidate's contribution to any joint publications can be identified and whether the candidate is solely responsible for a sufficient part of the assignment.

### **Evaluation of the extended abstract / kappe**

The assessment committee should evaluate all central aspects of the extended abstract / kappe such as:

Is the aim clear?

Is the application of theory/literature satisfactory?

Have the methodologies been described in detail?

Have the results been clearly described?

Is the discussion exhaustive?

Assess whether the content of the individual works collectively forms a whole.

In the extended abstract, the candidate must not only summarise but also synthesise the research questions and conclusions presented in the individual works in an overarching perspective, and in doing so show how the different works are related.

### **Evaluation of thesis presented as a monograph**

The assessment committee should evaluate all central aspects of the thesis, such as:

Is the aim clear?

Is the application of theory/literature satisfactory?

Have the methodologies been described in detail?

Have the results been clearly described?

Is the discussion exhaustive?

Is the work satisfactory overall?

### **The thesis as a whole**

Is there coherence between the different parts of the thesis?

Does the thesis contribute to new knowledge in/about/for professional practice?

In the assessment of the thesis, particular emphasis is placed on whether the thesis is an independent and comprehensive scientific work of a high academic standard in terms of research questions, methodology, theoretical and empirical basis, documentation, critical assessment of the literature and form of presentation. It is particularly important that an assessment is made of the suitability of the material and methods in relation to the questions raised in the thesis, and the validity of the arguments and conclusions presented.

The thesis must constitute new knowledge within the field and be of a level that makes it worthy of publishing as part of the scientific literature within the subject area.

<p>Other comments <i>(reasons for dissent among the committee members must be stated here)</i>:</p>
---

## Conclusion

<input type="checkbox"/>	a) The thesis is worthy of defence without changes. <u>§ 15.3</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	b) The committee recommends that the candidate makes minor revisions to the thesis within three (3) 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 “suggested revision” paragraph below. <u>§15.4</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	c) The thesis has been found <b>not</b> worthy of public defence in its current form but may be resubmitted for assessment in a revised form no earlier than six (6) months <b>after the faculty has made its decision</b> . <u>§15.5</u> . The assessment committee’s report must give a clear rationale for why the thesis is found not worthy.

<p><b>In the case of b) and c) - suggested revisions.</b></p>

## Signatures

First Opponent	Second Opponent	Committee Coordinator
Date & Place	Date & Place	Date & Place

## Appendix

### **From: «Guidelines for the assessment of Norwegian doctoral degrees» UHR 2022**

#### 3. Assessment committee's assessment of the doctoral work

##### 3.1 Requirements for the thesis or for the artistic PhD result

*General guidelines for scientific and artistic PhD programmes:*

#### **Section 11-1 Requirements for the scientific thesis**

The scientific thesis must be an independent piece of research or research and development work that meets international standards with regard to ethical requirements, academic standards and methods in the discipline.

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

The thesis may consist of a monograph or a collection of several shorter pieces of work. In the case of the latter, clarification must be given of how the individual pieces are related.

The main component of the scientific thesis may also consist of a new product or a systematised collection of material, or can take a different form of presentation (e.g. audio, images, film, digital forms of production) in which the theoretical and methodological bases do not appear in the product itself. In such cases, the thesis must include a supplementary part in addition to presenting the actual product. This will take the form of a written account of the research question, choice of theory and method, and an assessment of the result in accordance with international and academic standards in the discipline.

The institution will decide which languages may be used.

#### **Section 11-2 Requirements for the artistic PhD result**

The artistic PhD result must consist of an artistic project as well as material that documents artistic reflection. The artistic project must be an independent work that meets international standards with regard to the level and ethical requirements within the discipline.

The artistic PhD result must be at a level that enables it to contribute to the development of new knowledge, insight and experience in the discipline.

The artistic project may consist of one or more parts or of a collection of works comprising a whole. If the artistic project consists of several smaller works, the candidate must explain how they are related.

Normally, only works that have been produced after admission to the PhD programme may be included, but in exceptional cases, earlier works may be used if this has been a prerequisite in the project description.

The artistic project must be an artistic work of a high standard in terms of originality, expression, coherence and communication. The artistic project must be presented publicly, see Section 18-2.

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

- the process concerning artistic choices and pivotal moments, use of theory and methods, dialogue with different networks and research communities, etc.

- the position and description of the candidate’s artistic point of view and work in relation to the relevant field, nationally and internationally, and
- the contribution to knowledge production in the field, including any innovations in the discipline.

The candidate chooses the medium and form for the reflection component and for any other documentation. The institution will decide which languages may be used for reflection and documentation.

The artistic PhD result must be documented in a permanent format.

#### **Section 11-3 Joint works**

The institution decides whether a thesis or artistic PhD result produced in a collaboration consisting of several partners may be submitted for assessment. In such cases, it must be possible to identify the contributions of the individuals involved.

For works that have been produced in collaboration with partners or co-authors, the candidate must follow the norms for crediting co-authorship and joint work that are generally accepted in the scientific community and in accordance with international standards.

If the scientific thesis consists mainly of articles, the candidate must normally be listed as the lead author of at least half of the articles.

Theses and PhD results with several contributors must include a signed declaration that describes the candidate’s contribution to each piece of work. This declaration must be signed by all the contributors including the candidate.

### 3.2 Assessment of the scientific thesis

*General guidelines for scientific and artistic PhD programmes:*

#### *Section 15-1 Assessment of the scientific thesis*

The assessment committee may require the candidate to submit their source material and additional or explanatory information.

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

On the basis of the submitted thesis and any additional material, the assessment committee may recommend that the institution permits the candidate to make minor revisions before the committee submits its final recommendation. The committee must provide a written list of what the candidate needs to rework.

If the institution allows minor revisions to the thesis, a deadline normally not exceeding three (3) months will be set. A new deadline for submission of the committee’s final recommendation must also be set. The candidate has no right of appeal against the institution’s decision in relation to this section.

If the committee finds that extensive changes are needed in order to deem the thesis worthy of public defence, the committee must reject the thesis.

In the assessment of the thesis, particular emphasis is placed on whether the thesis is an independent and comprehensive scientific work of a high academic standard in terms of research questions, methodology, theoretical and empirical basis, documentation, critical assessment of the

literature and form of presentation. It is particularly important that an assessment is made of the suitability of the material and methods in relation to the questions raised in the thesis, and the validity of the arguments and conclusions presented.

The thesis must constitute new knowledge within the field and be of a level that makes it worthy of publishing as part of the scientific literature within the subject area.

If the doctoral work consists of a written component in combination with a product documented in a permanent format or a production, an assessment will be made of whether the content of the combined works form a whole and that this meets the requirements for an independent piece of research for the doctoral degree. This requires the committee to attend, or in some other way witness, any production that is carried out as part of the doctoral work. It must be clear from the written component that the work satisfies the requirements for research questions, methodology, theoretical and empirical basis, documentation, critical assessment of the literature and form of presentation. The written component must also explain the choices made regarding the product or production.

If the thesis consists of a collection of several shorter pieces of work (manuscripts/articles), the committee shall, based on the summary of the thesis (cf. Section 11-1, third paragraph), assess whether the content of the individual works collectively form a whole. The summary must be written solely by the candidate, and is a very important part of the thesis both for the candidate and for the committee's assessment. In the summary, the candidate must not only summarise, but also synthesise the research questions and conclusions presented in the individual works in an overarching perspective, and in doing so show how the different works are related.

If the thesis contains several pieces of work from more than one author, the committee shall, based on the declaration of co-authorship, assess whether the candidate's contributions are identifiable and whether the candidate is solely responsible for a sufficiently large part of the thesis. If the candidate's own documentation is not sufficient, the committee can obtain additional information.

If the thesis in its entirety is submitted as a joint work, the research project and/or thesis will naturally be more extensive than would be the case for an individual piece of work. As far as is possible, each of the candidates must be assessed and tested according to the same requirements for individual pieces of work. Monographs cannot be accepted as joint work.