

FORM 4.4 Assessment of the PhD thesis by the Evaluation Committee

|  |
| --- |
| To be filled in electronically by the committee coordinator and to be e-mailed to the faculty PhD contact person no later than 25 working days prior to the planned public defence. |

**This form accounts for**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **First** time submission: | “Original” thesis  “Revised” thesis | **Second** time submission: | “Reworked” thesis |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | | **Candidate, committee, thesis** | | |
|  | | PhD candidate: | Full name of the candidate | |
| Evaluation committee: | Member 1 (Full name, academic title, place of employment, country)  Member 2 (Full name, academic title, place of employment, country)  Member 3 (Full name, academic title, Faculty of employment) | |
| Title of thesis (No): | Title of thesis, in Norwegian | |
| Title of thesis (En): | Title of thesis, in English | |
| **2.** | **The evaluation committee’s conclusion. The committee recommends the thesis to be:** | | | |
|  | *First time submission;*  original thesis | | Approved for public defence.  Not approved for public defence in its present form. The thesis may be subject to minor changes; revised and resubmitted, within a deadline of maximum 3 months (of full time) work.  Rejected. Fundamental changes are necessary. The thesis may be reworked and resubmitted one more time after minimum 6 months. | |
| *First time submission;* revised thesis | | Approved for public defence.  Rejected. Fundamental changes are necessary. The thesis may be reworked, and resubmitted one more time after minimum 6 months. | |
| *Second time submission;*  reworked thesis | | Approved for public defence.  Rejected for a second time. Further revision is not permitted. | |
| **Dissenting opinions, if any:** | | | |
| *State any dissenting opinions and reasons for disagreement among committee members here* | | | |
| **3.** | | **The committee’s assessment of the thesis and proposals for revisions, if any** | | |
| a. | | *The committee members must assess the PhD thesis in accordance with* [*NMBU’s PhD regulations (section 10)*](http://www.nmbu.no/en/research/phd/regulations_guidelines) *and* [*Guidelines for the Evaluation of Candidates for Norwegian Doctoral Degrees*](http://www.nmbu.no/sites/default/files/pdfattachments/guidelines_for_the_evaluation_of_norwegian_phd_degree_uhr.pdf) *(section 3). Consider strengths and weaknesses, material and methods, arguments and conclusions.*  *The committee coordinator inserts here the joint written assessment report & conclusion (normally 2–3 pages).*  *(Any individual assessment reports must accompany form 4.4 when submitted to the faculty. In case the committee does not recommend approval of the thesis in its present form, the committee must include an overview of the specific aspects the PhD candidate must revise.)* | | |
| b. | | **How do you assess the thesis according to the standard at your university or in your field:** (this information is for university internal use only) | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **1st opponent’s appraisal:** | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | | Originality |  |  |  |  | | Depth and coverage |  |  |  |  | | Theoretical level |  |  |  |  | | Methodological level |  |  |  |  | | Skills in written presentation |  |  |  |  | | Contribution to the advancement of the field |  |  |  |  | | External relevance (applied/societal/cultural/industrial) |  |  |  |  | | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **2nd opponent’s appraisal:** | Excellent | Very good | Average | Below average | | Originality |  |  |  |  | | Depth and coverage |  |  |  |  | | Theoretical level |  |  |  |  | | Methodological level |  |  |  |  | | Skills in written presentation |  |  |  |  | | Contribution to the advancement of the field |  |  |  |  | | External relevance (applied/societal/cultural/industrial) |  |  |  |  | | | |
| **4.** | **The coordinator of the committee has compiled the individual assess­ment reports**  **and presents, by submitting form 4.4, the committee’s recommen­dation to the faculty** | | | |
|  | | **Date:**  ***Signature of the coordinator of the committee***  ***NB!*** *No signature needed when the coordinator sends form 4.4 by e-mail to the faculty PhD contact.* | | *Please mark attachments accompanying form 4.4:*  Individual report from 1st opponent  Individual report from 2nd opponent  Other: |