

**FORM 4.1. PROPOSAL FOR MEMBERS OF EVALUATION COMMITTEE   
  
Proposal raised by an employee at the relevant faculty (the faculty to which the Dr. Philos. Candidate is affiliated).** According to [**NMBU regulations**](http://www.nmbu.no/sites/default/files/pdfattachments/ph.d-forskrift_nmbu_final_eng_final_0.pdf), a committee of at least three members are to be appointed to evaluate a Dr. Philos. thesis and – if the thesis is approved – the two trial lectures and the public defence.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of proposer: |  | | Date: | | Choose date |
| Department: | Choose faculty | | | | | |
| Name of Dr. Philos. candidate: |  | | | | | |
| Title of thesis: |  | | | | | |
| Submission date (ca): | Choose date | Proposed disputation date: | | Choose date | | |
| The proposed committee members are willing to join the committee: | Yes  No | The CV-s of the proposed members are attached: | | Yes  No | | |
| **To our knowledge, the proposed committee members will not be in any conflict of interest** when being appointed as a member of the evaluation committee, neither due to any research cooperation with the Dr. Philos. candidate nor by any personal relationship: | | | |  | | |
| **We have asked the proposed committee members to inform us about any potential conflict of interest:** | | | | Yes  No | | |

As a rule, the evaluation committee shall include members of both genders, and at least one member shall come from a foreign institution. If the proposal does not comply with these provisions, special grounds must be given. Rules for impartiality pursuant to *Section 6* of *the Public Administration Act* apply to the members of the committee. Supervisors or co-authors cannot be members of the evaluation committee.

|  |
| --- |
| **The following evaluation committee is proposed for evaluation of the thesis:** |
| **First opponent:**  *Title and degree + Name:*  *Work place (name of institution):*  *Address (to which the thesis can be sent by post):*  *Country:*  *Telephone:*  *E-mail:*  *Gender (F/M):*  **Second opponent:**  *Title and degree + Name:*  *Work place (name of institution):*  *Address (to which the thesis can be sent by post):*  *Country:*  *Telephone:*  *E-mail:*  *Gender (F/M):*  **Third opponent/third member (Head of Committee / Coordinator):**  *Name:*  *Work place / NMBU faculty:*  *Gender (F/M):* |
| **Reasons why the proposal does not include a man/woman and/or a representative of a foreign institution:** |
|  |

The proposal must explain the reasoning behind the selection of members and indicate how the committee as a whole covers the subject area(s) addressed in the thesis.

|  |
| --- |
| **Grounds for choosing these committee members *(brief account of their academic qualifications and the reasons why each is a suitable opponent (5–20 lines of text))*:** |
| **First opponent:**  **Second opponent:**  **NMBU member:** |

**Approval and further procedure**The faculty considers and approves the proposal for members of the Evaluation Committee.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval by the faculty** | | | |
| The proposal is approved by  (faculty body/official): |  | Date: | Choose date |
| Name(s)/ Signature(s): |  | | |

After the faculty approval, the proposal is forwarded to the Department of Research, Innovation and External cooperation (via P360).

Rector appoints the Evaluation Committee and the Department of Research, Innovation and External cooperation informs the committee members.

Upon appointment of the Evaluation Committee, the faculty PhD contact person sends the thesis to the committee (electronic and/or paper version), and in agreement with the coordinator informs the members about the deadline for assessment.