**Report from the assessment committee – doctoral thesis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PhD candidate** |  |
| **Title PhD thesis** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Members of the evaluation committee** |
| **Chair** |  |
| **First opponent** |  |
| **Second opponent** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **The committee’s overall assessment of the thesis** |
| *See the document "*[*Guidelines of assessment of doctoral degrees at HVL*](https://www.hvl.no/globalassets/hvl-internett/dokument/p.hd/phd-dokumenter-engelsk/guidelines-for-the-assessment-of-doctoral-degrees.pdf)*" and concise guidance at the bottom of this document.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion** |
|  | Final recommendation – Worthy of defence  |  | Is the decision unanimous?Yes  No  |
|  | Final recommendation – Not worthy of defence |  | Is the decision unanimous?Yes  No  |
|  | Recommends minor revisions |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Signatures** |  | **Date** |  |
| **Chair** |  |
| **First opponent** |  |
| **Second opponent** |  |

*Final recommendation (the PhD regulations, section 5-8):*

*The assessment committee gives its recommendation as to whether the work is worthy of public defence. The recommendation must include a reasoned report and any dissenting views.*

*The recommendation must contain a brief description of the work's format (monograph/collection of articles). It must also include a description of the thesis’ scientific significance and its key elements (e.g. theory, hypotheses, material, methodology and findings).*

*If the committee approves the doctoral work for public defence, a relatively brief explanation of its reasoning should be given. The committee should then endeavour to set out its recommendation in a general and concise form. In cases where the committee concludes that the doctoral work should not be approved, a more detailed explanation of the committee’s reasoning is expected.*

*Revision of a submitted thesis (the PhD regulations, section 5-7):*

*On the basis of the submitted thesis and any additional material (ref. Section 5-6), the assessment committee may recommend that the programme committee permit the candidate to make minor revisions to the thesis before the committee submits its final report. The committee must provide a written list of the specific areas that the candidate must revise.*

*If the committee finds that extensive changes regarding the thesis’s theory, hypothesis, material or methodology are needed in order for the work to be deemed worthy of a public defence, the committee must reject the thesis.*