



INNKALLING MØTE I PROGRAMUTVALG FOR FORSKERUTDANNING

Onsdag 25.09.24, kl. 14.00-15.30

Sted: Armauer Hansen Hus, møterom 437, 4.etg

Sak 19/24	Godkjenning av innkalling og saksliste
Sak 20/24	Godkjenning av referat fra 12.06.2024
Sak 21/24	Orpheus Label Selvevaluering Saksforelegg
Sak 22/24	Godkjenning av opplæringsdelen fra forskerlinjen Saksforelegg
Sak 23/24	Antall veiledere & Hvem kan bli veileder (del av programbeskrivelsen) Saksforelegg / Diskusjonssak
Sak 24/24	Søknad om godkjenning av et nytt ph.d.-emne BCEPS900 som erstatter for INTH950 Saksforelegg
Sak 25/24	ORIENTERINGSSAKER - Høring for ph.d.-forskriften
	Eventuelt

Martha Enger (s.)

Havjin Jacob. (s.)



REFERAT MØTE I PROGRAMUTVALG FOR FORSKERUTDANNING

Onsdag 12.06.24, kl. 14.00-15.30

Sted: Armauer Hansen Hus, møterom 437, 4.etg

Til stede: Martha C. Enger (leder), Harald Barsnes, Simon Nygaard Øverland, Kaia Nepstad, Åshild Johansen, Stephanie Le Hellard. Hege Ommedal og Havjin Jacob.

Meldt fravær: Kristine Bærøe, Anne Berit Guttormsen, Stian Knappskog

Sak 11/24	Godkjenning av innkalling og saksliste Godkjent To saker er meldt inn under eventuelt.
Sak 12/24	Godkjenning av referat fra 17.04.2024 Sirkulasjonssaken er vedlagt referatet. Godkjent.
Sak 13/24	Reviderte retningslinjer for midtveisevaluering og midtveiskomite Oppdaterte veiledninger for midtveisevaluering og midtveiskomite Et av instituttene våre har rapportert at noen ph.d.-kandidater er bekymret for midtveisevalueringen, da formålet og gjennomføringen ikke er klart nok. Midtveisevalueringen er ikke en prøve, men er ment for å støtte kandidatene faglig og bidra til å fremme deres fremgang, samt gi en mulighet til å reflektere over prosjektets status. Det er essensielt at både kandidaten og midtveiskomiteen deler denne forståelsen av midtveisevalueringens hensikt. Midtveisevalueringen er obligatorisk og godkjennes som ett studiepoeng. Formålet er å være en støtte for kandidaten og veilederne, da det er like viktig for begge parter. Hvis prosjektet trenger justeringer, eller det er problemer med veilederforholdet, er det bra at dette er en del av kvalitetssikringen. Det skal være til hjelp for både kandidat og veiledere, for å vurdere hvor langt man har kommet i løpet, og vurdere om veilederteamet, prosjektet osv. kan trenge justeringer. Definisjonen av hva som er til hjelp må være klar.

<p>Vedtak</p>	<p>Teksten må være konsistent mellom retningslinjene, skjemaet, og det som sendes til komiteen.</p> <p>Teksten under oppsummeringen på skjemaet bør flyttes opp.</p> <p>Det er fint hvis instituttene lager kalenderoppføringer for midtveisevalueringer, slik at de blir lagt ut på instituttens kalendere når det er tid for midtveisevalueringer.</p> <p><i>Programutvalget for forskerutdanning godkjenner reviderte retningslinjer for midtveisevaluering og midtveiskomiteen med de justeringene som kom frem i møtet.</i></p>
<p>Sak 14/24</p>	<p>Treårs versus fireårs finansiering av stipendiatstillinger</p> <p>Ifølge bologna-prosessen er en internasjonal ph.d.-tid begrenset til 3-4 heltidsarbeid. Forskerutdanningen fører til tildeling av en ph.d.-grad og har som mål å gi kandidatene kompetanse til å være selvstendige forskere, samt være i stand til å drive ansvarlig, original og uavhengig forskning med karriere i eller utenfor akademien. I Norge omfatter forskriften om ansettelsesvilkår §1-3 stillingskategorien stipendiat, med 3 hele årsverk dedikert til doktorgradsarbeidet, og et gjerde år dersom stillingen inkluderer pliktarbeid. Hovedvekten er lagt på karrierefremmende arbeid, for eksempel undervisning, veiledning og formidlingsoppgaver, men ikke mer enn 10% administrative oppgaver.</p> <p>Pliktarbeid har vært ulik gjennomført av ph.d.-kandidater der noen har gjort mye og noen svært lite. I 2023 ble det innført nye retningslinjer for pliktarbeid ved fakultetet. Dialogmøter med instituttene har avdekket at det er utfordrende å tildele undervisningsoppgaver til kandidater som ikke snakker norsk, ikke er klinikere, eller av andre årsaker. Til tross for retningslinjene, er det mange som ikke blir brukt i undervisning. De blir i stedet satt til andre oppgaver som i utgangspunktet ikke er undervisning.</p> <p>Finansielle innstramminger i universitets- og høyskolesektoren, samt endringer i eksterne finansieringskilder som Kreftforeningen og Norges forskningsråd, tyder på en fremtidig mangel på stillinger. Utvalget har diskutert effekten av dette på belønningssystemet, hvor vi kan oppnå 12,8 millioner kroner etter fem år sammenlignet med 9 millioner i dag, og muligheten til å utlyse 12 ekstra stillinger hvert år.</p> <p>Utvalget er enige om at det er et problem at kandidater ikke deltar i undervisning, som er hensikten med pliktarbeid. Vi har kandidater som ikke snakker norsk, eller som til og med bor i utlandet, som har det fjerde året med pliktarbeid. Dette indikerer at de i realiteten har fire år til forskning og ikke 25% pliktarbeid.</p> <p>Utvalget diskuterte også denne ressursen der ph.d.-kandidater veileder masterstudenter og får uttelling, og eventuelt hva skjer når denne faller</p>

	<p>bort. Det kan være at kandidater må fortsatt veilede masterstudenter, selv om de ikke har pliktarbeid.</p> <p><i>Utvalget støtter treårige stipendiatstillinger, og kvalitetssikring av det eventuelle fjerde året.</i></p>
<p>Sak 15/24</p>	<p>Søknad om opprettelse av et nytt ph.d.-emne (Kurs i forskningsetikk for forskere)</p> <p>Klinisk institutt 1 ved emneansvarlig Daniela Elena Costea søker om godkjenning av dette emnet på ph.d.-nivå med fire studiepoeng. Kurset er planlagt i 15 dager, inkludert 10 dager med undervisning, fire dager med selvstudie, og en dag med hjemmeeksamen. Totalt beregnet arbeidsmengde er 100 timer som tilsvarer 4 studiepoeng. Utvalget gikk gjennom emnets innhold og omfang og diskuterte overlappet av kurset med vår obligatorisk kurs i forskningsetikk (MEDMET901). Det er betydelig overlapp med MEDMET901. Denne overlappen gjelder grunnleggende aspekter knyttet til forskningsetikk, og den utgjør 2-3 studiepoeng. Det som ikke overlapper med MEDMET901, er fokusert på etikk og spesielle utfordringer i konfliktområder. Ph.d.-kandidater som tar både MEDMET901 og dette kurset, ville fått redusert studiepoeng tilsvarende overlappet.</p> <p>Utvalget diskuterte likevel viktigheten av kurset for forskere, masterstudenter, og ph.d.-kandidater i Sudan. Derfor anbefaler utvalget emneansvarlig å vurdere muligheten for å tilby kurset på masternivå og få det godkjent i et masterprogram. Eventuell overlapp må igjen vurderes dersom det sendes til et masterprogram.</p> <p>Utvalget vedtar følgende:</p> <p><i>Programutvalget godkjenner ikke opprettelse av emnet «kurs i forskningsetikk for forskere»</i></p>
<p>Vedtak</p>	
<p>Sak 16/24</p>	<p>Forslag til møtedatoer for PFU høsten 2024</p> <p>Foreslått møtedato 23.10.2024 passer ikke for noen i utvalget, og vi flytter det derfor til uken etter som blir da 30.10.2024.</p> <p>Det tredje møtet blir forskjøvet en uke også, slik at det ikke kommer tett på andre møtet i høsten.</p> <p>Møtene i høst blir da følgende:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 25.09.2024 - 30.10.2024 - 27.11.2024

Sak 17/24	ORIENTERINGSSAKER Visedekanen orienterer om arbeidsgruppe for utredning av retningslinjer for monografi. MED har foreløpig ingen retningslinjer for monografier, da det ikke har et behov med ca. 1-2 avhandlinger som monografi siden 2013. Det har vært lagt de samme kravene for monografi avhandlinger som artikkelbaserte avhandlinger. Fakultetet ser nå at det må lages egne retningslinjer for omfang, innhold og struktur av monografiavhandlinger. Det er oppnevnt en arbeidsgruppe ved Det medisinske fakultet som skal jobbe med dette og levere rapporten i oktober. Det blir da vedtatt i PFU på møtet i høsten 2024.
	Eventuelt <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Det kommer en sak på sirkulasjon til utvalget som omhandler forskerlinjen.- Helse Vests forskningsmidler 2025 planlegges publisert neste uke her eSøknad (ihelse.net). Personer fra UiB som ikke også er ansatt i et helseforetak i regionen (eller private ideelle) har mulighet for å søke med forankringsavtale.

Martha Enger (s.)

Havjin Jacob. (s.)

DET MEDISINSKE FAKULTET

PROGRAMUTVALGET FOR FORSKERUTDANNING

MØTE: Sirkulasjonssak sendt ut 17.06.2024

SAK 18/24

Navneendring forskerlinjen

Hva saken gjelder

Ny finansieringsordning for studiepoeng blir iverksatt høsten 2025. I den forbindelse er antallet kategorier endret fra 5 til 3. Medisin og odontologi er som tidligere plassert i dyreste kategori, som gir mer enn dobbel uttelling i forhold til de to lavere kategoriene. Forskerlinjen er imidlertid blitt plassert i midterste kategori ved UiB, UiO og NTNU, men ikke ved UiT, der den fortsatt ligger i øverste kategori. Årsaken til dette er mest sannsynlig at ved UiT heter forskerlinjen «Medisin profesjonsstudium – forskerlinje» mens på de andre lærestedene heter det bare forskerlinjen ved det medisinske fakultet. Myndighetene har dermed ikke forstått at våre forskerlinjeprogram er en integrert del av grunnstudiene. Vi foreslår derfor en navneendring på våre studieprogram for forskerlinjen til:

Medisinstudiet, profesjon, forskerlinje
Odontologi (tannlege), master, forskerlinje

Vi ønsker i første omgang å kun endre navnet på programmene, og ikke gjøre endringer i utdanningsplanene. Dersom navneendring alene ikke medfører at finansieringskategorien kan endres, må vi vurdere å gi forskerlinjestudentene en samlet utdanningsplan for både forskerlinjen og resterende del av medisinstudiet/odontologistudiet ved opptak til forskerlinjen. Dette må i så fall utredes nærmere

Forslag til vedtak

1. *Programutvalg for forskerutdanning godkjenner navneendringen for forskerlinjen.*
2. *Programutvalg for forskerutdanning godkjenner ikke navneendringen for forskerlinjen.*

HAJA/17.06.2024

DET MEDISINSKE FAKULTET

PROGRAMUTVALGET FOR FORSKERUTDANNING

MØTE 25.09.2024

SAK 21/24

Orpheus Label - selvevaluering

Hva saken gjelder

Orpheus Label er basert på selvevaluering av ph.d.-programmet ved institusjonen. Orpheus Label tildeles for en periode på fem år. Etter det må det fornyes. Det medisinske fakultet fikk hadde selvevalueringen i 2014. For å få fornyet dette, er Det medisinske fakultet bedt om å fylle ut skjemaet ved å indikere om vi fortsatt overholder hver av de kjerneanbefalingene i [Orpheus Best Practice](#).

Med utgangspunktet i selvevalueringen fra 2014, er skjemaet oppdatert med gjeldende regler og praksis (vedlagt).

Programutvalget bes om å gå gjennom dokumentet og komme med eventuelle endringer eller kommentarer.

Forslag til vedtak

Programutvalget tar selvevalueringen til etterretning.

Vedlegg

- Selvevaluering (spørreskjema)

HAJA/18.09.2024

The labelling procedure is based initially on self-evaluation using the *Standards for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in Europe*, Aarhus University Press, 2012, published by ORPHEUS (Organisation for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in the European System), AMSE (Association of Medical Schools in Europe), and WFME (World Federation for Medical Education). The labelling procedure is open to all ORPHEUS members. Application for labelling should be sent to President ORPHEUS, Prof. John Creemers, KU Leuven, Belgium, and to the chairman of the ORPHEUS Labelling Board, Prof. Gül Güner Akdoğan, School of Medicine, IEU, Izmir, Turkey.

The ORPHEUS/AMSE/WFME document refers to two types of standards:

- **Basic standards:** Standards that should be met from the outset.
- **Quality development:** Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice. Fulfilment of (or initiatives to fulfil) some or all such standards should be documented.

This document (available on www.orpheus-med.org) may be referred to for extra information, in particular the Annotations. To receive an ORPHEUS, label the Basic Standards should be fulfilled, and the institution should be working on at least some of the Quality Development standards.

Applicants for an ORPHEUS label will be asked to fill in the self-evaluation questionnaire below. The information should be sufficient to document the extent to which each standard is fulfilled. The website of the institution should have sufficient information in English to support the responses in the questionnaire. The completed questionnaire will be evaluated by the ORPHEUS Labelling Board and, if found satisfactory, a panel of two persons will be appointed, who will then make a short site visit to discuss points arising from the written material, and to meet with various stakeholders (head of graduate school, head of graduate school administration, supervisors, students, thesis assessment committees, etc.). Following the site-visit, the evaluation committee will report to the Labelling Board who will recommend to the ORPHEUS Executive Committee if a label can be granted. Institutions receiving a label will receive a diploma to indicate that the institution complies with the ORPHEUS/AMSE/WFME PhD standards.

NB. PhD students are referred to in this self-evaluation as “PhD candidates”.

The completed questionnaire should be sent to President ORPHEUS, Prof. John Creemers, KU Leuven, Belgium, and to the chairman of the ORPHEUS Labelling Board, Prof. Gül Güner Akdoğan, School of Medicine, IEU, Izmir, Turkey.

Website

The graduate school website should provide as much information as possible in English to support the responses to the questions below. Examples are given in Quality Development 8.2 (page 15).

Core data.

Please provide the following information.

		Evaluator comment
Name, position and e-mail of person completing the questionnaire	Professor Martha Enger , Head of Programme Board	
Name of PhD organization responsible for PhD education (e.g. Graduate School of ...)	Faculty of Medicine, University of Bergen	
Name of the University or Faculty of which the PhD organization is a part	Faculty of Medicine, University of Bergen	
Name and e-mail of the head of the PhD organization	Professor Per Bakke , Dean Faculty of Medicine, per.bakke@uib.no	
Name and e-mail of the head of the PhD organization administration	Synnøve Myhre, Synnøve.myhre@uib.no	
Total number of PhD candidates (PhD students) currently enrolled	547 enrolled in the PhD programme and 62 enrolled in the Medical Student Research Programme (MSRP) at the Faculty of Medicine.	
Gender, age, etc. of PhD candidates	<p>PhD Candidates:</p> <p>Age: Average age for PhD candidates when admitted to the PhD programme is 35 years.</p> <p>Gender: From 547 PhD candidates, 215 (40 %) are men and 332 (60 %) are women.</p> <p>MSRP students: 62</p>	

	Gender: From 62 students, 29 (47 %) are men and 33 (53 %) are women.	
Number of PhD candidates who entered the graduate school in most recent year (give date)	130	
Number of drop outs in most recent year.	2 (2023) 0 (so far in 2024)	
Number of PhD theses successfully defended in most recent year (give date)	80 (2023)	
Total number of international PhD candidates currently enrolled	175 (32%)	
Number of qualified persons available to the Graduate School for supervision (supervisor pool)	Total: 653 Internal supervisors (UiB employees): 71% (n=465) External supervisors (non-UiB employees): 29 % (n=188)	
Number of current principal supervisors	Total: 238 Internal supervisors (UiB employees): 79% (n=188) External supervisors (non-UiB employees): 21% (n=50)	
Number of current co-supervisors	Total: 415 Internal supervisors (UiB employees): 67% (n=277) External supervisors (non-UiB employees): 33% (n=138)	
Number of PubMed publications of supervisor pool in most recent year	N/A	
URL of the PhD organization (website address)	- Docotral education at the Faculty of Medicine - The Programme Board for the PhD programme (PFU) at the Faculty of Medicine	

Documents

Please provide

- a) The most recent evaluation of the PhD programme by PhD candidates if any.
According to the University of Bergen's system of quality assurance, an external committee (including a representative member /or views of potential employers) should evaluate the PhD programme every six years, with the main purpose of providing an independent and overall assessment of the Faculty's PhD programme. The Faculty of Medicine had an external evaluation of the PhD programme in 2021 (Attachment i).
- b) The titles of a random sample of 10-20% of PhD theses accepted in previous calendar year. Please give in each case references of the articles/manuscripts on which the thesis is based, if any.
For a list of a selection of PhD theses accepted in 2023 is attached (Attachment ii), and a list of key paper (Attachment iii). The papers were selected by the relevant departments and most of them have been included in a PhD thesis in the last five years.

Self-evaluation

For each point, specific and comprehensive information is requested, with links to relevant documentation in English on the graduate school website or elsewhere. The centre column gives examples of the type of information requested. Normally at least 40-50 words per point but may be longer.

Basic standards

	Basic standards (Standards that should be met from the outset)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation on e.g. graduate school website where relevant. Normally at least 40-50 words per point, but may be longer.	Evaluator comment
1. Research environment				
BS1.1	There should be a strong research environment around every PhD project, either within the institution or within collaborating institutions	<p>Describe research areas covered by institution. Give examples of key papers. Collaboration with other institutions. Reference to website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For a description of research areas covered by the Faculty, visit this webpage. - For a list of key paper, see attachment iii. The papers were selected by the relevant departments and have all been included in a PhD thesis in the last five years. - Core Facilities at the Faculty of Medicine are collections of advanced scientific equipment / infrastructure that is manned by highly qualified technical staff. It is available to the internal research community., as well as external users. 		
BS1.2	Facilities should be compatible with the requirements of completing the PhD project	<p>Describe facilities available at the institution and from other institutions. Give examples.</p> <p>Facilities available for PhD candidates are divided into three levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The division of Research and Innovation, is a central division that provides research-service and -administrative support to UiB's central management, the faculties, departments, research groups and individuals. It is also the division of Research and Innovation that has the overall responsibility for quality assurance of the PhD programmes at the UiB. 2. The Faculty, which has the overall responsibility for administering the PhD programme at the medical faculty, and provides service and support to the departments, research groups and individuals affiliated with the faculty. The Programme Board is organised under the faculty, and among its main purposes are to ensure scientific coordination and high quality in the PhD programme at the Faculty of Medicine. 3. The Departments, are responsible for day-to-day follow up of their PhD candidates and provide academic and administrative support to ensure that their candidates have the necessary facilities available to successfully complete the PhD project within the designated timeframe. 		

BS1.3	Research consistent with international ethical standards	<p>Provide reference to local ethical committee and other organizations concerned with maintaining ethical standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethics in research: The faculty emphasises the importance of maintaining high ethical standards in all matters of education and research. - Ethical training in the PhD programme: The faculty accommodates training so that all PhD candidates can be well-versed in ethical standards and principles and can integrate ethical considerations into their research. PhD candidates receive training in research ethics through the MEDMET901 – Ethics and health research, which is a compulsory course for all PhD candidates at the Faculty. In 2023, the MEDMET901 course was updated to emphasize research integrity and develop skills to assess sustainability in health research, including their own projects. - The laboratory Animal Facility: in accordance with the European Convention for the Protection of Vertebrates Used for Scientific Purposes [Scientific Procedures] Act 1986, and national regulation of animal experimentation, § 13 Planning and performing experiments, the faculty requires that «all persons that plan or perform procedures on animals must undergo a training program approved by the Norwegian food safety Authority before protocol approval - The National Research Ethics Committee (NEM) and Regional Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics (REC): The Faculty of Medicine uses REC to evaluate and ensure that the research involving human participants is conducted responsibly and according to ethical norms. REC reviews research proposal to assess their ethical implications, focusing on informed consent, risk/benefit analysis, and compliance. It is compulsory to have REC approval for research involving human subjects/biological material- even when subjects and or materials are provided by another nation. - Personal Data and Privacy Gateway (GDPR): concerns how personal data is managed for administrative, archival and research purpose according to European directive and the Norwegian Data Protection law. (The privacy policy outlines the responsibilities for data processing, the types of personal data involved, the objectives of processing, the rights of data subjects, and contract details. - The Research Ethics Committee at the Faculty of Medicine: is a resource for promoting ethical awareness among researchers and students. There is also a central Research Ethics Committee for all of UiB which also works to contribute to promoting knowledge about research ethics and preventing research misconduct. 		
2. Outcomes				

BS2.1	PhD programmes should provide PhD candidates with competences to become qualified and independent researchers, according to principles of good research practice	<p><i>What sort of training is offered to make PhD candidates independent researchers? What training is provided for transferable skills? How are these competencies evaluated?</i></p> <p>Training: Firstly, the University of Bergen (UiB) adheres to the Salzburg principles of the third cycle within the Bologna process. Notably, the first of the ten Salzburg principles is a fundamental aspect of doctoral training at UiB, that is, the focus on advancement of knowledge through original research.</p> <p>Secondly, in alignment with the Bologna process, all candidates are required to complete a training component equivalent to one semester of full-time studies (30 ECTS). This training component includes both mandatory and elective courses. The faculty holds the authority to evaluate and approve elements within the training component. However, in certain instances, the Programme Board may also grant approval, upon application, for specific elements. Ultimately, the faculty is ultimately responsible for approval of the training component. The Faculty of Medicine has established guidelines for approving the training components of the PhD program.</p> <p>Lastly, in accordance with the Bologna process, the faculty and the Programme Board ensure that PhD activities comply with the national qualifications framework. These guidelines ensure that doctoral education demonstrates a significantly higher level of academic rigor compared to Master's and Bachelor's education.</p> <p>At the Faculty of Medicine, PhD candidates can benefit from a variety of transferable skills training arranged by the research schools. These training components typically include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research methodology: training in designing, conducting, and analysing research studies. - Scientific dissemination: training on how to effectively communicate research findings to both academic and non-academic audience. - Career guidance: workshops and seminars aimed at preparing candidates for careers both within and outside academia. - Interdisciplinary collaboration: opportunities to engage with researchers from different fields to foster interdisciplinary research. - Participation in the national research schools. Provides opportunity to join courses and activities organized by other Norwegian universities. <p>The Faculty of Medicine is part of the NorDoc Network, that is a consortium of doctoral schools and faculties of health sciences across the Nordic countries. This network aims to enhance doctoral training in health sciences by providing a shared course database that is accessible to all PhD candidates enrolled in member institutions.</p> <p>A PhD candidate at one of these institutions, can participate in the courses listed in the NorDoc Course Database for free, if the course is free for the local students (free market agreement). The database includes a variety of scientific and generic courses. However, the candidate would require coverage for expenses related to board, lodging, and travel home institution/research group.</p> <p>Evaluation: The PhD candidates are evaluated consecutively during all stages of the doctoral education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Through annual progress reports - Through the completion of midway evaluation - Through completion of elective courses, with an assessment upon completion of the course. 		
-------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Through participation in research schools, including seminars and network meetings. The meetings consist of weekly scientific presentations from various basic, translational or clinical PhD candidates, followed by discussions around the presentations. - Through participation in a research group, scientific network groups and during individual supervision sessions. - Dissemination activities (FORMIDL901) 		
BS2.2	A PhD degree should also be of benefit in a career outside academic or clinical research (problem solving, analysis, evaluation, technology transfer etc.)	<p>At which times during their programme are PhD candidates provided with career advice?</p> <p>At the Faculty of Medicine, PhD candidates receive career advice and support through various channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supervisors: regular guidance and mentorship from their supervisors. - Appraisal interviews: periodic discussions to assess progress and plan future steps. - Follow-up meetings: periodic meetings to ensure continuous support and address any concerns. - Seminars led by research advisors on CV preparation, grant writing, and entrepreneurship. - PhD candidate representative in all formal committees for arrangements, evaluations and policy committees. - Career day at the Faculty of Medicine: an annual, thematic event offering insights and practical advice on career options. - UiB Ferd Career Centre for Early Researchers: Resources and training to help plan post PhD careers. - The PhD legal regulation now requires that all PhD candidates must have a carrier plan from the start of their PhD period. - Carees competence – Norwegian Directorate for Higher Education and skills: 		

3. Admission policy and criteria				
BS3.1	PhD candidates should be selected on the basis of a competitive and transparent process	<p><i>Describe the admission process.</i></p> <p><i>The faculty has two types of applicants: Applicants with funding through UiB fellowships, and applicants with funding from external sources other than fellowships from the UiB.</i></p> <p>The process for applying for UiB fellowships: <i>The application process for UiB fellowships involves the Faculty announcing a limited number of PhD fellowships each semester. Typically, the Faculty receives over 80 applications with named candidates for UiB fellowships each semester. Through an open and transparent assessment process, between five and ten candidates are selected and offered a UiB fellowship. Some of these are open competition positions, others are strategically earmarked certain domains such as odontology or medical research students.</i></p> <p>The application process for admission to the PhD programme¹: <i>PhD candidates enrolling into the PhD programme need to have established contact with a member of the academic staff at UiB who is willing to act as supervisor. The application form should be filled out in cooperation with the supervisor and should be sent by way of the department. A preliminary assessment of the application according to current rules is done by the department, prior to the application being submitted to the faculty. Three main principles underlie the department's evaluation of the applicant 1) the quality of the proposed PhD project, 2) the quality of the research environment in which the PhD project is included, and 3) the candidate's merits and motivation. In addition to this, the department must evaluate if the proposed progress plan and plan for funding is realistic. On recommending admission, the department establishes that the relevant equipment and other infrastructure (office space, laboratory facilities etc.) are available for the candidate to complete the project in question.</i></p> <p><i>It is the faculty that ultimately approves admission to the PhD program. This decision is based on a comprehensive evaluation of the project description, the applicant's formal qualifications, sufficient resources for the realisation of the research project and the plan submitted for the research training and is made on recommendation from the department in question. At least two supervisors must be appointed, responsibility for the handling of other needs outlined in the application must be allocated, and the agreement period/admission period must be set with a start and end date. The start date must correspond to the start date of the funding. The PhD candidate and the supervisors are informed of the result of the admission process by a letter as soon as a decision exists. Attached with the decision letter is also important information regarding the PhD programme and the department in question, as well the Regulations for the PhD programme at the faculty (PhD Regulations) and the PhD agreement.</i></p> <p><i>The PhD agreement states the rights and obligations of both parties and must be signed no later than one month after the candidate has been notified of admission.</i></p>		

¹ Applicants with UiB fellowships, go through this process as part of the application for the UiB fellowship. Such candidates do not repeat this process when applying for admission to the PhD programme.

BS3.2	Applicants for PhD programmes should have an educational level corresponding to a master's degree	<p><i>Describe the level required. Are persons with a medical degree or other professional degree accepted?</i></p> <p><i>The standard process is in line with established rules as specified in the Regulations for the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree at the University of Bergen. For admission to the PhD programme, the applicant must normally hold a five-year master's degree, with regards to the second cycle, or a cand.med. (6 years), cand.odont. (5 years), cand.pharm. (5 years), or cand.psychol.degree (6 years), or equivalent.</i></p> <p><i>The Faculty of Medicine also approves one-year master's degrees as a basis for admission to the PhD program. The condition is that the degree is part of a comprehensive higher education consisting of a completed bachelor's and master's degree or a longer integrated course of 4 acceptable years, according to HK-Dir's guidelines, and includes a master's thesis that amounts to at least one semester's work (30ECTS).</i></p> <p><i>Education from abroad is otherwise assessed according to HK-Dir's criteria.</i></p>		
BS3.3	<p>Before enrolment or at clearly defined times during the programme, the institution should evaluate and approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific quality of the project - The likelihood that the project can result in a thesis of the required standard within the timeframe - The possibility for the PhD candidate to provide creative input during the project - Qualifications of the nominated supervisors 	<p><i>Describe how and when the PhD project is approved.</i></p> <p><i>The project descriptions are assessed by an admission committee consisting of two academic staff members from the department to which the candidate will be affiliated. These individuals are appointed by the faculty based on proposals from the department. The written recommendation of the admission committee is part of the admission grounds.</i></p> <p><i>PhD project descriptions that are awarded funding after competitive evaluations e.g. Regional Health Collaboration Committee (Helse Vest) or UiB in connection with scholarship awards will not be reassessed by the department's admission committee but will be assessed directly by the faculty. However, the faculty may request a statement from the admission committee if necessary.</i></p> <p><i>The Project Description:</i> <i>The project description is usually about 7 pages and should explain the topic, research questions, choice of theory and method, ethical considerations, and information about applications for Norwegian and foreign ethical approval, if applicable. The project description should also include a timed progress plan in the form of a Gantt chart for the various parts of the research work, including a tentative publication plan. The project description should also include proposals for supervisors, specifying the responsibilities and roles of each supervisor.</i></p> <p><i>An overview of collaborators and planned stays abroad should be included. Any intellectual property restrictions to protect others' rights must be disclosed. For applicants with personal PhD funding, such as from the Faculty of Medicine or the Regional Health Collaboration Committee, the project description that formed the basis for the scholarship award will also be used as the basis for admission to the PhD program.</i></p>		

BS3.4	A PhD programme should only be initiated when the resources for completion are available	<p><i>Describe how PhD programmes are financed and how it is ensured that full financing will be available.</i></p> <p><i>The standard process is in line with established rules as specified in the Regulations for the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree at the University of Bergen.</i></p> <p><i>Before admission, the applicants must document a plan for financial support. Admission depends on sufficient funding for the whole programme period (3 years) and must cover both expenses related to the PhD project as well as living costs. On recommending admission, the department establishes that the relevant equipment and other infrastructure (office space, laboratory facilities etc.) are available for the candidate to complete the project in question.</i></p> <p><i>Most applicants have been granted national or international research fellowships to conduct their PhD project, or they have permission/approved leave of absence from other positions to work on their PhD thesis. In such cases, the faculty requires that the applicant document that they have permission from their current position for at least 20 % in order to work on their PhD thesis.</i></p> <p><i>For applicants employed at a Norwegian university hospital or collaborating regional hospitals with active research environments, admission with 20% research time can be granted in some cases. Admission can only be granted if the following conditions are met:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The project is closely related to the candidate's clinical work (must be specified in the statement of intent and motivation letter).</i> <i>• A clear statement of intent from the relevant hospital department that the candidate will be given time for research and necessary facilitation for the completion of both the research project and the training component.</i> <i>• A realistic timeline of a maximum of 6 years from the start of funding, confirmed by the main supervisor and approved by the admission committee.</i> <i>• A motivation letter from the candidate.</i> <p><i>Candidates who fulfil the article requirements for a PhD at point of application, must be enrolled and financed for at least 12 months.</i></p> <p><i>Self-financed candidates, i.e., candidates with their own private funds, are not admitted to the program.</i></p>		
-------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

4. PhD training programme				
BS4.1	Programmes should be based on original research, courses and other activities which include analytical and critical thinking	<p><i>Describe the content of PhD programmes.</i></p> <p>According to the Regulations for the Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) degree at the University of Bergen, with supplementary regulations for The Faculty of Medicine, the content of the PhD training is as follows:</p> <p><i>The training includes independent research that must be documented by a high academic level thesis of international standard. Additionally, the PhD candidate must undergo a training component, providing training in the discipline context, use methods and theories that highlight both breadth and depth of the state of the field, and that also contextualises the discipline within a broader scientific framework. The PhD training also aims to equip PhD candidates with competencies in dissemination of academic work to the scientific community, colleagues, students and the general public.</i></p> <p>Reference is made to the Norwegian Qualifications Framework. The Norwegian Qualifications Framework is adapted to the European qualifications framework for higher education. The Framework describes qualifications in higher education through learning outcomes, rather than input. For each of the three main levels of higher education (Bachelor's, Master's and PhD), learning outcome is divided into knowledge, skills and general competence. More information about the expected learning outcome at each level of higher education can be found in the Norwegian Qualifications Framework. Levels and learning outcome descriptors.</p>		

BS4.2	Programmes should be performed under supervision	<p><i>Describe how supervisors are appointed. Before admission, applicants for the PhD programme must establish contact with a member of the scientific staff at UiB who is willing to act as supervisor.</i></p> <p><i>All applicants for admission to the PhD program at the Faculty of Medicine must be assigned two supervisors, one of whom will act as the main supervisor and one as a co-supervisor. If academically justified, up to three supervisors may be appointed in exceptional cases, with each supervisor's role described separately in the application. No more than three supervisors can be appointed. At least one of the supervisors must be employed at the faculty of Medicine for the entire agreement period. Employees in technical positions cannot be appointed as supervisors. A Professor Emeritus cannot be appointed as the main supervisor but can serve as a co-supervisor.</i></p> <p><i>If the main supervisor or the co-supervisor, who is the only supervisor employed at the Faculty of Medicine, becomes emeritus during the agreement period, a new main supervisor or a new co-supervisor employed at the Faculty of Medicine must be appointed for the remaining period. The department must propose a new main supervisor to the faculty at least three months before the main supervisor's transition to emeritus status. An emeritus can continue as a co-supervisor within the limit of a maximum of three supervisors in the supervisory team.</i></p> <p><i>The project description is prepared jointly by the candidate and the relevant supervisors but should mainly be written by the candidate.</i></p> <p><i>Internal main supervisors are required to complete the faculty's two e-learning courses before admission can be granted. If the main supervisor is external, either they or the internal co-supervisor must have completed the courses.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course for PhD supervisors • Processing of Personal Data in Medical and Health Research <p><i>For external supervisors not employed at a Norwegian research institution, information about their qualifications and workplace must be documented through a CV detailing their competence, experience, and current workplace.</i></p>		
BS4.3	Programmes should ensure that PhD candidates have substantial training in ethics and responsible conduct of research	<p><i>Provide a list of the courses in ethics and responsible conduct of research. How many PhD candidates take these courses each year? According to the Guidelines for calculating course credits in the PhD programme, all PhD candidates are required to take the following courses in ethics and responsible conduct of research:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethics and Health Research (MEDMET901) - Processing of Personal Data in Medical and Health Research <p><i>Furthermore, the guidelines also state that candidates whose research project includes the use of laboratory animals, training in the use of laboratory animals in medical research (CAREIN901) is mandatory.</i></p>		

BS4.4	<p>Programmes should have clear 3-4 year timeframe. Extensions should be possible but limited and exceptional</p> <p>Provide information about the normal length of PhD programmes. What is the actual length of study from enrolment to (a) submission, (b) defence? How is permission granted for extension?</p>	<p>Standard length of PhD programmes: According to the PhD regulations §5.3, the standard length of the PhD training is three (3) years of full-time studies. A fourth year may be granted when financed by the department/research group where 25 % of the time should account for duty work. Due to this, the standard length of the PhD education for UiB research fellows is 3 years of full-time studies. Furthermore, the PhD regulations §5.4 states that it is not acceptable to plan to complete the PhD education at a rate of progress that leads to a course of study that is longer than six (6) years. The maximum duration of a PhD programme is normally eight (8) years from the start date, not including statutory leave and required duties.</p> <p>A shorter agreement period is granted if the candidate has already completed parts of their PhD education program, or if the admission is based on previous employment in an educational position (doctoral research fellow, research assistant, etc.), so that the total time for the PhD education project is three years. (Cf. Regulations on terms of employment for positions such as postdoctoral fellow, doctoral research fellow, research assistant, and specialist candidate, § 1-3, 5th paragraph).</p> <p>Statistics show that the current situation at the faculty is in line with the established rules. The average PhD period for all candidates at the faculty was 3.6 years (2023). The average PhD period only for candidates at the Faculty with employment through a UiB research fellowship was 3.7 years (2023); statutory leave of absence and duty work not included.</p> <p>Special Arrangements for Former Students in the Medical Student Research Program: Former students in the Medical Student Research Program who proceed directly to a PhD project within the same research topic get a 20-week reduction in their agreement period based on the continuation of the training component in its entirety. If they do not continue with a PhD project within the same topic, the dissemination component must be undertaken again with a corresponding adjustment of the graduate period. Furthermore, the five-year rule for including previously completed courses in the training component applies.</p> <p>The provision that an applicant should be rejected if less than one (1) year of full-time work on the research project remains at the time of application does not apply to applicants who will complete their PhD as a continuation of their Medical-Student-Research-Program project less than a year after completing their Cand.med. or master's in dentistry with a research track.</p> <p>Former Medical-Student-Research-Program students who have published all the articles to be included in their PhD project may be admitted for up to one year without funding to complete the PhD dissertation and submit the thesis, provided that the supervisor and department recommend admission. Applications for admission to the PhD program under this rule must be submitted no later than August 15 for those completing their medical/dentistry studies in the spring semester or January 15 for those completing their medical/dentistry studies in the fall semester.</p> <p>Conditions for extension after funding ends: The candidate's affiliation with the PhD program and rights to supervision require a valid PhD contract/agreement period. The agreement period can be extended upon application. The application must include a description of what has been done/published and what remains of the PhD work, as well as a concrete and realistic plan for completion within a</p>		
-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

	<p><i>reasonable time. An application for extension can only be granted if the faculty, after a comprehensive assessment, finds that the project can be completed within the extension period. Confirmation from the supervisor and the department regarding supervision during the extension period must be provided. A clear plan with a detailed description of milestones showing the planned progress during the extension period must be attached so that the department can follow up with the candidate. Upon extension, the candidate must apply for approval of the training component before the end of the extension, if this has not already been done. When applying for further extension, a good justification for the continued delay, progress since the previous application, and a concrete and good plan for completion will be crucial. If the candidate has not applied for an extension before the end of the agreement period, the candidate will be notified and may be withdrawn from the PhD program.</i></p> <p><i>The maximum extension period in the PhD program is 2 calendar years from the end of the regular agreement period. Statutory leave of absence and duty work are not included. The candidate is responsible for documenting relevant leaves as soon as possible.</i></p>		
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

BS4.5	<p>Programmes should include relevant courses totalling about 6 months. A substantial part should be concerned with training in transferable skills. (NB. "courses" can be liberally interpreted as scientific activities not directly related to the project)</p>	<p><i>Provide a list of courses and other activities. How are these assessed?</i></p> <p><i>The training component at the Faculty of Medicine is 30 ECTS credits in accordance with the PhD regulations §7-2.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to the credit-bearing activities, the candidate must complete an e-course on the Processing of Personal Data in Medical and Health Research upon admission.</i></p> <p><i>The training component of the doctoral programme consists of 30 ECTS, including a compulsory part and an elective part.</i></p> <p>The training component's compulsory part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Course in ethics and health research (Ethics and Health Research) - The midway evaluation - The Scientific dissemination of the PhD project. - A course in animal research in Norway (CAREIN901) <p>The training component's elective part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research courses arranged by the research schools at the faculty of medicine. Upon admission, PhD candidates are also linked to relevant research schools. The research schools arrange a great variety of activities such as weekly seminars and network meetings, research courses and training – all of which PhD candidates participate actively in. All research schools offer special courses to graduate students, PhD candidates and researchers - Research courses organized by other universities in Norway or abroad. - Research courses in the NorDoc course base. - Research stay at other institutions - Clinical speciality approved in Norway <p><i>Course credits are calculated in accordance with ECTS standardisation (1 credit per 25-30 hours work).</i></p> <p><i>A maximum of 10 ECTS credits can be from master's level courses. The rest of the training component should consist of activities at the PhD level and specialist training level for candidates in dentistry.</i></p> <p><i>As a rule, the training component should be completed and approved at least six months before the planned submission.</i></p> <p><i>The faculty provides guidelines for calculating ECTS credits within the training component.</i></p> <p>Assessment: <i>Course assessment must include the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluations of the course from students, preferably as assessment of the teaching. A summary of the student evaluations is to be published through Database for quality assurance reports. - Assessment of whether the progress and organising of the course confers with the established goals for the course, comments to the student evaluations, and other forms of evaluation. In addition 		
-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments of previous work with evaluations and the follow-up of such evaluations. <p>Evaluation of the PhD courses and course portfolio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The courses must be evaluated at least every three years or every third time the course is conducted (for courses that are conducted less frequently than annually). For courses that are initially intended to be held only once, the faculty decides whether the course should be evaluated. - An evaluation of the faculty's portfolio of Ph.D. courses and the framework of the training component shall be conducted at least every three years 		
BS4.6	There should be arrangements that allow PhD candidates to perform part of their programme in another institution, national and abroad	<p>Describe the arrangements provided for allowing PhD candidates to spend part of their time in another institution.</p> <p>Training abroad as part of the doctoral education: The PhD programme at UiB is flexible with regards to studies abroad, and the Faculty strongly encourages all PhD candidates to spend time at a suitable institution abroad as part of their PhD degree. Establishing contact with suitable institutions and the planning of the studies abroad is normally done by the PhD candidate and his/her supervisor, with little involvement of the administration. If the candidate travels to a research institution abroad to learn techniques, conduct experiments or engage in other academic activities, the stay abroad may be approved as part of the training component's elective part. After returning, a report about the stay must be submitted (signed by the candidate and supervisor) in addition to a confirmation from the host institution regarding the duration of the stay and its content. PhD candidates who spend minimum 2 weeks at an institution abroad can apply to the Faculty for 1 ½ ECTS per week spent abroad. A maximum of 6 ECTS can be earned this way.</p> <p>Financial support for stays abroad for PhD candidates: Every year the Faculty of Medicine sets aside funds in the budget to support its PhD candidates who are going on research stays abroad. All PhD candidates who are funded by the University of Bergen and can apply and receive financial support for research stays abroad lasting 3-12 months. PhD candidates are also encouraged to seek funding from other sources. Information about relevant sources for additional funding is available online.</p> <p>Since 2021, 28 PhD candidates who are funded by UiB have had research stays abroad, where 14 have been out for 6 months or more. We also have several candidates who travel abroad for research stays with externally funded projects.</p>		
BS4.7	Programmes that are performed in parallel with clinical/professional training should have the same time for research and course work as any other PhD candidate	<p>Describe the PhD programmes provided in parallel with clinical/professional training. How is it ensured that such PhD candidates have sufficient time for their PhD studies?</p> <p>Several of our PhD candidates have been admitted to the PhD programme based on a plan of 50 % progression with their PhD education, parallel with clinical/professional work. In such cases, the Faculty requires documentation that the PhD candidate have been released from their current position for at least 20 % in order to work on their PhD thesis.</p> <p>There are several ways to ensure that candidates with clinical/professional training have sufficient time for research; including through discussions with their supervisor, with the PhD coordinator at the Departments, through progress reporting, midway evaluations and follow-up meetings.</p>		

BS4.8	Progress of PhD candidates should be continuously assessed by the institution throughout the PhD	<p><i>Describe the arrangements to monitor PhD candidates.</i></p> <p>Annual progress Reporting: The PhD candidate and the main supervisor must each year submit separate and independent written reports on the progress of the PhD education (PhD regulations § 8). The departments follow up their candidates after the annual progress reporting. The research leader and the administrative officer at the department are responsible for reviewing the reports, and the research leader is responsible for following up candidates who report poor progress or other issues that require intervention. The Program Committee for PhD Education reviews the departments' summary reports annually as part of the quality assurance work.</p> <p>Midway Evaluation: The midway evaluation provides an overview of the progress in the individual PhD program and is intended to identify any delays relative to the planned progress. The research leader at the department to which the candidate is affiliated is responsible for following up with candidates where the midterm evaluation reveals concerning progress.</p> <p>The midway evaluation is an integral part of the quality assurance of the research education and should be comprehensive, academic review of the project milestones/deliverables, as well as the candidate-supervisor relations. The objective is to highlight obstacles to progress in order to facilitate the candidates' timely completion of the project with high quality standards. The Faculty of Medicine has developed specific guidelines for the midway evaluation. The departments may also have their own procedures for implementation. If the midway evaluation reveals delays or other challenges, the department, through the research leader, must initiate follow-up within one month. Midway Evaluation Faculty of Medicine UiB</p> <p>In addition to any regulated forms of evaluation, PhD candidates are consecutively provided with feedback from other PhD candidates and the respective research environment through their participation in research schools.</p>		
5. Supervision				
BS5.1	Each PhD candidate should have a principal supervisor and when relevant at least one co-supervisor to cover all aspects of the programme	<p><i>How many supervisors do PhD candidates have?</i></p> <p>At the Faculty of Medicine, PhD candidates are normally assigned two supervisors upon admission. The main supervisor has the overall responsibility for the supervision and for the collaboration between the supervisors. If the main supervisor is not employed at UiB, an internal co-supervisor must have a specifically delegated responsibility for following up the candidate regarding practical matters and regulations at UiB.</p> <p>The PhD regulations' eligibility requirements (§ 6-2) for supervisors include that a supervisor cannot be related to or in-laws to the candidate or any of the other supervisors as closely as /siblings/spouse/partner/parent-child.</p>		
BS5.2	The number of PhD candidates per supervisor should be compatible with the supervisor's workload	<p><i>What is the range in the number of PhD candidates per supervisor?</i></p> <p>The number of PhD candidates per supervisor ranges from one to eight per supervisor (including both principal and co-supervision). However, a majority of supervisors are principal supervisor and/or co-supervisor to no more than three PhD candidates. More than 80 % are principal supervisor to one or two candidates.</p>		

BS5.3	Supervisors should be scientifically qualified and active scholars in the field concerned	<p><i>Provide information about the qualifications required for a supervisor.</i></p> <p><i>According to the PhD regulations, §6.2, the supervisor(s) must have a doctoral degree or equivalent academic competence within the subject area, and be an active researcher. At least one of the appointed supervisors should have previous experience of supervision of candidates at the master's and/or PhD level. Employees in technical positions (category C) cannot be appointed as supervisors.</i></p>		
BS5.4	Supervisors should have regular consultations with their candidates (annotation: varies during the programme but will normally mean several times per month)	<p><i>Provide information about the number and type of consultations that supervisors hold with their PhD candidates.</i></p> <p><i>The PhD regulation, §6.3, state that the candidate and supervisor should be in regular contact. Beyond this, neither the PhD regulations nor other guidelines specify the frequency of consultations between PhD candidates and their supervisors. However, PhD candidates and supervisors are expected to meet several times per month to discuss the progress of the project. In addition to this, the research groups and research schools ensures regular contact as both PhD candidates and supervisors participate in these forums.</i></p>		
BS5.5	It should be ensured that training for all supervisors and potential supervisors is available	<p><i>Describe the training courses available. Provide information about number of supervisors who have taken these courses.</i></p> <p><i>The following training elements are available to supervisors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>– Educational course in supervision of PhD candidates: UPED622. All new members of the faculty are strongly encouraged to take the course.</i> <i>– Annual seminars for supervisors at the Faculty. Since 2010, the Faculty has arranged annual full-day seminar, in addition to lunches or breakfasts with professional insights (4-6 times a year) for all PhD supervisors. The seminars focus on topical issues relevant for PhD education and act as forums where supervisors can discuss issues, exchange experiences, and increase their understanding of the activities related to the PhD programme at the Faculty. Although participation in the seminars is voluntary, all supervisors are strongly encouraged to participate.</i> <i>– e-course for training of supervisors: The Faculty offers an e-course designed for supervisors of PhD candidates, which includes:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. General Information (Information about the PhD at UiB, the Faculty of Medicine)</i> <i>2. Admission (Requirements, training component, supervision)</i> <i>3. Follow up</i> <i>4. Examination (requirements, process)</i> <i>5. Plagiarism and research misconduct</i> <i>6. Pedagogical guidance.</i> <p><i>Each element contains questions that the supervisor must answer correctly in order to pass the e-course.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- E-course in Processing of Personal Data in Medical and Health Research</i> 		

BS5.6	The supervisor-candidate relationship is the key to a successful PhD programme. There should be mutual respect and shared responsibility	<p><i>Describe the procedures taken to enhance the supervisor-candidate relationship. Describe how supervisors and PhD candidates are matched. Describe arrangements for solving supervisor-candidate conflicts.</i></p> <p>Enhance relationship: <i>The PhD candidate establishes contact with the supervisor prior to the admissions process. Thus, PhD candidates and supervisors are not matched by the Faculty. However, the Faculty aim to enhance the supervisor-candidate relationship in the following ways:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Regular meetings for PhD candidates at the departmental level</i> - <i>Participation in research school's network meetings where supervisor and candidate meet regularly</i> <p>Solving conflicts: <i>According to the PhD regulations §6.3, It is the Faculty's policy that one should always seek to resolve conflicts at the lowest possible level. Cases concerning termination of supervision should always first be discussed at the candidate's department with PhD Coordinator. If the matter cannot be resolved by the department alone, the case may be transferred to Faculty level.</i></p> <p><i>The PhD candidate and the supervisor can, by mutual agreement, request the faculty to make changes to the supervision relationship for the PhD candidate. Applications for a change of supervisor must be justified. Applications for changes in the supervision relationship should be sent to the faculty using a specific form without undue delay. Changes in supervisors will not be backdated and should normally be reported at least six months before the end of the PhD period. A supervisor cannot resign before a new supervisor is appointed. Changes in the supervision team are not granted after the candidate has submitted the thesis for evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate or supervisor wishes to terminate the supervision relationship because they find that the other party is not fulfilling their obligations as specified in the regulations and related agreements, the matter should first be discussed with the concerned party to find a solution that is academically sound and acceptable to all parties. The PhD candidate and the supervision group should jointly find a solution to the situation. If this fails, the department should be contacted for assistance in finding solutions. Changes in the supervision relationship can be approved in such cases without all parties' consent.</i></p> <p><i>Disputes about the supervisor's or candidate's academic rights and obligations can be brought by the parties or the department to the faculty for resolution. The faculty's decision can be appealed to the Central Appeals Committee.</i></p> <p><i>All parties must ensure that disputes over rights and any other issues that may lead to conflicts are clarified as early as possible to avoid delays in the PhD candidate's project.</i></p>		
-------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

6. PhD thesis				
BS6.1	<p>The PhD thesis should be the basis for evaluating if the PhD candidate has acquired independent research skills and can evaluate work done by others</p>	<p><i>Is this correct for your institution?</i></p> <p><i>Yes. The PhD regulations § 10.1 states that the thesis must be an independent, academic work that meets international standards, and must be an advanced academic level in respect of the formulation of the research topic, conceptual clarification and methodical, theoretical and empirical rationale, documentation and formal presentation.</i></p> <p><i>The PhD thesis, trial lecture and public defence must all be approved by an independent evaluation committee in order for the candidate to be conferred to the degree Philosophiae Doctor (PhD).</i></p> <p><i>The PhD regulations § 10.2 state that if a written work has been produced in collaboration with other authors, the PhD candidate must follow the norms for co-authorship that are generally accepted in their academic community and in accordance with international standards. In theses that include work with multiple authors, a signed declaration that describes the PhD candidate's input in each work must be enclosed. The statement must be written in the same language as the thesis and must be submitted along with the thesis. The statement is redistributed to the evaluation committee.</i></p> <p><i>Dissertations at the Faculty of Medicine can also be written as a monograph or be based on several sub-studies that are published or planned for publication. If a sub-study has not been submitted to a peer-reviewed journal at the time of submission, the publication plan must be included in the co-authorship declaration.</i></p> <p><i>One must adhere to the Norwegian national register of scientific publication channels: Search in Norwegian List Norwegian Register (hkdir.no). Articles published elsewhere should not be included in a PhD dissertation.</i></p> <p><i>If the dissertation is based on several sub-studies, the issues and conclusions presented in the sub-studies should be presented in a comprehensive perspective in the compilation, thereby documenting the coherence of the dissertation.</i></p> <p><i>Regardless of the format, the dissertation should contribute to the development of new academic knowledge and be at a level that reflects that the research could be published as part of the scientific literature in the field.</i></p> <p><i>For further details, refer to the faculty's guidelines regarding the requirements for doctoral dissertations: Guidance on Doctoral Theses at the Faculty of Medicine Faculty of Medicine UiB</i></p>		

BS6.2	<p>The benchmark in health sciences is equivalent of three <i>in extenso</i> papers in scientific peer-reviewed international journals. If papers are in top-rank journals, fewer are acceptable. Manuscripts are also acceptable. It is the task of the assessment committee to determine if the material demonstrates 3-4 years of research at international level.</p>	<p><i>Describe the content required for a PhD thesis regarding original work.</i></p> <p><i>As stated in Guidelines for publications in doctoral dissertations at the Faculty of Medicine, a doctoral dissertation should normally consist of three scientific articles prepared for international journals with a peer review system. As a general rule, the doctoral candidate should be the principal author of at least two articles. Where the candidate is not the principal author, he / she should have contributed considerably in the collection of data, interpreting of results and writing of the article. The number of articles will depend upon the extent and quality of each article, and on the candidate's contribution. If the candidate has put an unusually large amount of work into one article, and that article is of a very high standard, the number of articles may be reduced. Under these conditions, one and the same article may be included in maximum two doctoral theses. Manuscripts are also acceptable. However, the Faculty recommends manuscripts that are either submitted or accepted for publication.</i></p> <p><i>It is the task of the evaluation committee to determine if the material demonstrates 3 years fulltime of research at international level. Faculty approves systematic reviews and metanalysis papers to be included in theses but not overview review papers</i></p>		
BS6.3	<p>In addition to papers, the thesis should include a full literature review and full account of aims, method, results, discussion and conclusion.</p>	<p><i>Describe the content of the other parts of the thesis.</i></p> <p><i>As stated in Guidelines for publications in doctoral dissertations at the Faculty of Medicine, in addition to the individual articles, the thesis should include a general presentation of the scientific results with a detailed, up-to-date comparative discussion. It should demonstrate scientific overview and maturity, as well as the ability to penetrate scientific problems. Normally, the theses include a full literature review and full account of aims, method, results, discussion and conclusion. In addition, methodological considerations are also normally emphasised in the theses. In the methodological considerations the candidate evaluates the choice of methods in the study, and discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the chosen methods. Such considerations are not necessarily clearly identified in each individual article.</i></p>		
BS6.4	<p>If the thesis is presented in other formats (e.g. as single monograph), the assessment committee should ensure equivalence to the above benchmark</p>	<p><i>How many theses are presented in other formats e.g. monographs?</i></p> <p><i>Almost all PhD theses are presented as collection of articles.</i> <i>In a one year perspective (2023), 1.2 % (one out of 77 theses) was presented in other formats (monograph).</i></p> <p><i>In a five year perspective (2019/2023), 0.60 % (three out of 487 theses) was presented in other formats (monograph).</i></p> <p><i>As stated in Guidelines for publications in doctoral dissertations at the Faculty of Medicine, point II Unpublished monographs will be evaluated according to the same criteria as a collection of printed articles with their summary. It is to be understood that the minimum requirements regarding scientific quality and quantity are identical.</i></p>		
BS6.5	<p>A PhD thesis in clinical medicine should meet the same standards as other PhD theses</p>	<p><i>Is this correct for your institution?</i> <i>Yes. The Faculty only offer one PhD programme, and doesn't distinguish between PhD theses in clinical medicine and other PhD theses in other academic areas.</i></p>		

7. Assessment				
BS7.1	Acceptance of a PhD thesis should include acceptance of both written thesis and a subsequent oral defence	<p><i>Describe the procedures for assessing the written thesis and the oral defence.</i></p> <p><i>The evaluation procedures consists of three stages:</i></p> <p>Evaluation of the thesis: <i>The evaluation committee is requested to state whether or not the thesis satisfies the formal and real requirements set out in the PhD Regulations. The Guidelines regarding requirements for a PhD thesis at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Bergen should be used as a support for the committee's evaluation. The evaluation committee's decision is stated in the evaluation report. The statement of the committee (evaluation report) should first and foremost present a clear and unambiguous conclusion as to whether the qualitative and quantitative scientific requirements have been met, so that the thesis can be defended for the degree of PhD. The statement should provide a well-grounded justification for this conclusion.</i></p> <p>Trial lecture over a given topic: <i>The chairman of the evaluation committee is responsible for ensuring that the title of the trial lecture on a topic of the committee's choice is received by the Faculty at least one month before the planned trial lecture. The title of the lecture should be submitted in writing. The title will be treated as confidential until it is given to the doctoral candidate, 10 working days before the date of the trial lecture. The trial lecture will be given in a central auditorium and at a time which permits it to be included in the Faculty's basic and advanced teaching schedule. The subject of the lecture should be taken from central areas of clinical, paraclinical or preclinical medicine, and should be of interest to both students and staff at the university and hospital. The length of the lecture will be 45 minutes, followed by questions and discussion. The trial lecture must be approved by a committee appointed by the Faculty before the public defence takes place.</i></p> <p>Public defence: <i>The doctoral candidate initiates the defence by presenting the objectives of the scientific study and the results it has obtained. The introduction should not exceed 30 minutes. Thereafter, the defence continues in the form of a discussion of the thesis involving the opponents and the doctoral candidate. At the public defence the first and second opponents each submit an oral opposition, the point of which is to present a critical analysis of the thesis. Central aspects of the thesis are discussed with the doctoral candidate, on this occasion in greater detail than in the written statement.</i></p>		
BS7.2	PhD degrees should be awarded by the institution on the recommendation of assessment committee who have evaluated the thesis and the oral defence	<p><i>Is this correct for your institution?</i></p> <p><i>Yes. According to the PhD regulations, § 14, The University Board confers the philosophiae doctor degree on the PhD candidate on the basis of the report that the trial lecture and disputation have been approved.</i></p> <p><i>The diploma is issued by the institution. The diploma must state the title of the thesis for which the PhD degree was awarded. Information about the academic training programme the PhD candidate has participated in must be enclosed with the diploma.</i></p>		

BS7.3	The assessment committee should consist of established and active scientists without connection to the milieu where the PhD was performed and without conflict of interest. Min. two should be from another institution	<p><i>How are the members of the assessment committee appointed and how is it ensured that there is no conflict of interest?</i></p> <p><i>The PhD regulations, § 11.2, state that the Faculty is to appoint an expert assessment committee consisting of at least three members which shall evaluate the thesis. The main supervisor submits a proposal for the evaluation committee and a declaration of co-authorship statement on a prescribed form to the Department. The Department is responsible for submitting the dissertation to the faculty and must ensure all formalities are in order and recommend the evaluation committee before forwarding. The composition of the assessment committee shall normally be such that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Both genders are represented, also among the opponents.</i> - <i>The majority have no association with the University of Bergen</i> - <i>One of the members, if possible, is from a foreign institution</i> - <i>All members hold a PhD degree or equivalent qualifications</i> <p><i>The faculty assesses the composition of the evaluation committee and ensures that all members are competent and impartial. The faculty will then also appoint one of its representatives as chair of the committee.</i></p>		
BS7.4	The supervisor should not be a member of the assessment committee	<p><i>Is this correct for your institution?</i></p> <p><i>Yes. According to the PhD regulations, § 11.4, the appointed supervisor may not be a member of the committee. The appointed supervisor also may not be the administrator of the committee's work or chair the public defence.</i></p>		

BS7.5	<p>If the assessment of the thesis/defence is negative, the PhD candidate should normally be given an opportunity to rewrite/an additional defence</p>	<p><i>What arrangements are there for a negative assessment?</i></p> <p><i>According to the PhD regulations, § 11.4, the assessment committee may, based on the submitted doctoral thesis and any additional materials, suggest that the faculty allows the candidate to make minor revisions before the committee submits its final report. The committee will provide a written list of specific items that need reworking. However, the committee will not recommend minor revisions if the issues are only minor ambiguities that can be clarified during the defence.</i></p> <p><i>If the faculty permits minor revisions, a deadline of up to three months will be set for completing these revisions. Additionally, a new deadline for the committee's final recommendation will be established, which must be within two months after receiving the revised thesis.</i></p> <p><i>The faculty's decision in this matter cannot be appealed by the PhD candidate.</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate fails to submit the revised thesis within the set deadline, the committee must recommend that the faculty rejects the thesis.</i></p> <p><i>If the committee determines that extensive changes are necessary for the thesis to be deemed worthy of a public defence, it must recommend that the faculty rejects the thesis.</i></p> <p><i>The faculty determines the eligibility of the doctoral thesis for public defense based on the assessment committee's recommendation. If the faculty has reasonable doubts about endorsing the committee's recommendation, or if the committee's recommendation is divided, the faculty will seek further clarification from the assessment committee or appoint two new experts to provide individual evaluations of the thesis. Any additional or individual evaluations must be shared with the PhD candidate, who must be given the chance to respond. In cases of a non-unanimous or negative recommendation, the faculty board will make the final decision</i></p> <p><i>If a doctoral thesis is deemed unworthy of defense by the faculty, it may be revised and resubmitted for re-evaluation. This re-evaluation can only occur once. When requesting a new assessment, the candidate must explicitly state that the thesis was previously evaluated at the University of Bergen and was not approved for public defense. For the revised thesis, at least one member from the original assessment committee should be included in the new committee to ensure continuity. The new assessment committee will conduct its evaluation independently but will have access to the previous committee's recommendation.</i></p>		
-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

8. Structure			
BS8.1	<p>The graduate school should have sufficient resources for proper conduct of PhD programmes. This includes resources to: Support admission of PhD candidates, implement the PhD programmes of the PhD candidates enrolled, assess PhD theses and to award PhD degrees</p>	<p><i>Provide information about the resources available to the graduate school.</i></p> <p>Administrative resources: <i>PhD are supported and followed up consecutively by the research administration at the Faculty and the departments. Each candidate has at least one administrative contact person at their respective department and one administrative contact person at the Faculty. The research administrations supports the candidates in all phases of the PhD programme, from admission to the award of PhD degrees, and ensures that all conditions are in place in order for candidates can complete their PhD degree successfully within the estimated time period.</i></p> <p>The Programme Board: <i>The Programme Board is responsible for ensuring scientific coordination and quality assurance in the PhD programme at the Faculty.</i></p> <p>Organised feedback and regular reporting: <i>Through the application process, the candidates receive feedback from the research environment regarding the design and planned implementation of their proposed PhD project. They also receive feedback from the research environment on their preliminary work and progress in the PhD programme through completion of the midway evaluation. In addition, through regular reporting, both candidates and their supervisors are encouraged to give feedback about the status and progress of the PhD project (see point BS4.8).</i></p> <p>Assessment of PhD theses and award of PhD degree: <i>The Faculty has well established routines for the final stages in the PhD programme, and candidates are offered both administrative and scientific support in these stages (see BS7.1. for an overview of the evaluation phase). The University Board confers the philosophiae doctor degree on the PhD candidate on the basis of the report that the trial lecture and disputation have been approved.</i></p>	

Quality development

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	<i>Examples of type of information needed</i>	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
1. Research environment				
QD1.1	Institutions lacking facilities/expertise should collaborate with stronger institutions to reach required standards	<i>Describe collaborative arrangements with other institutions.</i>	<p><i>The Faculty collaborates with several institutions through different channels:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National forums for Vice Deans of research and other heads of PhD programmes (e.g., Head of Programme Boards etc.) - National forums for administrative staff for PhD programmes and doctoral educations - Annual participation in the Orpheus conference and the European University Association. - Membership of the Nordic Doctoral Training in Health Sciences (NorDoc Consortium) 	
QD1.2	When relevant, PhD programmes should include time in another laboratory, preferably abroad	<i>How many candidates have time in another laboratory? How many abroad?</i>	<p><i>Several of our candidates have spent time for training or work in another laboratory, including at international institutions/research facilities.</i></p> <p><i>The Faculty of Medicine has nine core facilities available, and there are five additional facilities at other faculties within UiB. PhD candidates receive comprehensive information about these facilities at the start of their PhD program.</i></p> <p><i>The Faculty of Medicine organizes annual startup seminars for PhD candidates, providing information about research opportunities abroad and encouraging them to pursue these experiences.</i></p> <p><i>However, the Faculty does not have a complete list of the number of candidates who have conducted training or work in another laboratory.</i></p>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	<i>Examples of type of information needed</i>	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD1.3	Possibilities for joint and double degrees should be explored	<i>Are there arrangements for joint or double degrees?</i>	<p>Yes. According to the PhD regulations §18, The institution may enter into a collaboration with one or more Norwegian or foreign institutions to collaborate on joint degrees (incl. cotutelle agreements).</p> <p><i>In joint degrees, exceptions from the provisions can be made if necessitated by the collaborating institutions' regulations. Such exceptions must, both individually and jointly, be fully justifiable.</i></p> <p>The joint degree between UiB and University of Hawassa emerged from IGS. To date, 12 joint PhDs have been awarded and the collaboration remains ongoing. The collaboration was recently acknowledged in an editorial in Nature.</p> <p>University of Bergen established comprehensive guidelines for Formalized PhD Collaboration.</p>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	<i>Examples of type of information needed</i>	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
3. Admission policy and criteria				
QD3.1	In choosing PhD candidates, the applicants potential for research should be considered, not just past academic performance	<i>Describe the application procedure, and the weight given to e.g. previous exam marks, research experience, expressed motivation, performance at interview, letters of recommendation.</i>	<p><i>In the application procedure, weight given to:</i></p> <p>Educational background: <i>The PhD programme at the Faculty of Medicine is based on five-year Norwegian master's education according to the Bologna process, Norwegian postgraduate programme of professional study, or equivalent education as approved by the faculty.</i></p> <p>Research experience: <i>Although extensive prior research experience is not a requirement, the applicant should have previous experience with conducting research.</i></p> <p>Expressed motivation: <i>The applicants motivation for the specific PhD project and for conducting a PhD degree is given great weight</i></p> <p>Performance at interview: <i>When establishing contact between the supervisor and applicant, the supervisor normally interviews several prospective candidates</i></p> <p>Letters of recommendation <i>from previous employers and/or supervisors</i></p> <p>The application should contain: <i>An extensive and detailed project description, including an academic outline of the project schedule, funding plan, documentation of specific requirements regarding academic and material resources, any plans for stays at another research institution (including abroad) or enterprise, a plan for academic dissemination, details of any intellectual property restrictions to protect the rights of other, a plan for the training component, including training that will provide a general competence in keeping with the qualifications framework, a proposal for at least one supervisor and an indication of affiliation with an active research community, a description of any legal and ethical issues raised by the project and how these can be resolved.</i></p> <p><i>The academic environment the PhD candidate is to be affiliated with should actively participate in developing the project description and in the programme for the actual PhD education.</i></p>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD3.2	Projects should be externally assessed by written project description or presentation to panel of independent scientists	Are PhD projects externally assessed? Who does this?	<p>Not all PhD project are externally assessed. However, PhD projects with funding from external sources (e.g. EU funding, The Research Council of Norway or the Western Norway Regional Health Authority, etc.) will be assessed by the external source of funding during the application process for such funds. Research projects with funding from the UiB will undergo a prior assessment from an independent scientific committee. The assessment committee consists of one representative from each of the five departments, as well as the Heads of Research from each department.</p> <p>In addition, the specific PhD project will also be internally evaluated at the department level as part of the individual PhD candidate's application for admission to the PhD programme.</p>	
QD3.3	PhD candidates should have rights and duties commensurate with the value (to the institution) of the research performed	Describe the rights and duties of PhD candidates. How much are PhD candidates paid?	<p>The rights and duties of PhD candidates are specified in the PhD regulations and in the Agreement concerning admission to the PhD programme at the University of Bergen.</p> <p>The Faculty of Medicine does not offer any kind of scholarship or other financial benefits beyond research fellows. For UiB research fellows, the general pay and working conditions are controlled by the Basic Collective Agreement for the Civil Service. The Faculty has differentiated salary for the UiB research fellows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New candidates begin at pay grade 55, NOK 540.500-, with yearly increases in pay 2. Candidates with completed medical internship or dentists with one year practice work begin at pay grade 57, NOK 557.100-, with yearly increases in pay 3. Candidates with completed medical specialist training is placed in pay grade 59, NOK 575.400-, with no further increases in pay <p>Other aspects of the employment relationship are regulated by, among other things, the Act relating to Universities and Colleges (uhl), the Civil Service Act (tjm1), the Working Environment Act (aml), the National Insurance Act, the Act relating to the Norwegian Public Service Pension Fund, the Act relating to Age Limits, the Act relating to Public Services Disputes, the Basic Agreement for the Civil Service including the adjustment agreement applicable at UiB, the personnel regulations and any special agreements that may be relevant to the position.</p>	-

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD3.4	If the PhD candidate is obliged to obtain extra income, it should be ensured that the PhD candidate has the necessary time to complete the programme	<i>Do PhD candidates get extra time if they have to work for extra income (e.g. by teaching or clinical duties?).</i>	<i>It is not uncommon that PhD candidates, and especially candidates which undergo clinical/professional work parallel to their doctoral education, apply for part-time work with their PhD, and as stated in BS4.7, several of our PhD candidates have been admitted to the PhD programme based on a plan of reduced progression with their PhD degree due to teaching or clinical duties. Is stated previously, in such cases, the PhD period is extended according to the indicated progress (at least 50 % progress is required at the point of admission).</i>	
4. PhD training programme				
QD4.1	Merit should be given for courses taken elsewhere or other relevant experience	<i>Is merit given? For courses? For previous research?</i>	<p><i>According to the Guidelines for calculating course credits in the PhD programme, a total of 30 ECTS must be approved as the training component in the doctoral training. Research courses can be organised by the Faculty of Medicine, other faculties at the University of Bergen, or by other universities or university colleges in Norway or abroad. Where academic discipline-oriented or research area-related courses have been organised at the Faculty, these are expected to be included in the training component.</i></p> <p><i>Participation in a research course that is not credited using ECTS standards may be approved on application, for calculating credits. Approval requires that documentation for the course is submitted (schedule, course description and syllabus), in addition to proof that the candidate has completed and passed the course.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the guidelines states that if the candidate travels to a research institution abroad to learn techniques, conduct experiments or engage in other academic activities, the stay abroad may be approved as part of the training component's elective part. After returning, a report about the stay must be submitted (signed by the candidate and supervisor) in addition to a confirmation from the host institution regarding the duration of the stay and its content.</i></p>	
QD4.2	For PhDs performed by clinicians, leave-of-absence from clinical duties should be provided for the PhD part of such programmes	<i>Is leave-of absence provided?</i>	<i>Yes. It is common for clinicians to propose educational plans which involve part-time work with the PhD thesis, and part-time clinical duties. The estimated PhD period for such candidates is normally six (6) years.</i>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD4.3	The graduate school should offer confidential PhD candidate counselling concerning the PhD programme, supervision, personal matters etc.	<i>Describe what counselling facilities are available, and the degree to which the counsellor is independent of the doctoral school leadership and supervisors. How many PhD candidates use such facilities each year?</i>	<p>PhD coordinators at the departments: Each department have at least one PhD coordinator who acts as a primary point of contact for all PhD candidates affiliated with that specific department. The PhD coordinators are considered independent of the doctoral school leadership and supervisors. As PhD coordinators are located at the departments, close to the research environments, they are easily available for both candidates and supervisors all year.</p> <p>Head of Research at the Department: Each department has a Head of Research (or equivalent position). The Head of Research is responsible for matters concerning research and the doctoral education at the departmental level. The Head of Research is independent of the doctoral school leadership and supervisors.</p> <p>Although the Faculty holds no statistics of how many candidates use such counselling facilities, the departments report that they handle a few matters each year.</p>	
QD4.4	Graduate schools should consider having a thesis committee for each PhD candidate that monitors the progress of the PhD candidate through meetings with the PhD candidate and the supervisors	<i>Do PhD candidates have a thesis committee? Who is on this committee?</i>	<i>As stated in the PhD regulations §6.1, all candidates who are admitted to the PhD programme at The Faculty of Medicine, must have at least two supervisors. In addition to this all candidates must undergo a midway assessment. For this purpose, a dedicated midway evaluation committee is appointed to assess the progress of the candidate and to give academic input within the candidate's field and/or related fields. Thus, it is not considered necessary to have a thesis committee that monitors the progress of the candidate.</i>	
QD4.5	The graduate school should encourage and facilitate PhD candidate involvement, and interact with PhD candidate representatives regarding design, management and evaluation of PhD programmes.	<i>How can PhD candidates interact with the leadership of the graduate school?</i>	<p>PhD candidates interact with the leadership of the graduate school in the following ways:</p> <p>Participation in the Programme Board and Board for extended Research Management: PhD candidates are permanent members with voting rights in both the Programme Board and Board for extended Research Management.</p> <p>EUREKA, the student organisation for The Medical Student Research Programme at The Faculty of Medicine (NB! Website only in Norwegian)</p>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD4.6	There should be an appeal mechanism allowing PhD candidates to dispute decisions concerning their programmes and thesis assessment	How can PhD candidates appeal?	<p>The appeal mechanisms for PhD candidates to dispute general decisions concerning their PhD programmes are regulated through the PhD regulations §17. The PhD regulations §17 are in accordance with the Public Administration Act § § 28. Appeals can be presented to the proper authority which will vary depending on the matter.</p> <p>The appeal mechanisms for PhD candidates concerning the thesis assessment specifically are regulated through the PhD regulations §17, which states that a rejection of a thesis, trial lecture or defence may be appealed in accordance with the provisions of § 28 and following of the Public Administration Act. The appeal must be sent to the Faculty, and must detail the grounds on which the rejection is being appealed. After the case has been presented to the assessment committee, the Faculty may set aside or amend the decision if it finds the appeal to have been substantiated. If the Faculty does not allow the appeal, the appeal is sent on to the Central Appeals Committee for a decision. The Appeals Committee may test all aspects of the appealed decision. If the subsidiary body or the appeals body finds reason to do so, a committee or a number of individuals may be appointed to evaluate the assessment that has been made and the criteria the assessment was based on, or to perform a new or supplementary expert assessment.</p>	
5. Supervision				
QD5.1	Responsibilities of each supervisor should be explicit	Provide information about the responsibilities of the supervisor.	The rights and duties of the supervisor are specified in the PhD Regulations § 6, as well as the PhD Agreement (see QD5.4.).	
QD5.2	Supervisors should have broad local and international scientific networks	How is it ensured that supervisors have suitable networks?	The faculty does not regularly measure if supervisors have suitable networks. However, the networks of the supervisors are evaluated as part of any applications for UiB funding, as well as in the evaluation of the PhD project in the admissions process.	
QD5.3	Supervisors should assist with career development	How do supervisors assist with career development? Does the graduate school provide such assistance?	Although the faculty does not have any specific measures to assist the candidates with career development, all supervisors are encouraged to provide guidance to their candidates regarding this. Both supervisors and to some extent the administration assist with career development on an individual and informal basis. For additional information see BS2.2.	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD5.4	Institutions should consider having contracts on the supervision process, signed by supervisor, PhD candidate and head of graduate school	Are such contracts being used?	Yes. According to the PhD regulations § 5.4 , admission to the university's PhD programme must be formalized in a written agreement within the framework of the standard agreement for admission adopted by the University Board. The agreement is to be signed by the candidate, supervisor(s), department and the faculty that the candidate has been admitted to. The agreement governs the parties' rights and obligations during the period of admission and is intended to ensure that the candidate regularly participates in active research environment and is to facilitate the completion of the PhD programme within the agreed-upon time. If a supervisor is appointed after the date of admission, this supervisor must sign the agreement immediately after their appointment as supervisor.	
QD5.5	The principal supervisor, at least, should have some formal training as supervisor	Provide information about training courses for supervisors. How many supervisors have had such courses?	According to the PhD Regulations § 6.1 , at least one of the appointed supervisors should have previous experience of supervision of candidates at the master's and/or PhD level. The e-course for supervisors is mandatory for all new supervisors, and from 2025, the course will be mandatory for both new and experienced supervisors Furthermore, all new members of the scientific staff are strongly encouraged to take the course UPED622 – Educational course in supervision of PhD candidates (cf. BS5.5) . In the last few years several members of the scientific staff have successfully completed this course. Furthermore, both new and experienced supervisors are encouraged to participate in the annual supervisor seminar (cf. BS5.5).	
QD5.6	Supervisors should where possible also act as co-supervisors for PhD candidates at other graduate schools	Is this common?	Although it isn't common, we have a number of supervisors affiliated with the Faculty of Medicine who co-supervise candidates at other graduate schools.	
6. PhD thesis				
QD6.1	The thesis should be written and optimally also defended in English, unless national regulations stipulate otherwise. An abstract of the thesis should be published in English	Provide information about the language used in the thesis.	According to the PhD regulations § 10.4. The thesis must be written in English, Norwegian, Swedish or Danish. If the candidate wishes to use a language other than these, an application to this effect must have been submitted and approved at the time of admission, (cf. § 5.1.). Still, the faculty advises all candidates to write their thesis in English. This is also the case for Norwegian-speaking candidates.	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	<i>Examples of type of information needed</i>	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD6.2	If articles/manuscripts are joint publications, co-author statements should document that the PhD candidate has made a substantial and independent contribution. Ownership of results from PhD studies should be clearly stated	<i>Describe the procedure used to identify the contribution of the PhD candidate to each of any multi-authored publications. What procedure is used to assess the accuracy of any statements made? Are there circumstances where the same publication is used in more than one thesis? How is the question of ownership dealt with?</i>	<p><i>According to the PhD regulations § 10.2, joint work is accepted for assessment (including as one of several works, cf. § 10.1), provided the candidate's contribution represents an independent effort that can be identified to the extent necessary for the assessment. In such cases, statements must be obtained from the other authors, or their central representatives, and possibly from others involved in the work, in order to identify the contribution made by the doctoral candidate. Joint work should, as far as possible, be agreed upon in advance.</i></p> <p><i>If a written work has been produced in collaboration with other authors, the candidate must follow the norms for co-authorship that are generally accepted in their academic community and in accordance with international standards. In theses that include work with multiple authors, a signed declaration that describes the candidate's input in each work must be enclosed.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the GUIDANCE ON REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS FOR THE PhD DEGREE AT THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE, UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN states that under exceptional circumstances, a complete thesis may be the joint effort of two doctoral candidates. In such cases, the thesis should be equivalent in scope to two normal doctoral theses. In addition, the independent efforts of each individual candidate must be clearly defined and should be equivalent to about half of the scientific work involved. This also applies to the summary.</i></p>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD6.3	PhD theses should be published on the graduate school's homepage, preferably <i>in extenso</i> . If patent or copyright legislation prevent this, at least abstracts of the theses should be publicly accessible	<i>Provide information about how PhD theses are published.</i>	<p>According to the PhD regulations § 14.3, the thesis must at the latest be publicly available two weeks before the public defence is held. The thesis must be made available in the form in which it was submitted for assessment, alternatively as revised on the basis of the committee's preliminary remarks, cf. § 11.4.</p> <p>Furthermore, according to the PhD regulations § 14.4, the candidate must prepare a press release well in advance of the dissertation and submit it to the faculty for approval. The press release must be prepared in accordance with the adopted template. The faculty is responsible for sending the press release to the Division of Communication no later than two weeks before the public defence.</p> <p>The time and place of the public defence must be announced to the public ten (10) working days in advance.</p> <p>All PhD candidates are also invited to publish their thesis in Bergen Open Research Archive (BORA).</p>	
QD6.4	There should be a lay summary of the thesis in the local language	<i>Describe the format of any lay summary.</i>	A lay summary of the thesis is in the format of a press release (cf. PhD regulations 14.4).	
7. Assessment				
QD7.1	The oral defence should be open to the public	<i>To whom is the oral defence open?</i>	According to the PhD regulations § 15.3 , the defence is open to the public.	
QD7.2	Where possible at least one member of the assessment committee should be from another country	<i>How many assessment committees include members from another country?</i>	According to the PhD regulations § 11.2 , two of the committee members should have no affiliation with UiB. At least one member should be from an international institution of higher education. We find that this is widely practiced at the Faculty of Medicine.	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD7.3	Apart from the thesis, the institution should ensure that sufficient transferable skills have been acquired during the PhD programme	How does the graduate school ensure that transferable skills have been acquired?	<p>The faculty ensures that our PhD candidates acquire transferable skills during the doctoral training:</p> <p>Communication skills: As an obligatory part of the training component, all PhD candidates must complete dissemination activities equivalent of 6 ECTS. Such dissemination activities include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - participation in national, regional or international conferences with either poster or oral presentation - Original academic or popular-scientific lecture - Popular science article/feature article within the candidate's academic discipline <p>In addition to obligatory activities, all candidates are encouraged to convey their research consecutively during their doctoral education. In such ways, candidates are considered to acquire extensive communication skills.</p> <p>Teamwork: During the doctoral education PhD candidates will gain much experience with teamwork, for instance by working in research teams and take part in research groups.</p> <p>Project management: Perhaps one of the most important transferable skill candidates acquire during their doctoral education is to manage their PhD project from the initial to final stages. Thus project management is an important transferable skill that PhD candidates acquire during their doctoral education.</p> <p>Seminar series: The research schools at the Faculty of Medicine organize regular academically themed seminar series where candidates are invited to give lectures and present their research. Additionally, they get to know other research environments and build a larger network.</p> <p>Representative on various committees: PhD candidates have the opportunity to serve as representatives on various committees at the faculty and at various events. This helps them build their transferable skills.</p>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	<i>Examples of type of information needed</i>	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
8. Structure				
QD8.1	There should be procedures for regular review and updating of the structure, function and quality of PhD programmes, including both supervisor and candidate feedback	<i>Provide information about how this is performed.</i>	<p>The Programme Board is a main forum to review and update the structure, function and quality of PhD programme. Both supervisors and candidates have representatives in the board. In addition, individuals may submit matters to the board.</p> <p>The annual supervisor seminars and lunch and breakfast seminars are a second forum to review, discuss and propose changes to the PhD programme. Although the supervisor seminars do not have authority to make decision, propositions may be presented to the Programme Board</p> <p>The annual progress report and midway evaluations may act as a third way for the individual candidate or supervisor to review the PhD programme and propose updates.</p> <p>Program evaluation: Through program evaluations that the faculty is required to conduct every six years, the program receives an external and comprehensive review of the PhD program. The committee examines the entirety of the faculty's program and provides advice on potential improvements. The Faculty of Medicine conducted a program evaluation in 2021 (attachment i).</p>	

Theme	Quality development (Standards that are in accordance with international consensus about good practice)	Examples of type of information needed	Please indicate the extent to which standards are met. Please be specific and comprehensive; refer to documentation where relevant. Normally 40-50 words per point; extended responses may be supplied on a separate sheet.	Evaluator comments
QD8.2	<p>The graduate school should have a website in the national language and in English, including transparent information on policies concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - background for the graduate school and the research environment - expected outcomes of the PhD programmes - description of the graduate school leadership and administration - responsibilities of the head of the graduate school and the administration - quality assurance and regular review to achieve quality improvement - admission policy including a clear statement on the PhD candidate selection process - the structure, duration and content of the PhD programme, including course requirements - type of courses offered, possible time in other institutions - the methods used for assessing PhD candidates - the requirements for the PhD thesis - the procedure for assessing PhD theses - the formal framework for following the progress of individual PhD candidates - supervisor appointment policy, supervisor qualifications, duties of supervisors and duties of PhD candidates outlining the type, responsibilities and qualifications of supervisors - effective use of information and communication technology - appeal procedures 		<p><i>Information about the Doctoral Education at the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Bergen is available on our websites. The website also provides information about the Faculty Management, our research schools and core facilities. Both general information about the PhD degree at the UiB as well as more specific information about the content of the PhD programme at the Faculty of Medicine, is available on our websites. Furthermore, regulations and guidelines regarding the PhD programme are also published on our websites, including the PhD regulations, guidelines about the methods used for assessing PhD candidates and the requirements for the PhD thesis. The formal framework for following the progress of individual PhD candidates is described in our website regarding the annual progress report and the midway evaluation. In addition, each department provide information about their own midway evaluation: Midway evaluation at the Department of Biomedicine Midway evaluation at the Department of Clinical Medicine Midway evaluation at the Department of Clinical Science Midway evaluation at the Department of Clinical Dentistry Midway evaluation at the Department of Global Public Health and Primary Health Care</i></p> <p>The Programme Board ensures quality assurance and regular review to achieve quality improvement in the PhD programme.</p> <p>All websites above are available in both Norwegian and English unless otherwise specified.</p>	

Godkjenning av opplæringsdelen fra forskerlinjen

Hva saken gjelder

Vedkommende er tidligere forskerlinjestudent, og har tatt opplæringsdelen i tidsrommet 2016-2022. Hun ble tatt opp i ph.d.-programmet våren 2024 i ett nytt prosjekt, og søker nå om å få fritak fra deler av opplæringsdelen i ph.d.-programmet (vedlegg 1).

Programbeskrivelsen sier at «opplæringsdelen godkjent som del av fullført forskerlinje unntas fra 5-årsregelen, dersom ph.d.-prosjektet er en direkte videreføring av forskerlinjeprojektet». Forskerlinjekandidater som av ulike grunner velger å bytte prosjekt faller utenfor dette unntaket.

Fakultetet har hatt som praksis at dersom kandidater bytter forskningsgruppe og prosjekt må de ta en ny opplæringsdel som er tilpasset det nye prosjektet. For de obligatoriske emnene i opplæringsdelen er det de vanlige reglene for opplæringsdelen i ph.d.-forskriften som gjelder. Disse reglene sier at man kan få innpasset inntil 10 studiepoeng fra før opptak, men emnene kan ikke være eldre enn 5 år ved opptakstidspunktet. Da mange kandidater tar det obligatoriske grunnkurset (MEDMET1/MEDMET900) tidlig i forskerlinjeløpet, og i tillegg da ofte har et opphold mellom forskerlinjen og opptak til nytt ph.d.-prosjekt for å ta LIS-1, fører dette til at grunnkurset da er eldre enn 5 år ved opptakstidspunktet og konsekvensen er da at disse kandidatene må ta emnet på nytt. Det samme gjelder mer allmenngyldige kurs innen statistikk og metoder som fortsatt kan være aktuelle for nye doktorgradsprosjekt.

Kandidaten argumenter for at dette er urimelig og at 5-årsregelen bør beregnes fra dato for fullført forskerlinje, og ikke når disse kursene er tatt.

Utvalget bes om å drøfte denne saken som et grunnlag for å etablere en generell praksis i fremtidige lignende tilfeller.

Forslag til vedtak

- 1) Fakultetet endrer praksis for tidligere forskerlinjekandidater og beregner 5-årsregelen fra forskerlinjens slutt for grunnkurset og andre allmenngyldige kurs.
- 2) Fakultet opprettholder dagens praksis og beregner 5-årsregelen fra når emnene er tatt

Vedlegg

1. Klage på underkjennelse av opplæringsselementer i PhD-utdanning.

Nadia Pristaj
Stipendiat v/ IGS, UiB
Årstadveien 17
5009 Bergen

Martha Enger
Leder for Programutvalg for forskerutdanning
Universitet i Bergen
Jonas Lies vei 91
5019 Bergen

Dato: 23.07.2024

Klage på underkjennelse av opplæringsselementer i PhD-utdanning

Bakgrunn

Jeg studerte profesjonsstudiet i medisin v/ UiB mellom 2015 og 2022. Underveis ble jeg tatt opp ved forskerlinjen (FL) med et prosjekt innen kardiologi som jeg gjennomførte med 1 publikasjon som hovedforfatter og flere publikasjoner som medforfatter, og som utsatte min grunnutdanning med 1 år. I regi av FL gjennomførte jeg den obligatoriske opplæringsdelen som vi fikk beskjed at ville være godkjent for videre PhD-prosjekt, og dermed var det fordelaktig å utsette medisinstudiet med 1 år samt jobbe parallelt med FL prosjekt tom. 5 året (den mest krevende delen av studiet) mht. videre forskningskarriere. Jeg sørget for å være tidlig ute og gjennomførte de store og omfattende kursene under heltidsåret mitt for å ikke måtte søke fritak fra undervisning senere for å ta disse kursene (MEDMET1 2017, Statistikk 2018, FLART 2017 med flere kurs). Jeg publiserte FL-artikkelen min i 2020, hovedoppgaven i 2021 og fullførte FL med det samme prosjektet som jeg startet med. Jeg bestemte meg likevel for å bytte til et annet PhD-prosjekt grunnet arbeidsmiljørelaterte utfordringer i den første forskningsgruppen. Like etter fullført FL og profesjonsstudium i medisin var jeg så heldig at jeg fikk LIS-1 stilling i Bergen og startet dermed min kliniske karriere i 2022. Under LIS-1 kom jeg i kontakt med min nåværende forskningsgruppe og vi planla sammen oppstart av PhD-løpet i mars 2024 like etter fullført LIS-1.

Jeg er aktuelt stipendiat i forskningsgruppen SMIL ved FAM, IGS, UiB – med Knut Erik Emberland som hovedveileder og Guri Rørtveit som medveileder. I den forbindelse har jeg søkt om innpassning av min opplæringsdel fra FL i PhD-utdanningen. Hele opplæringsdelen min fra FL (som er på PhD-nivå) ble ved førstegangssøknad underkjent delvis på bakgrunn av irrelevante emner for det nye prosjektet og delvis grunnet 5-års regelen som jeg søkte om å få vurdert individuelt. Jeg har forståelse for at kardiologi-spesifikke emner er lite relevante for et infeksjons- og allmennt medisinsk prosjekt og aksepterer at disse ikke blir innpasset, men jeg har store vanskeligheter med å forstå 5-års regelen i mitt tilfelle.

Argumentasjon

FL-admin. bruker fordelen med videreføring av godkjent opplæringsdel som et sentralt rekrutteringsvirkemiddel av nye FL-studenter til forskningsvirksomhet som i seg selv er en stor ekstrabelastning for studenten ved siden

av medisinstudiet. FL blir presentert som en investering av tid og innsats i videre PhD-arbeid. Imidlertid kom det ikke like tydelig frem at dette ikke gjelder ved prosjektskifte. Det er svært få legestudenter som vet hvilken spesialitet de vil ende opp med når de på 1. året av medisinstudiet velger et FL-prosjekt. Dermed vil et mindretall av disse videreføre prosjektet til en doktorgrad. FL studenter som ønsker å fortsette med en PhD men er uheldige og enten mistrives i forskningsgruppen eller ikke har et prosjekt som kan videreføres til et PhD-prosjekt vil dermed tape fordelene av FL-opplæringen til tross for den samme mengden innsats og arbeid som deres mer heldige medstudenter som valgte «riktig» prosjekt/gruppe har. 5 årsregelen skaper dermed rom for diskriminering etter hvor heldig eller uheldig man har vært med å plukke ut et forskningsprosjekt på 1. året av medisinstudiet. Dette anser jeg som urimelig og svært urettferdig. Hadde 5 årsregelen blitt aksentuert ved rekruttering av FL studenter, så er jeg sikker på at søkertallet til FL hadde gått drastisk ned, noe som er svært uheldig gitt at det er et stort behov for rekrutterer til akademisk virksomhet for å øke den medisinske kompetansen og kunnskapsbasen.

Jeg har vært forskningsaktiv tom. november 2021 hvor jeg anvendte kunnskap og ferdigheter ervervet via FL-opplæringsdelen i mine artikler. Jeg hadde en pause fra forskning grunnet obligatorisk klinisk tjeneste i 1.5 år (LIS1), men returnerte umiddelbart tilbake til akademisk virksomhet (PhD) like etter fullført LIS1. Jeg opplever at jeg nå blir straffet for å ha gjennomført opplæringsdelen tidlig under FL samt for å ha valgt «feil» prosjekt på 1. året av studiet, noe som jeg tror er u hensiktsmessig gitt tanken bak 5 års regelen. Jeg har vist gjennom studiet og mine karrierevalg at jeg er dedikert til akademisk virksomhet og har holdt meg så forskningsaktiv som jeg kunne ha vært gitt omstendighetene.

I svaret på min første klage ble bl.a. «presedens» fra tidligere vurderinger brukt som argument for underkjennelse av mine opplæringselementer. Alle har sine ofte tungtveiende grunner til hvorfor de ikke velger å fortsette med det samme PhD-prosjektet etter vellykket gjennomført FL noe som bør vurderes på et individuelt nivå.

Jeg ser ikke nødvendigheten med å bruke flere uker på kurs som jeg allerede har gjennomført og som er universale for alle forskere (MEDMET1, FLART og Statistikk 1 og 2) når jeg så sårt trenger denne tiden til å sette meg inn i et helt nytt felt, forskningsmetode og prosjekt. Hvis dere likevel mener at MEDMET1 har en utløpsdato etter 5 år, så vil det eneste rettferdige være å kreve at alle vitenskapelig ansatte ved MEDFAK fornyer kurset hvert 5. år ved oppstart av nye prosjekter.

Konklusjon

Med denne klagen ønsker jeg å reise diskusjon rundt hvorvidt det er riktig å diskreditere opplæringsdelen til søkere med godkjent FL som velger å endre prosjekt, og om en kort pause grunnet en obligatorisk klinisk tjeneste som er svært vanskelig å bli ansatt til skal gi grunnlag for krav om gjentakelse av hele opplæringsdelen i ettertid.

Som et kompromiss foreslår jeg at 5 årsregelen beregnes fra dato for fullført FL og ikke fra kursdato, da gjennomføringsevne hos den enkelte ex-FL student bør vektlegges og belønnes med tilrettelegging for videre forskningskarriere og ikke straffes med plassering tilbake til nullpunkt.

Med bakgrunn i det overstående mener jeg grunnngivningen for avslaget på min søknad er urimelig, og jeg ber om at vedtaket omgjøres i min favør.

Med vennlig hilsen,
Nadia Pristaj

Antall veiledere & Hvem kan bli veileder (del av programbeskrivelsen)

Diskusjonssak

Hva saken gjelder

Ph.d.-administrasjonen har siden mai jobbet med revisjon av programbeskrivelsen, som ikke har vært oppdatert siden 2019. Det er lagt spesielt vekt på to faglige tema, samt gjort språklige justeringer.

De faglige endringene gjelder spesielt:

1. Endringer i det totale antallet veiledere for ph.d.-kandidat.
2. Presisering knyttet restriksjoner i oppnevning av veiledere i teknisk gruppe, stillingskategori C.

Ph.d.-forskriften for Universitetet i Bergen sier at hver ph.d.-kandidat som hovedregel skal ha to veiledere. Det skal oppnevnes én hovedveileder og en medveileder (§6-2 (1))¹.

Fakultet har hjemmel i forskriften til å oppnevne flere enn en medveileder, men dagens praksis er at det skal fremgå tydelig av søknadsdokumentasjonen at medveilederens rolle i veilederteamet og det individuelle bidraget går vesentlig utover det som forventes av en samarbeidspartner eller mentor.

Dagens programbeskrivelse for ph.d.-programmet på MED punkt 4.1 sier at:

Ved det medisinske fakultet skal ph.d.-kandidater normalt ha to veiledere ved opptak. Hovedveileder har det overordnede ansvaret for veiledningen, og for samarbeidet mellom veilederne. Dersom hovedveileder ikke er ansatt ved UiB, skal en intern medveileder ha et konkret delegert ansvar for å følge opp kandidaten med tanke på oppfølgingen av praktiske forhold og regelverk ved UiB.

Ved begrunnet søknad kan ph.d.-kandidater få oppnevnt inntil fire veiledere. Det må framgå hvordan ansvaret fordeles mellom veilederne. [...].²

En gjennomgang av antall veiledere for 422 kandidater med aktive veilederforhold pr. medio september 2024, viser denne fordelingen av totalt antall veiledere i teamet:

2 veiledere, 1 hoved og en medveileder	3 veiledere, 1 hoved- og 2 medveiledere	4 veiledere, 1 hoved- og 3 medveiledere
120 stk/28,5%	186 stk/44%	116 stk/27,5 %

Tallene indikerer at rundt 71 % av kandidatene ved MED har flere enn normalt anbefalt antall veiledere, 2 stk, én hovedveileder og én medveileder.

Forskning viser at når det er mange veiledere, kan det uheldigvis oppstå en spredning av veiledningsansvar, som kan være uheldig for kandidaten. I store veilederteam kan det muligens oppstå pulverisering av veilederansvar. Fakultetsledelsen har i den senere tid diskutert størrelse på veilederteam. Det er dekanatets syn at fordelingen av det faglige ansvaret i veilederteamet skal være tydelig for kandidaten. Kandidaten skal være tett tilknyttet forskningsmiljøet, men det betyr likevel ikke at alle mentorer og faglige ressurspersoner må være oppnevnt som veiledere. Man kan fortsatt bidra betydelig

¹ [Forskrift for graden philosophiae doctor \(ph.d.\) ved Universitetet i Bergen - Lovdata](#)

² [Programbeskrivelse: Ph.d.-programmet ved Det medisinske fakultet | Det medisinske fakultet | UiB](#)

som faglig samarbeidspartner, gjennom publikasjonsarbeid eller som mentor, uten å være formelt oppnevnt som veileder. Basert på disse vurderingene vil dekanatet redusere det maksimale antallet veiledere fra fire til tre, én hovedveileder og maksimalt to medveiledere etter faglig begrunnelse hvor det tydelig skal fremgå hvorfor alle de tre foreslåtte kandidatene må oppnevnes som medveiledere.

Fakultetet har våren 2024 behandlet en søknad om oppnevning av en teknisk ansatt med doktorgrad og gitt avslag da det kun ligger til vitenskapelige stillinger å veilede doktorgradskandidater. Det er nå presisert i programbeskrivelsen at ansatte i tekniske stillinger i stillingskategori C ikke kan oppnevnes som veiledere.

Begge de to faglige endringene er inkludert i punkt 2.5 om Veileders rolle i søknadsprosessen i programbeskrivelsen. Gammel og ny versjon viser i tabellen under.

PFU bes om å diskutere endringene som er beskrevet over.

Gammel pkt 2.5	Ny pkt 2.5
<p>2.5 Veileders rolle i søknadsprosessen Alle som søker om opptak til ph.d.-programmet ved Det medisinske fakultet skal få oppnevnt to veiledere ved opptak. Søker må ha etablert kontakt med veileder som ønsker å ta på seg ansvaret som hovedveileder. Man må også ha et forslag til medveileder, intern eller ekstern. Minst en av veilederne skal ha ansettelse ved fakultetet i hele avtaleperioden. Professor Emeritus oppnevnes ikke som hovedveileder, men kan være medveileder.</p> <p>Prosjektbeskrivelsen utarbeides av kandidat og aktuelle veiledere i fellesskap, men bør i hovedsak skrives av kandidaten selv.</p> <p>Det er krav om at interne hovedveiledere må ha tatt fakultetets to e-læringskurs før opptak kan innvilges. Dersom hovedveileder er ekstern, må denne eller intern medveileder ha tatt kursene.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veilederkurs for ph.d.-veiledere: https://mitt.uib.no/courses/1061. • Behandling av personopplysninger i medisinsk og helsefaglig forskning: https://mitt.uib.no/courses/23681 <p>Der det er eksterne veiledere som ikke er ansatt ved norsk forskningsinstitusjon skal informasjon om deres kvalifikasjoner og arbeidssted dokumenteres gjennom en CV som redegjør for kompetanse, erfaring og nåværende arbeidssted.</p>	<p>2.5 Veileders rolle i søknadsprosessen Alle som søker om opptak til ph.d.-programmet ved Det medisinske fakultet skal få oppnevnt to veiledere, hvorav en skal fungere som hovedveileder og en som medveileder. Dersom det er faglig begrunnet, kan det unntaksvis søkes om inntil tre veiledere, hvor hver av veilederes rolle skal beskrives særskilt i opptakssøknaden. <u>Det kan ikke oppnevnes flere enn tre veiledere.</u> Minst en av veilederne skal være ansatt ved fakultetet i hele avtaleperioden. Professor Emeritus kan ikke oppnevnes som hovedveileder, men kan være medveileder.</p> <p>Dersom hovedveileder eller medveileder som er eneste veileder ansatt på Det medisinske fakultet endrer tilknytning til UiB til emeritus i løpet avtaleperioden, skal det oppnevnes en ny hovedveileder eller en ny medveileder med ansettelse på Det medisinske fakultet i hele gjenværende periode. Instituttet skal fremme forslag til fakultetet om ny hovedveileder senest tre måneder før hovedveilederes dato for inntreden som emeritus. Emeritus kan fortsette som medveileder innenfor rammen av maksimalt tre veiledere i veilederteamet.</p> <p>Ansatte i tekniske stillinger (stillingskategori C) kan ikke oppnevnes som veileder.</p> <p>Prosjektbeskrivelsen utarbeides av kandidat og aktuelle veiledere i fellesskap, men bør i hovedsak skrives av kandidaten selv.</p> <p>Det er krav om at interne hovedveiledere må ha tatt fakultetets to e-læringskurs før opptak kan innvilges. Dersom hovedveileder er ekstern, må denne eller intern medveileder ha tatt kursene.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Veilederkurs for ph.d.-veiledere: https://mitt.uib.no/courses/1061.- Behandling av personopplysninger i medisinsk og helsefaglig forskning: https://mitt.uib.no/courses/23681 <p>Der det er eksterne veiledere som ikke er ansatt ved norsk forskningsinstitusjon skal informasjon om deres kvalifikasjoner og arbeidssted dokumenteres gjennom en CV som redegjør for kompetanse, erfaring og nåværende arbeidssted.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

HEOM/17.09.2024

DET MEDISINSKE FAKULTET

PROGRAMUTVALGET FOR FORSKERUTDANNING

MØTE 25.09.2024

SAK 24/24

ePhorte sak.nr. 2024/8726

Søknad om godkjenning av et nytt ph.d.-emne BCEPS900 som erstatter for INTH950

Hva saken gjelder

Institutt for global helse og samfunnsmedisin ved emneansvarlig Kjell Johansson søker om godkjenning av følgende emne:

- Grunnkurs i helseprioriteringer (5 ECTS)

Dette emnet vil erstatte emnet INTH950 som instituttet har valgt å legge ned.

Forslag til vedtak

1. Programutvalget godkjenner opprettelse av emnet «Grunnkurs i helseprioriteringer». Studiepoengtildeling angis dersom denne fraviker foreslått studiepoengtildeling.
2. Programutvalget godkjenner ikke opprettelsen av emnet i nåværende form. Begrunnelse og forslag til revidering gis.

Vedlegg

- Søknadsbrev fra instituttet
- Emnebeskrivelse

HAJA/ 18.09.2024



Havjin Jacob

Referanse

2024/8726-KIN

Dato

03.07.2024

Søknad om å godkjenne nytt ph.d.-emne

IGS søker om godkjenning av eit nytt ph.d.-emne.

Dette gjeld: Introduction to priority setting in health (tiltenkt emnekode BCEPS900). Emnet er på 5 studiepoeng.

Emnet vil erstatte emnet INTH950 som instituttet har vedlagt at blir lagt ned.

Emnebeskrivelse er lagt ved. Kurset vil ikkje kreve ekstra midlar då det erstattar eit anna. Instituttet har godkjent emnet.

Vennlig hilsen

Kirsti Nordstrand
Rådgjevar

Dette er et UiB-internt notat som godkjennes elektronisk i ephorte

Institutt for global helse og
samfunnsmedisin
Telefon 55582086
post.med@uib.no

Postadresse
Postboks 7804
5020 BERGEN

Besøksadresse
Kalfarveien 31
Bergen

Saksbehandler
Kirsti Nordstrand
55 58 85 13

NORSK	ENGELSK
Kurskode BCEPS900A	Course code BCEPS900A
Studienivå Ph.d.	Level PhD
Kursnamn Grunnkurs i helseprioriteringar	Name Introduction to priority setting in health
Kortnavn G.kurs i helseprioriteringar	Short name
Stedkode 13260000	
Fagkode (fylles ut av administrasjonen ved instituttet) 705	Subject code 705
<p>Kursinnhald</p> <p>Deltakarane vil læra dei grunnleggjande metodane for prioritering innan helse, med vekt på korleis ein kan evaluera rettferd i tilgang til helsetenester og rettferd i fordelingar av helseresultat, og å integrera verktøy for likestilling og helsemaksimering.</p> <p>Kurset er delt inn i to delar:</p> <p>Del 1: Vil dekkja teoretiske konsept om UHC, etikk, likerett og rettferd og dessutan helsemaksimering, og korleis dei blir brukte i globale og nasjonale prioriterte helsetenester.</p> <p>Del 2: Vil dekkja praktiske øvingar om sjukdomsbyrde, kostnadseffektivitet og bruk av FairChoices DCP-analyseverktøy</p> <p>Dei første dagane er i stor grad teoretiske og består av ei blanding av forelesingar, gruppeøktar og diskusjonar om hovudtema beskrivne ovanfor. Studentane er pålagde å delta i gruppearbeid om tildelte tema. Dette inkluderer daglege studentaktive undervisningsøvingar, med vekslende gruppesamansetningar og presentasjon av resultat for klassen. Dei resterande dagane er kombinasjonar av teori og praksis, og studentane skal jobba gjennom øvingar på eigne bærbara datamaskinar etter eit «learning by doing»-prinsipp</p>	<p>Course content</p> <p>The participants will learn the basic methods for priority setting in health, with an emphasis on how to evaluate equity in access to health services and fairness in distributions of health outcomes, and to integrate tools for equity concerns and health maximization.</p> <p>The course is divided into two parts:</p> <p>Part 1: Will cover theoretical concepts of UHC, ethics, equity and fairness as well as health maximization, and how they are applied in global and national health care priority settings.</p> <p>Part 2: Will cover hands-on exercises on burden of disease, cost-effectiveness, and use of <i>FairChoices DCP Analytic Tool</i></p> <p>The first days are largely theoretical and consist of a mixture of lectures, breakout sessions and discussions on the main topics described above. Students are required to participate in group work on assigned topics. This includes daily student active teaching exercises, with alternating group compositions and presentation of results for the class. The remaining days are combinations of theory and practice, and students will work through exercises on their own laptops on a “learning by doing” principle.</p>

Læringsutbytte

Etter at kurset er gjennomført skal kandidaten ha følgende læringsutbytte definert i form av kunnskaper, ferdigheter og generell kompetanse:

Kunnskap

Studenten

1. kan forklara og grunngje fordeling av knappe ressursar etter utilitaristiske, egalitære og prioritære prinsipp, og korleis dei gjeld helse.
2. er i stand til å beskriva sentrale prinsipp og kriterium for helseprioritering
3. er i stand til å forklara grunnleggjande idear om rettferdig prioriteringsprosess
4. er i stand til å forklara kva ein Essential Health Service Package (EHSP) er og nøkkeltrinna for å revidera EHSP
5. kan forklara det grunnleggjande omgrepet økonomisk evaluering
6. er i stand til å forklara forskjellen mellom data om gjennomsnittleg befolkningsdekning for ei helseteneste, og data om fordeling av dekning oppdelt etter nøkkeldeterminantar for helse

Ferdigheter

Studenten

1. kan identifisera og argumentera mot urettferd i helse og helsedeterminantar
2. kan identifisera og analysera ulike data som trengst for utvikling/revisjon av EHSP
3. kan utforska og bruka FairChoices DCP-analyseverktøy
4. er i stand til å produsera prototype EHSP

Generell kompetanse

Studenten

1. kan identifisera og analysera avvegingar i prioriteringa til helsevesenet basert på nøkkelverdiar
2. kan evaluera og kritisk analysera helseintervensjonar i samsvar med prinsipp om helsemaksimering og rettferdig fordeling og standard kvantitative metodar
3. kan beskriva nøkkelement for rettferdig prioritering

Learning outcomes

Upon completing this course the candidate will have the following learning outcomes defined in terms of knowledge, skills and general competence:

Knowledge

The student

1. is able to explain and justify distribution of scarce resources according to utilitarian, egalitarian and prioritarian principles, and how they apply to health.
2. is able to describe key principles and criteria of health priority setting
3. is able to explain basic ideas of fair priority setting process
4. is able to explain what an Essential Health Service Package (EHSP) is and the key steps for revising EHSP
5. is able to explain the basic concept of economic evaluation
6. is able to explain the difference between data on average population coverage for a health service, and data on distribution of coverage disaggregated according to key determinants of health

Skills

The student

1. can identify and provide arguments against unfairness in health and the determinants of health
2. can identify and analyze various data needed for EHSP development/revision
3. can explore and use the FairChoices DCP Analytic Tool
4. is able to produce prototype EHSP

General competence

The student

1. can identify and analyze trade-offs in health care priority setting based on key values
2. can evaluate and critically analyze health interventions according to principles of

	<p>health maximization and fair distribution and standard quantitative methods</p> <p>3. can describe key elements of fair priority setting process in EHSP development/revision</p>
Undervisingspråk Engelsk	Language of instruction English
Fagleg ansvar Kjell Arne Johansson	Academic responsibility Kjell Arne Johansson
Kontaktinformasjon IGS: studie@igs.uib.no	Contact information IGS: studie@igs.uib.no
Undervisingsperiode Vår	Study period Spring
Studiepoeng 5	Credits (ECTS) 5
Påmelding og – fristar UiB sin faste frist for vårsemester: 1. desember	Course registration and deadlines 1 st of December
Kven kan delta Ph.d.-kandidatar	Who may participate PhD-students
Krav til forkunnskaper Grunnleggende ferdigheter i Excel-programvare. Gode arbeidskunnskaper i engelsk (TOEFL-score på minst 550 poeng papirbasert eller 213 poeng datamaskinbasert, eller tilsvarende godkjent test). Økonomer, andre samfunnsvitere, leger, etikere, psykologer, sykepleiere, tannleger og andre med utdanning på bachelornivå eller høyere i et relevant emne ved en anerkjent institusjon kan tas opp til mastergradskurset	Pre-requirements Basic skills in Excel software. Good working knowledge of English (TOEFL score of at least 550 points paper-based or 213 points computer-based, or an equivalent approved test). Economists, other social scientists, medical doctors, ethicists, psychologists, nurses, dentists and others with training at the bachelor level or higher in a relevant subject at a recognized institution can be admitted to the MSc level course

<p>Program Kurset vil vera heildigitalt over 8 dagar (to veker). Ein kombinasjon av forelesingar, lesing, aktiv deltaking i diskusjonar og gruppearbeid, hands on analysar på datamaskiner, plenumspresentasjonar og diskusjon. Deltakarane må ta med eigen bærbar PC med R og R-studio programvare førehandsinstallert.</p> <p>Det er tre obligatoriske oppgåver, med ein kombinasjon av individuelt arbeid og gruppearbeid. I tillegg vil gruppearbeid i klassen bli vurdert, noko som krev oppmøte..</p>	<p>Program The course will be fully digital over 8 days (two weeks). A combination of lectures, reading, active participation in discussions and group work, hands on analyses on computers, plenary presentations and discussion. Participants need to bring own laptop with R and R-Studio software preinstalled.</p> <p>There are three mandatory assignments, with a combination of individual work and group work. In addition, group work in class will be graded, which requires attendance.</p>
<p>Vurderingsform Studentane vil bli vurderte baserte på utføring av dei tre obligatoriske oppgåvene (10 % kvar), deltaking i undervisninga (10 %), og eit essay om eit tema med relevans for prioritering i helse (frist for innlevering 2 veker etter kurset).</p>	<p>Form of assessment Students will be graded based on their performance of the three mandatory assignments (10% each), participation in class (10%), and an essay on a topic with relevance for priority-setting in health (deadline for submission 2 weeks after the course).</p>
<p>Undervisingsstad Digitalt</p>	<p>Course location Digitally</p>
<p>Tilrådde forkunnskapar Sjå krav til forkunnskap</p>	<p>Recommended previous qualifications See pre-requirements</p>
<p>Utfyllande kursomtale -</p>	<p>Supplementary course content -</p>
<p>Inngår i opplæringsdel Ja, kurset kan inngå i opplæringsdel</p>	<p>Part of training component Yes, the course might be part of training components</p>
<p>Litteratur Liste i Leganto</p>	<p>Reading list Reading list in Leganto</p>
<p>Fagleg overlapp 3 studiepoeng med planlagt masterkurs BCEPS300</p>	<p>Course overlapp 3 ETCS with BCEPS300</p>
<p>Innleiarar Kjell Arne Johansson m.fl</p>	<p>Lecturers Kjell Arne Johansson and others</p>

Mal for forside til emnebeskrivingar ved UiB:

Emnebeskriving for (Namn på emnet, nynorsk)

..... (Navn på emnet,, bokmål)

..... (Name of the course, English)

Godkjenning:

Emnebeskrivinga er godkjend av (Fakultetet brukar nemningar for godkjenningsorgan i samsvar med eigen praksis.):

Programutvalget:(dd.mm.år)

Institutt for :(dd.mm.år)

..... fakultet:(dd.mm.år)

Emnebeskrivinga vart justert:(dd.mm.år) av

.....

Evaluering:

Emnet vart sist evaluert:(dd.mm.år)

Neste planlagde evaluering:(dd.mm.år)

DET MEDISINSKE FAKULTET

PROGRAMUTVALGET FOR FORSKERUTDANNING

MØTE 26.09.2024

SAK 25/24

Orientering - Høring om ph.d.-forskriften

Hva saken gjelder

Forsknings- og innovasjonsavdelingen (FIA) har sendt ut høring for endringer i alle tre doktorgradsforskriftene, ph.d., dr.philos. og kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid. Forskningsseksjonen har utarbeidet et høringssvar for ph.d.- og dr.philos.-forskriften i samarbeid med visedekananen.

Tidslinje for FIAs prosess

21. oktober: Høringsfrist for fakultetene

11. desember: Behandling i Forskningsutvalget

13. mars: Behandling og vedtak i Universitetsstyret

Det er ventet at de reviderte forskriftene trer i kraft etter behandling i Universitetsstyret i mars 2025.

De viktigste endringene for MED er gjort i ph.d.-forskriften. Endringer i dr.philos.-forskriften tas til etterretning.

De viktigste innspillene fra MED til endringer i ph.d.-forskriften viser under i kronologisk rekkefølge av paragrafer til PFUs orientering.

§ 5-1. (5) om vilkår for opptak.

Søkere som kan komme i kontakt med mindreårige eller andre sårbare grupper som en del av forskningen/det kunstneriske utviklingsarbeidet eller opplæringsdelen, kan bli bedt om å levere politiattest ved opptak.

MED: Det er ikke en ph.d.-administrativ oppgave verken å motta en politiattest eller vurdere om søker oppfyller krav til kontakt med mindreårige eller sårbare grupper i ph.d.-prosjektet.

Det må være hovedveileder/prosjekteiers ansvar å redegjøre for om søker trenger å fremvise politiattest på lik linje som for etiske godkjenninger. Opptakssøknaden må få et eget punkt *ja/nei* for om prosjektet er av en slik art at det krever politiattest, som må besvares av søker. Ved behandling av søknader hvor det er krysset av for ja, må HR/ansettelsesmyndigheten gi en uttalelse til ph.d.-administrasjonen om hvorvidt UiB-ansatte stipendiater oppfyller kravet for slikt arbeid. Dersom søker en ansatt i annen institusjon, må det fremlegges tilsvarende bekreftelse fra arbeidsgiver som vedlegg til opptakssøknaden.

§ 5-1. (6) om vilkår for opptak.

Søkere som ellers er kvalifiserte, skal ikke tas opp dersom planlagt forskning/kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid eller opplæringsdel ikke er i strid med reglene om eksportkontroll.

MED: Det må være hovedveileder/prosjekteiers ansvar å redegjøre for om prosjektet er i tråd med reglene for eksportkontroll. Opptakssøknaden må få et eget punkt med krav om dokumentasjon fra instituttet på at både prosjektet og elementer i opplæringsdelen er i tråd med dette regelverket.

- *§ 10-3. (1) d) om deler av arbeid fra opplæringsdelen kan inngå i avhandlingen/ph.d.-prosjektet.*

Kravet om "ny faglig kunnskap" etter § 10-1 innebærer at [...]

d) deler av arbeid som har blitt godkjent som besvarelse eller andre aktiviteter i opplæringsdelen, kan likevel inngå i avhandlingen

MED: § 10-3 (1) d) kan tolkes dit hen at kandidaten kan "klippe og lime" fra tidligere eksamensbesvarelser i opplæringsdelen inn i avhandlingen uten omarbeiding for avhandlingens faglige kontekst. Dette er ikke i tråd med MEDs holdning om forebygging av selvplagiering som fusk. Fakultetet veileder stipendiatene til å ikke klippe og lime direkte fra tidligere eksamensbesvarelser i opplæringsdelen, men å skrive om og tilpasse meningsinnholdet til bruk i avhandlingen. MEDs syn har tidligere blitt kommunisert til FIA blant annet i ph.d. koordinatorforum våren 2024.

MED mener at sakskomplekset §10-3 (1) d) i sin helhet må forankres i ph.d.-forskriften. Departementets diskusjon av begrepene «fusk», «selvplagiering» og gjenbruk av eget arbeid i forslaget til ny UH-lov (s. 243 - 246) er både omfattende og nyansert. Fuskebegrepet defineres ikke inn i loven og Departementet legger på institusjonen å *vurdere hvordan de skal definere, ramme inn og synliggjøre fusk på best mulig måte i virksomheten sin* (s. 244). MED erfarer, i likhet med FIA, at gjenbruk av deler av arbeidet fra opplæringsdelen er et tema mange ph.d.-kandidater kommer borti i løpet av ph.d.-utdanningen. Hvis det er slik at det oppfattes som uheldig at praksis mellom fakultetene på dette feltet er ulik og at det ikke er noen faglige grunner til at det skal være forskjellig, må man unngå at hvert fakultet skal lage egne utfyllende regler, men heller beskrive en sentral og felles praksis for hele UiB. Vi er alle kjent med god vitenskapelig standard og praksis for kildehenvisning til andres arbeider og det legges til grunn i utkastet at denne praksis også skal gjelde til eget arbeid. Men for 10-3 (1) d) bør UiB utarbeide felles beskrivelse spesifikt for kildehenvisning for gjenbruk av eget arbeid fra opplæringsdelen, som er vurdert og har gitt studiepoenguttelling til egen ph.d.-avhandling, enten alene eller i samarbeid med andre og lenke til disse i en fotnote i ph.d.-forskriften. Dette er et nytt særrområde som krever ekstra varsomhet. Da kan vi enes om en praksis for gjenbruk av deler fra opplæringsdelen til ph.d.-avhandlingen, forankret i UiBs ph.d.-forskrift.

HEOM/13.09.2024