**Declaration of impartiality**

**for\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (committee member)**

**in connection with the doctoral dissertation  
  
of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (candidate)**

Name of main supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of co-supervisor (s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Names of the other members of the committee: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The regulations for the degree philosophiae doctor (ph.d.) at Høgskulen på Vestlandet, FOR-2021-06-10-2111, § 5-5 declare that the rules of impartiality in the Public Administration Act § 6 apply to the committee's members.

The committee member is required to complete the form below. Before taking on the responsibility of a committee member, it is crucial to declare one’s impartiality. This is achieved by selecting the appropriate answer options in the form. Additionally, the committee member has the option to provide supplementary information regarding professional or personal relationships in the provided sections.

Some simple guidelines are given for the assessment of impartiality as an appendix to this statement.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Questions:** | **Yes:** | **No:** |
| 1. | Are you related to, or do you maintain a close relationship with, the doctoral candidate, or one of the candidate's supervisors or co-authors? |  |  |
| 2. | Have you engaged in joint publications, presentations or any other professional collaboration with the doctoral candidate in the past 5 years? |  |  |
| 3. | Have you engaged in joint publications, presentations or any other professional collaboration with one or more of the doctoral candidate's supervisors or co-authors in the past 5 years? |  |  |
| 4. | Are you aware of other factors that might impact confidence in your impartiality in relation to the assessment? |  |  |
| **If you answer yes to any of the questions, please elaborate below:**  (e.g. year of publication, form / duration of collaboration, etc.) | | | |

Pursuant to sections 6 and 8 of the Public Administration Act, I consider myself impartial, and undertake the task as a member of the assessment committee.

Name:

Title:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX to the declaration of impartiality**

**Guidelines for the assessment of impartiality**

The assessment of impartiality is based on the Public Administration Act § 6:

<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/1967-02-10>

Some conditions will automatically lead to disqualification:

• when the committee member is related to or in-law with a party in the ascending or descending line or in the sidelines as close as the sibling

• when the committee member is or has been married to or is a partner with or is engaged to, or is cohabiting with a party, or is a foster father, foster mother or foster child of a party

• when the committee member is the guardian or representative of a party or has been the guardian or representative of a party after the case began

• when the committee member is, or has in less than 3 years ago been, a supervisor for the doctoral candidate

Other factors must be considered using discretion. The Public Administration Act § 6 second paragraph specifies that one is disqualified when there are other special circumstances that apt suitable to impair confidence in his impartiality. It is further stated that one should emphasize whether the decision in the case may entail a special advantage, loss or inconvenience for him personally or someone with whom he has a close personal association.

Below are some points that may be helpful in assessing what constitutes disqualification:

* Close personal relationship

Several legal sources point out that the quality of the relationship must be similar to that which leads to automatic disqualification, i.e. a relationship that is as close as one would normally have to siblings or in-laws. In practice, one has often looked at whether there is a close personal friendship, for example where there’s regular private contact. Thus, there must be more than an acquaintance for it to be a close personal relationship.

* Close professional relationship

A normal collaboration at work and contact that follows from work in the same field will normally not lead to disqualification. A close professional collaboration or co-authorship of a more recent date must be considered specifically. Scope (number of co-publications and publication frequency) and proximity in time will be relevant in the assessment. Number of contributors to a publication, and the role the person has played should be considered in this context. Editorial responsibilities will normally not lead to disqualification.

You do not automatically become disqualified if you have a professional collaboration closer in time than 5 years, but you are required to declare it, so that it can be assessed.

The specific points related to the assessment of what constitutes a close professional relationship are taken from the Research Council's provisions on impartiality and trust:

<https://www.forskningsradet.no/contentassets/15005fdac9d1477c95f45913a9d9493f/bestemmelseromhabilitetogtillit100608eng.pdf>

Be aware that personal or professional disagreements may also be relevant to consider.