

WRITTEN WORK ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME IN LAW AT THE FACULTY OF LAW IN BERGEN

Summary

This summary does not cover absolutely every point in the document, and you must therefore familiarise yourself with the full text of this document. It is advisable to reread the text several times during your studies.

For the purpose of this document, "written work" means study group assignments and large group assignments (in the first to third years), compulsory course assignments (in the first to fourth years), various forms of compulsory assignments for elective courses, home examinations and Master's theses.

Law is an academic study, and writing different types of texts is a core academic activity. Scholarly writing is governed by a number of rules, and violation of these rules has consequences. The rules are based partly on legislation, including the formal regulations and guidelines laid down by the Faculty, and partly on established academic traditions. In addition, the requirement that students submit written work is central to the pedagogical principles on which the Master's programme is built. Basically, the main objective is to promote learning and skill.

Minimum academic requirements apply to the quality of required assignments. They apply to both the form of presentation and the methods used. Intellectual property rights and academic standards require honesty and precision in the use and citation of sources: you must provide accurate and detailed references whenever you quote or paraphrase texts written by others, be they Acts of law, preparatory works, literature or some other source. This document provides references to a number of useful guides on this topic. In addition, quotations must not constitute too large a part of your text; it is independent analysis and drawing conclusions based on the sources that are the core of the programme. Part of being a student is finding out which techniques and methods suit you best; the purpose of this document is to highlight methods that should generally be avoided as they increase the risk of an assignment being rejected or other sanctions.

This document also covers the requirements regarding critiquing your fellow students' work and recycling your own previous assignments in connection with repeating a course. It is not possible to "recycle" old assignments, but a reasonable degree of similarity is accepted, as long as the guidelines in this document are followed.

All required written work is checked. Any irregularities in the citation of sources or if the work is not considered to be sufficiently original will result in rejection of the paper. Serious cases may be considered as cheating or attempted cheating, which may lead to annulment of the course and the examination, meaning you will have to repeat the entire course. It may even result in exclusion (expulsion) from the University for one or two semesters.

1. Academic writing as part of the learning process at the Faculty

A key aspect of the implementation of the national "Quality Reform" at the Faculty is the submission of original pieces of written work as part of the learning process on the programme. Students shall submit a variety of different kind of written work: assignments through the Kark system in the first three years of study, compulsory course assignments in years 1–4, home examinations, required written assignments on the elective courses and a final Master's thesis in the fifth year.

Through the various written assignments that each individual student must submit, and others' feedback and comments on these works, students gain more knowledge about the content of the rules of law in the relevant fields, methodology and skills (knowledge of and application of the sources of law that indicate the content of the rules of law) and presentation and legal essay writing skills (structure, precision and clarity). In this way, written work constitutes the very backbone of the system at the Faculty of Law in Bergen. It is therefore important that students are familiar with the requirements that apply to written work. Below is an account of these requirements.

Study group assignments

Before starting work on a written study group assignment, students are expected to have prepared for the writing process. You must have attended the lectures, read the textbooks on the relevant subject, prepared for the study group session where the assignment is to be discussed, and discussed the assignment at the study group meeting. In this way, you will have had the opportunity to form your own impression of the state of the law in the relevant area and make up your own mind about how the specific legal issues ought to be resolved. In educational psychology, this is called "social constructivism" and entails that an individual applies and develops (constructs) knowledge through interaction in a group.

Although this lends the programme a collective aspect, the individual student's paper in response to the study group assignment and other written assignments on the course shall still be an individual, independent and original piece of work. In other words, you must not collaborate with other students during the actual writing process and must not use essays, notes or other written material that other students have prepared. Through this requirement, the Faculty ensures that students comply with the requirement of independence, so that the feedback and comments on written work and the Faculty's approval of completion of the course are based on the individual student's own performance.

In the fourth and fifth years

In the fourth and fifth years, you do not have to participate in study groups and large groups, and you submit fewer written assignments. However, you do have to write compulsory course assignments for all the fourth-year courses and many of electives. The requirements that apply to these assignments are similar to those for the study group assignments.

The Master's thesis in the fifth year of study is the written assignment that is subject to the most stringent requirements in terms of complying with the rules presented below. The thesis shall apply legal research methods and be of a very high academic standard in terms of presentation.

2. Written work at the Faculty of Law – general requirements

All legal essays and argumentation on the law programme must be based on legal methodology as presented in the courses on legal sources and methodology and other courses. The source of law principles, which have been derived from legal practice over time, govern the selection of relevant factors within the sources of law, how to draw conclusions from these factors, and how to combine or choose between conclusions, before settling on a final interpretation. This also means that you as a student must argue points of law within the constraints ensuing from the source of law principles.

In addition to adhering to the source of law principles, you as a student must also refer to relevant legislation, preparatory works, judgments and other sources of law, in the manner specified in Section 4.1 [hyperlink] of "Source Citation and Referencing". The source citation requirement is based on scientific ideals that require independence, rigour, objectivity, balance, verifiability and a critical attitude in the person performing analytical activities, including legal argumentation and analysis. The requirements for rigour and verifiability imply not only that you retrieve and use arguments from various sources, but also that you specify exactly which sources you used and where in the sources you retrieved the arguments from. Without such references, the written work does not satisfy the minimum requirements for academic quality.

The scientific ideals of independence and verifiability also imply that you as a student distinguish clearly between your own and other people's contributions to the legal argumentation or analysis. This is also called academic integrity. There are separate guidelines on citing sources and reference to other authors' material that you use in your work, see Section 4.2 [hyperlink] of "Source Citation and Referencing". On this point, the legislation largely corresponds with the scientific ideals, through the limitations on using other authors' material defined in the Copyright Act of 12 May 1961 no. 5. However, the scientific ideals go farther than the Copyright Act, as discussed in more detail in Section 4 below.

3. The requirement for individual, original work by each student in more detail

The Faculty of Bergen wishes to promote the main academic and scientific ideals through the students' work on written assignments in the programme. These ideals necessitate a particular work process, which will be outlined below.

Each student shall work individually and independently on their analyses of the law. This kind of analysis involves identifying the relevant legal questions and forming an opinion about what constitutes the key arguments for and against a particular solution in connection with a question of law, based on the available sources of law and the facts. It is not sufficient that you simply reproduce the content of a statute, preparatory work, case law or legal literature or simply state the factual elements without processing the material. You must make your own independent analysis and present your own original reasoning. Only then are you individually and independently processing the material, and only then do your argument and your conclusion rest on a solid foundation.

The requirement that students produce individual, original work also necessitates that you clearly identify which parts of the text are based on your own individual, independent legal analysis and which parts are reproduction of the available sources of law. If you reproduce text from an Act of law, preparatory work, case law or other source, this must be indicated clearly in the paper by means of quotation marks and references. The same applies to legal or other literature: you must cite your sources precisely. A fundamental part of the academic tradition is citing one's sources reliably and in a verifiable manner, cf. Section 2 above.

It is also important to remember that if correctly referenced quotations from various sources take up too much space in a paper, the paper as a whole will not meet the requirements for independent, original work. The quotations might be so dominant in the paper that the text does not reflect your own independent reasoning and analysis.

Although it is essential that your references are accurate, complete and precise, correct source citation alone does not make a good paper. On the basis of the scientific ideals, students are expected to produce a comprehensive and detailed analysis of the relevant legal question. The analysis shall be based on a thorough, complete and balanced interpretation of the relevant sources of law in the light of the specific issue being considered. Your own independent argumentation must demonstrate thoroughness and objectivity. For example, you must not argue or analyse only one side of an issue, but must also consider and present the arguments from the opposite point of view. Even if you are personally convinced that a particular argument is decisive, you must still present other arguments. Commitment to a cause is positive, but the scientific ideals require that you consider all sides of a case and are balanced in your argumentation.

Forming an opinion on the content of the rules of law is a very serious matter, particularly in specific cases, and you as a student must assume an appropriate degree of gravity when you argue points of law. Through the conclusions they draw, lawyers make decisions that have a huge impact on individuals, businesses, the government and society at large, meaning these decisions must be founded on the most thorough and balanced argumentation based on recognised sources of law, accepted legal methodology, and the best possible understanding of the facts of the matter.

4. Relationship between the scientific ideals and copyright

Pursuant to the 1961 Copyright Act, any person who creates a literary, scientific or artistic work ("intellectual property") shall have the exclusive right to make copies thereof or make the work available, cf. Section 2, first paragraph of the Copyright Act. The person who created the work has the copyright therein. Textbooks, journal articles, course assignments, and most other written works are regarded as intellectual property. Oral presentations too, such as lectures, are intellectual property.

In Sections 2 and 3 above, we discussed the requirement for precise citations and references when using another person's material. The exact content of the exclusive right to intellectual property and the legal background to the requirements concerning source citation and referencing are that without the consent of the person who created the work (the author), the work can only be used to the extent permitted by Chapter 2 of the Copyright Act. Moreover, regardless of whether consent has been given to use a work or the use of a work is covered by the statutory exceptions to the exclusive rights in Chapter 2, the author's name must always be stated when a work is used, cf. Section 3, first paragraph of the Copyright Act.

A pivotal provision in Chapter 2 of the Copyright Act is the right to quote works by others, cf. Section 22 of the Copyright Act. A work may be quoted without the author's consent if the work has been made publicly available, but citation must always be in accordance with "proper usage". This implies that one should not reproduce too much of another person's work through the right to quote. Nevertheless, quotations should not be so short that they can provide a misleading impression of what the author has expressed in his/her work as a whole.

If you use someone else's intellectual property in your own paper in a way that is not covered by the exceptions provided in Chapter 2 of the Copyright Act, you are violating the author's exclusive copyright conferred by Section 2 of the Copyright Act, assuming the term of protection of copyright has not yet expired, i.e. 70 years after author's death, cf. Section 40 of the Copyright Act. Note that the requirement to state the name of the author pursuant to Section 3 of the Copyright Act never lapses, even after expiry of the term of protection. If you are not covered by the exceptions in Chapter 2 of the Act, quoting from a work will constitute a violation of Section 2 of the Copyright Act, even if you name the author in accordance with Section 3 of the Copyright Act. Stating the author's name pursuant to Section 3 is a requirement in addition to compliance with Section 2.

Note that paraphrasing another author's text without reference to the paraphrased work is considered plagiarism pursuant to Section 4 of the Copyright Act. In such cases, there is so much of the original wording that paraphrasing without specifying the source is considered a violation of copyright.

Contravention of the rules laid down in the Copyright Act is sanctioned by punishment, compensation and other sanctions, see Chapter 7 of the Copyright Act. These are thus rules that must be respected, regardless of the context in which a person uses (or plans to use) another person's work. The guidelines on referencing to textbooks and other written material in Section 4.2 of "Source Citation and Referencing" are thus partially a matter of

complying with Norwegian law. As law students and future lawyers, students at the Faculty of Law in Bergen have a special duty to be aware of the rules.

The Copyright Act only protects the concrete expression of ideas, i.e. the textual (or visual, etc.) expression, not the idea itself. The scientific ideals that all activities at the University and the Faculty are based on dictate more stringent rules for referring to other people's work than are required by the Copyright Act. As stated in the document "Source Citation and Referencing", cf. Section 4.2.2.5, academic integrity dictates that you must also specify sources that you base your ideas on, even if these sources are only used as a starting point for your further independent processing of ideas.

The scientific ideals also set stricter requirements for citation than the Copyright Act. For example, the Copyright Act does not require precise reference to the exact page in the work where the quotation is taken from. But the scientific ideal of verifiability requires such precise references in a legal context, cf. Section 4.2.2.2 in "Source Citation and Referencing".

As a final point on the relationship between the scientific ideals and copyright, it should be mentioned that public documents such as statutes, preparatory works and case law are not protected under the Copyright Act, cf. Section 9 of the Copyright Act. According to the Act, then, this kind of material can be used and quoted freely without the author's consent and without citing the source. However, both in academia and on the basis of the scientific ideals, strict requirements for accuracy and thoroughness apply to quotations from these kinds of sources too, cf. Section 2 above and Section 4.1 of "Source Citation and Referencing".

5. Verification of compliance with the requirements concerning individual, original work at the Faculty

When reviewing and commenting on papers submitted by students, study group leaders and large group leaders may discover that a submitted paper does not fulfil the requirements that apply to written work outlined above. In connection with required coursework assignments, it is the person who reviews the paper or the course coordinator (in connection with checking standards) who will be able to detect such non-fulfilment, whereas in connection with home examinations or a thesis, it will be the examiners or the course coordinator (again, in connection with checking standards). Failure to fulfil the requirements regarding individual, original work may also be identified through random spot checks by the study group leader, large group leader or the course coordinator.

Judging whether the minimum requirements for written assignments have been fulfilled or not is based on a discretionary assessment. It is always the course coordinator who makes the final decision in this respect.

No student who respects the rules in Sections 1 to 4 above on the requirements that apply to written work and adheres to the academic ideals in the process will risk having a paper being rejected on technical grounds.

However, students who are not consciously aware of their own work processes or who aim to do the bare minimum in terms of what can be accepted as an individual, original piece of work run a great risk of having their work rejected on technical grounds.

The Faculty strongly advises students against focusing on the minimum requirements for written performance in connection with writing different types of text. If you aim merely to scrape over this lower limit, the risk of having a piece of work rejected is much higher than if you set out to produce a high-quality text. In addition, this kind of attitude is clearly in breach of the academic and scientific ideals described in Section 2 above.

The Faculty's checking of technical aspects of students' work takes into account the year the student is in and whether the work is submitted towards the beginning or the end of the course. It should also be emphasised that checking the technical aspects of a paper does not constitute an assessment of the quality of the paper. The main objective is to check that the student has produced a sufficiently individual, original piece of work, regardless of the quality or grade awarded to the paper. If an individual student's original work is incoherent and unintelligible, or completely lacking legal relevance, the paper may have to be rejected on these grounds.

A minimum condition for academic approval of a paper is that it answers all the questions in the assignment.

6. Good and bad routines

No two students are alike, and the Faculty cannot declare that one particular way of working is best for everyone. The Faculty would encourage students to experiment with different forms of writing and to work on developing their own style. Nevertheless, it is possible to provide some general guidelines that most people find helpful.

Many students find that sitting with the source text(s) open in front of them when they are writing is not conducive to independent thought, because it is easy to blur the lines between the content of the sources and own analysis. This can affect both the content and originality of what you write, and it can result in insufficient references to the relevant source.

All students ought therefore to maintain a constant focus on whether they are reporting information taken more or less directly from the sources or whether they are independently analysing information from the sources. When you repeat information taken directly from the sources, you must immediately specify the source in accordance with the guidelines on source citation as specified in "Source Citation and Referencing". Typically, such a reference ought then to be followed by your own independent legal analysis or reasoning.

If you get feedback that your legal argumentation or analysis is not independent or original enough, you might find it helps to study the sources first, noting down the main content in the sources either as a quotation or in the form of your own summary of the content, before you sit down to write the paper in its entirety, with only your notes in front of you. This technique makes it easier to distinguish between the information taken directly from the sources and your independent analysis and argumentation on the basis of information from

the sources. When using this technique, remember always to note down the source references in the notes you make from the sources and be sure to include them in your final draft. Otherwise, you may find that this working method creates problems in terms of the source citation and originality requirements!

The scientific ideals also dictate that one should be critical and constantly assess one's own way of working. Concentrate from the very outset on adopting routines and methods that suit your learning style and that help you to comply with the requirements for original, independent work and source citation. Be sure to adjust your habits and methods if you get negative feedback on the quality of the written work you submit or if you feel you have the potential to produce work of a higher academic quality. Finally, take time to check your written work before submitting it, focusing on references and originality; do not place too much confidence in your routines.

7. The requirement for individual, original work when resubmitting previously submitted papers

Section 5-2 of the Curriculum for the Master's Programme in Law at the University of Bergen specifies the rules for repetition of courses. These rules stipulate that students repeating a course shall participate on the same conditions as students who have not previously had the course approved. It is also stated that students repeating a course cannot resubmit previously submitted papers. Students are required to produce new, individual, original work.

This means that you cannot base your paper on a previously submitted paper. Nor can you have your previous paper in front of you when writing the new paper for the course. Cf. section 4 above.

Nevertheless, a paper will be regarded as an individual, original piece of work even if it contains elements from your previous paper for the course. Since we all have our own, individual writing style, it is almost impossible to avoid some similarities between new and previous papers. And of course there is nothing wrong with recalling points you made in a previous paper and building on them in a new paper. The main thing is that the new paper reflects that you have participated in the new course on an equal footing with the students taking the course for the first time and that you have written a new individual, original response to the coursework assignment.

As mentioned, the reason for this requirement is to ensure that you participate in the course on the same conditions as the students taking the course for the first time, as far as possible. Without this requirement, students repeating a course would not need to get involved in the discussions in the study groups, because they would simply be able to submit a previously submitted paper. This would undermine the group dynamic and the learning process in the study group, both for yourself and for the other students.

Moreover, allowing resubmission of previously submitted papers would make it difficult for study group leaders, large group leaders and you yourself to realistically gauge your current

level of knowledge. It is important to measure your current level of achievement, not the level you had last time you took the course.

One frequently asked question regarding the prohibition on resubmitting previously submitted papers is how much reuse of a previously submitted paper is allowed. As stated, there shall be no direct reuse of previous papers. Students who set out to base their new paper on their old paper, for example, by using the old document, or by having the previous paper in front of them when they are working on the new paper, are already starting to stray from the academic and scientific ideals on which the programme is based. This will greatly increase the risk of the paper being rejected.

The Faculty therefore requires that new papers submitted by students repeating a course shall be written from scratch, within the specifications stated above. If you follow these guidelines, you will never have a new assignment rejected, even if there are some similarities to your previously submitted paper.

8. Critiquing other students' study group papers

For your comments and feedback on another student's paper for the study group assignment to be approved, your comments as a whole must demonstrate a thorough assessment of the material, methodological and presentation (language, structure and precision) quality of the paper. Your comments must also cover all the main parts of the paper. Comments and feedback from students are thus subject to both qualitative and quantitative requirements.

The Faculty sets these requirements to peer critiquing because we believe that reviewing and making detailed comments on other people's work is a good way to learn how to formulate key points related to the content of the rules of law and legal methodology, as well as giving students the chance to critically assess which presentation techniques best serve to communicate points sufficiently clearly and precisely. Critiquing other students' papers is thus an important element in the learning process, providing different perspectives and experiences than those gained from writing one's own paper. Writing your own papers and critiquing other people's papers are two different aspects of a comprehensive curriculum. It is therefore important to approach both activities with equal vigour.

The Faculty has previously suggested that students must make at least three or four substantive comments on a fellow student's paper for the peer critiquing requirement to be met. However, we would stress that this is the absolute minimum for the number of comments that can be accepted. Students who make so few comments risk having their critiquing rejected. For so few comments to fulfil the critiquing requirement, each of the comments must be very substantial. The four comments must also satisfy the criterion of covering the entire paper. If large parts of the paper have not been commented on, the critiquing will be rejected.

9. Administrative plagiarism control of written work

Shortly after the final papers for a course have been submitted via the Kark system (or Mi side for Masters' theses), all the submitted texts are run through Ephorus¹ for plagiarism control. This software compares the individual papers with texts in the program's database and open sources on the Internet. The database contains papers by other students on the same course and on previous courses that have been submitted by the Faculty. Ephorus registers whether parts of the text in a student's paper are identical to (parts of) one or more of the texts in the database or on the Internet. Ephorus reports text similarities to the Faculty by e-mail – usually within a few minutes, although sometimes it may take up to several hours.

Ephorus only checks for similar text; it cannot assess the reason for the text similarities. A member of staff therefore goes through all the e-mails and sorts out the cases that do not require follow-up. Text similarities that are a matter of quoting text from the assignment question or from legislation, limited quotations from the texts in the Ephorus database or other random text similarities will not be counted as cheating. However, they may lead to a paper approaching the lower limit of what can be approved in relation to the requirement for original work, if the paper contains very many quotes and very little independent analysis by the student, cf Section 3, fourth paragraph above.

There will always be some cases in which the need for follow-up must be assessed, because it is possible that the requirements for written work described above have not been met. These cases are processed the "Cheating Committee",² which is headed by the Vice-Dean for Education. The Committee reviews papers to determine whether the student has met the requirement that the submitted paper is his/her own individual, original work, as described above or not. Some cases will be dropped at this stage, because closer examination reveals that the paper is still in compliance with the Faculty's requirements.

Cases that are not dropped after the first review by the cheating committee fall into two categories:

Some cases are not pursued any further; the student simply receives a letter from the Faculty presenting the findings, pointing out what is not optimal in the paper, and explaining what the student ought to have done differently. This kind of letter also serves as an official warning: The Committee will not be so lenient if a similar case appears for the same student again. These cases are not pursued any further

In cases that are pursued further, the student will not be able to receive a grade in that particular course until the matter has been finally resolved. The student will receive a letter informing them of the committee's findings and inviting them to make a statement about the matter. The student is also informed that he/she will be summoned to a meeting roughly two weeks later. Some students contact the committee straight away and request that the meeting will be held immediately, in which case the Faculty does its best to comply.

¹ <https://wikihost.uib.no/uawiki/index.php/Ephorus>

² In item no. 69-09/10, the Academic Affairs Committee adopted: 1. The contact people for instances of suspected cheating are the Vice-Dean for Education, head of the Section for Academic and Student Affairs and an officer appointed by them.

In the latter cases, all the Faculty knows at this stage is what we write in the letter: the Faculty has found text similarities that do not appear to be consistent with the course requirements regarding individual, original work. A letter is sent to the student, because the Faculty needs to hear the student's explanation of the reason for the specific case of the text similarity in order to be able to determine whether and if so how to follow up the particular case.

At the meeting, the student has the opportunity to explain the reason for the text similarity and the Faculty has the opportunity to ask follow-up questions. The meeting also provides the Faculty with an opportunity to clarify the requirements that apply to written work, including the rules for reproducing, referring to and quoting from different types of sources.

After the meeting with the student, the Faculty decides how the particular case should be treated. Normally, the student will be informed of the Faculty's opinion within 2–4 days. We prefer to postpone drawing a conclusion until all of the meetings for a particular course have been held, to ensure all students are treated equally. In cases where meetings have to be held with many students on a single course, it may take some time before the committee reaches a final conclusion that can be communicated to the students.

In some cases, the case is dismissed, often with a warning, as described above. In some cases, the Faculty issues an apology; for example, if the investigations reveal that one student's work has been unlawfully used by another student.

In other cases, the paper is rejected on an objective basis. This means that we have found that it does not meet the requirements regarding written work described above in this document.

NB! Rejection of a paper on an objective basis does not count as cheating. Cheating means that a student has acted wilfully or with gross negligence, whereas rejection of a paper on an objective basis only entails the objective finding that the text does not meet the minimum requirements for originality.

The consequences of rejection of a paper on an objective basis depend on the extent to which the student has met the compulsory coursework requirements for the relevant course. If you are already borderline in terms of required participation, or the paper in question is a compulsory course assignment, rejection of a paper may mean you will not get the course approved and therefore have not met the requirements necessary to be able to take the examination. An annulment decision can be appealed to the University of Bergen's Central Appeals Committee.

In a few cases, we decide that we are facing a case where the requirement of subjective fault has been met (intent or negligence), and we are dealing with a suspected case of cheating. Such cases are sent to the Central Appeals Committee for decision, and a copy is also to the student. The student has the opportunity to state their case to the Central Appeals Committee. Note, very few cases go this far. The Central Appeals Committee rules on the case on a free basis, generally using one of the following three options: 1) the case is

dismissed, 2) the course is annulled³, or 3) the course is annulled and the student is excluded for one or two semesters. Annulment of the course means that the student no longer meets the requirement of having successfully completed all the required coursework, and that they are thus no longer entitled to take the examination for that course. If the student has already taken the examination, then that too will be annulled. Exclusion means that you lose all your rights at the University of Bergen and in the Student Welfare Organisation in Bergen (SiB). However, once the period of exclusion is over, you can return to the programme without application or any other formal requirements.

If you are found guilty of cheating by the Appeals Committee, this will not be recorded on the diploma, transcript or any other document issued by the University. The University is of course bound by a strict duty of confidentiality in such cases.

10. The fourth and fifth years

After three years of study, the Faculty expects you to have achieved a certain level of personal, professional and academic maturity. This means that even more is expected of you than in lower years. The same minimum requirements continue to apply in terms of original work and academic quality, and the Faculty's monitoring is also the same. However, since you are now on a higher level, the standards are also higher in terms of what is expected of you. As you progress through the programme, it is not only *advisable* to learn and maintain good habits and to always check your own work, it is *essential*. Basically, the further you progress on the programme at the Faculty, the more stringent the requirements. However, as your studies progress, you will also find you are better equipped to uphold the scientific ideals and to comply with copyright and academic rules when arguing points of law.

And remember: all fourth and fifth year papers submitted through Kark or Mi side are checked as described in Section 7 above.

For more information, contact:

Per Gunnar Hillesøy, senior advisor at the Section for Academic and Student Affairs:

per.hillesoy@jurfa.uib.no

Christine Stoltz Olsvik, head of the Section for Academic and Student Affairs:

christine.olsvik@jurfa.uib.no

³ In theory, the Appeals Committee can also choose to annul only the non-compliant paper. The consequences this has will then depend on whether the student fulfils the overall requirement of having successfully completed all the required coursework for the course in question without this paper. In practice, however, the Appeals Committee seldom makes use of this option.