

Instructions for administrators of doctoral work at the PhD programme in artistic research at the Faculty of Humanities

The administrator's primary task is to ensure that the committee's work is done in accordance with the PhD-regulations. In the assessment process the administrator has a vote and an equal responsibility for the assessment as the two external members. In some cases, the committee may consist of three external members in addition to an internal administrator. In such cases, the internal administrator will not be involved in the assessment of the doctoral work. Regardless it is the administrator's responsibility to ensure that the committee hands in a well-reasoned report. The administrator is also responsible for the following process:

Immediately after appointment:

- Settle on a date for the possible defence together with the rest of the committee if this has not already been done by the Department. Send the date to phd@hf.ntnu.no.
- Ensure that the committee has a joint understanding of the regulations and guidelines that apply for the assessment process.
- Inform the external members of the committee of the practice for assessment, report and defence at NTNU.
- Set internal deadlines for the committee's work.

The public presentation:

If the public presentation of the artistic result takes the form of a concert, exhibition, performance or other event taking place at a specific time and location, the whole evaluation committee must be present. The committee members themselves should book their travel, but the administrator should assist in coordinating this and make sure that all members of the committee are present for the public presentation. The administrator has a particular responsibility on the day in ensuring that the external opponents find their way around and are introduced to the candidate and the representatives for the Faculty and Department.

We highly recommend that the committee meet and discuss the public presentation after the event. The Faculty may book a room for this if needed.

After receiving the critical reflection:

Coordinate the committee's report (see template for more information) and send it to phd@hf.ntnu.no by the deadline specified in the transmission letter. The deadline cannot be more than three months after receiving the critical reflection.

If the doctoral work is approved:

- Clarify roles for the opposition during the defence
- Clarify the topic for the examination on an assigned topic. This must be sent to phd@hf.ntnu.no no later than three weeks before the public defence
- Clarify whether the committee members will participate physically, or whether digital participation must be organized
- Ensure that the external members of the committee have arranged travel and accommodation in accordance with the guidelines in the letter of appointment

Date of public defence

As mentioned above, the administrator must ensure that the proposed date for the public defence is settled immediately, if it has not been clarified prior to appointment. Public defences at the Faculty normally take place on Fridays. The defence should take place no more than five months after the committee has received the doctoral work. Please contact the Faculty at phd@hf.ntnu.no to determine the date.

Evaluation of the doctoral work

The administrator shall ensure that the committee is familiar with the relevant regulation's requirements for the report and the possible conclusions, including their consequences. The assessment can have three outcomes:

- Approval of doctoral work
- Recommendation for minor revisions of the reflection component before the final report is completed (cf. Section 15-1 of the PhD Regulations)
- Rejection of doctoral work

If the doctoral work is approved, it must be publicly defended (public defence). Prior to this, the candidate may make some corrections to the reflection component, but only of a formal nature. These changes must be listed in an errata list, which must be approved by the committee prior to publication of the reflection component. In other words, an approval means that the doctoral work is approved as it is.

Minor revisions can only be given to the reflection component, and it is important to have a clear understanding of what this entails and when it should be used and not used. In some countries, such minor reworkings are standard, but according to section 3.6 of the Guidelines for the Assessment of Candidates for Norwegian Doctoral Degrees, this is not a standard procedure in Norway. The committee cannot propose minor revisions if it believes it will require a work effort of more than 3 months, and the changes cannot be of a substantive nature. Minor revisions should therefore not be used if fundamental changes regarding theory, research question, material, documentation or methodology, are necessary. Thorough consideration must be given to whether the critical objections are of such a nature that they can be addressed in the discussion between the opponents and the candidate at the public defence, or whether they are of such a nature that it is necessary to rework the reflection component for the doctoral work to be worthy of defence for the degree. If the committee recommends minor revisions pursuant to Section 15.1 of the PhD regulations, the committee shall provide a concrete overview in written form of what the candidate must rework. If the Faculty allows minor revisions, the candidate will be given a deadline for new submission, and the committee will then be given a new deadline for submitting their final report. The deadline will usually be three months (it may not be shorter), but the candidate may sometimes be given an extension due to circumstances related to work or family concerns as most candidates will no longer be funded by the university at this point.

If the committee cannot approve the artistic result as it exists and/or finds that fundamental and extensive changes to the reflection component are necessary for the work to be recommended for public defence, the committee shall reject the doctoral work. If the doctoral work is rejected, the candidate may not resubmit the work in a revised version for six months and they only have one

opportunity to have the work reassessed. A second rejection means that the candidate will not have any more opportunities to submit the work for assessment for the doctoral degree.

See Section 15 of the PhD-regulations, as well as Section 3 of the Guidelines for the Assessment of Candidates for Norwegian Doctoral Degrees for more information about the assessment.

Basis for evaluation

PhD candidates in artistic research have a lot of freedom when it comes to the form of their doctoral work. The doctoral work itself must consist of an artistic result and documentation of critical reflection, but the details of how this is made publicly available depends on the project itself. It is important that the committee assesses the doctoral work as a whole, and we emphasise that it is the totality of the doctoral work that must satisfy the requirements of Section 11-2 of the PhD regulations. The candidate must detail in their application for assessment how both the artistic result and the critical reflection will be made available. Part of the committee's work is to assess whether the chosen medium and form is appropriate for the doctoral work.

In special cases, the committee may require the submission of source material and supplementary or clarifying information. In such cases, the committee may also ask academic supervisors to provide information about the supervision carried out and the work involved in the project. This is not common, but it is an opportunity the committee has according to the regulations.

Report

The administrator shall ensure that the final report contains the necessary information in accordance with Section 3 of the Guidelines for the Assessment of Candidates for Norwegian Doctoral Degrees. We recommend that you use the Faculty's template for the report. The administrator is also responsible for ensuring that the assessment is completed by the deadline. The deadline is a maximum of three months after the committee has received the totality of the doctoral work and no less than four weeks prior to the public defence. If there are any delays, the Faculty must be notified as soon as possible.

The report must include:

- a short description of the format of the work, type of work and extent
- discussion of the artistic significance of the doctoral work
- discussion of the doctoral work's key aspects
- assessment and weighing of strengths and weaknesses of the work
- A well-reasoned conclusion with a recommendation to the Faculty
- signatures with the date and names of committee members

See the template for more detailed information.

The committee shall submit a joint report in which any dissenting opinions or individual statements are included. Dissenting opinion must be justified. The administrator sends the final report to the Research support office at the Faculty of Humanities (use the email address phd@hf.ntnu.no). The report does not need to include physical signatures at this time, but some documentation that all committee members consent to the report must be provided, for example in the form of confirmation by email.

The Faculty is responsible for announcing the conclusion and sending the report to the candidate. The candidate may comment on the report within ten working days. Any comments are sent to the Faculty. The Faculty may request further clarification from the committee based on the report and/or the comments from the candidate.

The committee's report forms the basis for the Faculty's decision. The decision will be sent to the administrator and candidate with a copy to the Department and main supervisor. The administrator briefs the rest of the committee.

If the Faculty decides to approve the doctoral work, the examination on an assigned topic and the public defence will be planned. In the case of minor revisions, the committee will be informed of the candidate's deadline for resubmission. Once a revised reflection component is submitted within the deadline, the committee proceeds with the evaluation. If the doctoral work is not approved, the evaluation process is completed, and the external members will receive their payment.

Examination on assigned topic and public defence

The examination on an assigned topic is an independent part of the doctoral examination where the purpose is to test the candidate's ability to acquire and convey knowledge beyond the topic of their specialty. The committee must specify the topic of the examination and may also specify the form. In accordance with the PhD-regulations, the candidate is given the topic by the Faculty ten working days prior to the examination taking place. The topic and form must therefore be limited in scope.

The time limit for the examination is usually 45 minutes. If the committee wishes to have a different time frame or plan for a format that requires specific equipment, the administrator must contact the Research Support Office to see if the committee's wishes may be fulfilled.

The administrator is responsible for clarifying the topic of the examination on an assigned topic and ensuring that the committee discusses and prepares for the defence. The topic of the examination must be sent to the Faculty no later than three weeks before the public defence.

The opposition for PhDs in Artistic Research is usually carried out by the joint committee and takes the form of a discussion between the committee and the candidate. The committee decides themselves how they prefer to structure the discussion within the time frame. (up to two hours after the candidate's 20 minute presentation of their project).

The administrator must inform the opponents of the normal procedure for opposition at public defences at the Faculty of Humanities. If the opponents are unfamiliar with Norwegian defences or have little experience as opponents, please emphasize that the objective is a constructive discussion between candidate and opponents and that the opponents are encouraged to challenge the candidate professionally in a respectful manner. Foreign opponents should also be informed about the relatively mild and ritualistic character of Norwegian public defences, and that the public defence is in practice approved when the doctoral work has been approved for public defence (unless extraordinary factors are revealed during the public defence that were not known at the time of the assessment of the doctoral work). See section 5.2 of the Guidelines for assessment of Norwegian doctoral degrees for more information about the opposition.

It is important that the Faculty is notified if the opponents have any special needs in connection with the public defence. We also ask to be informed of any presentations in connection with the opposition. If there is a need for a physical working meeting with the rest of the committee the day before the public defence, it may be practical to carry this out in the form of a working dinner.

Expenses for this can then be covered by the Faculty at the rate of meeting remotely over three hours. Please contact your orderer (bestiller@hf.ntnu.no) for practical information and assistance.

On the day of the public defence, the administrator has an extra responsibility to ensure that the opponents find their way around, and that they are introduced to the chair of the defence and the doctoral candidate. Unless the committee consists of three external members as described earlier, the administrator is an ordinary member of the committee during the defence. The administrator therefore participates in the assessment of the examination on the assigned topic and the defence itself, as well as participating in the discussion with the candidate. If any of the external committee members participate digitally, the administrator is responsible for inviting to separate digital evaluation meetings after the examination on an assigned topic and public defence. The Faculty prepares the approval protocol for signatures from the committee, as well as other necessary documents for the external committee members.

A public defence dinner is a private event organized by the candidate. However, it is not uncommon for the committee to be invited to the dinner, and for the non-opponent (usually the administrator) to give a short speech to the candidate on behalf of the committee. In that case, it is the candidate themselves who is responsible for any invitation.