

Regulations concerning the *Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) in Artistic Research* degree at the Norwegian Academy of Music

(Adopted by the board of the Norwegian Academy of Music 14.12.2017 pursuant to the Act of 1 April 2005 no. 15 Relating to Universities and University Colleges (the Universities and University Colleges Act) Sections 3-3, 3-9 (7) and 4-13. Entry into force (Section 25): 01.02.2018.)

This is a translation of the Norwegian version of the Regulations. Legal authenticity remains with the Norwegian version as published in Norsk Lovtidend. In the event of any inconsistency, the Norwegian version shall prevail.

PART I INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

1 Application of regulations

These regulations apply to organised programmes of study leading to the qualification of *Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) in Artistic Research* in music performance and composition at the Norwegian Academy of Music (NMH). The regulations pertain to the admission to, participation in and completion of the programme of study.

2 Definitions

The PhD in Artistic Research is hereafter also referred to as the *artistic PhD* or the *doctorate*.

The terms *the PhD work* and *the project* describe the work carried out in the period between the agreed start and end dates, *not* including the mandatory component.

The terms *artistic PhD portfolio* and *PhD portfolio* cover both the artistic performance and composition output as well as the *material documenting artistic reflection*, also described as the reflection, cf. 11-1.

The term *artistic output* only refers to the artistic performance or composition output.

3 Scope, content and objective of the PhD programme

3-1

The PhD programme should qualify the candidate for artistic research of an international standard and for other work requiring a high level of artistic insight and expertise in accordance with good academic practices and ethical standards.

The PhD programme should give the candidate knowledge, skills and expertise in keeping with the national qualifications framework.

The PhD programme consists of three (3) years of full-time study and includes a mandatory component worth at least 30 credits.

The main component of the PhD programme consists of independent artistic research carried out under active supervision.

3-2

The PhD in Artistic Research degree is conferred on the basis of

- approved artistic output, cf. 11-1
- approved reflective component, cf. 11-1
- approved completion of the mandatory component, alternatively other approved academic training or qualification
- approved public defence of the artistic PhD portfolio (*viva voce*)

4 Responsibility for the PhD programme

The R&D committee is responsible for the PhD programme within the framework described in these regulations. The R&D committee shall appoint a dedicated programme committee for the programme, hereafter referred to as the programme committee, and issue it with a detailed mandate.

Proposed changes to these regulations shall be considered by the R&D committee following input from the programme committee and put to the board for a final decision.

The programme description shall be adopted by the R&D committee following a recommendation by the programme committee.

5 Quality assurance

The PhD programme is subject to the NMH's quality assurance system.

PART II ADMISSION

6 Admission

6-1 Admission requirements

To be eligible for admission to the PhD programme, the applicant must normally have at least a performing arts and/or creative master degree in the relevant subject area, cf. the descriptors contained in the second cycle of the qualifications framework.

The NMH may approve a different, equivalent qualification as grounds for admission.

The NMH may request additional qualifications in accordance with openly available criteria and in line with the institution's recruitment policy and academic profile.

The application should include:

- Fully completed application form
- Documentation of the required qualifications
- Project description, including
 - academic description of the project
 - project timetable
 - funding plan
 - documentation of special needs for academic and material resources
 - any plans for a stay at another institution
 - dissemination plan
 - information about any restrictions on intellectual property rights to protect the rights of other parties
- Schedule for the mandatory component
- The name of at least one proposed supervisor and details of involvement in active artistic research communities
- Details of any legal and ethical issues that the project raises and how these can be addressed. The application must state whether the project is dependent on permission from research ethics committees or other authorities or from private individuals (informants, patients, parents etc.). Such permissions should be attached to the application if possible

The programme committee prepares an application form and guidelines for the application and project description, and it may decide to request additional documentation.

The NMH may decide to impose a residency requirement. Information about such residency requirements must be easily accessible to the applicants.

Applications for admission to the PhD programme should normally be made no later than three (3) months after commencing the project that will lead to the degree. The application will be rejected if less than one year of full-time work on the project remains at the time the application is made, cf. 6-3.

6-2 Infrastructure

The candidate shall have at their disposal the infrastructure needed to complete the project. The NMH shall decide what should be deemed necessary infrastructure. For candidates with external funding or employment, an agreement shall be entered into by the institution and the external party for each project. As a general rule, the agreement must be signed prior to the admission of the candidate or immediately thereafter.

6-3 Admission procedure and decision

The R&D committee may stipulate more detailed procedures for considering applications over and above those described in 6-3-1 and 6-3-2 subject to a proposal from the programme committee.

6-3-1 Expert assessment

The programme committee shall appoint experts to consider each application. At least two experts shall assess each application.

The assessments shall be put in writing and comply with the criteria set by the programme committee.

6-3-2 Interview

Applicants may be invited to an interview. The programme committee decides who should be called for an interview based on an overall assessment of the applications.

The programme committee appoints the interview panel.

The programme committee makes a final, ranked recommendation for admission to the PhD programme based on the framework stipulated by a superior authority at the NMH. The recommendation should be based on an overall assessment of the application and applicant.

6-3-3 Admission, nomination and appointment

The admission decision shall be based on an overall assessment of the application and applicant.

The appointments committee shall make the appointment if the admission relates to an advertised research fellowship. In such cases admission to the PhD programme and appointment to the research fellowship role are one and the same thing, and the R&D committee shall make its nomination based on the programme committee's recommendation, cf. above. For applicants with external funding, the programme committee makes a decision to admit the applicant within the framework set by the superior authority.

When deciding to admit/appoint an applicant as a research fellow, the contract period should be stipulated with a start date and an end date. The start date shall be the same date as the start of the funding / appointment to the research fellowship.

Admission will be refused if

- agreements with external third parties prevent the publication and public defence of the artistic PhD portfolio,
- the intellectual property rights agreements entered into are so unreasonable that the NMH should not participate in the project,
- the applicant cannot fulfil the requirement of having at least one year of the project remaining after the applicant has been admitted to the programme, cf. 6-1,
- the applicant has commitments that would impede the expected progress.

7 PhD agreement

7.1 Parties to the agreement

Admission to the PhD programme are formalised in a written agreement signed by the candidate,

supervisor(s) and the NMH. The agreement regulates the rights and obligations of the parties during the enrolment and shall ensure that the candidate becomes a regular participant in an active and relevant academic community. The agreement shall help ensure that the programme is completed by the agreed end date. The NMH shall prepare the agreement.

For candidates with funding from, employment with or other contributions from an external party, a separate agreement between the candidate, the NMH and the external party shall be entered into in accordance with established guidelines.

In instances where the candidate will be affiliated to foreign institutions, the NMH's guidelines on overseas affiliations must be adhered to. A separate agreement shall be entered into using a dedicated form. The agreement should normally be prepared at the same time as the admissions contract.

7-2 Agreement period

The NMH may stipulate a maximum time frame for completing the programme above and beyond statutory leave entitlements and obligatory duties.

Any extension of the agreement period must be considered in light of the candidate's rights as an employee or be clarified especially with regard to the candidate's funding situation.

In the event of any interruptions permissible under the law, the agreement period shall be extended correspondingly. The NMH may extend the agreement period subject to a justified application. The NMH may set additional conditions if an extension is granted.

Upon expiration of the enrolment, the parties' rights and obligations under the agreement shall cease to exist, and the candidate may lose their right to supervision, enrolment on courses and access to the institution's infrastructure. The candidate may still apply to have their PhD work assessed.

7-3 Voluntary termination before the agreed end date

The candidate and the NMH may agree that the candidate should withdraw from the PhD programme before the agreed end date. In the event of such voluntary termination a declaration shall be made to clarify issues surrounding employment, funding, rights to results etc.

If the termination is due to the candidate's wishing to change the project or transfer to a different programme, the candidate must reapply for admission on the basis of the new project.

7-4 Involuntary termination in the event of delay or lack of progress

When one or more of the following conditions are present, the NMH may decide to terminate a candidate's participation in the doctoral programme without the candidate's consent:

- Significant delay to the completion of the mandatory component.
- Repeated or material breaches by the candidate of the disclosure, follow-up or reporting obligations, including failure to submit progress reports, cf. 10-1.
- Delays to the progress of the project of a nature that raises justified doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to complete it by the agreed end date.
- Involuntary termination under these provisions may only be imposed if the failure to make progress or the delay is due to circumstances within the candidate's control.

Decisions under this clause are made by the R&D committee. Appeals are heard by the NMH appeals committee.

7-5 Involuntary termination in the event of cheating in examinations or tests

The NMH may annul examination or test results if the candidate is found to have cheated in examinations or tests during the PhD programme, cf. Section 4-7 of the Universities and University Colleges Act. If the misdemeanour is so serious that it constitutes dishonesty, cf. *ibid.* Section 4-13 (1) and the Act on Ethics and Integrity in Research Section 8, second paragraph, the NMH may decide to terminate the candidate's participation in the doctoral programme, cf. Section 7-6 below.

Decisions under this clause are made by the NMH appeals committee. Complaints are considered by the Joint Appeals Committee, cf. Section 5-1 of the Universities and University Colleges Act and associated regulations.

7-6 Involuntary termination in the event of dishonesty

If a candidate is guilty of dishonesty, cf. Section 4-13 (1) of the Universities and University Colleges Act and Section 8, second paragraph, of the Act on Ethics and Integrity in Research, the NMH may decide to terminate the candidate's participation in the doctoral programme.

Decisions about involuntary termination due to dishonesty are made by the NMH appeals committee. Appeals against such decisions are considered by the Ministry of Education and Research or by an appeals committee appointed by the Ministry.

7-7 Termination of employment and dismissal

A candidate's employment as a research fellow may be terminated when there is just cause for doing so due to circumstances on the part of the institution or the candidate, cf. the State Employees Act Sections 19 and 20, or the candidate may be dismissed pursuant to Section 26 (*ibid.*).

PART III EXECUTION

8 Supervision

Work on the doctoral project shall take place under individual supervision. Together the NMH and the supervisors shall ensure that the candidate is a regular participant in an active academic community.

8-1 Appointment of supervisors

The candidate should in principle be assigned two supervisors, of whom one is appointed main supervisor. Supervisors are appointed by the programme committee. The main supervisor should be appointed as soon as possible after admission.

The *main supervisor* has overall responsibility for following up on the candidate's academic progress and work in accordance with the timetable. If an external main supervisor is appointed, a co-supervisor from the NMH must also be appointed.

Co-supervisors share academic responsibility for the candidate with the main supervisor.

The impartiality rules set out in Chapter 2 "Concerning disqualification", Sections 6–10, of the Public Administration Act apply to the supervisors.

The main supervisor must hold an artistic qualification at associate professor level or above or demonstrate equivalent experience, in the relevant field. All supervisors must hold a doctorate or equivalent qualification and be active in their respective fields.

At least one of the appointed supervisors should have previous experience or training as a supervisor at PhD level.

The candidate and supervisor may ask the programme committee to appoint a new supervisor for the candidate. The supervisor may not step aside until a new supervisor has been appointed. Any disputes concerning the supervisor's and the candidate's academic rights and obligations may be referred by the parties to the NMH for consideration and a resolution.

8-2 Supervision content

The candidate and supervisor should communicate regularly. The frequency of communication should be described in the annual progress report, cf. 10-1.

The candidate and main supervisor should together review the project description and consider the need for adjustments as soon as possible and no later than three (3) months after admission. Any material changes to the project description must be approved by the programme committee.

Supervisors should advise on delimiting topics and artistic research issues and assess methodology and outcomes, including documentation and presentation formats, and provide

guidance on relevant academic discourse. The candidate should be given guidance on ethical matters related to the PhD work.

Supervisors must keep up to date with the progress of the candidate's work and assess progress in light of the timetable set out in the project description, cf. 6-1.

Supervisors must follow up on any academic matters that may delay completion in order that the candidate can complete the programme within the stipulated time frame.

9 Mandatory component

9-1 Objective, content and scope

The PhD programme shall be organised such that it can be completed within the stipulated time frame.

The programme committee is responsible for ensuring that the mandatory component and work on the project together give the candidate a qualification of a high academic standard in an international perspective. Training in disseminating results and an introduction to ethics, theory and methodology are part of this process. Together with the PhD work, this training should help the candidate achieve the expected learning outcomes in line with the national qualifications framework.

The candidate should be offered guidance on future career prospects in and outside academia and develop an awareness of the competencies the candidate has acquired through the PhD work.

If the NMH is not organising all of the mandatory component, arrangements must be made for the candidate to receive equivalent training at other institutions.

The mandatory component shall make up at least 30 credits, of which 20 credits must be taken after admission. Elements to be included in the mandatory component should not be more than two years old at the time of admission.

Courses at PhD level at other institutions must be approved in line with the provisions in Section 3-5, first paragraph, of the Universities and University Colleges Act.

9-2 Involvement in the academic community

The candidate is expected to contribute to the institution's academic community, for example through academic activities such as seminars, workshops and dissemination activities. The institution and supervisor should systematically follow up on these activities to ensure that contact with the academic community is planned and maintained.

9-3 The candidate's rights to leave of absence

Candidates who are on parental leave from their PhD programme may continue to follow the tuition and sit examinations in subjects and courses forming part of the mandatory component in line with the National Insurance Act Chapter 14, Section 14-10, fourth paragraph, and the NAV's directive relating to Section 14-10, fourth paragraph, dated 18.12.2006.

10 Reporting and midterm evaluation

10-1 Reporting

The NMH's educational quality assurance system shall include measures to identify lack of progress with the project and mandatory component and shortcomings in the supervision, and it shall include procedures for following up on any shortcomings that have been uncovered. The system shall normally include annual and separate reporting from the candidate and supervisor, and it shall be designed so as to avoid duplicate reporting.

The candidate and supervisor have equal responsibility for reporting. A lack of or inadequate reporting by the candidate may result in involuntary termination before the end of the contract period, cf. 7-4. Supervisors who fail to fulfil their reporting obligations may have their supervisory responsibilities removed.

When preparing their reports, the candidate and main supervisor shall go through the project description and consider the need for adjustments. Any material changes to the project description must be approved by the programme committee.

The NMH may request additional reporting if required.

10-2 Midterm evaluation

A midterm evaluation of the PhD work should normally take place in the third or fourth semester. The programme committee shall stipulate further guidelines for the midterm evaluation.

If the midterm evaluation uncovers significant weaknesses in the PhD work, measures to rectify the situation must be implemented.

11 Requirements for the artistic PhD portfolio

11-1 Requirements for the artistic PhD portfolio

The PhD portfolio shall comprise an artistic output as well as material documenting artistic reflection. The artistic output shall be an independent work that meets international standards in respect of excellence and ethical principles in the field.

The PhD portfolio shall be of such quality that it can make a contribution towards developing new knowledge, insight and experience in the field in question.

The artistic output may comprise one or more parts or a collection of works forming a whole. If the artistic output consists of multiple smaller works, the candidate must give an account of the correlation between them.

In principle, only works produced after admission to the PhD programme should be included, but in exceptional cases previous works may be used if their inclusion was a prerequisite in the project description.

The artistic output shall be an artistic work of a high standard in terms of originality, expression, coherence and presentation. The artistic output shall be presented in public, cf. Section 18.

The artistic reflection shall be documented in the form of submitted material, especially in relation to

- processes concerning artistic choices and turning points, the use of theory and methodology, dialogue with various networks and professional communities etc.
- description of the candidate's artistic position and work in relation to the field in question – both nationally and internationally
- contributions to professional development in the field, including any innovations.

The candidate is free to choose the medium and form for the reflective component and for any other documentation.

The programme committee shall decide which languages should be used for reflection and documentation.

The artistic PhD portfolio shall be documented in a permanent format.

11-2 Collaborative work

The programme committee shall decide whether an artistic PhD portfolio produced by several people in collaboration may be submitted for assessment if the individual contributions can be identified.

For works created by several collaborators, the candidate must observe the generally accepted principles on crediting co-collaborators in the academic sector in question, in line with international standards.

In the case of PhD portfolios containing contributions from multiple collaborators, a signed statement describing the candidate's contribution to each work must be submitted. Both the

candidate and all contributors must sign.

11-3 Inadmissible works

Works or parts of a work that have been submitted as a basis for a previously completed examination or degree will not be accepted for assessment unless they constitute a minor part of the PhD portfolio. Data, analyses or methodologies from past degrees may still be used as a basis for work carried out on the project.

The use of published works older than five (5) years at the time of admission is not accepted. The programme committee may dispense with this requirement if extraordinary circumstances so dictate, cf. 11-1.

The artistic PhD portfolio may only be assessed by one educational institution, cf. 13-2.

12 Obligation to report on results with commercial potential

The rights of collaborating institutions must be regulated by a written agreement.

The NMH's prevailing regulations shall determine how candidates employed by the NMH should report results with commercial potential produced during the period of employment.

In the case of candidates with an external employer, an equivalent obligation to report shall be stipulated in the contract between the NMH, the candidate and the external employer.

For candidates with no employer, an equivalent obligation to report shall be stipulated in the admissions contract between the NMH and the candidate.

PART IV COMPLETION

13 Application for final assessment

13-1 Basis for assessment

The criteria for awarding the artistic doctorate are described in Section 3-2.

An assessment will be carried out following submission of an application to have the artistic PhD portfolio assessed, cf. 13-2.

It is the main supervisor's responsibility to notify the responsible NMH unit that an application for assessment is imminent, in order that the necessary preparations can be made.

The main supervisor should normally recommend the application.

13-2 Application for assessment of the artistic PhD portfolio

The following must be attached to the application:

- An account of what will form the basis for the assessment, including a plan for where, when and how the artistic output will be presented in public.
- An account of the choice of medium, language and format for the reflective component and the date of submission, cf. 15-1.
- An account of how the mandatory component has been or will be completed and of any other academic study or qualifications.
- Proof of required permissions, cf. 6-1.
- Plan for approved documentation and filing in a permanent format of the entire PhD portfolio.
- Statement from collaborators where required, cf. 11-2.
- Declaration stating whether the work is being submitted for assessment for the first or second time.
- Declaration stating that the work has not been submitted for assessment at another institution.

The application should be made to the NMH no later than five (5) months before the planned presentation of the artistic output.

13-3 Processing of the application

The programme committee shall consider the application to have the artistic PhD portfolio assessed. Applications that do not meet the criteria set out in Section 13-2 must be rejected. The NMH may reject applications to have a PhD portfolio assessed if it is evident that it is not of a satisfactory quality and will be failed by an assessment committee.

14 Appointment of assessment committee

Once the programme committee has approved the application to have the artistic PhD portfolio assessed, the R&D committee, acting on the programme committee's recommendation, shall appoint an assessment committee comprising at least three members to assess the PhD portfolio and viva voce. The impartiality rules set out in Chapter 6 of the Public Administration Act apply to the members of the assessment committee.

The assessment committee shall normally be composed in such a way that

- both genders are represented
- the majority of the assessment committee are external members, and at least one of its members is not affiliated to the NMH
- at least one member has its principal employment at a relevant overseas institution
- all members hold doctorates or equivalent qualifications in the subject area, and at least two members have relevant artistic qualifications at associate professor level

The NMH shall also appoint a co-ordinator/secretary for the committee.

Justification must be given if the criteria are to be disregarded.

The R&D committee is to establish a procedure for appointing members. The proposed composition of the committee shall be justified and demonstrate how the committee as a whole covers the fields addressed in the PhD work. The R&D committee shall appoint a chair from the committee's members or in addition to the committee's members.

The appointed supervisors and others who have contributed to the PhD work may not serve in the assessment committee or administer it.

When required, the R&D committee may appoint a substitute member to the assessment committee.

The candidate shall be informed of the proposed composition of the committee and may submit written comments no later than one week after the proposal has been made known to the candidate.

15 The work of the assessment committee

15-1 Assessing the artistic PhD portfolio

The assessment committee shall be issued with a copy of these regulations, the approved project description and any guidelines on the assessment of the doctorate. The assessment committee shall also be given an account of what will form the basis for the assessment, including a plan for where, when and how the artistic output will be presented in public, cf. 13-2, and in which format the reflective component will be submitted.

Before the assessment committee commences work, the NMH shall meet with the committee and review the objective and profile of the PhD programme as well as the assessment committee's responsibilities and duties.

If the public presentation of the artistic output is made in the form of a concert, exhibition, performance or other time-specific and location-specific presentation, all members of the assessment committee should normally be present.

The candidate has two options for submitting material documenting artistic reflection:

- If the candidate wants the committee to peruse the reflective component before the presentation of the artistic output, the committee must have received this material no later than four (4) weeks before the presentation.
- If the candidate wishes to complete the reflective component after the public presentation of the artistic output, this material must be made available to the committee no later than two (2) months after the presentation.

15-2 Elaboration on material demonstrating reflection on the work

On the basis of the submitted project, the assessment committee may advise the NMH to permit limited further elaboration to be given on the material demonstrating reflection before making its final recommendation. The committee shall prepare a written summary of exactly what it wants the candidate to elaborate on.

If the NMH permits a limited elaboration to be given, it must also set a deadline of no more than three (3) months for such elaboration to be given. The option to request an elaboration on the material demonstrating reflection may only be exercised once. A new deadline must also be set for the committee to submit its final recommendation. The NMH's decision under this provision may not be appealed by the candidate.

15 The assessment committee's recommendation

The assessment committee shall submit a justified recommendation on whether the PhD portfolio is worthy of being defended for the PhD degree. All parts of the submitted or presented documentation must be described according to the criteria in Section 11-1. The recommendation should be discursive in style and end with a clear conclusion as to whether or not the portfolio should be approved. Any dissent or individual statements shall be included in the recommendation, and they must be justified.

The assessment committee's recommendation should be addressed to the NMH.

The committee's recommendation must be ready no later than three (3) months after the committee has received all parts of the PhD portfolio for assessment.

The committee's recommendation should be submitted to the NMH, which will present it to the candidate. The candidate shall be given a period of ten (10) working days to submit written comments to the recommendation. If the candidate does not wish to submit any comments, the NMH must be notified as soon as possible.

Any comments made by the candidate should be submitted to the NMH. The NMH shall make a final decision on the matter, cf. Section 16.

15-4 Correcting errata

A submitted or presented artistic PhD portfolio may not be amended or withdrawn until a final decision has been made as to whether or not it is worthy of being defended.

However, the candidate may seek permission, even after submission or presentation, to rectify errata, but only in the reflective component. The application must be accompanied by a complete corrigendum of the errata that should be rectified. An application to correct errata must be submitted no later than four (4) weeks before the committee's deadline for submitting its recommendation, and it may only be done once.

16 Institutional procedures related to the assessment committee's recommendation

On the basis of the assessment committee's recommendation, the NMH will determine whether the artistic PhD portfolio is worthy of being defended.

Unanimous decision

If the assessment committee's recommendation is *unanimous* and the programme committee bases its deliberations on this recommendation, the programme committee shall make its decision in keeping with the unanimous recommendation.

If the programme committee finds that there are justified doubts as to whether the assessment committee's unanimous recommendation should be heeded, the programme committee shall put the matter to the R&D committee, which may make a decision in keeping with the

assessment committee's recommendation or seek further clarification from the assessment committee and, if appropriate, appoint two new experts to make individual statements on the PhD portfolio. Such additional statements or individual statements shall be put to the candidate, who will be able to submit their comments. The R&D committee shall make a decision on the matter based on the recommendation and the statements that have been obtained.

Split decision

If the assessment committee's recommendation is *not unanimous* and the programme committee chooses to base its deliberations on the views of the majority, the programme committee shall make its decision in keeping with the majority's recommendation. If the assessment committee's recommendation is not unanimous and the programme committee is considering heeding the view of the minority when making its decision, the programme committee shall put the matter to the R&D committee, which may make a decision in keeping with the majority view or seek further clarification from the assessment committee and, if appropriate, appoint two new experts to make individual statements.

Such additional statements or individual statements shall be put to the candidate, who will be able to submit their observations. If both of the new experts concur with the majority in the original recommendation, that recommendation shall be upheld.

The candidate shall be informed of the outcome following the evaluation of the statements made by the new experts.

17 Application for reassessment

An artistic PhD portfolio which has not been found worthy of being defended may be reassessed in reworked form no earlier than six (6) months after the NMH has made its decision. Reassessment may only take place once.

The deadline for making an application for reassessment is two (2) years after the NMH first decided not to approve the portfolio.

In the event of a new application for assessment, the candidate must state that the work has previously been assessed and not found worthy of being defended, cf. 13-2.

If the resubmission is made to a different institution, a new application procedure must be completed, cf. 6-3.

18 Publication

18-1 Publication requirements

The artistic PhD portfolio shall be made public.

The candidate must publish a brief written summary or presentation of the PhD portfolio in English and Norwegian, alternatively also in another language if this language has been used in all or parts of the work. The presentation shall be published.

18-2 Accessibility

The artistic output shall be given a public presentation. The reflective component and any other material that forms part of the assessment shall be made public no later than two (2) weeks before the public defence. The material shall be made accessible in the format in which it was submitted for assessment, cf. 15-1.

The artistic output and the reflective component shall be archived in a permanent format.

Restrictions may not be placed on the publication of the artistic PhD portfolio with the exception of a previously agreed deferral of the publication date. Such deferral may take place to allow the NMH or any external party that has funded the PhD partially or in full to make decisions on patenting etc. The external party may not demand that all or parts of the PhD portfolio be made exempt from publication, cf. 6.

The candidate shall observe the applicable guidelines on the crediting of institutions when publishing or releasing the work. As a general rule, the institution should be credited if it has provided a necessary and significant contribution to or basis for the published work. Other

institutions should be listed if they satisfy the criterion for contributors.

19 Public defence (viva voce)

A public defence of the artistic PhD portfolio shall take place no later than two (2) months after the programme committee has deemed the work worthy of being defended.

The time and location of the public defence shall be announced no later than ten (10) working days before it is due to take place.

The assessment committee that originally assessed the PhD portfolio shall also assess the public defence. The public defence shall be conducted in English or Norwegian unless the programme committee agrees to another language being used.

There should normally be two opponents. The two opponents shall be members of the assessment committee and appointed by the R&D committee.

The viva voce shall be chaired by the principal or by a person authorised by the principal. The person chairing the viva voce shall give an account of the submission and assessment of the PhD portfolio. Next the doctoral candidate shall give an account of the objective and outcome of the PhD work. The first opponent opens the opposition, and the second opponent closes it. The NMH may stipulate a different distribution of tasks between the opponents and between the doctoral candidate and the first opponent. Once both opponents have concluded their opposition, the other persons present shall be permitted to speak *ex auditorio*. One of the opponents concludes the opposition, and the chair concludes the viva voce.

The assessment committee shall make a recommendation to the NMH in which it describes its evaluation of the defence of the PhD portfolio. The recommendation shall conclude by stating whether the viva voce should be passed or failed. The recommendation must state the reason if the viva voce is deemed a fail.

20 Approving the public defence

The programme committee shall make a decision on approving the viva voce based on the assessment committee's recommendation.

If the NMH decides not to approve the viva voce, the candidate shall be given one opportunity to defend the PhD portfolio again. A new viva voce may be held six (6) months later at the earliest and shall be assessed by the same assessment committee if possible.

21 Conferral and diploma

21-1 Conferral

Upon approval of the mandatory component and all parts of the PhD portfolio, the degree of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) in Artistic Research shall be conferred on the candidate.

21-2 Diploma

A diploma shall be issued containing information about the academic training the candidate has participated in and which subject area the PhD work relates to.

22 Diploma supplement

A supplement to the diploma shall also be issued in line with prevailing guidelines on diploma supplements.

PART V JOINT DEGREES AND COTUTELLE AGREEMENTS

23 Joint degrees and cotutelle agreements

23-1 Joint degrees and cotutelle agreements

The NMH may enter into agreements with one or more Norwegian or foreign institutions on collaborating on joint degrees or cotutelle agreements.

Agreements on joint degrees and cotutelle agreements may make exceptions for provisions contained in these regulations if required in light of the regulations of the collaborating institutions. Any such exceptions must be fully justifiable, both singly and jointly.

23-2 Joint degrees

A joint degree is a collaboration between multiple institutions in which all parties bear joint responsibility for admission, award of the degree and other matters described in these regulations. The collaboration is normally organised as a consortium and is regulated by an agreement between the consortium members. For completed joint degrees, a joint diploma will be issued, in the form of a) a diploma issued by all consortium members, b) a diploma issued by each of the consortium members, or a combination of a) and b).

Joint degree agreements shall normally only be entered into if an established, stable academic collaboration between the NMH and at least one of the consortium members already exists.

23-3 Cotutelle agreements

A cotutelle agreement involves joint supervision of candidates and collaboration on the training of candidates. Cotutelle agreements are entered into for each candidate and should be based on a stable academic and institutional partnership.

23-4 Requirements for joint degrees and cotutelle programmes

The admission criteria, the requirement for the PhD portfolio to be made available to the public, and the requirement for giving a public viva voce in front of an impartial assessment committee cannot be waived.

PART VI APPEALS, TRANSFER RULES AND ENTRY INTO FORCE

24 Appeals

24-1 Appeal against rejection of application for admission, appeal against decision to terminate a student's admission rights, appeal against rejection of application for approval of parts of the mandatory component

Rejections of an application for admission, decisions to terminate a student's admission rights and rejections of an application for the approval of parts of the mandatory component may be appealed pursuant to the provisions of the Public Administration Act Sections 28 et seq. NMH appeals committee is the appellate body.

24-2 Appeal against an examination in the mandatory component

Examinations taken as part of the mandatory component may be appealed pursuant to the Universities and University Colleges Act Section 5-3 "Complaints regarding marks awarded" and Section 5-2 "Complaints against procedural errors in connection with examinations".

24-3 Appeal against rejection of application for assessment, failed PhD work or defence

Rejections of applications to have the PhD portfolio assessed and decisions on failed PhD portfolios or defences may be appealed pursuant to the provisions of the Public Administration Act Section 28 et seq.

The NMH appeals committee is the appellate body, cf. Section 4-13 (4) of the Universities and University Colleges Act. If the R&D committee deems it necessary, it may appoint individuals or a panel to evaluate the assessment that has been made and the criteria on which it was based or to perform a new or supplementary expert evaluation.

25 Transfer rules

Candidates admitted to the Artistic Research Fellowships Programme may apply to the NMH to

be considered for admission to the PhD programme.

26 Entry into force

These regulations shall enter into force on 1 February 2018.