

Guidelines for the assessment for the PhD in Artistic Research at Faculty of Fine Art, Music and Design, University of Bergen

The committee's mandate

The evaluation committee's mandate is to assess the artistic PhD result, comprising an artistic result as well as material that communicates the artistic reflection, and issue a written reasoned recommendation to the faculty whether they find the artistic PhD result worthy of being defended for the PhD in Artistic Research at the University of Bergen. If the artistic PhD result is worthy of being defended in a public defence, the committee must evaluate and approve the public defence before the doctoral candidate is awarded the PhD degree. These guidelines concern the assessment of the artistic PhD result.

Note that there should be no contact between the committee members and the candidate/supervisors during the assessment period. All queries should be directed to the faculty's contact.

The duties of the chairperson

The chairperson of the committee:

- serves as a full member of the committee
- coordinates the committee evaluation process and ensures that progress is made, and deadlines met
- coordinates the compilation of the committee's report and distributes tasks among the committee members in connection with the public defence.
- serves as a link between the committee and the faculty

The committee's report

All components of the submitted or presented material should be discussed based on the requirements for the artistic PhD result, as defined in the [Regulations for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor \(PhD\) in Artistic Research at the University of Bergen](#), [section 10-1](#) and [section 10-2](#).

The committee should give special consideration to whether the artistic result is an artistic work at a high level in terms of originality, expression, coherence, and dissemination and meets international standards in terms of level and ethical requirements within the subject area. Note that the terms originality, expression, coherence, and dissemination must be used specifically in the report. If the artistic result consists of several smaller works, the committee should normally make mention of each work in the report.

The committee should further assess whether the artistic reflection responds sufficiently to the requirements in [section 10-1](#).

The assessment committee assesses the artistic PhD result as either pass or fail. The recommendation should be in a discursive form, weighing the strengths and weaknesses of the artistic PhD result, and end with a clear conclusion as to whether to accept the result. [The artistic PhD result recommended for public defence can have weaknesses, but these weaknesses are of such a nature that they can be defended in an oral defence.](#)

Any dissent or individual statements should be included in the assessment, and they should be justified. The assessment committee's recommendations are addressed to the faculty.

The committee's recommendation shall be made at the latest within three (3) months after the committee has received all components of the PhD result for assessment.