

PROCEDURE FOR FINAL APPRAISALS

This Procedure was endorsed by the Steering Committee on 8 September 2008.

The procedure will form the basis for procedures for – and final appraisal of - candidates in the National Norwegian Artistic Research Fellowships Programme. It has seven main parts:

- Registration procedure;
- The material to be made available for appraisal;
- Appointment of the appraisal committee;
- The appraisal committee's work and recommendation;
- Reference to the appeal provisions of the programme;
- Consideration of the recommendation;
- Issuing of diplomas.

In addition, a standard template has been drawn up for the conducting of oral reviews – the Viva Voce.

By and large the procedure shall provide a sufficient basis for carrying out a final appraisal, and the reproduction of provisions in the regulations is in accordance with the endorsed revised version of the same date. It will nonetheless be expedient if the appraisal committee and other bodies considering candidates have familiarised themselves with the actual regulations for the programme. All references to paragraphs (§) refer to the provisions in the regulations, while the chapter references refer to this procedure.

1. REGISTRATION

1.1. FINAL DATE FOR REGISTRATION

Applications for presentation for appraisal shall be addressed to the Steering Committee no later than six months before the appraisal is scheduled to take place.

1.2. PRECONDITIONS FOR REGISTRATION

§ 6 of the regulations stipulate requirements that have direct bearing on whether a candidate can be accepted for final appraisal:

- During the programme period the candidate shall present and have his/her project work discussed at project seminars.
- As part of the compulsory programme, the research fellow shall hold seminars or teach/ lecture on topics related to his/her own project, thereby gaining training in academic communication.
- Everyone who is admitted to the programme must complete the compulsory part. Documentation is required that the research fellow has acquired the necessary specialist knowledge.

It is the Steering Committee itself which will consider whether these requirements are satisfied, and the Steering Committee shall only accept the registration of candidates who satisfy these requirements, cf. sub-chapter 1.3 on how candidates are to register for final appraisal. Registered active participation in at least 80 per cent of the programme is a requirement for completion of the compulsory common programme.

1.3. CONTENT OF APPLICATIONS AND APPENDICES

Applications shall contain:

- A project summary of one to two pages, enhancing the project's artistic focus and main issues, how the final results are planned to be publicly presented, references to relevant discursive fields and in which ways this project contributes to new artistic developments;
- An account of what is to form the basis for the appraisal pursuant to Chapter 2.1 - 2.4;
- An account of how the compulsory parts of the programme have been completed;
- A proposal for where and in what way the final artistic result is to be publicly presented;
- A proposal for the date of the appraisal (public presentation of the final artistic result, completion of the documentation material, and the viva voce).

A written recommendation from the main supervisor shall be enclosed with the application.

A statement from the institution concerning the following shall be enclosed with the application:

- A brief assessment by the institution of whether the candidate will be ready for appraisal on the stipulated date;
- Whether the institution endorses the proposal for public presentation of the artistic result, and what has been done to facilitate it;
- A reasoned proposal of candidates for an appraisal committee (including CVs for the proposed experts) stating whether the experts will be available on the date in question.

On the basis of the application, the Steering Committee shall decide whether and when an appraisal will take place, with respect to both the public presentation of the final result and the date for the viva voce.

2. BASIS FOR THE FINAL APPRAISAL

2.1. MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE APPRAISAL

Pursuant to § 7 of the regulations, completion of the programme shall be approved on the basis of the following:

- a) The artistic result;
- b) Critical reflection;
- c) Documentation of possible professional innovation
- d) *The Viva Voce* - An oral review of the project by the candidate and the appraisal committee.

The basis of the appraisal shall be taken in the revised project description and – if applicable - later adjustments endorsed by the Steering Committee.

§ 5 of the regulations stipulate what is to be documented under the different items. See also Chapter 2.2 – 2.4 of these procedures.

2.2. THE ARTISTIC PROJECT/WORK OF ART

The artistic project must be an independent work of art at a high international level with respect to originality, expression, consistency, relevance, presentation and communication. The work shall contribute to the development of new insight, knowledge and/or experience. The work of art must be a free-standing piece of work, or consist of several parts, or be a collection of pieces that together make up a whole. Normally, only work produced during the programme period will be included, but an exception may be made to allow inclusion in the documentation of work produced before admission if this was an assumption in the project description.

Part of a joint work of art – or the artistic part of a joint work that is a combination of artistic and scientific work – may be accepted for appraisal provided that it represents an independent contribution that can be identified to the extent necessary for appraisal. In such cases, declarations must be obtained from the other contributors and others who have followed the work to enable the research fellow's contribution to be identified.

The work of art shall be presented in public as part of the final appraisal of the research fellow. If the project is presented in public in the form of concert(s), exhibition(s), performance(s) or similar presentation(s) of a non-permanent nature, documentation of a permanent nature must be produced, such as audio/ video recordings, photographic documentation, instructions for reconstruction (for instance of exhibitions) etc. One copy shall be made available to the programme committee.

2.3. CRITICAL REFLECTION

In addition to the artistic result of the work, the research fellow must describe:

- Personal artistic position/work in relation to chosen subject area nationally and internationally;
- How the project contributes to professional development of the subject area;
- Critical reflection on the process (artistic choices and turning points, theory applied, dialogue with various networks and the professional environment etc.);
- Critical reflection on results (self-evaluation in perspective of the revised project description).

The results of the critical reflection shall be available to the public and must be of a permanent nature. The candidate freely chooses medium and form. One copy shall be made available to the programme committee.

2.4. OTHER DOCUMENTATION

The candidate is also required to submit documentation of possible artistic innovations within technologies, work process, methodology, material skills etc. and make these findings available to others.

Documentation of possible professional innovation must be of a permanent nature and available to the public. The candidate chooses medium and form. One copy shall be made available to the programme committee.

2.5. VIVA VOCE

The Viva Voce is a public event and the institution will advertise the event to relevant professional environments and in appropriate form.

The Viva Voce normally takes place a minimum of four weeks after the public presentation of the artistic result. The Viva Voce shall be based on all the presented material according to Chapters 2.2 – 2.4. This material must be submitted no later than two months after the public presentation and the Viva Voce shall be conducted within a timeframe of four to eight weeks after submission. It is possible to apply for exemption from these deadlines, but all material for evaluation, as required in Chapters 2.2 – 2.4, must be made available no later than four weeks in advance of the Viva Voce, and the Viva Voce should take place no earlier than three days after the presentation.

The Viva Voce can, however, not be conducted before the committee's interim recommendation about the artistic quality, according to Chapter 4.2, is available. Nor can the Viva Voce proceed according to plan if the committee requires additional documentation according to Chapter 4.4.

The Viva Voce will not be conducted if the committee finds the public presentation and submitted material insufficient to comply with the requirements for Approved, as stated in Chapter 4.4.

2.6. TRANSLATION

It is the institution's responsibility to ensure that relevant parts of the material - if necessary for appraisal purposes - are available in English. Application can be made to the Steering Committee for partial coverage of such translation costs.

3. THE APPRAISAL COMMITTEE

3.1. APPOINTMENT OF AN APPRAISAL COMMITTEE

The institution shall appoint an expert appraisal committee for the final appraisal, cf. § 8 of the regulations, in consultation with the programme committee. Members of the appraisal committee must be approved by the Steering Committee before they can be appointed. The institution is responsible for entering into employment contracts with the members.

The appraisal committee shall consist of at least three members. No more than one of the committee members may be in employment by the institution at which the research fellow is employed. One of the committee members should, if possible, be from a relevant foreign artistic institution. If possible, both genders should be represented. Members must as a minimum have qualifications corresponding to associate professor level, or equivalent.

The rules in §§ 6 ff of the Public Administration Act concerning impartiality apply to committee members, cf. § 10 of the Act. Neither a member of the programme committee nor the candidate's tutors may be a member of the appraisal committee.

The research fellow shall be informed of the composition of the appraisal committee.

3.2. CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE AND THE COORDINATOR/ SECRETARY

The institution shall appoint one of the members as chair of the committee. The institution shall also appoint an employee of the institution as coordinator/ secretary for the committee's work.

4. THE COMMITTEE'S WORK AND RECOMMENDATION

4.1. THE BASIS FOR THE APPRAISAL

The basis for the final appraisal is apparent from the objective for the whole programme as formulated in section 1 of the regulations:

The national Programme for Research Fellowships in the Arts shall qualify participants for work in the arts and for other work in the community that requires a high degree of artistic competence and insight. The objective of the programme shall be to produce an independent work of art at a high international level. The research fellow shall also study theory and method in depth in order to acquire greater depth and breadth of knowledge in his/her own field, while at the same time putting the discipline in a broader context.

4.2. COMMITTEE MEETING FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC PRESENTATION/INTERIM RECOMMENDATION

The full committee shall meet with the secretary immediately after (in prolongation of) the public presentation of the artistic result to evaluate its artistic quality, cf. § 5.1 of the regulations. The committee makes its interim recommendation that the candidate be permitted to proceed or not on the basis of the presentation's artistic quality against the established criteria for evaluation of the artistic project as regulated in Chapter 4.3.1, compared with the candidate's revised project description. On this basis the committee *may* come to the conclusion that the project is *Not Approved*, and that the process shall not proceed. Such decision must be unanimous.

This recommendation must be available no later than six days after the public presentation. If the committee finds the candidate *Not Approved* according to the paragraph above, the following provisions relating to procedures for considering the committee's recommendation, apply correspondingly here.

4.3. THE APPRAISAL COMMITTEE'S FURTHER PROCEEDINGS

The appraisal committee shall jointly make a recommendation on the basis of the final appraisal pursuant to Chapter 2.1 – 2.5 of the regulations after the Viva Voce has been carried out. The recommendation shall contain a discussion of each of the four elements of the basis for appraisal in accordance with the guidelines described in each of the following sub-chapters compared with the revised project description and including subsequent endorsed adjustments approved by the programme committee.

The recommendation itself should be discursive in form, ending with a clear conclusion as to whether the project should or should not be approved.

The committee shall normally not be in professional contact with the candidate before the Viva Voce, but under special circumstances the tutor may be requested to meet in front of the committee to elaborate on her/his counselling and explain work with the project.

4.3.1. The artistic project/work

The appraisal committee shall – on the basis of the revised project description – *make special mention of* the artistic project as it is presented to the committee in the public presentation and other documentation.

The committee shall *evaluate* whether the project has resulted in an independent work of art of high international level with respect to:

- Originality;
- Expression;
- Consistency;
- Relevance;
- Presentation and communication;
- How this project contributes to professional development of the subject area.

The committee shall *evaluate* whether the work contributes to the development of new insight, knowledge and/or experience.

4.3.2. Critical reflection

The committee shall *revise* chosen medium and form and *evaluate* whether the reflection has found its relevant application in relation to the artistic project. The committee shall *evaluate* how the candidate has addressed the demand for critical reflection according to Chapter 2.3, including how the candidate approaches relevant professional discourse and whether the candidate contributes to critical reflection in the subject area.

4.3.3. Other documentation

If the project also demonstrates professional innovation as described in Chapter 2.4, the committee shall revise the chosen medium and format and evaluate whether documentation has proper form according to the innovation.

The committee shall also evaluate how well versed the candidate is in this area, how significant these innovations are to the profession, whether documentation is presented adequately and is accessible for others.

4.3.4. The Viva Voce

The committee shall, as stated in Chapter 2.5, *evaluate* whether the Viva Voce supports the results from the other parts of the appraisal.

A standard for the Viva Voce has been prepared as an appendix to this procedure.

4.4. THE COMMITTEE'S CONCLUSION AND FINAL RECOMMENDATION

The committee's conclusion whether the public presentation and submitted material satisfies the requirements for *Approved* must be available before the Viva Voce can be conducted. For the purpose of clarification or elaboration the committee may request additional information from the candidate. Until such information is presented the Viva Voce may not be conducted.

If the requirements for *Approved* have not been satisfied, the committee shall inform the institution. In this case the Viva Voce may not be conducted.

The appraisal committee makes its final conclusion as to whether the project on a whole satisfies the requirements for *Approved* or *Not Approved* in an immediate session following the conclusion of the Viva Voce. Subsequently the candidate and the institution will be notified of the result.

Generally the committee delivers a justified recommendation within a month following the Viva Voce, or after further evaluation has been stopped. The committee's recommendation shall conclude whether the project as a whole is *Approved* or *Not Approved*.

Dissent on the recommendation must be justified. Individual comments or dissent from committee members must be included together with the recommendation.

The appraisal committee shall address their recommendation to the institution.

5. CONSIDERATION OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The institution shall send the appraisal committee's recommendation to the candidate as soon as possible. The candidate should be given at least one week to submit any written comments on the recommendation.

If the candidate's comments can have a bearing on the question of whether or not the project can be approved, the comments should be presented to the appraisal committee before the case is sent to the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee shall – on the basis of the appraisal committee's final recommendation – make a recommendation to the institution with respect to the approval or non-approval of the project. The Steering Committee can request the appraisal committee to elaborate on its appraisal before making its recommendation or, if applicable, require that a new appraisal committee be appointed.

The institution makes the final decision concerning approval. A decision on approval may not be made that is not in accordance with the Steering Committee's recommendation. The candidate and the Steering Committee shall be informed about the institution's decision as soon as possible.

In the case of non-approval of a project, the candidate can apply to present him/herself for a new appraisal six months at the earliest after the final decision was made not to approve the project. Only one new appraisal is permitted, and the final deadline for submitting application for renewed appraisal is 2 years after the final decision of non-approval was first taken.

6. APPEALS

The Ministry has established a separate procedure for which decisions are eligible for appeals as well as the appropriate body to appeal to.

7. DIPLOMA

If the appraisal committee has recommended approval of the project and the Steering Committee has made a corresponding recommendation, the institution shall issue a certificate of approval, which will be called a diploma. The institution draws up and signs the diploma. The diploma's main page should state that the National Norwegian Artistic Research Fellowships Programme is comparable to a PhD and that the candidate's work is at the highest level of formal education within artistic research in Norway.

The diploma shall have an addendum referred to on the diploma's front page. The addendum shall confirm that the candidate's work has been approved pursuant to the research fellowship programme. The additional section shall be in Norwegian and English and be signed by the chair of the Steering Committee and secretary.

THE NATIONAL NORWEGIAN ARTISTIC RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS PROGRAMME

A separate supplement shall contain a brief description of the programme in English. The supplement shall state that by a successful appraisal, the candidate qualifies as Associate Professor at University/ University College level.

In terms of graphic design, the diploma shall be adapted to the profile of the individual institution. The Steering Committee shall draft the text on the diploma and the additional section, which must be finally approved by the Ministry.

Bergen, 08 September 2008.

Siri Meyer (s.)
Steering Committee Chair

Johan A. Haarberg
Director General

STANDARD PROCEDURE FOR ORAL REVIEWS

The Viva Voce is a public event and shall be properly announced to relevant academic milieus by the institution locally and nationally well in advance of the event. The institution should also produce an invitation for this occasion.

The institution hosts the event and appoints a representative from the institution to chair the event. The event shall take place in dignified form. Its duration should not exceed 2 – 2½ hours.

The Viva Voce commences with a presentation of the project. The presentation is either given by the candidate him/herself or by a member of the appraisal committee. The presentation should not exceed 45 minutes. If a member of the appraisal committee gives the presentation, the candidate shall be given an opportunity to voice comments immediately following the presentation.

After a break, a discussion between the candidate and appraisal committee ensues regarding the project, artistic result and other documentation presented. The chair of the appraisal committee is responsible for carrying this discussion through.

Once the discussion has been concluded, there will be opportunity for questions from the floor. This should not exceed 15 minutes.

The chair of the event shall bring the event to a close by stating that the project is deemed to have been adequately elucidated and that the appraisal committee's final conclusion will be drawn by the committee members in a session immediately following the Viva Voce. The candidate and institution will be notified of the committee's conclusion as soon as it has been reached.

The appraisal committee then leaves for consultations to make their final conclusion as to whether the project is *Approved* or *Not Approved*. Their conclusion will be announced to the candidate and institution, *if possible* while the audience is still in the auditorium.

If the conclusion can be announced with the audience still in the auditorium the chair of the event facilitates that the chair of the appraisal committee may announce the conclusion in the appropriate dignified form.

Bergen, 08 September 2008.

Johan A. Haarberg
Director General