

# External review of study courses and programmes at University of Gothenburg

Panel statement for doctoral education in Performance Practices, Crafts and Artistic Practice at the Artistic Faculty of University of Gothenburg

*June 12<sup>th</sup> 2024*

## Introduction

The panel has consisted of:

- Professor Catherine Dormor, University of Westminster, Professor of Textiles and Feminisms (chair)
- Gregor Retteneger, (student representative)
- Tünde Mariann Varga, Associate Professor, Art Theory and Curatorial Studies Department, The Hungarian University of Fine Arts
- Leena Rouhiainen, Head of Research Institute, Professor in Artistic Research, University of the Arts Helsinki

The role of panel is to review and benchmark the doctoral education provision in Performance Practices, Crafts and Artistic Practice at the Artistic Faculty. We have based our feedback and comments on the University's criteria and our expert knowledge of doctoral programmes internationally. Throughout we have been careful to work in accordance with the University Policy for Quality Assurance and Continuous Quality Improvement.

The review took the form of the following:

- Document Portfolio – see Appendix 1 (received 6<sup>th</sup> March 2024)
- Online Preparatory Meeting with Anna Frisk and Professor Mick Wilson (3<sup>rd</sup> April 2024)
- Online Pre-Meeting of Panel
- Site Visit – see Appendix 2 (11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> April 2024)
- Online Post-Visit Meetings of Panel (22 May, 3 June 2024)

Process: ahead of the site visit all panel members reviewed the documentation and created a series of questions. Each panel member took the lead on a particular area of doctoral provision. The panel worked to ensure questions were framed in a robust, but supportive manner to best establish how the doctoral provision was structured, delivered and monitored. The panel members have worked collectively to produce this document, which we intend as a useful and reflective document for the faculty.

## High Level Summary

### Strengths

The panel were impressed by a number of areas within the programme, which they felt the Faculty and University could meaningfully use as marketing and public profiling material. The students recruited were consistently high-quality researchers and very committed to the

programme and University; this seemed to align with the fact that they felt the feedback process was real and meaningful and functions beyond university policies.

The underlying course structure is a strength, most particularly in the way that it supports students; recent changes have allowed for greater flexibility, something that alumni commented on positively (even enviously). This flexibility offers a strong base for building a sense of community between researchers across the disciplines. Course content, specifically the Basic Course 3: Theoretical Course, was seen as a space where students engaged strongly.

The Percentage Seminars are a unique strength for the programme and offer a robust platform for supporting students to successful completion. These are further used to build students' confidence in presenting their research and training other students in critique and preparation for their own Seminars. The Seminars are supported by the Wednesday sessions at HDK-Valand and for performance practices at the Academy of Music and Drama joint seminars with the doctoral education in musical performance and interpretation where students come together as a community and build towards the Seminars. Visiting PhD students bring a range of broader dialogues, supporting the programme, faculty and students to have a broad view of the role of, and context for, artistic research.

There was a strong sense of community, which is supported by the many groups and projects that students can join, the ways in which supervisory teams are arranged and good opportunities to work beyond the students' own disciplines and approaches. This all means that students are well prepared for post-doctoral working contexts both within and beyond academic settings.

Graduating students were noted for the leading roles they have taken up, meaning that the University and Faculty have a leadership role within the sector and continue to deliver to best practice. The panel noted how much had been developed since the last review and commended the faculty on this.

Students found the opportunities to teach work extremely well. Teaching supports them to develop their own research into student-facing content as well as developing their pedagogical skills. This was particularly important for those new to teaching. Where doctoral students were teaching into compulsory units, this supported them to build a sense of community with the teaching faculty.

Although the panel saw excellence across all disciplines within this review, it was noted that the Craft Programme was a particular feature due to its rarity in the sector. This has built a strong sense of community within and beyond the University. The focus on craft's role within society rather than just skill development was noted for its capacity to deliver social and cultural impact. This was seen as a progressive approach within the field.

The Doctoral Administrator, Anna Frisk, was highlighted by Faculty, students, alumni and the review panel as a huge strength to the programme. She is an important lynchpin and source of knowledge.

### **Areas for Development**

There were a few areas where development is important to schedule as a priority to ensure students are best prepared for successful completion of their doctoral degrees.

All students should engage with research ethics policies and procedures. It was noted that until recently it was understood that artistic research did not fall under the research ethics policies, but that this had now been reviewed and needed to be attended to. In some cases,

this might involve some retrospective review. The panel noted that there was a revised course content being delivered in June 2024 and they were encouraged that this will support students more effectively in making ethics applications. This should be reviewed after its first delivery and appropriate iterations made as an ongoing process. It is important that all faculty are trained in supporting students to complete the template.

The panel commended the faculty on the number of recent developments and enhancements to the programme, and now felt it was important that the Strategic Plan was strengthened to give a much firmer space to clearly articulate planning for recruitment strategies and research thematics for the next five years. This should also include a funding strategy that builds on the successes and thus takes a more strategic trajectory. This strategic work would enable a more clearly and fully articulated space for discussing how the research methodologies deployed within artistic research might speak to a broader audience and act as interventions within and beyond academic settings as well as the important societal impact of such research.

Some concern was shared regarding admissions processes and thematic identification and the panel recommend that faculty explore how they might take a more strategic approach to recruitment to support pipeline development and thus the research agendas of the University, working within the parameters of national legal frameworks where necessary.

An area that the panel spent some time exploring in all meetings was the number of syllabi being deployed. While it was acknowledged that work had already been carried out to reduce the number of syllabi, it was felt that these should be much further simplified and high level, alleviating the need for the multiplicity and potentially offering increased agility for contextual changes. The panel believe it is feasible to reduce to a single high-level syllabus as is common across their settings and those they work with.

The panel noted that while the teaching students undertake is positive and supports their ongoing career plans, for those unable to take up teaching due to disciplinary alignment or capacity within the faculty, there was a sense of lack of parity. The faculty might consider if there are other institutions or settings where these students might access some teaching experience.

The panel noted that the Basic Courses were a strength of the programme, but that these could now be more integrated into a shared framework to better establish their importance to students.

The panel were delighted to see well-designed and produced theses and encouraged the University to ensure these were made available and advertised so that they could reach a broader public. In addition, the panel encourage supervisors to support students to extend the range and form of theses, given University regulations allow for increased fluidity; they might want to review other university models to build a repository for students to reference.

### **Identified Risks**

The panel observed a number of risks that the University should be aware of, noting that these are areas where future-proofing actions should be considered.

Co-Tutelle projects are a strength within the programme. These are built into the strategic plan and the annual work plans, however, the additional time and effort required to set these up and administer them should be closely monitored and meaningfully directed. This should include a clear articulation of what benefits these bring to the University and students involved.

The panel noted that the number of Horizon bids in development is relatively high for a team of this size and wanted to signal the pressure this places on faculty members, as HDK-Valand has the strategic goal to generate one Marie Curie ITN bid per annum from 2024 to 2026. Additionally, although the faculty are leading on some projects within the sector that bring external attention and prestige to the University, care should be taken that this is balanced

against the needs of internal research development and doctoral supervision. This work should ensure it has succession and pipeline development built into all bids and external projects.

The current supervisory model appears to place heavy reliance on few faculty and it was noted that some of these are on fixed term contracts. This raises issues around continuity and succession planning.

Within the strategic plan it would be good to ensure that areas of specialisms are clearly articulated and how they are being supported to ensure a clear rationale for retaining their independence from more general artistic practice contexts.

## **1. Achieved study results match intended learning outcomes and the qualitative targets of the Higher Education Ordinance.**

Currently there are two types of syllabi for the doctoral programme: the general PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) and the artistic PhD (Doctor of the Arts). Within these two types there are still variations for the main subject areas. The panel notes that this is because in the past two distinct curricula were employed, but now a common syllabus has been developed for basic courses by the tutors. These include three fundamental courses which base student-researchers' knowledge, skills, and approach to meet third-cycle educational outcomes. The courses are Writing, Research Methodology, and Theory.

The common framework of *Artistic Practice establishes a dialogue between practical questions and theoretically based methods within the field*, aiming to proficiently educate research students and expand dialogue within and beyond these disciplinary contexts into broader societal impact. This structure allows for a simplified, more sustainable, and manageable format for the faculty, as well as acting as an umbrella structure for the divergent practices in artistic research fields at HDK-Valand. i.e. Craft, Design, Fine Art, Literary Composition, Photography. The panel felt this was a strength and one that should be considered at HSM to reduce the number of syllabi and create greater clarity for students.

The panel notes the following changes in the syllabi

### **a. Basic Courses:**

1. Basic Course 1. The writing course ("Writing Research/Research Writing" 7.5 HECs) has been devised so that doctoral students meet vital research skills as theory-in-practice based learning process. Such as editorial skills, practices of small publishers, co-editing journal issues.
2. Basic Course 2. The course on Methodology ("On research methods and research design" 7.5 HECs). The course gives examples of divergent methodologies from feminist to the indigenous focusing on practice through workshops.
3. Basic Course 3 "Theoretical Constructs in Artistic Research" the third fundamental course. The course focuses on theoretical construct in artistic research (AR), focused around students' research interests and is a deeper dive into the particular research interest of the participants through a thorough analysis of their work as case studies.
4. Basic Course 4 "Operating and communicating in a cross-disciplinary research milieu", 7.5 HECs) is the fourth fundamental course. In most cases there is a requirement to accomplish the course by the organization of a symposium (i.e. KNAKV0 2021, Basic course 4, Nicholas Aikens.)

**Strengths:** The panel noted that these practical skills enable students to gain the required knowledge and skills as defined by the Higher Education Ordinance. Basic courses structure students' thoughts and help them to prepare for their own research procedures. Students'

feedback re-enforce the usefulness and applicability of the skills and knowledge, especially in developing a sound research attitude in the field of the arts.

**Weakness:** At the moment too many syllabi are in use, but it is clear that the new system will simplify the present system. The new syllabi which apply to the different subject areas brings them under the umbrella of Artistic Practice. The panel noted that this could potentially become a single, slightly higher level, syllabus as deployed in most other universities within the sector. This would reduce confusion and enable a more agility in programme delivery

#### **b. Elective Courses:**

Students are offered a wide variety of **elective** courses as well as the basic courses. Elective courses can be offered by the host department, but students are free to choose from other departments' courses and institutions which allows them to identify needs appropriate to their research project. One example from an individual study plan, the co-operation with Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, allowed for a research possibility for the doctoral student to fulfil elective course criteria (Nicholas Aikens individual study plan, elective courses).

**Strengths:** Elective courses help immensely the development and completion of the doctoral thesis/ work. With a programme that is focused on practice-based research, this capacity to build in knowledge and understanding from other disciplines and courses allows for the originality of the doctorate to be more securely established. Elective options allow students to focus upon post-doctoral and employment ambitions that might not be within academia, building individual approaches and knowledge bases as required.

#### **1.2 A selection of Individual Study Plans**

The individual study plans reinforce the effectiveness of the open structure of the programme. The individual study plan also tracks the development of the doctoral student.

- Nicholas Aikens (Artistic Practice, supervisor Mick Wilson) has accomplished a co-funded programme with Van Abbemuseum. The elective courses provided the possibility to work closely with the research in a museum setting, supported by his HDK-Valand supervisor. The ambitious and important research project placed substantial focus on curatorial actions (versus theory-based doctoral work in curatorial field). He was able to undertake his research within the museum setting as well as drawing on HDK-Valand's research network for publishing phases of the work. e.g. EARN platforms.
- Gustav Thane (Craft supervisor Jessica Hemmings), researching in craft, has benefited greatly from individual consultations with his three supervisors. He has also progressed through publication and was able to participate in research possibilities of the institution.
- Anders Carlsson (Performance Practices supervisor Cecilia Lagerström) has taken various elective courses including research education in performance practices, ethnography for creative practice, and institutional politics and performance. He has also taught at the performing arts (acting department), and participated in PARSE conference organization.

**Strengths:** There is an inherent flexibility built into the individual study plans: students have agency in designing their own research path. They receive immense amount of help from supervisors and assistant supervisors. The arrangement of supervisor and assistant supervisors offers space where students can engage with different viewpoints collectively; it also ensures that there is continuation in case the chief supervisor leaves the programme. The Individual Study Plan enables doctoral students to identify and become involved in teaching, research activities, and some of the organisational aspects within the departments. They can also identify how and why they might participate in conferences, workshops and publications as a fundamental part of their progress. Supervisors can support and monitor their progress through these activities.

**Risks:** The Individual study plan model creates significant workload for supervisors due to the high level of flexibility of the system, meaning supervisors need to be mindful of the workload and work with students to make best use of the allocated time. While the common language is English, this can slow down the pace of conversation and writing for some students. Where a supervisor only has one language, this also creates problems for recruitment and research development.

### **1.3 Summative assessment assignments** and assessment criteria in relation to learning/qualitative targets.

Each basic and elective study course has a clearly identified assignments, reading lists and other resources that are highly relevant and up to date. It was noted that the reading and assessments are demanding but students find them helpful for preparing them for research and their dissertation.

As part of the ongoing nature of the programme, students are required to participate at conferences, workshops, in the research programmes, and to publish findings and research outputs

It was noted that the dissertation can be a compilation of the publications and/or documentation of artistic projects. Students get regular feedback on their progress from their tutors and at the **percentage seminars**. The percentage seminars provide individual and peer feedback on the progress of the research and dissertation or whether their research meets study criteria and a practice for their doctoral defence. Teachers and doctoral students both reported the percentage seminars as one of the most important element of the doctoral programme.

**Strengths:** The percentage seminar is a strength of the programme (and obligatory in all of the faculty's third-cycle subjects) and very much valued by both students and supervisors. The dissertations are of high standard of artistic and scientific merit, they are also published and distributed giving the sense of an achievement to doctoral candidates.

## **2. Teaching is focused on student/doctoral-centred learning.**

### **2.1 Procedures ensuring high-quality supervision and teaching.**

Students meet with their supervisor and assistant supervisor regularly to review and analyse the progress of the research project. Comments and action points are recorded in the Individual Study Plan to ensure clarity of understanding and to track progress. Concerns can also be logged by students and/or supervisors.

**Strengths:** The provision currently relies on a relatively high number of individual consultations which ensures students are well supported to successful completion.

**Risk/Problem:** The relatively high number of consultations creates a heavy workload for supervisors. Where the common language for consultations is solely English this can slow down students' understanding and progression during consultation; this becomes a problem for both student and supervisor.

### **2.2 Doctoral students' possibilities for actively participating in the local, national and international research environment.**

Students are highly active in participating in the existing research networks of the programmes. They publish, participate in conferences and international workshops, which can be seen in their individual study plans. Examples of this are:

EARN (European Artistic Research Network), HDK-Valand  
PARSE, HDK-Valand & HSM Research Platform  
SAR (Society of Artistic Research)  
ERA (Educational Research in the Arts) HDK-Valand & HSM Research Platform  
PLACE (Public Life, Arts and Critical Engagement) HDK-Valand & HSM Research Platform  
BDL (Business & Design Lab)\_The Artistic Faculty and the School of Business, Economics and Law Research Platform, hosted by HDK-Valand  
The Research Catalogue  
BIP, Erasmus International Research Week, Budapest, Krakow (2023-25) HDK-Valand  
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro research exchange (Performance Practices, HSM)

There are plans for a collaboration with University of the Arts Bremen and Nouva Accademia di Belle Arti, Milan. This will enable good opportunities for further outreach and ensuring funding.

### **3. The content and form of teaching rests on scientific and/or artistic bases and proven experience.**

All indicators the panel received and feedback in the student panels demonstrate that there is sound teaching, and doctoral students are successful in completing their PhDs within the required timeframes. Recent changes to the course structure appear to have been beneficial both in terms of content and research development, but also in terms of community building. The study groups came up as a well-established system for peer cooperation. There was some small concern that students in different study groups do not have as many opportunities to work together, but the new course structure has addressed this, and future reviews should observe an improvement.

Faculty members state that HDK-Valand considers itself an education facility first and a research facility second for historical reasons. This enables PhD students to have good access to teaching opportunities and they enjoy that facility and the collegial relationships with other teaching faculty this allows, which seems to have a positive impact on the importance that is put on teaching. Both staff and student representatives have pointed out strong support for their teaching and collaborative networks that bring more and less experienced teachers together.

**Strengths:** Supervisors and course leaders deliver high quality teaching and students are supported to complete their doctoral studies within the required timeframes. There are robust systems in place to support PhD students in their teaching.

**Risk/Problem:** Further opportunities for students/study groups to work together could be developed.

### **4. Teachers have up-to-date and adequate competence as regards their subjects and teaching and learning in higher education, and the numbers of teachers are in proportion to the scope and content of study courses and programmes**

It is clear from the review documents and from the interviews the panel conducted that supervisory staff and course leaders are highly skilled in working with doctoral students to successful completion of their degrees. The panel members were impressed with the care and

rigour with which students are supported through their doctoral studies. It was noted the post-doctoral routes taken up by students were of an impressive standing, including those who had selected not to pursue careers within academia.

**Strengths:** Doctoral students are supported with high quality supervision and doctoral training.

**Risks/Problem:** There is a high dependency in some areas on a low number of supervisors, which has potential pipeline and succession concerns. Thought should be given to how this might be better managed to support students in the event of a faculty member leaving the institution.

##### **5. Study courses and programmes are relevant to the needs of the students/doctoral students and society. Description and analysis of the course/programme strengths and weaknesses in relation to the criterion, as well as any recommendations for suitable improvements.**

Whilst there is a description of the **admissions process** in the syllabi and in CANVAS, it is somewhat unclear as to when and with what thematic focus a call for new doctoral positions might be opened. The admissions process is one of most important decision points for doctoral study and ensuring an equitable process is vital.

The doctoral candidates mentioned that in their experience the admission process was long and that the delayed admissions results were challenging. We therefore suggest that the faculty prioritises establishing clear and transparent long-term goals ensuring that equity of opportunity is at the forefront and the strategic research interests of the faculty are likewise recognized. It is also recommended that the evaluation process, admissions criteria and panel composition is more openly communicated to the applicants.

The basic **course structure of doctoral education** with its courses 1-4 on writing, methodology, theory as well as communicating in cross-disciplinary environments is well planned. The courses offer appropriate skills for and the sessions are valued by the doctoral students. They are one of the strengths of the doctoral education in the faculty and offer a strong base for building community amongst a broad range of doctoral students. Doctoral students told the panel that the courses are useful, not too difficult and help in orienting in the beginning of the doctoral studies. They also mentioned that there is sufficient time to address individual research projects in them. They also appreciated the elective courses and the opportunity of taking them also in other universities. The alumni were envious of the developments and flexibility of the new structure.

The **Percentage Seminars** are a unique strength in supporting doctoral students in reaching the milestones and successful completion of the doctorate. They are excellent in training the doctoral students in both giving and receiving critique, building confidence and preparing for the final examination. The Percentage Seminars mirror the research problems, methods and goals of the doctoral research and thus include showcasing artistic output via documentation as well as exhibition or performance. Allowing for different kinds of setup of the Seminars actively supports the research the doctoral students conduct in the faculty and thus is well-appreciated by the reviewers as an example of best practice.

Students are well supported in developing broader skills for their future careers. Supervisors offer **career support** and discuss exit plans with advanced doctoral students. Additionally, the doctoral students have an opportunity to be engaged with the research platforms of the faculty; a research counsellor offers tuition in research funding opportunities and writing applications. These all are good measures. However, to best support the doctoral candidates' successful postdoctoral careers, a greater variety of work-life skills should be introduced into the compulsory courses of the syllabi and tuition plans.



The opportunity to part-take in the **Teaching and Learning in Higher Education** study module and to receive a certificate is a great advantage and prepares doctoral students well for the postdoctoral phase in their careers. However, not all doctoral candidates have equal opportunity to access teaching or related duties. The panel recommends that this should be addressed. The panel positively noted that HDK-Valand is launching an initiative that seeks to ensure equitable distribution of teaching opportunities to doctoral candidates in 2025.

There are some challenges concerning how to ensure research integrity and implement research ethics in relation to ethical review processes. This is partly due to the **Swedish Ethical Review Authority** not previously requiring artistic research to seek ethical approval, mostly as a result of not understanding the specificity involved in this field of research. This has created confusion both within academic staff and the doctoral students. The issue has however been recognized by the faculty and steps are being taken to clarify the situation. To this end, it has created new training, to be implemented in late June 2024, to tackle the problem and further support doctoral students' understanding and skills in undertaking ethical reviews. Despite the design of their research, all of the doctoral students will have training in completing ethical reviews to ensure they are compliant for future research projects. The panel supports this work and recommend that the faculty joins forces with other higher education institutions forwarding artistic research in Sweden and lobbies for the Ethical Review Authority to recognize artistic research in feasible ways.

There is some confusion and overlap in the scheduling between the joint doctoral courses and seminars and the doctoral activities going in the different subject areas. The panel recommends strongly that the faculty implements an **annual scheduling session** between the academic staff of the three subject areas to establish a well-functioning overall doctoral training calendar and potentially set this up as a regular shape to support good planning processes.

#### **6. Students/doctoral students have influence in planning, implementing and monitoring study courses and programmes.**

The panel noted that representatives of the doctoral student body are included in the most important academic bodies of the Artistic Research School and the overall university. As stated in the 2024 Submission to the External Review Panel: "Doctoral students are represented on all committees and decision-making bodies that effect research education. This includes the Research Councils at department level, KF BUFF, the Faculty Board, and the University committee for doctoral students (GUDK), which appoints representatives to the University's Doctoral Education Board (FUB) and the University Board. Two doctoral students were involved in the 2023 recruitment cycle, one as part of the initial short-listing panel and one as part of the interview panel. In Performance practices there has, since the start of the subject, been one doctoral student in the committee in each recruitment process." These positions offer the doctoral students good opportunity to monitor and influence the strategic and operational planning of doctoral education.

The faculty has a good feedback system that allows for students to influence the contents and implementation of the study courses. Close ties to their main supervisors is another route for raising individual concerns. The supervisors have regular meetings together in which ways to consider how to best support the doctoral students can be discussed. The Wednesday seminars and the joint seminars at HSM also offer the opportunity for the doctoral students to raise issues to be discussed together. It is commendable that these are actively supported by faculty and students.

#### **7. The study and learning environment is accessible and purpose-oriented for all students/doctoral students.**

The physical site and workspaces for the PhD students that we saw provided suitable accommodation for students to feel part of a community of researchers and to be able to conduct desk-based research activities and disseminations. The shared research room was a good size and had capacity for larger and smaller group activities, as well as housing a collection of PhD (and other) research publications.

Speaking with the students it was clear that they felt largely supported in conducting their research in line with their particular project. It was clear from speaking with the student and alumni group that specialist equipment and facilities are sometimes needed to be sourced elsewhere or supplied. While this could initially appear to be a weakness, it also recognises that PhD students in the arts would usually come to this level of study with established working practices and networks, including working spaces that can support that practice appropriately. It would be useful to ensure that the availability of specialist equipment was signalled clearly for incoming students.

From our meetings, site visit and online materials supplied, the learning environment seems to support students to progress their degrees well and there are a wide range of resources and facilities available to them. There were no reports of inadequacies, and the reviewers felt that the offer was comparable, even advantageous, in comparison with sector benchmarks.

## **8. The study courses and programmes are continuously monitored and developed.**

In reviewing the documentation, the review panel wanted to understand how the different seminars and monitoring processes functioned from a student and faculty perspective. We were satisfied that the review processes were appropriately robust. The panel could see that the robustness of the review process is underpinned by the External Examiner role and that the high levels of success of students progressing through the course and onto doctoral award was reflective of the strong programme.

Students and faculty reported on changes to the courses and structures over recent years, with a strong emphasis on ensuring students received training and support to enable them to successfully complete their doctoral studies within the requisite time frames, whilst also continue to produce cutting-edge work that contributes to their disciplinary arena.

Students reported that their feedback was well received and acted upon. The panel were satisfied that there were robust and meaningful feedback processes were in place.

## **9. Other views from the panel**

The panel wants to thank all faculty and students who actively engaged in this review process. We noted that this was a robust programme and that students are well supported in successfully completing their doctoral research within the required timelines. The financial support offered by HDK-Valand and HSM (with their joint artistic research school) is a considerable part of this, but it does come with its own difficulties and complications, particularly the need to recruit students who will be able to complete a doctoral degree. We applaud the faculty on the strong research community within the University and the ways in which this community supports a range of innovative and forward facing approaches to doctoral study and submission formats.

We recognise the adjustments and changes that have been put in place in recent years, alongside institutional mergers. This has perhaps led to a higher number of syllabi than is strictly necessary and a recruitment process that could potentially fall outside of the desired equitable processes. We have made a number of recommendations to support faculty in addressing these concerns.

## **APPENDIX 1 - List of input documents for the panel**

### **PART A: OVERVIEW OF DOCTORAL STUDIES AT THE FACULTY**

1. Introduction: Doctoral Studies at the Faculty
2. Emergence of doctoral studies in artistic subjects in the Faculty
3. Different doctoral level award types and submission formats.
4. The faculty common research education framework (Artistic Research School)
5. Key data and indicators on doctoral education.
6. Key strategic development goals in doctoral education.
7. QA/QI work on the common research education framework.

### **PART B: SUBJECT SELF-EVALUATION REPORTS**

1. Introduction to Subject Self-Evaluation Reports
2. Performance Practice
3. Crafts
4. Artistic Practice
5. The doctoral students' response to the report materials

### **ONLINE RESOURCES**

### **PART C: GENERAL INFORMATION ON PHD**

1. Archive of Newsletters on Faculty's Research Education
2. General Information (rules for % seminars, links to material in GU etc.)
3. List and links to all the general syllabi
4. List and links to the course plan / kursplan - basic courses
5. List and links to the course plan / kursplan - elective courses
6. Links to information about other doctoral & licentiate programmes within our Faculty
7. Links to information about research platforms within our Faculty
8. Research Data Management Plan
9. Research Ethical Review (in development)
10. Doctoral Project Budget
11. Quality Assurance processes to enhance research education
12. Partnerships in research education
13. ArtMonitor: Our Faculty publishing imprint for the PhD and Licentiate theses

### **PART D: ARCHIVE OF DOCUMENTATION**

#### Framework and steering documents

1. The general syllabi for third-cycle studies in the three subjects
2. Rules and regulations for third-cycle studies at the University of Gothenburg
3. Relevant steering documents.
4. Documents describing internal QA process

#### Operational documents

5. Strategy and operational plans
6. Minutes and notes from the various steering and planning meetings
7. Course examples for the compulsory basic courses.
8. Course examples for the elective courses.
9. Compilations of course evaluations.
10. Compilations of other feedback and evaluations.

#### Overview of personnel, projects and public profiles.

11. List of active doctoral students.
12. List of supervisors.
13. Sample of the individual study plans.
14. Links to relevant websites.

Outcomes

15. Links to completed dissertations

Supplementary

16. Documents and information requested by the panel.

## APPENDIX 2 – PROGRAMME SITE VISIT

List of people meeting the panel

ZOOM ADDRESS: <https://qu-se.zoom.us/j/6192242458>

IN PERSON MEETING: The meetings are in the new doctoral seminar room (old PhD studio 2) Valand building

### **Day 1 Thursday 11 April**

- 09.00-09.45 The panel carries out an internal meeting
- 09.45-10.45 Doctoral Students Artistic Practice \_ **Purpose, Admissions and Examination Process, induction/welcome, funding sufficient?**  
In person – Linda Thompson (year 2 PhD), Sanskriti Chattopadhyay (year 3 PhD), Nkule Mabaso (year 3 PhD), Seda Yildiz (newly commenced PhD), Jack Faber (guest PhD)  
On zoom – Jennifer Hayashida (year 4 PhD), Thiago de Paula Souza (year 3 PhD)
- 11.00-12.00 Course leaders – **ALL Questions, format of submissions – framing, supporting, examining**  
In person: Prof. Maria Bania, Prof. Mick Wilson, Prof. Elena Raviola, Prof. Cecilia Lagerström  
Apologies, other commitments: Erling Björgvinsson
- 12:00-13.00 Lunch Break
- 13.00-14.00 Doctoral Students Crafts – **Intensity, Teaching, Difference between Crafts/Arts, Doctoral community, ethics**  
In person: Gustav Thane, Birgitta Nordström  
On zoom: Rosa Tolnov Clausen
- 14.15-15.30 Supervisors – **Intensity, Admission, Ethics, Assessment, work-life preparation**  
In person: Cecilia Lagerström, Jessica Hemmings, Mick Wilson, Daniel Jewesbury, Tyrone Martinsson  
Apologies, other commitments: Nils Olsson (conference), Niclas Östlind (teaching), Jyoti Mistry ( filming)
- 15:45-16:45 Doctoral Students Performance Practices – **Thesis preparation, Preparing for Post-Doc, Examination Assessment, ethics**  
In person: Nathalie Fari, Victoria Brattström?  
On zoom: Lito Walkey, Anders Carlsson
- 16.45-17.30 Alumni – **purpose of course, admission, preparing for post-doc, where are you now – how University prepared**  
In person: Ram Krishna Ranjan (artistic practice/film), Kerstin Hamilton (artistic Practice/Photography), Emelie Rödahl (Crafts). On zoom: Andjeas Ejiksson (artistic practice/literary composition)  
Apologies, other commitments: Hedvig Jalhed (performance practices)

### **Day 2 Friday 12 April**

- 08.30-09.30 Doctoral education management - **ALL questions, format of submission, is funding sufficient**  
In person: Dr. Carina Borgström Källén (Vice-Prefekt for Doctoral Education, HSM)  
Prof. Cecilia Lagerström (Formerly subject responsible PhD Performance Practices 2006-2023)  
Dr. Niclas Östlind (Vice-Prefekt for Research HDK-Valand)  
Prof. Mick Wilson (Director of Studies Doctoral Education HDK-Valand)
- 09.45-10.45 Panel prepares feedback to faculty management and department management/equivalent
- 11.00-12.00 Feedback to faculty management and department management/equivalent

In person: Prof. Maria Bania (Vice Dean Research & Doctoral Education)  
Prof. Anders Hultqvist (Vice-Prefekt Research HSM), Dr. Niclas Östlind (Vice Prefekt  
Research HDK-Valand)  
Catharina Bergil (Head of Unit Performance, HSM), Linda Sternö (Head of Unit  
Film/Photography/Literary composition), Mick Wilson, Carina Borgström Källén, Anna  
Frisk  
On zoom: Katarina Andersson (Head of Unit Craft & Fine Art HDK-Valand)  
Apologies (other commitments) Dr. Henric Benesch (Dean)

12.00-13.00 Lunch  
13.00-15.00 Panel works with review statement

**The external review panel comprises:**

**Catherine Dormor**, Professor of Textile Practices & Feminisms, Head of Westminster School of Arts,  
University of Westminster

**Leena Rouhiainen**, Professor of Artistic Research, Head of University of the Arts Research Institute,  
Theatre Academy, University of the Arts Helsinki

**Tünde Varga**, Associate Professor at the Department of Art Theory and Curatorial Studies, The  
Hungarian University of Fine Art, Budapest

**Gregor Rettenegger**, Doctoral Student, Journalism Media and Communication, Faculty of Social  
Sciences, University of Gothenburg