EQ-Arts

A framework of good practices for 3rd Cycle doctoral awards in the creative and performing arts and design sector

Table of Contents

Part 1: Context

Part 2: Programme specification

Part 3: Research ethics and integrity

Abbreviations

AEC	Association of European Conservatoires
AR	Artistic Research
CPAD	Creative and Performing Arts and Design
CrD	Creator Doctus
DBS	Disclosure and Barring Service
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
EEA	European Economic Area
ELIA	European League of Institutes of the Arts
EQA	External Quality Assurance
EQAR	European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education
EQF	European Qualifications Framework
ESG	Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area
EU	European Union
EUA	European University Association
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
HEI	Higher Education Institution
IP	Intellectual Property
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
QA	Quality Assurance
SHARE	Step-Change for Higher Arts and Research in Education

Part 1: Context

Introduction

This document is intended to support those agencies and institutions involved in the design and/or accreditation of *European Qualification Framework (EQF)* level 8, 3rd Cycle research degrees, leading to a doctoral award,[1] within the *Bologna* process.[2]

In particular, it is directed towards the design and delivery of 3rd Cycle doctoral programmes in a group of cognate disciplines that constitute the creative and performing arts and design sector (referred to as CPAD hereafter) where, generally, there still is a major under-provision across the European Union (EU). More specifically, this guidance is intended to support practice-based areas where non-textual materials (e.g. images, objects, sounds, spaces etc.) will form the dominant mode of research enquiry and challenge the form that a final thesis might take.

The purpose of this document is to help contextualise the key characteristics and framework for a doctoral programme within the differing requirements of national accreditation systems and qualifications frameworks across Europe. This is the first version of the document, published in August 2021, which may be subsequently updated.

Who should use this document?

The guidance contained in this document is intended to be of value to those involved in a field of the CPAD sector, whether as:

- A national accreditation agency involved in the approval or periodic review of doctoral programmes;
- A higher education provider thinking about developing a doctoral programme or considering entering into a joint doctoral partnership with another institution;
- A prospective candidate for a doctoral programme;
- An employer interested in learning more about the knowledge and skills expected of doctoral graduates or thinking of working with a higher education provider in the delivery of a doctoral programme.

This document does not include programme specifications for research masters' degrees such as the MPhil or MRes, but refers to them where they may be included in the design of an overall doctoral programme.

Relationship of this document to legislation

Each Higher Education Institution is responsible for meeting the regulatory and legal requirements placed upon it by, for example, its own government, educational ministry, national accreditation agency or funding body. This document does not set out to interpret country-specific regulatory or legal requirements, nor does it include any such requirements. Because the responsibility for academic standards will always remain with the Higher Education Institution that is designing and/or

1 This document emerged from a three-year pilot project titled Creator Doctus. This project aimed to initiate the development of a 3rd Cycle research degree within the *Bologna Process* equivalent to a traditional Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). Further information on Creator Doctus can be found at <http://creatordoctus.eu> [last accessed, 5 August 2021].

2 Further information on the *Bologna Process* can be found at <https://www.abdn.ac.uk/documents/bologna-process.pdf> [last accessed, 30 August 2021].

in the creative and performing arts and design sector

delivering a doctoral programme, this document has an advisory purpose that is intended to inform the processes of quality enhancement and assurance.
In using this document to help inform the design, delivery or review of a doctoral programme, higher education providers may need to refer to other benchmark statements alongside this one. These may include requirements set out by, for example, professional, statutory and regulatory bodies or take account of employer or industry expectations.

About EQ-Arts

This document has been prepared by EQ-Arts, which is a sector-specific, not-for-profit Foundation specialising in enhancement-led quality assurance (QA) for a wide range of disciplines within the CPAD sector.[3]

EQ-Arts has worked with national accreditation agencies and Higher Education Institutions across Europe. Having demonstrated that its work is compliant with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG2015), EQ-Arts is included in the *European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education* (EQAR).[4]

EQ-Arts is a QA agency that, through its inclusion in the EQAR Register, has powers of accreditation. In the course of its work, EQ-Arts has previously undertaken reviews on behalf of national accreditation agencies to first scrutinise a proposal they have received for accreditation, and then make a recommendation on whether the agency should or should not consider licensing the proposing institution to offer doctoral programmes.

The following guidance, therefore, sets out some of the elements that EQ-Arts would consider if contracted to scrutinise a doctoral proposal for accreditation, or to review an existing doctoral programme already accredited, on behalf of a national accreditation agency or of a Higher Education Institution.

The importance of accreditation

Accreditation is the formal process through which an accreditation agency will assess the academic standards that an institution must meet in order for it to be licensed to award research degrees. Accreditation agencies normally are legal entities approved by acts of parliament within the countries they serve.[5] EQ-Arts is an international, fully independent accreditation agency, but works to the same European Standards and Guidelines (ESG2015)[6] for internal and external quality assurance as do national agencies.

Accredited degrees are very important in that they ensure an equivalence of standards through which a doctoral award will be formally acknowledged by other countries, recognised by institutions and organisations, and potential employers.

Higher Education Institutions in the CPAD sector have gathered considerable

3 Further information on EQ-Arts can be found at <http://www.eq-arts.org> [last accessed, 5 August 2021].
4 Further information on the work of EQAR can be found at <https://www.eqar.eu> [last accessed, 5 August 2021].
5 European accreditation agencies and quality assurance organisations can be found at <https://european-accreditation.org/ea-members/directory-of-ea-members-and-mla-signatories/> [last accessed, 5 August 2021] and at <https://www.enqa.eu/membership-database/> [last accessed, 5 August 2021].
6 See https://www.eqar.eu.

experience in the quality assurance and enhancement of 1st and 2nd Cycle awards (BA/MA). Only in the last 15-20 years, however, has there been some growth, in some European countries but not all, in the development and delivery of 3rd Cycle doctoral programmes.
The guidance set out in this framework is intended to assist academic institutions as they gather experience in the planning of doctoral programmes and/or the making of a formal application for the accreditation of such a proposal.
This document does not seek to influence an institution's judgment on the distinctive characteristics of a doctoral programme within its specific institutional context, but rather to simply offer guidance on the general standards and frameworks that the institution will need to consider prior to their proposal for a doctoral award being scrutinised by a recognised[7] accreditation agency.

Qualifications frameworks

Generally, a proposal for the accreditation (or periodic review) of a doctoral programme should demonstrate how it interprets and delivers the learning outcomes set out in recognised qualifications frameworks that incorporate doctoral level research. In this respect, the following two qualifications frameworks will frame the learning outcomes expected of European doctoral awards:

- The Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area,[8]
- The European Qualifications Framework (EQF).[9]

The Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area was agreed in 2005 by Education Ministers of the intergovernmental *Bologna Process*. The Framework's aim is to organise national higher education qualifications into an overarching European-wide qualifications framework whereby these are defined according to three Cycles of complexity and difficulty:

1st Cycle	Bachelors
2nd Cycle	Masters
3rd Cycle	Doctoral

The European Qualifications Framework (EQF) was developed by the European Union as a translation tool to make national qualifications easier to understand and more comparable across Member States. The EQF seeks to support cross-border mobility of learners and workers, promote lifelong learning and professional development across Europe.

The 3rd Cycle (e.g. PhD or doctoral degree) of the *Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area* refers to, and is the equivalent of, level 8 of the *European Qualifications Framework* (EQF). Most importantly, the EQF is closely linked to national qualifications frameworks[10] in all the EU Member States, along with a further eleven countries. In this way, the EQF provides a comprehensive map of all types and levels of qualifications in Europe (which are increasingly accessible

7 A national or independent Quality Assurance agency that is on the EQAR Register.
8 http://ecahe.eu/w/index.php/Framework_for_Qualifications_of_the_European_Higher_Education_Area#Third_cycle_-_PhD [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
9 https://europa.eu/europass/en/european-qualifications-framework-eqf [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
10 https://europa.eu/europass/en/national-qualifications-frameworks-nqfs [last accessed, 31 August 2021].

through qualification databases).

Since the *Bologna Declaration,* there has also been an on-going debate concerning the inclusion and recognition of artistic research at the 3rd Cycle doctoral level including, for example, the following:

- The *TUNING Educational Structures in Europe* 2000 project,[11] which aimed to link the political objectives of the *Bologna Process* to the higher educational sector overall;
- The European University Association (EUA) *Salzburg Principles*[12] of 2005, which identified 10 principles for 3rd Cycle degrees;
- The EUA *Salzburg II Recommendations*[13] of 2010, a reference document for those who are shaping doctoral education either in their country or in their institution;
- The European Commission's *Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training*[14] of 2011 added transferable skills training, quality assurance, exposure [of doctoral candidates] to industry and other relevant employment sectors to the list of recommendations for 3rd Cycle education;
- *Step-Change for Higher Arts and Research in Education*[15] (SHARE, 2010–2013) identified numerous examples of best practice for PhD projects and doctoral programmes from all over Europe, and developed a toolkit for curriculum building by providing reflections on methodologies employed by research in the arts as well as an in-depth study on the question of [new] disciplines;
- The OECD's *Frascati Manual*[16] of 2015 included artistic research for the first time;
- The ELIA *Florence Principles*[17] of 2016 is a position paper on the doctorate in the arts, extracting the critical core of doctoral education in the arts and seeking to provide orientation pillars for a field which has been developing over the past 20 years;
- The *Vienna Declaration* of 2019[18] is a joint policy paper describing key features of the area of research which is known as Artistic Research (AR), by signatories representing the major European higher arts education and cultural networks;
- The *Creator Doctus (CrD)*[19] proposal for a new 3rd Cycle doctoral award that is the equivalent of a traditional Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) but based in the field of artistic research and includes the involvement of societal partners.

11 http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/images/stories/HUMART/SQF_for_the_Creative_and_Performing_Discilpines.pdf [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
12 https://eua.eu/resources/publications/626:salzburg-2005-–-conclusions-and-recommendations.html [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
13 https://eua.eu/resources/publications/615:salzburg-ii-–-recommendations.html [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
14 https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/policy_library/principles_for_innovative_doctoral_training.pdf [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
15 http://www.sharenetwork.eu/resources/share-handbook [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
16 https://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascati-manual.htm [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
17 https://cdn.ymaws.com/elia-artschools.org/resource/resmgr/files/26-september-florence-princi.pdf [last accessed, 31 August 2021].
18 https://societyforartisticresearch.org
19 Further information on Creator Doctus can be found at <http://creatordoctus.eu> [last accessed, 5 August 2021].

Purposes of the doctorate

Doctoral degrees are the most distinctive of all academic awards because of their basis in research. Through a doctoral programme, students receive training in research as well as being required to demonstrate their ability to produce and share new insights or understandings through independent study in their specialist discipline. Beyond this, the doctorate experience provides students with the intellectual and creative scaffolding that will enable them to deal with many complex and challenging issues beyond and after their immediate programme of work. Until recently, the primary purpose in acquiring a doctorate was to gain access to an academic profession. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly common in a number of countries globally for new academic staff to be expected to possess a doctoral degree and so help to maintain the high quality of research in their academic institution. However, in recent years there has been considerable diversification of doctoral programmes, with this now being one of a number of possible career options. Doctoral graduates now work in a diverse range of occupations and professional contexts.

Context for the doctorate

In higher education, generally, the doctoral degree is the most well-known and established postgraduate qualification. However, in the CPAD sector, doctoral programmes are relatively new, having only started to emerge around 15-20 years ago.

Some disciplines within the CPAD sector, that focus on areas of history, theory and critique, have had a longer engagement with traditional forms of text-based scholarship, and so are readily compatible with a subject-specialist Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). However, it is in the practice-based areas, where non-textual forms of scholarship (e.g. images, objects, sounds, spaces etc.) form a major part of the research methodology, that new forms of doctoral research have recently started to emerge along with types of scholarship and assessment criteria relevant to these disciplines.

Perhaps for these reasons amongst others, there has in recent years been a diversification of doctoral programmes that recognise increasingly wide professional approaches and needs. This has often led to the design of doctoral programmes that are differently structured to the traditional PhD, along with the emergence of titles such as *'professional doctorate'*, *'practice-based'* or *'practice-led'* doctorate and, more recently, the 'Creator Doctus' experiment.

In this context, doctoral programmes are generally of two types, though in some countries these are not distinguished as separate awards and may have overlapping characteristics. These are:

- the subject-specialist doctorate, and
- the professional/practice-based doctorate.

Subject-specialist doctorates are the most common and longest standing types of research degrees, usually taking the form of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). The traditional PhD will focus on original research that contributes new insights and understandings to the pool of knowledge in an academic field. The professional/practice-based doctorate is generally intended for practitioners and/or professionals who have practical work experience and mastery of professional areas that could be advanced through the application of research.

Some of the characteristics of a subject-specialist Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in a field of the CPAD sector are as follows (though this list is not comprehensive):

- The programme of doctoral work is normally based on a supervised research project that is generally agreed at the point of admission and/or approved within the first 6 months of the student's registration;
- Alongside subject-specific research skills, some PhD programmes may also include research and skills training in order to provide a balance of personal and professional development. Sometimes these skills are assessed as part of the student's progression, sometimes they are taken account of in the final examination and sometimes there is no assessment of research skills;
- Whether or not research skills and training are taken account of in the assessment regime, the final examination of the research degree will focus on the quality and originality of the candidate's thesis[20] and their defence of it in a *viva voce* examination;
- Where the research is based in practice, there will be an agreement prior to the final examination on the balance that the thesis may take between a text-based critical account of the research and a portfolio-based submission of, say, the artefacts or compositions that exemplify the research. Usually, though not always, the traditional PhD will give emphasis to the text-based critical account;
- Though practices vary, the final examination usually consists of a minimum of two examiners, one of whom will be internal to the institution and at least one other examiner who is external to the institution. Some institutions allow the student's supervisor to be present (with the candidate's agreement) as an observer and may employ an independent chair for the examination panel to ensure fairness and consistency;
- To recognise those research programmes based in practice, a small number of doctoral awards may include a sub-title to the award of 'Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)' such as 'Doctor of Philosophy Musical Composition'. In such instances, the award is often known as DPhil.

In contrast to the subject-specialist doctorate, professional/practice-based programmes create the opportunity for experienced professionals/practitioners to situate the knowledge they have accrued through practice within an academic research framework. These programmes are often seen as a post-experience qualification and so appropriate for professionals/practitioners in their early- to mid-career track.

The titles of professional/practice-based doctorates will often reflect the student's specialist subject or field of study. In this case there is considerable variation in the nomenclature that is used. The common convention, however, is to title the award 'ProfDoc' or 'Doctor of…' followed by the subject specialism. For example: Doctor of Music (DMus); Doctor of Fine Art (DFA); Doctor in Performing Arts (DPA) etc. Some of the characteristics of professional/practice-based doctorates are as follows though, again, this list is not comprehensive:

- Professional/practice-based doctorates are usually focused on an independent research project that is located within the student's professional field;
- Such projects may focus on the production of a research portfolio/performance, or other forms of artefacts, that replace the traditional thesis at final examination. The balance of research portfolio to any supporting text-based critical account of the research is normally agreed at the outset of a programme;
- Professional/practice-based doctorates sometimes contain a taught element that may be assessed as part of the student's progression. The final examination will be focused on a *viva voce* examination of the candidate's portfolio/performance/thesis against clearly defined assessment criteria to which the student has access;
- Whereas the traditional PhD normally contributes new insights or understandings to the pool of knowledge in an academic field, the professional/practice-based doctorate will likely result in the advancement of professional practices or organisational changes that are achieved through the application of research.

20 See Section 2.12., 'Programme description – The thesis'.

Part 2: Programme specification

This framework sets out the elements that an institution will need to consider, and then specify, when planning the design of a doctoral programme.

The awarding body and the teaching institution

The specification for the doctoral programme should identify, separately by name, both the awarding body for the programme and the teaching institution.

Name of the awarding body. The awarding body is the name of the institution that is to be licensed by an accreditation agency to offer a specified doctoral award. The awarding body will be responsible for the overall governance of the programme (including, for example, approving leadership of the programme, providing procedures for admissions, examinations, appeals, equality and diversity, and discipline etc.) and for having measures in place to assure the quality of the provision along with its enhancement.

Name of the teaching institution. The name of the teaching institution is the organisation that is responsible for the delivery and assessment of the doctoral programme.

In some instances, the awarding body and the teaching institution may be one and the same organisation. However, in other cases, the awarding body or teaching institution may choose to work in partnership with a separate higher education provider in the delivery of the doctoral programme. For example in many instances, the awarding body will be a modern multidisciplinary University already licensed to provide doctoral awards, and the teaching institution may be an independent specialist higher education arts organisation that is new to doctoral work.

Level of the award

The specification for the doctoral programme should make clear how it is designed to deliver an award that is equivalent to level 8 (PhD) of the *European Qualifications Framework* (EQF) and equivalent to the standards set for 3rd Cycle degrees within the *Bologna Framework*.

Name of the exit award(s) and title of the programme

Exit award(s): The exit award has legal standing as the name that will appear on the student's graduation certificate on successful completion of the programme. This should be detailed in the programme specification. Examples of these may be, for instance:

- Doctor of Philosophy (PhD);
- Doctor of Philosophy in Musical Composition (DPhil Musical Composition);
- Doctor of Music (DMus);
- Doctor of Fine Art (DFA);
- Doctor of Performing Arts (DPA);
- Doctor of Design (DDes).

In some instances, the doctoral programme may be designed to include an intermediary award such as an MPhil. One example of such a requirement could be as follows: 'A candidate wishing to pursue a PhD in Musical Composition shall normally be registered in the first instance for the degree of MPhil or MMus, and successfully complete the relevant upgrade process before transferring their registration to the PhD programme'. In this instance, the doctoral programme, overall, will have two possible exit awards – the MPhil/MMus and the PhD – of which the candidate may only receive one award.

Programme title: In some instances, the doctoral programme, overall, may contain a number of subject specialisms or more than one exit award. In such cases, the title of the doctoral programme may be different to that of the exit award, which has legal standing. In such instances, any differences between the programme title and exit award(s) should be made clear in the programme specification.

The home department

The programme specification must identify the academic teaching home for the admission, supervision, progression and assessment of students. The academic home for each programme will constitute an essential part of the research environment supporting doctoral programmes and so play an important part in the accreditation process. There are different forms of home locations for doctoral work, of which the following two are typical examples:

- Located in a discipline-specific academic department responsible for the delivery of 1st Cycle bachelors and 2nd Cycle masters awards;
- Located in an independent unit such as, for example, a Doctoral College or Doctoral Centre within the teaching institution but separate from the academic departments responsible for bachelors' and masters' programmes.

Each institution should decide the best home base for their doctoral students, whether this is to establish a 'graduate' school or locate their 3rd Cycle students within the disciplinary department (e.g. fine art, design, music, theatre etc.). There are strong academic arguments for both models, but the academy must ensure that whichever model they choose, the output and impact of the research produced can feed back into the curriculum and learning and teaching strategies for all three cycles of study (BA, MA & Doctoral).

A further alternative is for doctoral programmes to be part of a doctoral network/consortium where a number of Higher Education Institutions work together to deliver elements of a single doctoral programme. Where such networks exist, they are based on the principle of collaboration wherein no single institution will have the range of specialist resources needed to deliver a high-quality doctoral programme,[21] or alternatively to create an enhanced research cluster,[22] to increase and build on individual institutions' research offer.

Research environment

All forms of doctorates in the CPAD sector, whatever their types of outcomes or methodologies, are research degrees. Accordingly, the quality of the research environment offered by the home department is a critical element in the provision of doctoral programmes. Inclusion in an active and vibrant research environment, including contacts with other researchers, is essential to the experience and success of doctoral students, whatever their subject, mode of study, or home base. Exposure to an active research environment helps to develop an understanding of the stages involved in research, and serves to encourage both creative and scholarly rigour as well as original ideas. The research environment is especially important in areas of the CPAD sector, where practice-based methods of scholarship appropriate to these disciplines are still in the process of being established. The following list of elements may form part of the research environment described in the programme specification, though this is not intended to be a comprehensive list:

Research strategy: This would be an important element in describing the institution's/home department's approach to developing a research environment on a rolling three- to five-year basis (the 'research strategy' section may also include its approach to all of the elements set out below).

In particular, the institution's/department's distinctive approach to the nature of research in the CPAD sector should be clearly articulated. There has been considerable debate over appropriate definitions of research for the sector as a whole, as distinct from the natural and physical sciences, where the *discovery of new knowledge* is often the key objective. Ultimately, each institution will define its own strategic approach to artistic research as appropriate to the award of a doctoral degree. In terms of the guidance in this document, research in the CPAD sector is considered to:

- test the limits of existing knowledge to determine its limitations;
- create new insights and understandings that are effectively shared.

Supervision and examination: This section should describe the existing expertise of academic staff in supervising doctoral students either to successful completion or in progression. Such supervision may be undertaken at the home institution or at another institution, where the role of staff as first or second supervisor should be made clear. Instances where academics may have acted as an external examiner

21 For example see *Techne* which can be found at <http://www.techne.ac.uk> [last accessed 14 September 2021] and *The Graduate School of Culture Studies and Arts* <http://doktorikool.humanitaarteadused.ut.ee/graduate-school-culture-studies-and-arts?lang=en> [last accessed 14 September 2021].

22 For example, see *Midlands4Cities Consortium (M4C)* comprising of BCU, Birmingham, Warwick, Coventry, De Montfort and Leicester Universities. This consortium supported successful candidates with AHRC studentships, professional training, expert supervision across numerous disciplines and encouraged trans-disciplinary projects that could draw on expertise in any number of specialist fields of study. See Henry Rogers & Inês Bento-Coelho, Annexe 3: 'Two Distributed Learning Models in Doctoral Education', Case Study 2: The Centre for Fine Art Research at Birmingham School of Art (2009-2016) in *The Creator Doctus Constellation. Exploring a new model for a doctorate in the arts* (2021).

to doctoral candidates at another institution or in their home institution should also be specified, together with the strategies the institution will put in place to develop the supervisory capacity of academic staff and approve them to supervise.

Intellectual and creative environment: The originality and rigour of research outputs produced by academic staff in the home base for the doctoral programme (as recognised through peer review or the award of grants) will be an indicator of the intellectual and creative environment for doctoral students. As long as the research element of such outputs is evident, they may take a range of forms, such as, for example, exhibitions, performances, publications, products, objects, images, digital artefacts, and so on.

Research impact: It is not presupposed that all research should have impact, though a healthy research environment may include some examples of it. For the purposes of this document, a definition of research impact may be evident in the following question: 'what has changed because of the research?'. Normally, such impact would be outside the home institution and academia. Given the very broad reach of artistic research, such impacts may be evident in, for example, public discourse, creativity, culture and society, the environment, the economy and business, public policy, professional practices, industry, public health and wellbeing, etc.

Interaction: This refers to the strategies the institution will adopt to ensure that doctoral students are exposed to researchers working at the highest level in the student's chosen discipline/field, along with their access to other academics for advice and support. It should also set out how opportunities will be made available for doctoral students to interact with people and organisations who will use the outcomes of research for their own purposes, and/or with people who are active in other fields of research.

Physical resources and facilities: This should include the availability of appropriate workshop and/or studio facilities as well as access to appropriate learning and research tools, including access to IT equipment, library and electronic publications, and specialist equipment.

Skills support and career development: This describes the opportunities available for doctoral students to develop research-related skills appropriate to their particular field of artistic research, along with access to opportunities that will help to advance their ability to complete the programme successfully. Opportunities for the development of personal and employment-related skills, along with the availability of advice on career development, should also be described.

Research support for the sector: Some institutions may seek to contribute to the larger research environment outside their institution, and across the CPAD sector. This may be evidenced in several ways such as, for example: participation of academics in important national committees or policy reviews concerned with research; participation in the peer review of research proposals for research councils; keynote lectures delivered at important international research conferences; the organisation of international research conferences etc.

Research ethics and integrity: The institution's approach to research ethics and integrity will constitute an important element of the research environment as the ethical policies, protocols and procedures will articulate the institution's interpretation and application of accepted key moral norms and principles. Given that policies for research ethics and integrity are not always found in the research

environments for the CPAD sector, fuller guidance on these issues has been set out in Part 3 of this document.

The programme director

The awarding body must identify and approve a suitably qualified academic to be the programme director and provide a full CV demonstrating their qualification to undertake this role.

Modes of study

Institutions must specify the permitted modes of study, which may be:

- full time;
- part time;
- a mixture of full and part time.

Duration of study

The maximum and minimum periods of time for each mode of study should be identified. Normally, these would be as follows:

	Full-time study	Part-time study
Minimum period:	2 years	4 years
Expected period:	3 years	6 years
Maximum period:	4 years	8 years

Starting point(s)

Each institution must stipulate the date(s) at which a student's programme of study can commence and the registration becomes active. Some programmes will have a single entry-point say, for example, in September of each year, whereas others may have two entry-points, in January and September.

Admission criteria

Doctoral proposals should specify the criteria for entry to the programme. The following are some examples of standards appropriate for level 8 doctoral studies:

Academic

- Applicants should normally possess at least a first degree or equivalent in a relevant area.
- Applicants should also normally have (or expect to be awarded) a taught Masters in a relevant subject area.
- Where an applicant possesses non-standard qualifications or equivalent experience, these will be considered. In such instances, the institution should describe how non-standard qualifications/experience will be reviewed and approved so as to ensure that all applicants are treated equally.

Language

- The taught language for the programme should be specified.
- The programme should also specify how applicants whose first language is not in the taught language of the programme will be expected to demonstrate an appropriate level of spoken and written academic proficiency.
- For example, should the taught language of the programme be English, which is

not the applicant's first language, then normally, applicants would be expected to have attained a score of at least 7.0 on the IELTS (International English Language Testing System) or equivalent test, with a 7.0 score in the writing element.

Credits

In keeping with the *European Standards and Guidelines (ESG2015)*, proposals for the accreditation of a doctoral programme should specify the total number of ECTS credits attached to the programme. The ECTS requirements vary significantly from country to country. The breakdown of credits to each component of the overall programme (as set out in the programme description) should also be detailed.

Programme description

The description of the doctoral programme should detail the key elements in its overall structure and whether an intermediary award such as the MPhil is, or is not, included in the programme structure. Normally, the main elements that a programme description will cover are:

- The research project;
- Taught components;
- Workshops/training;
- The thesis.

The programme specification should detail the total number of ECTS credits attached to the programme overall and the breakdown of these credits to each of the elements within the programme.

Research project: Normally, a doctoral programme will require the student to undertake a supervised independent research project that constitutes the main body of work they will present for final examination. A critical point in this process is to determine how and when each student's independent research project will be approved. In a small number of instances, this is done at the point of application. However, unlike the natural sciences, it is less likely that the research questions underpinning an independent project will be sufficiently developed prior to the student's registration. Normally, once a student has registered, a specific amount of time is given for the independent research project to be fully developed through an outline proposal that is then formally considered for approval. The headings and requirements for the outline proposal should be clearly described to the student once they have registered. If the outline proposal is approved within the outcomes expected for a 3rd Cycle doctoral award, then the student will be allowed to progress. If the student's outline proposal is not approved, then the institution should explain how this will be dealt with. In some cases, the intermediary award of an MPhil or equivalent is used where the outline proposal does not meet the criteria for a doctoral award and so the student is allowed to progress to an MPhil.

Taught components: In some programmes, such as the professional doctorate where students may have returned from mid-career tracks, there is a taught component built into the programme structure through lectures and seminars. Where this is the case, the institution should specify if and how the student's performance in the taught components will, or will not, contribute to the final award. In some instances, the student is simply expected to have completed each component and is awarded the respective number of credits as part of the overall requirement.

Workshops/training: Most doctoral programmes will include workshops for

training in research skills, though these may vary depending on the distinctive characteristics of each programme. The training for doctoral students should be clearly described in the programme specification, including whether the training is required or optional.

The thesis: The term 'thesis' is used to denote a body of work submitted for examination. In a traditional doctorate, this body of work usually takes the form of a text-based critical evaluation with supporting materials. In the CPAD sector, however, much of the initial research enquiry may involve methods based on non-textual forms such as, for example, images, objects, sounds, spaces, digital artefacts etc. In this case the final thesis itself will be a balance of arts practice and text that is appropriate to the research. The specific balance of materials in the body of work submitted for examination will be a matter for each institution to determine. In some instances, the text-based thesis with supporting appendices of visual materials may be considered appropriate, in others the emphasis may be on non-text forms with an accompanying written evaluation in the region between ten to thirty thousand words. In other instances, non-text forms such as a performance may constitute the thesis. In judging how to specify the requirements placed on students when producing a body of work for examination, each institution should ensure that they are commensurate with the learning outcomes for a level 8 research degree. Given the definition of research adopted within this document, the thesis would, generally, be expected to *present new insights and enhanced understandings that are effectively shared.* In this respect, the research imperatives need to be made accessible when they are not self-evident in the manifestations of that research i.e. images, objects, sounds, spaces etc. Furthermore, these *insights and understandings* need to be presented in a form that can be *effectively shared* — not just in the oral examination, but made accessible to future generations of scholars.

Learning outcomes

Doctoral proposals should articulate the learning outcomes that each student will be expected to have achieved by the end of their programme. These should fulfil the outcomes expected for a 3rd Cycle research award (i.e. PhD, doctoral degree) in the *European Qualifications Framework (EQF)* as set out below:

EQF level 8: Learning Outcomes

Skills	Knowledge	Responsibility and autonomy
The most advanced and specialised skills and techniques, including synthesis and evaluation, required to solve critical problems in research and/or innovation and to extend and redefine existing knowledge or professional practice.	Knowledge at the most advanced frontier of a field or work or study and at the interface between fields.	Demonstrate substantial authority, innovation, autonomy, scholarly and professional integrity and sustained commitment to the development of new ideas or processes at the forefront of work or study contexts including research.

Given the distinctive characteristics of practice-based research methodologies in the CPAD sector, institutions should articulate the specific learning outcomes they might expect students to demonstrate in terms of *skills, knowledge, responsibility and autonomy* as set out above in the EQF framework. In doing this, institutions may wish to consult other models of good practice such as, for

example, the *TUNING Educational Structures in Europe* project.[23] This sets out to help link the political objectives of the *Bologna Process* to the higher educational sector overall. In this respect, *TUNING* offers further guidance on how to interpret the EQF learning outcomes for 3rd Cycle research degrees within the specific context of doctoral work in the creative and performing arts sector as shown below.

In 2007, as part of the *TUNING* process, disciplines in the CPAD sector worked to define the learning outcomes specific to their respective programme. The European League of Institutes of Arts (ELIA), a major network of higher arts education institutions, through its ERASMUS Thematic Network project *inter}artes* (2007-10), worked in collaboration with European discipline networks, CUMULUS for design, ELIA Dance Section, the Association of European Conservatoires (AEC) for music and Paradox for Fine Art, to write discipline-specific learning outcomes, which were endorsed through the *TUNING* process. These generic and discipline-specific learning outcomes are shown in Table 1 and Table 2 on the following pages.

23 http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/images/stories/HUMART/SQF_for_the_Creative_and_Performing_Discilpines.pdf [sic] [last accessed, 31 August 2021].

Theatre	Design	Fine Art	Music
An ability to: • recognise and validate problems. • critically analyse and evaluate their own findings/outcomes and those of others. • apply effective project management through the setting of research goals and intermediate milestones and the prioritisation of activities. • design and employ systems for the acquisition and collation of information and insight through the effective use of appropriate resources and equipment. • identify and access appropriate bibliographical resources, archives, and other sources of relevant information. • be creative, innovative and original in their approach to research, demonstrating flexibility and open-mindedness while recognising boundaries and drawing upon/utilising sources of support appropriately. • constructively defend research outcomes, construct coherent arguments and articulate ideas clearly to a range of audiences, formally and informally through a variety of techniques. • develop and maintain co-operative networks and working relationships with supervisors, collaborators, colleagues and peers, within the institution and in the wider communities of research and practice. • original, independent and critical thinking, and the ability to develop theoretical and/or practical concepts in the field of Theatre study or practice. • a knowledge of recent advances in their own field of study and in related areas.	An ability to: General knowledge • participate in the academic debates in related fields (e.g. economics, culture, technology, art) from the Design/Design research/Design theory perspective. Theoretical skills • contribute to general theoretical discussions with ideas and theories developed in Design and understanding their potential for other fields. Conceptualisation skills • formulate and evaluate concept-type tools in general. Ideation skills • analyse and develop general ideation philosophy, principles and practices. Processual skills • develop general project management concepts and methods based on experience in Design. Communication skills • develop new modes of communication in written, oral and visual forms, including in one or more foreign languages. Teaching skills • lecture/teach Design to students of other academic disciplines. General knowledge • contribute to and restructure the theoretical and historical framework of Design. • initiate and lead the discussion on the position of Design in the social, cultural/artistic, political, ecological and economic contexts.	An ability to: • acquire a systematic understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of the field of learning. • prioritise research activities and set achievable intermediate goals appropriate to a project of advanced research. • employ insight into the development of working processes and critical analysis during the research process. • demonstrate a significant range of the principal skills, techniques, tools, practices and/or materials which are associated with the field of learning. • develop new skills, techniques, tools, practices and/or materials. • document, report on and critically reflect on research findings to specialist and non-specialist audiences. • create and interpret new knowledge, through original research and advanced scholarship. • exercise responsibility and a significant level of perception and accountability in contexts that are unforeseen and ethically complex. • possess a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of recent advances in contemporary Fine Art practices, theoretical discourse and art contexts.	An ability to: Independence • pursue one's own questions and ideas. • comprehend the transferability of one's research capabilities to other fields and recognise any associated career opportunities. • sustain and deepen one's inquiring, research-oriented approach throughout one's career and, where appropriate, across all aspects of one's work and endeavour. Critical awareness • question the legitimacy of self-serving or commonplace ideas, conventions, fashions, etc. • see one's own shortcomings and untapped potential, and devise strategies for maximising one's performance. • recognise and challenge the standards within one's community of researchers, practitioners and creators. • respond with understanding and responsibility to critical considerations from within one's community of researchers, practitioners and creators. Communication skills • establish and maintain cooperative relationships with colleagues and students within one's own institution and among the wider scholarly and artistic community. • write/present/perform clearly and appropriately for the target audiences (e.g. research reports, journal articles, presentations, performances or other artistic events intended to have a research output). • improve the public's understanding and/or artistic insight in one's field of study. • assess the effect of one's own behaviour on other team members, artistic collaborators, etc.

Theatre	Design	Fine Art	Music
• the ability to self-direct a significant research project, based upon a clearly focused and well-founded research proposal. • a mastery and understanding of relevant research methodologies, techniques and generative strategies and their appropriate application within the field of theatre research and/or practice. • a broad understanding of the wider context in which their research takes place and the ability to position the outcome of their research in relation to peer review and published, performed and other public outcomes. • an ability to make a contribution which is at the forefront of developments in contemporary theatre practice or the contemporary study of theatre and/or its development, as well as within the wider cultural context.	Theoretical skills • create and develop theoretical concepts related to own Design work and Design in general. • contribute to the further advancement of Design philosophy. Creative skills • fully-fledged understanding of creativity in Design, ability to direct and develop creativity in other fields. Processual skills • develop the general Design process. • plan and manage large-scale Design/ Design research/R&D projects. Learning skills • develop learning theories and methods in Design. Communication skills • communicate own ideas and Design processes to academic audiences. Teaching skills • teach Design and/ or Design-related techniques and technologies to Design students at all levels, including supervision of doctoral projects.	• demonstrate skills acquired through research training and the development of experimentation/ innovative research and working processes relevant to artistic projects. • self-direct a research project, based on a focused and well-founded research proposal. • position the individual research project in relation to peer review and published, exhibited and other public outcomes. • make a public presentation of the research outcomes, that displays a significant level of understanding of audience interaction and reception. • make a contribution at the forefront of developments in contemporary art and the wider cultural context.	Artistic development and skills • integrate and demonstrate original artistic insights in performing, composing, theorising and teaching. • extend in a significant way our artistic understanding and communicate those insights in a fully realised manner. • develop and realise artistic autonomy. Research skills • frame research proposals – whether pertaining to theoretical, practical or creative issues or a combination of these – rigorously, lucidly and in terms of questions to be answered, insights to be gained, and indicators of success to be applied. • identify and contextualise currently dynamic issues in one's field, in the sense of open questions, new topics and trends. • realise the goals set for one's project, through intermediary steps and appropriate methods, equipment and team members, where relevant. • identify and utilise the relevant literature and/or other resources in connection with one's field. • critically analyse and evaluate one's own and other's outcomes. • document, analyse and summarise the interim and final outcomes of one's projects. • use project funding and evaluation systems in the development of one's own work. Theoretical (knowledge-based) outcomes • awareness of, and respect for, standards of excellence in one's own field; the capacity to distinguish between valuable and irrelevant inquiry, whether in the theoretical, practical and/or creative spheres. • thorough knowledge and understanding of the national and international context of activity and output into which one's work will be disseminated. • awareness of ownership rights of those who might be affected by one's project (e.g. copyright, intellectual property rights, confidential information, ethical questions, etc.). • awareness of the work and health implications for those involved in one's activities; the capacity to conduct research with a strong sense of responsibility and vigilance. • awareness of the economic potential and utilisation of one's outputs. • awareness of relevant methods and techniques of inquiry related to one's field of study.

Supervision

Quality of supervision will be one of the most important elements in a doctoral programme and will play an important part in the recruitment of high-quality doctoral students. It is important, therefore, that each institution has measures in place to ensure that their doctoral supervisors are appropriately skilled and supported. This requires both high-level knowledge of a specialist subject discipline and experience in the research methods and approaches that will underpin each student's doctoral programme.

Supervisory expertise: The expertise of a potential doctoral supervisor is usually judged by (i) their research outputs and activity, and (ii) the number of doctoral students supervised to successful completion. Although in most cases, both criteria would be considered (especially in the case of a lead supervisor), there are some instances where a supervisor may meet only one of the criteria – say, for example, in the case of an early-career researcher who produces outstanding research but has not yet supervised doctoral students. In such circumstances, the institution would normally ensure that the supervisor is a member of a supervisory team where the combined expertise is sufficient to support the student's programme (it is common practice that the supervisory team has a combined experience of a minimum of two doctoral research students to successful completion). In some institutions, supervisors are themselves required to hold a PhD though this is not general practice, being considered a qualification that is desirable but not mandatory when the other criteria have been fulfilled. Practices vary considerably on whether to maintain an approved list of qualified supervisors within the institution. Generally, it is good practice that an institution describes (i) how they will determine whether an academic is qualified to supervise doctoral students; (ii) how the names of qualified supervisors are formally recorded; and (iii) how the list of qualified supervisors will be reviewed and, if so, how often.

Supervisory team: A recent survey of doctoral programmes[24] indicates that the majority of European institutions specify that there should be between two and three supervisors assigned to each doctoral student.

A range of titles are used to identify the roles of supervisors in a supervisory team, though one is usually identified as the supervisor who will be responsible for the student's programme of research overall and be their main point of contact. This role is given a variety of titles such as: director of studies; main supervisor; first supervisor; lead supervisor; primary supervisor. Remaining supervisors are generally known as second and third supervisors.

Usually, in addition to the first supervisor, the supervisory team will include the breadth of academic, pastoral and skills knowledge. Practices vary on the composition of such teams, which may include (i) an expert researcher in the specific disciplinary area; (ii) someone who is engaged in the support of postgraduate students at departmental or institutional level; (iii) an early-career researcher in the disciplinary area; (iv) a postgraduate tutor; (v) individuals holding similar roles. A significant number of institutions stipulate that there ought to be one supervisor for practice and one for theory, and some include external *'professionals'.*

A further advantage in establishing a supervisory team is that it opens the

24 See Inês Bento-Coelho, Annex 2: 'Survey Analysis: Doctoral Education in Europe: Policies and Practices in Artistic Research', in *The Creator Doctus Constellation. Exploring a new model for a doctorate in the arts* (2021).

possibility for an early-career researcher, who has little to no experience of doctoral supervision, to gain that experience in a supervisory team led by an experienced first supervisor. Often, the early-career researcher will be included in a team of three alongside the first and second supervisors, though there are other instances where the team is comprised of just two supervisors. This kind of arrangement has the great advantage of helping to build the pool of qualified supervisors with specific experience of doctoral research in the CPAD sector. The combined knowledge and experience of the supervisory team should ensure that a doctoral student has access to people who have experience in supporting students from admission, through progression and examination to successful completion of their programme. At least one member of the supervisory team should always be a person involved in research in the relevant disciplinary area so that the student's progress is informed by up-to-date knowledge of research in the discipline.

Each institution will decide the best supervisory model to fit their own circumstances, and the programme specification should clearly describe how the student's supervision will be organised and the supervisory arrangements formally approved.

Supervisory hours: The amount of time that a student devotes to their doctoral programme is usually equivalent to the norms expected for the award of ECTS credits. In this context, there is no correlation between the study hours that the student will devote – which can be highly variable – and the supervisory hours to which they are entitled – which are determined by each institution and described in the programme specification. There is no internationally defined amount, and considerable variation in, the supervisory hours that are allocated by institutions to the supervision of each doctoral student. Designated supervisory hours in the institutions range from 35 to 75 hours per year for a full-time student, with the majority allocating a minimum of 75 hours per year. It is important to bear in mind that this is the allocation of minimum supervisory hours to which the student is entitled, as opposed to the number of hours allocated to each member of a supervisory team. The distribution of these hours within a team can depend on whether the supervisor in question is the first, second or third supervisor, and on whether the student is full-time or part-time. Often, the time allocation for first supervisors will be double that of second supervisors. In some instances, if there is a third supervisor or an external advisor, it is likely that there will be a specific time allocation put in place.

Research supervisors and doctoral students share the responsibility to ensure that regular and frequent contact is maintained. It is also important that each institution has measures in place to monitor the overall workload of individual supervisors to ensure that they have time to support their research students with sufficient contact. This should normally require time allocated for research supervision recognised in the supervisor's employment contract.

Supervisory meetings: The outcomes of supervisory meetings should be recorded. This may be by both the supervisors and the student or by either, but it is essential to ensure that there is a common understanding and that the student is clearly aware of the outcomes. These records should include information on progress made, the setting of objectives and key feedback issues as well as areas of discussion, concern or disagreement. Institutions should make sure that doctoral students have easy access to their supervisors for advice and guidance throughout

the programme, irrespective of their home base or geographical location. If the main supervisor is not available, then the institutions should have measures in place for the student to know who their alternative contact will be.

Supervisory changes: If the doctoral student's first supervisor is unable to continue supervising their research, then the institution should have clear mechanisms in place to appoint another appropriate supervisor to undertake this role. Each institution will decide how long they think a first supervisor may be *'absent'* before they make a permanent replacement. Such measures should take account of the need to maintain continuity and stability in the doctoral student's programme of research.

In some instances, the relationship between a doctoral student and their first supervisor may not be working well. In such cases, the institution should ensure that the student knows where to seek other advice and that mechanisms are in place for the student to raise concerns regarding supervision. Normally, institutions will provide this information through a separate policy dealing with concerns, complaints and appeals.

Professional development: Supervisor training is an area where there are major differences in practice. However, there is a rapidly growing number of institutions introducing supervisor training, ranging from formal to informal processes. Key areas for the training of supervisors include guidance on doctoral 3rd Cycle EQF level 8 study – standards; learning outcomes; literature review; research methodologies; record keeping; referencing and plagiarism; ethics; IPR etc.

Training for societal and professional partners: Mentoring is an essential part of the experience for all new supervisors: academic, societal, and professional. A clear induction for societal and professional partners in which all aspects of the experience are explored is essential. It is also critical that these partners have a clear understanding of the level of learning and the required learning outcomes the research student is expected to achieve at the end of their study.

Admission

Each institution should specify the entry criteria (see section 2.10.) and any other admission requirements for the doctoral programme. For example, in some instances a candidate may be required to attend an admission interview and/or to provide an outline proposal of their research project or special topic. Often, the outline proposal will be in a very early stage of development that, if accepted into the doctoral programme, would need further refinement under supervision. In some fields of research, it may be relatively straightforward to identify the research questions on which the research project will be based. In other cases, however, the research questions may only be clarified through the process of practice-based enquiry once the student's programme has commenced. Whichever approach the institution adopts to describing its entry criteria and admission requirements, these must assist potential supervisors to identify a research project or special topic that will develop into a programme of research that leads to *new insights and enhanced understandings* and, hence, successful completion of the programme.

Progression

The institution must clearly describe how each student's progress from admission to examination will be monitored and evaluated. The main purpose of the monitoring process is to ensure that the student is appropriately supported towards success-

ful completion of their programme within the agreed timescale. The monitoring process also helps supervisors to judge whether the student's progress is satisfactory and, if not, what measures should be taken to help the student make improvements.

Progression monitoring operates less frequently than meetings between the doctoral student and their supervisor(s) and for example may include:

- Annual review by a panel charged with the responsibility of monitoring the progress of all doctoral students;
- Transfer from an intermediary award such as MPhil to the PhD;
- Successful completion of a probationary period after registration.

Progression requirements will vary depending on the nature of the doctoral programme. However, in the CPAD sector, there often are arrangements in place to ensure that a doctoral research project/thesis proposal is formally approved (usually within the first six months of the programme and no later than the end of the first year) before the student is allowed to progress. In some instances, this may be done through a transfer from MPhil to PhD or equivalent, or the successful completion of a probationary period throughout which the thesis proposal has been fully developed.

In order that the research student and their supervisor(s) can plan for the key stages of progression – including the preparation of appropriate materials and documentation along with appropriate consultations with staff involved in the student's programme – the institution should make available information that for example includes:

- Guidance on the progression monitoring process and its formal requirements;
- Timetable and schedule for progression monitoring;
- Guidance on the potential outcomes of formal progression meetings or assessments;
- The criteria that will be used to decide the outcomes of progression monitoring, e.g. whether a student's registration will be continued, extended, suspended or terminated;
- The institution's complaints and appeals procedure and how the student can access this.
-

Examination

Although operational arrangements for the final examination of a doctoral candidate may vary from one institution to another, the underlying principles and good practices on which the assessment process is based will likely be consistent.

As each student progresses through their doctoral programme, they should be provided with assessment experience that helps them to fully demonstrate their academic achievements. In some institutions, doctoral students are also provided with training that helps them to prepare for the final examination; such training may include, for example, workshops, written guidance, or the opportunity to participate in a mock *viva*. Prior to the final examination, the institution should provide doctoral students and examiners with written information that gives them a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in the process.

The final examination is normally, but not always, based on the presentation of a substantial body of work and a *viva voce* examination. The format and range of materials that may constitute the substantial body of work (the thesis)[25] will have been agreed at the outset of the student's programme of research. The make-up of this body of work will vary depending on the specialist discipline or research project with which the student has been involved. The format and make-up of the body of work (for example, whether it is text 'heavy' or text 'light') will not indicate different levels of achievement, but will provide the examiners with material that can help them to assess, in research terms, those *new insights and enhanced understandings that have been effectively shared.* It is the originality and intellectual rigour of the body of work that examiners will interrogate, including the format of its presentation. In this respect, the originality of the submitted body of work may be evident in one of its aspects but not necessarily in all its elements.

The doctoral candidate's final examination will normally be conducted by a panel of experts. Institutions should clearly describe the constitution of the final examination panel, along with the process for the selection of its individual members and their formal approval. To ensure the independence of the examination panel, institutions should describe those instances where a potential examiner may have a major conflict of interest that could prejudice their independence (either real or perceived). By way of example:

- In the case of an external examiner who, until recently, was an employee of the institution;
- Collaboration with the student's supervisor on, for example, co-exhibitions, co-authored publications, or research grants;
- Collaboration with the doctoral candidate on, for example, co-exhibitions, co-authored publications or research grants;
- Potential examiners whose own work is the focus of the doctoral candidate's research project.

Although practices vary, the constitution of a final examination panel usually includes the following:

- A minimum of two qualified examiners who are experts in the research specialism of the student. One of these is normally external to the institution with neither of them being the student's supervisor. If one of the external examiners has not examined before, or has limited experience, then the other examiner(s) should have sufficient experience to ensure that the process is rigorous and fair;
- More than two examiners are sometimes appointed if the student's thesis is, for example, highly interdisciplinary or has been engaged with a societal partner, or where the student is a member of staff. If more than two examiners are appointed, they are all normally external to the institution;
- In some instances, an independent chair may be appointed to oversee the business of the panel but who does not contribute to the assessment judgment. Generally, the chair will ensure the independence and consistency of the process and its adherence to the assessment criteria. Where an independent chair is appointed, the institution should clearly describe the role and responsibilities of the chair. If an independent chair is not appointed, then the institution should find alternative means to ensure fairness and consistency on behalf of the doctoral candidate;
- In some instances, the student's supervisor is permitted to attend the exami-

25 See Section 2.12., 'Programme description – The thesis'.

nation panel as an observer, but not a member, and with the student's consent. Usually, the supervisor is not allowed to speak on behalf of the student or to participate in the examination.

The institution should always ensure that the assessment criteria are made available to the doctoral candidate and to the examiners. These criteria will reflect the nature of the research discipline in which the doctoral candidate has been engaged. For example, they should accommodate a body of work that includes non-text elements such as, for example, artefacts, performances, compositions etc.

Practices vary considerably on the way that examiners will engage with, and report upon, the body of work that a doctoral candidate submits for examination. Usually, the collective judgment of the examination panel takes the form of a written report. Often, the examiners will be required to first submit an independent report on the thesis prior to the *viva,* and then submit a single joint report on the *viva*'s conclusion. Whichever approach the institution adopts, this should be clearly described in written guidelines prior to the *viva* so that all parties have a clear understanding of requirements. The guidelines should also include information on:

- The range of assessment outcomes available to the examination panel such as, for example, referral or resubmission, or the award of a qualification that is different to the one for which the candidate is registered;
- What information the doctoral candidate should receive if they are requested to revise and resubmit their thesis, including the timescale for this and what the student's status will be during this process;
- Whether or not the same examiners should be used for a resubmission.

In particular, the institution should develop explicit guidelines to deal with a situation where the external examiners may not be able to arrive at a consensus.

Methods for monitoring and enhancing quality and standards

Institutions that have been licensed to offer doctoral programmes will be expected to monitor and evaluate their provision on a systematic basis. In this respect, each institution should describe the structures, processes, timescales and benchmarks they will use to monitor provision.

Although practices vary, the monitoring and evaluation of doctoral programmes is usually undertaken by some form of research committee that reports to other senior academic committees of the institution. The Director of postgraduate programmes (or their equivalent) usually chairs the research committee, with its membership including doctoral supervisors and other personnel who support doctoral students. Such a committee will often meet three times a year and have the following types of responsibilities (this list is indicative rather than comprehensive and will vary depending on the institutional context):

- Overseeing the appointment and approval of doctoral supervisors;
- Maintaining and reviewing a list of approved doctoral supervisors;
- Reviewing supervisors' responsibilities and workload annually;
- Reviewing a schedule of research training workshops;
- Ensuring that appropriate information is made available to all supervisors and students concerning the operation and delivery of the doctoral programme;
- Overseeing arrangements for the progression and examination of doctoral students and dealing with instances where there may be concerns over a student's progression;

- Making arrangements to replace a supervisor who can no longer supervise or dealing with a supervisor/student relationship that is not working well;
- Convening an annual review panel to undertake the monitoring and annual evaluation of the doctoral programmes and respond to key issues arising through the report.

Monitoring and evaluation is normally done against internal and external benchmarks that are appropriate to the specialist areas of doctoral provision. However, all providers of doctoral programmes will be expected to demonstrate that they are meeting the standards expected for level 8 research degrees as set out in their own learning outcomes for doctoral programmes.

The following quality assurance statements are taken from the EQ-Arts Standards that relate directly to Part 1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG2015). These have been specifically formulated to provide Higher Education Institutions with a set of standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance (IQA), and are fully addressed in the context of external quality assurance (EQA) review procedures.

Quality Assurance Processes

- Does the institution involve the participation of internal and external peers/ experts and stakeholders in its IQA and EQA processes?
- Does the design of the institution's quality management processes assure institutional standards in Learning, Teaching and Research and how is this achieved?
- Does the institution use an appropriate set of qualitative and quantitative indicators, such as key performance indicators (KPIs), to critically evaluate, accurately measure and monitor its progress towards the realisation of its stated strategic research objectives?
- Are the programmes informed by leading research in the subject field?
- Has the institution developed a doctoral level *Code of Practice* with the aim of providing research students, supervisors, and others involved in the operation of postgraduate research degrees with a framework for the administration, supervision and organisation of research degrees at the institution?
- Does the institution ensure that there is a consistency of approach in the application of criteria and requirements across all programmes?
- Does the institution have measures in place to ensure that all doctoral students are treated equally and fairly and how are these applied?

Student-centred learning

- Is the design of the research study programme aligned with the institutional vision, mission and strategies?
- Are the learning, teaching and assessment methods and criteria effectively aligned with intended learning outcomes?
- Are students made fully aware of relevant assessment criteria and are they given clear, objective, and timely feedback on their level of achievement against the learning outcomes?
- Are students provided with opportunities to engage with related professional practices and the world of work as part of their research study programme?
- Are the regulations pertaining to the student experience applied according to the specific rights of the students, their individual rights, and their diversity?

Human resources

- Is the compliment of teaching, research, academic management and study support staff available to research students, sufficient to enable them to achieve their learning outcomes?
- Do the competences of the research staff enable students to achieve their learning outcomes?

Learning & teaching resources

- Does the institution make appropriate resources available to deliver the relevant quality of research?
- Does the institution ensure that the technical, digital and physical infrastructure made available to research students enables them to achieve the intended Learning Outcomes?
- Is an appropriate range of study, research and individual well-being support and guidance readily accessible to all students?

Part 3 : Research ethics and integrity

This section provides general guidance for 3rd Cycle researchers and their supervisors about ethics policies, and the ethical issues that can arise in the process of undertaking artistic research. Simply put, ethical policies, protocols and procedures are the application of accepted key moral norms or principles. Where professional codes of conduct exist, these should be adhered to, as well as any relevant legal statutes. Specific guidance on research ethics policies[26] and applications for ethics approval should be sought by supervisors and 3rd Cycle researchers from the doctorate awarding institution where their research degree is registered.

Introduction

> It would be wrong to think that other disciplines have formulated ethical practices and procedures that the creative arts and design can simply adopt. [Newberry, 2010, p.384]

To place this quote by Darren Newberry[27] in context, although ethics (from the Greek *ethos*) is an established branch of philosophy, the development of ethics policies and protocols for research is a relatively recent development. Arising in the mid-twentieth century, it initially related (urgently) to the oversight of human experimentation in medical science (see the Declaration of Helsinki, 1964), and reflected the recognition of the need for the medical research community to be self-regulating. It was subsequently adopted across the social sciences and other people-centred research disciplines and in the university sector.

In the CPAD sector, the increase of practice-based research degrees and of participatory practices over the last three decades, has provided the impetus for

26 All Higher Education Institutions undertaking research or awarding research degrees will have a published Research Ethics Policy and protocol.

27 From 'Research Training in the Creative Arts and Design' by D. Newberry. In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, p.384, Eds. Biggs, M., & and Karlsson, H., (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).

the sector to engage formally with ethics policies and protocols. However, as a sector, we would want to state very clearly that ethical questions have frequently arisen or featured in our practices – certainly since the last century – and that artists, designers and performers have often been in the vanguard vis-à-vis debates on ethics as a contested zone. But the imperative now, is for us to actively position our research in relation to formal ethical principles and protocols and their implementation, in order to be ethically just, while not being overwhelmed or held to ransom by the established approach to ethics that predominates the fields of scientific research.

Fundamental to research ethics, and widely accepted, are four cornerstone principles:

- respect for autonomy;
- beneficence;[28]
- non-maleficence;[29]
- justice

and respect for these principles lies at the heart of human rights legislation (Human Rights Act 1998).

Most Higher Education Institutions' (HEIs) research ethics policies articulate the four principles through assessment of the relative risks and benefits of research to individuals and society, and address the participants' right:

- to honesty and openness;
- to be protected from harm;
- to give informed consent;
- to anonymity;
- to privacy;
- to confidentiality;

as well as the right to withdraw from the research.

Within the CPAD sector, we now confidently advocate for *and* undertake artistic research (or its various synonyms), and, as stated above, we find ourselves having to negotiate how ethics policies, that have been developed and established largely by and for health and social science researchers, relate to our disciplines – to the design and methods of our practice-based research projects. Darren Newbury helpfully counsels us not to be tempted to just turn a blind eye to established ethics policies and protocols in our institutions, be they a University or an Arts Academy, but to continue to embrace the complex ethical questions that arise within the CPAD sector, whether within a research context or not.[30] Moreover, our sector really needs to ensure that arts and design voices are heard, and to fully contribute as active participants to the ongoing wider debates on ethical issues in research across the disciplines.

The more experience that CPAD 3rd Cycle researchers and their supervisors can gain in navigating the way through the challenges and contested territories of ethics protocols, the better placed we are to contribute to decisions on ethical approval pertaining to research in our sector. Such decisions should be based upon

28 Broadly, beneficence is the principle that researchers should have the welfare of the research participant as a goal of their research study (or clinical trial in medicine).

29 Broadly, non-maleficence is the principle of avoiding causation of harm to the research participant.

30 From 'Research Training in the Creative Arts and Design' by D. Newberry. In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, p.385, Eds. Biggs, M., & and Karlsson, H., (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).

finding and advancing the means to facilitate artistic research, whilst reducing the risk involved, and identifying best practice(s). While the fear of litigation in institutions is palpable and may result in a tendency towards risk aversion at ethics committee and senior management level, our motivation should be to enable and produce excellent and innovative research, whilst ensuring that both the researcher's and the participants' wellbeing and rights are safeguarded.

But let's take a moment to consider what it is to act ethically as researchers, first in a general sense, and then in terms of when to seek ethical approval for the implementation of design and methods encompassed in our research projects.

Acting ethically - being a responsible researcher

To act ethically is expected of any and all 3rd Cycle researcher in the arts, as well as beyond completion of a research degree, i.e. in post-doctoral and research settings. Acting ethically involves taking responsibility for our *general conduct* towards ourselves, towards others and towards the living and material world and is a judicious expectation of 3rd Cycle researchers on the part of the academic institutions, the funding councils/bodies that support 3rd Cycle research, and wider communities to which we belong. It involves considering the implications of actions undertaken within the framework of our practices and activities as artists, designers, filmmakers, photographers, dancers, musicians, performers etc., and should be understood as contributing to good practice across the CPAD sector. Acting ethically does not *necessarily* require ethics approval from your awarding institution or funding bodies, and it is just as relevant to professional artists, designers and performers, as it is to those involved in artistic research. For example, it may involve: respect for others including awareness and mitigation of unconscious bias; paying close attention to health and safety considerations and related risk assessment; selecting technical processes and/or sustainable materials that do not further harm the planet's fragile eco-systems; working with open-source coding; understanding Intellectual Property (IP) rights.[31] There are a myriad of ways in which we can choose to act ethically that are without institutional research ethics policies. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)[32] is an additional legal requirement with which all EU citizens need to comply.

Ethical approval

So when *is* ethical approval required by 3rd Cycle researchers, and how do we distinguish between when it is needed and when it is not necessary?
Broadly speaking, all CPAD 3rd Cycle researchers commencing a research project should at least consider the ethical implications of the design and methods of their research project. This is usually stipulated by academic institutions, as is attendance at an ethics workshop or successful completion of an ethics module or course, usually as part of research skills training. The majority of artistic research projects do not require ethics approval, because they do not involve human participants *directly* as research subjects. If a CPAD 3rd Cycle researcher needs to involve human

31 For further information, see World Intellectual Property Organization, which is a self-funding agency of the United Nations. https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/.

32 The General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679 is a Regulation in EU law on data protection and privacy in the European Union and the European Economic Area. It also addresses the transfer of personal data outside the EU and EEA. It was implemented in 2018 and replaced the Data Protection Directive.

(or animal)[33] subjects as part of their research, and if the research is undertaken *with* (as in collaboratively) or *about* those human participants or subjects, and will form part of the research project methods and research analysis or outcomes, then the researcher needs to have a conversation with their supervisor(s) to ascertain whether ethics approval is needed. This is the first step. The second step is for both the student and supervisor(s) to familiarise themselves with their institution's research ethics policy, and by so doing, decide whether ethics approval is needed or not.

Once a decision has been taken that ethics approval needs to be sought, the 3rd Cycle researcher will have to make an ethics approval application to be considered by the Ethics Committee[34] in their awarding institution, whether at Department, Faculty or Institutional level. The application form for ethical approval will usually cover the general principles of Ethics Policies outlined above in the introduction, and below in Section 3.6. However, the way in which the artist, designer or performer addresses the general principles will be specific to their research project and discipline. It will take some time to consider all aspects of the ethics application, and seeking advice is useful in preparing the application form. This time may feel like a hindrance to getting on with your research, but it is worth acknowledging that it enables you to give concentrated thought to the particularities and feasibility of your research methods, and this can be hugely beneficial to the design of your artistic research project. Where a 3rd Cycle researcher in the CPAD sector is using an interdisciplinary approach and is proposing to use qualitative social science methods,[35] such as semi-structured interviews or a case study analysis, then the completion of an ethics application will reflect those research ethics protocols.

When should ethical approval be discussed by the 3rd Cycle researcher and their supervisor(s)?

It is important that ethical approval is sought and granted in writing *before* any research that requires ethical approval is undertaken by the 3rd Cycle researcher, therefore, a conversation between student and supervisors on this matter should take place early on, preferably at the same time that the project proposal is under discussion or being approved.

Ethics and the challenges for the 3rd Cycle doctoral researcher in the arts

The gamut of ways that artists, designers and performers interface with various audiences and publics (human subjects) frequently leads to a lack of clarity or confusion about whether ethical approval is needed or not. In artistic research, there are no hard and fast rules about ethics approval being required, so the need for a discussion early on in the research project is of paramount importance to avoid failing to have approval granted when and where it is really needed, which could jeopardise the whole research project. It is important to keep in mind that doctoral research is, above all, training and preparation for future research, so understanding and grasping the importance and relevance of ethics policies and procedures is part

33 In addition to human subjects, ethics approval should also be sought for research that involves animals – as sentient beings.

34 All Higher Education Institutions undertaking research or awarding research degrees will have an Ethics Committee, with representative membership, that is convened regularly to consider ethics applications and grant ethics approval. See Section 5 of this Ethics guide.

35 For qualitative research methods see *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th edition), by N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (London: Sage Publications, 2017).

and parcel of the doctoral experience, even when approval is not needed. Artistic research methods may incorporate uncertainty or chance, or depend upon iterative or non-linear processes and approaches, with future directions and potential outcomes not known at the outset. While this approach needs to be defended and preserved, it places responsibility on the 3rd Cycle researcher and their supervisor(s) to be prepared to seek ethics approval if new research methods are introduced that involve human participants, at any point during the research period. Because ethics committees often meet at set times, for example quarterly, research may be hindered because ethical approval needs to be granted in writing before the research involving human participants is commenced. Remember, this is a key requirement of all ethics approvals.

The following section provides examples of contexts where ethics approval may or may not be required in order to proceed with the research project.

In the case of an audience attending a performance undertaken as part of a research project, no ethics approval would normally be needed. However, if the audience are asked specifically to participate in, for example, an evaluation of the performance, and their responses are recorded in some format and used in the research, then ethical approval probably needs to be sought.

- In the case of a filmmaker who has made arrangements for professional actors to play various rehearsed/scripted parts, no ethical approval would normally be needed. However, if improvisation is the focus of the research, and one of the methods is for the actors to improvise their performances, and the researcher intends to capture their feedback about the experience of improvisation, or document and analyse or represent their performances as part of the research, then ethical approval probably needs to be sought. If the feedback from actors is done using semi-structured interviews, then it would need ethical approval.
- A more complex set of ethical considerations and questions arises where, for example, artistic research involves deception, or acts of deliberate provocation – for which there is a long pedigree in the arts,[36] and where informing a public or an audience in advance of the 'act' in order to prevent harm (of whatever kind) would negate the integrity of the research outcomes. In such a case, the application for ethical approval would need to set out ways in which risk can be mitigated, reduced, though rarely removed altogether. It is such cases that require careful consideration, attention, innovation and resourcefulness on the part of the 3rd Cycle researcher and their supervisors in preparing the ethics approval application for the ethics committee – which may or may not grant ethics approval at first, and may request revisions to the application.
- An area of increasing challenge to artistic research is digital information storage and data protection legislation (GDPR, see above). This is of particular relevance and concern for CPAD researchers using photography and documentary filmmaking whose practice necessarily involves visual representation of human participants. Given that critical arts practice has long been engaged with ethical issues arising in the politics of representation,[37] the CPAD research community are well placed to address such challenges and may, indeed, be able to advise in disciplines such as visual anthropology where lens-based research methods are used.
- Participatory arts practice may be central to a 3rd Cycle researcher's doctoral project proposal, and the researcher may have previously worked on creative projects with participants and be highly experienced in such an approach. However, once a participatory approach is designed into a research project, whereby the participants are part of the research analysis and published findings or research outcomes, ethical approval will be needed. For specific advice when participants are co-researchers, see Ethics protocols for Community-based Participatory Research.[38]

36 From 'Research Training in the Creative Arts and Design' by D. Newberry. In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, p.385, Eds. Biggs, M., & and Karlsson, H., (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).

37 See *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices* (2nd Edition), by S. Hall, J. Evans, and S. Nixon (Eds.) (London: Sage Publications, 2016).

Ethics Committees

Depending on the institutional context and research structures of the awarding HEI, the ethics committee may be convened at subject-specific level. Alternatively, it may be convened to consider ethics applications and issues across all the disciplines in the wider institution. In the latter case, committee membership should include academics who represent the full range of disciplines. Representation and attendance of CPAD researchers and/or academics on ethics committees is valuable in such cases because arts research methods and approaches may be unfamiliar to science or humanities-based academics.

Ethics committees may not grant ethics approval on first submission of an ethics application, but might request revisions to be made. This might be a request for: further information from the researcher about planned mitigations; or a request for participant information sheets or briefing materials to be improved; or even a change to the intended research methods. The researcher is usually invited to reapply for ethics approval. NB: this may cause a delay to the commencement of the aspects of the research requiring ethics approval. Sometimes, in order for approval to be granted, conditions may be given. This is more likely when considering complex ethical issues.

Ethics protocols and principles

This section provides general guidance on ethical principles for research involving human participants that are normally included in institutional research ethics policies. Remember that such HEI policies and protocols normally cover research in all disciplines, from sociology to sports studies, from science to engineering, from ethnography to nursing, so may not immediately appear relevant for arts and design. However, to reiterate, it is the interpretation and application of ethics protocols in a specific research context that is necessary, and that general principles be upheld.

a) Informed consent

- The researcher should, where possible, inform potential participants in advance of any features of the research that might reasonably be expected to influence

38 Durham University Ethics guide for Community-based Participatory Research: https://www.durham.ac.uk/media/durham-university/research-/research-centres/social-justice-amp-community-action-centre-for/documents/toolkits-guides-and-case-studies/Ethics-Guide.pdf.

their willingness to take part in the study. This can be done in a printed information sheet, or at a briefing session and should be submitted to the ethics committee to evidence consideration for the autonomy of the participant.
- Where the research topic is sensitive, the ethical protocol should include verbatim instructions for the informed consent procedure and consent should be obtained in writing.
- Where children[39] are concerned, informed consent may be obtained from parents or teachers acting *in loco parentis*, or from the children themselves if they are of sufficient understanding. However, where the topic of research is sensitive, written informed consent should be obtained from individual parents.

b) Openness and honesty
- So far as possible, researchers should be open and honest about the research, its purpose and application. This can be done in an information sheet, handed to participants before the research commences, or at a briefing session (see below). This information sheet should be included in the ethics application as evidence of consideration of openness and honesty.
- Where research requires deception in order to achieve its intended purpose. Deception is usually only approved where specific conditions have been met. For example: when deception is unavoidable if the purpose of the research is to be achieved; if the research objective has strong merit, and if potential harm arising from the proposed deception can be effectively neutralised or reversed by the proposed debriefing procedures (see below).
- Failing to inform participants of the specific purpose of the study at the outset is not normally considered to be deception, provided that adequate informed consent and debriefing procedures are proposed.
- Covert observation should be resorted to only where it is impossible to use other methods to obtain essential data. Ideally, where informed consent has not been obtained prior to the research, it should be obtained *post hoc*.

c) Right to withdraw
- Where possible, participants should be informed at the outset of the study that they have the right to withdraw at any time without penalty.[40]
- In the case of children, those acting *in loco parentis* or the children themselves if of sufficient understanding, shall be informed of the right to withdraw from participation in the study.

d) Protection from harm
- Researchers must endeavour to protect participants from physical and psychological harm at all times during the research.
- Where stressful or hazardous procedures are concerned, obtaining informed consent (as above) whilst essential, does not absolve the researcher from responsibility for protecting the participant. In such cases, the ethical protocol must specify the means by which the participant will be protected, e.g. by the availability of qualified medical assistance.

39 If children or vulnerable adults are involved as participants in doctoral research, the researcher needs to go through a process to be checked for a criminal record. In the UK, this is the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS).

40 This can jeopardise research, and can often be addressed by proposing a window of time during which research participants can withdraw. Providing transcripts to participants, for example of recorded interviews, can also be proposed as a way to secure the research material.

- Where physical or mental harm nevertheless does result from a research procedure, investigators are obliged to take action to remedy the problems created.

e) Briefing and debriefing
- Researchers should, where possible, provide an account of the purpose of the study as well as its procedures. If this is not possible at the outset, then ideally it should be provided on completion of the study.

f) Confidentiality
- Except with the consent of the participant, researchers are required to ensure confidentiality of the participant's identity and data throughout the conduct and reporting of the research. Anonymity is subject to the same conditions.
- Ethical protocols may need to specify procedures for how this will be achieved. For example, transcriptions of the interviews may be encoded so that no written record of the participant's name and data exist side by side. Whether records are held on computer or not, GDPR applies. Researchers should make clear to participants the nature of any promises on confidentiality or restrictions on the use of data.

g) Ethical principles of professional bodies

This set of principles is generic and not exhaustive of considerations that apply in all disciplines. Where relevant professional bodies have published their own guidelines and principles, these must be followed and the current principles interpreted and extended as necessary in this context.

Frequently asked questions

Q. I am collaborating in part of my research with a professional writer. They don't want to be anonymised when I publish my research. I thought I had to anonymise them?

A. No, it is quite OK for you to name your collaborator with their consent, in fact not to do so may seem underhanded or unprofessional on your part. Always ask!

Q. My research project involves making a series of portraits (I am a painter) over an extended period of time, involving three sitters from a specific community. Do I have to seek ethical approval?

A. No, not unless your research questions are devised to include the sitters' experiences, and you intend to involve them in directly answering your research questions (through, for example, a questionnaire or unstructured interviews). However, there may be other considerations that you can address by acting ethically as a researcher.

Q. My artistic research is about site-specific memory and traces relating to a former prison, and I want to set up a series of informal and open-ended conversations with former prison officers which I will record on audio only. Can I leave my application for ethical approval until after the conversations as I don't know yet whether I will include any of the dialogue in my research project?

A. No, you should apply for ethical approval before undertaking any of the conversations. A few pointers for your ethics application are: you will need to include an information sheet for the former prison officers outlining the research aims and objectives, how you will protect their identity and the identity of any other persons they may mention, provide information about their right to withdraw (usually within a specified timescale), how you will store any data on them, and inform them how

you intend to use the dialogues in your research. On the basis of all this information, you will need to ask them to give their consent to participate in the conversations. The ethics committee will deliberate on the detail in the application and decide whether to grant ethics approval.

Q. My doctoral research involves appropriation, but one of my peers in a recent research workshop told me that it is tantamount to plagiarism,41 and that I need to apply for ethics approval to cover it as a method. Is this correct?

A. No, for a start plagiarism is not included in Ethics Policies, and guidance on plagiarism by students would normally be covered in the relevant Higher Education Institution's code of conduct. Appropriation in art practice is not the same as plagiarism, and as a method, this issue should be discussed with your supervisors.

Q. I am an art tutor (in a different academy from where I am registered as a doctoral student) and I am using action research as a key method in my doctorate. I intend to try some innovative pedagogical approaches on my first year students in their normal timetabled sessions next week. I assume that I don't have to seek ethical approval as I would be teaching them anyway and they are young adults?

A. In this case you *do* need to apply for ethical approval from the HEI where you are registered as a doctoral student, as the BA and MA students will become research subjects within the context of your action research methodology, regardless of their age. You will also need to apply for ethics approval in the institution where you teach.

Q. In my last supervisory meeting we discussed that I may include some rodents (mice or rats) in one of my site-based installations. I am worried that the audience might be distressed or concerned to see the creatures in an artwork. Do I have to worry about getting ethics approval?

A. In the first instance you *would* need to get ethics approval, because you are including live animals in the research and you need to ensure that they come to no harm. Secondly, you would be well advised to display a statement to inform the audience that the rodents will not be harmed, to allay their potential concern, but you don't need ethics approval for the audience as participants – unless you are planning to involve them directly in the research.

41 Plagiarism (presenting someone else's work or ideas as your own, with or without their consent, by incorporating it into your work without full acknowledgement) is usually addressed through academic misconduct processes in Higher Education Institutions. Plagiarism checker software is freely available.

Bibliography

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2017). *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th edition). SAGE Publications.

EQAR, [online] Available at: https://www.eqar.eu

EQ-Arts, [online] Available at: http://www.eq-arts.org

European accreditation agencies and quality assurance organisations, [online] Available at: https://european-accreditation.org/ea-members/directory-of-ea-members-and-mla-signatories/

Hall, S., Evans, J., & Nixon, S. (Eds.) (2016). *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices* (2nd Edition). SAGE Publications.

Newberry, D. (2010). 'Research Training in the Creative Arts and Design', in Biggs, M., & and Karlsson, H. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts.* Routledge.

The Bologna Process (1999), [online] Available at: https://www.abdn.ac.uk/documents/bologna-process.pdf

The Creator Doctus project (2013-21), [online] Available at: http://creatordoctus.eu

The ELIA Florence Principles (2016), [online] Available at: https://cdn.ymaws.com/elia-artschools.org/resource/resmgr/files/26-september-florence-princi.pdf

The European Commission's Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training (2011), [online] Available at: https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/policy_library/principles_for_innovative_doctoral_training.pdf

Europass, European Union, The European Qualifications Framework (EQF) (2017), [online] Available at: https://europa.eu/europass/en/european-qualifications-framework-eqf

The European Higher Education Area (EHEA), The European Standards and Guidelines (ESG2015), [online] Available at: http://www.ehea.info

The European University Association (EUA) Salzburg Principles (2005), [online] Available at: https://eua.eu/resources/publications/626:salzburg-2005-–-conclusions-and-recommendations.html

The European University Association (EUA) Salzburg II Recommendations (2010), [online] Available at: https://eua.eu/resources/publications/615:salzburg-ii-–-recommendations.html

ECApedia, The Bologna Working Group (2005) The Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area, [online] Available at: http://ecahe.eu/w/index.php/Framework_for_Qualifications_of_the_European_Higher_Education_Area#Third_cycle_-_PhD

The Graduate School of Culture Studies and Arts (GSCSA), Estonia, [online] Available at: http://doktorikool.humanitaarteadused.ut.ee/graduate-school-culture-studies-and-arts?lang=en

Europass, European Union, The National Qualifications Frameworks (2017), [online] Available at: https://europa.eu/europass/en/national-qualifications-frameworks-nqf

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), The Frascati Manual (2015), [online] Available at: https://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascati-manual.htm

The TUNING Educational Structures in Europe Sectoral Qualifications Framework for Humanities & Arts project, (2000) [online] Available at: http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/images/stories/HUMART/SQF_for_the_Creative_and_Performing_Discilpines.pdf [sic]

The Society for Artistic Research (SAR), The Vienna Declaration (2019), [online] Available at: https://societyforartisticresearch.org

Wilson, M & van Ruiten, S (Eds.), SHARE: Handbook for Artistic Research Education (2010–2013), [online] Available at: http://www.sharenetwork.eu/resources/share-handbook

Contributors

On behalf of the EQ-Arts Board, this document has been authored by:

Dr. Sarah Bennett: Artist – Researcher – Academic – PhD Supervisor and Visiting Fellow. Following her recent retirement as Head of the School of Art and Architecture at Kingston University, London, Sarah Bennett continues to be affiliated as a Visiting Fellow, and to supervise doctoral students at Kingston, as well as with Transart Institute (which offers practice-based doctoral research degrees in collaboration with Liverpool John Moores University). She has supervised 10 doctoral students, including 7 to completion. As a Board Member of EQ-Arts, Bennett has chaired enhancement reviews in Higher Education Arts institutions across Europe. Her artistic research focus is institutional systems, in particular those of Victorian psychiatry, explored through archives and architectural sites.

Professor Bruce Brown: Visiting Professor at the Royal College of Art and Goldsmiths College, London. Prior to this, he was Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research at the University of Brighton where he is Professor Emeritus. He recently chaired the Creative Arts panel for the Hong Kong Research Assessment Exercise 2020 and the Research Grants Panel [Arts] for Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia in Portugal. He chaired the Main Panels for arts and humanities in the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF2014) and the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE2008). He is a previous Board Member of the UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) and recently chaired a review of arts Doctoral awards for the Estonian Quality Agency. He is an Editor of Design Issues Research Journal (MIT Press) and was a member of the Editorial Board for The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts. He is an elected Fellow of Academia Europeae and the Royal Society of Arts.

Professor John Butler: As the former Head of Birmingham School of Art and Associate Dean for Research, John Butler became an Emeritus Professor of Art at Birmingham City University. A former President of ELIA (2000-04) and coordinator of the European Thematic Networks for the Art projects artesnetEurope (2000-04) and inter}artes (2004-07). He was awarded Doctor Honoris Causa by the University of Art & Design Cluj-Napoca Romania & Plymouth University and is currently the Chief Executive Officer EQ-Arts.

Further information can be found at:
http://www.eq-arts.org/operational-management/board/

Colophon

Authors:
Sarah Bennett
Bruce Brown
John Butler

Production: Christie Bakker (GRA), Liza Prins (GRA)
Graphic Design: Studio Remco van Bladel i.c.w. Matthijs Afman & Julia Waraksa
Copy Editing: Stephanie Racette
Printing: Drukkerij Raddraaier SSP, Amsterdam
Date: October 2021

Typefaces: Glossy, Balance
Paper: Munken Polar Rough – 100 grs

Published by: Gerrit Rietveld Academie, EQ-Arts © 2021

ISBN/EAN: 978-90-830969-7-1

Partners:

Funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained

herein.