

Assessment panel's report on the evaluation of third-cycle programmes in music

Assessment panel's task

The Swedish Higher Education Authority (UKÄ) tasked us with reviewing programmes leading to degree of licentiate and degree of doctor in music. Annex 1 presents our assessments with the related justifications and a proposed overall assessment for each programme reviewed.

We hereby submit our report to UKÄ.

Assessment panel's composition

The assessment panel included the following members:

- Professor Gerhard Eckel, University of Music and Performing Arts Graz and KTH Royal Institute of Technology (chairperson and subject expert)
- Docent Franziska Schröder, Queen's University Belfast (subject expert)
- Anne Piirainen, Sibelius Academy, University of the Arts, Helsinki (doctoral student representative)
- Anders Engström, Business Manager at Playground Music Scandinavia AB and Svenska Oberoende Musikproducenter (employer and working life representative)

See annex 2 for circumstances regarding conflicts of interest.

Assessment panel's work

The evaluation is based on the requirements laid out in the Higher Education Act (1992:1434) and the Higher Education Ordinance (1993:100). In cases in which the higher education institution offers both licentiate and doctoral degrees in music, they were evaluated as one unit. Assessment material consists of the higher education institutions' self-evaluation, including annexes formulated based on *Guidelines for the evaluation of third-cycle programmes*, Swedish Higher Education Authority 2016, revised 2018, general and individual study plans, interviews with representatives of the reviewed programme and doctoral students, and other material provided by UKÄ. This material is presented in annex 3.

Assessment process

From the material, we have assessed the quality of the programmes based on the following assessment areas and assessment criteria.

- preconditions
- design, implementation and outcomes (including gender equality and follow-up, measures and feedback)
- doctoral student perspective
- working life and collaboration

The assessment panel's preliminary report per programme was sent to the relevant higher education institution for review, so the higher education institution was able to point out any factual errors. The review period was three weeks. The responses from the higher education institutions are presented in annex 4. We have reviewed the higher education institutions' responses, and in cases in which we assessed them to be relevant, changes were made in the reports.

The assessment panel's reflections

Generally the assessment panel was impressed with the quality of the third-cycle programmes in music in Sweden. Despite their small number and scale, they offer well-structured research education and compelling contexts to conduct artistic and scholarly research in music. The interviews with students and staff confirmed that there is a high degree of satisfaction and commitment, as well as an awareness of the necessities and opportunities to further develop the programmes.

The assessment panel was impressed by the generous allocation of supervision time and the high level of qualification of the supervisory staff in both programmes. Nevertheless, with respect to supervisor training, the assessment panel suggests that all supervisors should receive specific supervisor training, which currently is not the case. The assessment panel notes that efforts are being made to maintain and further develop the productive and inspiring research environments and suggests increasing the numbers of doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers for further enhancement of the research environments.

Despite many efforts in creating international collaboration, the assessment panel has found little evidence of research communication at international conferences and symposia. The assessment panel suggests obliging the doctoral students to present their work to the international research community in talks and publications and to provide the necessary funding where it is not yet available.

With respect to the design and implementation of the programmes the assessment panel noted that course plans were very well-structured with a wide spectrum of courses and seminars that the doctoral students can choose from. Some of the established structures may need to be adapted though, should the number of doctoral students increase, which would be highly desirable. In order to increase the coherence among the doctoral students, the assessment panel suggests making a number of courses compulsory.

The assessment panel notes that one of the reviewed programmes is formally a scholarly programme, although it is run as an artistic research programme. The assessment panel is concerned about this ambiguity and suggests that the discrepancy, with respect to the general orientation of the programme, should be addressed in order to establish more coherency among the third-cycle programmes in music on a national level.

With respect to the outcome of the programs the assessment panel notes that the intellectual autonomy and artistic integrity of the doctoral students are well trained in the

regular research seminars. The tool of the individual study plan is applied with varying rigor and the assessment panel suggests using it to better monitor the progress of the research project and the intellectual development of the student. The assessment panel has found little evidence of how the doctoral students contribute to the development of society, particularly at a national level.

With the exception of the staff in one programme, the gender balance in the research environments is good in the long run and the assessment panel notes a generally good awareness of gender issues.

The assessment panel notes the good opportunities the doctoral students have to influence the content and implementation of their programmes and their opportunities to supervise Bachelor's and Master's student project. Doctoral students have a wide choice of courses and seminars that address their individual needs, both within and outside the institution. The interviews showed that –with a few exceptions– the general work conditions for doctoral students are good. The assessment panel noted that in one programme the doctoral students spend very little time on campus, which has a negative influence on the research environment.

The assessment panel noted that most doctoral students in the reviewed programmes are experienced professionals who are well integrated into work life and can be expected to continue their careers after their studies. Their third-cycle studies provide them with additional academic training, preparing them well to work as post-docs as well as senior research and teaching staff.

In conclusion, the assessment panel is grateful to the staff and doctoral students of the evaluated programs for their enthusiastic engagement in the assessment process. The assessment panel members wish the higher education institutions well for the continuing the successful development of their third-cycle programmes in music.

On behalf of the assessment panel

Gerhard Eckel
Chairperson

Annex 1

Assessment panel's assessments and justifications

Luleå tekniska universitet

Higher education institution	Third-cycle subject area	ID no.
Luleå tekniska universitet	Musikalisk gestaltning - licentiat- och doktorsexamen	A-2018-02-4435
<p>Assessment area: Preconditions</p> <p>Assessment criteria: Staff</p> <p>Assessment with justifications: <i>The number of supervisors and teachers and their combined expertise, scholarly and pedagogical, are sufficient and proportional to the volume, content and implementation of the programme in the short term and long term.</i></p> <p>At time of assessment, there were two main and seven assistant supervisors available for five doctoral students. The main supervisors are well qualified, connected researchers who have received supervision training. The principal supervisors have 80 hours per year and assistant supervisors have 40 hours per year allocated in their contract for supervision. A recruitment system ensures a good match between doctoral students and supervisors. At times, two assistant supervisors with specialised knowledge are assigned to each doctoral student. The assessment panel considers this good practice.</p> <p>In terms of staff ratio, there is not much room for a change in supervisor if desired, and three out of five doctoral students were with the same senior supervisor. Should the programme grow in volume, more supervisors will have to be appointed. Supervision is carried out regularly with the necessary flexibility according to the current needs of the student.</p> <p>The higher education institution offers courses in research supervision and organises an annual meeting of research supervisors. Personal development plans for supervisors are part of the annual monitoring on the department level. Research progress is monitored at faculty level.</p> <p>The senior supervisors show good competence and experience as their list of publications is extensive. The assistant supervisors also show expertise in their field. The number of supervisors and teachers and their combined expertise - scholarly, artistic, professional and pedagogical - are sufficient and proportional to the content and implementation of the programme in the short and long term.</p> <p>In line with the requirements by the higher education institution, all the principal supervisors have at least associate professor (docent) qualifications. The assessment panel noted that both principal supervisors have undergone education in research supervision, at the University of Gothenburg and at Luleå University of Technology. Furthermore, the higher education institution regularly organises courses for research supervisors, including courses on research funding, gender and diversity in postgraduate education, learning objectives and individual study plans, ethics, the supervisor's role and the relationship between supervisors and doctoral students.</p>		

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

The interviews revealed an enthusiastic commitment by senior management staff to invest in the programme and to support new ideas; in particular, the new 'Vision2020' has a strong technical and artistic practice component and the faculties seem to work closely together, with plans being made to appoint a new professor and to keep recruiting new staff.

Assessment area: Preconditions**Assessment criteria: Third-cycle programme environment**

Assessment with justifications: *Research at the higher education institution has quality and scale for third-cycle education to be carried out at a high scholarly level and within a good educational framework. Relevant collaboration occurs with the surrounding society, both nationally and internationally.*

Recently, there has been an increased interest in the higher education institution's doctoral programme - 40 applicants (both Swedish and international) have applied for only two doctoral positions. The higher education institution has a five-step admission process for prioritising and admitting students. Although time consuming, the staff believe this process is worthwhile. Indeed, the assessment panel found the process to be rigorous.

The higher education institution has an outstanding infrastructure, such as the Studio Acusticum building, which includes a 600-seat concert hall, advanced recording and playback equipment, and a highly flexible Black Box suitable for experimental musical and stage productions. In addition, Studio Acusticum has practice and seminar rooms and its own record label.

There is potential to collaborate with external organisations such as locally funded ensembles dedicated to and jazz. Currently, a doctoral studentship is being designed that will support collaboration between one doctoral student and the Piteå Chamber Opera. In addition, there is a potential for student collaborations with other organisations such as Norrbotten NEO and Norrbotten Big Band. Such collaborations will certainly increase the quality of the research environment as current doctoral students do not spend much time on campus (only one week/month). The interviews revealed that plans are in place to collaborate more closely with Norrbotten NEO, an organisation that has provided funding for one doctoral student. There are also plans for a new post-doc and potentially for a new course in contemporary music performance. The assessment panel sees these plans as another way to keep improving opportunities for doctoral students as they are tied to local ensembles closer to the school.

In the self-evaluation it was pointed out that a research area with a focus on 'Innovative Art and Technology' was created at the higher education institution, and it would seem that this sign of excellence, in addition to the existing relationship with Applied Acoustics, should be used in better ways as so far to attract a larger, and indeed, an international doctoral student cohort. The interviews confirmed that the research area 'Innovative Art and Technology' benefits from small amounts of funding for collaborations, such as using sensor technologies.

The assessment panel recommends that other collaboration partners such as the School of Theatre in Luleå and research areas in computer graphics and lighting design at Campus Skellefteå should be pursued and offered as future collaborative studentships. In addition, the assessment panel believes students would benefit from collaboration with the sound engineering department.

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

The assessment panel notes with some concern that none of the doctoral students live in Piteå. A serious question arises about the doctoral student community in the field of Musical performance at the institution. The assessment panel understands that all of the doctoral students have a professional career, but the fact that doctoral students do not reside in Piteå negatively impacts the research environment. The assessment panel notes the efforts that are being made in creating future doctoral positions through collaborations with local institutions, which link to the facilities and musical resources at the higher education institution, and the assessment panel finds that the excellent resources at the higher education institution must be used for advertising such positions at national and international level. In terms of post-doctoral positions, the higher education institution will have to seek external funding (e.g., EU funding) and possible cross-faculty posts.

The assessment panel notes that the higher education institution established a doctoral student week, where every month all doctoral students meet for three seminars (research, work-in-progress, literature/thematic) and supervision. Interdisciplinary meetings in the context of the 'Innovative Art and Technology' at the higher education institution also take place during this week. Doctoral students participate in the National Network for Artistic Research in Music (NKFN) and a funding scheme for conference participation is in place. The assessment panel notes that a real effort seems to be made in order to create a good research environment, despite the absence of many of the doctoral students. The assessment panel suggests that the physical presence of all researchers (doctoral students and supervisors) on campus would create a more fruitful and sustainable research environment.

The interviews confirmed that doctoral students attend the doctoral student weeks and that they engage in seminars, supervision meetings and doctoral seminars. The students seem well-prepared for their seminars. Also, the students confirmed that the overall atmosphere was very good and that during periods where they did not meet they exchange ideas and engage in group chats.

There is a lack of international presentations by doctoral students; this shortcoming will need to be addressed. Furthermore, the assessment panel recommends that the supervisory teams and the doctoral students plan for a minimum number of international presentations, especially since funding has been made available to doctoral students.

It was noted with great praise that Luleå University of Technology hosted the Swedish Research Council's annual symposium on artistic research (November 2018). Such activities increase the visibility and showcase the higher education institution's excellent infrastructure to an international audience. The assessment panel recommends that such highly visible events be regularly conducted. Currently, there is no detailed description of an in-house forum for presentations and discussions of research (apart from the standard research seminars) or a visiting speaker programme. As such, the assessment panel recommends that the programme develop an invited speaker series with national and international speakers/artists.

Overall assessment of the assessment area preconditions**Assessment with justifications:** *Satisfactory*

The assessment panel notes that the supervisory capacity is sufficient due to the low number of doctoral students. When more students and a wider range of research topics are in place, additional

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

supervisors and/or senior staff will need to be recruited. The interviews confirmed that plans are in place for further recruitments.

Although the assessment panel commends the higher education institution's breadth and depth of collaborations, we recommend that other national and international networks be more actively pursued and implemented (e.g., through EU funding). A flourishing research community consists of doctoral and post-doctoral students and the assessment panel recommends that attracting post-doctoral students should be one of the strategic priorities.

The assessment panel specifically noted a lack of international presentations by doctoral students, which will need to be addressed and a minimum amount of international presentations be agreed between the supervisory team and the doctoral student, especially seeing that funding has been made available to students.

The assessment panel notes with some concern that the doctoral students are not present at Campus Piteå and that this has an impact on the research environment. The assessment panel notes the efforts that are being made in integrating future doctoral positions, which link to the facilities and musical resources at the higher education institution and the assessment panel finds that the excellent resources at the higher education institution must be used for advertising such positions at national and international level.

The assessment panel confirmed during interviews that staff and doctoral students spoke with pride of the excellent facilities and that the infrastructure is considered as very good. An effort to collaborate with the sound engineering department should be pursued.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes**Assessment criteria: Achievement of qualitative targets for 'knowledge and understanding'**

Assessment with justifications: *The programme facilitates through its design and implementation and ensures through examination that doctoral students who have been awarded their degrees show broad knowledge and understanding both within their third-cycle subject area and of the scientific methodology in the third-cycle subject area.*

The self-evaluation illustrates that the higher education institution ensures the doctoral students have a broad knowledge and understanding in Musical performance through supervision, courses on research methodology, qualitative research, information retrieval and reference management, and university pedagogy. As an example of good practice, the dissertations of the two students who have been awarded their degrees during the last five years clearly show a broad knowledge and understanding within their subject and respective methodology.

The assessment panel notes that the doctoral programme is formally a scholarly programme, although it is run as an artistic research programme. The assessment panel is concerned about this ambiguity and suggests that the discrepancy with respect to the general orientation of the programme be addressed as a matter of priority. Currently, students are mainly trained in artistic research in two subject-specific courses (Musical performance and artistic research and Being a researcher in music). These courses also cover scholarly methodologies, such as phenomenology and hermeneutics, but not to an extent typical for a scholarly programme.

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

The research seminars are well-organised, are regularly held, and efficiently present content on many levels. Every semester, all doctoral students participate in one or two common departmental seminars to foster interdisciplinary collaboration and distribute general information about third-cycle education. Doctoral students meet their principal supervisors at least once per month and their assistant supervisors whenever needed. The doctoral students prepare material for the meeting (text and documentation) and share it with their supervisors. During the research seminars, the doctoral students are required to submit an advance summary of their presentations or their full presentations. Furthermore, the doctoral students receive feedback on their presentations before and during their actual presentations.

This seems an excellent way of providing further training to the overall doctoral student cohort (having to comment on another area of research); however, with an increased number of doctoral students such a system is unlikely to be workable as it would put a lot of time pressure on already highly busy doctoral students. A different system, in which one or two responders are identified, might need to be implemented if the number of doctoral students was to significantly increase. The chairing of the seminars by a doctoral student is an example of good teaching/learning practice. The assessment panel also positively noted that all responses of the seminars are logged onto the higher education institution's learning platform accessed through its website.

It was noted, as an example of good practice, that the 50 per cent seminar and the final 90 per cent seminar are evaluated by an external senior researcher. The assessment panel would like to be assured that these external evaluators are independent of the doctoral students work. The assessment panel recommend that such an evaluator be recruited from an international or national cohort of experts. The assessment panel suggests that an invited speaker series could be established, which would allow the 50 per cent and 90 per cent seminars to be combined with an assessment by an invited expert.

The assessment panel notes that there are no criteria mentioned regarding how artistic work (especially concerts) are evaluated with respect to their role in a scholarly research process. The individual study plans do not show clearly the project description nor a good record of the academic and intellectual progress of the doctoral student. The assessment panel recommends that individual study plans should be used more efficiently by better tracing the development of the doctoral project.

It became evident from the self-evaluation that the amount of course credits required for a degree is flexible; the General Curriculum specifies an interval of 60 to 120 credits (for the degree of licentiate, 30 to 60 credits). For most doctoral students, the courses correspond to 60-80 credits (30-40 credits for the degree of licentiate), depending on the individual needs of the doctoral students, with regard to their previous studies and the requirements of their research projects. There seems to be a wide range of courses offered. The doctoral students complete various courses at the higher education institution, including subject-specific courses, courses on qualitative research, information retrieval and reference management, and university pedagogy, but they are also given the flexibility to take courses elsewhere when a subject relevant to their project is not offered at the higher education institution.

Individual reading courses are defined by the supervisor and doctoral student depending on the needs of the particular project. Individual courses may also take the form of an artistic project. Two subject-specific courses in Musical performance, on 7,5 credits each, were given in 2015/16 and

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

2016/17. The first course Musical performance and artistic research provides an orientation in artistic research, both generally and in the field of music. The course material consists of articles and book chapters specified in the course plan, and in addition two individually chosen artistic doctoral dissertations, in music and in another artistic subject, respectively. The examination is based on the doctoral students' participation in the discussions, critical written essays (three for individual course parts and one covering the course content as a whole), and oppositions to another doctoral student's final essay. The second course, Being a researcher in music, comprises seven three-hour seminars, including an evaluation session as part of the last seminar.

The assessment panel was concerned that none of the courses are compulsory. Although doctoral students are encouraged to take courses to train them for a future career as supervisors and teachers (e.g., a course in university pedagogy), there does not seem to be any requirement for any professional training apart from the three monthly seminars, which are three to four hours each. The assessment panel strongly suggests that some compulsory courses be introduced.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes**Assessment criteria: Achievement of qualitative targets for 'competence and skills'**

Assessment with justifications: *The programme facilitates through its design and implementation, and also ensures through examination that doctoral students who have been awarded their degrees can demonstrate the ability to plan and use appropriate methods to conduct research and other qualified tasks within predetermined time frames, and in both the national and international context, in speech, in writing and authoritatively, can present and discuss research and research findings in dialogue with the academic community and society in general. Doctoral students are able to contribute to the development of society and support the learning of others within both research and education and in other qualified professional contexts.*

The ability to plan and conduct research, including reflection on the choice of methods, is trained well and followed up regularly. Appropriate methods to ensure that doctoral students prepare in accordance with the requirements (e.g., for seminars) is in place and notes are kept in the individual study plan by the doctoral students and their supervisors.

Doctoral students are prepared to teach at Bachelor's and Master's level courses and supervise Bachelor theses. The opportunities for the students to teach and supervise within the department are excellent. Although their teaching activities would even further profit from the doctoral students spending more time at the higher education institution campus.

The measures to ensure reaching the target knowledge and understanding are tailored towards achieving competence and skills to plan and conduct research in a timely fashion. If doctoral students fall behind the time plan, this is recorded in the individual study plan and a system is in place for remedial measures. This is scrutinised by the head of department through the Coordinator of Third-Cycle Studies. The progress of the doctoral students is also followed by the head of sub-department. The assessment panel finds this system to be very robust.

Doctoral students are introduced to research methods in the subject specific courses and methodological questions are systematically discussed in supervisory sessions. Although the self-evaluation report states that doctoral students regularly participate actively in national and international conferences, there is little evidence in the individual study plans that this is indeed the

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

case. The statement that in 2018 doctoral students had paper proposals accepted for different international conferences was not evident from the students' publication list, apart from one paper presentation in Tromsø, Norway. Therefore, if funding is in place, a minimum attendance at international events should be agreed upon at the outset of the student's study.

Publication lists from the doctoral students indicate a focus on practice-based outputs (performances, recordings and compositions). Each doctoral student has a good track record based on the time they are allocated. Few doctoral students participate in international conferences and no doctoral student has published a monograph or a journal article, which is very untypical for a scholarly programme. This lack of student publications and/or presentations at international events needs to be addressed.

Outreach activities include doctoral students presenting their research to the public (as seminars, concerts and other performance activities), although a more focused effort on social engagement might need to be pursued. Furthermore, the assessment panel would like to see how artistic research might develop a theoretical foundation in its relation to scholarly research and how it might define societal need. Initiatives such as 'communicating your research' or 'popular art/science presentation', which ask doctoral students to present their work to a non-specialist audience, should be more thoroughly encouraged.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes**Assessment criteria: Achievement of qualitative targets for 'judgement and approach'**

Assessment with justifications: *The programme facilitates through its design and implementation, and also ensures through examination that doctoral students who have been awarded their degrees can demonstrate intellectual autonomy and scientific probity as well as the ability to make assessments of research ethics. The doctoral student also has a broader understanding of the science's capabilities and limitations, its role in society and human responsibility for how it is used.*

Intellectual autonomy and scholarly probity are trained in the regular research seminars, for which the doctoral students have to prepare in writing and assess each other's research projects. The response model of the research seminars ensures that the doctoral students can demonstrate and defend their intellectual, scholarly and artistic choices.

Questions of ethics in research are addressed in the subject-specific course Being a researcher in music. Typical questions relate to publishing recordings of rehearsals and performances as part of a dissertation project. The interviews confirmed that questions about artistic research are subject of debate and that doctoral students take courses at University of Gothenburg with a focus on artistic research. The assessment panel was concerned that none of the courses are compulsory and strongly suggests that some compulsory courses be introduced.

Questions concerning the capabilities and limitations of science and art are also addressed in both subject-specific courses (Musical performance and artistic research and Being a researcher in music) and are frequently treated in seminar discussions.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes**Assessment criteria: Gender equality**

Assessment with justifications: *A gender equality perspective is taken into account, communicated, and supported by the content, design and implementation of the programme.*

Datum
2019-04-02

Reg.nr
411-00073-18

The current gender balance is good with close to equal numbers of male and female doctoral students and with a similar balance in the supervisory team. The assessment panel positively notes that several of the research projects indeed tackle gender within their projects (such as gender issues in opera performance).

The assessment panel also notes that the higher education institution has measures in place, including policy documents intended to implement gender perspective at all levels, to ensure that gender equality policies are met. Gender equality monitoring processes are in place.

The fact that students are not working as a cohort on site (i.e., some work outside of the university context, some in isolation, and some in smaller groups) could potentially lead to a non-awareness of gender issues. The assessment panel encourages an ongoing programme and research environment where exchanges (also with other schools and research groups) might counteract such tendencies.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes

Assessment criteria: Follow-up, measures and feedback

Assessment with justifications: *The content, design, implementation and examinations are systematically followed up. The outcomes of the follow-up are translated, when necessary, into actions for quality improvement, and feedback is given to relevant stakeholders.*

The individual study plan as the main tool to follow-up the doctoral students' academic performance is updated and revised at least twice a year. The doctoral students and their supervisors agree on the contents of the individual study plan throughout the doctoral students' education. The agreements are followed up by the Coordinator of Third-Cycle Studies.

The assessment panel notes that the individual study plans are difficult to understand and should be redesigned to allow for incremental updating. This would help in assessing the development of the research. The assessment panel suggests that the individual study plan should contain an abstract of the project, which should also be updated once a year.

The interviews revealed that some doctoral students saw the individual study plan as an extra layer of bureaucracy to deal with, although most found that the individual study plan helped them see a structure to their work. However, all agreed that the individual study plans are generally not well connected to their research. The department/faculty might want to look into how the individual study plans could be improved to better support the students and not simply to provide an unwanted layer of extra work to deal with at the end of each semester.

The assessment panel notes that progress is also followed up in formalised individual development dialogues between the department head and the chaired professors. Doctoral students from all subjects meet regularly with the Coordinator of Third-Cycle Studies for information and discussion on the participants' projects and other relevant issues. The general curriculum is revised when needed and when a new chaired professor is appointed. The subject-specific courses are evaluated periodically.

The generic model for evaluation of research subjects and research educations at Luleå University of Technology is applied. Top-down processes are complemented by bottom-up processes for

Datum
2019-04-02

Reg.nr
411-00073-18

identifying issues. The general curriculum is revised on demand and when a new chaired professor is appointed. The subject-specific courses are evaluated periodically. External peer review takes place at the mid-point in the doctoral student's studies and during the final seminar.

The assessment panel sees potential areas of improvement in developing and maintaining contact with alumni and feeding their knowledge and experiences back into the programme.

The higher education institution acts to ensure that the doctoral students carry out the programme within the planned period of study.

It is not possible for the assessment panel to comment on completion rates, as the last cohort of doctoral students only commenced in 2015 and none of the doctoral students have completed their degree at the time of this assessment.

Overall assessment of the assessment area design, implementation and outcomes

Assessment with justifications: *Satisfactory*

The assessment panel notes that the target knowledge and understanding is well addressed by the research seminars, which are held regularly and efficiently. The format of the seminars stimulates the engagement of the doctoral students and their responses are shared on the higher education institution's learning platform accessed through its website, which is very positive. As the current system does not scale well, an alternative system may have to be installed if the number of students were to significantly increase. The assessment panel notes that there is a wide range of courses available for the doctoral students to pick from according to their projects and individual needs, but none of them are compulsory. The assessment panel strongly suggests compulsory courses be introduced, especially to train students as future supervisors and teachers. The assessment panel notes that the doctoral programme is formally a scholarly programme, although it is run as an artistic research programme. The assessment panel is concerned about this ambiguity and suggests that the discrepancy with respect to the general orientation of the programme be addressed immediately.

With respect to developing competence and skills, the assessment panel notes that students are well trained to plan and conduct research in a timely fashion and that there is a robust system in place for remedial measures should they be required. Research methods and methodological questions are addressed systematically and students are encouraged to participate in international conferences through a funding scheme. The assessment panel has found little evidence of conference presentations in the individual study plans and suggests that a minimum number of attendances should be introduced and agreed with the students at the outset of the study. The opportunities for the students to teach and supervise within the department are excellent, and could be further improved by an increased presence of the students at the campus of the higher education institution. The assessment panel could not find evidence of how doctoral students contribute to the development of society at large and suggests that they should be encouraged to present their work to a non-specialist audience.

With respect to the target judgment and approach, the assessment panel notes that the doctoral students' intellectual autonomy and artistic integrity are well-trained in the regular research seminars. Questions of research ethics are addressed in courses and may also be assessed by a special committee at university level if required.

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

With respect to gender equality, the assessment panel notes a good balance among doctoral students and supervisory team. Policies and measures are in place that monitor and maintain gender equality. To mitigate the ignorance of gender issues that might be the result of a lack of student interaction, the assessment panel suggests more exchanges be established within the research environment and with other schools or research groups.

The assessment panel notes that besides the individual study plan as the main tool to follow-up the doctoral students' performance, progress is monitored in formalised dialogues between the chaired professors and the head of department, which the assessment panel deems as a very positive arrangement. The assessment panel is concerned about the fact that no criteria seem to be in place to evaluate artistic work. The assessment panel recommends that a clear project description be added to the individual study plans and that these project descriptions be updated regularly in order to track the intellectual and academic development of the doctoral students.

Assessment area: Doctoral student perspective**Assessment criteria: Doctoral student perspective**

Assessment with justifications: *Doctoral students are given the opportunity to take an active role in the work to improve the content and implementation of the programme.*

Doctoral students have good opportunities to actively influence content and implementation of the programme, both formally and informally. Through the regularly revised individual study plan, each doctoral student has the opportunity to influence the offered supervision and discuss the contents of the programme. Suggestions, wishes, and experiences of the doctoral students are considered when redesigning courses and seminars. If necessary, supervision is revised.

The self-evaluation indicates that doctoral students have a sufficient amount of qualified supervision, both on the individual level and in form of seminars and courses. Doctoral students have a wide choice of courses and seminars that meet their individual needs both within and outside the institution. There are no compulsory courses, which the assessment panel finds can be somewhat confusing for the students, especially at the beginning of the studies. The assessment panel suggests that some compulsory introduction courses would be a positive addition to the course offer.

The doctoral students have good opportunities to participate in decision processes on department and university level as they are represented in the Student Union's doctoral section and participate regularly in the section meetings.

The programme ensures a good physical and psycho-social work environment for the doctoral student.

As the self-evaluation shows, the doctoral students have good working conditions. Doctoral students are offered their own workspace and possibilities for using the excellent infrastructure, such as the concert venues and high-end technical facilities in the Studio Acusticum. The possibilities for collaboration with local ensembles (e.g., Norbotten NEO) are an example of good practice. The assessment panel recognises the significant efforts have been made to broaden the collaboration with further local ensembles in the near future.

Datum
2019-04-02

Reg.nr
411-00073-18

The current doctoral student group is very small. The assessment panel notes with concern the fact that none of the five doctoral students live near the campus. Exchange and communication within the doctoral student group happen mainly through online platforms and during the one doctoral student week per month. The recent efforts to create new doctoral student positions and the new requirement of students to be on campus more often (at least one week per month) are seen as very positive. There are currently no post-doc researchers, but efforts are ongoing to enlarge the senior research environment with one new post-doc position starting in the near future.

The workload of the doctoral students tends to be very high as it combines research, ongoing artistic work, teaching duties, and frequent travel.

The interviews confirmed that the doctoral students feel listened to and valued and that their tailor-made individual study plan, agreed upon between students and supervisors, is useful, although some doctoral students were concerned that in their first year they were unsure what needed to be achieved. Therefore, the assessment panel recommends that setting clearer goals and aims for incoming doctoral students should be made a priority.

The opportunities for the doctoral students to teach and supervise within the department are excellent, and could be further improved by an increased presence of the doctoral students at the campus. National collaboration is stated as very active in the self-evaluation. The assessment panel recommends that the programme develop opportunities for students to interact with international researchers and doctoral students by, for example, requiring them to present their research at international conferences. Better communication with beginning doctoral students about the working conditions, such as the use of work computers and more transparent information on available project funding, are potential areas of improvement. Also, clear evaluation parameters for the artistic work within the doctoral research project needs to be developed further.

In the university, there are two doctoral ombudsmen and psychological services are available for doctoral students. On university level clear procedures for an eventual change of supervisor exist, but there is currently not much room for a change in supervisor if needed, as three out of the five students are with the same senior supervisor.

Overall assessment of the assessment area doctoral student perspective

Assessment with justifications: *Satisfactory*

Doctoral students have good opportunities to influence content and implementation of the programme. The programme offers adequate supervision for the doctoral students to develop their knowledge and skills in order to accomplish their studies successfully. The individual study plans are tailor-made according to the student's project and are discussed regularly. Doctoral students have a wide choice of courses and seminars that address their individual needs, both within and outside the institution. Viewpoints and experiences of the doctoral students are discussed regularly and the feedback is considered when making improvements to the programme. Apart from the consequences of the doctoral students spending little time at the campus of the higher education institution, the working conditions are good due to individual working space and excellent infrastructure with artistic and technical facilities. The integration of doctoral students in the Bachelor's and Master's programmes is good through teaching and supervising students. The assessment panel believes the

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

quality of the programme will improve when more students are admitted, the students have a greater presence on campus, and a larger post-doc research environment is established.

Assessment area: Working life and collaboration**Assessment criteria: Working life and collaboration**

Assessment with justifications: *The programme is designed and implemented in such a way that it is useful and develops doctoral students' preparedness to meet changes in working life, both within and beyond academia.*

The programme offers enough breadth to allow doctoral students to sufficiently prepare themselves for both an academic career and a career outside academia.

It became evident from the self-evaluation that doctoral students in Musical performance almost always have plenty of experience with professional life as musicians and, in many cases, as teachers. Moreover, the research within the programme presupposes continued musical activity in public contexts by the doctoral students. This means that the doctoral students bring experience from working life when admitted and continue their public musical work after admission, as a natural and necessary part of their research. These experiences prepare the doctoral students to continue their work as professional musicians after graduation.

The doctoral students are also prepared for a career within the academy since courses in university pedagogy and in supervision are part of their studies. The doctoral students are also engaged in teaching and supervision of students from the Bachelor's programme, and in some cases, in the organisation of courses. Furthermore, the doctoral students are encouraged to apply for research funding on a small scale during their studies.

Annual individual career development dialogues are carried out by the heads of the respective sub-departments, where the performance of the previous year is assessed, and an individual development plan for the next year is agreed upon.

The assessment panel praises the fact that the individual study plans include a tentative plan about the doctoral students' future working life. The self-evaluation showed that there are also several good possibilities to use the Studio Acusticum as a hub for collaborations and concerts. The higher education institution shows a positive attitude towards creating connections towards both the academic and music industry environments.

There has been a great change in the way music listeners consume music. This change affects not only the music industry but also how music is composed, arranged and recorded. In order for doctoral students to be closer to the recorded music industry, the assessment panel suggests that topics about current and future music consumption be included in the course offerings when relevant. As mentioned above, the assessment panel suggests the department develop a speaker series with national and international speakers and artists as well as international music business professionals.

Overall assessment of the assessment area working life and collaboration

Assessment with justifications: *Satisfactory*

It became evident from the self-evaluation that doctoral students in Musical performance almost always have a great deal of experience of professional life as musicians and, in many cases, as teachers. Moreover, the research within the program presupposes continued musical activity in public

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

contexts by the doctoral students. This means that the doctoral students bring experience from working life when admitted and continue their public musical work after admission, as a natural and necessary part of their research. This gives the doctoral students a preparedness for a continuation of their work as professional musicians after graduation.

The doctoral students are also prepared for a career within the academy since courses in university pedagogy and in supervision are part of their studies. The doctoral students are also engaged in teaching and supervision of students from the Bachelor's programme, and in some cases, also in the organisation of courses.

It was noted that the higher education institution reaches out to interact with many local institutions, but there is also an ambitious plan to connect with other Swedish universities to broaden knowledge and share experiences in a wider context. In addition there are also a number of international contacts taken.

Overall assessment: High quality

Assessment with justifications: *In conclusion, the programme is assessed as maintaining high quality.*

The assessment panel notes that although the present supervisor capacity is sufficient, additional supervisors will need to be recruited when/if the number of doctoral students and the range of topics increase. The assessment panel acknowledges the good collaborations within the higher education institution, but recommends the programme to engage more in national and international networks. Doctoral students should present more at international conferences and a post-doctoral programme should be installed to attract international researchers. The assessment panel notes with concern that the doctoral students, despite the excellent infrastructure, are rarely on Campus Piteå (only one week/month), which can have a negative impact on the research environment.

The assessment panel notes that the target knowledge and understanding is well addressed by the research seminars, which are held regularly and efficiently. However, the assessment panel is concerned about the fact that no criteria seem to be in place to evaluate artistic work and it suggests a clear project description be added to the individual study plan. The assessment panel acknowledges the wide range of available courses and suggests, that some should be made compulsory. With respect to developing competence and skills, the assessment panel notes that students are well trained to plan and conduct research in a timely fashion and that there is a robust system in place for remedial measures should they be required. The students' intellectual autonomy and artistic integrity are also well-trained in the regular research seminars. With respect to gender equality the assessment panel notes a good balance among students and supervisory team. The content, design, implementation and examinations are systematically followed up. The outcomes of the follow-up are translated, when necessary, into actions for quality improvement. The assessment panel sees potential areas of improvement in developing and maintaining contact with alumni and feeding their knowledge and experiences back into the programme.

The assessment panel notes that doctoral students have good opportunities to influence content and implementation of the programme. Doctoral students can choose from wide range of courses and seminars according that address their needs, both within and outside the institution. The working

Datum
2019-04-02

Reg.nr
411-00073-18

conditions are good due to the excellent infrastructure. The integration of doctoral students in the Bachelor's and Master's programmes is supported through teaching and supervision.

The programme offers enough breadth to allow doctoral students sufficiently to prepare themselves for both an academic career and a career outside academia. It became evident from the self-evaluation that doctoral students in Musical performance almost always have considerable experience as professional musicians and, in many cases, as teachers. Moreover, the research within the program presupposes continued musical activity in public contexts by the doctoral students. This means that the doctoral students bring experience from working life when admitted and continue their public musical work after admission, as a natural and necessary part of their research. The doctoral students are also prepared for a career within the academy since courses in university pedagogy and in supervision are part of their studies.

Lunds universitet

<p>Higher education institution Lunds universitet</p>	<p>Third-cycle subject area Musik - konstnärlig licentiat- och doktorsexamen</p>	<p>ID no. A-2018-02-4434</p>
--	---	---

Assessment area: Preconditions

Assessment criteria: Staff

Assessment with justifications: *The number of supervisors and teachers and their combined expertise, artistic and pedagogical, are sufficient and proportional to the volume, content and implementation of the programme in the short term and long term.*

The assessment panel notes that the programme has good supervisory capacity. In Spring 2018 there were two senior supervisors (one a professor, both with doctoral degrees) and four assistant supervisors for four doctoral students out of a supervisor team of 11 persons, of which there is only one female. Per the requirements of the higher education institution, all the principal supervisors have at least an associate professor (docent) qualification and all have a doctoral degree. One of the assistant supervisors was without a doctoral degree and only three were employed at 100 per cent at the higher education institution. Supervisors meet regularly in supervisor seminars to discuss supervision related questions.

Supervision is provided by a minimum of two supervisors and each doctoral student is provided a minimum of two supervisors (a principal and an assistant supervisor) who provide up to 340 hours of supervision over four years. This amount of supervision is generous and exceeds many national and international doctoral programmes.

The supervisory capacity extends from music/musicology specialists to music education, psychology and theatre. Supervisors are chosen from a field of expertise according to the needs of the doctoral student. This means that a member of staff is allocated to each doctoral student as well as an assistant supervisor from the Theatre Academy, from the Department of Psychology and in some cases from abroad.

The assessment panel notes that supervisors meet on a regular basis and in doctoral seminars, but there is no mention of any specific training requirements for the supervisors. The assessment panel suggests that a compulsory course in supervisor training be implemented.

The principal supervisors are well qualified and connected researchers themselves, running several funded research projects of artistic research. The supervisors have research time allocated as part of their contracts which is good practice.

The doctoral students are given the opportunity to change supervisors throughout their education. Clear routines have been established for how such changes are carried out, starting with a dialogue between doctoral student, supervisors, and the programme director. A change in supervisors must be approved by The Faculty Committee (Konstnärliga Fakultetsrådet) and by the Dean of the Faculty.

The assessment panel notes that for the currently only four doctoral students studying (one working at 50 per cent), the staff/doctoral student ratio is very generous. The assessment panel believes that

with such an excellent team of supervisors an effort could be made to recruit more doctoral students in the long term.

During the interviews, the assessment panel noted that a major change is taking place as the department is in the process of replacing a professor who intends to leave. Until the new professor is appointed, the announcement for two new doctoral student positions, which should have been six months ago, is delayed. The recruitment for these two positions now needs to be a matter of utmost priority so as not to negatively influence the overall research environment.

Assessment area: Preconditions**Assessment criteria: Third-cycle programme environment**

Assessment with justifications: *Artistic research at the higher education institution has sufficient quality and scale for third-cycle education to be carried out at a high artistic level and within a good educational framework. Relevant collaboration occurs with the surrounding society, both nationally and internationally.*

The assessment panel notes that the higher education institution makes use of the Inter Arts Center (IAC), a music hub for doctoral students. IAC provides flexible localities and technology such as audio and video editing studios and project rooms. IAC has been the venue for the recurring Interference Laboratories, where each doctoral student is allocated space to present ongoing work. The programme has received invitations from several international researchers. Doctoral students also have access to a wider interdisciplinary community at the Theatre Academy. In short, the IAC provides a healthy research environment for artistic research.

Some supervisors have established an excellent network of research collaborations through grants from the Swedish Research Council and ongoing research funded by the Wallenberg Foundations, the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, and the Krapperup Foundation. The project funded by the Krapperup Foundation includes contributions from two doctoral students.

The assessment panel also notes the very good staff exchanges between Malmö Academy of Music (Malmö, Sweden), Kunstuniversität Graz (Graz, Austria), and DocArtes (Ghent, Belgium). Researchers from these institutions provide lectures and supervision for doctoral students. Overall, the contributions of international senior researchers have helped develop a highly positive research environment.

Ongoing research networks, including the 2015 National Network for Artistic Research in Music (NKFM) and the 2018 Interference Laboratories, are being actively pursued to increase future collaboration and organisation of courses and seminars at the national level. The IAC is home to several funded artistic research projects run by supervisors who also involve doctoral students. The research environment is well-connected nationally (e.g., NKFM) and internationally (e.g., DocArtes). The research environment is shared with other programmes (e.g., theatre), fostering interdisciplinary exchange.

The higher education institution wants to increase the number of doctoral students, including through the use of competitive EU bids. The assessment panel commends this effort and considers an increase in doctoral students essential and achievable.

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

As there is no allocated funding for doctoral students to attend international conferences and events, the assessment panel strongly recommends that this lack of funding to be addressed. Without a minimal amount of funding the doctoral students are not encouraged to present their work at international events, and this in turn, can also lead to a non-awareness of the Malmö Academy of Music's excellent work at an international level.

The interviews confirmed that plans are under way for a new campus in the next five to six years. This new campus will be the home for music, arts, theatre and the IAC. This project seems to have the appropriate funding. The assessment panel sees this plan as a highly positive development as the centre will strengthen the links between disciplines, contribute to a better research environment, and connect researchers with the Bachelor's and Master's programmes.

Overall assessment of the assessment area preconditions**Assessment with justifications:** *Satisfactory*

At least two supervisors, a principal and secondary supervisor, are assigned to each doctoral student and these supervisors provide up to 340 hours of supervision over four years. This is a generous allocation. The assessment panel notes that the supervisors meet on a regular basis and in doctoral seminars, although supervisors do not receive any specific training in supervision. The assessment panel suggests that a compulsory course in supervisor training should be implemented.

The assessment panel notes that the higher education institution makes use of the Inter Arts Center (IAC), a hub for doctoral students in music. IAC provides flexible localities and technology such as audio and video editing studios and project rooms and each doctoral student is allocated space to present ongoing work at the Interference Laboratories. Overall, the higher education institution promotes an active research environment by encouraging active participation in artistic research both nationally and internationally. However, there is no allocated funding for doctoral students to attend international conferences and events. To address this shortcoming, the assessment panel strongly recommends that proper funding should be secured. A proper amount of funding will encourage the doctoral students to present their work at international events, exposure that will also promote the excellent work done at Malmö Academy of Music both nationally and internationally.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes**Assessment criteria: Achievement of qualitative targets for 'knowledge and understanding'****Assessment with justifications:** *The programme facilitates through its design and implementation and ensures through examination that doctoral students who have been awarded their degrees show broad knowledge and understanding both within their third-cycle subject area and of the artistic research methodology in the third-cycle subject area.*

It is positive that the programme strives to develop knowledge and understanding of artistic practice not only within but also external to the higher education institution. The Interference Laboratories is a good platform for achieving these goals, as it provides a forum for discussions on artistic research and a place where artistic practice is discussed from multiple perspectives

The programme is structured into eight well-articulated components: supervision, doctoral seminars, the Interference Laboratories, courses, part time seminars, conferences and participation in several networks, docent seminars, and Higher Research Seminars. Doctoral students are free to select

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

courses depending on the nature of their projects, and they are encouraged to take foundation courses and a series of doctoral seminars (which are offered about every two weeks). The institution recognises the importance of continuous design and evaluation of individual projects as it has effectively implemented individual study plans.

Three part time seminars monitor the progress with the help of an external opponent, and a clear outline of the programme has been provided: the doctoral programme in Music includes 60 credits for course work and 180 credits for the thesis/artistic research project. Of the 60 course credits, 30 are to be used for 'foundation courses' (Introduction Course, Method Development in Artistic Research in Music, and Academic Writing in Artistic Research in Music). However, foundation courses do not seem to be compulsory. The assessment panel strongly recommends that certain courses be made compulsory.

Each doctoral project is assessed through a series of seminars (at 25 per cent, 50 per cent and 75 per cent). Such system ensures consistent and good feedback and is in line with other national and international doctoral programmes. The assessment panel commends the institution's understanding that each project is unique and its flexible approach in offering space for each artistic project to develop. However, the self-evaluations and the interviews do not make it clear whether doctoral students are encouraged to chair a seminar. As this opportunities represent good teaching and learning practice, the assessment panel recommends that doctoral students be given this opportunity when possible.

Overall, the programme is well connected to other similar programmes in Europe with docent seminars being held by post-docs in artistic research who aim at docent qualification. Higher Research Seminars complete the programme and foster discussion among different disciplines and knowledge traditions. This rich mix of components gives the doctoral students plenty of possibilities to develop and challenge their projects, acquiring broad knowledge and understanding in their subject area and methodology.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes**Assessment criteria: Achievement of qualitative targets for 'competence and skills'**

Assessment with justifications: *The programme facilitates through its design and implementation, and also ensures through examination that doctoral students who have been awarded their degrees can demonstrate the ability to plan and use appropriate methods to conduct research and other qualified artistic tasks within predetermined time frames, and in both the national and international context, in speech, in writing and authoritatively, can present and discuss research and research findings in dialogue with the academic community and society in general. Doctoral students are not able to contribute to the development of society and support the learning of others within both research and education and in other qualified professional contexts.*

The higher education institution provides courses, seminars, and external collaborations that help develop the doctoral students' competence and skills. In addition, their communicative skills are developed through their preparation and submission of artistic publications and conference presentations.

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

A course in artistic research methods is taught on both the Bachelor's and Master's programmes. As some doctoral students teach these courses, there seems to be a good continuity and implementation of research already at the Bachelor's and Master's programme.

The higher education institution offers Higher Research Seminars, a place for cross-disciplinary discussion and exchange of ideas between knowledge traditions. An external guest lecturer, often from another discipline, is invited to discuss a topic that connects to in-house research projects. The assessment panel finds that the programme offers introduction and method courses that prepare and train doctoral students to conduct their research and present results in national and international contexts. The various presentation and exchange formats built into the programme ensure that doctoral students regularly expose their work in speech and writing to a variety of audiences. The individual study plans are used to keep track of the doctoral student projects and are reviewed regularly by the doctoral students and their supervisors. The programme offers the doctoral students rich opportunities to engage in critical discourse and defend their work.

The assessment panel commends that the higher education institution has increasingly structured the course part of the programme, partly in response to requests from the doctoral students, but also partly due to staff's own experiences. The assessment panel also notes that many of the reading courses on offer have been designed to meet specific needs of individuals, sometimes including external lecturers. Such flexibility in offering bespoke courses for doctoral students provides excellent value to the doctoral programme.

Competency and skills are further enhanced through participation in the annual ARTikulationen Conference, a festival in Graz, Austria, the Orpheus Doctoral Conference in Ghent, Belgium, and conferences at the Guildhall School of Music in London, UK. In addition, students are given a regular chance to rehearse and discuss conference presentations. The individual study plan makes it evident that the few doctoral students have a strong profile at the national and international levels.

The assessment panel notes the absence of any funding for doctoral students to attend international events- this shortcoming needs to be remedied. The assessment panel also notes a shortage of senior researchers, but the interviews suggest that such issues are being addressed through national and international collaborations. However, the interviews also acknowledge the lack of formalised collaborations with music institutions in the region and elsewhere. The faculty are looking into ways to address this issue, which will also be addressed through the development of the IAC. The assessment panel commends that an effort is being made to create a network with institutions in the field of theatre.

The assessment panel found that there was little evidence in the self-evaluation, the interviews and the individual study plans on how the doctoral students, through their artistic and academic practice, contribute to the development of society particularly at a national level. The assessment panel notes that there is little mention of any outreach activities and recommends the programme pursue a much more focused effort on social engagement.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes

Assessment criteria: Achievement of qualitative targets for 'judgement and approach'

Assessment with justifications: *The programme facilitates through its design and implementation, and also ensures through examination that doctoral students who have been awarded their degrees*

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

can demonstrate intellectual autonomy, artistic integrity, and disciplinary rectitude as well as the ability to make assessments of research ethics. The doctoral student also has a broader understanding of art's capabilities and limitations, its role in society and human responsibility for how it is used.

Intellectual autonomy and artistic integrity are needed to define and execute research projects through artistic practice. Through the Interference Laboratories, the programme ensures that doctoral students can demonstrate and defend their intellectual and artistic choices. Special courses are offered (e.g., in gender analysis, ecology, or music psychology) to ensure that the students can articulate their understanding of their own practices. This ability is a prerequisite for assessing research ethics and understanding the implications of artistic and scientific practice for society; however, the assessment panel strongly recommends that certain courses should be made compulsory.

The assessment panel notes that there is a strong focus on developing the doctoral students' abilities to reflect on their own artistic practice and art's role in society; yet, the programme could provide doctoral students with more opportunities to examine how artistic practice benefits society.

Several projects are excellent examples of artistic work that have been recognised at an international level.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes

Assessment criteria: Gender equality

Assessment with justifications: *A gender equality perspective is taken into account, communicated and supported by the content, design and implementation of the programme.*

There is a developed awareness about questions of gender and several projects and courses closely examine gender issues. The assessment panel notes that the current gender balance among staff is unsatisfactory. In addition, only one senior female member is part of the supervisory team. The assessment panel recommends that such gender imbalance be addressed for future recruitment of external specialists. The assessment panel notes that, in general, there is an awareness among staff that gender issues need to be addressed. The interviews revealed that there is the intention for a special committee and a gender equality expert to be appointed.

Currently, all doctoral students are female. The gender balance among the doctoral students can be considered good when looking back until the start of the programme (five male and five female doctoral students since the beginning of the programme).

The assessment panel notes that the Faculty of Fine and Performing Arts has a zero tolerance policy towards all forms of discrimination. The assessment panel acknowledges that admission decisions are not affected by considerations of gender, ethnic or social background, religion or other belief, sexual orientation or disability. The assessment panel encourages an ongoing programme and research environment where exchanges (also with other schools and research groups) can counteract any potential tendencies of gender prejudice.

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes

Assessment criteria: Follow-up, measures and feedback

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

Assessment with justifications: *The content, design, implementation and examinations are systematically followed up. The outcomes of the follow-up are translated, when necessary, into actions for quality improvement, and feedback is given to relevant stakeholders.*

The individual study plans are signed off by the head of department, the supervisor, and the doctoral student. The individual study plans are kept updated and are signed every year.

The assessment panel notes that there are several formats to evaluate the programme, ranging from group discussions to written responses, or a combination of both. The self-evaluation clearly reveal that flexible feedback mechanisms are in place and that the doctoral students' feedback is used to improve and to redesign courses.

The higher education institution acts to ensure that the doctoral student carry out the programme within the planned period of study.

The assessment panel notes completion rates of three doctoral students since 2014 with four doctoral students being on track for completion in the next two to four years. The individual study plans are sufficiently detailed and rigorous and they are effective in monitoring the progress in order to help the doctoral students and keep them on schedule.

Overall assessment of the assessment area design, implementation and outcomes

Assessment with justifications: *Satisfactory*

The assessment panel notes that the target knowledge and understanding is well addressed by the doctoral seminars and courses. There are three part-time seminars held to monitor the progress with the help of an external opponent. Of the 60 higher education credits for courses, 30 are allocated for foundation courses although these courses are not compulsory. The assessment panel strongly recommends that certain courses be made compulsory. Overall the assessment panel notes that the programme is well connected to other similar programmes in Europe.

The assessment panel finds that competence and skills are trained through various courses, seminars and external collaboration at higher education institution. Specifically, communicative skills are developed through seminar and conference presentations. Furthermore, the programme offers introduction and method courses that prepare and train the doctoral students to conduct their research and present results in national and international contexts. Doctoral students' skills and competencies are further developed at conferences and events. The assessment panel found that there was little evidence in the self-evaluation, the interviews and the individual study plans on how the doctoral students, through their artistic and academic practice, contribute to the development of society particularly at a national level. The assessment panel notes that there is little mention of any outreach activities and recommends the programme pursue a much more focused effort on social engagement.

The assessment panel find that the qualitative target judgement and approach is achieved through the Interference Laboratories and the programme ensures that doctoral students can demonstrate and defend their intellectual and artistic choices. Special courses are offered (e.g., in gender analysis, ecology, or music psychology) to ensure that the students can articulate their understanding of their own practices. This ability is a prerequisite for assessing research ethics and understanding the

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

implications of artistic and scientific practice for society. However, the assessment panel strongly recommends that certain courses be made compulsory.

It is evident for the assessment panel that there is a developed awareness about questions of gender and several projects and courses closely examine gender issues. The assessment panel notes that the current gender balance amongst staff is unsatisfactory. The assessment panel recommends that such gender imbalance be addressed for future recruitment of external specialists.

With respect to follow-up, measures and feedback, the assessment panel notes that the individual study plans are sufficiently detailed and rigorous and monitor the progress in order to help doctoral student stay on schedule. They are kept updated and are signed every year. The assessment panel notes that there are several formats for evaluating the programme, ranging from group discussions to written responses, or a combination of both. The self-evaluation clearly states that there are flexible feedback mechanisms in place and that students' feedback is used to improve and to redesign courses.

Assessment area: Doctoral student perspective**Assessment criteria: Doctoral student perspective**

Assessment with justifications: *Doctoral students are given the opportunity to take an active role in the work to improve the content and implementation of the programme.*

Doctoral students have good opportunities to influence content and implementation of the programme, both formally and informally. The self-evaluation states that the individual study plans are tailor-made according to the doctoral student's project and that the individual study plans are regularly reviewed by the doctoral students and supervisors. The assessment panel recognizes that the amount and quality of supervision is high and well varied due to active international exchanges and the activities at the IAC. Doctoral students have a wide choice of participating in courses and seminars, according to individual needs, both within and outside the institution.

Doctoral students evaluate the programme in various forms, individually, in groups, and as written responses. Viewpoints and experiences of the doctoral students on the courses are discussed regularly and student feedback is used to improve the programme. As an example of good practice, a doctoral student survey has been carried out and the results are taken as basis for further improvement.

Supervision is revised if necessary and there is a transparent procedure for changing a supervisor. In addition, doctoral students have good opportunities to participate actively in decision processes on department and university level. It became evident from the interviews that there are major staff changes under way and that in the near future difficulties changing supervisors might arise due to the low numbers of qualified supervisors available.

The programme ensures a good physical and psycho-social work environment for the doctoral student.

The self-evaluation shows that the IAC provides the necessary infrastructure for artistic research projects of the doctoral students, including flexible localities, project rooms, and studio technology. The assessment panel notes that improvements need to be made with respect to the availability of competent technical support in the IAC and more individual workspace for the doctoral students.

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

The current student group is very small, although active and coherent. The assessment panel notes that the currently all female student group is seen to moderate the gender imbalance among supervisors and former doctoral students. As an example of good practice, several doctoral students are involved in joint research projects with supervisors. The creation of further doctoral student positions is a potential area of improvement.

Overall assessment of the assessment area doctoral student perspective**Assessment with justifications:** *Satisfactory*

Doctoral students have good opportunities to influence content and implementation of the programme. Individual study plans are tailor-made according to the students' projects and are discussed regularly. When needed, supervision is revised. Doctoral students have a wide choice of courses and seminars that address their individual needs, both within and outside the institution. Viewpoints and experiences of the doctoral students are discussed regularly and the feedback is used to improve the programme.

There is a transparent procedure for changing a supervisor. Doctoral students have good opportunities to participate actively in decision processes also on the department and university levels.

The IAC provides the necessary infrastructure for the doctoral students to carry out their artistic research projects. Increased availability of competent technical support in the IAC and more individual workspace for the doctoral students are potential areas of improvement.

The current student group is very small, although active and coherent. The assessment panel notes that the currently all female student group is seen to moderate the gender imbalance among supervisors and former doctoral students. As an example of good practice, several doctoral students are involved in joint research projects with supervisors. The creation of further doctoral student positions is a potential area of improvement.

Assessment area: Working life and collaboration**Assessment criteria: Working life and collaboration**

Assessment with justifications: *The programme is designed and implemented in such a way that it is useful and develops doctoral students' preparedness to meet changes in working life, both within and beyond academia.*

The programme offers enough breadth to sufficiently prepare doctoral students for both an academic career and a career outside academia.

It became evident to the assessment panel from the self-evaluation that the higher education institution sees several options for the working life of the doctoral students after they have graduated. For example, they are prepared to work as artists, to work with projects based at institutions, and to work in postdoctoral positions and senior research/teaching positions. The fact that the doctoral students are most often experienced professionals is seen by the assessment panel both as an asset and as a prerequisite for a successful doctoral education.

A number of the teachers and professors are active in professional practices and develop and maintain good contacts with different actors within artistic research in Sweden. Several of the doctoral students also have a background in practice or in teaching.

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

The higher education institution offers courses that are important for a professional career, such as courses in communication, teaching, project planning, leadership and entrepreneurship. The doctoral students also have the possibility to teach at the Bachelor's or Master's programme which is an important step in the development of the individual candidate's professional profile.

There are good possibilities to use the IAC as a hub for connecting with the surrounding society as well as with the academic and music industry environment. The interviews also made it evident that these possibilities are not fully exploited for various reasons. The assessment panel thinks that there is room for improvement in this area. Nevertheless, the doctoral students have many contacts outside the faculty and many perform locally, nationally and internationally.

The assessment panel believes it would be useful to expand the individual study plans to include a tentative plan and direction for the doctoral student's future working life. The assessment panel also notes that there could be more collaboration and exchange with other creative industries that share similar challenges and opportunities.

Overall assessment of the assessment area working life and collaboration**Assessment with justifications:** *Satisfactory*

The programme offers enough breadth to allow doctoral students sufficiently to prepare themselves for both an academic career and a career outside academia.

It became evident to the assessment panel from the self-evaluation that the higher education institution sees several options for the working life of the doctoral students after they have graduated. For example, they are prepared to work as artists, to work with projects based at institutions, and to work in postdoctoral positions and senior research/teaching positions. The fact that the doctoral students are most often experienced professionals is seen by the assessment panel both as an asset and as a prerequisite for a successful doctoral education.

There are good possibilities to use the IAC as a hub for connecting with the surrounding society as well as with the academic and music industry environment. The interviews revealed that these possibilities are not fully exploited for various reasons. The assessment panel sees room for improvement in this area. Nevertheless, the doctoral students have many contacts outside the faculty and many perform both locally, nationally and internationally.

Overall assessment: High quality**Assessment with justifications:** *In conclusion, the programme is assessed as maintaining high quality.*

Each doctoral student is allocated at least a principal and secondary supervisor, with up to 340 hours over four years of supervision. This amount is generous. The assessment panel acknowledges an active research environment at the higher education institution with high ambitions to actively participate and influence the field of artistic research. To improve the visibility of the doctoral students' work, the assessment panel suggests the institution to allocate funding for doctoral students to attend international conferences.

The assessment panel notes that the Interference Laboratories is a good platform for developing knowledge and understanding within the artistic practice while providing a forum for discussion of

Datum
2019-04-02Reg.nr
411-00073-18

artistic research. The programme is structured into eight well-articulated components. Overall the assessment panel notes that the programme is well connected to other similar programmes in Europe. Skills and competencies are further enhanced through opportunities where doctoral candidates are invited to the annual ARTikulationen event in Graz, Austria, among other events. The assessment panel found that there was little evidence in the self-evaluation, the interviews and the individual study plans on how the doctoral students, through their artistic and academic practice, contribute to the development of society particularly at a national level. The assessment panel notes that there is little mention of any outreach activities and recommends a much more focused effort on social engagement to be pursued by the higher education institution. It was noted in the interviews, that the students are able and willing to contribute to the development of society. Intellectual autonomy and artistic integrity are needed to define and execute research projects through artistic practice. Through the Interference Laboratories, the programme ensures that students can demonstrate and defend their intellectual and artistic choices. Special courses are offered (e.g. in gender analysis, ecology, or music psychology) to ensure the students develop an articulated understanding of their own practice as a prerequisite to make assessments of research ethics and understand the implications of artistic and scientific practice for society. The assessment panel found that there is a developed awareness about questions of gender and diversity as several projects and courses closely examine gender issues. During the interviews, senior staff commented on this issue and the assessment panel was pleased to hear that a special committee and a gender equality expert will be appointed. The assessment panel notes that there are several formats for evaluating the programme, ranging from group discussions to written responses, or a combination of both. Courses are redesigned based on student feedback, which is very positive.

Doctoral students have good opportunities to influence content and implementation of the programme. The IAC provides the necessary infrastructure for the doctoral students to carry out their artistic research projects. The availability of competent technical support in the IAC and more individual workspace for the doctoral students are potential areas of improvement. Although the current student group is very small, it is active and coherent. The creation of further doctoral student positions and institutional funding for doctoral students to attend international conferences are potential areas of improvement.

The programme offers enough breadth to allow doctoral students to prepare themselves for both an academic career and a career outside academia. It became evident from the self-evaluation that the higher education institution sees several options for the working life of the doctoral students after they have graduated. The fact that the doctoral students are most often experienced professionals is seen by the assessment panel both as an asset and as a prerequisite for a successful doctoral education.

Annex 2

Assessment panel and reported conflicts of interest

	Luleå tekniska universitet	Lunds universitet
Assessment panel members/Higher education institution		
Professor Gerhard Eckel, University of Music and Performing Arts, Graz		
Anders Engström, Playground Music Scandinavia AB		
Anne Piirainen, Sibelius Academy, University of Arts, Helsinki,		
Docent Franziska Schroeder, Queen's University, Belfast		

Annex 3

Presentation of assessment material from each higher education institution¹

Luleå tekniska universitet

Third-cycle subject area	Self-evaluation	General study plan	Individual study plans	Interview higher education institution	Interview doctoral students
Musikalisk gestaltning - licentiat- och doktorsexamen	Yes	Yes	6	Yes	Yes

Lunds universitet

Third-cycle subject area	Self-evaluation	General study plan	Individual study plans	Interview higher education institution	Interview doctoral students
Musik - konstnärlig licentiat- och doktorsexamen	Yes	Yes	7	Yes	Yes

Presentation of other assessment material

In addition to the material submitted by the higher education institutions, UKÄ has produced key figures of doctoral student completion rates in the form of net and gross period of study for doctoral students in the third cycle programme subject of music during 2011–2016.

¹ When the number of doctoral students is 16 or fewer, all doctoral students' individual study plans are selected. When the number of doctoral students is 16 or more, a random selection is made and 16 individual study plans are selected.

Annex 4

Higher education institutions' responses on the preliminary reports

Universitetskanslersämbetets utbildningsutvärderingar

Delningssvar – synpunkter på preliminärt yttrande

Lärosäte: Luleå tekniska universitet

Forskarutbildningsämne/: Musikalisk gestaltning

Luleå tekniska universitet har granskat bedömarens preliminära yttrande angående bedömningen av lärosätets forskolläro-utbildning. Se bifogad tabell med sakfel/kommentarer till det preliminära yttrandet.

Lärosätet ges möjlighet att kontrollera innehållet i det preliminära yttrande och påpeka eventuella sak-/faktafel. Synpunkterna på yttrandet bör utgå från de bedömningsområden och bedömningsgrunder som ingår i utvärderingen.

Ange i tabellen vilken sida i yttrandet korrigeringen avser, vid behov kan tabellen byggas ut. Korrigeringarna bör hållas så kortfattade som möjligt. Observera att det inte är möjligt att inkomma med ny fakta som ej fanns tillgänglig i de ursprungliga underlagen.

Exempel

Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigering
2	3	5	Antal helårsstudenter uppgår till 25, ej 45.

Bedömningsområde: Förutsättningar

Personal			
Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigering

Forskarutbildningsmiljö			
Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigering
3	5	1	The correct English name of the university is; Luleå University of Technology

Bedömningsområde: Utformning, genomförande och resultat

Måluppfyllelse – kunskap och förståelse			
Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigerig
6	2	4	“...there does not seem to be any requirement for any professional training apart from the three seminars, which are three to four hours each.” Suggested clarification: the three monthly seminars

Måluppfyllelse – färdighet och förmåga			
Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigerig

Måluppfyllelse – värderingsförmåga och förhållningssätt			
Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigerig

--	--	--	--

Jämställdhet			
Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigerig

Uppföljning, åtgärder och återkoppling			
Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigerig

Bedömningsområde: Doktorandperspektiv

Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigerig

Bedömningsområde: Arbetsliv och samverkan

Sida	Stycke	Rad	Korrigerig

Universitetskanslersämbetets utbildningsutvärderingar

Delnings svar – synpunkter på preliminärt yttrande

Lärosäte: Malmö Academy of Music, Lund University

Forskarutbildningsämne: Music

Assessment area: Preconditions

Overall assessment of the assessment area preconditions			
Page	Setting	Line	Correction/comment
3	4	4	<p><i>"supervisors do not receive any specific training in supervision"</i></p> <p>Supervisors have attended the 5-year course in supervision held by Konstnärliga forskarskolan (see section 2.6 in the self-evaluation). All staff at MAM have to attend Higher Education Development courses (also mentioned in 2.6).</p>
3	5	6	<p><i>"there is no allocated funding for doctoral students to attend international conferences and events"</i></p> <p>The PhD candidates appointed after Konstnärliga forskarskolan receive 20 000 SEK/student (see section 6.2 in the self-evaluation). PhD candidates regularly attend international conferences and events (see for example sections 3.1.6 and 3.2.2 in the self-evaluation).</p>

Assessment area: Design, implementation and outcomes

Achievement of qualitative targets for 'knowledge and understanding'			
Page	Setting	Line	Correction/comments
4	3	5-6	<p><i>"the self-evaluations and the interviews do not make it clear whether doctoral students are encouraged to chair a seminar or to participate in another doctoral student's seminar"</i></p> <p>PhD part time seminars are public events in which all PhD candidates are expected to attend. They provide the opportunity for peer comments (see section 3.1.5 in the self-evaluation). IAC seminars (see 3.1.6) and Higher Research Seminars (see 3.1.8) also provide opportunities for presenting and sharing ongoing PhD projects.</p>