

## **Additional PhD regulations of the Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts (ARIA)**

### **I General provisions**

Art. 1. These regulations apply to the organization of doctoral studies in the Arts at the Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts (ARIA). Such studies comprise the doctoral study programme and the doctoral thesis. The regulations supplement the Higher Education Codex of 11<sup>th</sup> October 2013, ratified through the Conclusion of 20<sup>th</sup> December 2013 concerning the restructuring of higher education in Flanders in relation to obtaining the academic degree of doctor, as well as the General regulations on obtaining the academic degree of doctor at the University of Antwerp (hereafter called 'UAntwerp general PhD regulations'), approved by the Board of Directors of the University of Antwerp on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

Art. 2. Within ARIA, the following boards, commissions, and persons are authorized for the PhD and the doctoral study programme in the Arts:

- the Research Council of the Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts, which assumes the role of faculty PhD commission (see articles 20 and 21 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations);
- the Steering Group of the Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts;
- the ad hoc admissions committees;
- the individual PhD commissions (IPCs);
- the faculty PhD coordinator.

The responsibility of the various boards and commissions with respect to the doctoral research and doctoral study programme will be explained in the following articles.

Art. 3. The Steering Group of ARIA, following a recommendation from the Research Council of ARIA, has the following power of decision with regard to the relevant PhD studies:

- the admission to the PhD, on the basis of a suitability screening of the candidate and of the proposed research project (see articles 8 and 9 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations);
- the determination of a possible study programme during the PhD for candidates who fall under article 4 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations;
- the determination of a possible preparatory programme for candidates who fall under articles 10 and 11 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations;
- the granting of a possible exemption of the doctoral study programme for candidates who fall under article 12 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations;
- the composition of the individual PhD commissions and the appointment of the chair (see article 14 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations);
- the composition of the ad hoc admissions committees for candidates who fall under Art. 11 of these additional regulations;
- the appointment of the faculty PhD coordinator;
- the approval of the evaluation reports of the individual PhD commissions on the occasion of the annual progress reports (see article 20 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations);
- the composition of the PhD jury, the appointment of the chair and the determination of the modalities of the pre-defence and the public defence of the thesis (see article 25 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations);
- the issues in Art. 5 of these additional regulations, as recommended by the individual PhD commission.

Art. 4. The Steering Group of ARIA has autonomous power of decision with regard to:

- the evaluation and approval of the doctoral study programme files and the awarding of the supplement to the certificate for the doctoral study programme.

Art. 5. The individual PhD commission (IPC) has the authority to make recommendations to the Research Council of ARIA on:

- the evaluation of the annual progress report of the PhD student (see article 20 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations);
- the monitoring of the possible study programme of the PhD student as determined by the Steering Group of ARIA;
- disputes between PhD student and supervisor(s).

Art. 6. The ad hoc admissions committee has power of decision with regard to meeting the conditions of a preparatory programme which may be imposed by the Steering Group of ARIA on candidates who fall under Art. 11 of these additional regulations.

## II Conditions of admission

Art. 7. The PhD in the Arts is open to any candidate who meets the conditions stipulated in the Higher Education Codex of 11<sup>th</sup> October 2013 and who has moreover received, following a suitability screening by the Research Council of ARIA, the explicit permission from the Steering Group of ARIA.

Art. 8. The suitability screening of the candidate by the Research Council of ARIA is conducted on the basis of a file as stipulated by articles 8, 9, 10 or 12 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations.

Art. 9. The results of the suitability screening should be communicated to the candidate within a reasonable period of time. As a reasonable period of time, a term of 6 weeks is proposed. If the results of the suitability screening in the context of articles 8 or 12 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations are not communicated to the candidate within three months, a positive decision will always be presupposed. The latter does not apply to the suitability screening which is conducted in the case of articles 9, 10 or 11 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations, although here too the aim should be to decide within the reasonable term of 6 weeks.

Art. 10. If the Steering Group of ARIA imposes a study programme on the candidate during the PhD (see article 4 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations), it will communicate this to the candidate together with the results of the suitability screening. This study programme consists of a maximum of 60 study points (ECTS) and is part of the candidate's doctoral study programme. The Steering Group also determines the term within which the study programme needs to be completed. The candidate will contact the faculty administration for practical arrangements relating to the assigned curriculum.

Art. 11. If the Steering Group of ARIA imposes a preparatory programme, including exams, on the candidate (see articles 10 and 11 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations), it will communicate this to the candidate together with the results of the suitability screening. This preparatory programme consists of a maximum of 60 study points (ECTS) and cannot be part of the candidate's doctoral study programme. The candidate will enrol with the Registrar's Office (Dutch: *Centrale Onderwijsadministratie*) in the form of a diploma contract for the components of this preparatory programme. These courses are in principle taken within the Antwerp University Association (AUHA). The ad hoc admissions committee serves as the examination board for this programme.

Art. 12. The individual PhD commission (IPC) is composed by the Research Council of ARIA at the same time as the candidate is given the permission to enrol as a PhD student (see article 14 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations). This composition is subsequently ratified by the Steering Group of ARIA. When the IPC is put together, maximum attention is given to the diversity of its composition. A homogeneous composition in terms of gender identity may be approved only if it is motivated convincingly by the supervisors.

## III Doctoral study programme

Art. 13. In the doctoral study programme, the PhD student needs to strengthen his/her competences as a young researcher. On this matter, he/she needs to report annually via the online *Student Information System Antwerp (SisA)*. Aided by the [competence profile](#) for PhD students at the University of Antwerp, the PhD student determines, in consultation with his/her supervisor(s), which activities he/she undertakes with an eye to fulfilling the requirements.

Art. 14. To be able to complete the doctoral study programme successfully, the PhD student must submit an activity file to which the following general rules apply:

- activities should have been undertaken for a total of minimum 30 points;
- in at least 4 categories of the competence profile, at least 1 point should have been obtained in each case;
- no more than half of the total number of points may be obtained within 1 competence category;
- for all activities, a proof of participation needs to be supplied.

The PhD student concludes the doctoral study programme *before* the official composition of the PhD jury and in accordance with the procedure explained on the website of the Antwerp Doctoral School.

Art. 15. For the attribution of points per activity, the table in Appendix 1 with specifications and limitations is used. ADS courses which the PhD student has taken since the academic year 2015-2016 and which he/she has successfully completed are automatically added (with the respective grade and link to the competence category) to the survey of activities in SisA.

## IV Annual evaluation of the doctoral research and the doctoral study programme

Art. 16. The annual evaluation of the doctoral research happens by means of a content-oriented progress report which the PhD student submits through SisA by 1<sup>st</sup> May of every year. This content-oriented progress report is evaluated by the individual PhD commission, which reports back on its evaluation to the faculty PhD commission.

Art. 17. The annual evaluation of the doctoral study programme happens also by means of a report which the PhD student submits through SisA by 1<sup>st</sup> May of every year (see Art. 13 through 15 of these additional regulations). This evaluation process is monitored by the faculty PhD commission, which reports back on this to the Steering Group of ARIA and to the Antwerp Doctoral School.

Art. 18. In the content-oriented progress report on the doctoral research, the candidate demonstrates which research activities he/she has conducted in the context of his/her doctoral project, indicates how the actual research has progressed compared to the previous year, proposes a timetable for the near future and develops a vision of the final output of the research as well as how the doctoral research could eventually be evaluated by the PhD jury (see Art. 21 of these additional regulations).

Art. 19. Based on the content-oriented progress report, the IPC enters as much as possible into active consultation with the PhD student on the research in progress, preferably in the form of an actual meeting with the PhD student. On the basis of both the report and the consultation, the IPC assesses whether the PhD student may continue the doctoral programme. This is reported back to the faculty PhD coordinator by 1<sup>st</sup> July. The latter, in turn, presents the reports for collective discussion to the next meeting of the Research Council of ARIA.

Art. 20. In case of a negative assessment, the IPC has the authority, following a recommendation from the faculty PhD commission, to refuse further enrolment for the ongoing PhD (see article 20 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations). Before further enrolment is refused, the PhD student in question always has the opportunity to exhaust the possibilities for appeal as provided in articles 53 through 57 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations.

## V Doctoral thesis, pre-defence and public defence

Art. 21. In the case of a PhD in the Arts, the concept of 'thesis' refers to a specimen which always comprises artistic work with a form of reflection. The precise form which both the artistic work and

the reflection take is agreed upon in the course of the supervision process in consultation between the PhD student and his/her IPC.<sup>1</sup>

Art. 22. Artistic and/or design realizations and/or published articles by the PhD student in question may be an integral part of the thesis (see article 22 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations). The concrete assessment hereof lies with the individual PhD commission.

Art. 23. The PhD jury is composed by the Research Council of Aria on the advice of the supervisors. This composition is subsequently ratified by the Steering Group of ARIA. When the jury is put together, maximum attention is given to the diversity of its composition. A balanced composition in terms of gender identity is maximally sought after (equal number in case of an even number of jury members, an imbalance of only one member in case of an uneven number of jury members). An exception to this rule may be approved only if it is motivated convincingly by the supervisors.

Art. 24. The assessment of the thesis by the PhD jury consists of a non-public pre-defence and a public defence (see article 32 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations). The pre-defence is part of the evaluation of the thesis.

Art. 25. Prior to the pre-defence, the members of the PhD jury (with the exception of the supervisors) send an evaluation report about (already available parts of) the thesis to the chair of the PhD jury. This report needs to state explicitly whether the PhD student is admitted to the defence; if the permission is not given, the rejection needs to be sufficiently motivated. If a member of the PhD jury is unable to be present at the pre-defence and is equally unable to participate through teleconferencing, the chair assumes the responsibility of reproducing the respective reports adequately and of using them as guidelines during the questioning.

Art. 26. If the PhD jury, following the pre-defence, admits the thesis only conditionally to the public defence (see article 35 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations), it informs the PhD student in writing of the expected adaptations, the term within which such adaptations are expected, and the procedure which will be followed during the new assessment. This may imply that the expected public defence is moved to a later date.

Art. 27. In case of a negative assessment of the (draft of the) thesis by the individual PhD commission or the PhD jury (see respectively articles 31 and 33 of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations), the procedure concerning the public defence of the thesis is put on hold. The committee or jury in question informs the candidate in writing of the steps which are necessary to be able to restart the procedure. At the same time, the committee or jury determines who will monitor the execution of these steps (the chair or the full committee or jury).

Art. 28. The University of Antwerp and the Steering Group of ARIA commit themselves, in consultation with the School(s) of Arts which is/are involved with the thesis, to provide a fitting environment for the public defence of the thesis.

Art. 29. During the public defence, supervisors in principle do not ask questions about contents and abstain from participating in the argumentative debate. This may also apply to the chair of the PhD jury if the role assigned to him/her is limited to an organizational and ceremonial function.

## VI Special provisions

Art. 30. In case the PhD student needs external mediation or wishes to make use of the possibilities for appeal which are provided, he/she turns to the dean of the administrating Faculty of Letters, 'FLW' (see article 49ff of the UAntwerp general PhD regulations).

Art. 31. These regulations come into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> As a general guiding principle, ARIA uses the following officially communicated vision: 'Research *in* the arts is fundamentally different from research *on* the arts. We define research in the arts as knowledge-enhancing artistic research that may be assessed in a dialogue with peers. The essence of the investigations is artistic. This implies that its verbal (sometimes foreign-language) defence and communication (e.g. a written thesis accompanying a stage act) cannot and should not be decisive in the final assessment of the artistic research. The results of the artistic research, however, do have to lend themselves to debate through dialogue.'

## Appendix 1: Table of activities with specifications and limitations for the attribution of points in the context of the doctoral study programme as stipulated in Art. 14

Note: The following list of activities is indicative and not exhaustive. If an activity cannot be found in the list, the PhD student may make a motivated suggestion him/herself for the number of points to be attributed.

Competence category	Activity	Calculation of points	Maximum
A. Research skills and techniques	Course <sup>2 3</sup>	0.1p/hour	
	Performances, exhibitions, concerts, presentations and comparable activities	0.1p/hour	
	Research stay, internship	1p/5 working days <sup>4</sup>	5p
	Attending international conference	Points to be distributed between compcat A (half) and compcat F (half) <sup>5</sup>	
	Online training, webinar	0.1p/hour	
	Review of book/article, evaluation of proposal/manuscript	To be determined by peer review on the basis of details provided	
	Member of examination board	0.1p	
B. Adaptation to research environment	Course <sup>6</sup>	0.1p/hour	
	Member of board or commission (e.g. editorial board, faculty commission, research board,...)	0.2p/year and per board	
	Member of peer review commission	Max. 0.5p to be determined on the basis of details provided	0.5p
	Project proposals <sup>7</sup>	Max. 1p on the basis of details provided	1p
	Project defence (e.g. IWT)	0.5p	
C. Research management	Course <sup>8</sup>	0.1p/hour	

<sup>2</sup> E.g. E-sources, Excel, Access, Scientific Reasoning and Reporting.

<sup>3</sup> These may also be papers/presentations in the guise of study days, workshops, conferences etc.

<sup>4</sup> The attribution of points is determined per unit of 5 working days.

<sup>5</sup> The PhD student may always supply a clear motivation for why the activity in his/her case belongs in only one of the two categories.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Innovation Management & Entrepreneurship.

<sup>7</sup> Points awarded if the project has been granted and if evidence is produced (e.g. supervisor's testimony) that the PhD student is personally the author and not his/her supervisor or research unit. Obtaining the subsidy after a successful project application may not be submitted separately and additionally.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Project Management, Word, Mindmapping.

	Supervision of final assignment or paper/thesis <sup>9</sup>	1p/BA final assignment 2p/MA final assignment	Awarded once per item
	Co-ordination or organization of activities, curatorship	Max. 3p/activity	3p/activity
	Supervision Erasmus mundus	To be determined by peer review on the basis of details provided	
	Supervision ASO project	To be determined by peer review on the basis of details provided	
	Organization of a production - chief organization - co-organization	3p 1p	
	Organization of an event - chief organization - co-organization	1p 0.5p	
	(Co-)organization research unit	1p	
	Organization paper/presentation or panel debate	0.5p	
	Presentation/respondentship	0.5-1p to be determined on the basis of details provided	
	Organizing an exposition/curating an exposition	2p	
D. Personal efficacy <sup>10</sup>	Course <sup>11</sup>	0.1p/hour	
	Publications <sup>12</sup> - in book - other carriers	Max. 3p/publication on the basis of details provided	3p/publication
	Productions: exhibitions, performances, concerts and comparable activities	Max. 3p/production on the basis of details provided	3p/production
	Prize for article/publication	0.2-0.5p to be determined on the basis of details provided	
	Publication for a wider audience	0.5p	
	Launching of website Maintenance of website	1p/website 0.5p/website per year	
	Commissioned artwork	2p	

<sup>9</sup> The PhD student's name should be mentioned as a supervisor on the title page.

<sup>10</sup> Publications may be honoured only after acceptance (proof by editor or copy of publication). The calculation of points depends on the author's contribution to the publication.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. Time Management, Achieving your goals.

<sup>12</sup> Recordings (including, possibly, internationally recognized awards) and concerts/lecture performances (on 'major/important' stages) are also regarded as an artistic 'publication'. E.g. CDs (or other carriers).

	Solo work	3p	
E. Communicative skills <sup>13</sup>	Course <sup>14</sup>	0.1p/hour	
	Language training	0.1p/hour	
	Teaching or supervision of practicum in higher education <sup>15</sup>	0.2p/hour with max. 6p	6p
	Presentation/paper	Max. 3p/presentation	3p/presentation
	Poster presentation	Max. 2p/poster	2p/poster
	Knowledge transfer in a company/to a wider audience	0.1p/hour	
	Interview for a wider audience (radio, TV, print media)	0.2p	
	Press conference on project	0.2p	
	Participation in panel debate	Max. 0.2p/year	0.2p/year
	Teleconference presentation	Points to be determined on the basis of details provided	
	Being reviewed for an exhibition (via press,...)	0.2p (like an interview)	
F. Networking and teamwork	Course <sup>16</sup>	0.1p/hour	
	Attending international conference	Points to be distributed between compcat A (half) and compcat F (half) <sup>17</sup>	
G. Career management	Course <sup>18</sup>	0.1p/hour	
Not honoured:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation in meetings;</li> <li>- Publications: reports, refereeing of publications;</li> <li>- Presentations at meetings;</li> <li>- Performing as evaluation leader;</li> <li>- Launching of programme;</li> <li>- Surveillance during exams;</li> <li>- Mention in ranking (without winning a prize);</li> <li>- Being represented by a professional organization;</li> <li>- Meetings with supervisors and other academic/artistic advisers;</li> <li>- Meetings to prepare a project;</li> <li>- Chairing of boards/committees;</li> <li>- Membership of juries (final papers/dissertations, project proposals, prizes/awards, ...);</li> <li>- Stakeholders' meetings;</li> </ul>		-

<sup>13</sup> For presentations, points can be awarded only if the PhD student was him/herself the 'presenting author'.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. Giving presentations, Writing, Communication, PowerPoint, Speedreading, Webdesign, Writing proposals, Coaching for writing.

<sup>15</sup> Included in this category is also the presentation of one's own research within one's own department or in a class when invited by the official instructor of the course.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Leadership and Teamworking.

<sup>17</sup> The PhD student may always supply a clear motivation for why the activity in his/her case belongs in only one of the two categories.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. Job application techniques.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supervision interview research assignment;</li> <li>- Presentation within research unit.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

In general, the following specifications apply:

- The points in the table, determined by the Research Council of ARIA, apply to all PhD students who study in the field of the Arts. The Education Council of the University of Antwerp (Dutch: *Onderwijsraad*) always has the right to request adaptations of the points attributed by the faculty.
- Activities which have been undertaken after obtaining the diploma which permits access to the enrolment in preparation of the thesis but *before* the actual enrolment took place may be taken into account, as a whole or in part, for the attribution of points in the context of the doctoral study programme.
- For pedagogical tasks, the rule applies that the efforts should be checked and confirmed by the supervisor(s).
- For research communication, one should think in the first place of posters and presentations at art-critical, art-historical and popularizing gatherings, but the active involvement in the organization of such meetings may also be honoured.

### Specialization Visual arts

D. Personal efficacy	Track reports	Number of points to be determined on the basis of details provided
----------------------	---------------	--

### Specialization Music

Competence category	Activity	Calculation of points
D. Personal efficacy	Publication in a music magazine	Max. 3p on the basis of details provided
	Making recordings	1-3p if relevance for the research is demonstrated
	Providing text for programme leaflet	Relevance for the research to be determined on the basis of details provided
	Composition of programme for concerts/exhibitions	0.5p
	Editing of critical scholarly scores	0.5p-3p depending on length; must be substantial (e.g. 2 pages of a song or symphony)
	Composer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- premiere of a musical composition</li> <li>- revision of a musical composition</li> <li>- renewed performance of a musical composition</li> </ul>	3p 2p 1p
F. Networking and teamwork	Participation in international competitions	0.5-3p on the basis of details provided



G. Career management	Making of digital portfolio	0.5-2p on the basis of details provided
Not honoured:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Professional profiling;</li> <li>- CD booklet, unless it has newsworthy content;</li> <li>- Track reports.</li> </ul>	