

Dance/Theatre Session 1

THE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH OUTPUTS FOR THE DISCIPLINES WITHIN PANEL 13 DANCE /THEATRE

Examples of types of outputs likely for XXX	How can this type of output comply with expectations of: a) peer review / citation, b) exegesis as contribution to knowledge, c) pre-eminence in the field, including evidence of significant impact	Other comments / issues
<p>EVENT – CREATIVE WORKS ie: publicly demonstrated/performed...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - showcase - performance - show - artefact - <p>there is 'performance as research' and 'performance' – implications for review process, judgements of quality</p> <p>need different kind of peer review process for different types of 'performance'.. therefore different makeup of panel of reviewers</p> <p><i>need peer reviewers who are au-fait with the genre/context</i></p> <p>'qualitatively describe' rather than metrically assess? <i>Can a peer</i></p>	<p>(venue not a metric)</p> <p>Need own way to rank venues, context/locality of reviews etc.. collaboratively agreed (also host organisation, commissioning body, funding partners and sources,</p> <p>(reality of pressure to produce text-based evidence)</p> <p>What do we want in a peer review/citation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - artistic peer review v academic 'peer review' - tensions? Different interpretations and understandings/expectations of 'peer review' - distinction between 'quality' and 'impact' - qualitative description and metrics - look at product but must consider ephemera/context of product - specific discursive qualities - Note: there are 2 elements to 'peer review' for RQF – as part of the portfolio evidence, and then as part of the RQF assessment activity - <i>Note: Know where peer review is already operating in the field and build on that – need mechanism to track this, follow links between performance, eg, and the publications associated with them, generated by/from them (reviews of performances etc) – ease the primacy of the exegesis etc</i> - End-user as peer – the user of the work as the reviewer/peer of the work? How? - Peer assessment/review that has had direct contact with the work/experience/performance....'liveness' – ability to indicate that 	<p>Common term which can accommodate sub categories.</p> <p>End users can be industry, artists...not necessarily public</p> <p>Don't rule out research that does not end up as a 'product'</p> <p>Performance that is not public</p> <p>Research in a 'showing' form that are used further by others</p> <p>What constitutes a product? A new way of doing things, a new methodology, training regime...not a work, but an outcome of intensive research process</p> <p><i>Outcomes</i> of the process – can capture this.</p> <p>Metrics as defined by end-users as participants</p>

<p>review process metrically assess? Detailed discursive from which the metrics are extracted? WHO would do this?</p>	<p>experiencing the 'liveness' of a work is essential, implications on the resulting artefact, ephemera surrounding the work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding bodies produce reviews of works they fund - Creation of archival or specialist collections to support the structure <p>Pre-eminence or peers?..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - partners/commissioning body/hosts - esteemed peers: mix of industry and academia? (ie – industry is often involved in academic, ir performance companies IN unis) ... (evidence in portfolio) (panel assessors) specific and/or range – powerful but dangerous... recommend training process for industry peers? Broad range guard against subjectivity... issues with accessing appropriate peers (ie geography), industry involvement crucial..., - end-users (not always public audience..but also education depts, other disciplines, organisation, govt, community groups – particularly industry?!) 	
(outcomes of) Research process/showcase		
Case study form		
Prototypes – product or no product		
Methodologies?		
Processes		
RESEARCH PRESENTED IN THE PERFORMANCE FORM	<p>(Ie...Adrian's example of student performance of a piece which was used by the principal to test another research purpose....performance not necessarily high quality...but successful in testing editing process.) need to Define the end users</p>	
TEXT-BASED (reviewers work, editors, criticism, the work of these practitioners)		
CREATION OF ARCHIVAL OR SPECIALIST COLLECTIONS TO SUPPORT THE STRUCTURE		

Dance/Theatre: session 2

The Context Statement

Comments/issues/discussion re things which can be included etc

Further 'evidence' of impact, such as:

- Funding sources as review (can be mentioned but not counted)
- External Funding acquired through peer review
- Funding linked to end-users

History of research and context to inform readers/assessors who are non-discipline

Other publications which have 'impact' other than metrics

Other non-institutional repositories accepted by the industry, to 'evidence' Impact and esteem eg: Austage, Australian Dancing, Austlit, NFSA – there is an esteem factor built into these, peer review, peer esteem is 'built in' in some cases. *Context statement would make this distinction between what is merely 'archived' and what is included through a peer review/esteem process*

Institutional repositories must link sideways to where 'evidence' is already collected....ie, Austage etc, rather than duplicate

GROUPS

Context statement would cover the whole grouping, not treating individuals

Rationale re choice of grouping – the makeup of the chosen grouping

IE: Context statement for a particular group can therefore refer to these different databases via their institutional repository

CS would/should DEFINE the nature of the group, AND HOW IT CAME INTO BEING. What 'group' means in the context of the submission. This could strengthen the submission if the group is shown to be truly collaborative and creative etc etc etc rather than merely convenient. Forecast the 'impact' of this group to the future....even if it is the strengthening of the

Authenticity of collaborative groupings?

Articulate the commonalities and coherences within groupings which cross disciplines – particularly if not overtly apparent

Total number of research outputs : CS would define what this means in the context of the submission?

Esteem indicators means **research** esteem, CS would describe the surrounding ephemera which evidences research esteem

In conventional definition, esteem comes from traditional pool of academic colleagues. This is not appropriate for this sectors in all cases, so must have accommodation to evidence esteem from industry peers., Respresentation for esteem comes from industry peers, not appropriate for esteem to come from academic peers, that is not where measures of peer esteem come from in this sector.

IMPACT

End user change, change of policy, behaviour

Discussion

Q: can a case study be a group of works, or just one?

Q: would there be multiple versions of a project, prepared by the varying groups involved? The descriptions of the process is very 'individual'

Comment: a group would be formed by individuals with their own record of output – the '4' outcomes

Q: does a context statement always *have* to be text-based? – recommend, dependent upon the grouping, that the CS could take a different form....seriously consider this where circumstances suggest:

Comment: the CS is a type of exegesis, text would be appropriate and advantageous then...

Recommendation: Consider submitting a CS in an alternate format where appropriate to the research submission

Q: "Claytons groups"....

Discussion: opportunity to strengthen cross-institutional groupings – to grab this and use it to advantage. Cross-disciplinary, cross-institutional, ... smaller institutions will be forced into interdisciplinary groupings. Opportunity and risk.

RFCD coding (arbitrarily)determining groupings?

Recommend: it is essential that cross instit groupiongs are accommodated appropriately....considered thoughtfully by panel 13....not be subjected to institutional politics.

Recommend : this should be clearly articulated in the DEST rhetoric

Consensus: this group is already engaged in cross groups, and wish to be endorsed in this activity. Despite funding driving institutional behaviour.

Cross institutional/disciplinary collaboration promotes excellence in outcomes. How can funding reward be managed in order to encourage continuing collab not undermine it.

Recommend reconsider the issues of 'interpretation' as opposed to 'new' work?

Need Flexibility in what is 'research esteem'

Dance/Theatre: session 3: Impact Measures/Indicators

Indicators

- * End user change – (how to measure? Basket metrics.... External end users, internal end users? Expert or non expert end users? (People – “it’s people at the end of the day” that are the consumers somehow of the ‘arts’)
- * Change of policy
- * Change in behaviour and attitudes

- *International student enrolment (choices based on quality research)
- *Site visits, international interest in work, activity,
- * Personal journals, documentation, reflection/reflective practice documentation

- *Community impact/application Communities... community activity, communities as end users, beneficiaries.
Measure a significant positive difference to a community over time....? How – what is the measure? Longitudinal. How to embrace activity which has a community ethos, social impact over time. Can community application be a ‘product’ itself and uptake be the measure?

- *support statements from end users (which might be different from end user *change?*)

- *venues???? Venue metrics, venue prestige????? If well scaffolded, if used in conjunction with other indicators, this indicator could be less problematic than it appears..... and taken in the context of the appropriateness of the work.

- Other Metrics???
- *measure of **exposure** is important in demonstrate impact (of a work/research)
- quantified then according to the type of work

- * commissions and sustainability of commissions (note: however, this is object based thinking – need to think in terms of the research GROUP)
- **level** at which the work was commissioned, (state, federal, local international – and backtracking through iterations of funding work) and recommissioning....sustainability of commissions

- *Government advisory activities
- *Expertise – sector needs to define who is accepted as experts – from participants, to people, to practitioners, to peers....
- *nominations and awards and reviews and acknowledgments and extent of media coverage (beware of simple ‘popularity’ – popularity (or lack of it) alone may not be the only or best measure – but if you have a hit then of course you take what you can use....)

- *Chain of Evidence – trail of ‘take-up’ of an idea or element from research activity, perhaps into other media or forms. *Chain of impact.*

*Impact in the **professional** art field – the non-university arts professionals are thus the end-users.... Is the difference between dance researchers active within a uni environment and dance professionals taking up what is 'produced' by the researchers

*Partnerships with industry

*Standing of the industry partners

*Standing of the venue

*Value - was the work appreciated, was the work valued – as a measure of impact.

Intrinsic value, extrinsic value – need definitions...

*standing of 'experts' who can vouch for 'value' of a work, who has the ability to say something works, something has value...who are the 'experts'

*Contribution to incubating/growing an **Australian** cultural environment – as opposed to an adopted international cultural environment

*international competitiveness for works as an Australian cultural product

*contribution to *innovation* within the discipline within Australia (eg: contribution to innovation in Australian dance) (- define innovation)

Review sources which are accepted by the industry – sector

Issues:

Consider distinction between quality and impact. – a project can have intrinsic quality...it then has to claim varying degrees of impact depending upon take-up, depending on

Issue: If you can work with metrics, go with it... if you don't have metrics, how to measure the impact of the deeper message of the work.

How to avoid a total 'product' focus which may cut out community, social benefit.

When the (community) project is set up, way to measure must be set up at the start – built in.

Arts council etc are already doing this type of thing .. they already ask for community 'impact' and measurements when assessing grants.

But then what is the sliding scale of 'community' – national scale, the state scale, then local etc etc?

Response: - first - evaluation of the success or otherwise of the project, and second, the research which goes/went into it.... Contextual.

University context implies a 'research' ethos within which the practitioners/researchers are operating

Group collaboration again...

Need a group of researchers around you to capture full range of impact – eg: ethnographic measures require a skilled ethnographer

Need to identify *who are* the end-users before you can gather data from them.

- 'expert' end users.... Laypeople... non-professional end users. The quality of the end user need not necessarily be taken to reflect retrospectively on the quality of the work

Define internal end users – DEFINE 'END USERS'

Purposiveness of the activity which makes it research...

Consider the nexus between research and teaching. NOTE: The internal student as end user – as unit of measurement, may be limited. May stunt reach of research impact if the nexus between teaching and research is the ONLY measure. Can argue that all research should feed into teaching anyway.

Measurable outcomes which demonstrate change on an end-user – easier when that was the initial intention. Not so easy when the particular measurable 'change' which eventuates was not the primary intention of the research.

A product, a commodity, is much easier to track in terms of impact or change, than a result which is not a 'commodity'

How do you measure a social or cultural 'improvement'?

It is the job of the research group to come up with ways, with indicators - 'built in' to the research.

It's not going to look like the sciences, because it is not the sciences – accept this
