

## **General summary:**

### **Makeup of Panel including 'End-User' members, as well as those from outside the discipline being judged:**

Widespread concern about the depth of awareness required for informed decision-making – therefore some form of educative process of Panel members is needed prior to RQF assessment (eg – even with 7 members on the Music board of the Australia Council, the full diversity of the field is not represented – how can 1 Music expert within Panel 13 fulfill the expectations of the RQF process)

The notion of 'end-user' as opposed to 'user' needs to be questioned

Creative writing should be included in this panel

### **Modes of publication:**

What constitutes a creative arts research product / outcome? A new way of doing things, a new methodology, training regime...not a work, but an outcome of intensive research process

Issues around self-publishing - difficult to deal with quality

Self-publication – does not necessarily preclude peer review – this often comes after the publication, not before, and therefore self-publication can be rigorous and not merely 'vanity press'

Are commercial entities (publishers, venues, etc) a reliable indicator or proxy for quality?

We need a relational way to rank venues / publishers / initiators of outcomes, and also the context / locality and reputation of public domain reviews etc. these need to be collaboratively agreed (also the host organisation, commissioning body, funding partners and sources) – this information needs to be included in the Context Statement

### **Non traditional research outputs:**

Outputs should include curated works (exhibitions, festivals, performances etc) which rely on collaborators or other creative product

Not only are creative works research outputs, but also the research findings arising can be presented in non-text forms

Allied processes (eg new methodologies for creation of work) are also a verifiable research outcome, as a corollary to laboratory work, including instances where outcomes are not an artistic success – new knowledge has still been created

Is a practice leading the field? – peers should be able to determine this – this should be the point of differentiation between research and professional practice

DEST already acknowledges the H & J categories as research; one starting point for the RQF is the question as to how we can modify these categories to suit our purposes today – we also need to draw upon the work of those universities which have developed their own additional research categories, with already collected data to match

The research aspects of a particular output might outweigh its artistic merit – aesthetic criteria as an absolute means of judging the output should not be imposed

### **Peer review:**

Within many arts areas, blind review is not the norm in relation to public domain outputs – therefore this type of process is not the only reliable proxy for quality – but how can we turn this to our advantage?

The RQF panels should be advised to consult the established track record of pre-existing peer review processes of arts partners, eg Australia Council

Other non-institutional repositories accepted by the industry, to 'evidence' Impact and esteem eg: Austage, Australian Dancing, Austlit, NFSA, Australian Music Centre – there is an esteem factor built into these entities

### **Context Statement**

Given the constraints on the length of the Context Statement for entire Research Group (anecdotal reports suggest 2-4 pages), we are concerned that much qualitative and contextual information may not be able to be included, to the disadvantage of both the individual and the group, and ergo the sector.

The context statement should allow or encourage a space for interpretation and reflection, depending on available space

CS should distinguish between what is merely 'archived' and what is judged through a peer review / esteem process

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

Does a context statement always have to be text-based?

### **Contexts statements are likely to include:**

- Capacity building is a central concern of the arts, design and architecture – connected to the relative “youth” of the disciplines in research terms

- Explains the manner in which the discipline undertakes creativity and research – outlines its processes
- Use the narrative to explain the past and then construct a future for the research grouping
- Contextualise the work within its field; needs some argument as to how it can be viewed as research (leadership in the field is part of this)
- Connection to the creative “professions” gives the group its particular qualities.
- A strong strategic direction, possibly covering both where the research is heading, and where the group is evolving
- The words used will point to how the group has become one producing leadership/break-through research: so past and future are important in this statement
- What are we known for? (eg, technical inventiveness, innovation within a form or medium) bring this in to the context stmt (ie, don't send technical inventiveness in creative form to the IT panel – claim it within the creative panel). This allows too a claim about why research might be disseminated through a novel, rather than a research output

Each of the case studies (4 per researcher) needs its own contextual statement – could be 300 words – but the works can not rely on the Context Statement as a whole for explication

### **Impact Statement:**

The creative arts have an under-acknowledged impact on wider social benefits, eg health, economic, cultural heritage, identity, tourism etc.

The IS can and should incorporate feedback from NGOs, the education sector, social welfare agencies etc

Impact measures are frequently longitudinal in nature and therefore a longer span of data collection may be necessary

This should also include ongoing research outputs or usages related to the original output – this is a form of reversioning which also has its own validity re. impact

How do we frame history / criticism / theory in panel 13; as this is necessary to the production of design / production / performance etc. ... therefore, the combination of the two is an important feature of panel 13. The impact of history and theory could/should be (in)directly through the production of material works by other members of the group (and vice versa).

### **Metrics which are relevant to Creative & Performing Arts:**

Traditional metrics of arts participation which are publicly available should be included. In addition, for Multimedia and digital distribution of work – web metrics should be included, where relevant, as these are increasingly reliable as being equivalent to citation indices

Furthermore, spinoffs will naturally occur, often without reference to the original researcher, and the impacts might be far removed in terms of their original intent – however the primary researcher or group should be able to claim these additional indicators of impact as being part of their own work

One measure of impact: have you been commissioned or engaged to deliver programs in your area? Is the work impacting on critical engagement – feeding other practitioners' work? Is it producing a discursive effect in the community?