

Evaluation framework design for artistic and design research in Flanders (ECOOM)

{
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Birgitte Martens
Walter Ysebaert

↳ INTRODUCTION TOPIC:
EX-POST FUNDING MODEL FOR ARTISTIC & DESIGN RES.

↳ Heterogeneity & diversity:
disciplinary
intra-disciplinary
research cultures
publications cultures
research traditions

⇒ indicators:
publication & citation counts

ECOOM-case: additional complexity
Artistic & design research
New fields of research: no tradition, culture, ..
Research result: praxis + text
(not always 'scientific')

- ‡ ECOOM-VUB coordinating instance: midwives
- ‡ Decree: ex-post funding for A & D Research (2019+2023)
- ‡ Decree: allocation additional means for R
- ‡ Indicator-based + output

- ‡ Difficult institutional position of the artistic & design educational & research programmes
- ‡ 2004: ° university associations, 1 university + several HEIs
- ‡ University: monopoly master degrees + PhDs
- ‡ HEIs: professional educational programmes + research for practice

=> Problem art academies (2012)

⌘ **BELGIAN SOLUTION:**

⌘ Architecture & Design: university departments

⌘ (Audio)visual Arts, Music, Performing Arts:

⌘ **SPECIAL STATUS: hybrid**

⌘ New institutional body: *Schools of Arts*

⌘ ° evaluation design framework

⌘ stakeholder discussions since 2009

Registration of research realisations

Evaluation framework

Consensus on organising principles:

1. Terminology:

not 'assessment' => 'evaluation'

not 'output' => 'artistic and design realisations'

not 'quality criteria' => 'research quality dimensions'

not 'non-traditional' / 'non-written' 'output': A & D R.

2. **Not evaluation of intrinsic quality** of art work/design object or exegesis on art work/design object (quality assurance)

3. Choice for clear **purpose of the framework**: allocation model to support 'innovative (for the arts, for artistic and design research) and daring research

4. **Recognition for internal/institutional diversity, heterogeneity** => allergy towards levelling and standardising effects

5. Peer review: leading principle of evaluation
 - (1) PR of results in central database
 - (2) Selection of 3 cases / institution
 - (3) PR + peer visit (selection reviewers + selection of institutions representative for their research policy, research culture, ...)
 - (4) PR negotiation + concertation
 - (5) Qualitative report

6. Indicator-assessment forum (Rémi Barré)
 - Collective learning
 - Discipline building
 - Capacity building

7. Testcase 2015/2016: doable, realistic, sustainable?

& EVALUATION FRAMEWORK (testcase)

REGISTRATION:

institutional level

fine-tuning with Flemish central database

Extra review-specific fields:

1. Research context
2. Evaluation panel (6)
3. Impact description
4. Impact reference

+ appropriate research roles:

creator, performer, contributor

+ appropriate research output categories:

artefact, design, performance (publicity/
research component)

PEER SCREENING:

↳ policy document + access to central database per peer panel

PEER VISIT: selection peers + selection institutions

PEER EVALUATION GUIDELINES:

↳ Not evaluation intrinsic quality

↳ Not checklist document

↳ Document clarifying research quality dimensions:

 ↳ Originality and authenticity

 ↳ Rigour

 ↳ Relevance: artistic, social, scientific

 ↳ Transparency and explicitation (of the research process)

 ↳ Representation (of research results)

 ↳ Impact: societal, artistic, scientific

Conclusion (1):

ADMITTEDLY, heavy tasks for peers (testcase)

⇒ problem: what is result from praxis/research?

⇒ Problem: lack of insights and data

⇒ weights for different categories?

⇒ no insight in what is registered as A & D R

⇒ Testcase: evidence gathering

⇒ ECOOM: Working group

⇒> indicator assessment forum

⇒> visibility & recognition

⇒> discipline & capacity building

& Conclusion (2):

Achievement: conflicting views on A & D R:

Teapot concept

=> art work does not need explaining

Different epistemology:

sensuous, embodied, instinctive, transdisciplinary...

Growing rapprochement:

despite teapot & epistemological difference,

concern to avoid isolated position

+ dialogue with & openness towards sciences