

Creative Outputs –Evaluation Process

René A. Smith, PhD

Presentation to ASSAf Annual National
Scholarly Editor's Forum Meeting

21 Nov 2022

Recognition of peer-reviewed creative outputs

- 2013 Working Group Report on Creative Outputs
 - Advised DHET on (amongst others) appropriate peer review systems; allocation of units and processes; procedures for submission and evaluation of creative outputs
- On innovations, DHET worked closely with the National Intellectual Property Management Office (NIPMO)
- 2014 - 2016 Policy development – sector consultation
- 2017 [*Policy on the Evaluation of Creative Outputs and Innovations Produced by South African Public Higher Education Institutions*](#) (Government Gazette No. 395, on 28 April 2017)
- 2018 Creative Outputs workshops – national
- 2019 Implementation Guidelines
 - Creative artistic outputs; Registered patents, and Registered Plant Breeders' Right
- [Creative Research Outputs Report 2020](#) First cycle (n-3; deadline: Nov 2019)
- [Creative Research Outputs Report 2021](#) Second cycle (n-3; deadline: Nov 2020)
- [2021 Implementation Guidelines](#) (revised October 2021)
- Creative Research Outputs Report 2022 Third cycle (Awaiting report)

Creative Outputs Guidelines and Reports

– Public Documents










RESEARCH AND CREATIVE OUTPUTS

The Directorate: University Research Support and Policy Development manages the implementation of the Research Outputs and Creative Outputs policies.

The policies aims to encourage research productivity by rewarding quality research and creative outputs at public higher education institutions. Under these policies, all public higher education institutions must annually submit to the Department their subsidy funding claims for research and creative outputs

Research Outputs Sector Reports

The Department produces reports relating to the performance of the universities based on their submissions.

-  [Creative Outputs Evaluation Report 2021](#)
-  [Creative Outputs Implementation Guidelines October 2021](#)
-  [Report on the Quality of South Africa's Research Publications](#)
-  [Creative Outputs and Innovations Evaluation Report 2020](#)
-  [Report on the evaluation of the 2019 Universities' Research Output](#)
-  [Report on the evaluation of the 2018 Universities Research Output](#)
-  [Report on the evaluation of the 2017 Universities Research Output](#)
-  [Report on the evaluation of the 2016 Universities Research Output](#)
-  [Report on the evaluation of the 2015 Universities Research Output](#)

*[*Click here for all Reports \(archived\)](#)*

Policy provisions

- Purpose - *To recognise and reward quality creative outputs and innovations produced by public higher education institutions*
 - Allocating subsidy to the universities
- The policy covers the following:
 - Innovations (Patents and Plant Breeder's Rights)
 - **Creative output sub-fields**
 - Fine Arts and Visual Arts;
 - Music;
 - Theatre; Performance and Dance;
 - Design;
 - Film and Television; and
 - Literary Arts.

Provisions (select)

9.2 The innovations recognised in terms of this policy are patents and plant breeders' rights.

10. This policy acknowledges that there are other legitimate and worthwhile research practices which may not be covered in the above categories, or fall neatly within the parameters of "creative outputs". These often include practices falling within the realms of research undertaken by those in Journalism, for example, as well as activities such as translation and scholarly editing.

11. It should be noted that the Department's subsidy is aimed at universities and not individual scholars or academics. Only work that is germane to one of the core functions of an institution will be considered.

PRINCIPLES

12. This policy aims to support and encourage scholarship. Institutions and academics must remember the importance of integrity when submitting their claims and are urged to focus on quality outputs and not maximum accrual of subsidy funds.

13. Similarly, when moving between institutions, author affiliation should reflect the institution where the work was created/ invented/ published, supported and funded.

Evaluation Process

Internal

- Application
- Creative Outputs Review process
 - Internal committees screen and verify for policy compliance prior to submission to DHET
- Approved institutional submissions
 - Institutional Research Offices consolidate for submission to DHET for evaluation and allocation of subsidy
 - Letter of declaration signed by DVC (or official rep)
 - Letter clarifies internal evaluation committee members
- Upload to ROSS
 - Must include two peer-reviewer reports from experts in discipline or subfield

External

- Application peer-review process *overseen by Universities*
 - Peer-evaluation by university selected expert reviewers
 - Reviewer templates
 - Creative outputs submitted must have been recommended by reviewers
- Sub-panel review process *overseen by DHET*

Peer Review process outlined in Policy

CREATIVE OUTPUTS

PEER REVIEW

19. Peer Review is understood to be the refereeing or evaluation of a complete creative output by independent experts in the field in order to ensure quality and determine whether the work or output qualifies for subsidy.
20. Institutions must choose peer reviewers who have appropriate academic qualifications and/or experience to assess submissions by creative practitioners working in a scholarly framework.
21. The following general submission procedure shall be followed by institutions:
 - 21.1. **Step one:** The applicant provides copies of material to the research office at his/her institution.
 - 21.2. **Step two:** The internal institutional mechanism screens the submitted material.
 - 21.3. **Step three:** The research office identifies three external peer reviewers and sends each a copy of the submitted material.
 - 21.4. **Step four:** The peer reviewers write their reports and submit these to the research office.
 - 21.5. **Step five:** The Research Office of the institution is responsible for arranging that peer reviewers attend live musical performances where this is deemed

- appropriate and feasible; for dispatching to them all evidence subsequently submitted; and for providing said peer reviewers with clear guidelines for assessment.
22. Institutions are advised to constitute an internal evaluation committee of suitably qualified persons to assess submissions, and to establish whether they meet the criteria as set out in the policy document.
 - 22.1. The internal evaluation committee must be chaired by the DVC: Research or equivalent and examine issues such as: the peer review process; quality of outputs; and address any matters pertaining to integrity.
 - 22.2. The research office consolidates the peer reviews into a report with a recommendation for onward transmission to DHET for final assessment and allocation of units. If an institution receives at least two negative peer reviews, it should not secure further reviews and should not submit the application to DHET for potential subsidy. Such an application should be considered unsuccessful.
23. Creative Outputs and Innovation will be assessed by a panel of experts established by DHET.

DHET Evaluation Panels

Sub-field Panels

- DHET allocates submissions to sub-field panel members for review
 - Disciplinary/field/practice experts
- Application review
 - Review of all info submitted via ROSS, including reviewer reports
 - Present submissions qualifying for subsidy and determination of unit allocation
 - Provisions in Terms of Reference (select):

They shall assess the creative works and determine if they embody original research production by practitioners/ scholars across the breadth of creative outputs disciplines as stipulated in the policy and the implementation guidelines.

They shall conduct evaluation of the creative outputs submissions with adherence to the highest quality standards of evaluation of creative and innovation outputs and consistent with the rigour expected of academics and professional practices in the respective fields.

They shall recommend the outcomes of their evaluations to the Advisory Panel.

They shall make recommendations on efficient implementation of the policy and improvements to DHET processes.

Advisory Panel

- Advise DHET on the processes and procedures for efficient assessment of creative research outputs in line with the Policy
- Advise DHET on policy improvements
- Chair subfield panel meetings
- Advisory Panel ToR specifically states:
 - Contribute towards continuously improving criteria and guidelines for sub-panels in line with the policy
 - Advise on efficient ways of implementing the Policy and on improving the process of evaluation including the online system
 - Recommend necessary improvements

Some Feedback

- Each annual evaluation meeting begins with a plenary presentation, discussion and information sharing.
- Panels also provide feedback to DHET after each annual evaluation meeting.
- Panel members *represent the sector and not their respective institutions*.
- Some areas identified since the first cycle:
 - Annotations
 - Peer review process
 - Curatorial Practice
 - Retrospectives
 - Confidentiality
 - Conflict of interest
 - DHET processes
 - ROSS system
 - University/Research Office participation and processes
- Policy Review processes take time (five years).
- Implementation Guidelines have been updated since first cycle.
- Relatively new process and openness to improving and strengthening system.

Contact – DHET:

Dr Idah M Makukule
Deputy Director: University Research Support and
Policy Development
Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET)
123 Francis Baard Street, Pretoria 0001
Tel: +27 12 312 6241
Email: Makukule.I@dhnet.gov.za

Thank you.

Questions?