

# 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 exegis 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