

Research Assessment Exercise 2020
Panel 12 – Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design
Panel-specific Guidelines on
Assessment Criteria and Working Methods
(September 2018)

Content:

Introduction

Section A: Submissions

Section B: Assessment Criteria: Research Outputs

Section C: Assessment Criteria: Research Impact

Section D: Assessment Criteria: Research Environment

Section E: Working Methods

Introduction

1. This document sets out the assessment criteria and working methods that the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2020 will apply. It should be read alongside the General Panel Guidelines of the exercise. The provisions set out in this document serve as further elaboration and amplification on the assessment criteria and working methods as applied to the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel. In areas where no additional information has been specified, the provisions in the General Panel Guidelines will prevail and apply in the assessment process of the Panel. These guidelines do not replace or supersede the requirements for submissions that are set out in the Guidance Notes for the RAE 2020.

2. This document describes the criteria and methods for assessing submissions in the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel. It provides guidance on the type of information required in the submissions. It also provides a single, consistent set of criteria that will be applied by the Panel and any sub-group(s) it may convene when undertaking the assessment having regard to any differences in the nature of disciplines of respective units of assessment (UoAs) under purview. It also provides a common approach to the working methods applied within the Panel.

Section A: Submissions

UoAs under the Panel

3. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel will assess universities' submissions from the following UoAs –

<u>Code</u>	<u>UoAs</u>
38	visual arts, design, creative media, other creative arts and creative writing
39	music and performing arts

4. The Panel expects to receive submissions whose primary research focus falls within the respective remit of the above UoAs. It acknowledges the diversity and range of related forms of academic research under its purview. These will include, for example, creative practice, user-centred and scholarly approaches to research. The Panel will, therefore, adopt an inclusive approach to the assessment of submitted research.

4.1 The Panel's boundary includes research relating to material, sonic, spatial and visual cultures where methods of designing, making, performing, representing, writing, criticism, history and theory are integral to their production.

4.2 Within this boundary descriptor the Panel's scope will cover a range of disciplines including (but not limited to): architectural design; broadcast journalism; broadcast media and television; crafts, applied and decorative arts; creative media; dance; digital heritage and image simulation; drama; fine arts; graphic arts; industrial and product design; information design; service design; interaction and game design; interior and landscape design; live and sonic art; music; musical composition; musicology; performance; photography, film and animation; screen studies; textiles, dress and fashion; theatre; visual communications and advertising.

4.3 The Panel anticipates that some, if not all, of the above disciplines will include research in areas of: co-design and community engagement; creative writing; entrepreneurship and enterprise; gender studies; history, theory and

criticism; museology and curatorship; pedagogy; policy, management and innovation; public art.

Inter-disciplinary Research

5. The Panel recognises that the individual UoAs within its purview do not have firm or rigidly definable boundaries, and that many aspects of research in the creative and performing arts and design are naturally inter-disciplinary or multi-disciplinary or span the boundaries between individual UoAs, whether within the Panel or across panels.

5.1 For these reasons the Panel expects to assess submissions that do not always map onto institutional structures. The Panel will assess, on an equal basis, submissions that reflect the work of coherent administrative units such as departments, alongside submissions that do not map neatly onto departmental or other administrative structures within the submitting institution. In either case, there will be no advantage or disadvantage in the assessment of outputs or impacts that are identified as inter-disciplinary nor will institutions be penalised if submissions contain some work that overlaps UoA boundaries.

5.2 The Panel will apply the standards of excellence defined by the starred quality levels equally to research in inter-disciplinary areas and to research within distinct disciplines. The Panel considers that all such research is capable of displaying the highest standards of quality.

5.3 The Panel will adopt the arrangements for assessing inter-disciplinary submissions as set out in paragraphs 39-40 of the General Panel Guidelines. These will include the appointment of more than one Inter-disciplinary Champion to the Panel, use of the cross-referral system to other panels, and, the appointment of additional specialist assessors where appropriate and necessary.

6. Inter-disciplinary research submitted to the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel may include, for example, other disciplines such as; anthropology; archaeology; architecture; computer science and information technology; education; social studies; engineering; health sciences; history; management and business studies; humanities; urban planning.

Assignment of Eligible Academic Staff in Each UoA

7. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel does not expect to receive information on sub-disciplines in relation to eligible academic staff and respective research.

8. It is critical that research outputs are assessed by the most appropriate panel. If a panel suspects any anomaly regarding universities' assignment of eligible academic staff (and therefore their outputs) to research area(s) and UoA(s) under its remit, it will follow the procedures for re-assignment of the eligible staff according to paragraphs 10-11 of the General Panel Guidelines. The Panel also recognises its responsibility to handle submissions arising from any re-assignment of eligible academic staff to the Panel. The Panel would find the assignment of eligible academic staff likely susceptible to anomaly where the majority of their outputs fell outside the panel's boundary descriptor (see paragraphs 4.1-4.3 above).

University's Research Strategy Statement

9. Following paragraphs 2.16-2.18 and Appendix B of the Guidance Notes and paragraph 15 of the General Panel Guidelines, the Research Strategy Statement submitted by each university will provide contextual information for the Panel when assessing the submissions. These Statements will not be assessed, but may help the Panel to understand better the material that is presented in each submission, particularly insofar as UoAs refer to the overall position of their university. The Statements will also help the University Grants Committee (UGC) when viewing the quality profiles of the universities as a whole upon completion of the RAE 2020.

10. *(Template paragraph deleted)*

Section B: Assessment Criteria: Research Outputs

Output Types

11. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel will consider the eligibility of research outputs as described in paragraphs 16-18 of the General Panel Guidelines, paragraphs 5.7-5.11 and Appendix F of the Guidance Notes.

- 11.1 Additionally, a non-traditional research output will be eligible if its research imperatives and associated methods have been made accessible and, so, effectively shared (see paragraph 20 of this document).

12. The Panel will assess the quality of each eligible output on its own merits and not in terms of its publication category, medium or language of publication. The Panel will examine each item in sufficient detail so as to form a reliable judgment on the quality of that output. The Panel will not assess outputs mechanistically according to the exhibition, performance or publication venue. The Panel recognises that there can be work of the highest quality in various output forms, and no distinction will be made between the types of output submitted nor whether the output has been made available electronically or in a physical form.

- 12.1 The Panel will neither advantage nor disadvantage any form of research output whether it is physical or virtual, textual or non-textual, visual or sonic, static or dynamic, digital or analogue so long as it meets the definition of research as set out in paragraphs 2-3 of the General Panel Guidelines.

13. Forms of research outputs that are admissible and relevant to the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel include the following examples (see paragraph 5 above for a description of the Panel's boundary). The following list should not be regarded as exhaustive. Equally, there is no implication of priority or importance in the examples in this list –

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| • Artefact | • Exhibition |
| • Archival/special collection | • Edited book |
| • Architectural design | • Journal article |
| • Authored book | • Materials |
| • Chapter in book | • Musical composition |
| • Conference contribution | • Patent/published patent |
| • Confidential report | • Performance |
| • Creative writing | • Research dataset/database |
| • Curatorial project | • Software |
| • Design | |
| • Design process/program | • Body of Work |
| • Devices and products | [see paragraphs 14.2-14.6 below] |
| • Digital or visual media | • Other |

14. All research outputs will be assessed for the quality of original research they include. The Panel will accept the submission of a review article only where it contains a significant component of unpublished research or new insight. Such outputs will be judged only on that element of original research or novelty of insight.

14.1 Where additional information is provided, the submission should not include claims for the perceived quality of the research output; the Panel will ignore these if they are included.

Body of Work

14.2 A submission may take the form of an individual output or a Body of Work.

14.3 For the purposes of RAE 2020 a Body of Work is defined as: a single coherent work published in two or more parts of knowledge or practice, that is derived from research, has scholarly rigour, and, may have enabled the translation of research to impact.

14.4 A Body of Work may include a number of smaller scale items that address different aspects of a single research project. The Body of Work must offer a single, coherent, account of the research project that would not be evident from any single item if submitted by itself. Indicative examples are: a design program that involves multiple channels of investigation to arrive at a single artefact or a system; a solo exhibition or performance in which the thematic nature of the production requires various avenues of enquiry and forms of output; multiple dictionary or encyclopaedia entries and groups of short items or related critical works with a common thread of research.

14.5 The Body of Work must be in digital format and uploaded as a single file onto a repository to which the Panel will have access.¹ A URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for the location of the Body of Work must be included in the 300-words textbox (see paragraph 20 below).

¹ Where the items in a Body of Work output are of a non-traditional form then they should, additionally, include the information required for non-traditional outputs as set out in paragraph 20 of this document.

- 14.6 Where each item making up a Body of Work embodies research (as defined for the purposes of the RAE in paragraphs 2-3 of the General Panel Guidelines) then a Body of Work may be submitted as a single output to be assessed as a whole.
- 14.7 The criteria for double-weighting will equally apply to a Body of Work as to a single research output (see paragraphs 16-17 of this document).

Outputs with significant material in common

15. The Panel will consider subsequent editions, performances, compositions, broadcasts or exhibitions of previous work only where they contain a significant component of new research or insight.

- 15.1 Where a submitted output includes significant material in common with an output published prior to 1 October 2013, the submission should use the textbox to explain how far the earlier work was revised to incorporate new research or insights.
- 15.2 Where two or more research outputs within a submission include significant material in common, the Panel will assess each output taking account of the common material only once. If the Panel judged that the outputs do not contain sufficiently distinct material, and should be treated as a single output, an “unclassified” score would be given to the “missing” output.

Double-weighting of Research Outputs

16. Paragraphs 29-31 of the General Panel Guidelines indicate that in exceptional cases a submitting university may request that outputs of extended scale and scope be double-weighted in the assessment. In view of the established practice in creative arts, performing arts and design, of publishing major research outputs in the form of texts, exhibitions, performances or designs, the Panel recognises that there will be outputs of such scale and scope and will consider the items submitted for double-weighting in line with the General Panel Guidelines.

17. When requesting double-weighting of an output, universities should submit a statement of not more than 100 words, explaining in what

ways the output is of sufficiently extended scale and scope in order to justify the claim. The Panel will decide whether to double-weight the output on the basis of the following characteristics:

- the production of a research output which was contingent upon the completion of a complex and extensive period of workshop/studio practice (collective or individual);
- the production of one or more creative outputs that investigate a given theme in considerable depth, from different perspectives, or in relation to different contexts;
- the generation of an extensive or complex concept or proposition;
- the collection and analysis of a considerable body of material;
- the use of primary sources which were extensive, complex or difficult to access;
- the presentation of a critical insight or argument which was dependent upon the completion of a lengthy period of data collection or investigation of materials.

The Panel may consider, for example, a sole-authored monograph, extensive musical composition, theatrical performance, solo exhibition or design scheme to be equivalent to requiring research effort for producing two single outputs though such claims will not be automatically accepted. Should a claim not be accepted then the reserve output will come into play.

Co-authored/Co-produced Outputs

18. The Panel affirms the principles and arrangements on assessing co-authored/co-produced research outputs as set out in paragraphs 32-34 of the General Panel Guidelines.

19. Where co-authored/co-produced outputs are submitted for consideration universities may only attribute them to individual members of staff who made a substantial research contribution to the output.

- 19.1 The Panel does not require the submission of information about the individual co-author's contribution to a co-authored output and, if received, it will take no account of such statements. The Panel may, however, in some individual cases request such information through an audit to verify that an author/producer made a substantial

contribution to the output. Where this cannot be confirmed or verified the output will be graded as “unclassified”.

- 19.2 Once the Panel has determined that the co-author’s/producer’s contribution to the research content of the output is distinct and substantial, it will assess the quality of the output as a whole, taking no further regard of each individual co-author’s/producer’s contribution.

Non-traditional Outputs

20. The Panel welcomes research outputs in a non-traditional form according to paragraphs 35-37 of the General Panel Guidelines. Non-traditional research outputs may be submitted as a single item or as a Body of Work (see paragraphs 14.2-14.6 of this document).

- 20.1 For the purposes of RAE 2020 the definition of “non-traditional” is: a research outcome that does not, by itself, reveal its research imperatives and associated processes of investigation in order to establish a permanent legacy that can be effectively shared.
- 20.2 Where the outcome of research fulfils the definition for a non-traditional output (e.g. an artefact, composition, performance, design or system) then the following additional information is requested:
- 300-words textbox: a description in the textbox accompanying each output (see paragraphs 20.3 below). Its primary purpose is to provide the Panel with information that is not accessible from the research output itself but is essential to the assessment. This is a requirement in such instances.
 - Body of Evidence: where the research outcome and the 300-words textbox, together, do not provide information that is essential to a proper and full understanding for the assessment then a Body of Evidence (see paragraphs 20.8 – 20.14 below) may be made available to the Panel. This is an option but not a requirement in such instances.

300-words Description

- 20.3 The 300-words description accompanying each output must only be used where the output is defined as being non-traditional (see paragraph 20.1 above) or it does not, by itself, reveal the research imperatives and associated processes of investigation.
- 20.4 The textual descriptor must not exceed 300 words and should always use the minimum to effectively communicate information that is unavailable elsewhere but essential to the assessment.
- 20.5 The 300-word descriptor should also include the following information:
- how the output has met the three assessment criteria of significance, originality and rigour where this is not self evident in the output itself;
 - where relevant, the URL link to a Body of Work (paragraphs 14.2-14.7 above) and confirmation whether this is, or is not, in the public domain;
 - where relevant, the URL link to a Body of Evidence (paragraphs 20.6-20.13) and when this was first effectively shared.

Submitting institutions should ensure that these URL links remain in full working order where they have been provided. Each URL will be counted as one word in the textbox.

Body of Evidence

- 20.6 For the purposes of RAE 2020 a Body of Evidence is defined as (i) a structured set of material(s) (ii) that clearly articulate the research imperatives and associated processes of investigation where these are not evident in the research outcome(s) and (iii) provide a permanent legacy of that research so it can be effectively shared.
- 20.7 Where the research output consists of two or more outcomes then these will be described in the Body of Work (see paragraph 14.3 of this document). The Body of

Evidence should be structured in such a way as to exemplify the academic rigour underpinning the production of a non-traditional research output (whether it be a single item or a Body of Work) so this can be effectively shared.

20.8 Whereas the Panel has no expectation of the most appropriate and effective way to structure a Body of Evidence it should, nonetheless include some, if not all, of the standard elements of any research endeavour e.g.:

- the outcomes of the research;
- the research question(s);
- the research field and key works referenced;
- the research methods and materials;
- how the research was tested and the feedback used;
- the research conclusions;
- the novelty of the research outputs;
- the dissemination and distribution of the outcomes.

20.9 The Body of Evidence may contain textual, visual, sonic and/or time-based materials sufficient to articulate the research, outcomes, imperatives and processes. In non-traditional research outputs that contain performances, films or other time-based media then the evidence should include digital recordings of such material either as separate files or integrated within the Body of Evidence².

20.10 The Panel recognizes that in some, if not many, cases a Body of Work and a Body of Evidence may have the same research materials in common. In such instances one set of materials having a single URL may be provided so long as they meet the requirements of both a Body of Work and a Body of Evidence.

² In such instances the digital files should be of good quality being at least 300 dots per inch for image files, audio not less than 16 bit, and high definition video, or any other widely used and accepted format such as pdf or mp3.

- 20.11 The Body of Evidence should be presented in a manner and language that can be effectively shared with any person wishing to learn from, assess, or make use of the research – either now or at some point in the future.
- 20.12 Where a Body of Evidence is made available it should be archived on a repository to which the Panel will have access throughout the assessment period. The URL for this location must be included in the 300-words textbox (see paragraphs 20.3- 20.5 above).
- 20.13 Where non-traditional outcomes do not reveal their research imperatives and associated research processes through the output itself, nor through the 300-words text descriptor or through a Body of Evidence, then they will be regarded as creative practice that is not research.

Criteria and Quality Levels for Assessing Research Outputs

21. Panel members will use their professional judgement with reference to international standards in assessing research outputs.

22. In assessing outputs, the Panel will look for evidence of originality, significance and rigour, and will grade each output into one of the five categories of quality level as set out in paragraph 19 of the General Panel Guidelines. The generic description of the quality levels as set out in paragraph 20 of the General Panel Guidelines will be applied in the Panel's assessment.

23. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel provides the following amplifications on the criteria of assessing research outputs –

originality: the degree to which the work has developed new formulations or data and/or initiated new methods and/or new forms of expression.

significance: the degree to which the work has enhanced, or is likely to enhance, knowledge, thinking, understanding and/or practice in its field.

rigour: the degree of intellectual coherence, methodological precision and analytical power; accuracy and depth of scholarship; awareness of and appropriate engagement with other relevant work.

24. In addition, the Panel provides the following advice on their understanding of the quality definitions adopted for assessing research outputs:

4*	3*	2*	1*	unclassified
Outstandingly novel, innovative and/or creative.	Significantly novel or innovative or creative.			
Instrumental in developing new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences.	A catalyst for, or important contribution to, new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences.	An incremental and cumulative advance on thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences.		
A major expansion of the range and the depth of research and its application.	A significant expansion of the range and the depth of research and its application.	A useful contribution to the range or depth of research and its application.		
A primary or essential point of reference.	An important point of reference.	A recognised point of reference.	Based on existing traditions of thinking, methodology and/or creative practice.	
Of profound influence.	Of considerable influence.	Of some influence.	A useful contribution of minor influence.	
				Below the quality threshold for one star.
				Does not meet the definition of research used for the RAE.

Metrics/Citation Data

25. *(Template paragraph deleted)*

26. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel will neither receive nor make use of any bibliometric data to inform their judgement. In assessing the quality of outputs the panel will not privilege any journal or conference ranking/lists, the perceived standing of the publisher, or the medium of publication, or where the research output is published, exhibited, performed, or, in the case of some design artefacts, the place and context of their usage.

Additional Information on Research Outputs

27. Other than the information required on research outputs as specified in the Guidance Notes, and specifically required by the Panel during the assessment process (as set out in this document for non-traditional outputs and double-weighting) no other information should be provided, and the Panel will take no account of any such information if submitted.

Section C: Assessment Criteria: Research Impact

Range of Impacts

28. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel will accept submissions on research impacts that meet the generic definition and criteria as set out in paragraphs 47-48 of the General Panel Guidelines.

29. The Panel will assess the quality of all eligible impact submissions based on their merits on equal footing with no consideration given to the differences among submitting universities/units in terms of staff size, resources and histories. The Panel recognises that impacts within its remit can be manifested in various ways and may occur in a wide range of spheres whether locally, regionally or internationally.

30. Examples are provided in Table A to illustrate the range of potential impacts from research across the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel along with indicators of Reach and Significance. These examples are indicative only, and are not exhaustive or exclusive. Equally, there is no implication of priority or importance in the ordering of examples in the list.

31. Universities are expected to submit their strongest impact cases and not to align submitted cases specifically with the particular types of impact listed, as an impact case may describe more than one of the types of impact set out in Table A below.

Table A: Examples of Impact

Areas of Impact	Types of Impact	Indicators of Reach and Significance
<p>Impacts on creativity, culture and society</p> <p>Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose behaviours, creative practices, rights, duties and other activity have been influenced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with museum professionals results in enhancements to (cultural) heritage preservation and interpretation, including museum and gallery exhibitions. • Co-production of new cultural artefacts, including for example, films, novels and TV programmes. • Generating new ways of thinking that influence creative practice, its artistic quality or its audience reach. • Inspiring, co-creating and supporting new forms of artistic, literary, linguistic, social, economic, religious, and other expression. • Research-led engagement with marginalised, under-engaged and/or diverse audiences leads to increased cultural participation. • Developing stimuli to cultural tourism and contributing to the quality of the tourist experience. • Improvements to legal and other frameworks for securing intellectual property rights. • Increased understanding of local traditions leading to enhanced cultural preservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testimonials from creative practitioners, curators, media professionals. • Publication and sales figures both in Hong Kong and overseas, audience or attendance figures (including demographic data where relevant), broadcasting data and other forms of media, download figures, or database and website hits over a sustained period. • Evaluative reviews of impact in the media. • Tourism data, including audience figures and visitor numbers at exhibitions, events, performances. • Professional evaluations of exhibitions, performances or other outputs. • Audience/visitor/participant feedback (e.g. through surveys, interviews or focus groups).

Areas of Impact	Types of Impact	Indicators of Reach and Significance
<p>Impacts on health, and wellbeing</p> <p>Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups whose health outcomes have been improved and whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of new products, devices or processes that have protected the health of individuals or supported the performance of the human body. • The application of creative practices in the visual arts, theatre, performance or music to improve the health and wellbeing of, patients, individuals or groups. • The improvement of patient health outcomes through, for example, the design of new medical devices, technologies or care products. • Public health and quality of life has been enhanced through, for example, the design of information campaigns to enhance public awareness of a health risk, enhanced disease prevention or, in developing countries, improved water quality or access to healthcare. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of take-up and use of new or improved products and processes that improve quality of life and wellbeing. • Evidence of enhancement of patient experience. • Measures of improved clinical outcomes, public behaviour or health services. • Measures of improved wellbeing, improved patient outcomes, public health or health services.
<p>Impacts on commerce and the economy</p> <p>Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributing to economic prosperity via design and the creative sector including publishing, music, theatre, museums and galleries, film and television, fashion, textiles, products, tourism, and computer games. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helping crafts based producers, sole traders and/or microbusinesses to establish cost effective business models. • Evidence of improved cost-effectiveness in design and manufacturing processes. • Sales of new products/

Areas of Impact	Types of Impact	Indicators of Reach and Significance
<p>Impacts on commerce and the economy <i>(continued)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved support for the development of “small scale” craft processes and batch-production technologies. • A spin-out or new business has been created, established its viability, or generated revenue or profits. • Contributing to innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products or services. • Decisions are made not to introduce a new process or product as a result of research. • Social enterprise initiatives have been created. • Gains in productivity have been realised as a result of research-led changes in practice. • The performance of an existing business has been improved through the introduction of new, or the improvement of existing products, processes or services; the adoption of new, updated or enhanced technical standards and/or protocols; or the enhancement of strategy, operations or management practices. • Performance has been improved, or new or changed technologies or processes adopted, in companies or other organisations through highly skilled people 	<p>services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business performance measures (for example, turnover/profits, trends in key technical performance measures underlying economic performance). • Employment figures. • Licences awarded and brought to market. • Demonstrable collaborations with industry (including knowledge transfer partnerships, and contracts). • Commercial adoption of a new technology, process, knowledge or concept. • Business performance measures, for example, sales, turnover, profits or employment associated with new or improved products, processes or services. • Jobs created or protected. • Investment funding raised from Hong Kong and/or non-Hong Kong agencies for start-up businesses and new activities of existing businesses. • Evidence of critical impact on particular projects, products and processes confirmed by independent authoritative evidence, which should be financial where possible. • Evidence of research leading to avoidance of negative outcomes. • Tourism data, including

Areas of Impact	Types of Impact	Indicators of Reach and Significance
<p>Impacts on commerce and the economy (continued)</p>	<p>having taken up specialist roles that draw on the research, or through the provision of consultancy or training that draws on the research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy, operations or workplace practices of a business have changed. 	<p>audience figures and visitor numbers at exhibitions, events, performances.</p>
<p>Impacts on public services and policy</p> <p>Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), charities and public sector organisations and local communities, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In delivering a public service, a new approach, technology or process has been adopted or an existing approach, technology or process improved. • Research is used to re-design current processes or services, or to identify new services to be provided. • (Sections of) the public or local communities have benefited from the design of public service improvements. • The work of an NGO, community group, charitable or other organisation has been influenced by the research. • Policy decisions or changes to legislation, regulations or guidelines have been informed by research evidence. • Research stimulates critical public debate that either leads to the adoption or non-adoption of policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of improved public or community services, including, where appropriate, quantitative information. • Satisfaction measures (for example, with services). • Formal partnership, consultancy agreement or research collaboration with major institutions, NGOs, community groups or public bodies. • Acknowledgements to researchers on webpages, in reports or briefings. • Distinctive contributions to expert panels and policy committees or advice to government (at local, national or international level). • Quantitative indicators or statistics on the numbers of attendees or participants at a research event, or website analytics for online briefings. • Testimonials from Members, Committees, officials, chief executives or community leaders where available.

Areas of Impact	Types of Impact	Indicators of Reach and Significance
<p>Impacts on practitioners and the professions</p> <p>Impacts where beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals, including service users, and community leaders involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practices have changed, or new or improved processes have been adopted, in companies, businesses or other public or community organisations, through the provision of training or consultancy. • Professionals, businesses and organisations are able to adapt to changing cultural values, market demands and new production processes as a result of research. • Professional methods, processes, ideas or ethics have been influenced by research. • Educational or pedagogical practices and methods have changed in primary, secondary, further or higher education, within or beyond the submitting unit. • Professional bodies and learned societies have used research to define best practice, formulate policy, or to lobby government or other stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented change to professional standards or behaviour. • Evidence of adoption of best practice (for example, by educators, arts commissioners or design studios). • New or modified technical standards, processes or protocols. • Evidence of debate among practitioners, leading to developments in attitudes or behaviours. • Literature/web information from practitioners and advisers, including the research findings and how they are applied in practice. • Traceable reference to inclusion of research in national or international standards or authoritative guidance. • Traceable references by practitioners to research papers that describe their use and the impact of the research.
<p>Impacts on the environment</p> <p>Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural and/or built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement of the environment through creative interventions or the design of new systems, product(s), process(es) or service(s). • In the design of consumer products the reduction of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales of new products or the implementation of new systems that bring quantifiable environmental benefits. • Verifiable influence of design solutions or creative interventions that bring

Areas of Impact	Types of Impact	Indicators of Reach and Significance
<p>Impacts on the environment (<i>continued</i>)</p>	<p>wastage through environmentally friendly design solutions that extend the life cycle of products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of new materials and processes that are environmentally friendly and enhance the built environment. • Influence on professional practices. • Changing public perceptions, practices or policies on environmental issues through the design of information campaigns. • Changing the operations of a business or public service to achieve environmental (green) objectives. 	<p>environmental benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traceable reference to the inclusion of research into new creative and design practices, industry guidance or legislation. • Traceable impacts on particular projects or processes which bring environmental benefits. • Documented case-specific improvements to environment-related issues. • Traceable reference to impact of research in planning decision outcomes.
<p>Impacts on understanding, learning and participation</p> <p>Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, communities and organisations whose awareness, understanding, participation or engagement have been enhanced as a result of research.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced cultural understanding of issues and phenomena; shaping or informing public attitudes and values to the creative and performing arts and design. • Public or political debate has been shaped or informed by research; this may include activity that has challenged established norms, modes of thought or practices. • Research in the creative and performing arts and design has challenged conventional wisdom, stimulating debate among stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented evidence that public understanding has been enhanced through active collaborative involvement in research. • Documented evidence of policy debate (for example, in Legislative Council, the media, material produced by NGOs). • Public debate in the media. • Documented shift in public attitude (for example, to gender issues, or social factors in education). • Citation in a public discussion, consultation document or judgement. • Citation by journalists,

Areas of Impact	Types of Impact	Indicators of Reach and Significance
<p>Impacts on understanding, learning and participation (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased understanding of gender roles has improved equality. • Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation. • Influencing the design and delivery of curriculum and syllabi in schools, higher education (HE) institutions, non-HE institutions or other educational organisations in terms of the value of learning through the creative arts and design. • Influencing a wider public debate on the contribution of creative arts and design to public space and identity. 	<p>broadcasters or social media.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of increased attainment and/or measures of improved engagement with the creative and performing arts and design in non-HE education. • Evidence of use of education materials arising from the research.

(Note: Other examples of research impact as well as other examples of evidence or indicators for research impact in other jurisdictions may be accessible online such as <<http://results.ref.ac.uk/Results/SelectUoa>> from the United Kingdom.)

Impact Overview Statement

32. Following paragraphs 7.7 (a) and (b), 7.8 and Appendix G of the Guidance Notes and also paragraph 49 of the General Panel Guidelines, submitting units are required to describe the arrangements they had in place during the assessment period to facilitate the translation of research to impact e.g. how they have created and sustained pathways to impact and continued to develop these in order to effectively link research with communities who may benefit. This is distinct from the environment overview statement, which should describe how the units support the conduct and production of research.

33. The impact overview statement should include relevant illustrative explanations with examples and traceable references where possible, rather than broad, general statements. The Panel expects the impact overview statement to include –

- **context:** main non-academic user groups, beneficiaries or audiences for the unit's research; main types of impacts specifically relevant to the unit's research, and how these relate to the range of research activities or research groups in the unit;
- **approach to impact:** the unit's approach to identifying and interacting with non-academic users, beneficiaries, or audiences; its approach and mechanism to support the achievement of impacts from its research; this could include but is not limited to indicators such as participation in knowledge exchange schemes; industrial training provided or consultancy undertaken;
- **strategy and plans:** how the unit is developing a strategy for achieving impact including its goals and plans for supporting and enabling impact from its current and future research;
- **relationship to the case studies:** how the selected case studies relate to the submitting unit's approach to achieving impact; how particular case studies exemplify aspects of the unit's approach or informed the development of the unit's approach; moreover, the Panel recognises that impact case studies are underpinned by research over a period longer than the assessment period, and that individual case studies may not directly relate to or necessarily arise from the unit's current approach.

Impact Case Study(ies)

34. Following paragraphs 7.7 (c) and (d), 7.9-7.10 and Appendix H of the Guidance Notes and also paragraph 51 of the General Panel Guidelines, submitting units are required to provide a narrative account in each case study that should be coherent, clearly explaining the relationship between the research and its impact – describing what has changed because of that research and the benefits arising from that change.

35. Each impact case study should include appropriate evidence and indicators that support the claims for the impact achieved, including who and what has/have benefitted. Individual case studies may draw on various evidence and indicators, which may take different forms depending on the type of impact.

36. Examples of potential evidence, or indicators of Reach and Significance, that may be mostly relevant to the Creative Arts, Performing

Arts & Design Panel have been included in Table A alongside the impact to which they relate. These examples are not intended to be exhaustive. Equally, there is no implication of priority or importance in the ordering of examples in the list.

37. The Panel provides the following advice on particular aspects of impact case studies –

- To assist the Panel, the first section of the Impact Case Study (Summary of the impact) should clearly summarise the Impact being claimed (i.e. what has changed) with some brief indication of its reach and significance. It should not be an abstract of the Case Study as a whole or a description of the research it contains.

Underpinning Research

38. The Panel acknowledges the level of quality required for research underpinning impact cases, i.e. equivalent to at least 2 star (2*) or international standing, as stipulated in the General Panel Guidelines. Impact case studies should include appropriate evidence or indicators of the quality of underpinning research i.e. key indicators of how each fulfils the criteria for significance, originality and rigour. Where necessary, the Panel may review the outputs concerned in order to ensure the quality of the research cited is of at least 2 star (2*).

39. Provided that the Panel is satisfied that the quality threshold has been met, the quality of the underpinning research will not be taken into account in the assessment of the quality of impact. Underpinning research referenced in a case study may also be submitted for assessment under the research output element. The evaluation of the outputs concerned under the impact element is a separate assessment only for assuring the threshold of underpinning research. In this case, the guidance on output types and criteria for assessing research outputs as stipulated in paragraphs 11-15, 21-24 above would apply.

Criteria and Quality Levels for Assessing Research Impact

40. The Panel will exercise its expert judgement in assessing the quality of each impact submission, and will not judge it in terms of the type of research underpinning the impact cases.

- 40.1 The submitting unit should not include claims for the perceived quality of the research impacts; the Panel will ignore these if they are included.

41. In assessing impacts, the Panel will look for evidence of reach and significance, and will grade each impact submission as a whole and give a rating using one or more of the five categories of quality level following paragraphs 53-55 of the General Panel Guidelines. In respect of the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel, the criteria of reach and significance will be understood as follows –

- reach: will be understood as the extent and diversity of the communities, individuals, organisations that have benefitted or been positively affected from the impact.
- significance: will be understood as the degree to which the impact has enabled, enriched, influenced, informed or changed the performance, policies, practices, products, services, understanding, awareness or well-being of the beneficiaries.

42. The Panel will make an overall judgement about the reach and significance of impacts, rather than assessing each criterion separately. The criteria will be applied in the assessment of the research impact regardless of the domain to which the impact relates. In addition, the Panel understands the quality standards for assessing research impact as follows –

- While case studies need to demonstrate both reach and significance, the balance between them may vary at all quality levels. The sub-panels will exercise their judgement without privileging or disadvantaging either reach or significance.
- Reach will be assessed in terms of the extent to which the potential constituencies, number or groups of beneficiaries have been affected; it will not be assessed in geographic terms, nor in terms of absolute numbers of beneficiaries. The criteria will be applied wherever the impact has been felt, regardless of geography or location, and whether in Hong Kong or abroad.

Institutions may submit case studies describing impacts at any stage of development or maturity. However, the assessment will be solely on the impact achieved during the assessment period, regardless of its stage of maturity. No account will be taken of anticipated or future potential impact, nor of impact that occurred outside the assessment period.

Section D: Assessment Criteria: Research Environment

Research Environment

43. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel will accept submissions on research environment according to paragraphs 57-58 of the General Panel Guidelines. The Panel recognises that excellent research can be undertaken in a wide variety of research structures and environments. The Panel has no pre-formed view of the ideal size or organisational structure for a research environment. The Panel will assess each submission based on what has been presented in relation to the work of the submitting unit in providing and ensuring a good environment.

44. As a research environment submission may relate to a single coherent faculty and equally to multiple departments, submissions may depict the commonalities and dynamics among faculties and departments within the submitting unit, and define their prime activities, how they operate and their main achievements.

44.1 Given that there is no expectation that the environment element of a submission will always relate to a single coherent organisational unit, submissions should explain any distinct groups or units covered, particularly where discrete organisational units form part of a single submission.

44.2 Neither the existence of research groups, nor their absence, is, in itself, considered significant by the Panel.

Environment Overview Statement

45. Following paragraphs 9.6 (a) and (b), 9.7 and Appendix I of the Guidance Notes, and also paragraph 59 of the General Panel Guidelines, submitting units are required to describe how they have supported the conduct and production of research. This is distinct from the impact overview statement, which should describe how the units encourage and facilitate the achievement of research impact.

46. Within the terms of the Guidance Notes, the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel will expect in particular to see the following in the environment overview statement which should reflect and evidence the unit's approach to equality and diversity as appropriate throughout:

- **overview:** submission in this part is expected to briefly describe the organisation and structure of the unit, which research groups are covered in the submission and how research is structured across the submitting unit;
- **research strategy:** evidence of the achievement of strategic aims for research during the assessment period, and details of future strategic aims and goals for research; how these relate to the structure described above; and how they will be taken forward; methods for monitoring attainment of targets; new and developing initiatives not yet producing visible outcomes but of strategic importance; identification of priority developmental areas for the unit, including research topics, funding streams, postgraduate research activity, facilities, staffing, administration and management;
- **people:** staffing policy and evidence of its effectiveness; how individuals at the beginning of their research careers are being supported and integrated into the research culture of the submitting unit; information on postgraduate recruitment, training and support mechanisms; mechanisms by which standards of research quality and integrity are maintained for example ethics procedures and authorship; evidence of the commitment to equality and diversity in the recruitment and support of staff with significant responsibility for research and research students may include (but not be limited to):
 - study leave arrangements (including supporting data where relevant);
 - the career pathways for fixed-term staff;
 - how conference attendance or other necessary travel to support research is facilitated for staff and research students with caring responsibilities, ill-health etc.;
 - support for staff and research students returning from periods of leave (including parental leave) or ill-health, managing long-term illness, or with caring responsibilities;
 - the submitting unit's approach to supporting the wellbeing of its staff and research students.
- **income:** information on research funding portfolio; evidence of successful generation of research income; major and prestigious grant awards made by external bodies on a

competitive basis; allowance will be made for disciplines that find it more difficult to attract research funding because of the nature of the research, and/or where more early career researchers are involved;

- **infrastructure and facilities:** provision and operation of research infrastructure and facilities, including special equipment, library, technical support, space and facilities for research groups and research students; information on joint-university or cross-institution shared or collaborative use of research infrastructure; examples may include but not be limited to:
 - evidence of areas where there has been significant investment, or through the development of research clusters that focus on distinctive areas of work, which may include the delivery of highly impactful research;
 - significant archives and scholarly collections;
 - how any relevant equality and diversity issues have been addressed, for example in relation to support for acquiring research funding, or support for accessing scholarly or operational infrastructure;
 - significance of major benefits-in-kind (including, for example, donated items of equipment, sponsorships secured, or other arrangements directly related to research).
- **collaborations:** information on support for and exemplars of research collaborations; mechanisms to promote collaborative research at local and international level; support for interdisciplinary research collaborations; research collaboration with research users;
- **esteem:** prestigious/competitive research fellowships held by individual researchers; external prizes and awards in recognition of research achievement (it would be helpful in this section if the submitting unit could provide a sense of scale and importance to the examples cited and the career stages of researchers);
- **contribution to the discipline or research base:** exemplars of leadership in the academic community such as advisory board membership; participation in the peer-review process for grants committees or editorial boards; indicators of wider

influence, contributions to and recognition by the research base include, but are not limited to:

- journal editorship;
- participation on grants committees;
- fellowships;
- prizes;
- membership of national and international research committees;
- initiating, hosting and organising conferences;
- invited keynotes, lectures and/or performances, or conference chair roles;
- refereeing academic publications or research proposals;
- co-operation and collaborative arrangements for post graduate research training.

Environment Data

47. Following paragraphs 9.6 (c) and (d), 9.8 and Appendix J of the Guidance Notes, and also paragraph 60 of the General Panel Guidelines, submitting units are required to provide environment data in conjunction with the environment overview statement. The Panel will consider the environment data within the context of the information provided in the environment overview statement, and within the context of the disciplines concerned. Irrespective of size each submission will be judged on its own merits against the criteria set out.

47.1 Where a submitting unit does include additional quantitative data in the environment template then, given the differences in size and scale between submissions, it would be helpful if these could be provided as (i) an absolute number, and (ii) that number normalised to per 1.0 full time equivalent (FTE) submitted researcher.

47.2 Data will be considered in the context of the narrative provided in the environment template, and taking account of the size of the submitting unit, its areas of specialism, its research groups, research strategy and different levels of research funding available in different fields. The Panel

recognises that different scales and organisational structures are appropriate to different research areas. In this spirit it will take into account the size of UoAs, while also making no automatic judgment in terms of the scale of any research environment.

47.3 The Panel does not require quantitative data provided by institutions in the environment template to be reported by research group.

48. Data on “staff employed by the university proper” and “graduates of research postgraduate programmes” will be used to inform the Panel’s assessment in relation to “people” (section (3) (i) and (ii)). Data on “on-going research grants/contracts” will be used to inform the Panel’s assessment on “income” (section (4)). Additional quantitative data or indicators that are particularly relevant to the Panel are indicated in paragraph 46 above. Such additional information should be submitted within the appropriate section(s) of the environment overview statement.

Criteria and Quality Levels for Assessing Research Environment

49. Panels will exercise their expert judgment in assessing the merits of each environment submission. They will consider each case on its own merits against the criteria as set out. They will not judge automatically in terms of the scale of the research environment concerned.

50. In assessing environment, the Panel will consider research environment in terms of vitality and sustainability, including its contribution to the vitality and sustainability of the wider discipline or research base. Given the primary role that people play as the key resource in the creative and performing arts and design, the Panel will attach differential weight to each of the components of the environment template. The Panel will grade each environment submission with weightings attached to individual aspects as follows:

- strategy 10%
- people 25%
- infrastructure 20%
- income 15%
- collaboration 10%
- esteem 10%
- contribution to the discipline or research base 10%

The Panel will use one or more of the five categories of quality level as specified in paragraphs 62-64 of the General Panel Guidelines for assessing each aspect within the environment element and by aggregating assessments of individual aspects to form an overall assessment for each environment submission.

51. The Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel provides the following amplifications to supplement the generic criteria for assessing research environment –

vitality: the extent to which a unit provides an encouraging and facilitating environment for research, has an effective strategic plan, is engaged with the regional and international research community, is able to attract excellent postgraduate and postdoctoral researchers through a worldwide reputation.

sustainability: vision for the future and investment in people and infrastructure in order to ensure the future health, diversity, well-being and wider contribution of the unit and disciplines.

52. The Panel will make an overall judgement about the vitality and sustainability of research environments, rather than applying each of these two criteria separately. In addition, the Panel understands the quality standards for assessing the research environment overall will have the following general characteristics:

4*	3*	2*	1*	unclassified
A major positive influence in supporting and stimulating the work of research staff and students.	A significant influence in supporting and stimulating the work of research staff and students.	Useful support for the work of research staff and students.	Some support for the work of research staff and students.	
A major influence in developing practices and standards for research and scholarship in the sector both locally and internationally.	A significant contribution in helping to develop practices and standards for research and scholarship in the sector both locally and internationally.	A useful contribution to the development of practices and/or standards for research and scholarship in the sector locally.		
Instrumental in developing, leading and/or participating in important research collaborations and/or networks with a range of stakeholders.	Played a major part in developing, leading and/or participating in research collaborations and/or networks with a range of stakeholders.	Participating in important research collaborations and/or networks with a range of stakeholders.	Some participation in research networks.	
Instrumental in developing and/or implementing approaches to diversity and equality for research staff and students.	Made a major contribution to the development and/or implementation of approaches to diversity and equality for research staff and students.	Had an important role in the successful implementation of equality and diversity policies for research staff and students.	Some evidence for the implementation of equality and diversity policies for research staff and students.	
				Below the quality threshold for one star.
				Nil submission.

Section E : Working Methods

Use of Sub-Group(s)/Sub-Panel(s)

53. There will not be any sub-group or sub-panel formed under the Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design Panel. The final assessment and grading will be decided by the Panel as a whole.

Allocation of Work in the Assessment Process

54. The Convenor, consulting the Deputy Convenor and other panel members, as appropriate, will allocate work to members and, if necessary, impact assessors and/or external reviewers in light of their expertise and workload. In allocating the work, the Convenor will also take into account any potential conflicts of interest of respective panel members and assessors. All panel members will take account of the requirements of the General Panel Guidelines to ensure that the exercise is conducted fairly and equitably.

55. Panel members will examine the submitted outputs in sufficient detail so as to form a robust judgment on their perceived quality, and put forward a recommendation to the Panel for a collective decision on the final grading. To ensure fairness and consistency, each research output will be assessed by at least two members, one of whom should be a non-local member to the extent possible. For UoA(s) which is(are) only housed at one or two local universities, submissions will be assigned to at least one non-local member in order to ensure fair and impartial assessment. Final grading on research outputs will be decided by the Panel as a whole.

56. Subject to conflicts of interest of individual members, the impact and environment submissions will be assessed by at least two members of the Panel having appropriate expertise. They will then recommend a profile to the whole Panel which will make a collective decision on the final profile.

Cross-Panel Referrals

57. This Panel will follow the procedures in paragraphs 41-43 of the General Panel Guidelines when initiating referrals to other panels and assessing submissions cross-referred by another panel.

58. Generally, research on pedagogy and education issues submitted to this Panel will be assessed by panel members or external reviewers with expertise in pedagogy or cross-referred to Panel 13 – Education.

59. Because much research in the creative and performing arts and design is inherently inter-disciplinary, or multi-disciplinary then there may be instances where work is cross-referred to or from panels containing the disciplines set out in paragraph 6 of this document.

External Advice

60. This Panel will follow the procedure in paragraph 66 of the General Panel Guidelines when referral to external reviewers for expert advice becomes necessary for panel assessment. External reviews may be sought in the cases for which members of the Panel do not have the necessary expertise such as outputs in foreign language or niche research work.

Trial Assessment

61. With reference to paragraphs 89-91 of the General Panel Guidelines, the Panel will conduct a trial assessment using a sample of submissions selected from universities' submissions. Sample submissions will be assessed by all members of the Panel in order to calibrate the application of assessment criteria for Outputs, Impact and Environment. Members will share among themselves any important observations in the assessment to ensure fairness and consistency in the actual assessment. Submissions used for the trial assessment will be assessed afresh during the main assessment period regardless of their assessment results during the trial. The Panel will decide on the sample size after the submissions are received.

Panel Feedback Report

62. With reference to paragraph 71 and Appendices E and F of the General Panel Guidelines, the Panel will provide feedback to the UGC after the assessment process. Non-local panel members will be involved in offering comments for an impressionistic international comparison. The Convenor on behalf of the whole panel will submit the panel feedback report to the UGC by 10 November 2020.