

**Faculty of Humanities
Department of Music
University of Pretoria**

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF CREATIVE PRODUCTION AND RESEARCH (MUSIC)

For the purposes of recognition of artistic production as research output, the following guidelines are proposed for the evaluation process:

1 Acceptable formats

a. Venue and organization presenting the performance

- The choice of a reputable venue is a recommendation, but not a determining factor.
- Concert halls connected to a University or Arts Council or reputable organization. Other venues/organizations/locations will be judged on their reputation/merit.
- Composition, if performed in public: reputable venue/organization
- Publisher of composition

b. Type of presentation

- A solo concert
- An ensemble concert
- Performance as soloist with orchestra/ensemble
- Inaugural concert
- Premiere or performance of significant composition(s)
- Broadcast performances
- Live or studio recording of concert/composition on CD/DVD
- Commercially-produced CD/DVD
- Composition(s) (if possible, with a recording of it)

c. Time constraints

- Performances for consideration should have taken place within two years of the date of application;
- After the date of the performance, the candidate should allow for a period of at least 6 months but not longer than two years for the collecting of adequate reviews and publications on the performance.

2 Procedures

- a.** Applicant's submissions should be accompanied by:

- All submissions should be accompanied by a framing document that explain researchers' scholarly engagement with the discipline in which they locate their creative work, as well as other relevant supporting documentation. The committee will differentiate between creative works *per se* and creative outputs with an overt, conscious scholarly objective.
- Two reviews or reports of the performance/recording/composition by approved peer-reviewers
- Every submission of a live performance should be accompanied by a recording of high quality, if possible.
- The performer must identify his passages of performance on the CD if the candidate is part of a large group of performers, where it would be difficult to assess the individual contribution

b. The Departmental Research Committee will appoint at least two external experts to compile evaluation reports on the event (please refer to Point 3). Applicants may nominate experts, but the Committee retains dictum.

- In general no evaluator must have close links to the University or the performer, but if no one can be found, the dilemma can be solved by appointing an expert believed to be independent and not biased
- The Head of Department will appoint the evaluators but the performer must also identify possible evaluators and the HOD will decide if they are acceptable
- The onus rests on the performer to inform the Music Department at least a month in advance of a performance so that evaluators may be identified and invited to attend the concert. This will ensure that they have the report forms beforehand and are alerted to the guidelines.

3 Evaluation

Please also refer to Addendum 1.

Since the basis and context of the proposed recognition are academic, it is desirable that evaluators will comment on the following aspects:

- Scope and nature of the performance/composition
- Report on musical and creative merits of the performance: musicianship; technical, interpretative and stylistic qualities; individual musical personality
- Report on composition: individuality, musical and creative merit, craftsmanship
- Quality and depth of documentation accompanying the application
- The contextual relevance, merit and value of the concert/composition to students, scholars and the public;
- Reviews or articles on the performance/composition.

4 Output categories

Category 1	▪ Demonstrable international exposure: 2 units
Category 2	• Above average to excellent musicianship with local/ national focus: 1 unit

5 Publication awards

- Performances/composition that have won recognised national or international awards/prizes/medals/competitions will qualify for publication awards.

ADDENDUM 1: REFEREE'S REPORT

Cover page: REFEREE'S REPORT ON PERFORMANCE /COMPOSITION

Name of referee:

Capacity or professional position:

.....

Name of the artist and performance/composition under review:

.....

.....

.....

Date of report:

May your name be forwarded to the candidate?

YES	NO
-----	----

May your report be forwarded to the candidate?

YES	NO
-----	----

REFEREE'S REPORT ON PRESENTATION OF PERFORMANCE/COMPOSITION

Please complete Sections A and B

Section A:

CANDIDATE'S NAME		
TITLE OF PRESENTATION		
TYPE OF PRESENTATION (Please tick)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Solo concert <input type="radio"/> Ensemble concert <input type="radio"/> Soloist with orchestra/ensemble <input type="radio"/> Performance: competition <input type="radio"/> Inaugural concert <input type="radio"/> Premiere of composition(s) <input type="radio"/> Broadcast performance <input type="radio"/> CD recording (live /studio) <input type="radio"/> Composition <input type="radio"/> DVD recording 	
DATE		
VENUE (IF APPLICABLE)		

Section B

Reviewers must give an opinion on the status of the output that will inform the discussion of the awards committee. Please comment amongst others on the following aspects of the performance/composition:

- Scope and nature of the performance/composition;
- Report on musical and creative merits of the performance: musicianship; technical, interpretative and stylistic qualities; insight, musical personality and presence;
- Report on composition: musical and creative merit, craftsmanship, individuality;
- Quality and depth of documentation accompanying the application (academic research underpinning the production of the creative work);
- The contextual relevance, merit and value of the performance/composition to students, scholars and the public;
- Reviews or articles on the performance/composition.