

**Ebit Faculty
Department of Architecture
University of Pretoria**

PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF CREATIVE PRODUCTION AND RESEARCH

1 General

For the purposes of recognition of **design** as creative output, the following guidelines are proposed for the evaluation process:

1.1 Acceptable formats

The format of presentation must be acceptable within the discipline of the design by way of conceptualisation, and/or presentation documentation, and/or production documentation and/or the product of design.

1.2 Type of design output

- The output may be or have been generated by way of commissioning, call for tender, competition submission or at the initiative of the designer to a perceived need or opportunity
- The output must have currency in the public domain
- The output must be subjected to peer evaluation
- The output must be critically recognised as being unique, and/or innovative, and/or merit worthy and/or worthy of being awarded a prize/ receive accolade/ be cited for achievement nationally/ internationally by reputable assessors or publication/s

2 Time constraints

- The work should have been produced not earlier than the period spanning the preceding three years, including the current year of application;
- Designs for consideration should have taken place within two years of the date of application;
- Documentation (reports from artist, evaluators etc.) must be handed in within six months after the work entering the public domain.

3 Procedures

- a. Applicant's submissions should be accompanied by:
 - Appropriate documentation on the academic research and/or conceptual content underpinning the design;
 - At least one review on the design;
 - A post facto report on the design.
- b. The Departmental Research Committee will appoint at least two (preferably external) experts to compile evaluation reports on the design (please refer to Point 3). Applicants may nominate experts, but the Committee retains dictum.

- c. In the case of a national or international award/prize/medal/competition/recognition (See Item 5), the above review is not applicable but the award, citation or other supportive documents relating to the academic and/or conceptual content must be handed in and be accompanied with a framing document. The Committee has the right to decide if an award/prize/medal/competition/recognition is deemed sufficiently meritorious.

4 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 design;
- Quality and depth of the academic research underpinning the production of the creative work;
- Technical expertise;
- The presence and quality of documentation accompanying the design;
- Overall professionalism in execution;

The contextual relevance, merit and value of the design to students, scholars and the public;

- Reviews or articles on the design.

5 National or International awards - Creative Output awards

- Design projects that have won recognised national or international awards/prizes/medals/competitions/recognition will qualify for publication awards. In this instance further peer review is not required.

ADDENDUM 1: REFEREE'S REPORT

Cover page:
REFEREE'S REPORT ON PRESENTATION OF DESIGN RESEARCH

Name of referee:

Capacity or professional position:

.....

Name of the designer and design 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 DESIGN RESEARCH

Please complete Sections A, B and C.

Section A:

CANDIDATE'S NAME	
TITLE OF DESIGN	
CLASSIFICATION OF DESIGN (eg. of conceptualisation, and/or presentation documentation, and/or production documentation and/or the product of design.)	Details:
DATE OF AWARD	

Section B:

Please comment briefly on the following aspects of the presentation of visual research:

- Scope and nature of the design;
- Quality and depth of the academic research underpinning the production of the creative work;
- Technical expertise;
- The presence, quality and content of documentation accompanying the design;
- Overall professionalism and presentation;
- The contextual relevance, merit and value of the design to students, scholars and the public;
- Reviews or articles on the design.

Section C:

In your opinion, is the academic merit, depth and scope of this design equal in weight to the writing and publishing of:

- an academic article
- a scholarly book
- none of the above?

Please tick and substantiate your choice.