



## Stellenbosch University

### Summary Report for Creative and Innovation Outputs Submissions 2019

Stellenbosch University submitted 87<sup>1</sup> items in the creative outputs and 24 patents in the innovations categories. A Total of 100.6665 units were awarded. Table 1 below gives an indication of the total units awarded per category. A total of 53.6665 units were awarded to the creative outputs category and 47 units to the Innovations category.

**Table 1: Total Units awarded per sub-field category**

| Category           | Sub-field Category             | Total units     |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Creative Outputs   | Film                           | 1               |
|                    | Fine Arts and Visual Arts      | 6               |
|                    | Literary Arts                  | 2               |
|                    | Music                          | 37,6665         |
|                    | Theatre, Performance and Dance | 7               |
| Innovations        |                                | 47              |
| <b>Total Units</b> |                                | <b>100,6665</b> |

### Creative Outputs

A total of eighty seven (87) submissions from Stellenbosch University (SU) were evaluated during the 2019 sub-panel evaluations for subsidy allocation. Fourteen (14) submissions were uploaded on ROSS but were not reviewed at the sub-panel evaluations meeting which took place in February 2020 for reasons provided for in the recommendations section. Table 2 provides a summary of creative outputs submitted by SU on the Research Outputs Submission System (ROSS).

**Table 2: Summary of creative outputs submitted**

| Status                | Number of Submissions |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Approved <sup>2</sup> | 44                    |
| Declined <sup>3</sup> | 42                    |

<sup>1</sup> On ROSS it states that SU submitted a total of 107, of this 14 items were under peer review, 6 items were automatically rejected as they received 2 negative peer reviews. Table 2 provides a breakdown of items.

<sup>2</sup> Approved by the DHET review panel: submitted creative outputs that went through the entire evaluation process and were awarded units for subsidy.

<sup>3</sup> Declined: creative research outputs that went through the entire evaluation process and were not awarded units by the subfield panel. There were items that were declined during the peer review process. On ROSS, a total of 47 items are listed as disapproved by the DHET. However, 42 items were declined as they did not meet the minimum requirements.

|                                    |            |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Not reviewed by Panel <sup>4</sup> | 1          |
| Under Peer Review <sup>5</sup>     | 14         |
| Two peer review rejection          | 6          |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>107</b> |

**Table 3: Total number of submissions reviewed**

| <b>Sub-Field</b>                       | <b>Submissions</b> | <b>Units awarded</b> |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| Film                                   | 1                  | 1                    |
| Fine Arts and Visual Arts <sup>6</sup> | 25                 | 6                    |
| Literary Arts                          | 4                  | 2                    |
| Music <sup>7</sup>                     | 51                 | 37.6665              |
| Theatre, Performance and Dance         | 6                  | 7                    |
| <b>Total submissions</b>               | <b>87</b>          | <b>53.6665</b>       |

For Fine Arts and Visual Arts, twenty five (25) items were reviewed at sub-field panel, of which eighteen (18) were declined for subsidy. It was noted by the panel that the annotation received from applicants did not adequately locate the research component in the creative outputs. For some items, there was confusion on how they were located in the sub categories of the subfields and they did not fit into their area of discipline. A total of six (6) units were awarded by the Fine Arts and Visual arts sub-field panel.

For Literary Arts, four (4) items were received, and a total of three (3) were reviewed at subfield panel meeting. One item was not reviewed due to lack of appropriate expertise in the DHET sub-panel. The outstanding item will be reviewed in the next cycle of 2020. A total of two (2) units were awarded for Literary Arts.

For Music there a total of fifty nine (51) items were reviewed, of which 37,666 units were awarded. The Department received the largest proportion of submissions from SU in the category of Music. A total of eighteen (18) items were declined for subsidy. A few items in this field were declined as the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process was detected by the panel members.

---

<sup>4</sup> Not reviewed by panel: Creative outputs that went through the DHET evaluation panel but were not reviewed due to lack of expertise in the subfield.

<sup>5</sup> Under Peer Review: Creative outputs that were incomplete or did not have sufficient peer reviewers.

<sup>6</sup> A total of 37 items were recorded on ROSS under the submission of Fine Arts and Visual Arts. However, it is important to note that, 12 items were under peer review, or missed the peer review deadline, or 2 negative reviews were received. A total of 25 items were eligible for review at the DHET evaluation panel.

<sup>7</sup> From SU there were a total of 59 items on ROSS, however, it is important to note of the 59 items 8 items were still under peer review or withdrawn by the institution. Therefore a total of 51 items were eligible for review at the DHET evaluations.

For the subfield of Theatre Performance and Dance, six (6) items were submitted to the Department. Of the six (6) creative outputs, four (4) were recommended for subsidy, a total of 4 units were awarded.

Tables 4, lists all the items with corresponding units allocated and Table 5 lists items that were declined with the reasons.

**Table 4: Total Units awarded per output category**

| DHET No | Subfield category                      | Title of output  | Units Awarded |
|---------|--|--|---------------|
| COF1    | Editing (Film)                         | Noem My Skollie: Soundtrack Production   | 1             |
| COFA1   | Artists books (Fine Arts/ Visual Arts) | Zwischen der Seiten: die Schatten durchstreifend   Between the folds: Drifting among shadows | 2             |
| COFA19  | Drawing (Fine Arts/ Visual Arts)       | Last   | 2             |
| COFA11  | Mixed Media (Fine Arts/ Visual Arts)   | Inalienability, 2017 and agency, 2017  | 1             |
| COFA13  | Installation (Fine Arts/ Visual Arts)  | Dolcefarniente   | 1             |
| COFA14  | Sculpture (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)      | Ruptures   | 1             |
| COFA31  | Sculpture (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)      | Transitions  | 1             |
| COLA2   | Poetry (Literary Arts)                 | The History of Intimacy  | 2             |
| COM1    | Group Performance (Music)              | Mendelssohn Sonatas for Piano and Violin   | 2             |

|       |                                     |  |   |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| COM13 | Conducting /<br>Directing (Music)   | Fine Music Radio Bursary<br>Competition Broadcast                      | 1 |
| COM14 | Conducting /<br>Directing (Music)   | Album production: Tim Kliphuis Trio,<br>Reflecting the Seasons         | 1 |
| COM15 | Conducting /<br>Directing (Music)   | University Pretoria Camerata: Love<br>and War                          | 1 |
| COM16 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | Aurora Australis   | 1 |
| COM17 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | Die Gangsters  | 1 |
| COM18 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | String Quartet No.2: A 29-year old<br>security guard                   | 1 |
| COM19 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | Fate's given chance  | 1 |
| COM20 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | Liminal(ity)   | 1 |
| COM22 | Group Performance<br>(Music)        | WALLS 1  | 1 |
| COM24 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | Afrikosmos   | 2 |
| COM26 | Group Performance<br>(Music)        | Das Lied von der Erde (As part of<br>the Moments in the Life concert)  | 1 |
| COM28 | Solo Musical<br>Performance (Music) | Songs of Love and Sorrow   | 1 |
| COM29 | Solo Musical<br>Performance (Music) | New songs from the Jewish Archive:<br>Looking forward through the past | 1 |
| COM30 | Solo Musical<br>Performance (Music) | Fractured Lives - Music Of The<br>Holocaust                            | 1 |
| COM34 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | Die Kruisiging   | 1 |
| COM39 | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | The Philosophy of Composition  | 2 |
| COM4  | Musical Composition<br>(Music)      | Between  | 2 |

|        |                                  |   |   |
|--------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| COM40  | Musical Composition (Music)      | Lovedale Harmony  | 1 |
| COM41  | Musical Composition (Music)      | Symphony No 2 (Tshikona)                                  | 2 |
| COM43  | Group Performance (Music)        | WEBER: Trio for Piano, Flute and Cello in G minor, Op. 63 | 1 |
| COM44  | Solo Musical Performance (Music) | Stabat Mater by Karl Jenkins                              | 1 |
| COM46  | Group Performance (Music)        | Faculty Concert 6: works by J.W. Holmes and H. Puts       | 1 |
| COM49  | Group Performance (Music)        | Khoi'npsalms  | 2 |
| COM5   | Group Performance (Music)        | Techno Parade   | 2 |
| COM50  | Musical Composition (Music)      | Rooted (the series)                                       | 2 |
| COM51  | Musical Composition (Music)      | to be : to know   | 1 |
| COM59  | Solo Musical Performance (Music) | Reflections and Illuminations                             | 1 |
| COM6   | Group Performance (Music)        | John Adams: Chamber Symphony                              | 1 |
| COM60  | Solo Musical Performance (Music) | Mendelssohn Elijah  | 1 |
| COM8   | Group Performance (Music)        | Hemp van Vlam   | 2 |
| COM9   | Solo Musical Performance (Music) | To be loved   | 1 |
| COTPD1 | Oral Performance                 | Eendag lank Gelede  | 2 |
| COTPD2 | Directing                        | 'Master Harold' ... and the Boys                          | 2 |
| COTPD3 | Directing                        | The Painted Rocks at Revolver Creek                       | 2 |
| COTPD5 | Performance                      | Die Feëkoningin   | 1 |

**Table 5: Items declined with Reasons**

| <b>DHET Number</b> | <b>Subfield</b>                       | <b>Title of output</b>   | <b>Reason</b>   |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| COFA6              | Sculpture (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts) | Liftup   | Multiple artist involved and the panel is of the view the output is not deserving a full unit but maybe 0.5 unit (as this is not permissible) therefore it is a not recommended |
| COFA16             | Video art (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts) | Mainstay   | The video link provided does not provide all the information needed, the video is very short. The scholarly rigour could not be determined by the panel,                        |
| COFA17             | Other (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts)     | Inaugural South African Contemporary Jewellery Awards Exhibition 2018  | The creative output submitted constitutes a single work in a group collection and does not demonstrate a body of work undertaken.   |
| COFA28             | Other (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts)     | Inaugural South African Contemporary Jewellery Awards Exhibition 2018  | The output did not demonstrate scholarly rigor.   |
| COFA37             | Sculpture(Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts)  | Artist Unknown   | The output did not demonstrate scholarly rigor.   |
| COFA39             | Other (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts)     | Triple Parade Biennial Exhibition                                      | Duplication of creative outputs received.   |
| COFA4              | Other (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts)     | Portrait - Philanderer;<br>Midlife Crisis<br>Harley and Fro<br>Forward | The creative output did not demonstrate scholarly rigor   |
| COFA7              | Drawing (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts)   | SUNSET   | The creative output did not demonstrate scholarly rigor.  |
| COFA9              | Sculpture (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts) | Lament   | The creator used the same annotation for another work they are claiming for (COFA14), the panel could not determine the scholarly rigour in the piece.                          |
| COFA18             | Other (Fine Arts/<br>Visual Arts)     | En - Masse   | The annotation did not demonstrate scholarly rigour.  |

|        |                                     |   |  |
|--------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| COFA35 | Other(Fine Arts/Visual Arts)        | Constraint (Tapestry)   | No evidence of engaging in the discourse (research, theoretical); lack of scholarly rigour.                |
| COFA34 | Other (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)       | En Masse  | Submitted under the wrong sub-field panel.   |
| COFA5  | Sculpture (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)   | Monument for Things that Disappear                                    | Single work in a group collection and does not demonstrate a body of work.                                 |
| COFA3  | Mixed media (Fine Arts/Visual Arts) | Portrait - Look The Other Way   | Single work in a group collection and does not demonstrate a body of work.                                 |
| COFA8  | Painting (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)    | New Work  | The output did not demonstrate scholarly rigor.  |
| COFA12 | Other(Fine Arts/Visual Arts)        | Title of piece:Seven Deadly Seductions / Title of group show: 100%New | The output did not demonstrate scholarly rigor.  |
| COFA29 | Sculpture (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)   | Lament (Exploded Geographies)   | Single work in a group collection and does not demonstrate a body of work.                                 |
| COFA33 | Other (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)       | South African Contemporary Jewellery Awards                           | Not clear how the creative work generates new knowledge; work submitted under the wrong sub-field panel.   |
| COFA36 | Sculpture (Fine Arts/Visual Arts)   | On Mystical Form  | Part of a Master's study and no re-contextualisation of the study was provided.                            |
| COLA1  | Poetry (Literary Arts)              | Thungachi   | Part of a PhD study and no re-contextualisation of the study was provided.                                 |
| COLA2  | Writing (Literary Arts)             | L'Année du Lion   | Translations fall outside the scope of the policy.   |
| COM10  | Conducting / Directing (Music)      | Conducting the Ramnicu-Valcea Philharmonic                            | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process |

|       |                                  |  |  |
|-------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| COM11 | Conducting / Directing (Music)   | Conducted the Bacau Philharmonic (Addinsell-Warsaw concerto; Liszt - Vallée d'Oberman and Mahler - symphony no. 1) | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process,  |
| COM12 | Conducting / Directing (Musci)   | Conducting Bucharest Philharmonic  | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process.  |
| COM21 | Group Performance (Music)        | Republiek van Zoid Afrika  | The annotation and description does not link to the criteria set out in the guidelines.  |
| COM25 | Group Performance (Music)        | Insurrection III: The Storming CD Launch   | The creative output falls outside the reporting year.  |
| COM27 | Solo Musical Performance (Music) | Die lustige Witwe  | The output does not meet the requirements for accreditation. It is not admissible as creative research output.   |
| COM3  | Solo Musical Performance (Music) | Dis Koue Kos Skat - Movie Soundtrack   | The output does not meet the minimum requirements for accreditation.   |
| COM32 | Musical Composition              | Reflections  | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process.  |
| COM33 | Solo Musical Performance (Music) | Fractured Lives: Music of the Holocaust  | The panel is of the view that this is a group performance. It is suggested that in future, all participants should be included in one application. All participants are from the same institution. 1 unit was awarded to the other application with the same title. That application should be merged with this application to share the unit. |
| COM35 | Conducting / Directing (Music)   | Conducting and performing as soloist with the Ramnicu-Valcea Philharmonic  | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process.  |



|        |   |   |   |
|--------|---|---|---|
| COM36  | Conducting / Directing (Music)            | Conducting Bacau Philharmonic                       | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process.   |
| COM37  | Group Performance (Music)                 | ifPOP Jazz Conversations                            | Falls outside the scope of the policy (curatorship).  |
| COM42  | Solo Musical Performance (Music)          | Composition and Politics in the Long 20th Century   | The focus of the output is not of a creative nature.  |
| COM45  | Solo Musical Performance (Music)          | Music for Mandela Tour with the Minnesota Orchestra | The mezzo-soprano part provides challenges for the applicant to show the substantive nature of the creative contribution to the project to the extent that the panel could award 1 full unit. |
| COM47  | Conducting / Directing (Music)            | Conducting Bacau Philharmonic 2018                  | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process.   |
| COM56  | Conducting / Directing (Music)            | Conducting Craiova Philharmonic                     | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process.   |
| COM57  | Conducting / Directing (Music)            | Conducting Craiova Philharmonic 2018                | The sub-field panel could not eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest in the peer review process.   |
| COM58  | Performance (Music)                       | Kalahari Elegy                                      | There is a lack of alignment between the annotation, peer reviews and a music output.   |
| COM7   | Solo Musical Performance (Music)          | The Messiah by GF Handel                            | The output does not demonstrate new research insights.  |
| COTPD4 | Writing                                   | Rooikappie en die Wolf                              | No innovation in the script writing; inappropriate, perpetuating gender stereotype.   |
| COTPD6 | Theatre- Making/ Dramaturgy/ Choreography | The Borrow Pit                                      | Insufficient evidence of contribution of the claimant.  |

The following item was submitted to the DHET panel but not reviewed due to the lack of expertise in the subject matter. . This item will be reviewed with the 2020 submissions.

**Table 6: Items not reviewed by Panel**

| DHET Number | Subfield      | Title of output |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| COLA3       | Literary Arts | Doodmenslik     |

Table 7 lists all the creative outputs that SU submitted on ROSS but the peer review process was not completed on time, and therefore they could not go through to the DHET panel evaluation stage. The Department acknowledges all the challenges that were experienced during the first round of the policy implementation, including the struggle by research offices to find appropriate external peer reviewers on time. A decision was therefore taken to re-open the ROSS peer review process of these items so that they can form part of the year 2020 submission.

**Table 7: Under Peer Review Items**

| DHET Number | Subfield  | Title of output                             |
|-------------|-----------|---|
| COFA2       | Fine Arts | 100 geographies art exhibition              |
| COFA20      | Fine Arts | Wild dog series title: Last Litter          |
| COFA21      | Fine Arts | Wild Dog series 2: Titled Last 1 to 3       |
| COFA22      | Fine Arts | ELEPHANT SERIES: Titled Last Loot 1 to 4    |
| COFA23      | Fine Arts | RHINOCERUS: LOOT 9                          |
| COFA24      | Fine Arts | CAPE VULTURE                                |
| COFA25      | Fine Arts | LAST LITTER                                 |
| COFA26      | Fine Arts | ELEPHANT SERIES: Titled Loot 8              |
| COFA27      | Fine Arts | LAST 13 & 14 (RHINO SCULPTURE INSTALLATION) |
| COM2        | Music     | Reflections and Illuminations               |
| COM23       | Music     | WALLS 2                                     |
| COM31       | Music     | Mendelssohn Elijah                          |
| COM38       | Music     | Record, Memory, Archive                     |

## **Innovations**

For innovations, 24 submissions were received from SU<sup>8</sup>, of the 24, a total of 23 innovations were awarded the maximum units of 2, and 1 was awarded 1 unit as it was co- owned. Therefore, SU was awarded a total of **47** units for innovations

## **Recommendations**

The Department has the following recommendations for SU in order to improve submissions:

- Institutions must familiarise themselves with the Policy on the creative outputs and the implementation guidelines in order to ensure compliance of the process.
- A number of items were placed under the incorrect subfield, for example, items in the Fine Arts and Visual Arts (other category) for Design. These items were evaluated using the criteria in which they were submitted. This resulted in some not being awarded units for subsidy. Institutions must make sure that submissions are correctly allocated.
- The annotation from applicants must be vetted at the institutional committee in order to ensure that the creative research component that the applicant is trying to relay is clear. The annotation should not be a bio of the applicant, but must set out the aims and purpose of the creative output and the context in which the creative output was created. (Please refer to the policy page 25 and the implementation guidelines pages 3-4 for annotation).
- The peer review process can be cumbersome, it is recommended that initial contact be made with potential reviewers so that they are aware to check their spam junk email as notification from ROSS sometimes does not land in the inbox. The focus should be on creative outputs that have gained maturation.
- Should the Department send any communication to the institution for clarification purposes, we encourage SU that detailed responses be taken into account as this has a bearing on decisions made.
- The institution should ensure that the “quality” of visual submission is clear, and where possible provide as much information as flat images cannot accurately relay creative research message.

Institutions are reminded that the Department will not allow any appeals for the creative outputs.

---

<sup>8</sup> For innovations a maximum of 2 units will be received if applicant is compliant.