



**higher education  
& training**

---

Department:  
Higher Education and Training  
**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

## **Creative Outputs Evaluation Report 2021**

**Published by the Department of Higher Education & Training  
123 Francis Baard Street  
Pretoria**

**Private Bag X 174  
Pretoria  
0001**

**Tel: +27 (12) 312 5253**

**Fax: + 27 (12) 325 4419**

**Web site: <http://www.dhet.gov.za/>**

**Copyright © Department of Higher Education and Training, Pretoria, South  
Africa, 2021**

## **Foreword by the Director- General**

The implementation of *The Policy on the Evaluation of Creative Outputs and Innovations Produced by South African Public Higher Education Institutions* (the Policy) is in its second cycle, which was marked by the submission of creative outputs by the due date of 30 November 2020. Hence, this is the second instalment of this report, which we hope you will find useful. The report provides an overview of creative research outputs by the higher education system in South Africa. It is a proxy for research activities taking place in the respective disciplines and at our higher education institutions.

2020 was one of the most challenging years of our times, as we navigated a global pandemic that affected not only international movement, but domestic and even personal contacts. Yet, the determination of our higher education sector can be seen in the research productivity and the outputs that the Department tracks annually. For instance, the number of creative outputs received by the Department increased from the previous cycle of submissions which was not affected by the restrictions of the pandemic lockdowns. This determination is encouraging indeed and we salute the individual academics who are the creators of new knowledge and the administrators who facilitate that creativity to happen.

It is encouraging to see that our universities show signs of being highly active in the creative arts disciplines which often are regarded as falling outside the mainstream. I am indeed honoured to present this report to our higher education sector. We hope that the research subsidy investment made by government will be put to good use and be further invested to grow research in the creative arts and to nurture young, up and coming talent, so that this productivity can be nourished and sustained.

We thank all those involved in all the processes leading to the compilation of this report, particularly the academics who are members of the discipline panels; the National Intellectual Property Management Office (NIPMO) and the National Research Foundation (NRF). We value your partnerships and the contributions you are making to support qualitative growth in our higher education system. We look

forward to a long and sustained partnership of contributing to the development of creative research outputs.



.....

Dr Nkosinathi Sishi: Director-General

Date: 27 December 2021

## Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	7
1. Introduction.....	8
1.1. Quality of submissions.....	8
1.2. Research Ethics and Integrity .....	9
2. Process and Procedure .....	10
2.1. Submission process.....	10
2.2. Evaluation process.....	11
2.3. Sub-field panels .....	12
2.4. Advisory panel .....	13
3. The 2020 Creative Outputs.....	14
3.1. Overall creative outputs submissions.....	14
3.2. Evaluated Creative Outputs Submissions .....	15
3.3. Creative outputs by sub-fields .....	16
3.3.1. Fine Arts and Visual Arts.....	18
3.3.2. Music .....	21
3.3.3. Theatre performance and dance .....	22
3.3.4. Design .....	24
3.3.5. Literary Arts .....	25
3.3.6. Film and Television .....	26
4. Innovations.....	27
4.1. Verification of data .....	27
4.2. Evaluation process.....	27
4.3. Submission approvals.....	27
4.4. Unit allocation .....	28
5. Conclusion .....	30

Table 1: Composition of the Advisory Panel.....	13
Table 2 Overall Creative Research Output Submissions, 2019 & 2020 .....	15
Table 3 Evaluated Creative Research Output Submissions, 2020 .....	16
Table 4: Submissions and Unit allocations by sub-fields .....	17
Table 5: Breakdown of Fine Arts and Visual Arts submissions and units accrued .....	20
Table 6: Units awarded in the Music sub-field.....	22
Table 7: Units awarded in the theatre performance and dance sub-field .....	23
Table 8: Unit allocation Design sub-field.....	24
Table 9: Units awarded in the Literary Arts .....	25
Table 10: Units awarded in Film .....	26
Table 11: Units awarded in Television .....	26
Table 12: Approval ratio of Patents and Innovations, 2020.....	28
Table 13: Overall Units Awarded for Innovations in 2019 and 2020 .....	29

## Acronyms

CPUT	Cape Peninsula University of Technology
CUT	Central University of Technology
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
DUT	Durban University of Technology
DVC	Deputy Vice Chancellor
HEMIS	Higher Education Management Information System
MUT	Mangosuthu University of Technology
NIPMO	National Intellectual Property Management Office
NMU	Nelson Mandela University
NRF	National Research Foundation
NWU	North-West University
PBR	Plant Breeders Rights
ROSS	Research Outputs Submission System
RU	Rhodes University
SU	Stellenbosch University
TUT	Tshwane University of Technology
UCT	University of Cape Town
UFS	University of the Free State
UJ	University of Johannesburg
UL	University of Limpopo
UKZN	University of KwaZulu Natal
UNISA	University of South Africa
UP	University of Pretoria
UWC	University of the Western Cape
UOTs	Universities of Technology
WITS	University of the Witwatersrand

## 1. Introduction

The Department of Higher Education and Training has been implementing the *Policy on the Evaluation of Creative Outputs and Innovations Produced by South African Public Higher Education Institutions (2017)* since 2019. The purpose of the policy is to recognise and subsidise quality creative research outputs. The policy recognises the following subfields:

- Fine and visual arts,
- Music,
- Theatre, Performance and Dance,
- Design,
- Film and Television
- Literary Arts.

Under innovations, the policy recognises patents and Plant Breeder's Rights (PBR), which are evaluated in collaboration with the National Intellectual Property Management Office (NIPMO).

All public higher education institutions must submit annually to the Department their subsidy funding claims for their respective creative and innovation research outputs. The Department then allocates research subsidy based on unit calculations for approved creative and innovation research outputs, through the use of the Implementation Guidelines developed by the Department for the purpose of guiding the process and procedure. Approved submissions can be awarded as either 1 or 2 units based on author/ creator contribution. The Implementation Guidelines have since been revised, in 2021, and henceforth there will also be an allocation of 0.5 units for qualifying and approved creative outputs.

### 1.1. Quality of submissions

The Department relies on all the documents that must accompany a submission as stipulated in the policy and in the Implementation Guidelines. Two peer evaluation reports that must accompany a submission are necessary for evaluation carried out



by the subfield evaluation panels. While many creative outputs cannot be viewed in their physical format or creative works that were live performances, institutions must ensure that the quality of the images; recordings of site-based works and videos, are of clear and high quality, thus, not compromising the quality of their assessment and evaluation.

The Department will continue to work with the sector to ensure continued engagement on quality creative research outputs.

### *1.2. Research Ethics and Integrity*

The policy outlines the principles of research ethics and integrity which must always be upheld when submitting claims to the Department. As with all other research outputs, the subsidy for the creative research outputs is allocated to the respective institution, and not the individual scholars or creators. Institutions are advised to avoid practices that promote perverse incentives.

## 2. Process and Procedure

### 2.1. Submission process

The Department works with the National Research Foundation (NRF) to receive submissions online making use of the custom-designed Research Outputs Submission System (ROSS). The submission process for institutions largely remained the same as that of the first round of 2019. For the 2020 submission, an online platform for innovation was developed in conjunction with NIPMO and the NRF.

Universities are required to submit their creative research outputs that had been peer-evaluated by their chosen expert peer-reviewers in their respective disciplines. Each submission must be accompanied by two peer reviewers' reports from experts in the or subfield. The policy states that universities "must choose peer reviewers who have appropriate academic qualifications and/or experience to assess submissions by creative practitioners working in a scholarly framework". Moreover, the Department developed and provided universities with a reviewers' template to assist with their reviews; standardisation of information to be submitted and for purposes of consistency in sub-panel evaluations. Peer reviewers also must make use of the developed *Implementation Guidelines* in assessing the creative outputs. The submitted creative outputs, therefore, must have been recommended by the peer reviewers. The *Implementation Guidelines* advise institutions that, "if an institution receives at least two negative peer reviews, it should not secure further reviews and should not submit the application to the Department for potential subsidy. Such an application should be considered unsuccessful". In an event there was one positive and one negative review report, a third review report may be sought.

As stipulated in the policy, when submitting, the universities must adhere to the following:

- Each submission must be accompanied by two peer-reviewers reports from experts in the discipline or subfield.

- The institutional research office must consolidate the peer reviews for onward submission on ROSS to the Department for final evaluation and allocation of subsidy.
- The institutional internal evaluation committee must screen and verify the submitted material to ensure policy compliance prior to submitting to the Department.
- All claims must be submitted with a letter of declaration signed by the Deputy Vice- Chancellor (DVC) Research or equivalent on or before the due date. The letter of declaration must reference the internal evaluation committee members.
- Acceptable submissions will have been produced in the prior three-year period (2017, 2018 and 2019) to the submission date.

The nature of the peer review process entails reviewers attending performances and visiting venues where the creative outputs are located. With the nationwide lockdown due to COVID-19 in 2020, some concerns from institutions were raised as they envisaged significant delays in completing the peer review process. However, as peer reviews are completed online and the physical creative outputs (visual image/ recording) are uploaded on ROSS, peer reviews were able to be conducted. Moreover, the 2019 submissions that could not be concluded due to a shortage of peer reviewers, have been included in this year's (2020) evaluations and form part of the analysis in this report.

## *2.2. Evaluation process*

Universities are required to submit their creative outputs that had been peer-evaluated by their chosen expert reviewers in their respective disciplines. Each submission must be accompanied by two peer reviewer reports; the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) or the web address to the institutional repository where the creative output has been uploaded; and any supporting documentation, such as press clippings or awards received to support the submission.

Each creative output item submitted gets verified by the Department to ensure compliance. Submissions that meet the requirements of the policy are then allocated to subfield panel members for review, prior to the evaluation sub-panel meeting taking place. Items that do not meet the requirements of the policy such as curation and translation are declined.

The subpanel members must study the two peer review reports and the creative output uploaded on ROSS, and make a recommendation for either approval or decline of the allocation of units. At the sub-panel evaluation meeting, each member presents and leads the discussion on items that were allocated to them. A decision is then made by the panel considering the recommendations of each member; two peer review reports; and the physical output, to either award 1 or 2 units or decline the creative output.

Evaluations of 2020 submissions took place online from 8- 12 March 2021. All the discussions were recorded. Each subpanel had a debriefing where observations and suggestions were forwarded to the respective chairs. A debriefing between the Department and the advisory panel took place on 1 April 2021, and further engagements continued during the year.

### 2.3. *Sub-field panels*

The Department appointed sub-field panel members who are experts in their respective disciplines. Their role is to evaluate submitted creative outputs. They are entrusted with identifying the quality, academic rigour, innovation, creativity, and research within their respective sub-fields. The following criteria of creative research inquiry, as stipulated in the policy, are assessed:

- **Originality:** whether the output contributes to fresh understanding and or, stylistic, thematic or conceptual innovation in the discipline: and
- **Relevance:** whether the creative output demonstrates intellectually and creatively informed response to the subject
- **Newness:** whether the creative output can be understood to indicate a given work that has never been accredited for subsidy before.

#### 2.4. Advisory panel

The Department has established an advisory panel comprising senior professionals from the higher education sector to evaluate all submitted creative outputs. Members of the advisory panel are appointed for a term of three years and are tasked, amongst other things, with:

- Advising the Department on the best processes and procedures for efficient assessment of the creative outputs;
- Ensuring that the creative research outputs are aligned with the policy;
- Advising the Department on policy improvements; and
- Chairing the respective subfield panels.

The current advisory panel is as presented in Table 1

*Table 1: Composition of the Advisory Panel*

Sub-field Panel	Chair		Co-Chair	
Fine arts and Visual Arts	Dr Rene Smith	DUT	Dr Phethiwe Matutu	NRF
Music	Dr Mario Nell	SU	None	
Film, Television & Performance	Dr Francois Human	TUT	Professor Jean Philippe Wade	DUT
Design	Professor Ian Low	UCT	Professor Johannes Cronje	CUT
Literary Arts	Prof Mokgale Makgopa	UNIVEN	None	

### 3. The 2020 Creative Outputs

The creative outputs submitted items are evaluated by the respective sub-field panels using the policy *Implementation Guidelines*. In addition to the process and procedure, the Implementation Guidelines delineate the number of units that an item can be allocated, between 1 and 2 units<sup>1</sup>. That is, each item is evaluated based on its qualities, the supporting evidence and in relation to the criteria stated in the policy, and summarised in the introduction above. Below is the breakdown of data relating to the items submitted and processed.

#### 3.1. Overall creative outputs submissions

Overall, there has been an increase in the number of submissions from 193 in 2019 to 235 in 2020, translating to an 82% increase. Similarly, the number of submitting institutions increased from 15 to 17. Of the 17 institutions, ten are traditional universities (UCT, UFS, UKZN, UL, NWU, UP, RU, SU, UWC & WITS); four are Universities of Technology (UoTs) (CPUT, CUT, DUT and TUT), and three are comprehensive universities (UJ, NMU and UNISA).

**Table 2** shows a comparative breakdown of submissions by institutions between 2019 and 2020. The table provides a combined number of creative outputs (items) submitted by individual higher education institutions and evaluated by the DHET evaluation panel in the 2019 and 2020 cycles. The actual evaluations included items that were carried over from the previous cycle of submissions (2019)<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Approved items previously could either be allocated 1 or 2 units, depending on their evaluation and the level of compliance with the set criteria. The units that can be allocated have since been revised and now include a fraction of 0.5 units across all the sub-fields.

<sup>2</sup> For various valid reasons the evaluation of some items could not be done or completed in the previous cycle, thus, the items were carried over to the next cycle. The affected items were submitted by the respective institutions and were reported in the previous institutional and sector reports.

Table 2 Overall Creative Research Output Submissions, 2019 & 2020

Institution	2019			2020		
	Items Submitted	Units Awarded	Proportion of Sector Units	Items Submitted	Units Awarded	Proportion of Sector Units
UP	15	13.31	10.90%	38	35.37	20.71%
SU	87	51.67	42.32%	39	34.45	20.17%
UJ	6	5	4.10%	20	19.33	11.32%
UNISA	1	0	0.00%	21	12.83	7.51%
UCT	25	24.29	19.89%	9	10.92	6.39%
UFS	25	7.33	6.00%	34	9	5.27%
NMU	8	7	5.73%	12	7.33	4.29%
DUT	7	0	0.00%	9	7	4.10%
TUT	0	0	0.00%	14	6.11	3.58%
UWC	1	0	0.00%	7	5.75	3.37%
WITS	10	8.5	6.96%	11	4.67	2.73%
RU	4	3	2.46%	3	4	2.34%
CPUT	0	0	0.00%	4	4	2.34%
NWU	0	0	0.00%	6	4	2.34%
UL	0	0	0.00%	3	3	1.76%
UKZN	1	1	0.82%	2	2	1.17%
CUT	3	1	0.82%	3	1	0.59%
<b>Total</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>122.1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>170.76</b>	<b>100%</b>

Sixteen (16) items were carried over from the previous submission cycle (2019). In the 2019 cycle 122,095 units were awarded and in the 2020 cycle 170.76 units were awarded, an increase of 39.86%.

### 3.2. Evaluated Creative Outputs Submissions

Table 3 shows the breakdown of items that were evaluated, approved or declined. The percentage approval refers to the number of items approved against the submitted. The target for each institution must be to be close to 100%, meaning that the submissions must comply with the qualities demanded by the policy and qualify technically. Technical compliance is the easiest to achieve and is stipulated in the Implementation Guidelines.

Table 3 Evaluated Creative Research Output Submissions, 2020

Institution	From previous submission cycle	Submitted for 2020 cycle	Total Evaluated	Approved	Declined	Percentage Approval	Units Awarded	Proportion of Sector Units
UP		38	38	34	4	89.47%	35.37	20.71%
SU	1	39	40	29	10	74.36%	34.45	20.17%
UJ		20	20	15	5	75.00%	19.33	11.32%
UNISA		21	21	14	7	66.67%	12.83	7.51%
UCT	5	9	14	8	1	88.89%	10.92	6.39%
UFS	2	34	36	6	28	17.65%	9	5.27%
NMU		12	12	9	3	75.00%	7.33	4.29%
DUT	1	9	10	6	3	66.67%	7	4.10%
TUT		14	14	9	5	64.29%	6.11	3.58%
UWC	3	7	10	4	3	57.14%	5.75	3.37%
WITS	1	11	12	5	6	45.45%	4.67	2.73%
NWU		6	6	5	1	83.33%	4	2.34%
CPUT		4	4	3	1	75.00%	4	2.34%
RU		3	3	3	0	100.00%	4	2.34%
UL		3	3	2	1	66.67%	3	1.76%
UKZN	3	2	5	2	0	100.00%	2	1.17%
CUT		3	3	1	2	33.33%	1	0.59%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>65.96%</b>	<b>170.76</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Note:** The "Percentage Approval" excludes the items that were carried over from the previous submission cycle (2019). However, "Approved" items include the items carried over from the previous cycle.

### 3.3. Creative outputs by sub-fields

As with the previous cycle, most submissions were from Music (79 or 33.62% of the sector units. In other words, a third of sub-field submissions); followed by Fine Arts and Visual Arts (54 or 22.98%); Theatre, Performance and Dance (45 or 19.15%); Design (32 or 13.62%) Literary Arts (21 or 8.94%) Film (3 or 1.28%) and Television (1 or 0.43%). The proportions too are similar to the previous cycle of 2019 submissions.

Even though Music accrued the majority of units, the majority of institutions, 14 of the 17, submitted items in the Fine Art sub-field; followed by Music (with 11 institutions); Theatre, Performance and Dance (10 institutions) and Television (1 institution). Analyses of each sub-field are carried out below.

Overall, the submissions by all the 17 institutions and across all the sub-fields amounted to 235 items. The total excludes the items that were carried over from the



previous submission cycle. As shown in the **table 4**, most submissions were in the Music sub-field (79 items); followed by the Fine Arts (54) and the least were in the Film (3) and Television sub-field (1). The latter two are grouped together in the policy. The number provided constitute the items that were eligible for evaluation and excludes the items that were rejected by the system because they did not meet the requirements and could not be evaluated. The examples of ineligibility are artistic outputs produced outside the range period allowable in the policy; duplicate submissions; and double negative peer-review reports.

*Table 4: Submissions and Unit allocations by sub-fields*

Institution	Music	Fine Art	Theatre, Performance & Dance	Design	Literary Art	Film	Television	Submitted Items - 2020	% of the Sector
SU	16	4	9	5	5			39	16.60%
UP	27	9	1		1			38	16.17%
UFS		6	18	10				34	14.47%
UNISA	9	12						21	8.94%
UJ	2	8	4	1	4	1		20	8.51%
TUT	4	2	4	4				14	5.96%
NMU	9	2		1				12	5.11%
WITS	3	4	4					11	4.68%
UCT	2	1	1	3	2			9	3.83%
DUT		1		5	1	2		9	3.83%
UWC	1	1			4		1	7	2.98%
NWU	4	1			1			6	2.55%
CPUT		1	2		1			4	1.70%
UL			1		2			3	1.28%
RU		2	1					3	1.28%
CUT				3				3	1.28%
UKZN	2							2	0.85%
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>% of Total</b>	<b>33.62%</b>	<b>22.98%</b>	<b>19.15%</b>	<b>13.62%</b>	<b>8.94%</b>	<b>1.28%</b>	<b>0.43%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

**Table 4** shows the number of submissions received across the subfields, the proportion of items from each sub-field and institution.

**Table 4** also shows the distribution of units across the subfields and the proportion of accrual of units by sub-fields and institutions thereof. The pattern of the proportion of distribution of units by sub-fields is similar to that of the previous cycle, wherein Music

accrued relatively the largest percentage (41,97%) followed by Fine Arts and Visual Arts (32,12%). The individual sub-fields are discussed in further detail in the report below.

### 3.3.1. Fine Arts and Visual Arts

Of the seventeen (17) universities that submitted, fifteen (15) made submissions in the subfield of Fine Arts and Visual Arts. Fifty- four (54) items were evaluated by the panel. The submissions by the 15 institutions almost double the number of institutions that submitted in the previous cycle (8). Of the 54 items submitted, thirty-four (34 or 62.9%) were approved for subsidy and a total of 46 units were awarded based on creator/scholar proportion of contributions. **Table 5** presents the output units accrued to the Fine Arts and Visual Arts.

Table 5: Breakdown of Fine Arts and Visual Arts submissions and units accrued

Institution	# Items Submitted	Online art	Performance	Video art	Installation	Artists books	Other	Sculpture	Multimedia	Painting	Drawing	Mixed Media	Units Accrued	% of the Sector
UP	9						0				4	9	13	28.26%
UJ	8					1			0			8	9	19.57%
SU	4					0		2			2	2	6	13.04%
UFS	6				0	0			3		0	2	5	10.87%
UNISA	12						1					4	5	10.87%
RU	2					1						1	2	4.35%
UCT	1									2			2	4.35%
CPUT	1											1	1	2.17%
DUT	1									1			1	2.17%
NMU	2						1						1	2.17%
WITS	4		0	0	1	0	0					0	1	2.17%
NWU	1											0	0	0.00%
TUT	2							0					0	0.00%
UWC	1												0	0.00%
UKZN	0												0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>% total</b>		<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>2.17%</b>	<b>4.35%</b>	<b>4.35%</b>	<b>4.35%</b>	<b>6.52%</b>	<b>6.52%</b>	<b>13.04%</b>	<b>58.70%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Mixed media constituted 58.70% of submissions. This was followed by Drawing (13.04%); Multimedia and Artists books (6.25% each); Other and Sculpture (4.35% each) and Installation (2.17%). In the previous cycle (2019) Artists books accrued the highest number of units (8) closely followed by Mixed media (7) units; Other and Video Arts (4 units each). The pattern of productivity in the Fine Arts and Visual Arts is as yet to emerge.

Overall, the evaluation panel noted an improvement in the quality of submissions received from universities. Furthermore, institutions strove to promote quality submissions in the form of applicant annotation- where the scholarly contribution, creativity, innovation was emphasised. Although the rejection rate in fine arts, visual arts is high, this has been attributed to some applications not providing sufficient visual documentation, while other submissions did not sufficiently articulate the art process.

### 3.3.2. Music

The Music sub-field had the second highest number of institutions that submitted their outputs (11 institutions) but the highest number of items (79) ahead of the Fine Art and Visual Art (54 items). Music also accrued most number of units (59.73 units). The breakdown of allocation of units by music genre is contained in **Table 6**.

*Table 6: Units awarded in the Music sub-field*

Institution	# Items	Group Performance	Conducting	Solo Performance	Musical Composition	Units Awarded	% of Sector Total
UP	27	9.37	2	7	1	19.37	32.43%
SU	16	1.16	9	2	2	14.16	23.71%
UNISA	9	3.83		2	2	7.83	13.11%
NMU	9	0.83	3	1.5		5.33	8.92%
NWU	4			4		4	6.70%
TUT	4	0.44	2			2.44	4.09%
UJ	2		2			2	3.35%
UKZN	2	2				2	3.35%
WITS	3	0.67			1	1.67	2.80%
UWC	2				1	0.5	0.84%
UCT	2	0.42				0.42	0.70%
RU							0.00%
UFS							0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>18.73</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>59.73</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Proportion of Total</b>		<b>31.36%</b>	<b>30.14%</b>	<b>27.79%</b>	<b>10.88%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

As shown in **Table 6**, most units accrued to group performance (18.73 units and 31.36% of the sub-field); then conducting (18 units and 30.14%); solo music performance (16.6 units and 27,79%) and musical composition (6.5 units and 10,88% of the music genre).

A pattern of accrual of units by genre is yet to emerge. In the previous cycle, most units accrued to group performance; followed by composition; solo performance and conducting or directing. In the current cycle, the pattern is different.

### 3.3.3. Theatre performance and dance

In the previous cycle the number of units accrued to the Theatre, Performance and Dance sub-field were so low that it its analysis in the report was combined with Film and Television sub-fields. Partly, this was due to some submitted items that were still to undergo or complete peer-review evaluations. As such, the evaluations in the current cycle include the outstanding items from the previous cycle. Therefore, the patterns of activity per sub-category cannot yet be established, as several cycles will have to be undergone before such patterns emerge. The number of units accrued to each sub-category are as shown in **Table 7**.

*Table 7: Units awarded in the theatre performance and dance sub-field*

Institution	# Items	Writing	Theatre- Making, Dramaturgy, Choreography	Directing	Performance	Scenography, Design, Performance Technology	Units Accrued	% of the Sector
CPUT	2	3.00	2.00	1.00			6.00	23.38%
RU	1	5.00					5.00	19.48%
SU	9			1.17	1.00	0.50	2.67	10.39%
TUT	4		2.00				2.00	7.79%
UCT	1			2.00			2.00	7.79%
UFS	18	2.00					2.00	7.79%
UJ	4	2.00					2.00	7.79%
UL	1		2.00				2.00	7.79%
UP	1	1.00					1.00	3.90%
WITS	4			1.00			1.00	3.90%
<b>Total</b>		<b>13.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>5.17</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>25.67</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Proportion of Total</b>		<b>50.65%</b>	<b>23.38%</b>	<b>20.13%</b>	<b>3.90%</b>	<b>1.95%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

In the 2020 submission cycle, the sub-field is showing its significant presence. It is the third with the most number of submissions (45) after Music (79) and Fine Arts and Visual Arts (54) and has a proportional share of 19.15% of the sector submissions across the sub-fields. Of the 17 institutions that submitted creative outputs, 10 were submitted in the Theatre, Performance and Dance sub-field.

As shown in **Table 7**, most units in the sub-field accrued to the genre of Writing with 13 units (making up 50.65% of the sub-field units); followed by Theatre-making, Dramaturgy, Choreography with 6 units (23.38%) Directing with 5.17 units (20.13%); Performance with 1 unit (3.90%) and Scenography, Design, Performance technology with 0.5 unit (1,95%).

Some institutions were noted to have submitted items under incorrect categories. The items were removed and institutions afforded an opportunity to rectify the error. In future, however, items that are submitted incorrectly will automatically be rejected on ROSS and will not move to the evaluation phase.

### 3.3.4. Design

The Design sub-field constitutes the fourth sub-field with most number of items that were evaluated for subsidy purposes. Eight (8) universities submitted a total of thirty-two (32) items that were evaluated for the purpose of subsidy allocation. The submissions from the sub-field constitute 13.62% of the overall submissions from the sector across all sub-fields. Thirteen (13) items were approved for subsidy, and nineteen (19) were declined. The Nineteen items accrued a total of 11.12 units and the distribution of units by sub-category is presented in **Table 8**.

*Table 8: Unit allocation Design sub-field*

Institution	# Items	Jewellery Design	Architectural Design	Fashion Design	Industrial Design	Graphic Design	Multimedia Design	Total Units Awarded	% of the Sector Total
DUT	5	3.00						3.00	26.98%
SU	5	2.00					0.29	2.29	20.55%
UCT	3		1.50					1.50	13.49%
CUT	3				1.00			1.00	8.99%
NMU	1		1.00					1.00	8.99%
TUT	4			1.00				1.00	8.99%
UFS	10		1.00					1.00	8.99%
UJ	1					0.33		0.33	3.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>11.12</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Proportion of Total</b>		<b>44.97%</b>	<b>31.48%</b>	<b>8.99%</b>	<b>8.99%</b>	<b>3.00%</b>	<b>2.56%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

The largest percentage of units (with 5 units and 44,97% of the sub-field total) was awarded in the category of Jewellery design; then Architectural design (3.50 units and 31.34%); Fashion and Industrial design (1 unit each and 8.99% each); Graphic design (with 0.33 units and 3.0%) and Multimedia (0.29 unit and 2.56%). This distribution of units across sub-fields is unlike in the previous cycle wherein the Architectural Design and Built Environment were the only sub-fields with submitted items and units accrued.

Although there was an increase in participation and number of creative output items submitted, there were many challenges faced during the evaluation process, which the Department is in the process of resolving for the next evaluation cycle. The sub-field is diverse and requires an equally diverse set of expertise for evaluations. Moreover, there are other issues such as the interpretation of “public domain” that is set as a criterion in the policy.

The relatively low approval ratio of items in the design subfield has been attributed to the applicant annotation not demonstrating scholarly rigour that substantiates the creative work.

### 3.3.5. Literary Arts

The policy recognises creative non-fiction, novels, novellas and short stories, oral performance literature and poetry. Of the seventeen (17) universities that submitted their subsidy claims, nine (9) universities submitted for the literary arts. A total of twenty-one (21) items were evaluated, twelve (12) were approved, and nine (9) were declined, an approval ratio of 57.14%. The genre of novel, novellas and short stories accrued 8 units, which translates to 56.14% of the sub-field total; followed by poetry with 5 units (35.09%) and creative non-fiction with 1.25 units (8.77%). **Table 9** shows the distribution of units in the Literary Arts sub-field.

*Table 9: Units awarded in the Literary Arts*

Institution	# Items	Novels, Novellas and Short Stories	Poetry	Creative Non-Fiction	Total	% Sector Total
SU	5	2	2		4	28.07%
CPUT	1	2			2	14.04%
UCT	2	1	1		2	14.04%
UJ	4	2			2	14.04%
UWC	4			1.25	1.25	8.77%
DUT	1		1		1	7.02%
UL	2		1		1	7.02%
UP	1	1			1	7.02%
NWU	1		0		0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>14.25</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Proportion of Sector Total</b>		<b>56.14%</b>	<b>35.09%</b>	<b>8.77%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

The evaluation panel noted improvement with regards to scholarly contribution from the applicant annotation. With the continued implementation of the policy, it is hoped that the number of submissions will continue to increase and the quality of submission improves.



### 3.3.6. Film and Television

The subfield of film and television recognises an array of genres, which include fiction and documentary. Paragraph 31 of the policy lists the recognised categories that qualify for accreditation. Two (2) universities, DUT and UJ, were the only ones that submitted in the Film sub-field, in the genres of cinematography (both) and directing (UJ). Three (3) items were evaluated. **Table 10** shows cinematography (66,67%) received the largest percentage of units awarded, followed by directing (33,33%). There was a success rate of 66.37% and low decline rate (33.33%) of items evaluated. DUT (66.67%) received the largest percentage of units awarded, followed by UJ (33.33%).

*Table 10: Units awarded in Film*

Institution	# Items	Directing	Editing	Cinematography	Producing	Performance	Writing	Total	% of the sub-field
DUT	2			2				2	66.67%
UJ	1	1						1	33.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>				<b>3</b>	
<b>Proportion of the total</b>		<b>33.33%</b>		<b>66.67%</b>					<b>100%</b>

In the sub-field of Television, UWC was the only university that submitted the only output item. The item was in the genre of documentary and was approved for subsidy for 2 units.

*Table 11: Units awarded in Television*

Institution	# Items	Fiction	Documentary	Total	% of the sector
UWC	1		2	2	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	

## 4. Innovations

The policy recognises patents and Plant Breeders' Rights (PBR) for the purpose of subsidy. The Department works in collaboration with the National Intellectual Property Management Office (NIPMO) in implementing this portion of the policy and the evaluation of submissions. There was a change from manual submissions of 2019 to an online submission system in 2020. The Department made use of ROSS, administered by the NRF.

### 4.1. Verification of data

The Department verified all submitted claims to assess for compliance and that all supporting documentation was attached. Where necessary, universities were contacted for additional information.

### 4.2. Evaluation process

A meeting to conduct evaluations comprising officials from the Department, the advisory panel for innovations, and officials from NIPMO was convened to carry out the evaluations. 25 January 2021 was the start of the evaluation which took place online via the Teams platform and 2 February 2021 was the second and the completion day of the evaluations.

### 4.3. Submission approvals

Sixty-four (64) patents, inventions and innovations were submitted by 11 institutions. Of the 64 items, thirty-five (35 or 54.69%) were approved and 29 (45.31%) were declined. All but one submission was for Plant Breeders' Rights (PBR), submitted by Stellenbosch University. **Table 12** shows that a total of 64 items submitted and the approval ratio per institution.

*Table 12: Approval ratio of Patents and Innovations, 2020*

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Number of Patents / Innovations Submitted</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Declined</b>	<b>Percentage Approval</b>
SU	17	26.56%	7	10	<b>41.18%</b>
UP	14	21.88%	12	2	<b>85.71%</b>
NWU	11	17.19%	7	4	<b>63.64%</b>
WITS	8	12.50%	1	7	<b>12.50%</b>
UCT	3	4.69%	3		<b>100.00%</b>
UKZN	3	4.69%		3	<b>0.00%</b>
NMU	2	3.13%	2		<b>100.00%</b>
UFS	2	3.13%	1	1	<b>50.00%</b>
UJ	2	3.13%		2	<b>0.00%</b>
RU	1	1.56%	1		<b>100.00%</b>
UNISA	1	1.56%	1		<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>54.69%</b>

As shown in the table, several institutions achieved high percentage approvals of their submissions, whilst a few had very low to no approval. Most items were declined due to lack of supporting documentation. To improve the success rate of submissions for innovations, institutions are urged to provide all the required supporting documentation and comply with all the technical requirements for a complete submission, as stated in the Implementation Guidelines.

#### *4.4. Unit allocation*

Approved individual submissions are awarded 2 units. In the case where authors or creators are affiliated with two or more separate institutions, the subsidy is shared amongst the claiming universities. The criteria used by the Department for unit allocation is as follows:

- First patent application of a patent family granted in a particular substantive examination jurisdiction.
- First Plants Breeders' Rights (PBR) application of a PBR family granted in a particular substantive examination jurisdiction.

Each application must be accompanied by the following documentation:

- A copy of granted patent including the allowed claims together with any drawings
- A copy of the granted PBR including the technical questionnaire and illustrations
- Copy of the certificate of registration
- All claims must be submitted with a letter of declaration signed by the Deputy Vice- Chancellor (DVC) Research or equivalent on or before the due date. The letter of declaration must reference the internal evaluation committee members.
- Output submissions for innovation all for a three-year period, (2017-2019).

The approved patents and innovations accrued a total of 55.096 units. The breakdown of the number of units accrued per institution and their proportion of the sector and, in comparison to the previous submission cycle (2019), are as shown in **Table 13**.

*Table 13: Overall Units Awarded for Innovations in 2019 and 2020*

Institution	2019			2020			
	Number of Patents / Innovations Submitted	Units Awarded	Percentage of the Sector Units	Number of Patents / Innovations Submitted	Approved	Units Awarded	Percentage of the Sector Units
UP	24	15	10.37%	14	12	21.11	38.32%
NWU			0.00%	11	7	14.00	25.41%
SU	24	47	32.49%	17	7	5.65	10.25%
UCT	28	41	28.34%	3	3	4.33	7.87%
NMU	3	6	4.15%	2	2	4.00	7.26%
UNISA	1	2	1.38%	1	1	2.00	3.63%
WITS	18	16	11.06%	8	1	2.00	3.63%
RU	4	2.67	1.85%	1	1	1.60	2.90%
UFS			0.00%	2	1	0.40	0.73%
UJ	1	2	1.38%	2	0	0.00	0.00%
UKZN	4	7	4.84%	3	0	0.00	0.00%
CPUT	1	2	1.38%		0	0.00	0.00%
UWC	3	5	3.46%		0	0.00	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>144.67</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>55.09</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 5. Conclusion

Thus far, the two creative outputs reports have not yet covered the demographics in the artistic outputs from the sector, particularly race and gender, and analysis of per capita output in the sector and at the individual institutions. The data on demographics is being gathered and subsequent analyses and reports should also cover these areas. Such analyses shall extract some HEMIS data. Higher education institutions, however, need not wait and rely on these analyses before they institute transformation initiatives. Transformation is the responsibility of all institutions within and outside of the higher education sector. Moreover, the transformation factor will also ensure the enrichment of research creative outputs from the sector. As the implementation of the policy progresses and improves, there will be a better understanding of the creator/scholar creative artwork research profile.

The enhancement of quality creative research outputs also relies on emerging researchers and scholars in the respective subfields. Future analyses of the patterns of production of creative outputs will also assist with devising initiatives for propelling a rich creative and diverse system reflective of the different cultures of our society.

The Creative Outputs Policy aims to recognise qualifying creative outputs submissions from public higher education institutions. It seeks to promote and encourage various forms of artistic research across the relevant disciplines, innovations and research on patents and their subsequent successful registration. The Department, therefore, believes that this interpretation of the policy cascades to institutional level as well and relevant investments are made from the research subsidy accrued in order to generate more research and produce more artistic outputs.

In the second year of implementing the policy, various debates have emerged, especially about the important role that creative research work plays in the academic arena. The definition of research within the creative arts study field has been brought up yet again. Without a doubt and as with research fields that primarily transmit new knowledge through publications, among others, the creative disciplines too have a nexus between research quality, creativity (of artistic works) and innovation, which the Creative Outputs Policy seeks to enhance.

General observations have been noted by the Department regarding the submission process and the use of the online platform, ROSS. A key challenge that persists is the number of creative outputs that remain on the system and are reported on as under peer review. This has both a negative and positive effect. On the positive side, this provides the Department with an overview to track and understand the sub-fields that have a challenge in finding sufficient peer-reviewers. On the negative side, it affects productivity and efficiency in the analysis and reporting on the affected disciplines, as items remain in the system and are eligible for evaluation once the peer-review process has been completed. The matter will be taken up with the respective sub-field disciplines and the advisory panel for remedies.

A point of concern raised by the evaluation panel (that is the advisory and subfield panel members) is the quality of the peer reviewer reports received from institutions. Some reports do not adhere to the implementation guidelines and the policy. This often leads to panel discussions on the poor quality of reports. Peer review reports are an important tool that assist the evaluation panels reach a decision on whether to award subsidy or not. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that institutions make certain that the creative peer review reports are of quality and are in line with the policy and the implementation guidelines. Measures will be taken on the creative outputs that are submitted with poor peer review reports.