		Ref. no.	SKH 2024/676/1.3.2
		Replaces	–
		Template adopted by	Board of Education and Research 2024-10-14, ref. SKH 2024/368/1.2.4

STOCKHOLM UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS | STOCKHOLMS KONSTNÄRLIGA HÖGSKOLA

Assessment report – research

Assessment group (name, title, organisational affiliation):

Mick Wilson, Professor of Art, Co-Diector of Centre for Art and the Political Imaginary, and Director of Doctoral Studies, HDK-Valand Academy of Art and Design, University of Gothenburg

Kajsa Dahlberg, Doctor, Visual Artist, currently holding a substitute position at the Kabelvåg School of Moving Images, The Arctic University of Norway, UiT

Jostein Gundersen, Associate Professor, Vice Dean of Research, University of Bergen, Faculty of Fine Art, Music and Design

Esther Siddiquie, Doctoral Researcher Advanced Practices, Visual Cultures Department at Goldsmiths University of London

llse van Rijn, Head of 3rd. Cycle Research at the Institute for the Performing Arts and Film ZhdK

Chair of the group: Mick Wilson, Professor of Art, Co-Diector of Centre for Art and the Political Imaginary, and Director of Doctoral Studies, HDK-Valand Academy of Art and Design, University of Gothenburg,

Student/doctoral student participation has taken place in the following ways: Esther Siddiquie, Doctoral Researcher Advanced Practices, Visual Cultures Department at Goldsmiths University of London is a current PhD student

Date of submission of the report: 28 May 2025

Purpose and instructions

Research evaluations are part of the quality system of Stockholm University of the Arts (SKH). The quality system consists of various structured collection activities. The quality system is intended to help ensure and develop the quality of SKH's artistic research, of which research evaluations are one of the activities.

The purpose of the research evaluations is to generate regular and systematic knowledge that is needed to ensure and develop the quality of SKH's research. The research evaluations should be quality-driven, highlighting strengths and identifying and addressing areas for development. Research shall be evaluated every six years

A research evaluation consists of four steps: start-up, self-evaluation, external reviews and measures.

BOX 240 45, SE-104 50 STOCKHOLM
+46 8 49 400 000 UNIARTS.SE

Instructions:

- – The template for the assessment report is part of the Guidelines for programme evaluations and is mandatory to use. The template mirrors the self-evaluation report template.
- – Research shall be assessed on the basis of the criteria below, which are based on SUHF's Joint framework for HEIs' research quality assurance
- – and enhancement systems.
- – The basis for assessment is the self-evaluation report and a compilation of key figures for research for the last five years. If the assessment group has requested additional documentation for the assessment, this must be stated in the assessment report.
- – Based on the criteria (see section 2.2), the assessment report should include recommendations, both strengths and areas for development, aimed at improving the research. A recommendation must be problem-based and thus differs from more general tips and advice, which may be included in the assessment under each criterion but not in the overall assessment. The assessment group shall clearly justify its assessment, preferably illustrated with examples. The assessment should **not** result in an overall rating of research at SKH.
- – The report should be a maximum of 15-25 pages, including 'template text'.
- – Before the assessment report is submitted to the SKH, the SKH must be given the opportunity to correct any factual errors and misconceptions.
- – The final report must be submitted by the chair of the assessment group to SKH, i.e. to the responsible officer at the Research Office, within the specified time.

Summary of the self-evaluation in terms of the strengths and development areas identified.s

---

This report has been prepared by the panel comprising: Dr. Kajsa Dahlberg, Ass. Prof. Jostein Gundersen, Esther Siddiquie, Dr. Ilse van Rijn and Prof. Mick Wilson. We were invited as the external research evaluation panel members in accordance with the quality system of Stockholm University of the Arts (SKH) in early Spring 2025. The task assigned to the panel was to assess SKH's research on the basis of the following criteria, which are based on SUHF's Joint framework for HEIs' research quality assurance and enhancement systems:

1. that there are systematic efforts to create forms and space for the development and renewal of the research/research environment
2. that there are systematic efforts made to promote good research practice, prevent research misconduct and deal with offences
3. that there is a systematic work and follow-up of efforts to interact with the surrounding society, inform about their activities and promote the dissemination and utilisation of research results produced by higher education institutions

4. that there are fair and transparent processes for recruitment and promotion that support the development and renewal of the research/research environment. Employees are given access to skills development and career support. Equal opportunities and gender equality are self-evident and integrated starting points
5. that research has appropriate support and processes for prioritisation and long-term renewal of research infrastructures
6. that there is a close link between research and courses and study programmes in an appropriate learning environment

The report writing process

In preparing our report we have proceeded on the following basis. Upon receipt of the Self-Evaluation Report 19 February 2025, we met via ZOOM to share our understandings and questions about the process, to discuss the material in the report and identify the issues that we wished to explore for further clarification and detail in advance of the Self-Evaluation Seminar.[1] We met on six subsequent occasions to prepare our questions and discuss the issues raised in both the Self-Evaluation Report and the Self-Evaluation Seminar, and then to formulate this report.[2] We used a shared online document as our common working space where we gathered our questions, reflections and the notes on our discussions, including notes of responses given during the Self-Evaluation Seminar itself. Immediately after the Self-Evaluation Seminar we held a short meeting and then proceeded to gather our reflections on the material. We further evolved our shared document to gather material under each criterion with reference to strengths, challenges and specific recommendations that we may wish to prepare. In each of our meetings we worked through the criteria by discussing in a series of rounds our individual interpretations, questions and judgements with respect to each heading. Having itemised our individual perspectives, we then proceeded to work through the material again to synthesize a collective position by composing the different individual contributions into a summary account of our collective understanding of the strengths, developmental challenges and recommended measures that may enhance the quality work being done with respect to each criterion.

The research quality assurance and enhancement procedure specified for our work did not require, nor allow for a site visit. We believe that given the centrality of embodied and situated artistic practices within the wide gamut of SKH's research that a site visit would be a recommended dimension of any future external review process. We also believe that our evaluation with respect to some of the criteria (such as criterion 1 on "systematic efforts to create forms and space for the development and renewal of the research/research environment") would be greatly enhanced by direct contact with the spaces in question. One further issue that we discussed as a panel was the way the self-report (via document and seminar)

---

[1] Our first meeting took place via ZOOM on 11/03/2025 from 13:00 to 15:00.
[2] Our subsequent meetings took place on 10/03/2025 from 13:00-14:30; on 11/03/2025 from 15:13-15:45; on 24/03/2024 from 13:00-15:00; on 14/04/2025 from 13:00-15:00; on 13/05/2025 from 09:00-10:00; and on 26/05/2025 from 13:00-14:00.

formed the central basis of our process, and that the criteria specified pertain not to the quality of the research outputs nor the specific research task choices taken on by SKH as such, but rather to the framing conditions within which the research is conducted. We worked fully within the parameters set. However, we would like to propose that an additional dimension of a future quality review process would include direct address in some form to samples of actual research outputs. We say this in the belief that one key index of the quality of processes, structures, and framing conditions is the actual output of a system.

Summary of the self-report

The strengths identified in the summary overview of the Self-Evaluation Report are: (1) The research goals and practices of Stockholm University of the Arts (SKH) are clearly and fully generated via artistic practice; (2) SKH houses a unique collection of subject areas—dance, dance pedagogy, circus, acting, performing arts, film and media, and opera—with artistic diversity is at the very heart of SKH and a committed ethos and practice of cross/inter/transdisciplinarity; (3) SKH operates four profile areas—Concept & Composition; Bodily & Vocal Practices; Art, Technology & Materiality; Site, Event, Encounter—which are used to systematically enable and cultivate the research environment orienting key processes such as the curation of the Wednesday research seminar series, the annual SKH research week and the biannual international artistic research conference; (4) The ecology of subjects together with the cross/inter/transdisciplinarity profiles generates conceptual, material, and practical linkages across artistic research, artistic education, and society and anchors extensive networks, and has enabled SKH to build and host more than 15 externally funded research projects which in turn add to this networked ecology and the extensive landscape of formats for sharing research.

The priority development areas identified in the Self-Evaluation Report are: (1) Strengthening links between research and education; (2) The "fast track" development of strategies for accessing external funding; (3) The development of an institution-wide system for planning research time and suggestion to link this to tracking registration of results; (4) The implementation of clear language practice guidelines to manage different languages in use and developing a systematic approach to translation within the work processes; (5) The development of internationalization and of "Equity Diversity Inclusion" so that both the capacity and competence to recruit, welcome and support international students and faculty is fully established, and that 'Equity, Diversity and Inclusion' agenda is embedded and actioned across the full spectrum of activities from staff and student recruitment to course, seminar, and conference content.

The panel broadly endorses this self-assessment and would particularly like to acknowledge that the self-assessment has been conducted with rigour adopting a clear authentic and frank approach to Self-Evaluation which is very much to be praised and welcomed. Our understanding of the summary overview in the Self-Report is that the strengths identified are linked directly to the development challenges, for example the unique collection of subject areas and the rich cross-

connectivity of the profile areas create the developmental challenge to establish institution-wide systems and common practices (whether of research planning and tracking; in language policy and practice; in internationalisation; or in Equity Diversity and Inclusion work). We believe this speaks to the systematic approach adopted in the Self-Report.

Additionally, the panel would like to note by way of introduction that several of the development challenges demonstrate important common themes. For example, several of the development areas share the theme of seeking institution-wide convergence on common, shared and embedded organisational capacities and practices that preserve the centrality of (different) artistic practice(s). Another cross-cutting theme the panel discerns in the Self-Report, is that the organisational history and custom-and-practice of the ancestor institutions that have combined to create SKH play a part in both underpinning the key strengths on the one hand, and in shaping the developmental challenges, on the other hand. For example, this rich organisational history has made artistic practice central to the research of SKH and also built the key strength identified above of the subject diversity. While it has also contributed to the key developmental challenges of, for example, building institution-wide strategies of strengthening links between research and education and systematic approaches for external research funding.

Assessment report

> **1. that there are systematic efforts to create forms and space for the development and renewal of the research/research environment**
>
> Description and analysis of the strengths and development areas of the research in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

The narrative of how the SKH research environment has emerged was clear and insightful. The seminar in particular (10/02/25) solved the committee's initial difficulties tracing the complex institutional architecture divided in subject and profile areas and a research centre; several thematic and inter-institutional research groups (e.g. Sustainability Group, Bodies are Ears, NAVET and EARN networks); a Board of Education and Research (NUF); and the forms and formats for sharing and developing research (e.g. Alliances & Commonalities and Doctoral Percentage Seminars).

The formats for sharing research, the Wednesday Research Seminars (WRS) in particular seem a successful integrating strategy, work to mix not only disciplines but also different career stages, and this is a very positive aspect. It is a well-conceived setup —echoing SKH's specific conception of an interdisciplinary approach as creating "encounter" between at least two disciplines—that appears from the Report and the Seminar to be successful, appreciated by all concerned and providing a basis for further development.

The self-assessment is clear, honest and constructive with respect to the need to interconnect the different subject areas and their curricula, and the challenges faced within the process. NUF seems to play a pivotal role in addressing the issue on an institutional level. However, SKH's vision of understanding artistic research as 'generated via artistic practice' (p.4), while leaving the term interdisciplinarity 'open' (p.6) seems to generate a tension in the urge to assemble disciplines, their ontologies and histories, 'schools' and fields. The Self-Evaluation Report signals tension in the meeting of the scientifically based dance pedagogy programme, and other, artistic practices (p.23). It also identifies the challenge of interdisciplinarity indicating that "some subject area staff feel excluded from the interdisciplinary research environment, feeling they are asked to surrender their subject specificity." (p.6.) The panel recommends that consideration is given to the possibility that the "encounter" between disciplines might begin from the differences between the disciplines rather than their commonalities.

The NUF seems important as well in redistributing research/funding time among (assistant-) professors. The (new) criteria holds that this should happen according to the needs (p.16) of the (assistant-) professors, while staying true to SKH's research mission as integral to its overarching mission, that 'artistic research is generated via artistic practice. SKH's "mission is to research art, and the contributions art makes to society, by practicing, processing, producing, and thinking in, with, and through art whether via subject specificity or in interdisciplinary relation with other artistic and/or related fields." (p.2.) The question arises how to identify the needs of the (assistant-)professors and we suggest that the NUF can develop a strategy that does this. In order to do so, it seems beneficial to critically review the (at times unbalanced) relations between (assistant-)professors' departmental duties on the one hand, and allotted research time, on the other (p.10; see also sections 4.1 + 4.2 pp. 15-16). This would enable clearer articulation of the opportunities of research time and how to both organise and distribute these. Defining the appropriate balance between departmental duties and research time seems crucial for doctoral candidates and postdoctoral researchers also (see section 5.3, p.20; section 2.3, p.22). This balance is not just a matter of volume, but also of the nature of the tasks assigned to different posts. We are unsure of the merit of using the doctoral and postdoctoral researchers to address what are perhaps structural needs in, for example, meeting EDI-criteria (p.20) or operational needs, for example facilitating events (pp.20-21). Similarly, we are unsure that (post-)doctoral candidates' research can be primarily used to generate a research environment when they actually need this environment to develop their research, while of course we also recognise the reciprocal dynamics here. We would like to see a clearer articulation of the strategy in this regard. With regard to the idea that a PhD student should be recruited to "bridge the gap between scientific and artistic research practices" (p.23), we again are wondering if a higher-level strategic action is required for such a goal. Are there other ways to "solve" e.g. the "strain on staff" in organising the A&C conference and the "better resourcing" (p.7) needed to facilitate the Research Week?

SKH's actions to, firstly, map the different forms of research outputs and to develop evaluation criteria that resonate with the field of artistic research and, secondly, to create incentives to apply for research funding seems to contribute to a more sustainable research environment. It would also meet the UN's international action plan for sustainable development, agenda 2030, which SKH follows (See section 7.1 of the Self-Evaluation Report). Additionally, a research environment would be generated in which EU funding opportunities and their potential in relation to research can more readily be engaged.

Recommendations:

1. The organisational structures and spaces could be more clearly articulated diagrammatically, not just for the external review process, but also for SKH colleagues' self-understanding of their own organisation, as well as for communication to a wider audience. An organogram would readily enable identification of existing "forms and space … of research" and areas for its "development and renewal."

2. As both a programmatic strategy and a way to address varying understandings of interdisciplinarity and (artistic) research, SKH's concept of "encounter" could be further developed, e.g., organising the Wednesday Research Seminars as a space where more than two disciplines meet each time, addressing the divergences and differences of subjects with an equal emphasis as that placed on finding commonalities, intersections, and convergences.

3. The panel recommends that SKH consider developing doctoral studies in the subject of performative and media-based practices based on collective processes in contrast to research mainly predicated on solo and/or individual art studio models. We recommend an assessment of the (spatiotemporal) conditions needed to develop these more collective, collaborative and time-based models. The panel believes that the new building offers an opportunity to do so. However, we make this recommendation without the advantage of having done a site visit.

4. The panel recognises that constructing a role, that of the new vice rector, as responsible for research funding acknowledges and addresses SKH's need for external resources for research, and we endorse this positive measure. Additionally, we recommend that the conditions—for research funding applications as an integral aspect of SKH's research—be actively enhanced, building further competence in project development, and in the identification of funding opportunities, among both artistic/academic staff and administrative staff. This would further consolidate existing measures and incentives present in the redistribution of research time as well as the development of systems for mapping and evaluating artistic research processes and careers. We recommend drawing upon international exemplars such as those provided by:

   - https://coara.eu/;
   - https://coara.eu/agreement/the-agreement-full-text/;

STOCKHOLM | **STOCKHOLMS**
UNIVERSITY | **KONSTNÄRLIGA**
OF THE ARTS | **HÖGSKOLA**

- https://www.uhr.no/en/news-from-uhr/nor-cam-a-toolbox-for-recognition-and-rewards-in-academic-careers.5780.aspx
- https://www.uhr.no/_f/p1/iaab5f9df-6f16-41a6-82fd-e17ba517eb3c/ku-cam-14052025.pdf

See also criterion 4 below.

> **2. that there are systematic efforts made to promote good research practice, prevent research misconduct and deal with offences**
>
> Description and analysis of the strengths and development areas of the research in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

The panel acknowledges the recognised necessity for intervention with respect to research ethics pertinent to artistic research as indicated in the SKH Self-Evaluation Report. The Report asserts that artistic research is not governed by the same ethical codes and conduct requirements as research in the sciences or humanities. (p.11.) We note for example that the Report asserts that "much artistic research exists in grey zones between participation and employment, anonymity and acknowledgement, single authorship and collaboration, often rendering the standard scientific ethical frameworks irrelevant." (p.11.) We note also the assertion that "each artistic project is required to establish its own ethical framework." (p.11.) The panel appreciates the recognition of the need for collective responsibility in promoting sound research practices across the university, as highlighted in the report, as a significant step toward the establishment of a university-wide ethical research framework. The panel proposes that rather than seeing research ethic regimes as categorically not applicable, or as intrinsically difficult to apply to artistic research, SKH could map research ethical standards and identify exactly where and how they do, or do not, apply to artistic research, as well as where it is necessary for artistic research to develop additional ethical frameworks in order to cover aspects that traditional research ethics don't address. (For example, to consider the ethical dimensions of categories such as "audience", which are normally nowhere to be found in research ethics, but everywhere to be found in artistic research.) Addressing research ethics effectively necessitates the implementation in various learning environments (course environment, supervisory level, funding/grant level) and underscores the need to formalise ethical research procedures across the board. As discussed in the Self-Evaluation Seminar, the committee endorses SKH's initiative to seek inspiration from research ethics models employed by other institutions, including those on an international scale. The University has instituted renewed supervisory guidelines to assist and support students in navigating the ethical challenges that may arise during their research. To ensure that all supervisors are adequately equipped to guide students through inquiries related to research ethics, the committee commends SKH's foresight in establishing mandatory supervisor seminars commencing in 2026: "The supervisor seminar is another opportunity to create peer dialogue and support around the issue

STOCKHOLM | STOCKHOLMS
UNIVERSITY | KONSTNÄRLIGA
OF THE ARTS | HÖGSKOLA

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

of ethics in artistic research." (p.12.) We also note that that "the newly established PhD Supervision in Artistic Research Course addresses ethics as one of its four core components, inviting course participants to present a potential or actual ethical dilemma they have identified in relation to the PhD project they are supervising and creating opportunity for a shared dialogue around this issue." (p.12.) The committee notes the consistent emphasis on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion issues as a strong indicator of the commitment to addressing fairness and equity in all facets of research processes. Furthermore, the committee positively acknowledges the thorough analysis and identification of interdepartmental challenges, such as substantial or uneven workloads. This was illustrated through an example provided on page 7 of the Self-Evaluation report of the 2024 (A&C) conference, which was unrealistically budgeted, relying solely on internal resources and imposing considerable strain on staff. Additionally, noting "competing responsibilities, administrative burdens, and institutional pressures" faced by researchers. (p.12.)

Simultaneously, the committee critically notes that the rights and obligations of PhD candidates and their involvement in establishing terms and conditions for ethical artistic research practices are unaddressed. The mentioned issue of the "grey zone" in which artistic research is situated (p.11) reveals that the understanding demonstrated in framing the research ethics challenge was not sufficiently resolved or fully specified. A connection to methodology was not made explicit, and the pedagogical task concerning research ethics is not adequately framed—as a location that simultaneously informs and drives the research. In light of this, the committee requests additional details regarding the steps taken in the formalisation process of research ethics and welcomes more practical information to achieve greater clarity.

Recommendations:

1. The committee welcomes the supervisory seminar and advises working on this topic with a constructive, methodological approach. Highly advises against working within the realm of Artistic Research's ethical exceptionalism based on the language of "scientific grounds".
2. Training should not be exclusive to supervisors, but be obligatory for anyone with research time, as opposed to need-based.
3. Ethical considerations can only be implemented if done sustainably, i.e., involving all levels of the organisation in the process. Ethically fair conditions for personnel should be shaped in order for the ethics course to be taken seriously. This directly relates to resolving the mentioned issue of work overload.
4. The panel believes that SKH, through developing its own systematic organisation-wide approach to research ethics, could use its national position, and its national and international prestige as a centre of expertise and innovation in artistic research, to influence the national research ethics debate in Sweden and establish broader recognition of the specificities of research ethics work within artistic research.

5. The panel recommends to look at other Research Ethics models and sources to inform the organisation's internal discussions on these issues, such as (indicative list only):
    - https://kunst-onderzoek.nl/en/projects/exploring-ethical-issues-in-research-in-the-arts/
    - https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/bitstream/123456789/129504/1/Doctoral%20school%20annual%20lecture%202024.pdf
    - https://advancingsupervision.eu/outputs/map-ethics/
    - https://blogs.ed.ac.uk/antart2023/timetable/week4/

---

3. that there is a systematic work and follow-up of efforts to interact with the surrounding society, inform about their activities and promote the dissemination and utilisation of research results produced by higher education institutions

Description and analysis of the strengths and development areas of the research in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

The committee appreciates and applauds the Self-Evaluation Group's identification of productive measures to increase visibility and interaction with society, e.g., an increased visibility of alumni on the website; commitment to inviting external artists; and the increased publication of artistic research results. However, within the context of SKH's mission to research art and the contributions art makes to society, a clearer statement of what "utilisation of research results" and "innovation" mean for artistic research at SKH would be very useful and something the panel believes is not addressed in the Evaluation Report. When discussed in the in the Self-Evaluation Seminar (10/02/2025), useful examples were given (e.g., Mia Engberg's Darkness as Material produced in two versions, one for a selected peer community, one for a wider audience, as a way to enhance impact). The panel's strong impression is that a common understanding of "utilisation of research results" has not yet been established across SKH. The Self-Evaluation Seminar demonstrated that the team could respond in detail with respect to singular cases. However, the question of utilisation of results seemed to be tied to medium-specific approaches whereby research outcomes are understood to have utility within their own domain (as indicated in the film example discussed in the seminar). The intra-institutional divergent perspectives demonstrate the need for a constructive, systematic discussion about the "utilisation of research results" and its implications leading to the formulation of a common understanding to enable more systematic work in this regard. This would also enable the construction of different strategies nuanced for different arenas and social contexts. (For example, interaction and visibility in national politics requires another strategy than interaction with the local neighbourhood or visibility on social media.)

The panel reads these varying views also as an incentive to create the (spatiotemporal) conditions and formats needed for sharing performative and

STOCKHOLM | STOCKHOLMS
UNIVERSITY | KONSTNÄRLIGA
OF THE ARTS | HÖGSKOLA

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

media-based research (see criterion 1). The panel sees importance in how socio-political interactions are structurally questioned and integrated in the institution. SKH clearly articulates the need to develop a strategy for public communication. In the Self Assessment Seminar there was a clear identification of the desire to generate constructive media attention and the challenge to do so because of the often sensationalist priorities of the media. The panel believes that SKH can benefit from its international recognition by peers, so that SKH's international reputation can be used to drive more visibility within the national media. The panel acknowledges the energy with which this issue is being addressed and proposes the following considerations as useful in shaping this development work: How the institutional strategy for communicating its understanding of artistic research is to be rolled out? Are the impact pathways for the dissemination and promotion of artistic research results also considered within research education and research initiation? How can these considerations be developed as integral to SKH's mission to research art and the contribution that art makes to society?

Recommendations:

1. The panel recommends developing an institutional discourse on the utilisation of research results and innovation actions, based on the research practices of SKH.
2. The panel recommends the development of a specific strategy for (i) outreach (ii) dissemination and (iii) impact tracking of research results that is based on establishing an organisation-wide model of innovation, impact and utilisation of research results appropriate to artistic research.
3. The panel notes that SKH values artistic contributions and impact and recommends that (a) there is a clearer communication practice around this; and (b) a courtship of media engagement through leveraging SKH's extensive partnerships with leading cultural providers.
4. The panel recommends that alumni regardless of their different levels of professional visibility after completion of studies, should be integrally included within SKH's communications and media strategies for profiling SKH's research contributions (p.13).
5. Impact could be addressed on both an institutional level and in specific research projects, already at the project initiation and development phases.
6. There may be a need for two different media strategies, responding to two different frames, one "national" and one "international". It appears from the Self-Evaluation Seminar discussion that the national media have been found to be more responsive to controversy rather than considered critical analysis of research. The panel suggests that SKH take a leading role in bringing the sector together to develop a shared public communications strategy, again leveraging its position and international reputation.
7. With respect to interacting with the surrounding society, it is recommended that different forms and formats of collaboration be developed, which build on the already existing "diverse range of fields, disciplines, and industries" (p.8) with which SKH connects (see also criterion 1). Linking individual practitioner researchers to existing and new societal partners can also have

value in producing a collective conception of artistic research and especially for reflecting on the conditions for performance-based artistic research.

8. The committee recommends SKH to develop a conception of collaboration as part and parcel of their concept of "encounter" between disciplines, enabling the University to reach outside itself in setting its research agendas, thus actively thinking through formats and relationships that are more receptive to external perspectives and inputs.

> **4.   that there are fair and transparent processes for recruitment and promotion that support the development and renewal of the research/research environment. Employees are given access to skills development and career support. Equal opportunities and gender equality are self-evident and integrated starting points**
>
> Description and analysis of the strengths and development areas of the research in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

Within the Self-Evaluation Report criterion 4 is divided into five sub-sections as follows:

4.1 Decline in active researchers, fewer professors, and increase in assistant lecturers
4.2 Reevaluating distribution of assistant professor research time
4.3 Role of external advisors in recruitment processes
4.4 Employee skills development opportunities
4.5 Special assignments within the university

As described in both the Self-Evaluation Report and during the Self-Evaluation Seminar, SKH is home to a unique and diverse set of seven subject areas: dance, dance pedagogy, circus, acting, performing arts, film and media, and opera. SKH's goal is both to support deepened artistic research "generated via artistic practice" (p.2) within these diverse fields individually and create a research environment that extends outwards and fosters interdisciplinary collaboration with potential to create "entirely new communities of practice" (p.2).

Within the scope of the overall Self-Evaluation (both Self-Evaluation and Self-Evaluation Seminar), we learn that—being an institution built on the merger of several different schools, each with their own individual research culture—the strategy has been to work with the research community as a unifying force for SKH, one that which will "hold together" a diverse set of artistic fields and practices (p.4). Our understanding is that the overall Self-Evaluation is partly assessing this initial strategy as the way forward, while simultaneously acknowledging that this is (and has) not been a straightforward process but rather one that comes with several problems and challenges.

One obstruction to the process of creating a more unified research community is the fact that, since 2018, there has been a decline in the number of active researchers at SKH, both in terms of a shrinking number of professorships (from 26 to 18), (p.15), and a rise in assistant lecturer appointments that do not include research time—a situation that is partly due to a challenging economic situation (4.1). This has led to an overall reduction in permanent, full-time staff members with research experience at SKH. The Self-Evaluation contains a clear analysis of this problem and proposes that, in order to maintain a strong research environment, "the research experience and competence of Professors and assistant professors must be considered in the hiring process" (p.16).

Further, the report (4.3) acknowledges that "external assessors play a significant role in recruitment processes at SKH, yet their selection seems somewhat ad hoc, lacks transparency and is inconsistent across subject areas." (p.16). As a response to this problem, the report proposes to develop a shared resource list of qualified external assessors—a "broad pool of qualified experts" that are committed to advancing artistic research. At the Self-Evaluation Seminar, the Self-Evaluation group expressed how this list is a proposed solution to a "very real problem". External assessors have a huge influence in the recruitment process and as they are currently appointed by the Head of subject, there is often a problem with transparency and where the aspect of research risks getting lost. As stated in the report "this lack of system regarding who is invited and why, undermines the accountability of the recruitment procedures and could also be inadvertently favouring certain disciplines or approaches over others, leading to a lack of diversity in the perspectives and expertise SKH offers" (p.16). Establishing a pool of assessors with focus on international artists and educators who are specialists in each of the seven subject areas—artists and educators who are actively engaged and committed to advancing artistic research—is one suggestion in the process of solving this significant challenge to the organization.

In addition to these concrete suggestions, the report lists several measures made to offer employee skills development opportunities at SKH aimed at developing various aspects of artistic research competence (4.4). These are: an obligatory supervision course and supervision seminars addressing urgent issues in all academic research environments such as research ethics and open research and engagement with A.I. The course "Training in teaching and learning in higher education", (HPU), aimed at teachers, professors, librarians, and PhD students that include exploring connections between research and education. A mentoring network is also in development, coordinated by the RC staff.

Employee skills and development opportunities is crucial for the development of SKH as research institution, and the panel supports the introduction of obligatory supervisory seminars as well as development opportunities for teachers and the development of a mentoring network. At the same time, the committee encourages SKH to expand such development opportunities and develop a comprehensive strategy for career advancement, including competencies in project development, publication and communication, project leadership, research and processual

leadership, supervision and mentorship. Increasing staff competencies in these areas we believe will greatly benefit SKH's overall ambitions of strengthening the research education, increasing opportunities for external research funding, connecting research and education, increasing interdisciplinary connections and strengthening research in all focus areas. This development work may usefully be informed by resources and models of career support being generated in the wider research community. The panel suggests that there may be use and value to be made from resources (already cited above under criterion 1):

- https://coara.eu/;
- https://coara.eu/agreement/the-agreement-full-text/
- https://www.uhr.no/en/news-from-uhr/nor-cam-a-toolbox-for-recognition-and-rewards-in-academic-careers.5780.aspx
- https://www.uhr.no/_f/p1/iaab5f9df-6f16-41a6-82fd-e17ba517eb3c/ku-cam-14052025.pdf

In addition, the report states that there are opportunities within the context of SKH for full-time employees to apply for special assignments within the university (4.5). These roles are applied for internally, require research competence, and hence, will work as an encouragement for staff to take active part in contributing to the development and renewal of the research environment.

Yet another response to the challenges faced by the research community at SKH is to reevaluate the distribution of assistant professor research time (4.2). As of today, all assistant professors (not assistant lecturers) get 10% research time. Based on the analysis that some teachers at SKH are not interested in artistic research, the suggestion is to create individual staff research plans, allowing those who are not interested in research to focus on teaching and training and to use the research funds to support those who are interested.

The issue of recruitment appears urgent when it comes to further developing the artistic research community at SKH. At the Self-Evaluation Seminar, the Self-Evaluation group generously shared experiences and thoughts on the SKH recruitment processes. The discussion presented a tension between skills and research, as something that needs to be compromised. The Assessment Committee acknowledges that there is an active and ongoing discussion at SKH on how to meet the strategic goals stated in the report of "fostering diversity, building interdisciplinary collaborations, and maintaining a balance between teaching and research priorities" (p.16). We concur with the need to move away from established hiring practices that risk leading to hiring staff that are hostile to research in a time where securing external research funds is vital for the organization. We strongly support the suggestion made in the report that every subject area should have at least one professor and that "the leadership group needs to be across all recruitment in order to ensure that there is consistency and alignment with SKH's broader objectives, including the commitment to diversity and appropriate support for EDI staff and students" (p.15).

Overall, we encourage the process of further developing a model in which hire is discussed at institutional leadership level, and that every hire needs to include

research competency. The Assessment Committee further believes that incorporating Artistic Research into education plans would inform job announcements in a way that would ensure teaching hires to meet at least minimal Artistic Research competency requirements.

However, while we understand the impulse to want to allocate research funds to those who have a specific interest in research (4.2), we are afraid that this measure will further cement the already troubling tensions between traditional skills training and research. We worry that this will only reinforce a perception of research as something that comes as an addition from the outside rather than being inherent to all forms of practice. We see it as important not to further reinforce divisions, but to encourage an environment where skills and research need not be opposites. Instead, we support further knowledge sharing practices between subject areas through building on what is already being done. To actively work with, for example, environment building events such as doctoral percentage seminars in ways that emphasize the recognition and support of the methodologies that are already in use and that are firmly grounded in artist skill and material experience. We see that in the longer term this is an issue of recruitment, ensuring that the organization recruits 'research-interested' new colleagues, well-disposed to research (not hostile to it.)

Recommendations:

1. Review processes for recruitment in order to secure applicants with research interests and qualifications (link to recommendation with respect to education plans below). We make the observation that incorporating AR into education plans can inform the job announcements meaning new teaching hires require some at least minimal AR competency.
2. To further develop strategy, local guidelines and training programmes for career advancement that includes competencies in artistic research, artistic research processes, artistic research supervision and mentorship, and leadership (e.g., a postdoc being developed to become EU project leader in the future not just professional courses but experience in research processes, team leadership role.)
3. We recommend an alternative approach to thinking through the position and role of dance pedagogy as a subject on scientific grounds co-existing with a predominant cluster of subjects on artistic grounds. One suggestion is that instead of seeing dance pedagogy the 'odd one out' rather to open a dialogue between scientific and artistic subjects so as to further sharpen institutional understanding and implementation of inter/multi/transdisciplinarity. A second suggestion is to consider if understandings of artistic research coming from Dance can generate an impetus to other, performance-based understandings.
4. The panel recommends that staff are encouraged to develop research plans and pursue research competency development even where substantial research time is not currently included in their individual contract / post.

> **5. that research has appropriate support and processes for prioritisation and long-term renewal of research infrastructures**
>
> Description and analysis of the strengths and development areas of the research in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

The Self-Evaluation report addresses the criterion in five sub-sections. (Note, we have amended the original numbering of these 1-5 to 5.1-5.5 for clarity):

> 5.1 New Building project
> 5.2 Dedicated space for research
> 5.3. Research office, communications, IT, Facilities and Services Department (FAS), Technical Production Department, and library
> 5.4 Expanding PhD funding options
> 5.5 Post doctorates

Within sub-sections 5.1 and 5.2 the focus is on physical structures, and the Self-Evaluation group reported challenges in the past years regarding the spaces available to the research centre. The new building will no doubt be an exciting and positive development for the research activities at SKH, as will more immediately the new premises for the research centre in the so-called "T35" above subject area opera. The panel finds that the Self-Evaluation is sensitive to both the possibilities and challenges that the new building and the new RC premises provide. While not as developed in the Self-Evaluation Report as in the Self-Evaluation Seminar, the Self-Evaluation group showed awareness of long-term challenges with the new building, including the difficulty of predicting future needs as well as a requirement to address more thoroughly issues of long-term renewal and re-investments.

Both in the Report and in the Self-Evaluation Seminar, the Self-Evaluation group has thoroughly addressed the challenge of securing spaces for research activities in competition with activities at BA and MA level. Rather than relying on the new building to resolve problems of access to suitable research spaces, the group identifies the immediate (and in relation to the new building prophylactic) need to develop an all-subject time and space schedule, securing PhDs and other researchers access to specialized spaces in the subject areas. Especially in the seminar, the Self-Evaluation group also addressed the risk of isolating research activities to a dedicated centre, contributing in a negative sense to the divide or tensions between research and other, subject specific activities. Our impression is that SKH is on a good way towards improving the structural conditions for researchers.

Sub-section 5.3 presents the different support services surrounding and supporting the research at SKH. The committee's impression is that SKH researchers have access to solid research support. The institution has undertaken successful restructurings of the IT services into a central IT-department, as well as a production services into a Technical Production Department. We would also like to mention SKH's work with the Research Catalogue, where research results are

STOCKHOLM | **STOCKHOLMS**
UNIVERSITY | **KONSTNÄRLIGA**
OF THE ARTS | **HÖGSKOLA**

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

presented openly to a quantitative and qualitative extent other institutions can learn from and be inspired by. SKH clearly has worked strategically and with qualified supporting staff to achieve such a high level of research dissemination on this specific platform.

Sub-sections 5.4 and 5.5 address the need to find new avenues for funding for both PhDs and Postdoctoral researchers. Under 5.5, the Self-Evaluation group articulates an ambition to hire postdoctoral researchers that can address and fulfil specific, urgent disciplinary needs at SKH, with EDI expertise via artistic practice as example. Although we find these issues slightly off topic for this criterion, we would like to commend the Self-Evaluation group for so clearly articulating their aims for securing (and increasing) funding for these categories of positions and for setting high ambitions for the contributions especially of post docs. Further, we appreciate SKH's attention to the potentially different conditions of PhDs with different funding and to it's consistent attention to building a research environment of both PhDs and postdocs.

Under this general criterion, the Self-Evaluation group has identified three areas of development: identify alternate opportunities for funding post-doctoral researcher; upskill staff, clarifying roles and responsibilities in relation to immigration, visa and relocation issues; and develop an all-subject area time and space schedule which equally prioritizes education and research activities.

Sub-sections 5.1 and 5.2, with respect to physical infrastructures: Through the Self-Evaluation Report and the Seminar, it is the evaluation panel's impression that SKH needs to think more broadly and holistically about physical research infrastructures. Although the Self-Evaluation group was clearly aware of potential long term infrastructural challenges, we feel SKH currently lacks a plan or strategy for long-term maintenance, upgrading, and reinvestment/renewal (or phasing-out) of research infrastructures, especially after the new building is in place. Such strategy should include digital infrastructures, ensuring that SKH's research can contribute to and profit from developments within AI and machine learning, contribute to open research/open data and maintain their duties regarding cyber security.

Maintaining, upgrading and reinvesting in infrastructures are tasks and procedures that presumably will not be covered by the one-off investment in the new building. How will SKH work in order to maintain and upgrade the quality of their research infrastructures in the next decades? Who will be responsible for developing strategies or plans, and for operationalisation? We further find that issues of sustainability in relation to both the new building and existing facilities while clearly raised in the Report are relatively under-addressed.

Sub-section 5.3 with respect to support: Under Areas for development, the Self-Evaluation group specify the need to "Upskill staff, clarifying roles and responsibilities in relation to immigration, visa and relocation issues" (p. 21). This lacks context in the Report, but from the Self-Evaluation Seminar, the panel learned that it relates to specific incidents where researchers did not obtain the necessary permissions to work for SKH/in Sweden in time and were not able to

STOCKHOLM | **STOCKHOLMS**
UNIVERSITY | **KONSTNÄRLIGA**
OF THE ARTS | **HÖGSKOLA**

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

accept positions in the institution. We support the group in this assertion and encourage SKH to upskill necessary staff in order to be able to host researchers from outside Europe. This would also be an important step in the institution's work to enhance work on EDI.

We would however like to add a caveat here which is that although "internationalization" and "EDI" are not unrelated, as our comment above indicates, we believe it is important to differentiate these. We note that they are mentioned together in one priority development area. Our sense is that there is a risk here of reducing EDI to a surface or fragmentary practice, and we recommend a systematic approach that identifies EDI as a structural programme of work.

Sub-sections 5.4 and 5.5 with respect to expanding PhD funding options and Post doctorates respectively: Both under this criterion and under criterion 6 (p. 23, dance pedagogy programme), the Self-Evaluation group articulates ambitions to hire PhDs and Postdoctoral fellows to fulfil strategic or disciplinary needs or gaps in the institution. The panel questions the idea of engaging young researchers in recruitment positions to fulfil the institution's disciplinary or strategic lacunae. Such a hiring strategy is in our opinion sub-optimal. Rather than attempting to build research activity around a PhD candidate or Postdoctoral fellow, the panel recommends that PhDs and Postdocs should be embedded into existing research groups, research projects and/or identifiable research environments with regular activities that can support the work of the early career researcher. This requires a different level of strategic planning, with potential implications for hiring strategies also in the subject areas. In the panel's opinion, such a strategy of prioritisation would be more likely to create conditions of solid research structure and support.

Recommendations:

1. The panel recommends that SKH develops a strategy for acquisition, maintenance, upgrading and reinvestment (or phasing out) of research and education infrastructures, including digital infrastructures
2. The panel recommends that SKH delegates responsibility for research (and education) infrastructures to a committee or working group, with support from the administration. The committee or group should have artistic, structural and financial competency, e.g. research leader, education leader, head of workshops/tech staff, IT staff and economy advisor.
3. The panel recommends that SKH develop a strategy for PhD fellows and Postdoctoral research fellows with the aim of incorporating them into ongoing research projects, research groups or active research environments

STOCKHOLM | **STOCKHOLMS**
UNIVERSITY | **KONSTNÄRLIGA**
OF THE ARTS | **HÖGSKOLA**

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

> **6.** **that there is a close link between research and courses and study programmes in an appropriate learning environment**
>
> Description and analysis of the strengths and development areas of the research in relation to the criterion and any recommendations for appropriate development work.

The Self-Evaluation Report provides a clear expression of the importance of strengthening the links between research and education as a key development area. (pp.2-3.) In the Seminar discussion of this criterion the Self-Evaluation group identified clearly some of the different dimensions of this challenge: they noted in particular that reporting processes needed to enable the disclosure of research activity that was already bound up with the educational processes at all levels; and they noted the different programme, course and pedagogical rhythms across the different subject areas and programmes.

Within the discussions of the Self-Evaluation Report and Seminar, we as external reviewers noted that in describing initiatives for strengthening links between research and education one key strategic emphasis is placed on the researcher as the bearer of knowledge who ensures connection of education to research by being personally present across both spaces. For example, the Self-Evaluation Report indicates that: "From 2025 the profile professors will move from the RC into the two departments, they will be based in the subject area that they were recruited within. 20% of their employment will be committed to working with and through artistic research on BA and MA subject area courses and contexts." (p.22.) On the other hand, we also noted that a key issue articulated in the Self-Evaluation Seminar was that there are structural challenges with aligning the different programmes with each other because of differences in course structures, course planning process and time-lines. Understandably, these structures are not convergent because they have evolved over time responding to different local needs and specificities. However, in the Self-Evaluation Seminar the desire for some convergence and repeatable patterns in planning and implementation of courses and programmes was clearly expressed by the Self-Evaluation Report writing team. They noted that lots of resonances across education and research would be made more readily possible if there were common logistical frames (e.g., course structures and planning routines.) The importance of the new approach to planning the overall "utbildningsutbud" of SKH was also identified by the Self-Evaluation Report writing team, and we as external reviewers share this view.

The external review panel noted that it is a strength of the existing approaches that there is a clearly articulated ambition to increase connectivity between education and research and that it is a particular focus of the SKH 2024-2027 strategic plan. (p.3) It is also a clear strength that there have been measures already developed such as setting up the "co-creative" teams to actively generate strategies and practices for research and education connectivity, and also the development work on the Methods in Artistic Research (MAR) course. There is a clear track record of

giving this development agenda central priority, and a clear willingness to experiment.

One issue which we believe might be given specific attention (as already indicated above with respect to inter/trans/cross-disciplinary research) is the role of dance pedagogy and the potential of educational work that is predicated not exclusively on artistic grounds as an opportunity for re-thinking education-research linkages. We believe that the presence of a diversity of educational bases—artistic and scientific—is a potential strength for thinking about the nature and tendency of such linkages because it helps to foreground the differences between educational and research missions, so that cross-connecting these is recognized as more than a replication of research processes within educational processes. Linkage can also entail testing, disseminating and translating research insights in different registers, lexicons and frameworks. It can also entail the generation of research tasks from the educational processes because issues often arise in educational activity that may require new knowledge, and this new knowledge might need to be generated beyond the immediate setting and activity of education itself.

Recommendations:

It was noted in the Self-Evaluation Seminar that much of the research activity already embedded or immediately adjacent to educational activity is not so clearly visible as research for various reasons. This can be because reporting systems seem to favour (or indeed actually favour) output formats that are different from those that appear in the immediate orbit of educational processes. There may also be substantial research that is not formalised as such but that could find formats that are more readily reportable or amenable to capture within auditing systems. We recommend that there are some measures taken with respect to this:

1. That the reporting and tracking processes are formalised in such a way as to provide formats and incentives for reporting the research activity already embedded or immediately adjacent to educational activity.
2. That there is a simple mentoring process developed and piloted with respect to supporting teachers to formalise the disclosure of their research activities, helping them to recognise and articulate the research value of their already existing activities.
3. We were especially impressed by the potential of the new "utbildningsutbud" process to provide an opportunity for tracking both existing linkages between research and education, and also for indexing increases in the volume of linkage and interchange between education and research. We recommend that a simple tagging system could be included within the "utbildningsutbud" which would identify where a specific educational course or activity itemised in the utbud would be tagged in terms of linkage to research, with a simple coding to identify the form of the linkage, e.g., (a) the curricular content is based on recent/current research; (b) the teaching methodologies are based on recent/current research; (c) the learning activity entails doing a research activity as part of the course; (d) the course has contributed to the formulation of new

STOCKHOLM | **STOCKHOLMS**
UNIVERSITY | **KONSTNÄRLIGA**
OF THE ARTS | **HÖGSKOLA**

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

     research tasks. A simple system like this can work to establish recognition of the importance and variety of education-research connectivity by all involved students, teachers, researchers, administrators and middle-management.

4. An ancillary exercise that complements this that we also recommend is to do a simple survey of existing course plans and programme syllabi documents to identify the volume, form and tendency of references to artistic research within these formal documents. This simple exercise would serve as a simple means to benchmark current practice and identify where there may be a need or opportunity for augmenting the relation between research and education in the core conceptualisation of the educational process and outcomes.

---

7. Other

Any descriptions, analyses and values regarding, for example, internationalisation, sustainable development and gender equality.

Issues of sustainability are addressed in the report under different headings, ("Subject area, thematic and inter institutional research groups" p. 8; Equity Diversity Inclusion (EDI) p. 24) however, it is specifically gathered under this heading "Other". According to the report (p.23) sustainability encompasses, among other things, environmental and climate issues, issues of social sustainability including equal terms and widening participation, as well as issues of long-term sustainability and resilience in funding and human resources. For example, SKH is modeling an approach to sustainable travel through encouraging PhDs to commit to travelling sustainably and to prioritize sustainable practices whenever possible and is acknowledging the need to expand such practices on BA and MA levels (p.24). The self-report analysis states that "SKH is not maximising the potential of collaborative, inter-subject, cross-disciplinary efforts in this area. Clear goals and priorities need to be set, with a focus on how these issues are being addressed on all three education cycles and how the research environment can best support this." (p.24) The panel agrees with the Self Report analysis and recommends a long-term strategic framework that provides an integration for short-, mid- and long-term measures, including those already underway within the organisation.

The panel takes note of SKH's efforts in Internationalization and Equity Diversity Inclusion (EDI), and we have discussed this above under criteria 5. We strongly commend the prioritization of areas of accessibility and research environment for international and EDI researchers (p.3-4). The presence of postdoctoral positions at various international institutions as mentioned during the Self-Evaluation Seminar is an example through which their efforts manifest. We commend the prioritisation and the work being done again with the caveat that these two areas—internationalisation and EDI—not be conflated. Internationalisation is mentioned in the report in a unidirectional manner, addressing international staff and students coming to SKH, rather than staff and students going abroad. Based on what the

STOCKHOLM | STOCKHOLMS
UNIVERSITY | KONSTNÄRLIGA
OF THE ARTS | HÖGSKOLA

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

panel learned about the success of SKH with International Post Doc Positions during the Self-Evaluation Seminar, there is a strong incentive to re-evaluate SKH's perspective on internationalisation by highlighting existing international partnerships and promoting a two-way vision of internationalisation.

While "Swedish gender law does not account for gender non-binary recruitment and representation" as stated in the report (p.24), SKH's efforts to transcend the gender binary while working within the legislative framework is admirable and progressive. This positions SKH as a leading force for gender equality that could set a strong example for other institutions. In the address to EDI, we note that this is framed through reference to individual research projects and courses, such as "A Season of Black Study I & II" as curated by John Paul Zaccarini through the Swedish Research Council funded project Future Brown Space" and the "Climate-Just Worldings" research project, rather than through structural measures as indicated in relation to the wish to transcend the gender binary. The panel commends SKH for articulating its concerns around EDI and recommends that this be approached also as a structural issue that pervades all priority areas such as hiring, curriculum, research agenda setting, utilisation of research results and societal engagement.

The panel notes that there is often a people-focused thematization of issues (e.g., "Professors embody the link between research and education" p. 3), as opposed to one based on systems, strategies, or material, which in many areas is a crucial complementary to people-centric approaches.

Recommendations:

1. The panel recommends anchoring work on sustainability in research practices by continuing and expanding thematic connections between artistic research and questions of sustainability: further develop relations with relevant, interdisciplinary research (e.g. NAVET, ISDRS); joining international conversations and networks, e.g. through becoming partner of the New European Bauhaus initiative, connecting to or initiating new COST Actions or developing projects eligible for allocation from climate research funding programs.

2. The panel recommends a two-way prioritisation of internationalisation that gives equal priority to SKH students and researchers going abroad, building upon the existing success of SKH in securing international postdocs for its graduates, and suggests that ERASMUS and ERASMUS+ funding may be a useful resource in this regard.

3. The panel suggests experimenting with the formulation of requiring "two genders" rather than "both genders" when appointing supervisors, committee members etc.

4. We recommend, as the Self-Evaluation group already has indicated as desirable in the Seminar discussion, that there is development and implementation of an SKH-wide applicable EDI policy and strategy that works in conjunction with specific local initiatives such as those identified above.

5. In general, we recommend a complementary approach, employing both
    people-centric and strategic organisation-wide approaches in addressing
    each of the developmental priorities identified in the Self-Evaluation
    Report.

8. Other comments from the assessment group

We have been able to address all issues within the headings provided.

9. Overall assessment

The assessment group should summarise below in a clear and concise manner
its previously expressed considerations and positions, and summarise its
previously expressed proposals for action. The summary judgement should
also provide feedback on good practices and areas for development.

In the panel's opinion SKH has demonstrated a robust and systematic approach to
self-assessment and has clearly articulated existing strengths and developmental
priorities. In the opening paragraphs of the introduction above we have summarised
these strengths and developmental areas. Here, we would like to underline that
SKH's research has deservedly achieved international recognition for its
contribution and excellence by international peers, in a way that speaks to a
successful arc of original and imaginative development and invention, rooted in a
challenging, ambitious and far-sighted organisational merger. SKH continues to
attract researchers and educators of the highest calibre and is a pivotally important
institutional locus for the artistic research sector nationally and internationally
providing exemplary thought leadership to the wider sector. In summarising our
overall assessment, we have identified some specific areas for development that we
would like to foreground. These speak both to the experimentation and excellence
of SKH's work to date and the formidable challenges that innovative artistic
research faces in rapidly changing wider societal, environmental, political,
economic and cultural conditions.

With respect to the quality review process itself we recognize the rigour and
authenticity of SKH's approach to the Self-Evaluation process. We have three
recommendations with respect to future iterations of external review which are: (i)
to include site visit as part of the process; (ii) to include consideration of specific
research tasks and outcomes within the process, based on the reasoning indicated
above in the Introduction; and (iii) to more fully articulate the specific agency and
expectations on the doctoral candidates' within the review process and the self-
report.

With respect to the question of research ethics we recommend developing an
approach which does not treat artistic research or artistic practices as spaces of
exclusively individuated judgement or of radical ethical exceptionalism (while we

STOCKHOLM | **STOCKHOLMS**
UNIVERSITY | **KONSTNÄRLIGA**
OF THE ARTS | **HÖGSKOLA**

Ref. no.
SKH 2024/676/1.3.2

recognise this is a contested area). In tandem with this, we recommend continuing your critical approach and considered resistance to the blanket imposition of paradigms of research ethics from other disciplines whether biomedical or social-scientific as normative for research in general. We would recommend further developing your collegial approach that includes specific group teaching and learning with respect to current research ethics debates and challenges, so that your critical relationship with norms being imposed from other domains is fully articulated within the learning process rather than becoming simply a default setting in the cultural attitudes of the early-stage researcher. Further, we recommend developing an institution-wide strategic approach that places the emphasis on building research ethics capacities and frameworks across several registers at once: individual, group and organisational.

With respect to external research funding, we commend the track record of substantial funding success, especially with respect to national research funding opportunities. We would recommend that a systematic analysis and actioning of European research funding opportunities (e.g., HORIZON) be built into the annual planning and review cycle, building upon the already existing national success. We propose that it may be possible to do this in such a way as to develop a pipeline approach that places individual initiative (to make research project applications) within a strategic framework that can manage the volatility and unpredictability of funding wins, so that application development continues regardless of success or not. We also recommend that research project applications should in themselves be recognized as important research outputs, again regardless of actual outcome.

With respect to many areas discussed above (reporting and planning research; recruitment processes; the linkages of education and research) we commend such institution-wide coordination measures as the new "utbildningsutbud" process which we believe might serve as a demonstrator of the value of integrated and convergent planning tools. We would recommend continuing with this strategic approach that enables systemic convergence and interaction across subjects. We note that research development was the key site for enabling the coming together of the historic institutions that have combined to create the rich ecology of SKH. We note that this has placed an extra organisational demand on research to provide a connective tissue for SKH's rich multiplicity. We believe that the success of the four profile areas—Concept & Composition; Bodily & Vocal Practices; Art, Technology & Materiality; Site, Event, Encounter—in providing a means for cross/inter/transdisciplinary work to blossom, would be further reinforced and augmented by an operational convergence in course and programme structures and planning routines in the education space that also worked in tandem with this thematization of cross-subject research and education activities.

With respect to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion (EDI), we note that SKH is articulating a substantial ambition to innovate in addressing these issues and commend the expression of this within the report. We see it as a very positive thing that this EDI agenda is being foregrounded in the discussion of different dimensions of the SKH's work (e.g., A Season of Black Study I & II) providing an important space

for discourse around EDI. Our recommendation, which we think partly echoes what is being indicated already by the Self-Evaluation Report and Seminar, is that this EDI agenda and ethos (currently under profound attack elsewhere in the world) should be anchored as a core mission principle that is tracked through all the different registers of the organisation's work. We see a risk that it could become a space of symptomatic action if there is not a deeply embedded and strategically articulated approach that is placed at the same fundamental level as SKH's commendable approach to make artistic practice the beating heart of its research. In a similar way, we would recommend that given the expressed desires in the Self-Evaluation Report, SKH consider adopting Equity, Diversity, Inclusion explicitly as the beating heart of its organisational culture and ethos. We believe SKH has the potential to give sectoral leadership on this issue, at a time when this agenda is vulnerable in many ways.

With respect to the theme of sustainability, the panel recognises the work already underway in this regard at SKH and recommends anchoring this work on sustainability further in research practices by continuing and expanding thematic connections between artistic research and questions of sustainability. Additionally, we recommend that this theme is integrally addressed with respect to the new building project and the longer arc of sustainability planning that the new infrastructure will require.

Finally, the panel would like to express its gratitude to the academic and administrative colleagues of SKH for creating a clear, systematic and robust process, and for giving us an opportunity to learn from the exceptional, dynamic and exuberant research milieu that has been created in SKH. We are confident that there is a bright future ahead for this research environment and that it will continue to yield exciting, challenging and unique research, a beacon for all those interested in artistic research as an essential and vital element in the life of twenty-first century society.

Mandatory annexes

Compilation of key figures for research for the last five years.