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Introduction

In the university world, the financial allocations for research are increasingly dependent on bibliometric indicators of faculty publications registered in databases and repositories. Following a decision by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Gothenburg, the allocation of faculty research resources, should from the budget year 2012 partly be based on bibliometric indicators and partly on external funds. Each faculty has had to develop and formulate their bibliometric indicators in a way that best reflects their specific subject field and their publishing culture. The Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts has, beside traditional publications, also decided to focus on the unique excellence that characterizes its field, i.e. artistic works.

We will show how it was made possible to use a bibliometric indicator also in assessing art works and how a workflow using the institutional repository as a platform was tried out in practice.

Since the research projects and the art works produced within the faculty are part of Swedish and international cultural history, the possibility for researchers, artists, employers and the public to be able to search and access this information, is an important aspect. Artistic research and practice, produced within the University, will be visible open access through the institutional repository. The collection could in the future serve as a source for research.

The University of Gothenburg

The University of Gothenburg is one of the major universities in northern Europe with approximately 38,000 students. The University consists of approximately 40 different departments covering most scientific disciplines.

The Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts offers undergraduate, master’s and doctoral education, and also conducts research and artistic development work within disciplines such as film directing, photography, music, drama, design, crafts, fine arts, and literary composition.

The Faculty is in the process of reorganization, and from the 1\textsuperscript{st} of July 2012 will be organized into three new institutions, one for music and drama, one for design and crafts, and one for fine art together with photography, film and literary composition.

In Sweden the situation for art institutions is not uniform. Some faculties of fine art, music and
theatre are part of larger universities, while some are autonomous schools, however, with a university status.
In Gothenburg the art institutions have been part of the University since 1977, and they have had to follow the same guiding principles as those adopted by other institutions.

Gothenburg University Library

Gothenburg University Library is an integrated part of the University of Gothenburg. The Library Director works directly under the Vice-Chancellor of the University. There are eight libraries and two learning centres, which together constitute Gothenburg University Library. The number of staff totals around 190 individuals. The Art Library (devoted to art, crafts, design, and photo) and the Music and Drama Library serve the Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts. Apart from the physical libraries there is also the Digital Services department, which handles coordination and development of the library web site, e-journals, e-books, subject databases, digitization and IT as well as systems development. The Digital Services department operates and develops two systems for electronic publishing. It also works with related services such as Open Access and bibliometrics.

In this project, staff from Digital Services has worked in close collaboration with staff from the Art Library and the Music and Drama Library.

The repository GUPEA and publication database GUP

Gothenburg University Library provides two databases for scientific publications. GUP (Gothenburg University Publications)¹ is a bibliographic database for registration of scientific publications by researchers at the University. Through a decision by the Vice-Chancellor in 2007, all researchers at the University are required to register their scientific publications in GUP every year. The software for GUP is Scigloo, an open source software, developed in-house in joint collaboration with Chalmers University of Technology.²

GUPEA (Gothenburg University Publications Electronic Archive)³ is the institutional repository for e-publishing of various publications including doctoral dissertations, research reports, student theses and learning material. The software for GUPEA is DSpace, the open source software initially developed by MIT and maintained by the DuraSpace organization.⁴

Both GUP and GUPEA were implemented at the University Library in 2005, and is maintained and developed by the Digital Services department. GUP contains, as of April 2012, approximately 60,000 references to scholarly publications from the University of Gothenburg, dating back to 2004. GUPEA, at the same time, holds approximately 16,500 records with full text, about half of these being student theses.

¹ http://gup.ub.gu.se/
² http://www.scigloo.org/
³ http://gupea.ub.gu.se/
⁴ http://www.dspace.org/, http://www.duraspace.org/
The publication database GUP also provides source data for the bibliometric part of the yearly faculty resource allocation. In the case of artistic works from the Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts, the process and workflow also involve the repository GUPEA.

**Background and purpose**

In accordance with the above mentioned request for all faculties to formulate a bibliometric indicator, the dean of The Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts commissioned a working group in January 2011 to deal with the bibliometric issues and to suggest an indicator for the artistic works, as well as for the scientific publications produced at the faculty. The group consisted of researchers and administrators from the faculty as well as a library representative.

A proposal was presented and accepted by the Vice-Chancellor in May 2011.

It was evident that a platform for handling the artistic works for the quality assessment and bibliometric process, was needed. The institutional repository GUPEA was seen as the most natural choice. With that decision, a collaboration with the Digital services department at the University Library started.

**Similar projects**

When starting our work we looked at different projects within the field, nationally and internationally.

The National Library of Sweden has for many years been promoting different Open Access projects in their program openaccess.se. In 2009, Sofia Arvidsson and Karin Süld at the University of Borås, presented a pilot study, within the Open Access program, for handling complex digital objects in open archives with reference to research in art and design. (Süld & Arvidsson, 2009)

In 2010, Stefan Andersson at Uppsala University, Per Larsson and Katarina Nordling, both at the University of Borås, further developed this work. (Andersson et al, 2010).

In the meantime a somewhat similar project, JAR (Journal of Artistic Research), had developed together with RC (Research Catalogue). JAR is an international, online, Open Access and peer-reviewed journal for the identification, publication and dissemination of artistic research and its methodologies, from all arts disciplines. JAR is underpinned by the Research Catalogue (RC) which is a searchable, documentary database of artistic research. Anyone can compose an exposition and add it to the RC using the online editor. Suitable expositions can be submitted to the editorial board for peer-review and publication in JAR.

The third project taken into account was the KULTUR Project, developed at the University of

---

5 [http://www.jar-online.net/](http://www.jar-online.net/)

6 [http://www.researchcatalogue.net/](http://www.researchcatalogue.net/)

7 [http://kultur.eprints.org/](http://kultur.eprints.org/)
Southampton and implemented at the University of the Arts, London, in the UAL Research Online.\(^8\)

**Bibliometric indicator**

The Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts has developed a system of ranking their publications, including artistic works, based on traditions within the humanities, social sciences and arts. The artistic works can qualify to one of two quality levels.

**Ranking scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artistic work – refereed</th>
<th>5p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book - national or international publisher</td>
<td>5p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article – refereed</td>
<td>3p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference paper – refereed</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic work</td>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter - national or international publisher</td>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research review</td>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality assessment**

The peer review process has been thoroughly discussed. One way of assessing the quality of art is judging the quality of the channels, where the art has been shown, performed or published, e.g. art halls, galleries, concert halls, and theatres. In the humanities and social sciences, this way of judging the channels or the publishers is an established bibliometric model, the so-called Norwegian model.\(^9\) To evaluate new experimental art, not shown in the established channels, could, however, be a challenge. Who is competent of making assessments in this field? Only peers who do the same kind of art? These are important things to be considered and to be aware of in the review process. It was decided to let a group of artists/experts from the faculty do the reviewing at this stage. The peer review process, however, starts before depositing the work into the repository. A preliminary quality assessment is made by the head of the institution or by the person responsible for a specific subject area. Only works with a basic qualitative level should be deposited for review. After the deposit, the peer review group examines the works and makes the final assessment. If needed, external experts are consulted. The work of the peer review group will in turn be supervised and evaluated by external experts for the sake of quality assurance.

Certain criteria have to be fulfilled for an artistic work to qualify for the highest score, 5 points. The work should have a high artistic level internationally and/or make an original contribution to the artistic knowledge field.

\(^8\) [http://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/](http://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/)

\(^9\) [http://dbh.nsd.uib.no/dokumentasjon/publisering/](http://dbh.nsd.uib.no/dokumentasjon/publisering/)
The following important parts should be documented in the registering process in the repository, GUPEA:

- The question or problem being the ground or basis for the work.
- The context/relation of the work to other relevant works of art, or the dialogue with or distance from/to other works of art.
- The context/place of the show.
- Documentation of the work (e.g. the different pieces included in an exhibition).
- Documentation of the show (e.g. pictures of the environment where the exhibition/performance is shown).
- Documentation of the reactions to the work (e.g. reviews, debate articles).

It is important that as many digital files as are needed to give a good representation of the work are uploaded to the repository. These can be in any format, and will be available Open Access. In the referee process there could be recommendations to the artist to change certain aspects of the work. Works fulfilling the criteria get the higher ranking.

**Metadata**

We adopted a pragmatic approach to the question of metadata. Art works are complex objects, as the previous projects mentioned have shown. For example, an art work can be an exhibition or a performance, with multiple digital files representing the work, in various media types (audio, video, images, etc.). The complexity is a challenge for institutional repositories, which mainly have been developed for text-based documents. The relations between parts in the work, roles that persons may have, and not least the context of the work, are other complex factors.

The KULTUR project in the UK developed metadata in a large part through online surveys and interviews, with different stakeholders, including practicing artists and researchers (Sheppard, 2009, White & Hemnings, 2010), while the Swedish projects approached the matter by examining existing metadata models (Sûld & Arvidsson, 2009, Andersson et al 2010). Our project has focused on the needs of the reviewers, since that is the main purpose of depositing the art works. The primary question has been: What information is needed to be able to review the work? This meant that questions of interoperability were not regarded as a high priority. The faculty working group wanted metadata that would give a full and rich description of the works, specifically to capture their intellectual context, as discussed above (see “Peer review”). The metadata process finally led to a somewhat simpler metadata schema than originally envisioned, due to practical circumstances such as a very fixed deadline.

The decision was made to choose just one publication type, “Artistic work” (in Swedish “Konstnärligt arbete”), to cover all possible art manifestations. An important field is “Description of the project”, where the artist/researcher should present in length the grounds and context for the work. This is viewed as crucial information for the evaluation. The initial round of deposits shows that the amount of information provided in this field (where you can also choose to upload a pdf file), varies considerably. It is possible that a further revision of metadata will be made, if it is deemed that
important aspects of the works are not being captured. Also the question of interoperability and standardization probably could be taken more into account.

The workflow

The original intention was to let the researchers deposit the works into the repository themselves, supported by three appointed librarians at the Art Library and Music and Drama Library. However, after discussing the process in more detail, the working group decided, for the sake of efficiency, to let the librarians do the actual deposit, at least in the first year. Time and resources, which otherwise would have been spent on educating approximately 100 researchers how to deposit, could now be saved, and the faculty could focus on informing the researchers about the peer review process. The researchers still had to submit their works and the descriptive metadata to the librarians. A guide was created, providing information on the type of data, which had to accompany the digital files. After that, the deposition of files and metadata into GUPEA was done. In total, 72 works of art were deposited in this first process, taking place during January and February 2012. Everything worked fairly well, but sometimes the information/metadata was too poor and the researchers had to be asked for additional information. There were also variations on the level of information provided in the field “Description of the project”. Some researchers had long, detailed lines of reasoning, whereas others had much shorter contributions. This metadata field is very important for the understanding of the intellectual context of the work and there are currently plans to produce more elaborate instructions for the researchers, regarding what information is needed. A large part of the works are also represented by various digital files, mostly images.

Six departments are represented: The Academy of Music and Drama, The School of Design and Crafts, Valand School of Fine Arts, School of Photography, and The School of Film Directing and Literary Composition. The registered works are mainly exhibitions (installations, public art, social interventions etc.), design projects, compositions, shows and books (photography, translations/interpretations, essays, etc.) Curating or producing an exhibition is also counted as an artistic work. There are many interesting examples of contributions to the archive, like Esther Shalev-Gertz (The last click), Jane Philbrick (The expanded field) from Valand School of Fine Arts, Annika von Hausswolff (Overhaul) and Per L-B Nilsson (An Irish Odyssey) from the School of Photography, and Birgitta Nordström (I sin linda) from the School of Design and Crafts, just to mention a few.

Another thing that was discussed during the project but not acted upon, was the visual aspect of the repository. Everybody agreed that it would be highly desirable to have an attractive interface design, since artists most likely are sensitive to this aspect. (Gray, 2009) The main purpose of the project, however, had to do with the quality assessment and bibliometrics, and there were no resources to improve the visual design of the repository at this stage. We hope to be able to deal with this issue in the future.

After deposit into GUPEA, and when the review process is finished, the records are imported into GUP, the publication database. The records are entered either as “Artistic work – refereed”

---

10 Gray discusses this in relation to the KULTUR project.
(generating 5 bibliometric points) or “Artistic work” (generating 1 point). The records in GUP contain less metadata and no digital files but provide a handle link to GUPEA where the work is more fully represented.

This concludes the workflow. The records in GUP are now available for the bibliometric process providing basis for the university budget procedure.

Final remarks

What will happen next? As mentioned, the Faculty will let external experts evaluate the review process on a recurring basis. The Faculty Dean has decided to appoint a specific person in all three departments, to be responsible for department deposits. This is a key factor in the future procedure. It is our belief that the faculty and the departments have the main responsibility for making researchers supply their works. However, the actual deposit into the repository is probably best handled by librarians once the researchers have handed over the files and the necessary information. The artists and researchers know their work and we, as librarians, know our systems and repositories. But the division of work between the Faculty and the University Library should perhaps be more formalized once the workflow is more settled. This first year has been one of testing the system and establishing a provisional workflow, and in all likelihood some adjustments will be made.
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