What should be the goals and priorities for artistic research outputs?

What is the goal of the research? 'For' the research (development of knowledge and understanding) or 'for' the student's artistic development?

Must the artistic process always take second place to the development of the research? Is it just incidental to the research process? Should practice not be guiding instead of following? (Depends where you are?)

Is it possible to conceive of artistic research without artistic development?

1. **Does the quality of the artistic material affect the validity of the artistic research argument, and how should we assess this artistic quality?**

Could bad art produce good research? (Are we producing 'research-art'?)

Assessment of the artistic value/validity of the output? How does the artistic validity influence the research validity?

Quality of art and the quality of the research – what's the connection?

Relationship between artistic criteria and research criteria?

What's the connection with the 'real world' – how do we connect with those outside academia?

How to we avoid the 'marble staircase to the shack'? How does this factor into evaluation of PhD, especially with respect to artistic outcomes in other contexts? And why is it difficult to discuss this?

How do we prevent an artistic research project becoming a scientific project? (slide into musicology)

Do we need to define quality for artistic research (our criteria? As compared with a viewpoint from other paradigms) Relationship between artistic development criteria and research criteria?

Should we have different criteria for 'creators' as opposed to 'reproducers'?

2. **How should we approach the review, peer review and assessment of artistic research outputs?**

What to do with an output that doesn't fit our models of evaluation? (What is quality? And in relationship with the market?)

Who are the peers for artistic research? (And how do we move from colleagues (individuals) to 'peers' (suggests a community of understanding/practice)?) Implication of peer review in established research disciplines.

When should peer review enter the research process? (Not just duplicating science – and not dependent on quantity, but on quality)

Does artistic research refer only to scientific models of evaluation? (i.e. corresponding to fixed models) Do we need to imagine a different?

How can we create a climate in which artistic experimentation can be discussed? (Are words not essential?)

3. **Making a difference in the world: the relevance and impact of artistic research outputs**

Is the evaluation of the project dependent on the contribution it can make to ideas of what art can do? (relation to our students' development)

Spin-offs from research outputs (e.g. from the thesis comes the book) – how can we be creative in reshaping research outputs in new ways that have an impact outside the research? (KE, impact)

Challenge vs. confirmation? The avant-garde function, especially within typical conservatoire education. How to keep a balance?

4. **How may we develop discursivity in artistic research?**

What is the relationship between words and music? How does it function?

How can we use words to strengthen and reinforce the artistic output?

Do we need to set words to our results? Is a commentary necessary?

How can we raise questions without words? How can we reflect without words?

What can you say in words? What can you not say in words?

What is the difference between a performance (an artwork) and an output of artistic research?

5. **'The medium is the message': what forms should the outputs of artistic research take?**

Does it (always) need to be a performance and a thesis? Other formats such as DVD? (Link to stakeholders, clients)

Do we have to find forms of output that illustrate the fertility of the process rather than summarising the results?

Should our outputs model the experimental process by avoiding standard forms?