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Executive summary

1. Introduction
This report was commissioned by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (Leadership Foundation), Arts Council England (ACE) and the Cultural Leadership Programme (CLP). It examines the landscape of collaborations between higher education institutions (HEIs), and arts, cultural and creative organisations in both the public and private sectors, and looks to the potential of those collaborations for the future. In doing so, it draws on the leadership literature in both the higher education and cultural sectors, and in particular on work on the leadership of collaborations; identifies the types of collaborations undertaken; examines a number of case studies as examples of good practice; and considers opinions about the nature of these collaborations in general, as articulated by a number of prominent individuals from both sectors involved. It is intended to be of interest to practitioners, policymakers and funders.

2. Approach
This report draws on the policy literature on HEIs’ knowledge transfer, the literature on collaboration and knowledge transfer within the arts and cultural sector, and the literature on leadership and the management of collaborations.

In order to convey the range of partnerships being forged between HEIs and arts and cultural organisations, our research explores the range and nature of collaborations that have been undertaken and are currently in train. We have selected 60 snapshots that present a geographical spread, include examples of collaborations at different stages of completion, reflect different scales of funding and different cultural forms, and involve a range of partners. These snapshots include collaborations based on relatively formal, institutional partnerships as well as those that depend on more informal, personal relationships. They explore a range of interests that include concerns with regeneration, economic development and graduate retention, as well as those focused on widening participation, research, consultancy, professional development, business collaboration, supporting cultural resources and events, and strengthening HEIs’ offers.

In developing the report, it was decided to focus on five case studies that seemed to this project’s steering committee to offer examples of good practice as well as proposing particular lessons about the leadership of collaborations and keys to the future potential of such partnerships. The case studies are based on interviews with people directly involved, and where possible we have also referred to third-party evaluations.

A number of other collaborations are also referred to in the report in order to illustrate specific points.

3. Background
To date, a number of factors have influenced the burgeoning of collaborations between HEIs and arts and cultural organisations. These include:

- Various policy initiatives have driven universities’ increased involvement in economic development, which the government identifies as ‘critically important to the future of this country’, not least in terms of its ‘knowledge economy’.
- The arrangements Her Majesty’s Treasury has made for a research system capable of delivering the government’s ambitions for economic growth and improved public services include the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF), while UK Research Councils continue to develop a portfolio of knowledge-transfer and exchange activities that embrace interactions between the research base and the user community.
- Beyond generating employment in the cultural sector, many policymakers believe that creativity has a wider role in driving innovation in the broader economy. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport et al strategy for the creative industries, Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy, has a strong focus on the production of talent, education, skills training and (to a lesser extent) the labour market. Increased links between small firms and HEIs and the extension of multidisciplinary ‘centres of creativity and innovation’ across the UK are considered highly desirable, and our case studies include projects specifically dedicated to this.
- The cultural sector has also been promoting collaboration. ACE’s strategy for higher education explicitly highlighted its interest in supporting HEIs to engage with other partners, to conduct audits of their current and potential cultural contributions to the communities they serve, and to establish ‘cultural footprints’ as a prelude to developing their own arts strategies and cultivating formal partnership agreements with ACE itself.

4. Collaborations and leadership
There is presently a drive to assess leadership in both the cultural sector and in higher education (and in the third sector generally), and many of the leadership issues they face are similar.

---

1. The term knowledge economy has been popular with policymakers from the 1990s onwards. For a discussion of how policymakers understand this term see DTI (1998).
2. HM Treasury 2004
3. DCMS et al 2008
4. ACE 2006a
The shared issues that are of particular relevance to our case studies include a tradition of learning on the job; strong professional identification and weaker institutional identification; and the fact that the sectors comprise large numbers of very small organisations (or, as is often the case in higher education, small teams within the larger organisations). Common challenges include the lack of time and space needed to develop professional leadership, the need for leaders to engage with those beyond their own professions and a prevailing suspicion of managerialism on the part of academics and cultural-sector workers.

However, partnerships between HEIs and the cultural sector seem to offer a model of collaborative or distributed leadership that allays some of the suspicions of more individualistic models, allowing both partners to pursue avenues of interest and opening up opportunities for newer, younger leaders to gain experience. Indeed, we could argue that some who are wary of leadership within organisations are more comfortable with the notion of collaborative leadership, and that a healthy model of collaborative leadership is developing.

Of course, collaborative leadership per se is not without challenges. Many of the collaborations that we studied simply came into being, leaving fundamental issues of leadership and further discussions about joint aims and understandings for later. This can be productive in the short or medium term, but it can also raise questions about the long-term sustainability of collaborations.

Much of the literature on cultural leadership, particularly that produced by funding and policy bodies, focuses on the pragmatics of generating leaders and individual leadership styles. However, for the purposes of this report, which is specifically about collaborations, the literature on individual leadership was less appropriate than that which considers leadership as an emergent property of a group or network. Given the increasing emphasis on partnerships in the higher education and arts and cultural sectors, future leadership training might do well to reflect this.

5. Observations from the case studies and selected snapshots

Several trends emerged after a thorough review of the case studies and selected snapshots.

The projects outlined in the case studies and snapshots responded to a wide range of motivations, opportunities and impetuses. As examples of good practice, they exemplify the future potential of such collaborations. They were often motivated by the desire to undertake specific research; to create, maintain and support new cultural venues and public spaces; to support strategic cultural-sector developments and improve the potential for graduate retention in the region; or to provide professional development. Each case study addressed a perceived gap in its particular market.

This also means that during the course of collaboration different people took positional leadership places as the need arose; the essentially non-hierarchical nature of most of the highlighted collaborations allowed for this. The legitimacy to lead was conferred, often because of expertise or the ability to carry things forward at a particular moment. Conversely, formal titles did not always translate into successful positional leadership.

Interviewees regarded the nature of partnerships in very different ways: some comprised professional teams brought together for a specific purpose; others emerged from long-standing relationships; still others identified their funders as collaborators.

Key to the success of many of these partnerships is the development of trust by the partners over a long time. The literature suggests that trust is often identified as one of the most important factors in inter-organisational relations, and although in some cases it arises almost naturally as an aspect of long-term personal relationships, even more formal partnerships –Channel M (Case Study 4. page 44) would be one such example – demonstrate that each time an outcome meets expectations, trusting attitudes are reinforced. In this example and in other case studies, this trust encouraged partners to ‘just get on with it’, in the words of one respondent.

Finally, many of the case study partners regarded leadership and management activities as purely pragmatic functions, which often involved fundraising, driving the collaboration or research primacy. Interviewees tended not to distinguish between management and leadership, and used the terms interchangeably.

6. Key issues identified by this report

The wider implications of this report fall into four areas: knowledge transfer and exchange; facilitating innovation; measuring collaboration; and models of leadership. We have identified these areas as crucial to the future potential of higher education / cultural sector collaborations.

We explored a considerable number of collaborations between HEIs (of all varieties) and cultural organisations. The perception that knowledge transfer in the arts and humanities is lagging behind science and technology, at least in terms of the sheer amount of activity, does not reflect the reality.

However, academics in the arts and humanities do not always consider their external engagements to constitute
knowledge transfer. Their activities may be considered part of the so-called 'gift economy' that characterises much informal collaboration, and outside the formal mechanisms used to record and measure more monetised or formal knowledge transfer.

The collaborations detailed in our case studies were driven by a mix of personal enthusiasms and institutional needs, and suggested that ideas do not have to be monetised to stimulate a sense of ownership.

It has been argued that a key policy aim should be to encourage interaction between different disciplines and between academics and practitioners, and to create spaces in which interactions can take place rather than focusing on specific outputs. Certainly, many of the collaborations that we observed facilitate innovation, and create places where ideas can flourish. In these instances, collaborations are not merely one-off projects, but sites for a series of potential activities. But such interpretive public spaces, which include universities as well cultural organisations, do not grow up naturally in market economies. Interviewees suggested that while many more collaborations would like to fulfil this function, the funding for such spaces is increasingly difficult as public funding is increasingly committed to specific projects with measurable outputs. Collaborations that devote resources to being interpretive public spaces are in particular need of being supported. But being subject to inappropriate measurement for the purposes of legitimation could damage the fragile ecology of collaborative activity.

We observed that arts and humanities collaborations tended to be prompted by HEIs. By comparison, their partner arts and cultural organisations were often relatively small, under-funded, less well connected and lacking the formal incentives to pursue such relationships. These differences determined power relationships within collaborations, and cultural organisations were not always able to engage on equal terms. With respect to measuring collaborations, success is often perceived in relation to replication. Yet the embedding of successful collaborations within a network of relationships, often tied to a specific place, means that it is sometimes difficult to transfer, or duplicate, successful projects in other contexts. Using repeat business as a measure may be inappropriate.

With regard to leadership, as mentioned previously, the leadership model most evident in our case studies was that of collaborative leadership. However, this trend, perhaps surprisingly, occasionally co-existed alongside more individualistic, charismatic models. The distribution of collaborative leadership was entirely in keeping with the emphasis on informal, even conversational, aspects of collaborations. In these cases, leadership was not so much vested in a person or a position, but in a relationship based on trust, obligation and commitment.

The culture of academics is, if anything, distrustful of overt organisational leadership. This appears to be partly about not wanting to swap their professional expertise for what is perceived as the more banal role of management, but also about a more deep-seated resistance to the language of leadership. The collaborative projects that we examined offered those academics a way forward without making them feel that they were compromising their professional expertise.

In terms of encouraging collaborations between the cultural sector and academia, it may be that the attempts to strengthen the leadership of such partnerships should focus less on individuals and more on asserting the particular needs of the overall ecology within which the collaborations take place. That ecology is less healthy now than it was when this research began over a year ago. The recession and the prospect of tighter public spending in the coming years have considerable implications for leadership in higher education and the cultural sector and for collaborations between them.
1. Introduction

At its simplest, knowledge transfer is about starting a conversation. This may be with a colleague from a university or a chance meeting with a researcher at a professional seminar you have attended. As in all conversations, knowledge transfer is a two way process.

It’s about being open to learning from others as well as sharing your ideas and experiences.

(Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) London, 2008: Methodology, 5)

In the light of increasing interest in the role that universities are playing, and can play, in wider economic development, this report – which is commissioned by the LFHE, ACE and the CLP – examines the landscape and history of collaborations between HEIs and arts, cultural and creative organisations in both the public and private sectors. The study gives examples of good practice that highlight the future potential of such collaborations and is intended to be of interest to practitioners, policymakers and funders.

Any historical account of the collaborations between HEIs and arts and cultural organisations would need to go back to the 1836 report of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, which established the Government School of Design in the hope of improving Britain’s economic performance in arts, manufacture and design. Given the focus of the present report on higher education and arts and culture collaborations, it is significant that a major feature of the Government School of Design plans was a museum.

It is outside the remit of this report to present a full history of interactions between higher education and cultural organisations, but it is worth noting that 160 years later, as a result of various reforms (including the change in the status of the former polytechnics and arts schools) and the significance now attached to the creative economy, the government’s expectations about what universities should deliver have much in common with the aims and objectives of the 1836 Select Committee. Contributing to economic prosperity, nurturing skills development and offering professional training are all on the current agendas of HEIs.

Over the past decade, the cultural sector has increasingly recognised that it should be working with academics. DCMS’s 2003 research strategy, for example, acknowledged the potential for working in partnership with the primary government-funded higher education funding councils that support cultural research in England, the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), in order to extend the department’s capacity to develop ‘evidence-based policy’. It also acknowledged that it should draw on the resources of the wider research community.

Recently, HEIs have increasingly promoted their contribution to the cultural life of the country, demonstrating the fact that they provide substantial cultural resources for their communities. The North West Universities Association’s report, The Contribution of the North West Higher Education Institutions to Cultural Life in England’s North West, highlights precisely that.

Few initiatives – at either national or local level – have sought to explicitly encourage collaborations between the two sectors. The AHRC’s funding of collaborative PhDs is an exception. Also, the ESRC’s Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change, which brings together the University of Manchester and Open University, was funded through the HEIF 2 initiative, to broker closer links between Manchester’s cultural institutions and the university and to generate insights into how academic interventions can usefully aid the activities and strategies of cultural institutions.

However, a number of other initiatives have implicitly promoted partnership work. These include AHRC’s recognition of a number of Independent Research Organisations; the Times Higher Education awards for excellence and innovation in the arts, which recognise the collaborative and interdisciplinary work that is taking place in universities to promote the arts; and ACE’s strategy for higher education.

Few publications have explored existing collaborations between the two sectors. Those that we identified were exclusively focused on the North West. These include a coordinated mapping exercise amongst staff at the National Museums Liverpool and University of Liverpool in 2005 which identified a number of areas in which colleagues were already collaborating and recognised other possibilities for
collaborating across research, publications and exhibitions development. A subsequent publication maps Liverpool’s arts and cultural sectors’ partnerships with HEIs. Other research commissioned by Arts Council England North West (ACE NW) together with Renaissance North West and the North West Universities Association covers similar territory to that of the present report. Shared Interest: Developing Collaboration, Partnerships and Research Relationships between Higher Education, Museums, Galleries and Visual Arts Organisations in the North West explores the relationships established between HEIs and museums, galleries and visual arts organisations in the North West, and considers how such collaborations can be strengthened and what can be learnt from them.

Within the context of policies focused on HEIs’ contribution to the national economy, such collaborations are often couched in terms of knowledge transfer. There has, however, always been some concern that models of knowledge transfer and collaboration are drawn largely from science and technology, which do not adequately reflect the workings of the cultural sector. Despite their exceptional, rather than replicable, nature, policymakers’ desire to reproduce the success of high-technology regions such as Silicon Valley has led to an emphasis on formal knowledge transfer activities based around universities’ science and engineering departments, and an initial concentration on spin-off and start-up firms.

Although science and technology have remained the centre of attention of many knowledge transfer initiatives, it has recently been argued that we need a more nuanced and contextualised understanding of the role that universities play in regional economic development, particularly in relation to the arts and humanities. Critics claim that the focus on formal knowledge transfer often underestimates the importance of existing, often dense, sets of relationships between practice and education in the cultural sector, but it may also overestimate the ability of often very small organisations to collaborate with (relatively) large HEIs.

The difficulties of understanding the nature of collaborations between HEIs and the cultural and creative sectors have been explored by Crossick and Million+. The former describes the problems of trying to articulate the relationship between the arts and humanities in higher education and the cultural sector in terms of standard models of knowledge transfer: how, for instance, can we measure the impact of research if the end product is not a journal article or a patent, but a theatre performance or art exhibition? The latter proposes strengthening the diverse approaches employed by universities in the UK (through developing productive and innovative links with industry, developing entrepreneurship alongside skills and critical thinking) and the need for more flexible funding regimes.

The present report was commissioned precisely to explore how collaborations between HEIs and the arts and cultural sectors work in practice and how they are led. It draws on the literature on leadership, particularly collaborative leadership; identifies collaborations; examines a number of case studies and considers opinions about the nature of these collaborations in general, as articulated by a number of key players in the two sectors. The fieldwork for this report was undertaken between January 2008 and July 2009.

---

13 Duffy and Hook 2005
14 Impacts 08 2009
15 Dawson and Gilmore 2009
16 Hague and Oakley 2001
17 Cross-sector initiatives, such as MLA London’s knowledge transfer programme, exist but tend to be few and far between (MLA 2008)
18 Crossick 2006, DCMS 2006
19 Crossick 2006
20 Atton et al 2008
2. Approach

This report was intended as a study of innovation and good practice in the leadership of collaborations between higher education and the arts and cultural sector. It was to include a brief history of the relationship between higher education and the arts and cultural sector, a set of detailed case studies of specific partnerships between HEIs and arts and cultural organisations across England, an analysis of the leadership and management lessons learned across these partnerships, and an appendix briefly listing some innovative partnerships of this type from across England.

Our discussion draws on the leadership literature, in both higher education and the cultural sectors, and in particular on work on the leadership of collaborations. These theoretical underpinnings are then fleshed out by pointing to some concrete examples of collaborations between the sectors.

The present document focuses on five case studies that offer some particular lessons about the leadership of collaborations. Appendix 1 contains a series of snapshots of other innovative collaborations. In addition, we conducted a series of interviews with key players at universities and cultural organisations to gain an overview of the drivers and barriers to this sort of collaboration. Finally, in the background and context section, a number of collaborations not included amongst either the case studies or snapshots are also referred to because they illustrate specific points. These are presented in boxes.

This report is not intended as an exhaustive or comprehensive study of the many and varied collaborations between higher education and the cultural sector, nor was it expected to quantify the number of collaborations that have taken place between HEIs and the arts and cultural sector in the UK. Given this, judgements about good practice or innovation can be only relative, and while the case studies presented seem to us to offer useful lessons about how collaborations take place, we do not claim that they represent the best practice or the most innovative examples that can be found.

2.1 Literature

While this report does not present a systematic review of all the relevant literature, it does draw selectively on both policy and academic writing to provide background material, historical underpinnings and an analysis of relevant leadership models.

In considering the literature on types of leadership, we found the work on collaborative literature to be particularly illuminating, particularly given what we found to be a reluctance to use the formal language of leadership among case study and other interviewees. We also looked at the literature on leadership, in both the arts and cultural sector and higher education. In addition, we considered the policy literature on HEIs’ knowledge transfer. There is also an extensive literature on the impact that higher education has on economic development, some of which is drawn on here. However, relatively little of it deals specifically with the impact of cultural sector collaborations.

There is little empirical material that specifically examines leadership issues in higher education and cultural collaborations, so we hope this work will add something new to our understanding of what is a developing field.

2.2 Snapshots

In order to convey the range of partnerships being forged between HEIs and arts and cultural organisations, a range of sources (listed in Appendix 3) were consulted which explored the nature of collaborations that had been undertaken and were currently in train. Together with the project’s steering committee, we selected 60 snapshots that were intended to:

- Present a geographic spread. Amongst hundreds of collaborations, we deliberately selected those from different geographic regions. Not surprisingly, London, with its density of HEIs and cultural organisations, accounted for the majority of our snapshots. The North West and North East are also particularly well represented.
- Include examples of collaborations at different stages of completion including those that had recently been completed. Given that these were expected to show some evidence of potential legacy, if not sustainability, we deliberately excluded projects at very initial stages. We were interested in how participants understood the impact of collaboration on the HEI, the cultural organisation and any other partners involved.
- Take account of collaborations with different scales of funding, across different cultural forms and involving a range of partners. Those examined include those based on relatively formal institutional partnerships as well as those that depended on more informal personal relationships.
- Explore different sets of interests. Many of the collaborations that took place outside London, for example, were driven by concerns with regeneration, economic development and graduate retention. We also identified those focused on widening participation, research, consultancy, increasing professionalism and continuing professional development, business collaboration, supporting cultural resources and events, and strengthening HEIs’ offer.

21 Huxham and Vangen 2005
22 Bolden et al 2008
23 Bryman 2007, Devlin et al 2008
25 Crossick 2006
The selection of the snapshots is discussed in more detail in the introduction to Appendix 1.

2.3 Case studies
From the 60 snapshots, five collaborations were selected for further investigation as case studies. These case studies were intended to examine each partnership’s background, its aims and objectives, characteristics and outcomes, leadership and management arrangements, and how any problems that the partners encountered had been overcome.

As indicated above, with the agreement of the steering committee we did not seek to exemplify best practice, since the nature of the case studies could not be predicted, and given the range of collaborations, notions of best practice might be difficult to determine and could potentially be contested. Nor did we seek to evaluate the relative success or failure of these partnerships. Instead, we were concerned to understand how such collaborations operated, how they were led and what, if any, barriers might have hindered their successful operation. In many instances, these proved to be sensitive issues.

Once the five collaborations were identified, we approached the lead partners from the HEIs and the cultural organisations involved. In all cases, we took advice from institutions about potential interviewees and, in most cases, worked from a shortlist of between five and 10 people involved in the collaboration, all of whom are identified in the Acknowledgements.

The topic guide for case study interviews presented in Appendix 2 provided the basis for semi-structured interviews that were, in almost all cases, carried out face-to-face. Also included in Appendix 2 is the guide used for a subsequent round of interviews, undertaken with key case study personnel, on the basis of specific questions posed by LFHE, ACE and CLP. We also looked at websites and relevant documents including, where possible, third-party evaluations.

2.4 Key players
In addition to the case study interviews, we conducted a series of face-to-face elite interviews with stakeholders. The interviewees were suggested by the steering group, and added to by us, and included vice-chancellors, policymakers in central government, people running collaborations, knowledge transfer staff and senior managers in the cultural sector. A full list of interviewees is included in the Acknowledgements.

2.5 Exclusions
Collaborations included in the snapshots and case studies excluded standard HEI provision such as student placements, degree and postgraduate courses, unless they constituted particularly innovative models. Several collaborations specifically exist to support undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching and are directed at students.

Since our research was about collaborative projects per se, we also excluded:

- Universities’ own cultural organisations (theatres, etc), unless they were involved with external arts and culture agencies. Several examples of public festivals based in HEIs are, however, included amongst the snapshots (including Snapshots 5, 6 and 9 – National Student Drama Festival, Fuse, and Brighton Photo Biennial, respectively) on the basis of their involving collaborations with external cultural organisations.
- Informal, personal consultancies undertaken by academic staff. The focus of this research is specifically on HEIs’ collaboration with the arts and cultural sector. Although consultancies are considered to benefit HEIs in many respects, those undertaken in a private capacity (whether paid or unpaid) may represent conflicts of interest with their universities over intellectual property rights, their normal academic duties and other interests, and may be subject to liabilities.
- Research collaborations solely between HEIs – that is with no cultural partners – even if they included interdisciplinary projects involving research in the arts and humanities and/or resulted in start-up companies.

2.6 Working definitions
A number of terms are used throughout this report, our working definitions of which are provided here.

Collaboration: a derivative of collaborate – to work jointly on an activity or project; to refer to the state of working jointly.

Cultural sector: a generic reference to the arts, museums and heritage sectors, and creative industries as fits the cultural remit of the DCMS.

Knowledge transfer/exchange: collaborative activities between academic and non-academic partners.

Note: People increasingly prefer to refer to knowledge exchange rather than knowledge transfer, implying a two-way process, and our interviews and case studies reflect this.

Innovation and excellence: are highly contested terms. Our understanding of them is that they are inherently relative.
Leadership and management: Whatever the differences in higher education’s and the cultural sector’s understandings of these terms, since the late 1970s the image of the leader as an artist who uses creativity and intuition to navigate his or her way through chaos has been contrasted with the manager who is perceived as a problem-solver, dependent on rationality and control.26

Leadership styles: It has been suggested that ‘There are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept’27 and that ‘The literature on leadership studies has struggled with problems that make consensus on a common definition of leadership highly unlikely’.28

Partner: ‘a person who takes part in an undertaking with another or others, especially in a business with shared risks and profits.’

Partnership: ‘the state of being a partner or partners’; the ‘association of two or more people as partners’.

Project: ‘an enterprise carefully planned to achieve a particular aim’.29

Transactional leadership: Writing about the cultural sector, Norman-Wright30 describes this style as based on the idea of the ‘heroic’ leader or ‘cult of personality’, which is associated with masculine physical qualities and behaviours. The notion is that leaders are ‘born not made’; the power to lead is derived from authority and position, and directive ‘command and control’ orders are made at a disengaged distance from the follower.

Transformational leadership: Norman-Wright31 applies this style of leadership to a modern environment in which people are less deferential, more educated and have more freedom to choose where they work. The leader’s job is to be inspirational and responsive to individual and organisational development needs. It is associated with nurturing qualities, facilitating people’s development and trusting them to act autonomously within certain parameters. The leader remains the focus and dependence is on him or her to ‘transform’ the organisation.
3. Background and context

A number of factors have influenced the burgeoning of collaborations between HEIs and arts and cultural organisations. These include a number of government policy initiatives; the importance for the higher education sector of funding knowledge-exchange activities and public engagement; ACE’s strategy for higher education; higher education and the creative and cultural sector workforce and the DCMS’s creative industries strategy, *Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy* — all of which are considered in the following section.

The government’s recognition of the importance of the cultural and creative economy has played an implicit role in developing collaborative relationships. In 2008, the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts reported that the creative industries

... employ more than a million people in over 110,000 businesses — this means that the creative industries are bigger than the financial services sector ... The most recent estimates suggest that the creative industries account for eight per cent of the UK economy — a total of £56.5 billion. Exports by the creative industries contributed £11.6 billion to the UK’s balance of trade in 2003.

In addition to their own potential for growth, the cultural and creative sectors are increasingly seen as important inputs to wider innovation. Rather than just seeing the knowledge economy as driven by developments in science and technology, policy is increasingly stressing creativity. As one Australian report puts it, ‘We have to move from our current position of relying on commodity knowledge production, to a point where we are constantly innovating on the basis of creative ideas.’ In this context, collaborations between cultural and arts organisations and HEIs are increasingly intended not just to benefit the cultural sector itself but to contribute to innovation throughout the economy.

Likewise, the university sector is now viewed as a key factor in innovation and economic growth. Britain’s higher education system has undergone significant changes since 1950, when less than two per cent of the college-age cohort went to university. Since the Second World War, the fastest growth rates in student numbers took place during the late 1960s and between the late 1980s and early 1990s — especially after the introduction of the 1992 Higher Education Act, which considerably increased the number of institutions providing higher education.

In addition to providing considerably more graduates, universities have become increasingly involved in economic development, which has increasingly come to be seen as... critically important to the future of this country. It can unlock the talents of our people, provide the research and scholarship our economy and society need, and play a critical role in maintaining a competitive and innovative economy.

This focus on HEIs’ driving innovation has been emphasised since the former Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) published its 1998 White Paper on competitiveness when the knowledge economy came to the fore of government thinking on productivity and economic growth.

Although the Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration recognised that ‘the role of universities is to educate students, rather than to train them for the specific needs of businesses’, it nevertheless argued that it is important for the UK economy that students leave universities with skills deemed relevant to employers. Lambert focused on UK universities’ potential to capitalise on trends in collaborative and increasingly globalised research and development, and recommended that universities should get better at identifying their areas of competitive strength in research, that businesses should learn to exploit the innovative ideas being developed in HEIs, and that government should do more to support business-university collaboration.

The proposition that universities should develop collaborations with potential employers and others is recognised in a range of more recent reviews including the Design Skills Consultation, *Leitch’s Prosperity for all in the Global Economy* and the Higher Education Funding Council for England’s (Hefce) Business and Community Interaction Survey. The latter argued for an education and training system that was more demand led – in this case, the demand being that of employers, rather than of employees or learners.

The Cox Review of Creativity in Business suggested that stronger links between universities and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) would benefit those in the cultural
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sector with specialist knowledge, research capability and access to facilities such as prototyping, and potential recruitment. The results of those stronger links are evident in Kitson et al’s report The Connected University, which shows how the ways in which businesses interact with universities is evolving.

Alongside this encouragement to collaborate is a set of differences between higher education and the cultural sector, which need to be borne in mind. This includes some fundamental differences in their respective understandings of research and operational practices, as Dawson and Gilmore have observed.

As a core function of universities, research contributes to the forging of academic identities at both individual and institutional levels. Since the advent of the national Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in 1992, in particular, it has become highly competitive. The RAE ‘provides ratings of the quality of research conducted in universities and higher education colleges in the UK, to inform the selective allocation of funds in accordance with the quality of the work undertaken and is judged by peers on the basis of published and practice-based outputs.

Although research in cultural organisations can embrace scholarly outputs (as in the examples of our Case Studies 3 and 5), they are often more concerned with applied research that is directed towards practical aims or objectives.

The operational expectations of the two sectors are also notably different. Although both are increasingly outward facing, working practices differ considerably. This was brought out by interviews for one of our snapshots, Dare, which links the University of Leeds and Opera North in a multi-year partnership agreement that covers a range of activities including work-based learning, production and performance, talks, conferences and research. In this case, as in others, the organisations involved are of very different sizes. The University of Leeds employs more than 8,000 people and its structure, like that of most HEIs, is relatively federal. Opera North is large for a performing arts organisation, but it is much smaller, and arguably more tightly managed, than the university. Differences in size and structure also mean that the university’s decision-making is slower and more consensual than in a smaller organisation such as Opera North, and the degree to which their respective managements or leaders can encourage or even direct collaboration also differs considerably.

### 3.1 Funding and research councils’ support of cultural collaborations

The landscape of the funding that supports HEIs’ and arts and cultural collaborations is complex. Unlike the ‘big pharmaceutical’ and technology sectors, where relatively large commercial players are easily identified, the cultural sector largely comprises SMEs. Although these organisations depend on graduate labour, they are historically less used than science, engineering or technology firms to either formal or semi-formal collaborations with universities. This has opened the door for a range of intermediaries, primary amongst which are funding and research councils.

**Knowledge transfer and exchange**

Alongside the 2004 Spending Review, the Treasury’s Science and Innovation Investment Framework 2004–14 sets out the government’s ambitions, in particular for contributions to economic growth and public services, and the attributes and funding arrangements for a research system capable of delivering these. The Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) is a stream of public funding dedicated to strengthening links between the knowledge base in HEIs, businesses and society. The current HEIF 4 is distributing £396m on a formula-funding basis to all eligible HEIs. Several HEIF-funded projects are referred to in this report, including the National Glass Centre (Snapshot 17), the Enterprise Centre for Creative Arts (Snapshot 28) and the Creative Industries Foundation Degree (Snapshot 24).

For a number of years, the UK Research Councils have been developing a portfolio of knowledge-transfer activities, which can be categorised as embracing interactions between the research base and the user community (people and information flows), commercialisation, collaborative research and development, and collaborative training.

Within the context of their knowledge-transfer activities, the UK Research Councils’ Collaborative Awards in Science and Engineering (CASE) schemes provide opportunities for PhD students to work within external organisations. In 2008, for example, the ESRC CASE studentship partners included the Museum of Science and Industry and the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA). Since 2005 The Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) CASE studentships have involved such partner organisations as Historic Scotland; the Natural History Museum; the Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh; and the London Zoo.

The obvious home for arts and cultural sector collaborations is, however, the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC).
An AHRC spokesperson interviewed for this research asserted that ‘knowledge transfer runs through everything that we do’ and ‘we provide lots of money to encourage partnerships’. Like the other research councils, the AHRC has increasingly emphasised funding formal knowledge transfer activities and is trying to capture the benefits of publicly funded research in those ‘areas of life where they make a difference’. However, the AHRC’s senior executive is aware of the discomfort that many academic colleagues feel towards both applied research and pursuing links with the creative industries: some regard these as strictly the domain of the new universities.

The AHRC’s equivalent of CASE studentships are its Collaborative Doctoral Awards, which were launched in 2005 (an example of which is given in Box 1). Between 40 and 60 such awards are made each year and the majority of partner organisations involve museums and galleries, some of which have been involved in several collaborations. Since 2005, for example, the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) has had 12 studentships; the British Museum, eight; and the Tate, seven.

**Box 1: Collaborative Doctoral Award**

An example of an award is The Institute of Cornish Studies at the University of Exeter’s Cornish Campus and the Royal Cornwall Museum (RCM). The RCM plans to replace its existing displays with a more coherent and thematic story of the social and economic development of Cornwall. The project will transfer research knowledge held by the Institute so that the Museum’s new display reflects the latest academic research.

In acknowledging that research takes place outside the higher education sector, the UK Research Councils have developed an integrated strategy for supporting research in organisations other than HEIs. The AHRC, for example, not only supports research in UK museums, archives and libraries, but recognises eight Independent Research Organisations (formerly known as Academic Analogues) – the British Library, the British Museum, the National Archives, the National Gallery, the National Maritime Museum, National Museum Wales, the National Portrait Gallery, the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, Tate, and the V&A. Examples of their collaborative research projects include those by the National Portrait Gallery (Case Study 3) and the Tate (Box 2).

AHRC research schemes to which its Independent Research Organisations can apply include its Science and Heritage Programme and its Research Networks and Workshops Scheme, which supports proposals to run a series of workshops aiming to facilitate interaction between museums, galleries, libraries and archives, and universities.

**Box 2: Tate Encounters** is an AHRC-funded research project, which was shortlisted for the 2008 Times Higher Education Research Project of the Year Award. Tate Encounters is a three-year research project funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council through the Diasporas, Migration and Identities Programme. The project, which started in April 2007, involves three collaborative institutions: Tate Britain, London South Bank University and the University of the Arts London. Tate Encounters aims to provide an in-depth account and analysis of the reciprocal meanings of a sustained encounter between London South Bank University students who have a migrant or diasporic family background and an important national cultural site (the Tate). The project aims develop knowledge and understandings of how narratives of Britishness are contained, constructed, and reproduced within the curatorial practices and collection of Tate, and of how such notions are received and valued by different migrant and diasporic family members within the context of the active material/visual cultural practices of everyday life. From this encounter the project will develop new curatorial and educational perspectives relevant to wider and more culturally diverse audiences and will contribute towards cultural change within the Museum and Galleries sector.

Despite questions about the continued relevance of university museums to their parent institutions’ teaching and research agendas, the AHRB (AHRC’s predecessor) argued that such institutions are of central importance to the arts and humanities research community in general. In 1998 the AHRB took on the administration of Hefce’s Museums and Galleries Fund, through which it currently funds some 30 university museums and galleries in England at a value of £9.9m, as well as a related Project Fund Scheme to enhance the use of, or access to, collections. This support is intended neither for teaching nor research activities, but to fund core stewardship activities where collections have research significance beyond their home institutions. The Museums and Galleries Fund reverted back to HEFCE in 2009, and at the time of our research, the AHRC was reviewing the fund in anticipation of that.

Collaboration between universities and cultural organisations are supported by other cultural-sector funding bodies,

---
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principally on the basis of their provision of public benefits. Since the launch of the National Lottery in 1994, for example, the Heritage Lottery Fund has provided around £17.7m to university projects of which £15.9m was direct funding.53

Public engagement
A second set of initiatives that is encouraging HEIs to collaborate with the outside world are focused on public engagement. According to the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, the strategic value of public engagement resides in ‘opening up universities so that the people who live around them have a much greater sense of what happens there and a great sense of ownership of the university’. The three key arguments for public engagement mattering include:

- The moral case, according to which HEIs are accountable to the public for the funding they receive.
- The business case – HEIs need to generate additional income, enhance their reputation, motivate their staff and students, contribute to their professional development, improve the quality of their teaching and research, and improve the recruitment and retention of staff and students.
- The academic case – enabling HEIs to contribute positively to society by generating social capital, building knowledge, inspiring learning, empowering individuals, influencing policy helping to generate prosperity and enhanced services.54

For example, Beacons for Public Engagement – a £9.2m programme supported by HEFCE, the UK Research Councils and the Wellcome Trust between 2006 and 2009 – was intended to help to support, recognise, reward and build capacity for public engagement work across the UK. The initiative comprises the National Co-ordinating Centre and six collaborative centres (including UCL, Box 3), each consisting of a number of HEIs and partnership organisations intended to foster a change of culture in universities and assist staff and students to engage with the public.

Box 3: University College London Beacon
As a Beacon for Public Engagement, University College London (UCL) will build on its extensive existing outreach programme with schools, colleges, museums, and community and other relevant groups. A university with a global reach, UCL is diverse, welcoming and multi-cultural, and committed to its founding ethos of inclusivity.

Each year its Bloomsbury Theatre and award-winning museums attract over 50,000 members of the public. In 2006–07, UCL hosted the Royal Institution’s Friday Evening Discourses, and its annual graduate shows in Fine Art and in Architecture attracted thousands of visitors.

UCL has a wide-ranging programme of public engagement activities, many of which are focused on people in some of London’s most deprived areas. Examples include the outreach activity of the UCL Petrie Museum of Egyptology and the Grant Museum of Zoology; UCL’s Centre for Transport Studies’ project to involve communities in urban street design initiatives; and the UCL Mobile Space Centre, taking space research to rural regions and deprived areas.

UCL’s network of partners includes the British Museum; the South Bank Centre; Birkbeck, University of London; Cheltenham Science Festival; Arts Catalyst; and City and Islington College.55

Universities are increasingly appointing public engagement champions amongst deans and pro-vice-chancellors. Arguably, during the writing of this report one of the most visible in relation to HEI/cultural collaborations has been Professor Paul Younger, Newcastle University Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Engagement and Chair of the Board of the new Great North Museum (Box 4), who acknowledged:

One of the key drivers for the University’s leadership of this project was to promote public engagement. To achieve 20,000 visitors over the Bank Holiday has exceeded our wildest expectations and we are absolutely delighted at the public response. Newcastle University is proud to be playing such an important part in creating cultural experiences for such a large and wide range of people56.
Box 4: The Great North Museum (GNM), which opened in May 2009, was created through a partnership among Newcastle University, Tyne & Wear Museums, the Natural History Society of Northumbria, the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne and Newcastle City Council. GNM Hancock brings together the North East’s premier collections of archaeology, natural history, geology and world cultures under one roof, and incorporates collections from the original Hancock Museum based at Newcastle University, and the university’s other museums – the Museum of Antiquities and the Shefton Museum. The university’s Hatton Gallery, which remains in its existing building, is also part of the GNM. The museum is being managed as part of the portfolio of Tyne & Wear Museums and Archive Service.

3.2 The Arts Council England and higher education
The DCMS has proposed a closer working relationship between HEIs and the cultural sector for some time. ACE’s relationship with HEIs includes its support of many regularly funded universities and arts organisations whose work supports HEIs by providing teaching expertise, student placements and exhibition and performance opportunities. It also supports developments in practice-based research through the AHRC, and commissions policy-based research from HEIs.

ACE annually provides some £7m to its regularly funded organisations based in HEIs and another £11.4m to arts organisations whose work supports HEIs. In the 10 years leading up to 2006, HEIs also received some £81m capital funding from ACE’s lottery funding, which contributed to buildings and spaces for student and community activities and resources for artists. Considerable investment is also made to universities’ cultural facilities through its Grants for the Arts funding scheme. ACE funding is also routed to universities via specific initiatives. ACE’s Cultural Sector Development Initiative (CSDI) programme in the North East (Snapshot 19) is one such example. A major element of the Universities for the North East’s programme is DigitalCity (Box 5).

ACE’s 2006 higher education strategy explicitly announced its intention to support HEIs in engaging with the users of knowledge and skills, as a third stream of activity, alongside teaching and research. However, increased dependency on external funders and decreased support by HEIs may contribute to cultural organisations’ vulnerability, as the example of the Gardner Arts Centre (Box 6) suggests.

Following the production of a series of internal, regional Higher Education Digests, ACE published Arts, Enterprise and Excellence: Strategy for Higher Education, which focuses on the common interests shared by the arts and cultural and higher education sectors.
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In order to increase and sustain funding for arts organisations that are part of HEIs, and to encourage universities to make wider investment in the arts, ACE recognised that it needed a better understanding of HEIs’ objectives and priorities. It proposed that HEIs conduct audits of their current and potential impact on the communities they serve, and that they establish their ‘cultural footprint’ as a prelude to both developing their own arts strategies and to cultivating formal partnership agreements with ACE itself. Such audits might include HEIs’ consideration of the role of the arts and cultural activities in their strategic planning; their direct and indirect support of arts organisations; their support of individual artists and the creative economy, including knowledge-transfer schemes; their cultural involvement in the local/regional community; their course content; diversity; and any others forms of engagement with the arts and culture.

Potential partnerships with HEIs will inevitably need to support ACE’s plans in the regions as well as complement the DIUS and Universities UK’s concerns about universities’ roles within their communities. As the example of the Huddersfield Contemporary Music Festival (Box 7) reveals, individuals who are central to such partnerships often assume dual roles as academics and cultural leaders.

Of the cultural footprint reports identified, two were commissioned by the Arts Council England South East (ACE SE) – the South East being home to 24 HEIs, making it second only to London. Although such reports present relatively early assessments of HEIs’ cultural contributions, they nevertheless highlight universities’ contributions to the cultural life of their localities and the degree of activities and ambitions on the part of the HEIs. They also identify a lack of profile, networking and joint actions, and highlight a number of opportunities and starting points for future partnership work.

**Box 6: The Gardner Arts Centre**, which was housed in a listed building designed by Sir Basil Spence at the University of Sussex, was forced to close in 2007. The Centre generated over half its income from the box office, commercial sponsorship and hiring out the building, but public funding sustained its programmes, which had been praised by the ACE. However, Brighton and Hove City Council withdrew the venue’s annual £30,000 grant in November 2006 (effective April 2007), redirecting that funding to to city-centre venues. The Gardner was unable to meet criteria that would also attract ACE funding. Its board therefore took the decision to close the centre.

The building, which we lease from the University of Sussex, is in need of significant investment, and the Gardner is also faced with an increasingly competitive arts economy following decisions by the Arts Council to concentrate support on city centre venues, which has inevitably impacted on our programme, audiences and income. (Board Chair, Deborah Grubb)

The university was reported to have been unable to afford the £6m that had been quoted for essential upgrades to the building.22

**Box 7: The Huddersfield Contemporary Music Festival**, the UK’s foremost festival of new music, has its offices on the University of Huddersfield campus and has enjoyed close association with the university over its 30-year history. However, in 2008 it announced a new three-year sponsorship deal, which would mark a new period of partnership and collaboration between the two organisations. As well as brokering a new funding arrangement, the university is providing a range of in-kind benefits including premises, equipment and information technology (IT) support.

Graham McKenzie, the Festival’s Artistic Director and Chief Executive, was appointed as a visiting research fellow at the university in May 2008. There would continue to be a wealth of opportunities for staff and students of the university to participate in the festival, whether as performers, composers, stewards, volunteers or attendees, or through work experience placements. Workshops and events would be organised for staff and students, contributing to their studies and their professional development, and the festival would play an enhanced role in promoting and developing the university’s international reputation for its music-based research and academic performance.66

What is clear from these early studies is that the full range of the Higher Education Institutions’ cultural resources are often hidden from public view and are therefore not always attracting the attention that they might. Both studies have revealed more activity than the commissioners had anticipated and have increased awareness and respect for the scope of University involvement in the local cultural ecology. In Canterbury, the review has stimulated active discussion with the City Council to improve the profile and marketing of their combined cultural offer. With HEIs encouraged to demonstrate benefits to the wider community, Cultural Footprints are one way of highlighting the resources they already offer.69

---
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3.3 Higher education and the creative and cultural sector workforce

As ACE\textsuperscript{70} observes, ‘Most artists and arts managers receive their initial professional training through the higher education system and people often extend their understanding of and enthusiasm for the arts while at university’.

The cultural and creative sector has relatively high levels of graduate employment compared with the rest of the economy.\textsuperscript{71} However, in terms of economic development many commentators have pointed out that the contribution of graduates to a regional economy is largely determined by demand-side factors: businesses that employ graduates (or the economy’s ability to support self-employment), rather than the supply of graduates per se.\textsuperscript{72} Universities situated in regions with abundant job and career opportunities are more likely to contribute to the economy than good universities located in weaker regions, which will lose graduates to more dynamic regions. HEIs have, therefore, increasingly been pushing for the development of regional knowledge-based economies, and greater regional graduate retention as many of our snapshots and case studies such as Culture Campus (Case Study 1) testify.

Whereas some critics consider universities’ contribution to their regional economies as possibly being overrated\textsuperscript{73}, others regard it as vital. One key interviewee not only pointed to the importance of creativity in the development of the local economy but highlighted the importance of his university’s contribution to it (Box 8).

\begin{boxedtext}
Box 8: Creative Industries Business Advice and Services (CIBAS) – Portsmouth and South East Hampshire

was set up in 2006 as one of three sister organisations supported by ACE to subsidise artists and small creative businesses working in the creative industries. Alongside the work of other agencies (such as Business Link), its function is to help ‘artists to understand that they are businesses’ by providing advice, professional development training, events and opportunities.

Its existence marks a strategic partnership between the University of Portsmouth, ACE SE and the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH).

As part of the University of Portsmouth’s Purple Door information service for businesses, the public and voluntary sector organisations and individual entrepreneurs in the South East, CIBAS is located within the university’s Research and Knowledge Transfer Services. This is intended to ‘support development, enterprise and innovation, and to enhance workforce skills, by providing access to the facilities, knowledge and expertise of the university, its academic staff and its students’. One of the aims of the university’s strategic plan, Looking Ahead 2007–12 is ‘to contribute to sustainable economic, social, cultural and community regeneration and development’.

It identifies CIBAS as having paved the way for that by helping to lead the development of an enterprise culture, not least through its support of start-ups.

ACE SE’s Resource Development aims to develop additional resources for the arts from non-arts partners – funding, skills, research, policy, strategy and partnerships from local government, regional development agency, cultural agencies, the corporate sector, etc.

The South East Hampshire Area Investment Framework funding from the South East England Regional Development Agency (SEEDA) is distributed through PUSH which is a partnership of private, public and social organisations committed to improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{boxedtext}
3.4 The public sector as a driver of creativity and innovation

Beyond generating employment in the cultural sector, many policymakers are convinced that creativity has a wider role in driving innovation in the broader economy.²⁵ *The Cox Review into Creativity in Business*²⁶ argues that design was the link between creativity and innovation. It defines creativity as the generation of new ideas and innovation as the successful exploitation of those ideas. Cox recognises that many businesses consider creativity and design as principally aesthetic considerations to do with the appearance of products. But he argues for a much broader notion of creativity and design as an integrated approach to doing business, using design methods to guide strategy and shape product, service and process development.

Cox recognises that the UK’s leading HEIs and its leading firms are already collaborating across industrial sectors and educational disciplines. But behind such collaborations is a long tail of SMEs, including those in the cultural sector, many of which are underperforming.

Agencies such as the Design Council have produced a body of research, which argues that businesses can benefit from being more design aware. But, according to Cox, without a serious process of engagement, such realities are unlikely to have an impact on many businesses. His recommendations, consequently, concentrate on deepening engagement between public-sector support and the research and development base, especially within HEIs and industry. *A Million Penguins* represents an example of one such engagement (Box 9).

---

**Box 9: A Million Penguins**

*A Million Penguins* was an experimental, collaborative novel that came about because of a meeting between a writer, already known for her work in new media and teaching at De Montfort University, and an executive at Penguin Books. Penguin was interested in the production of a collaborative novel, which it might at some point publish in traditional form, and the De Montfort students (who were distributed across the world) served as the editorial team.

The novel was to be created in MediaWiki, the same software as Wikipedia. It was seeded with a first line from another novel and ran as five-week experiment, receiving contributions from all over the world, resulting in what the Chief Executive of Penguin Books called, ‘not the most read, but possibly the most written novel in history.’ Once the website was up and running, anyone was allowed to contribute, and the first 24 hours saw several attempts at sabotage and spamming, but the team kept its nerve and kept the website open.

Unlike some more formal collaborations, *A Million Penguins* was a genuine experiment; no one knew what would happen, and no one had any clear expectation or outcomes in mind. Hence, no evaluation process was built in from the beginning, though the project did result in a research report²⁷, which looks at *A Million Penguins*, primarily as a social experiment. As a web-based initiative, a democratic style of management was the only way; the executive at Penguin Books was the only person who could ban people from involvement – a sanction that was used very sparingly.

The marketing of *A Million Penguins* was entirely viral, neither Penguin Books nor De Montfort publicised it, and its success in attracting contributors surprised them all. By the time it was closed to contributions on 7 March 2007, at least 750,000 different people had viewed the site, of whom 1,476 had registered as users, and between them had made 11,000 edits to the novel’s 1,000-odd pages.²⁸
As well as emphasising the importance of small firms’ links to HEIs, Cox also proposes extending multi-disciplinary courses at universities and creating a network of centres of creativity and innovation across the UK, with a national hub in London.

The Group for Learning in Art and Design, a membership organisation of university and college lecturers of art and design, has recommended a move away from narrow subject-based study and bringing different disciplines together to better reflect the multi-disciplinary nature of the creative industries. Initiatives such as the Crucible, University of Cambridge (Box 10), are specifically dedicated to collaborative and interdisciplinary models of working.

**Box 10: Crucible – research in interdisciplinary design**

The way the creative industries operate is often as collaborative partnerships across individual disciplines, and we need to make sure we reflect that in the way that we teach and learn. We need a collaborative model as opposed to a discrete model ... (with) people from graphic design and product design working together ... It would be a shame if we lost competitive advantages through not engaging well with our industry.

(John Last, Chair of the Group for Learning in Art and Design and Deputy Principal, Arts Institute at Bournemouth)

Cambridge University’s Crucible is one such network that encourages interdisciplinary collaboration. Crucible is a research network within and around the University of Cambridge. Its purpose is to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration of technologists with researchers in the arts, humanities and social sciences. The main focus of this collaboration is on design as a meeting point for widely differing research disciplines. Crucible activities include the establishment of new research programmes, training of researchers, input to policy bodies and identification of suitable funding sources for research in interdisciplinary design. Crucible provides both a scientific and organisational framework for this research.

The status of Cox’s proposed network of centres for creativity and innovation remains somewhat unclear, although a new generation of what might constitute hubs is emerging in the UK and in other countries. These aim to bring together an ‘innovation triangle’—creative activity with science, technology and engineering with business education. Examples include Design London – a partnership among the Royal College of Art, Imperial College and Tanaka Business School with funding from HEFCE, NESTA and industry (Snapshot 22) – and the Centre for Competitive Creative Design (C4D), a collaboration between Cranfield University and the University of the Arts, London. Some mixed-media centres such as the Watershed in Bristol (Case Study 2) are also operating across the boundaries of science, arts and technology.

### 3.5 The DCMS and the creative industries

The result of an almost two-year review, *Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy*”, sets out the DCMS’s strategy for supporting the creative industries. It has a strong focus on the production of talent, on education, skills training and (to a lesser extent) the labour market. Many of its recommendations concern 15 to 19-year-olds, but it also refers to higher education – more specifically, the Skillset Screen and Media Academy Network and Bristol’s Pervasive Media studio (see Case Study 2).

Skillset’s network is based around its new media academies, launched in December 2007, which include a variety of further education programmes and HEIs such as Bournemouth University, Birmingham City University, Central St Martins College of Art and Design, Goldsmiths University of London, National Film and TV School, the University of Teesside and many others.

Other DCMS initiatives have focused on bringing schools and further and higher education together. The Newham Creative Hub (initially known as the Academic Hub), for example, intends to explore sharing curriculum and facilities, collaborating on pre-degree and foundation courses, and student exchange and mentoring schemes (Box 11).
Box 11: Newham Creative Hub is part of the government’s Creative Britain New Talents for a New Economy strategy, which is led by DCMS in partnership with DIUS and BERR. The project was developed to enable collaboration between schools, further and higher education to provide development of creative skills for people aged 14–25. The members of the Newham Creative Hub are Brampton Manor School, Lister Community School, Little Ilford School, Stratford School, NewVic, Newham College of Further Education and the University of the Arts London. Its objectives are to:

• Inspire learners in the Hub schools and colleges, especially from year nine onwards, to build confidence, understanding and aspiration about studying in FE and HE.
• Increase parental support for children to study creative subjects at all levels in school, college and higher education.
• Collaborate on curriculum delivery, especially for the new Creative and Media Diploma.
• Provide targeted support for the most able and for learners with disabilities, helping to personalise learning in the arts.
• Use new technology as a creative tool and as a vehicle for learning and communication, for example by developing a hub website, blog and e-learning materials.
• Design holiday and weekend activities based on students’ interests and needs that will focus on the development of creative skills and address issues such as gender imbalance.
• Share industry and community contacts between partners in the hub.
• Support teachers through high-quality continuing professional development (CPD), for example in developing new skills and knowledge to deliver the Creative and Media Diploma and nurturing innovation and creativity.
• Offer careers and progression advice through student mentoring and ambassador schemes, campus-based learning and contact with university staff.
• Support portfolio and interview preparation and pre-university Foundation Degree-level activity.

Creative Britain also commits the government to a better understanding of the role of the creative industries in wider innovation. However, it stresses quantifying the economic benefits, and it could be argued that it will continue to miss non-commercial innovation in the cultural sector.

In terms of knowledge exchange, the emphasis is on reactively formal mechanisms, such as the Knowledge Transfer Network for the Creative Industries, run by the Technology Strategy Board and NESTA’s Creative Innovators Growth Programme, aimed at helping small creative businesses exploit new technologies.
4. The literature related to the leadership of HE and cultural collaborations

As Prime Minister Gordon Brown observed in his introduction to the CLP, "The cultural sector is not alone in addressing its leadership challenge." Many of the cultural sector’s leadership issues also confront both the education and third sectors. This part of the report considers the literature on the types of leadership that pertain to higher education and the cultural sector and explores the issues the literature raises in relation to the leadership of public-sector collaborations, the arts and cultural sector, higher education, and the provision of leadership training and education.

Concerns about leadership, arguably, came to the fore in both the higher education and cultural sectors in the wake of the then Department for Education and Skills’ Council for Excellence in Management and Leadership, Bryman’s comments, the leadership push in higher education was reinforced by the influential Dearing report and subsequent statements on higher education also emphasise the need for enhanced leadership.

Following those events, it is rare nowadays for statements on the broad cultural sector to be made without at least a passing reference to leadership. A recent statement of the role of local government in delivering cultural and sporting services refers to the need for leadership to improve services, manage change and support good governance. It also argues that while attempts have been made to improve leadership in the cultural sector, progress is still slow.

Studies of workforce development needs across the cultural sector similarly and consistently identify leadership and management as being in need of improvement. The lack of leadership skills is seen as being at the root of other issues in the cultural sector, such as the relative lack of diversity in the workforce.

By and large it is accepted that organisations cannot afford to ‘stand still’. The ‘no change’ option is actually not an option. With increased competitiveness (to include organisations looking to find their own ‘niche’ market) combined with greater capabilities in strategic planning (to include a better sense of determining mission critical strategies for a range of operational areas) more senior staff are engaging with the thorny issue of how best to bring about transformational, embedded and lasting change that will ensure their organisation not only survives, but thrives.

Cultural leaders have the capacity to ask questions other people didn’t think of, turn these questions into a dynamic vision, and drive the vision forward through all the problems. The confidence to discover dynamic models and ideas from a range of places, apply them, but to throw them out again once they start to get in the way.

No longer is ‘heroic’ leadership deemed to be the ‘panacea’ that an organisation’s board or appointing body seeks … Instead, the idea of dispersed, or ‘leadership at all levels’ is seen as a more appropriate means of bringing about and sustaining transformational and lasting change. This is achieved through a cadre of commissioned and passionate leaders ‘owning’ the goals of both continuous improvement and on-going learning.

It is important to recognise that the idea of a ‘great leader’ may not be helping us. We are often looking to our leaders to solve our problems and we find them lacking. The idea that an individual may come along who could save us and solve our problems maybe allows us to not recognise our own leadership skills. The great cultural leader is a caretaker of the absurd and the ‘marginalised’, finding the value in the disturbances and events that don’t match ‘the plan’; is a creator of situations where people within a group recognise the quality of leadership in themselves.

Despite the importance attached to leadership, however, the language of leadership did not come easily to many of our interviewees. This is consistent with other work on collaborative or distributed leadership. Indeed, as Huxham and Vangen note, people involved in collaborations are rarely explicit about the notion of leadership.

---

84 The CLP – an initiative supported by the government and jointly managed by ACE, MLA and Creative & Cultural Skills (CCSkills) – is intended to embed a culture of support and development for a diverse range of leaders by building on existing practice, addressing current gaps in provision, exchanging knowledge with other sectors and countries, and ensuring that there is a sound basis for the long-term enhancement of leadership skills and experience.

85 ACE 2006b: 5
86 Bryman 2007
87 NCiHE 1997
88 Local Government Association (LGA) 2008
89 CCSkills 2008
90 Source: Marshall (2007a: 2)
91 Source: John McGrath, Artistic Director, Contact Theatre (cited in ACE 2006b: 11)
92 Source: (Marshall 2007a: 1)
93 Source: Phelim McDermott, Artistic Director (cited in ACE 2006b: 14)
There may be several reasons for this. Bryman argues, for example, that academics often hold leadership or managerial positions in relatively low esteem and that the official discourse of leadership is felt to be at odds with the notion of the professional. In other words, ‘the audit culture’ – now associated with higher education as much as elsewhere – is identified with a more managerial culture that is perceived as less trusting of individuals.

This adds to the difficulties of studying leadership, which is inherently problematic for a number of reasons, including the multitude of nested phenomena (social, psychological, behavioural, environmental etc), its dynamic and changing character over time, and the symbolic and subjective dimension of construction and interpretation.

By extension, Bryman also comments on the difficulties of assessing the effectiveness of leadership. As this report describes, a variety of leadership models can be observed in collaborations between higher education and the cultural sector, but it is difficult, if not impossible, to attribute the success or otherwise of those collaborations to leadership alone, when so many other factors are in play. As Bolden et al observe, ‘it is by no means impossible that the styles or even many of the practices of effective leaders are the same as those of ineffective leaders.’

### 4.1 Types of individual leadership

Much of the literature, particularly that produced by funding and policy bodies, focuses on the pragmatics of generating individual leaders. Examples include Hewison and Holden’s report for the Clore Duffield Foundation (CDF); the various reports commissioned by the CLP, such as those by Devlin and Thorold and accounts of the debates and dialogues that it has supported; and proposals concerning the kind of leadership development that the arts and cultural sectors would like to see.

Although cultural leadership is often perceived from within the sector as ‘generically different to business leadership’, an objective assessment of cultural leadership reveals that the participants’ perceptions of their roles bear similarities to the way that leadership is perceived by those engaged in other fields.

However, Hewison acknowledges that there was ‘still work to be done on identifying what is specific to cultural leadership as opposed to the general concept of leadership as such’, and the degree to which cultural leadership is distinct from leadership in other sectors still remains unclear. The accepted understanding of cultural leadership assumes that ‘leadership qualities can be distinguished from managerial competencies; and that while all managers have to lead, leaders do not always have to manage!’ In a world in which it is no longer assumed that leaders are born, it is accepted that people may transition from being managers to being leaders.

Cultural leadership is not necessarily synonymous with creative leadership. Indeed, creative leadership is considered to be characteristic of good leadership per se:

Leading is … creative work. Every budget, every meeting, every presentation, every decision is a chance for a creative act. Every interaction is a chance to use art and design principles to get work done – in fact, in a community as visual and creative as RISD [Rhode Island School of Art & Design] it’s often the only way to do it.

It’s the capacity to think and act beyond the boundaries that limits our effectiveness. Every leader and organisation faces obstacles that are difficult to surmount – from corporate executives confronting the complex global marketplace to educators trying to lift student achievement to nonprofit groups and government agencies addressing critical social issues with tight budgets.

But, as Bennett et al note in relation to their investigation of the literature on distributed leadership in particular, there is little agreement about the attributes that characterise a leader or the definitions of particular leadership styles.

Certainly, little of the cultural leadership literature focuses on models of leadership per se. Hewison, Norman-Wright and Parker appear to be the exceptions.

However, the literature does theorise some of the types of leadership in the field. For example, Hewison divided styles of
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cultural leadership into three distinct types – the transactional, transformational and relational. All three leadership types have their counterparts in higher education.

Hewison describes transactional leaders as successful managers, but as less adapted to handling change, either as an external challenge or an internal development. Transformational leaders, by comparison, are regarded as ... comfortable with change ... They have the ability to lead organisations into new and unfamiliar territory. They do so by recognising the need for change, by creating a new vision and then carrying through the change to transform the organisation. This leadership type – sometimes called the ‘heroic’ leader – has been highly valued in the cultural sector.  

Bryman takes up the concept of the transformational leader and cites Burns to the effect that this kind of leadership entails binding ‘leaders and followers together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose’. (113) But unlike Hewison, Bryman argues that transformational leadership pertains to the transformation of people, not of the institution itself. He also suggests that transformational leadership is not always perceived as being the best, or most appropriate, model. Too frequent change can be disruptive, even damaging, if it breaks up existing cultural patterns that were working well.

Hewison’s third type, the relational leader, primarily works as an enabler. This type is a sharer who recognises that empowerment is not the same as mere delegation and is a communicator who is a team player and is ready to follow as well as lead. He argues that these types of leaders nurture other people’s talent and can produce stability in the wake of necessary change. Relational leadership is also known as ‘invisible’ leadership, and is considered to be better practised by women. (114)

There is conceivably a close relationship between the concepts of relational leadership and the notion of ‘boundary spanning’, which has often been considered in the context of UK public policy. (115) Williams (116) attributes this type of leadership with bringing unlikely partners together, breaking through red tape and seeing things in a different way.

The notion and practice of the boundary spanner that emerges in the literature is also useful in the context of the collaborations between higher education and cultural organisations. The 1990s onwards saw an increasing emphasis on partnership across the public sector, particularly in areas such as economic development, social inclusion and urban regeneration. (117) In these cases, partnerships were formed in recognition of the fact that no single agency had the expertise or resources to tackle complex, multidimensional socio-economic problems, and that people and agencies need to have a stake in the solutions, or they may not support them. The motivation for partnerships between higher education and the cultural sector is different from that between other agencies in the public sector because they are more focused on opportunities and less on overcoming problems, but the role of boundary spanning can be observed in at least one of the case studies discussed later in this report.

However, for our purposes, individual types of leadership are less relevant than a consideration of leadership as an emergent property of a group, or network, of interacting individuals and as emerging and shifting according to the expertise needed in a given situation – in other words, distributed or collaborative leadership. (118) This is considered below.

4.2 The leadership of collaborations

Styles: Research on the leadership of collaborations tends to focus on the practice of leadership, rather than on the characteristics of leaders. (119) Much of the research on collaborative leadership also refers to public-sector partnerships, including those in health and education. (120)

Because the two focuses of this report – the higher education and cultural sectors – largely exist within the public sector, the issues of public-sector partnerships raised in this body of literature are therefore considered in the following paragraphs.

A variety of terms – distributed, collaborative and democratic leadership – are used to cover leadership practices. While they may overlap, they are not identical: distributed leadership is synonymous with neither collaborative nor democratic leadership. (121) It may embrace the co-ordination of different tasks, rather than collaboration, and while it is not confined to any one individual, it is not necessarily democratically distributed.

The literature on team work and collaboration also explores the differences between formally structured and ad hoc partnerships. As Bolden et al’s research on leadership in higher education suggests (122), the informal networks, and the trust
they generate, are often as important as formally recognised channels.

Finally, the question of leadership processes is very important in the literature. In their study of collaborative leadership, Huxham and Vangen[23] consider what they describe as the ‘media’ through which leadership is enacted and which they divide into leadership through structure, process and participants.

- Leadership through structures refers to the way in which a collaboration is organised, who belongs to it, who is its designated lead, who can attend meetings and so on. This clearly shapes the outcome of collaborations. As Huxham and Vangen argue, in public-sector collaborations, structures are often externally imposed by policymakers or funders.

- Leadership through process can refer to the way things are done – by face-to-face meetings, telephone, email and so on, but also to the wider notion of how this enables or retards collaborations.

- Leadership through participants raises the issue of participants taking on a leadership role. In a collaborative set-up like Culture Campus, where the board is composed of the leaders of partnership organisations, different organisations will take positional leadership in delivering particular projects. In simpler, more project-focused collaborations, the role of different participants may be determined from the beginning and are less subject to change.

Challenges: The literature also touches on many challenges that must be addressed when engaging in collaborative leadership. Owen's research into HEIs' leadership of regional and local regeneration practice[24] highlights the leadership characteristics that appeared to inform good practice, particularly in the light of facing opposition from several quarters. However, Owen cites the need for a credible model based on technical expertise, conviction, the ability to secure local support, and negotiating and influencing skills. He also notes that major difficulties could take years of tenacious effort to overcome.

Other reports also emphasise the length of time needed for collaborations. In a review of 60 research projects on public-sector regeneration partnerships, Carley et al note[25] that ‘partnership perfection is difficult to achieve; indeed there is no perfect model. Partnerships will change, adapt and – hopefully – mature over time.’ In an analysis of 27 public-sector partnerships[26], Carley et al reach a similar conclusion: good collaborations grow organically, although they may emerge in response to an outside policy or funding stimulus, and they evolve over time, which is part of the vital process of developing consensus among stakeholders. There is, therefore, a danger in assuming that partnership models can be imported from one situation to another, particularly because the process of partnership formation includes an important element of mutual learning among partners, which strengthens individual collaborations in ways that are peculiar, and particular, to them.

It has also been suggested that one of the primary challenges of collaborative leadership is not only agreeing on aims at the beginning of a partnership, but deciding whether agreeing on aims is even necessary.[27] In the worst cases, partnerships fail to reach agreement about their aims because discussions about joint direction unearth irreconcilable differences.[28] Huxham and Vangen observe that this often reflects the fact that the stated aims and real aims for projects are often different: genuine aims are often tangled up with others, authentic and imagined. Agreeing on a complete set of aims and trying to achieve as many as possible is obviously ideal, but in practice this is difficult, particularly when agendas are hidden behind funding bids, and there can be a need to state an interest, other than the one the partners actually have, in order to qualify for funding.

Finally, another critical challenge to collaborative leadership may actually lie in the language itself. Although the notion of distributed or collaborative leadership seems to fit more comfortably with the collaborations we shall describe in our case studies, Bolden et al warn[29] ‘As a normative prescription of leadership practice in higher education, the notion of distributed leadership should be treated with caution.’

The more managerial culture of higher education[30], has, as discussed above, met with some resistance in universities. Bolden at al suggest[31] that the understanding of distributed leadership provides a framework that embodies both traditional notions of collegiality alongside more managerial notions, and indeed may be seen to bridge top-down and bottom-up decision-making processes. Given this, those reluctant to use what they feel are managerial terms, associated with individual leaders, may be more comfortable with the notion of distributed leadership. However, rhetoric and reality are not the same: merely describing practices as
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distributed leadership does not dissolve power differentials, and may, on occasion ‘obscure the mechanism by which decisions are made’.

By the same token, universities’ tendency to become more entrepreneurial can lead to fragmentation and institutional incoherence ‘as academic units offer their own programmes and go their own way.’ Things may be achieved through this way of working, but these partnerships may lack the sustainability of projects that have a stronger institutional hook.

4.3 Leadership in the arts and cultural sector
There is a relatively scant literature on leadership in the arts and cultural sector, which is perhaps not surprising given its short history. The little that does exist nevertheless identifies a common set of themes, many of which are echoed in our case studies.

**Styles:** As already stated, there have been relatively few attempts to define leadership styles within the literature on cultural leadership. Indeed, there is a strain of thinking in the cultural sector that is antipathetic to its being characterised in the same way as in other sectors, whether politics and administration or business and management (see above).

The characterisations of leadership styles as applied to the cultural sector include Hewison’s definitions of transactional, transformational and relational leadership described above. Norman-Wright subsequently applied definitions of engaging leadership, psychological and behavioural leadership, and situational leadership to the sector; and Parker harnessed the concept of neoteric leadership.

**Challenges:** The nature of the arts and cultural sector presents a number of challenges to leadership in the sector. As already mentioned, the cultural sector has a strong tradition of learning on the job, which is combined with a suspicion of vocational education and, occasionally, of notions like leadership per se. The sector is also characterised by strong professional identification, weaker institutional identification, and the simple fact of being composed of large numbers of very small organisations, ranged across the public, private and third sectors. As in the higher education sector, a relatively low status is attributed to leadership. For example, one of our interviewees proposed that only those directly involved in promoting leadership ever use the term, while another described their boss as an ‘inspirational leader,’ but added, ‘don’t tell him I said so, he’d hate it’.

But despite this hesitancy to address issues of leadership, Devlin et al suggest that it is not at all clear that cultural organisations need to professionalise their management in the way of other sectors. They assert, rather, that other kinds of businesses, faced as they are with the need to balance risks and creativity and the increasing need to operate in fluid networks, can learn a lot from the cultural sector. Indeed cultural leaders’ particular characteristics are considered to...

… engender new and unexpected meanings. The recognition and creative transgression of rules and norms is at the heart of cultural leadership. Cultural leaders are able to transmute how they are personally affected by the culture into creative action that midwives the future.

Nevertheless, there has been a long-standing tradition of UK arts organisations learning from businesses through Arts & Business’ Board Bank and other services. The Cultural Leadership Programme (CLP) ran Catalyst Unleashed in 2007, in partnership with Unilever, which brought together qualities mentioned earlier, it involves the ability to recognise that certain styles of leadership are more effective in some situations than in others and may require different applications of directive and supportive behaviours (Norman-Wright 2007).
participants from the cultural and corporate sectors to focus 'on personal and professional development whilst balancing this with issues such as operating strategically and under pressure'.

Another challenge faced by the arts and cultural sector relates to the small size of the organisations and the funding they attract. Small cultural organisations, with little core funding, often survive as a result of attracting project funding. Such organisations typically move from project to project and from funding bid to funding bid, which can undermine the time and space needed to develop professional leadership. Even for organisations with core funding, reliance on project funding can sometimes be problematic for other reasons.

Similarly, cultural organisations in the public, or third, sector may work with paid as well as unpaid staff, managers and trustees. Dealing with different stakeholders is hardly unique to the cultural sector, but it is a strong feature of it, and raises issues about the relative weighting of outwardly focused leadership (influence, advocacy), as distinct from inwardly focused, transactional leadership (defined below). In response to this, the CLP pays particular attention to the leadership issues for non-executives, and City University's CLP emphasises 'managing-up'.

The recent emphasis on partnership work across a whole range of public-policy areas also raises leadership challenges for the cultural sector, as elsewhere. One such challenge is the need to move beyond specific professional service competencies and interests. The inherent difficulties of that are explicit in different uses of language. As the Dare (Snapshot 51) shows, even common terms like 'market' or 'customers' can have varied meanings among different professional groups.

A common challenge acknowledged in the literature is the need for professional managers to move beyond their own service area and engage with other leaders beyond their own professions. This is problematic in a field in which identification with one's own professional interests – rather than with an institution or wider sector – is generally strong. It finds echoes in some of the research on leadership in higher education (below).

Finally, the expansion of the cultural and creative industries and their growing prominence within public policy has led to fears that while the UK has generated large numbers of small cultural firms, there are weaknesses in their capitalisation, management and leadership that need to be addressed, not least, via public intervention. According to NESTA, some 42 per cent of graduates who have studied creative subjects experience some form of self-employment in their first five years after graduation – although it is unclear whether this represents a strong sense of entrepreneurship or simply a response to an overcrowded labour market.

As a result, recent years have seen an increased emphasis on entrepreneurship training, or business education, within the context of creative and cultural education, as well as a greater focus on pathways from education into employment. The Cultural Leadership Programme itself has sought to blend entrepreneurial and leadership skills in its Entrepreneurs as Leaders strand.

4.4 Leadership in higher education

Styles: It is no coincidence that much of the work on distributed and collaborative leadership has been undertaken in relation to education, particularly given that characteristically much of its expertise is distributed across the many, not the few. In expertise-based collaborations such as those considered in this report, this approach is vital. Indeed, Bolden et al argue that distributed leadership in higher education is not just desirable, but necessary.

Challenges: As Bryman warns, however, this more managerialist discourse – indeed the notion of leadership at all – can be at odds with the notion of trusted professionals that many senior academics have grown up with. Bryman's review of the literature on academic leadership finds a number of studies arguing that the notion of leadership has low status among academics. Not only are they often reluctant managers, but managerial progression is sometimes low on the list of reasons given for remaining in academia.

Bryman also quotes Trow's observation that the rise of managerialism was perceived to reflect, 'a withdrawal of trust by government from the universities' and observes that many academics may be considered reluctant managers – a phenomenon that can also be observed in some cultural organisations.

Moreover, the stress on HEIs to be more entrepreneurial...
and more engaged with external partners\textsuperscript{158} has led to a change in emphasis apropos questions of leadership.\textsuperscript{159} It obviously brings the issues of the distribution of power across organisations to the fore and has, arguably, also had an impact on the traditional notion of collegiality.\textsuperscript{160} Placing stronger emphasis on responsiveness and participation in decision-making, together with a stronger commercial and business focus, is not always welcomed.

Given these developments, where leadership is needed, it often takes a distributed form, combining both formal roles (vice-chancellor, pro-vice-chancellor, dean, etc) with positional expertise-based roles and individual leadership with strong network-based leadership. For Bolden et al\textsuperscript{161}, the social capital represented by networks is integral to the manner in which leadership is enacted across HEIs. As in other organisations, this myriad of leadership styles and any changes in role can bring questions of leadership to the fore.

Bolden et al\textsuperscript{162} warn us to be careful when dealing with accounts of distributed leadership in higher education, as the suspicion of individual leadership and discomfort with the language of leadership may mean that ‘accounts of effective leadership are more likely the consequence of rhetoric’. In other words, as a result of the changing nature of higher education and the stress on entrepreneurship and managerialism\textsuperscript{163}, the idea of distributed leadership offers a normative framework that allows for notions of both managerialism and collegiality. Distributed leadership may be more comfortable rhetorically, especially for those who have not traditionally liked the language of leadership.

Research collaborations, either between academic institutions or between HEIs and other organisations, often display a model of leadership, in which leadership is assumed as a consequence of expertise. Our research suggests that this model applies to other forms of collaboration, not just those based on research. As Bolden et al note\textsuperscript{164}, this form of leadership again allows academics to take on managerial responsibility without sensing a tension between this and their identity as an academic.

4.5 Leadership development, training and education

The Cultural Leadership Programme undertook a small survey amongst leaders of major cultural organisations to explore the leadership development opportunities that they had experienced. The sample group had an average of 5.1 years in their current posts and 60% of them had previously been Chief Executives of other cultural institutions (with an average service of 8.5 years). Despite this wealth of experience, only 60% had undergone any sort of leadership development.\textsuperscript{165}

The growth in leadership development in the cultural sector needs to be seen in the wider context of leadership development across the public sector, including leadership academies such as the National College for School Leadership, the Local Government Leadership Centre and various programmes within the NHS.\textsuperscript{166}

The identification of leadership concerns in higher education in the mid-2000s resulted in the establishment of both the Leadership Foundation's and Hefce's Leadership, Governance and Management Fund in 2004. The role of the former is to define and meet the development needs of leaders, managers and governors across the UK’s 160 universities and higher education colleges. The latter is intended to encourage the development and embedding of recognised good practice in the areas of leadership, governance and management; involving collaboration and its dissemination across the sector; providing measurable change in, and having an impact on, the quality of leadership; and to provide esteem and recognition for leadership, governance and management.

Bolden et al argue\textsuperscript{167} that leadership development is seen as an area of high priority in most universities, and most have some form of in-house leadership development provision, which in some cases is becoming more personalised. This bespoke provision allows more room for the development of ‘soft’ skills and topics such as leadership through participation, but Bolden et al conclude\textsuperscript{168} that while collective forms of leadership are becoming more important, some leadership training still focuses too heavily on the production of individuals’ informal leadership roles.

However, calls for well-developed leadership in the arts and cultural sector go back further than the mid-2000s. The Museum Leadership Programme, at the University of East Anglia, for established museum professionals, was launched in 1988. It constituted a response to the increasing demand for people at senior levels within museums (and related organisations) who could demonstrate an exceptionally wide
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range of leadership and personal skills. As Hewison notes, the sector’s need for enhanced leadership capacity was reinforced in a number of reports.

Prompted by what was perceived as a crisis in cultural leadership, the Trustees of the CDF established a small task force in 2002 to consider the ways in which the foundation could stimulate fresh thinking around the issue of cultural leadership. On the basis of a report by Hewison and Holden, it induced its first fellows in 2004–05. A number of HEIs have been involved in delivering the Clore Leadership Programme’s short courses including: Nottingham University Business School; Ashridge Business School, Hertfordshire; Leeds University Business School; National College for School Leadership in association with Nottingham University Business School; Henley Business School, University of Reading; the University of Bath, and the University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

A number of public-sector initiatives followed the establishment of the Clore Leadership Programme. Other public sector initiatives include the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA)'s Take the Lead programme; the Museums Galleries Scotland's Leadership Programme; and various other in-house schemes, including those run by the V&A. Some regions, such as the South West, have piloted cultural leadership projects, and organisations such as NESTA and the ICA have run awards or events focused on cultural leadership. The MLA alone has invested some £645,000 to date in development and delivery of leadership programmes for museums, libraries and archives.

Since 2006 a number of postgraduate programmes have been developed in UK HEIs to address leadership in the cultural sector. The first cultural leadership MA was set up by City University London. As part of a cultural leadership programme for women, it sought to redress the gender imbalance in the sector, and emphasised the value of work-based learning and has generated a number of short courses. Subsequent courses include those at in the Faculty of Media, Arts and Social Science, Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU), and the MA in Creative and Cultural Leadership, Portsmouth Centre for Enterprise, University of Portsmouth.

To the best of our knowledge, the case studies scrutinised in this report have not, however, involved leadership students from City University or Liverpool John Moores University, or Clore Fellows. AHRC-funded PhD students worked on the exhibition of Polynesian art, explored in Case Study 5, and it is hoped that AHRC will also fund two PhD students to work on Making Art in Tudor Britain (Case Study 3).

**Challenges:** As suggested above, the relatively sparse literature on cultural leadership tends not to promote particular models of leadership. By the same token, cultural leadership courses do not promote specific types of leadership per se, although the University of Portsmouth’s MA Creative and Cultural Leadership is structured around four types of leadership: ‘self leadership,’ ‘transformational leadership,’ ‘creative leadership’ and global leadership.

Cultural leadership course curricula are principally intended to equip individuals with what are perceived as necessary competencies and qualities. According to the programme director of one of the country’s MAs in cultural leadership:

> We don't mention leadership types in the course outline. It just lists the competencies we expect people to acquire, such as, 'effective performance within a team environment and the ability to recognise and utilise individuals’ contribution to group processes, team selection, delegation, development and management’ and ‘leadership skills including selecting appropriate leadership for the style of situation; setting targets, motivating, monitoring, coaching and mentoring, continuous improvement’.

> Even for the Cultural Leadership module, all we say about models is: ‘an analysis of current models of leadership and their relationship to the sector; classical models and their lineage, leadership and followership; situational and transformational leadership; collective leadership.’

Courses also tend to be targeted at particular constituencies, not least those previously excluded from leadership positions – Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Leadership (CLP) and women (City University), as well as those employed in local authorities. Such emphases reflect an understanding of leadership that pertains to many, if not all, levels within an organisation, rather than being exclusively focused at the top.

Courses also profess to reject definitions of leadership that derive from other fields and may be constraining. Thus, amongst CLP publications, it is suggested that cultural leadership is distinct from heroic or charismatic leadership.
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styles – more usually associated with ‘captains of industry’
… cultural organisations have been quietly moving away
from this Napoleonic version of leadership for some time.177
Whereas the former director of the National Gallery has
described cultural leadership as depending on

… luck and timing and the availability of funding,
sometimes also … issues of character and intellectual
and artistic self-confidence, sometimes also … visual and
aesthetic judgment, a match between drive, intellectual
confidence and artistic expertise.178

others regard leadership in the cultural sector as wedded to
change, innovation and new ideas:

One of the big differences … between cultural leadership
and other types of leadership is change. Artists want
change. They are looking for new ideas, innovation. So
you need stable organisations that are enthusiastic about
change, and therefore leaders who are really adaptable
and flexible, and kind of engender that feeling in the
organisation. It’s kind of a weird one.179
5. Case studies

The following case studies are the primary empirical material contained in this report. As discussed in Section 2, they were selected on the basis of geographic spread, stage of completion, size, cultural form, and type of partners and intentions.

All the case studies are based on visits to the partners and a number of interviews. The interviewees were selected according to the nature of each particular case study. In some, formal roles needed to be covered; in others, leaders proposed other interviewees. Although the case studies differ in size and scope, they are presented in a form that enables loose comparisons to be made. The case studies were revisited and updated in April and June 2009.

5.1 Culture Campus, Liverpool

Overview

Type of project: Culture Campus is a high-level collaboration that brings together HEIs and cultural organisations in a citywide network.

Why this project was chosen: Culture Campus was chosen as a focus for this study because its core purpose – brokering links between higher education, the arts and cultural organisations – is synonymous with the subject of this report. The high-level involvement of pro-vice-chancellors and cultural organisations’ artistic directors in this project is distinctive, and Culture Campus is an evolving organisation whose history and current challenges exemplify many of the issues with which this report is concerned.

What is addressed by the collaboration: The early years of the twenty-first century saw renewed emphasis on the visual arts and culture in general in Liverpool: the Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art was re-launched in September 2002, the purpose-built Foundation for Art and Creative Technology (FACT) opened in 2003, and the city was bidding to become European Capital of Culture for 2008. Despite having better provision for the exhibition of contemporary fine arts in Britain than any city outside London, there were concerns that the city’s provision of postgraduate education in the fine arts was weak. This was considered to have a knock-on effect in terms of graduate retention. In order to address this situation and to build greater alignment among the city’s universities and major cultural organisations, not least in their capacity as potential employers, Culture Campus was established.

The project’s objectives: The origins of what became Culture Campus lay in a series of conversations among some of Liverpool’s primary cultural organisations from the end of the 1990s onwards. It then became an informal network, linking some of Liverpool’s primary visual arts organisations – the directors of the Biennial, FACT and Tate Liverpool – with the University of Liverpool and LJMU.

The initial focus was on improving the city’s provision of postgraduate education in the fine arts and developing its visual arts infrastructure. But like other long-term collaborations, the focus, partners and projects with which Culture Campus engages have changed in response to partner interest, the wider environment and funding opportunities.

It has developed over time via a series of initiatives focusing on employment, work placements, pathways to employment and the overall visibility of Liverpool’s visual arts culture. More recently, the focus on the visual arts specifically has lessened, as the organisation has sought to become a more general higher-level higher education/arts network in the aftermath of Liverpool’s Capital of Culture year.

Although its current remit and organisational form are by no means settled, at the time of writing Culture Campus remains involved with many of the major developments in Liverpool’s cultural economy.

Main activities: One of the informal network’s first activities was to commission research on graduate retention, particularly in the visual arts. The resulting report found that the emphasis of arts education in the city was ‘traditional’ and that its ‘focus was often on artists working on the refinement of specific disciplines, requiring large, self-contained, well-lit studio spaces to do so. However, the growth of conceptual art meant that work was less likely to be led by a specific medium and that recent art...
graduates were equally likely to enter related fields such as curation, writing or cultural entrepreneurship. Given this, the report was concerned with what it perceived as a lack of transferable skills for fine art graduates, and insufficient focus on professional development, with very few employment links, such as internships, available within the city.

Between April 2006 and March 2008, when organisational changes were afoot, Culture Campus produced a website[^183], which in addition to providing general information sought to offer both job and placement matching online, an intern programme and a magazine, in part as a forum for student journalists.

This project’s main outcomes: Outcomes so far have included an increase in the number of postgraduate study opportunities in the visual arts, which was an original aim of the project. These studies are undertaken primarily at LJMU, which now provides a new MA in Curating New Media Art and a Master of Fine Art.

In addition, Culture Campus has evolved from an organisation dedicated to the visual arts to a broader network that involves all of Liverpool’s HEIs and linking to a wider range of partners in arts and regeneration. In its current incarnation (post-March 2008), Culture Campus seeks to act primarily as a forum for shared interests and seeks to add value to the core organisational activities of its board members. In this case, the outcomes, whether in the form of collaborative PhDs or improved CPD programmes, may be realised by individual board members. It is also hoping to draw on its extended network to take advantage of the post-Capital of Culture development of Liverpool’s cultural research, policy and support infrastructure.

### Partnership, management, and leadership

**Partnership:** As mentioned previously, Culture Campus was originally formed by an informal network that brought together the Liverpool Biennial, FACT and Tate Liverpool and the two oldest universities in the city, LJMU – home of the city’s arts school and much of its arts education provision – and the University of Liverpool. More recently, Hope University, the most recent addition to Liverpool’s HEIs and by far the smallest HEI in the city, has become an active partner in Culture Campus; indeed some interviews argued, the most active.

Culture Campus has a (currently unfunded) secretariat supplied by Liverpool City of Learning (LCCL) and a strong alignment (not formally represented on its board) with Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium (LARC), a partnership of eight of the major cultural institutions in Liverpool, including the original Culture Campus partners together with those in the performing arts including the Liverpool Everyman and Playhouse, the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic, and the Unity Theatre, together with National Museums Liverpool and the Bluecoat.[^184]

**Management:** The partners, primarily the universities, initially funded Culture Campus, with much smaller amounts coming from Tate, FACT and the Biennial. However, in order to develop its activities, it needed to secure some form of public support and adapt its aims to the requirements of public funders. In 2006, the organisation was thus set up as a company limited by guarantee, a chief executive was appointed and it applied for regional development funds.

Applying for, and winning, two years’ funding from the Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWDA), however, changed Culture Campus from an organisation focused on the visual arts in higher education and the workplace, to one that extended into other cultural sectors, economic development, and informal education that provided support to small cultural businesses.

With this change in direction away from the visual arts to a wider set of economic development concerns, many on the board were unhappy. Although the chief executive had a formal title and role, this did not translate into successful positional leadership. The leader was unable to gain the required legitimacy among peers.

Although the organisation has since resorted to a more obviously collaborative leadership model, some interviewees indicated that Culture Campus lost focus as a result of the developments associated with NWDA funding. Others suggested that different priorities may have existed from the beginning and were, perhaps, inevitable given the different interests of the main players.

The University of Liverpool and LJMU – in a pattern repeated by HEIs across other interventions examined for the purposes of this report – had somewhat different reasons for being involved.

[^183]: http://www.culturecampus.co.uk
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On the one hand, the University of Liverpool, as a Russell group university, is concentrated in the sciences: it has a large medical school and up to a quarter of its undergraduates are studying a clinical subject. As with other older research-intensive universities in the UK, it is sometimes perceived as being remote from the city within which it is based, as addressing itself to a national and global market of academics and students, and as being less embedded in the local, than a new university such as LJMU. Its involvement in Culture Campus was one way to address this civic agenda and demonstrate commitment, not only to supporting the arts, but also to research into the sector, an issue made explicit by its Impacts 08 research partnership with LJMU. LJMU, on the other hand, could be seen to have much to gain directly from Culture Campus’ original aims of improving the visual arts infrastructure and retaining graduate arts students.

Leadership: From the outset, Culture Campus could be said to have suffered from an excess of leaders, given that its board was composed of vice-chancellors and chief executives of arts organisations as well as having (for a time) its own chief executive. Indeed, this led to tensions when the appointed chief executive favoured a focus on employability and small-firm development, rather than on improving the infrastructure of higher education in the visual arts. Another leading partner, in this instance, was the funder, NWDA, which needed to see returns in terms of jobs created or businesses assisted – a somewhat different set of criteria from Culture Campus’ original aims.

The universities were originally represented on the board by vice-chancellors, but as one interviewee commented, while this was not unusual in the setting-up stage of the organisation, devolving representation to pro-vice-chancellors was seen as more sensible once it was up and running.

The current board consists of the Chair, Christoph Grunenberg, the Director of Tate Liverpool; Lewis Biggs, Director of the Liverpool Biennial; John Belchem, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of Liverpool; Roger Webster, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, LJMU, and Bill Chambers, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Liverpool Hope University. The board was described by interviewees as very active; it meets monthly and is currently in a process of actively considering the future shape and direction of Culture Campus. At the time of writing, these considerations took the form of a day-long conference on the future of Culture Campus and a vision document, which was presented to the board.

With one exception, the chair of the board has always been representative of a cultural organisation, currently Christoph Grunenberg, Tate Liverpool. Interviewees argued that this is significant and acknowledges that the cultural organisations have been the more active players, not only in Culture Campus but in associated forums such as LARC. In addition, it signifies the distinction between Culture Campus and seemingly similar organisations, such as the London Centre for Arts and Cultural Enterprise (LCACE), which is a grouping of universities seeking to make links with cultural organisations. Culture Campus is very clear that it seeks to be a partnership between cultural organisations and HEIs, where HEIs are not the dominant partner. For similar reasons, the venue at which board meetings take place is deliberately rotated among partners.

Interviewees expressed some concern that the organisation is still ‘over-led’, and that the actual work of project development is carried out below the level of the board members by staff of the member organisations. Those interviewees in more junior roles claimed this could lead to a sense of disconnect between decision-makers and implementers.

On occasion, the chair of the board may act as Culture Campus’ public face, but the current public face of Culture Campus is Erica Jones, Liverpool City of Learning, who is the acting company secretary. The fact that she is in an acting role, which is currently unfunded, was seen by some interviewees to exemplify this concern that the task of implementing the board’s vision is currently under-resourced.

Erica credits her relationship with Belinda Kidd of LARC as the motivation behind Culture Campus’ current revival, after a difficult period when formal funding ceased, and the chief executive left. The connection (albeit informal) with LARC is important, as it represents the cultural sector in the city (membership of LARC goes beyond the organisations represented on the board of Culture Campus).

The secretariat is responsible for driving forward the project on a day-to-day basis and informally directs the project. As Useem argues, the key leadership activity here is getting people, both board members and people within their organisations, to interact. But the fact that Culture Campus formally has no chief executive or director as such is indicative of both the current state
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of flux within the organisation and the gap between actual and stated roles. The project’s leadership could thus be described as a form of positional leadership[^187], which means that one of the project’s primary activities is to ensure that board members can act as conduits to their organisations, for it is these individual organisations that generally take any mutual projects forward.

Culture Campus’ model is designed to achieve high-level buy-in and championship of specific projects (e.g., the Cultural Observatory), while delivery of these projects then cascades down to one of the individual partners. Culture Campus does not regard itself as a delivery organisation, and if there is disagreement about the running of a particular scheme, the organisation whose name is in the funding bid will make the final decision.

**Discussion**

**Links to the literature:** Given its high-level board, composed of the chief executives of various higher education and cultural organisations, Culture Campus is a strong example of collaborative leadership[^188]. This does not mean that it has never had a designated leader. Although it began as an informal network, from 2006–08 it had a formal chief executive, and since 2008 it has had de facto leadership from a secretariat. It also has a board chair, elected on a rotating basis primarily from arts organisations.

In addition, two of the leadership ‘media’ set out by Huxham and Vangen[^189] can be seen clearly in Culture Campus. First, the leadership through structure media was exemplified by Culture Campus’ transition to a limited company in order to receive NWDA funding. Second, Culture Campus also represents leadership through participants’ ‘media’ in that it has a variety of potential leaders, with different tasks at different times, but the non-hierarchical nature of the collaboration means that leaders are essentially positional leaders: the legitimacy to lead is conferred on them because of their position in the partnership structure and ability to carry things forward at any particular moment.

However, the difficulties of collaborative leadership discussed in the literature are also evident in the Culture Campus case. The competing interests of the two types of universities involved in Culture Campus, in this case the University of Liverpool and LJMU, are also touched on by the literature. Bolden et al.[^190] pick up the different forms of engagement between pre-1992 (‘old’) and post-1992 (‘new’) universities. They observe that older universities are more likely to get involved in research-based collaborations, and newer ones in collaborations around business engagement or the student experience.

We would argue that while this may hold for many collaborations, it is possibly not as firm a finding in the arts and cultural sector because the study of arts subjects, particularly fine art, music, drama or media, has often taken place outside older universities. This appears to be the case in Liverpool, where interviewees argued that the University of Liverpool is committed as much for civic reasons as for research-based ones, while LJMU has strong arts provision.

Similarly, Bolden et al.[^191] comment on the different forms of leadership in newer and older universities – with newer universities adopting a more managerial leadership style, and older ones continuing to favour a more collegial style. Certainly, the collegial
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nature of decision-making was commented on in some of the other interviews for the present study – at the University of Leeds for example, but in a collaboration such as Culture Campus these distinctions are perhaps ironed out by the uniformly high level of representation on the board. Indeed, interviewees did not observe that distinctions in the leadership style of the HEIs translated themselves into distinctions in their engagement with Culture Campus.

Sustainability and potential: In spring 2008 NWDA's funding for Culture Campus expired, and the post of chief executive was not renewed. The partners are currently considering its future in the hugely altered context of Liverpool after Capital of Culture 2008.

This review process is being supported by LCCL\(^{192}\), which promotes strategic co-operation between the region's universities and further education partners in a series of initiatives that include the creation of the country's first CPD Notice Board; a series of contracts with Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), such as the designing of the national learning mentor training programme; and work with schools, colleges and local authorities in relation to the new 14–19 diplomas and progression.

Culture Campus has also strengthened its alignment with the LARC, which has recently secured over £6m funding for a number of pioneering programmes including Liverpool Thrive (ACE), Find Your Talent (DCSF and DCMS), Creative Apprenticeships (led by CCSkills), and ACE NW and Cultural Leadership (supported by the CLP).

The University of Liverpool, LJMU and Hope have also recently bid successfully for the opportunity to host the Northwest Cultural Observatory, previously part of the NW Cultural Consortium.

While the details are currently unclear, it is envisaged that Culture Campus will continue to act as a broker between HEIs and the cultural sector, not just in terms of employability, but also in areas of research and policy advice on the cultural economy.

The wider implications of this case study: Culture Campus' original aim was to improve the visual arts infrastructure of the city, in terms of postgraduate provision, employment and placement opportunities, and research. This was reflected in the original make-up of the board. However, the difficulty of securing funding for such activities, compounded with the different agendas of the original two main HEI partners, meant that in the interests of securing funding other objectives were embraced. Although this was perceived as a way to improve Culture Campus' stability, it risked morphing the partnership into a cultural industry support organisation, many of which struggle to balance the very different roles of job creation, the provision of business advice and the amelioration of social problems.

The relative flexibility of the board and the longer-term personal relationships that it represents have, however, meant that it has been a matter of will to continue Culture Campus, even without funding, until new funding can be secured. This has been far from unproblematic, but it suggests the strength of this sort of distributed, socially embedded model of partnership\(^{193}\), which a more formalised structure perhaps could not adopt.
5.2 The Watershed, Bristol

Overview

**Type of project:** This case study focuses, not on a single intervention, but on a series of links that started in the late 1990s between Watershed, the University of the West of England (UWE) and Bristol University.

**Why this project was chosen:** It was chosen because the Watershed represents a particular kind of collaborative entity, that of the public space or institution as a trusted broker. Watershed is a highly collaborative, networked organisation, and its leadership model – that of the boundary spanner\(^{194}\) – reflects this.

Moreover, it is a physical, public space that is using cutting-edge digital technology to re-invent itself and its purpose. It is a role that other cultural organisations, for example FACT in Liverpool, one of the Culture Campus partners, also seeks to fill, and one that we think is important in the developing landscape of higher education and arts collaborations.

**What is addressed by the collaboration:** As a hub rather than a specific project, the Watershed was not set up to address particular needs. Instead, a whole raft of projects has grown from its role, firstly as a cultural institution and meeting place, and secondly as a broker of projects between academics, businesses, artists and arts organisations.

**The project’s objectives:** The Watershed Media Centre opened in 1982 as an arts cinema in a disused warehouse. Since then it has evolved into a home for collaboration across the media arts, with an explicitly educational agenda, and is now one of the UK’s primary mixed-media centres. These are only a small number of the wide variety of collaborations in which the Watershed is involved, and perhaps unusually for a cultural organisation, in its links with HEIs Watershed is often the senior partner.

**Main activities:** Over the past decade, Watershed has been home to a number of digital media collaborations, extending way beyond academia, but also including those with the University of Bristol and the UWE. These include:

- **The Clark Bursary**, a digital arts award\(^{195}\), which was launched in 1998 and run in conjunction with the J A Clark Charitable Trust, UWE and ACE. The award was an annual bursary to a UK-based artist interested in new media who would produce a work of art in the South West. The work was not a straightforward commission and often extended into multidisciplinary areas: for example, the sixth bursary winner, Dream Director, involved collaboration with a sleep psychologist at UWE. The scheme ended in 2007.

- **Bristol Media Exchange**\(^{196}\) is a not-for-profit, high-speed metropolitan area network, offering a range of services such as file transfer, voice-over Internet protocol (IP), video conferencing, utility provision, training, software and off-site back-up. Partners include the University of Bristol, Hewlett Packard European Research Laboratories in Bristol (HP Labs) and NESTA FutureLab.

- **dShed** is the archive space for the Watershed’s online content. It gets around 53,000 visitors a month, obviously many more than the building itself. The amount of content on the site is producing issues in terms of content management however, and the team is currently investigating various possibilities for archiving and searching content, including the development of a semantic web toolkit, which it is pursuing with the Institute of Learning and Research Technology at Bristol University.

- **iShed** is a community interest company set up to work as a broker with academic, commercial and cultural partners. It is part of dShed, Watershed’s archive space and brand for online content such as short films, digital arts and videogames as well as electronic forums.

- **The Pervasive Media Studio’s** intention is to provide an open access workspace in central Bristol for academics, small firms and artists who are working in the area of mobile or wireless applications. It was initially envisaged that both Universities would be partners in this arrangement, but while this has not happened formally, individual academics are using, and will continue to use, the space.

**This project’s main outcome:** The Watershed has successfully developed from an arts cinema to a hub for interdisciplinary collaborations between the screen industries and digital technology.
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Partnership, management and leadership

Partnership: Behind Watershed’s formal structures (discussed below) lies a network of often long-term personal relationships. Interviewees were very keen to stress that these are the real mechanisms by which this sort of collaboration is effected. Various interviewees commented on Watershed’s openness to a variety of collaborations – what Fleming refers to as ‘porousness’. However, the emphasis placed on the importance of personal relationships could potentially limit this openness.

Whereas Watershed’s formal links to the two universities appear to have weakened over time, personal collaborations have often intensified. Interviewees suggested that the competitiveness of HEIs within Bristol, a theme noted in interviews for other case studies, was sometimes seen to retard collaboration.

One interviewee commented that collaboration with academics only works where there is an academic partner who is prepared to ‘bend the system’, and manage the internal system of the university, such that it does not stymie external collaboration. Williams’ description of boundary spanners notes that one of the roles of this type of leadership is bringing unlikely partners together, breaking through red tape and seeing things in a different way. This description could apply both to Watershed’s leadership style and to the leadership style of those academics with whom they work well.

While individual arts and media academics work well with Watershed, their overlapping interests were sometimes seen to be treading on each other’s toes. Some people have argued that collaboration with engineers and scientists is easier because there is less of an overlap. There is also concern amongst some humanities and social science academics that collaborating with external agencies and business may compromise their traditional critical stance. This makes trust more of an issue in what are often less formally defined collaborations, but also leads to what one interviewee described as ‘longer brokerage chains’ in the arts and social sciences.

However, interviewees at Watershed also argued that over time they had become better at collaboration, and particularly more at ease in recognising when collaborations were not working. They cited one instance of an arts collaboration where the funder demanded a collaborative model and chose the partners. Watershed, as the recipient of the largest amount of funding, became a de facto leader of the collaboration, but as an interviewee commented, ‘We didn’t like being gatekeeper, and they didn’t like being a junior partner’. Recognising that the collaborative delivery model was not working, the partners decided to run it as parallel projects instead.

Management: As Watershed’s series of collaborations has evolved, its organisational and management structure has become more complex, in part because more of its collaborations have been with commercial partners, particularly HP Labs. This exposed the fact that Watershed’s ability to invest and take risks was constrained by both the arts funding system and the rules governing its charitable status, so it established a community interest company, iShed CIC Ltd, which, in theory, allows Watershed to attract investment from commercial organisations for the development of social enterprises.

Nevertheless, its initial activities under the iShed label – particularly the Pervasive Media Studio – have been publicly funded. Start-up funding for the studio came from the ACE’s Thrive programme and Mission Models Money. The Pervasive Media Studio is funded by Watershed with support from HP Labs and with capital support from South West of England Regional Development Agency (SWRDA). Funding for other projects has come from HP Labs, 3C Research, South West Screen and Bristol City Council, amongst others.

At the same time, the director realised that his own leadership of the organisation was becoming something of a brake on future development and collaboration, and that Watershed needed to diversify its leadership. He hired a development officer to work alongside him and stepped down from some of the public face roles, such as speaking engagements, a process he likened to cutting back some trees so that new trees could grow.

While the director remains the public face of the organisation and has often initiated collaborations, delivering those collaborations has generally devolved to someone else in the organisation; the director saw his role in those collaborations as ‘keeping the energy going’. This devolution has led to the development of new leaders within the Watershed group.
Although the director now continues to serve a managing director of the overall group, the current structure consists of:

- Watershed Arts Trust, Ltd., the film and media venue and dShed, runs as a registered charity of which the managing director of Watershed is the chief executive.
- Watershed Trading Company Ltd is effectively the café and venue catering, the profits of which go to Trust, which the managing director also runs.
- iShed CIC includes the Pervasive Media Studio and has its own chief executive, promoted from within the group. It is proposed to make this self-sustaining, with any profits retained in a creative venture fund.

Community interest companies are a relatively new organisational form within the cultural sector and issues of governance, as well as the limits of commercial activities, have yet to be resolved. iShed’s focus is on brokerage, but its activities raise questions about the degree to which it should invest in for-profit ventures and risk possibly losing its trusted broker status. The company currently has an initial advisory group, which includes one member of the Arts Trust board, and the Pervasive Media Studio has an informal board consisting of the managing director (from Watershed) and representatives from HP Labs and the UWE.

Leadership: The managing director was described as an ‘inspirational leader’ by one of the interviewees, though she immediately added, ‘He wouldn’t say that.’ The managing director, himself, described it more as ‘taking advantage of opportunities’, rather than ‘recognising the need for change, by creating a new vision and then carrying through the change’. It is clear that many of the collaborations with which Watershed becomes involved are expertise based rather than institutionally based (links with individual academics, not universities), and thus the projects themselves show collaborative rather than individual leadership. But as Bennett et al argue, notions of distributed leadership are not necessarily at odds with the notion of the strong leader or direction from the top and can perhaps be incorporated in the managing director’s notion of the leader as broker or translator.

However, one of the most significant tasks of leadership has been developing new leaders – a process which Watershed’s collaborative model has made possible. Whereas a single arts organisation may have limited room to develop new leadership opportunities, Watershed’s collaborative model has opened up a new set of possibilities, reflected in its organisational structure described above. This allows new leaders to develop who can take these different projects forward with a degree of autonomy, while remaining within an overall supportive environment.

Discussion

Links to the literature: The Watershed can be seen as a good example of the sort of dynamic and complex leadership model from which businesses outside the cultural sector can learn. At its heart is a style of leadership well captured in the literature on boundary spanners, where the process of collaborative exchange becomes vital to the ability of an organisation to realise its own objectives. In the case of Watershed, developing from a Bristol cinema to one of the most important cultural payers in the South West required intense collaboration and the management of collaborations.

Watershed has now become one of the major nodes in a variety of networks, particularly in the digital sector. Doing that successfully and sustaining it requires the development of a reservoir of people within the organisation who can act as boundary spanners,
and it is the development of such people that the chief executive is now concerned with. His own role as a broker has been highly successful, but for the organisation to grow this role needs to be taken up by other individuals and indeed, the process of collaboration, by creating new projects and organisations, has given Watershed space to develop these new boundary spanners.

The Watershed's activities, likewise, provide an example of Huxham and Vangen's leadership through structure, as it has adopted a quite complex management structure in order to accommodate a variety of collaborations, as well as its core business.

**Sustainability and potential:** The activities of hubs such as the Watershed are recognised as important to the development of the wider ‘creative economy’. While the organisation has evolved into a highly entrepreneurial model for seeking funding, there is some concern that its core activities – film and media – are attracting less revenue funding. However, revenue funding makes up a relatively small part of Watershed’s overall income, supporting its activities as a cultural organisation with a physical presence in the city.

The physical ‘space for things to happen’ that Watershed offers, together with the core cinema programme, is regarded by those who work there and others as vital to supporting its other activities. While project funding has increased, core funding has diminished. This can make it difficult to fund the (unpaid, uncounted) intermediary activities that are vital to making a collaborative public space work.

**The wider implications of this case study**

Relationships with the city’s universities work well at the level of individual academics’ involvement but less well at the institutional level. It has been suggested that as Watershed has grown stronger the relationships with local universities have weakened somewhat. This points to a couple of issues that we detected in interviews for other cases studies. In science and technology, large firms often partner with universities. However, in the cultural arena, HEIs often dominate collaborations. This may be due to the fact that cultural organisations and firms often tend to be small. In such collaborations, money tends to flow from the HEI to cultural organisations, which can produce a power imbalance. In the case of Watershed, which has proved adept at funding collaborative projects from different sources, the balance of power may have changed over time.

In other cases, the relationship with individual academics precedes institutional collaborations, and management faces the issue of how to sustain such relationships under an institutional umbrella without damaging them. It ensures that projects get underway, but although partnerships are sustainable at individual level, they are less likely to lead to strong institutional links.

Given its role in the production of new media content, it was not surprising that interviewees for this case study raised concerns about intellectual property. This poses a challenge for some brokerage organisations: the Watershed does not generally seek to retain any of the intellectual property generated by research collaborations, but offers to provide a platform for the distribution of the finished products. This form of intellectual property sharing is relatively common in the not-for-profit sector, but sits awkwardly in terms of the intellectual property framework and tax credit system that stipulate that organisations must retain all intellectual property derived from their research and development activities (in order to qualify for research and development tax credits, for example).
5.3 Making Art in Tudor Britain, London

The National Portrait Gallery holds the largest public collection of Tudor and Jacobean painting in the world. The collections are one of the most significant resources for the understanding of visual culture in the English Renaissance. This research programme offers a unique opportunity to develop and share our knowledge.

(Sandy Nairne, Director, National Portrait Gallery).

Overview

Type of project: Making Art in Tudor Britain is a high-level collaboration that brings together a number of national and international HEIs and cultural organisations.

Why this project was chosen: Making Art in Tudor Britain was chosen as a focus for this study because its modus operandi – that of a collaboration between curators, conservators, art-historians and historians focused on addressing questions that would be unanswerable by any individual or from the perspective of any single specialism – is synonymous with the subject of this report. It is concerned with creating new understandings of part of Britain’s artistic heritage. Its uniqueness in the context of this report resides in the fact that it breaks away from the conventional model of HEIs leading on collaborative research projects, and exemplifies the notion that scholarship, and leading on collaborative research projects, is not the exclusive domain of HEIs.

What is addressed by the collaboration: The majority of Tudor and Jacobean portraits are by unknown artists, and it is not known when, where and why they were painted. This project emerged as a direct response to the National Portrait Gallery’s acknowledgement of the limitations to research that was available for its 2006 exhibition Searching for Shakespeare. Its last major body of research on the collection – Sir Roy Strong’s 1969 catalogue, Tudor and Jacobean Portraits – still forms the basis of the gallery’s existing knowledge.

The project’s objectives: Unlike some of the other case studies, Making Art in Tudor Britain was initiated by a single organisation. It is an ambitious research project that involves the detailed and comprehensive scientific survey of 120 of the most important paintings, dated 1500–1620, from the collections of the National Portrait Gallery and elsewhere.

This project brings together a number of HEIs and cultural organisations as partners, including the National Portrait Gallery, the National Gallery, the Courtauld Institute of Art, the University of Sussex, Concordia University Montreal and the Institute Collectie Nederland, Amsterdam, in an effort to transform the understanding of the production of Tudor and Jacobean portraits, their patrons, markets and audiences, and international influences. According to one of the project proposal’s peer reviewers, it promises ‘a paradigm shift in the discipline’.

Main activities: This project examines a collection of paintings through the combination of the latest scientific techniques (such as X-ray photography, infrared reflectography, paint analysis, dendrochronology, microscopic examination and ultraviolet investigation) in order to reveal new information about individual paintings and piece together a map of the different artistic practices, materials, techniques and styles in use by artists working in Britain during the period under examination. The interpretation of those findings will, as has already been the case, depend on discursive interpretation with partners.

To date, the project has evolved through a number of phases described below.

- In the pilot, the National Portrait Gallery conducted an initial examination of 20 pictures (dated 1500–50) in 2004–05.
- The main research project started in April 2007 and involved an examination of a further 20 paintings (including those held by the National Portrait Gallery and other collections).
- The project hosted a series of three workshops in 2007–08, which were funded by an AHRC grant and represented the National Portrait Gallery’s first such award under its recent status as one of AHRC’s Independent Research Organisations (see 213 http://www.npg.org.uk/live/makingtudorartintro.asp (retrieved 06.11.2008) 214 http://www.npg.org.uk/whatsont/exhibitions/searching-for-shakespeare.php (retrieved 03.07.2009) 215 Infrared reflectography is used to reveal under-drawings and changes in the initial design; paint analysis, to investigate microscopic pigment samples in order to help with dating; dendrochronology is the examination of tree rings which can help to provide the earliest felling dates for the wood used in a panel, and indicate its geographical origin; X-rays can reveal changes in composition beneath the surface of the paint layers; microscopic examination and photography allow the construction of paint layers and glazes to be examined; and ultraviolet investigation helps to reveal old restoration and varnish layers.)
At 3 July 2009, five case studies were available at http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain/case-studies.php

The introduction to this report. Workshop participants included a range of British and international academics, curators and conservationists. Discussions focused on artistic practice in Tudor England; the research landscape, methodologies and uses of technical evidence; native practices, methods, materials and the context of craft production; and Netherlandish artists working in England in the early sixteenth century.

• Subject to further funding from AHRC, the National Portrait Gallery plans to continue the research over a four-year period (2009–13), which will enable the exploration of more comparative material and will cover the costs of additional staffing and the supervision of two PhD students.

• Finally, the project would culminate in an exhibition and associated publications.

This project’s main outcomes: It is somewhat premature to describe Making Art in Tudor Britain’s outcomes, but its intention is to generate new insights into the techniques and production of paintings in Tudor and Jacobean England, the complex relationships between continental and native artists of the period, and the requirements of their patrons and audiences. To date, the gallery has analysed 40 pictures (dated 1500–50) and established working partnerships with its collaborators.

The project is of particular interest to specialists in the UK, the Netherlands and Germany with whom the partners wish to share the knowledge and expertise gained through the project. It is proposed that the project will produce several conventional academic outputs, including the publication of three academic books on Tudor and Jacobean artistic practice, articles and a web-based dataset as well as a major exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery in 2013, with an accompanying catalogue and database, conference, seminars, public lectures and the reinterpretation of gallery displays and case studies on the gallery’s website.

Partnership, management and leadership

Partnerships: Engagement with other researchers is fundamental to this project. The project team, led by the National Portrait Gallery, is interdisciplinary and includes scientists, independent painting conservators, art historians and other academics. The role of the key partners – the head of the Department of Conservation and Technology at the Courtauld Institute of Art and an architectural and art historian from the Department of Art History at the University of Sussex – is to provide advice on the methodology and to assist with the interpretation of results throughout the course of the project.

These partners describe their commitment as prompted by the sheer excitement of being involved in such an important project, participating in the identification of trends in the historic use of materials, the opportunity to have access to the National Portrait Gallery’s technical equipment and skills, the chance to develop their own personal specialisms and knowledge base, being able to work on an interdisciplinary project with others, the potential strength and relative speed of joint working, and the absence of HEI bureaucracy.

Partners’ participation in the project to date has been self-financing. Without AHRC funding, the Courtauld has undertaken the examination of a number of works, as part of its own research and teaching initiatives. The National Portrait Gallery’s ongoing research depends on iterative collaboration with other experts because

The expertise of one institution alone cannot provide the answers to the complex questions about production, authorship, technical practice, materials, relationships between native artists and foreign émigrés from the Netherlands and Germany, patrons, and audiences, presentations and display that will emerge form the findings of the Making Art in Tudor Britain project.

In the project’s early stages, the National Portrait Gallery also took advice from scientific staff at other institutions including the National Gallery; the British Museum; Tate, London; and the Metropolitan Museum and the Frick, New York. This is not uncommon in relation to curatorial issues.

Management: As mentioned previously, Making Art in Tudor Britain is based at the National Portrait Gallery, where it is led on a day-to-day basis by the Sixteenth-Century Curator, who is also the public face of the project. The practicalities of Making Art in Tudor Britain depend on a series of formal contracts with the HEIs and all the contractors involved. Amongst other things, these cover issues of financing, copyright and intellectual property.
The National Portrait Gallery has committed £100,000 to the project, and by autumn 2008 it had received over £100,000 in donations, against a target of £375,000. In June 2008 it applied to the AHRC to provide support for 2009–13 and was invited to resubmit in November 2009. AHRC funding of £900,000 would allow the research, based in the gallery’s Conservation Studio, to continue for nearly four years and enable the exploration of more comparative material.

The tasks that make up the full project, as described in the National Portrait Gallery’s application to the AHRC, will be shared amongst the main partners once funding is secured. Until then, these are not yet in play. It is proposed that:

- The academic partner from Sussex University will contribute to the interpretation, supervise one PhD student, edit part of a proposed volume of essays, and research and write articles and a monograph on foreign artists working in England.
- The academic partner from the Courtauld will contribute to the interpretation, supervise the technical PhD student, edit another section of the volume of essays, and write articles comparing the National Portrait Gallery’s technical data to paintings in the Courtauld Gallery and elsewhere.
- The academic partner from Concordia University will share his research, contribute to the proposed 2010 Conference and workshops, write for the exhibition catalogue, and advise one of the PhD students on manuscript research.
- The technical staff will undertake the scientific research and oversee documentation.

AHRC funding will enable other appointments to be made to support the project. These will include an assistant technician to capture photographic data and compile the database in an established format, an assistant curator to work on the interpretation of the findings for the academic and public outputs, an IT technician to undertake the production of all web outputs and a curatorial assistant to provide administrative support to project staff, including scanning material for the database. It is also proposed to include two collaborative PhDs in the project – one focusing on the art-historical identification and examination of documentary sources about artists’ practice, the other, on technical aspects of art history, widening the analyses beyond the National Portrait Gallery’s holdings.

The project has an advisory body made up of specialist staff from the National Gallery, the Courtauld Institute of Art, the University of Sussex, University College London and the Institute Collectie Nederland, Amsterdam.

Leadership: The Sixteenth-Century Curator at the National Portrait Gallery is unanimously acknowledged as the project lead. She has driven the project and is responsible for its funding. Moreover, of all the partners, she proposes committing the most time to it. Nevertheless, it is agreed that both UK academic staff members involved will lead on particular facets of the project – including its publications and technical investigations. As one of them put it in an interview, ‘Genuine collaborations are not always about the most experienced person stepping in, but those with a hand on the tiller being there.’ By the same token, the conservator makes decisions about practical matters about which she advises and consults with the project’s leader.

Indeed, the project was perceived as centring on a three-way partnership and a distributed form of leadership based on mutual respect.

Discussion

Links to the literature: While Making Art in Tudor Britain was still at a developmental stage at the time of writing, it is a strong example of collaboration driven by new ideas and by an overarching and clear vision. Indeed, the roles of different participants were determined from the beginning and were less subject to change, and in that respect, Making Art in Tudor Britain best exemplifies Huxham and Vangen’s leadership through participants ‘medium’. This case study, then, focuses on the leadership of a specific project as distinct from organisational leadership.

Making Art in Tudor Britain provides a striking model of team-work. Much of the literature on team-work focuses on public-sector partnerships and is considered vital for the success of project-based teams. Indeed, the project is explicitly founded on the expectation of the partners’ mutual learning and individual transformation by virtue of the interdisciplinary nature of the project.

As the National Portrait Gallery is leading the project, the academics involved are liberated from having to assume more managerial responsibility, which the literature suggests they may hold in relatively low esteem. This specifically enables them to pursue
their own research interests. While the role of all the participants has largely been determined from the beginning, they regard themselves as leading on particular aspects of the project, suggesting some degree of distributed leadership.221

**Sustainability and potential:** In order to develop comparative findings, the research needs to be continued over a further four-year period. The ambition of the AHRC application is fundamental to the partners’ conception of the project. The successful funding for the 2010–13 period will result in its greater sustainability – not least in terms of the amount of knowledge acquired and its contribution to scholarship.

Whatever doubts there may be about the funding, there appear to be questions about the sustainability and potential of the partnership per se: the team is based around close academic circles – principally those of previous student/supervisor relationships.

**The wider implications of this case study:** Although Making Art in Tudor Britain was deliberately conceived as ‘manageable, pragmatic, not over-ambitious’, the funding of this project represents its most immediate challenge. Given the scale of its ambitions, the project had given rise to some tensions within the National Portrait Gallery itself. These were hopefully put to rest by the creation of an open day for colleagues in summer 2007.

Because of the considerable expectations of its academic partners, the National Portrait Gallery wishes to credit them appropriately, particularly in respect of individuals’ research contributions. Its proposals for the various publications related to the project are, in part, a response to that wish.

While the project is not entirely driven by the opportunity for grant funding, the National Portrait Gallery’s status as one of AHRC’s Independent Research Organisations has nevertheless had an impact on its development. It is unused to the AHRC’s regime of full economic costing and the time taken to decide on grant funding (since it was encouraged by AHRC to apply for a workshop grant to prove that the project team had consulted effectively, the whole process – including resubmissions – will have taken two-and-a-half years), and the slowness with which HEI bureaucracies commit to partnership work is challenging.

However, its engagement with academia has created a number of positive opportunities. These include:

- Opening up possibilities for the National Portrait Gallery to work with universities and access wider research networks. The workshop series for Making Art in Tudor Britain enabled the gallery ‘to ease its way into the higher education funding system’ as well as identifying potential relationships with other institutions.
- Enabling it to apply for types of funding that were not previously available to it, to develop a closer working relationship with the AHRC’s other Independent Research Organisations and to think more strategically about its research than it might otherwise have done. Indeed, the possibility of grant funding made a real difference to the gallery’s partners and enabled the proposals for the project to be more ambitious than they might otherwise have been.
- Encouraging the gallery to secure other collaborative partnerships. Its 2008 exhibition Brilliant Women was the product of a collaborative PhD award with King’s College, London;
- Reinforcing the gallery’s desire to achieve a balance between public outputs and sustaining its academic concerns, between a focus on its own collection and contributing to the work of other institutions.
- Allowing it to challenge the conventions of art history as practised in universities. The technical art history, promoted by Making Art in Tudor Britain, is better known within the museum sector than amongst HEIs. However, it has been suggested that such work, undertaken by interdisciplinary teams of conservation scientists, curators and historians, has ‘the potential to transform research practise’ and that

> The art-historical approach proposed by the NPG project, based as it is on a new balance of laboratory, library and archival research, should be moved to the centre of the discipline. … Supporters of that move will need to be resolute in a number of ways. First, they must be courageous, resisting the siren call and comfort of the traditional art-historical categories and labels. Second, they must give research priority to understanding more about the function of the work of art: what precisely were the circumstances of its original viewing? Third, art historians will have to be retrained to familiarise themselves with data sets and taught to allow for error, probability and serendipity in their interpretation. Finally, at an institutional level, we will have to combat the inevitable cultural resistance that there will be to this new form of art-historical interdisciplinarity

(Nigel Llewellyn, Head of Research, Tate National)222.
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5.4 Channel M, Salford

Overview

Channel M is Manchester’s only citywide television station broadcasting free-to-air via terrestrial transmitter since 2000. Now fully owned by the Guardian Media Group (GMG), it is also broadcast nationally on Sky and Virgin Media.

Type of project: Channel M is a collaboration between the International Media Centre (IMC) at Salford University’s School of Media, Music and Performance and GMG, a commercial media company, which the university has been able to integrate into its educational provision.

Why this project was chosen: This project was chosen because, unlike a research collaboration, it has a direct bearing on undergraduate teaching, and is thus integrated into the pedagogical process in a way that is distinctive from our other case studies. Staff at the IMC argue that it enables the University to attract undergraduates by offering them genuine commercial media experience.

What is addressed by this collaboration: The partnership responds to the University of Salford’s students’ need to gain work experience in a real commercial environment in a way that is relatively unusual for undergraduate courses.

The project’s objective: Undergraduates at Salford produce TV content that is broadcast on the Channel M station. University of Salford undergraduates can select Channel M modules as part of their degree course, and have these assessed as part of their programme of study. The collaboration offers them opportunities to participate as researchers, studio and location camera operators, directors, producers, sound recordists, presenters and performers.

While only a relatively small amount of content is broadcast, the students involved are able to gain some professional experience and to see their work broadcast – an unusual experience for media undergraduates. This is seen as a unique selling point of the course and one that helps to drive student recruitment. In addition, and perhaps of equal importance in terms of future employability, working on broadcast TV allows students to develop networks and contacts in local and national media.

Main activities: Students’ broadcast material for Channel M comprises four programmes:

- **Hitting Home**, a documentary programme.
- **Zeitgeist**, an arts and cultural programme for Manchester.
- **Gloves Off/Manchester Exchange**, a studio-based current affairs discussion.
- **Reel North**, a showcase for short films.

Programmes are written, researched, produced, shot and directed by undergraduates registered on a variety of BA courses (supported by university academic and technical staff). Media technology students work on technical aspects such as lighting, sound, vision, mixing and vision engineering.

This project’s main outcomes: There are outcomes in terms of TV programmes, but perhaps the more important long-term outcome is developing a potential cadre of TV professionals in the North West of England, at a time when both the demand for local content, and the relocation of parts of the BBC to Salford, are developing the media sector in that region.

The partnership between GMG and the School of Media, Music and Performance at the University of Salford allows undergraduates to be involved in all aspects of programme-making. Students currently produce 24 hours a year of broadcast material for Channel M, including documentaries, magazine programmes and current affairs.

Partnership, management and leadership

Partnership: Channel M is the result of long-standing links between the University of Salford and local broadcasters. The IMC at Salford, where the production of student work for Channel M takes place, was set up in 1993 by David Plowright (formerly of Granada) and (at the time) a visiting fellow at Salford. The 1996 Broadcasting Act opened up opportunities for local broadcasters, and Channel M was set up as a partnership between GMG, the University of Salford and two local companies, an editing facility and a local broadcasting company that was looking to acquire local licences at the time.
GMG has a 60 per cent stake, the others 20 per cent each. A year after establishment, the editing facility dropped out of the partnership, and the local broadcasting company was acquired by GMG. By that time, the costs of running a TV station had become apparent to the university, and GMG was allowed to acquire Salford’s 20 per cent stake, making it the sole owner. For GMG, Channel M is part of a portfolio of media products, and it promotes Channel M through its other local media outlets, such as the Manchester Evening News and local radio stations.

When GMG became the sole owner, it drew up a formal 15-year agreement with the IMC for the provision of student-made content. However, Channel M has become characterised by an increased amount of in-house programming, particularly in lifestyle and sports, since its satellite launch in 2006.

**Management:** The GMG runs Channel M as a commercial operation and the IMC functions as a sub-contractor, essentially as a supplier of content to the TV station. This relationship is governed by a formal agreement between the University of Salford and GMG. Channel M has a management committee, which includes representation from the IMC.

The day-to-day work of the partnership, however, is driven through by project managers on both sides of the partnership. Salford’s project manager is responsible for the content of the modules that the students take (the module is available on a variety of degree programmes) and takes a hands-on approach to the production of the material, attending up to 90 per cent of the shoots. He meets with his opposite number at Channel M about four times a year, but has at least monthly contact by email or phone. The formality of this relationship (and the frequency of contact) has decreased over time as the relationship has become a more trusted one.

Concern about the quality of programmes can be raised by either partner, and it was as the result of one such concern that Salford’s project manager became more involved in the production of the programmes and made himself available on set. On another occasion, however, quality concerns were raised by Salford and communicated to GMG.

**Leadership:** The power relationship in this collaboration has changed over time. The University of Salford is now a supplier to a commercial broadcaster – not the co-owner of a channel. When the agreement was signed, input from the university was reduced from 36 to 24 hours per week, while the station itself increasingly features the music, sports and lifestyle programmes which are so common to other channels. However, even in the current difficult economic circumstances there are no plans to cut further its content, which is enshrined in the formal agreement.

However, while GMG is the owner of the channel, it has no remit for the academic side of the partnership, beyond a general concern for maintaining the quality of broadcast content. Decisions about accreditation and course content remain with the HEI, and although questions of content may be raised informally in meetings, translating this into pedagogical terms is clearly the responsibility of the university.

Both organisations are thus leaders of their own sides of a partnership with a fairly clear division of labour. Positional leadership, however, can also be exercised by those outside the collaboration, in some cases as a by-product of other activities. One such example of this was the decision to broadcast on Sky and Virgin, which brought the channel to many more potential viewers. Interviewees argued that until that point GMG had been relatively ‘hands off’ in its approach to the content provided by the university, but as one put it, after the Sky deal the stakes became higher for GMG, and they started to feed back much more actively into the questions of content quality.

**Discussion**

**Links to the literature:** The development of trust by the partners over a long time has clearly helped the management process. As Williams comments, trust is often isolated as one of the most important factors in inter-organisational relations. In this case, as trust has increased, the need to meet or communicate has diminished somewhat; the clarity of roles in this collaboration means that each side can trust the other to get on with it without the need for frequent communication. As Vangen and Huxham argue, each time an outcome meets expectations, trusting attitudes are reinforced.
Sustainability and potential: Unlike some of the other collaborations featured in this report, the division of labour and the roles and responsibilities of each partner are very clear. This leads to a straightforward structure for the collaboration – a management board, with representation by the university, and two project managers who take care of distinct aspects of the production of student-made content for the channel.

The process of managing the collaboration has, however, changed over time. When GMG became sole owner, power clearly shifted, but the existence of a formal agreement, and particularly such a long-term agreement, has helped to stabilise the relationship despite these changes. However, in common with many in the media sector, the GMG has been making redundancies. At the time of writing, the understanding was that these did not affect the Channel M partnership and would not lead to reduction in the hours broadcast.

More positively, the Digital Britain report recommends a range of measures to strengthen local broadcasting, including an increase in the minimum number of local news bulletins broadcast each day. While there has been criticism of the recommendation to top slice the BBC licence fee to fund a series of independent consortia of local providers in place of ITV’s current regional news service, the Office of Communications (Ofcom) and the DCMS are seen to be keen to support the growth of locally and regionally produced content, particularly in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and in England’s larger cities. Ofcom’s view is that in the longer term, it will be appropriate for provision in England to shift from a regional to a more local level, delivered via broadband and digital television in larger conurbations. As one interviewee commented, Channel M may be an idea whose time has come.

Another major change in the media landscape of the North West is the relocation of some BBC services to Salford and the development of the Media City complex, built to house not only the BBC but also independent media production companies. Interviewees suggest that some 800–1,000 jobs could be created in the move, some of which will go to local labour, in addition to those staffers relocating from London and the south east. This could offer potential future employment to Salford’s IMC graduates, not just in the direct move of the BBC, but in the hoped-for development of small media firms around the broadcasting giants.

The reluctance of some BBC executives to relocate and the effects of the recession have tempered expectations somewhat, though the response of Salford’s undergraduates remains highly positive. Many describe it as the most beneficial part of the course, with one saying, ‘The module has been unlike any other I have experienced throughout my three years at university, and I feel this in itself has made the years at university worth it.’

The wider implications of this case study: While changes in the local media landscape open up possibilities for the University of Salford’s media students and act as a vindication of IMC’s approach to both media education and the importance of local media, the changes in the nature of the relationship between the GMG and the university have created a tension in combining commercial TV production – with its demand for deadlines and advertiser-friendly programmes – with critical, media education. Interviewees argue that it is possible to reconcile these, as the process of programme production, although deadline driven, provides space for discussion and debate of the issues that arise, from regulation to advertising. The media production component of Salford’s teaching is thus set within the context of a broader media education, and the production of Channel M material provides a practical, desirable, but single module within the curriculum.

The collaboration also raises broader questions about the degree to which critical social science and humanities work can be combined with the increasingly commercial nature of some cultural activity. This is particularly sensitive where the nature of the collaboration touches on undergraduate teaching, a core responsibility of universities. In this case, any tensions that arise are currently managed by individuals within collaborations, particularly the project managers. It is GMG and Channel M’s purpose to keep viewing figures high and produce quality content; it is the university’s responsibility to ensure that the commercial demands of broadcasting and the kind of content required do not compromise a critical media education. This is currently managed by individuals in the partnership, in a sense pursuing their own institutional interests, while ensuring that necessary compromises can be made.

Despite policymakers’ enthusiasm for collaboration, those, particularly academics, who do not want to engage in external partnerships with commercial organisations have generally been free not to do so. The direction of government policy, and increasing demands to see evidence of collaborative activity, may see the issue of how to balance an educator’s responsibility with that of a collaborator becoming more high profile for some in HEIs in the future.
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5.5 Pacific Encounters, Norwich

Overview

Type of project: This case study focuses on a collaboration between the Sainsbury Research Unit for the Arts of Africa, Oceania and the Americas and the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts around the exhibition Pacific Encounters: Arts and Divinity in Polynesia, 1760–1860 (2006). This was based on Director of the Sainsbury Research Unit Steven Hooper’s research project, Polynesian Visual Arts: Meanings and Histories in Pacific and European Cultural Contexts. Although the two partners are both sited at the University of East Anglia, they had never previously collaborated. Two related exhibitions, at the British Museum, London, and at the Musée du Quai Branly, Paris, followed the exhibition at the Sainsbury Centre.

Why this project was chosen: Pacific Encounters was chosen as a focus for this study because it links academic research and the making of a public exhibition – if not exhibitions. The combination of specialist research and its wider dissemination was supported by a range of funders.

What is addressed by the collaboration: The project drew on the principal researcher’s personal and professional interests, and those of the Robert and Lisa Sainsbury Collection at the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts. Indeed, Sir Robert Sainsbury’s enthusiasm for Polynesian Art had led to his funding of the Sainsbury Research Unit.

The project’s objectives: The research, and the collaboration with the Sainsbury Centre, had two ambitions: to explore the role and significance of Polynesian objects in their indigenous contexts and to examine their collection’s history – its acquisitions and journeys to Europe and America – and their current status in museums all over the world. The exhibition was also intended to demonstrate exchange between Polynesians and Europeans.

Main activities: The exhibition, Pacific Encounters: Arts and Divinity in Polynesia 1760–1860, was one of a number of activities generated around research undertaken by the research team. These included:

- The research project itself – funded by AHRB and its successor organisation, AHRC, and the Sainsbury Charitable Trust – produced a number of academic outputs, among them journal articles, conferences and conference papers, and workshops, as well as a book (see below).
- The book, Pacific Encounters: Art and Divinity in Polynesia, 1760–1860, jointly published by the British Museum Press, the University of Hawaii Press and the National Museum of New Zealand, accompanied the exhibitions at the University of East Anglia and the British Museum, and was shortlisted for the annual Art Newspaper and AXA Exhibition Catalogue Award 2006. A French edition was published in 2008.

The three exhibitions were:

- Pacific Encounters: Arts and Divinity in Polynesia, 1760–1860, at the Sainsbury Centre, which was organised in conjunction with the British Museum in 2006. This was the first exhibition at the refurbished Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts and brought together the largest group of Polynesian artworks ever assembled in an exhibition.
- The second exhibition, Power and Taboo: Sacred Objects from the Pacific at the British Museum (2007–08), was smaller and exclusively drawn from its own collection. The museum was the largest lender to the Sainsbury Centre exhibition; indeed, the project depended on researching its stored collections and paying for the conservation of several of their objects. Power and Taboo – which was curated by Lissant Bolton, Head of Oceania at the British Museum – only included objects from its own collection and had an anthropological emphasis that was distinct from Pacific Encounters’ focus on the encounter with the object and, therefore, with the aesthetic experience.
- A third exhibition, Polynésie, arts et divinités 1760–1860 (Art and Divinity in Polynesia 1760–1860), was shown at the Musée du Quai Branly, Paris, in 2008 and reprised the Sainsbury Centre exhibition.

This project’s main outcomes: In addition to the number of outputs generated around the research, for the researchers, the achievements were about overcoming a number of challenges – not least, having experienced ‘years of frustration at seeing what should be good exhibitions presented badly’.

229 Pricewaterhouse Coopers 2006: 1
230 Hooper 2009
231 Hooper 2006
Pacific Encounters represented an opportunity for the project’s leader to explore what could be achieved: how to provide an academic frame for an exhibition anchored in research, while at the same time, enabling an emotional and inspirational experience for the visitor, and how to design the exhibition and the accompanying texts. He indicated that he was wary of ‘fetishising the visual’, but also acutely aware of ‘the sin of fetishising the textual. Most visitors come to see exhibitions, not to read them’. He also had to come to terms with the political and ethical issues associated with the material in question: how to negotiate the relationship between ‘hosts’ and ‘guests’ – the curator hosting the objects assembled at the venue and all the visitors, but also the curator’s being a guest in the other institutions that housed the loans.

For the Sainsbury Centre staff, the experience of working on the creation of the Pacific Encounters exhibition was ‘pivotal’. They described it as having changed their ‘perception of what was possible’.

- It encouraged them to work with faculty members and to overcome the challenges of what ‘exemplified the university museum exhibition’. Pacific Encounters was the product of serious academic research and focused on unfamiliar objects, but it appealed to a wide audience.
- It also enabled them to overcome the difficulties of a regional gallery attracting national press. Thirty-five journalists, including representatives of national papers, attended the press day, and the exhibition generated an estimated £206,000 worth of free media coverage.
- In that it had a larger budget than usual (thanks to the support of the Gatsby Charitable Foundation, one of the Sainsbury family trusts), the centre’s staff reported that the experience increased their perception of ‘how things could be’.
- They also indicated that ‘working with indigenous cultures shifted a lot of our thinking’ – particularly in terms of developing the cultural kinships. Contemporary Polynesian artists’ work in the new public education studio space brought what had previously been a peripheral activity into the mainstream of the museum’s activities. Attempting to ‘bring the historical field to life’ laid ‘the foundations for an acknowledgement that mutual exchange was part of the process of the encounter’.

The AHRC, which funded the original research, used it as a case study to demonstrate the tangible social and economic impact of arts and humanities research in its bid to the government’s 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review. According to Pricewaterhouse Coopers, the exhibition ‘created an economic impact of … £240,000 on the Norwich economy and is anticipated to generate an impact of £2.7m on the London economy and £690,000 on the UK economy.’ The Sainsbury Centre attracted some 21,000 visits and generated £50,000 worth of sales. The British Museum attracted 123,576 visits (against a target of 80,000); Musée du Quai Branly attracted well over 100,000. A total of 12,500 books were produced, including 3,500 of the French edition.

Partnership, leadership and management

Partnerships: The project brought together two of the University of East Anglia’s divisions – the Sainsbury Research Unit for the Arts of Africa, Oceania and the Americas, and the Sainsbury Centre – through an exhibition that launched the reopening of the Sainsbury Centre in 2006, following a major refurbishment and building project, and celebrated the Sainsburys’ patronage of both partners.

The Sainsbury Research Unit offers postgraduate degrees and visiting fellowships for post-doctoral scholars and hosts regular symposia and academic meetings. It combines anthropological, art-historical, archaeological and museological approaches, and focuses on how artworks and objects from the three regions are made, used and circulated – in effect, how they matter to people, both in their original contexts and in the contexts of museums and exhibitions.

The Sainsbury Centre holds the Sir Robert and Lady Lisa Sainsbury collection of world art. It was the Sainsburys’ hope that students, academic staff and the general public would grow to appreciate the works on display in much the same way as they themselves had, by being able to look frequently and closely at them without the distraction of too much museum-style text and labelling.

Of course, mounting exhibitions involves several partnerships as a matter of course. The central relationship for Pacific Encounters was between academics and museum staff who are not members of faculty. No such collaboration had taken place before. Other partnerships included those between the head of collections and exhibitions and the teams working on outreach, events and marketing.
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External relationships included those with the exhibition designers and with the British Museum's Oceanic department and press office. Matters related to the launch of the exhibition were devolved to Maori groups who organised the opening ceremonies. One Rail provided first-class rail travel for press and VIPs travelling from London to the private view. Another crucial relationship was with Pasifika Styles 2006, an exhibition of Pacific contemporary art mounted at Cambridge University's Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, that was accompanied by a week-long performing arts festival to inaugurate the exhibition and rituals that involved objects from their collections being used by Maori ritual specialists. Pasifika Styles introduced two artists to the Sainsbury Centre, who worked on Pacific Encounters' education and outreach programmes.

Participants described the collaboration as ‘characterised by partnerships’. For the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts, in particular, it constituted a benchmark in terms of partnerships, and interviewees indicated that they would ‘like to work like that all the time’ – the only barriers being capacity and funding.

Management: The collaboration was led by the director of the Sainsbury Research Unit for the Arts of Africa, Oceania and the Americas, who was the principal investigator of the AHRC-funded research project and also served as the project's public face. While this was unusual in relation to Sainsbury Centre exhibitions (this role would conventionally be that of the director of the Sainsbury Centre or the vice-chancellor of the university), it was particularly appropriate in the case of Pacific Encounters, given the ceremonial ethos of the project. The project therefore proceeded according to the conventions of a guest curator working with a museum.

Specific tasks were delegated and broadly divided between scholarly content (whereby the writing of the labels was undertaken by the Sainsbury Research Unit's team, which included two research assistants) and exhibition tasks, which included display, education and outreach and which were undertaken by the Sainsbury Centre team. ‘At the point at which the research got turned into an exhibition, the tasks were identified: The ownership and detail of each task was negotiated and agreed amongst those involved.

Whereas no formal contracts were involved in this project, and no agreements existed on paper, other Sainsbury Centre projects – even within the university – are more formalised. This is usually a function of funding.

The AHRC provided £220,897 for the research, which covered the majority of the costs incurred – principally staff salaries, including a doctoral research student. It also subsequently granted a Research Dissemination Award to the project. The Sainsbury Centre Research Unit contributed £3,000 per year for three years for the research expenses, and support for office premises was provided by the Sainsbury Charitable Trust. The exhibition itself was supported by the Gatsby Charitable Foundation (one of the Sainsbury family trusts) and was organised in partnership with the British Museum.

Leadership: Research collaborations, either between academic institutions or between HEIs and other organisations, often display a model of leadership, in which leadership is assumed as a consequence of expertise. This case study serves as the best example of this trend.

The director of the Sainsbury Research Unit regarded his leadership of the project as driven by his passion for the subject. He approached his curation of the exhibition as being to ‘to give care and attention diligently; exercise guardianship; to have spiritual charge’. With regard to the Pacific Encounters exhibition, this was principally exercised in relation to the exhibition, marketing and education teams. While the leadership of the project was never contested, it effectively precluded the director of the Sainsbury Centre.

The Sainsbury Centre staff are unusually conscious of the relationship of leadership theory and practice, not least because the centre's director also runs the University of East Anglia's Museum Leaders Programme. Being located in, but independent of, an HEI they were also aware of the compatibilities of the scholarly and pragmatic cultures of higher education and the cultural sector.

As the staff observed in interviews for this report, the project raised ‘leadership issues [that] were (and continue to be) extremely interesting both from institutional and from wider cultural points of view’. They recognised ‘a fascinating number of models of leadership in Steve – a heroic, hierarchical, micro-manager and intellectual leader’. But they also identified ‘leadership potential at every stage, and development in each part of the work which contributed significantly to the way it appeared to the public’.
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The Sainsbury Centre staff regarded the leadership of the exhibition as shifting at different stages in its evolution among the exhibition designers and the education and marketing staff.

Many of the works were packed in collection storerooms and had rarely or never before been exhibited. Most of the work selected needed to be photographed. Conservation requirements took many weeks to assess and the subsequent conservation work took many months to complete.\(^\text{237}\)

The Sainsbury Centre works on the principle that leadership is expected to be shown at any level. Although people are responsible for particular tasks, they are encouraged to show initiative and make suggestions about how to proceed with other things. One of the researchers, for example created the Resource Area for the exhibition under the direction of the Sainsbury Centre's head of education and research. This style of leadership ensures that any such initiatives ‘bubble up to the surface through discussion’. One of the interviewees described their working practice as ‘discursive’ and emphasised that they share responsibility for accountability. They are, after all, ‘all working on the same thing’ and ‘towards the same ends’. The research team’s experience of working with the Musée du Quai Branly taught them that this was not necessarily the norm in terms of museum practice.

Wherever its leadership sat at particular times, engagement in the project allowed all members of the team to develop. The director of the Sainsbury Research Unit described learning from the Sainsbury Centre team; they too learnt from the curators’ approach to the loans and aspects of the presentation of the exhibition that they had never previously considered. The director of the Sainsbury Centre referred to experiencing different ways of engaging with objects that acknowledged and revered a history of generations’ worth of emotional investment in them. This was, perhaps, most clearly evidenced in the private ceremonies that took place around them.

Discussion

Links to the literature: *Pacific Encounters* – which brought the Sainsbury Centre’s permanent exhibition, education and marketing teams together with a temporary research team – is perhaps remarkable for accommodating two models of leadership that might not be obviously compatible: the leader’s approach was described as conforming to a model of charismatic leadership, which is rejected in much of the current literature on higher education and cultural leadership\(^\text{238}\), and the Sainsbury Centre’s distributed or collaborative leadership, which embraces the co-coordination of different tasks.\(^\text{239}\)
In other respects, this collaboration is a textbook example of Huxham and Vangen’s model of collaborative leadership, complying as it does with their notion of leadership as manifest through structure, process and participants. There was no question of ambiguity or disagreement about the aims of the partnership; the leadership of the project was manifest in the collaboration’s structures, in its discursive processes and in the Sainsbury Centre’s encouragement of participants’ taking on leadership roles.

Sustainability and potential: Quite apart from the dissemination of new scholarship on Polynesian art, Pacific Encounters encouraged Sainsbury Centre staff to work with members of faculty. At the time of interviews (summer 2008) they had more projects planned with academic colleagues over the next four years than in the past 20 years.

The wider implications of this case study: For Sainsbury Centre staff, the experience of Pacific Encounters was tied up with a period of closure for refurbishment. This gave them an exceptional opportunity to rethink many of their approaches, including the museum’s mission and its education and outreach policies.

*Ironically it was during the 18 months that the Centre was closed that it became possible to explore through objects and projects, the complexities of interaction between localism and globalism, to confront conflicting and contrasting ideas of cultural understanding between neighbourhood experience and foreign import.*

Amongst the challenges that the centre had to grapple with was ‘the task of confronting a Western-facing education (especially school) system with art from across the world’ and having ‘to convey in a few hours any meaningful experience of cultures in far-flung parts of the world, from the vantage point of the Norfolk and Suffolk countryside’.

Given their own limitations the project team necessarily approached Pacific Encounters through processes of...

…introduction, investigation and inquiry, building a repertoire of means to ask questions, researching different values and using expressive skills to allow comparison with familiar experiences. The task became one of turning widespread ignorance into curiosity, which could stimulate thirst for knowledge, imagination and creative responses …

For educators there remain enduring questions about our status both as ‘foreign’ peoples relating to an indigenous culture, as represented by its objects, and as natives of a particular locality receiving external influence from them. These issues hung in the air and informed our attitudes during the planning and delivery of the education programmes for Pacific Encounters.
6. Observations

This part of the report brings together a number of observations drawn from the case studies provided in Section 5, and to a lesser extent the snapshots (Appendix 1). Their implications for policymakers and practitioners are elaborated on in Section 7, entitled ‘The future potential of higher education and cultural-sector collaborations’.

6.1 Range of collaborations

The snapshots reveal a broad range of subject matter, including widening participation, research, consultancy, professional development, business, the provision of support services and strengthening the HEI offer. They also cover a wide range of cultural activity, including visual arts and design, performing arts, media, literature, creative industries, multi- and interdisciplinary subjects, and archaeology (Appendix 1).

The five case studies considered in this report, which were selected from these snapshots, also represent a range of collaborations, from the personal and informal to the institutional and highly formal. The number of collaborations identified even prior to the selection of the snapshots suggests that funders and policymakers who are encouraging collaborations between HEIs and cultural organisations are pushing at a door that is already open. Nevertheless, the reasons for participants’ pursuing collaborations varied. These included the desire to:

- Undertake research projects and exhibitions, such as Making Art in Tudor Britain and Pacific Encounters (Case Studies 3 and 5 respectively). Both sought to satisfy a combination of academic and public interests. As one HEI research partner put it, the challenge was to ‘provide an academic frame for an exhibition, anchored in research, while at the same time, and most importantly, achieving an emotional and inspirational experience for the visitor’.
- Create, maintain and support new cultural venues and public spaces. Although these may be led by HEIs, some collaborations with higher education develop from non-university sources such as the Watershed, Bristol (Case Study 1).
- Support strategic, cultural-sector developments. This was most apparent amongst the snapshots: CIBAS (Snapshot 53), for example, is intended to support artists and small creative businesses; Own-It (Snapshot 52) provides intellectual property advice; and the Learning Impact Research Project (Snapshot 54) was intended to provide the DCMS with evidence of the success of its investment in museum learning.
- Improve the potential for graduate retention in the region, an early goal of Liverpool’s Culture Campus, or to provide professional development, as provided to University of Salford undergraduates by Channel M.

Although these collaborations are sometimes portrayed as being driven by policy or funding initiatives, they represent responses to a range of motivations, opportunities and impetuses. In many cases, academics and cultural-sector workers can be seen to have taken advantage of funding provision: this may lead to a change of direction but can, equally, reinforce the pursuit of existing relationships.

6.2 What is addressed by the collaborations

Each of the case studies addresses what appear to be gaps in their respective markets – as identified either by the partners themselves or by funding and policymaking bodies. These include gaps in organisations’ knowledge base. The research project based at the National Portrait Gallery, for example, began with the gallery’s acknowledgement of the limitations of its knowledge about its Tudor portraits – when, where and why they were painted. By the same token, the research into Pacific Encounters (Case Study 5) had to do with exploring the role and significance of Polynesian objects in their indigenous contexts and examining their collection history.

Other case studies are more aligned to social or economic objectives. The Northern Writers’ Centre project (Snapshot 55), for example, was intended to address the lack of a physical public venue for writers; Culture Campus (Case Study 1), to improve the visual arts learning environment and graduate retention in Liverpool; and Channel M (Case Study 4) responded to the lack of local news programming and to students’ learning needs.

Both CIBAS (Snapshot 53) and the Learning Impact Research Project (Snapshot 54) addressed strategic needs as identified by ACE and DCMS. The former provides specialist business development support for creative people, and the latter the means by which museums, libraries and archives could measure the effectiveness of their learning resources.

All the collaborations we examined are dynamic interactions, and thus during their lifetimes new ideas arise, new needs are identified and priorities shift. This appears to be less of a feature of research-driven collaborations, which are focused on specific outcomes, such as exhibitions. However, those with wider social or economic aims often undergo significant changes in their form and purposes, as Culture Campus (Case Study 1) demonstrates. In this sense, collaborations could be regarded as ‘conversations’: they may take off in different directions at any time, rather than necessarily pursuing a linear relationship between clearly targeted objectives and results.
6.3 Partnership, leadership and management

The issues around partnership, leadership and management are complex, not least because they are understood and appreciated differently. Indeed, as one interviewee commented, this very complexity is sometimes taken to imply that there is a lack of leadership in the cultural sector. However, on the whole, the collaborative leadership model most in evidence consisted of a series of essentially positional leaders taking responsibility at different times and at different points of the process.

The hybrid nature of the collaborations examined in this report inevitably raises issues that are common to perceptions of leadership and leadership development in both education and the arts and cultural sectors. As already discussed, our case studies reveal a tendency to ‘just get on with it’, especially if aims are not agreed up front. Although this can be productive, it tends to mean that further discussions about joint aims and understandings are left to take place once a project is underway. This can also leave some partners unsatisfied. If no aims have been agreed, it is very difficult to know whether they have been met. In one example we came across, participants retrospectively reflected:

In retrospect, the arrangement was probably too casual. There was possibly a level of avoidance around leadership and management. We needed a more formal management structure. It would have allowed us to have resolved issues, particular around money (which became quite complicated) and encouraged us to clarify our different aims. When things got difficult we could have resolved them better.

This form of procrastination is a common feature of our case studies and accounts, in part, for the paucity of references to leadership issues. Although it is doubtless a successful strategy for some collaborations, the question of leadership was more easily resolved. The case studies suggest that in research-based collaborations, in particular, primacy in academic research remains a recognisable characteristic of leadership. In Making Art in Tudor Britain (Case Study 3) the curator of Sixteenth-Century Collections, the National Portrait Gallery, for example, was unanimously acknowledged as the project leader by the academics involved: she had driven the project and was responsible for its funding. Moreover, of all the partners, she proposed committing the most time to it. However, her academic partners anticipated having leadership delegated to them in relation to particular facets of the project. Indeed, the participants perceived the collaboration as centring on a three-way partnership and a distributed form of leadership based on mutual respect.

Within the context of Pacific Encounters (Case Study 5), leadership of the project was synonymous with the lead researcher, whom colleagues described as a ‘heroic, hierarchical, micro-manager and intellectual leader’. They, nevertheless, regarded the project as involving ‘leadership potential at every stage, and development in each part of the work which contributed significantly to the way it appeared to the public’. They also observed that leadership of the exhibition shifted between the exhibition designers, and the education and marketing staff at different stages of the project.

This kind of positional leadership model means that the formal leader of a collaboration may not always be the public face of a collaboration, nor the name on funding bids. In two of our case studies, a relatively charismatic individual leader was heavily involved, but even in these cases, they were aware of the need for collaboration and their individual models of leadership always co-existed with other, more distributed, models.

In some of our case studies – for example, Channel M (Case Study 4) – individual tasks and responsibilities are clear: there was relatively little overlap between what the partners did, and a formal, written agreement existed in which tasks were outlined. In other cases, such as Culture Campus (Case Study 1) a high-level board meant that different leaders could at times take different positions, and many of the tasks could be taken forward by more than one person. In these cases, the nature of positional leadership becomes particularly important.

Those interviewed for each of the five case studies regarded their partnerships differently, although partnerships and the identification of leadership tended to be determined by a degree of self-interest. Making Art in Tudor Britain (Case Study 3), for example, depends on an interdisciplinary team within which partnerships have been forged with scientists, conservators, art historians and other academics. The partners have themselves been drawn to the project by the prospect of adding to their knowledge of the field.

The partners in the Pacific Encounters project (Case Study 5) centred on the production of an exhibition. They included academics, a range of museum staff (including its education
and marketing teams) and external partners, such as the exhibition designers and the British Museum’s Oceanic department and press office, the project’s funders and sponsors, and colleagues at Cambridge University, who were pursuing a complementary project.

The case studies demonstrate that the line between institutional and individual partnerships is a fine one, and this sometimes reflects formal and informal relationships. Our assessment, in this context, reflects some of the literature’s elaboration of the differences among formally structured and ad hoc partnerships, particularly with respect to the issue of trust among partners. We observed that while both formal and informal partnerships tend to work best in an atmosphere of trust and relative openness, this seems to have been essential in the ad hoc, or project-based, teams that accounted for most of our examples. Mutual trust allowed them to get up to speed and to become effective relatively quickly, often in the absence of clear team roles.

Nevertheless, there were differing perceptions among the various case studies about who was regarded as a partner, and projects concerned with strategic developments tended to identify their funders and policymaking bodies as partners. As our study of Watershed (Case Study 1) revealed, even institutional collaborations are founded on personal relationships. Indeed, some collaborations bypass institutions entirely, relying instead upon links that are forged by entrepreneurial individuals operating outside formal institutional frameworks. The Opera North and University of Leeds’ collaboration around Dare (Snapshot 51), for example, was highly institutional at one level, but according to its participants was completely dependent on personal relationships. Another snapshot, the Northern Writers’ Centre (Snapshot 55), was proposed on the basis of a long-standing collaboration between two individuals: the director of New Writing North and the associate dean of Creative Practice at Newcastle University.

Sometimes preparing funding bids is what drives these informal relationships to formalise. In some cases, this may not change the leadership situation; in others, as when Culture Campus appointed a chief executive, this results in a more formal leadership model. Regardless of the reason behind formalisation, it is generally not an easy process. During the course of research for this report, one interviewee (Dare, Snapshot 51) recounted the difficulties of building a formal partnership via informal connections that went back 30 years. The process of crafting a formal agreement between the two organisations took nine months of negotiations, much of which was concerned with how to overlay successful formal leadership positions on the ‘organic mulch’ of the informal connections that already existed.

Whatever the individual difficulties of identifying leadership and the challenges of reconciling formal and informal collaborations, the importance of brokerage to this type of collaboration was mentioned by several of our interviewees. One talked of the need to ‘produce the ecology’, in which collaboration can take place. This ecology is precisely what another interviewee referred to as ‘places for things to happen’. At the heart of this brokerage is a style of leadership examined in the literature on boundary spanners, where the process of collaborative exchange becomes vital to the ability of an organisation to realise its own objectives. In the case of the Watershed, for example, the chief executive’s own role as a broker was highly successful, but for the organisation to grow this role needed to be taken up by other individuals, and indeed the process of collaboration, by creating new projects and organisations, has given Watershed space to develop these new boundary spanners.

Given the wide range of collaborations considered in this report, it is no surprise that there is considerable variance in the methods and processes by which the partners organise their partnerships; however, the common feature for all the case studies and snapshots we examined is that questions of leadership and management must – at some point – be addressed. For many, this may be a long-term, ongoing practice, while for others the answers may immediately be clear. Nevertheless, these issues are an inherent part of the process, and the case studies review many possibilities.

6.4 Sustainability and potential
The major potential of all the case studies pertains to knowledge exchange. As one university partner put it:

I learnt a lot from working with [the cultural organisation] about the sector – not least that they have an imaginative grasp over what can be done and creativity is possible. It’s hard to make space for either of those in a university – although it is precisely what universities should be doing.

However, the projects considered in this report tended to be perceived as additional to partners’ core activities and were, consequently, vulnerable.

Most case studies identified funding, or continued funding, as key to delivering projects’ potential and sustainability. Collaborations and knowledge exchange projects are often opportunistic and enabled by existing pockets of funding. But
the downside is that they are also vulnerable by virtue of the short-term nature of those sources of support. For example, the government’s plan for Business Support Simplification is currently concerned with streamlining support services to business and making substantial savings. By 2010, the 3,000 existing publicly funded business support schemes will have been replaced by 100 or fewer schemes intended to produce greater value for money. This is likely to affect the funding of particular types of collaborations focused on business support for creative industries.

Although the development of some collaborations was undoubtedly influenced by the possibility of support from particular sources, and others quite explicitly came about as the result of funding initiatives (CIBAS, Snapshot 53), many of the other collaborations examined in this report serve to illustrate the importance of genuine partnerships based on shared ambitions, rather than being merely prompted by funding opportunities.

But, as one of our key interviewees observed, sustainability and potential are both wide open to a range of possibilities: ‘Sustainability can take all kinds of forms, and projects will transmogrify over time.’ Amongst the case studies, the best example of this trend is probably Culture Campus (Case Study 1), which essentially began as an informal grouping, became a funded organisation intended to address a specific set of needs, and is currently re-orienting itself around another set of needs and seeking different forms of funding. Its sustainability is, therefore, not purely financial but inherent in the personal relationships and motivations of those involved.

Own-It (Snapshot 52) was similarly dependent on one source of funding, but it has developed an entrepreneurial model and is now drawing on a wider set of geographic relationships and funding sources. This includes charging users for certain services, and it has attracted new funding through the ACE AmbITion project.

Sustainability for Making Art in Tudor Britain (Case Study 3) is completely different. In order to develop comparative research findings, it needs to secure funding for an additional four-year period. This will result in what might be defined as its ultimate sustainability – a legacy of knowledge acquired and disseminated.

Whereas the research and exhibition phase of Pacific Encounters (Case Study 5) was complete at the time of writing, its potential and sustainability has shifted to prospective partnerships between the Sainsbury Centre and members of faculty at the University of East Anglia. At the time of the interviews (summer 2008) the Sainsbury Centre had more projects planned with academic colleagues over the next four years than had taken place in the past 20 years.

The potential of CIBAS (Snapshot 53) is considered to reside in its contribution to sustainable economic, social, cultural and community regeneration and development, not least through its support of start-ups. Yet the most fundamental aspect of the organisation’s sustainability is its own continued funding: support for the project has always been both short term and fragile, and the project is currently vulnerable to the government’s Business Support Simplification, which intends to streamline support services to business, and make substantial savings in that quarter.

For the MLA, the sustainability of Inspiring Learning for All, based on the University of Leicester’s Generic Learning Outcomes, is partly vested in a European libraries project (ENTITLE) and partly through Renaissance in the Regions, a central government scheme for supporting regional museums, which insists that its participants use the MLA evaluation framework (Snapshot 54).

One issue that arises, particularly when considering Watershed (Case Study 2), is what is increasingly seen as a need to fund organisations as public spaces in which such collaborations can evolve, as opposed to the funding of specific projects themselves. Watershed’s entrepreneurial leadership has secured a wide range of project funding for the organisation, but its day-to-day activities – the role of the space itself as a cultural entity – sometimes seem vulnerable. This is exacerbated as its project income rises. Dick Penny, Watershed’s Managing Director, noted that Watershed would very much like to get away from this state of affairs, and go back to having a stronger core-funding base. As yet, the organisation is not eligible for AHRC’s support as an Independent Research Organisation. ‘The intermediary role [of facilitating collaborations] while vital, is very hard to fund’, noted one Watershed interviewee.

In other collaborations (such as Dare, Snapshot 51), money changed hands between partners, but the daily work of collaboration – the conversations, meeting and brainstorming – was essentially unfunded.

6.5 Wider learning from the research
As one of our key interviewees observed, it is ‘blindingly obvious’ that HEIs and cultural organisations should collaborate: ‘There’s nothing to be lost by pursuing the relationship.’
Another HEI interviewee thought that there was no longer anything to prevent such collaborations, and everything to gain by them. Indeed, the fact that HEIs are entering into such relationships demonstrates that the image of universities as ivory towers is a thing of the past at least 25 years out of date.

It must be noted, however, that ‘cultural commonality of spirit’ is often not sufficient to see a collaboration through. Indeed, many of the relationships examined undermined the assumption that it could be so. The relationships that inspired projects needed to be sufficiently robust to survive tensions between partners (Northern Writers Centre, Snapshot 55).

This underscores the fact that in practice the working collaborations that we explored were far from straightforward. Although the cultures, priorities and organisational norms of HEIs and cultural organisations may at times be complementary, they can also be very different.

For example, universities’ levels of support for such relationships vary considerably. As one key HEI interviewee observed, the degree to which universities are prepared to invest in external relations ‘depends a lot on the VC’ and on ‘how much funding they think it might consume’. Another vice-chancellor considered himself to be relatively ineffective as far as collaborations were concerned: ‘The lower down the food chain you are, the easier it is to enable things to happen’, but he acknowledged that this was not necessarily easy, observing, ‘You’d need to argue your case fairly passionately.’

Similarly, we found that universities’ collaborations with cultural organisations were often considered to be peripheral to their primary priorities of teaching and research – even within the humanities. But, as an interviewee suggests, ‘What counts as “peripheral” has to do with what kind of organisation we [as individual universities] are, and how we choose to distinguish ourselves from others.’ The challenge is that views about a university’s distinctiveness and how to achieve or promote it are not necessarily consistent even within the same institution.

Moreover, what universities and cultural organisations might take as indicative of collaborations’ success may be unclear. Several partnerships were ultimately destabilised by ambiguities about what constituted achievable success, as well as issues of ownership and control. This was particularly a problem for those models ostensibly concerned with overcoming disadvantage and creating a robust infrastructure for creative industries businesses. Given the high number of sole traders, economic success might be measured more in terms of sustainable careers for individuals rather than of the development of growing businesses. Even with respect to models not focused on business/entrepreneurship links, different partners in the same collaboration often identified the highlights, indeed experienced, the same project differently. For the academic partner in Pacific Encounters (Case Study 5), for example, the achievements had to do with overcoming a number of challenges; whereas for the Sainsbury Centre staff, the exhibition they created was ‘pivotal’ in that it changed their ‘perception of what was possible’ – including their preparedness to work with academics. For the research’s funders, AHRC, the project provided them with the evidence with which they could demonstrate the tangible social and economic impact of arts and humanities research.

Likewise, the specific challenges identified by case study participants varied. The classic leadership by process concerns about who is included on the email list, who is invited to the meetings, and the mix of processes that are used in any collaboration were regarded as largely unproblematic by most of our interviewees. In one case study, however, process, particularly the use of email, was seen as a way to exclude some members of the collaboration.

Other challenges more generally included internal tensions created by major external collaborations (Making Art in Tudor Britain, Case Study 3) and having to find ways of integrating learning from collaborations into standard organisational practice (Pacific Encounters, Case Study 5). Funding limitations also presented a problem; for example, the cultural organisation involved in CiBAS (Snapshot 53) recognised that its relationship with parts of its HEI partner could be closer, although some of its funding priorities militated against this. Moreover, its model of working has been criticised as possibly inappropriate for dealing with long-term economic and social disadvantage.

The cultural differences between HEIs and cultural organisations often represent the greatest challenge for collaborations to overcome. This was manifest in several respects: the relatively decentralised, consensual management of academic institutions versus the sometimes more charismatic models in the cultural sector; different approaches to timescales and pacing (academic institutions were often seen as slower); bureaucracy and individuals’ relative lack of empowerment within HEIs (they are rarely able to make formal commitments); and attitudes to stakeholders (the notion of audience was perhaps stronger for cultural organisations). Indeed, some cultural organisations involved in the case studies referred to nagging doubts about whether partnerships with HEIs hindered, rather than helped, their potential engagement with target audiences. Having said
this, however, it is not a binary and simplistic distinction; there are cultural organisations that are consensual, just as there are academic institutions that are strongly led from the top.

A major difficulty was said to be the sheer amount of time that academic bureaucracies take to turn things around – at its most extreme in the two-and-a-half years it will have taken for the National Portrait Gallery to know if it has been awarded an AHRC grant for Making Art in Tudor Britain (Case Study 3). Others were more concerned with individual universities’ inability to respond quickly. As one of the academic partners reflected:

> It’s quite hard. I can see it both sides. Cultural organisations’ rapidity of response and ability to exploit opportunism is quite hard for universities to emulate. HEIs are like tankers that can’t be turned around easily. It’s particularly hard for those caught trying to deliver something on behalf of a university where management is hierarchical. I would have had to have been delegated considerable decision-making and financial authority to match the autonomy of the much smaller organisation we were working with. I was constantly having to report back in order to make decisions.

For its part, one of the cultural organisations had come to regard aspects of its collaboration with an HEI as implicitly contradictory:

> We often have to move more quickly. It’s easy to forget that the arts are brilliant at doing that, and it’s what makes us attractive as partners. But if the balance of the relationship goes a particular way, that can be very difficult. In a sense, it becomes self-defeating.

It was only in retrospect that a particular cultural organisation could reflect on the difficulties it had encountered in working with an HEI:

> We couldn’t talk about the problems of the relationship at the time. These had a lot to do with cultural differences – timescales, empowerment, status. The university wouldn’t allow us to phone particular people – it was all about them controlling communications ...

So much in universities is personality driven. Individuals can have enormous influence, although not structurally; conversely, they can be in positions of power and not do anything.

But, despite these challenges, the case studies revealed a host of achievements – the most visible of which includes the realisation of new venues, new opportunities and an expansion of activities. All these set out the potential for future collaborations.

Many outcomes are less tangible, although they still contribute to the case studies constituting examples of good practice. Far from being peripheral, many academics involved in the case studies, as well as their cultural-sector partners, regarded their collaborations as being of central importance. These collaborations enabled them to fulfil research objectives that would have otherwise been impossible, and allowed others to access different funding streams, audiences and networks. The National Portrait Gallery’s collaboration with the Courtauld Institute of Art and the University of Sussex has enabled it to analyse comprehensively a number of pictures (Case Study 3).

Both academics and people in the arts are increasingly involved in a whole variety of activities that increasingly take them out of their comfort zone and place them within a set of wider public-policy concerns. The resulting collaborations – many of which are either made possible, or indeed encouraged, by public policy and new sources of funding – are an example of this phenomenon. As might be expected, the encouragement of external collaborations produces a variety of responses. Some see it as an unavoidable evil and look for pragmatic strategies, while others see it as an important responsibility in terms of the use of public funding; still others think that such collaborations matter because the way in which knowledge is produced and used matters.

This more positive interpretation appears to be gaining ground, and it is unlikely that the current emphasis on greater collaboration and knowledge exchange will go away. Given this, we hope that the wider learning derived from these case studies can be used not only to inform a realistic model of partnership development in future, but also to highlight the potential of higher education and cultural-sector collaborations.
7. The future potential of higher education and cultural-sector collaborations

This final part of the report discusses what we see as the major issues arising from the literature and the empirical work presented here. These issues, by extension, inform what we would identify as the future potential of higher education and cultural-sector collaborations. They are presented in the spirit of conversation and collaboration, and we hope that these concerns will develop into a set of talking points and arguments for the policy and practice constituencies to wrestle with over the next few years.

We identify these wider issues as falling into four distinct areas: knowledge transfer and exchange; collaboration and innovation; measuring collaboration; and models of leadership.

7.1 Knowledge transfer and exchange

We have identified a considerable number of collaborations between HEIs (of all sorts) and cultural organisations. The perception that knowledge exchange in the arts and humanities is lagging behind that in science and technology, at least in terms of the sheer amount of activity, appears not to reflect the reality. Therefore, policymakers concerned with encouraging collaborations are, arguably, pushing at a door that is already open.

This disconnect between the perception and reality may stem from the fact that collaborations range from the personal and informal to the institutional and highly formal, and it is likely that many of them go unrecorded. Moreover, as a number of the interviewees for this project observed, academics, particularly those in the arts and humanities, do not always consider collaborative activities to constitute a form of knowledge transfer or exchange, and they may not associate them with the government’s calls for such activity.

Thus, it seems that while we perhaps need less stress on the simple fact of collaboration, we need a more nuanced understanding of how it takes place and what the motivations are.

7.2 Facilitating innovation

Many of the collaborations that we observed facilitate innovation, creating places where things can happen. In some cases – such as Own-It at the London College of Communication (Snapshot 52) – the HEI creates this place; in others – Culture Campus (Case Study 1) or Dare (Snapshot 51), for example – it is the partnership itself. For still others, the facilitator is the cultural organisation, as in the case of the Watershed (Case Study 2).

In these instances, collaborations do not merely constitute one-off projects, but sites for a series of collaborations. Lester and Piore, in their work on innovation, argue for the importance of public space, not solely in terms of the built environment, but in the sense of somewhere where conversations can take place in an atmosphere of trust, openness and mutual tolerance. Highly competitive environments, such as markets, may act as a spur to the later stages of innovation, but they can be inimical to those earlier, exploratory stages.

The so-called ‘interpretive public spaces’, which include universities as well cultural organisations, do not necessarily emerge in a natural, organic way in market economies. Indeed, it is often a function of public policy, and public funding, to create them. These spaces can include firms or organisations themselves, but competitive pressures and the trends to outsource have reduced the number of interpretative spaces within commercial firms. Our interviews suggest that while many of our collaborations would like to, and several do, fulfil this role, funding the ongoing work of collaborations is increasingly difficult, and more and more public funding is committed to specific projects with measurable outputs and outcomes.

It may be that when public policy focuses on a linear model of innovation (one that proceeds from basic research, through collaboration to commercialisation), we miss much of what happens in the arts and humanities, and are in danger of not giving enough recognition to the processes that allow such things to occur. One of the university vice-chancellors whom we interviewed agreed that the distinction between ‘blue skies’ and applied research, common to science and technology breaks down when applied to creative and cultural industries. In these sectors, cutting-edge research and new technologies can move very rapidly into applications and business, and new knowledge is frequently generated within the process of production. Yet capturing the value of process, and particularly of its consequences, in terms of the generation of relationships, trust and social capital presents methodological challenges not least in terms of measurement.

This vice-chancellor proposes that the key aim of policy should be to encourage the interaction between different disciplines and between academics and practitioners and to create a forum for these engagements, rather than focusing on specific types of output. We have identified such spaces in this
project, and the challenge is to understand the importance of these models, so that support for them can be integrated into mainstream policy and funding.

7.3 Measuring collaboration
A primary issue for policymakers and practitioners is measuring the effectiveness of knowledge transfer within the arts and humanities. Interviewees in senior positions in both academia and cultural organisations appear to welcome the prominence that collaborative projects give them, and many regard it as a possible route to further funding. But there are legitimate concerns that the vulnerable enterprise of collaborative activity could be damaged by being subject to inappropriate measurement for the purposes of legitimisation. It is clear that the issue of how to measure the impact of research in arts and culture in relation to the knowledge economy is still unresolved.

The chief problem is that the current metrics for knowledge exchange and transfer, while improving, remain poor at capturing such activities. This challenge does not merely reflect a lack of a common language – although this can be an issue – but it may also reveal different assumptions and motivations. Indeed, it raises an issue that goes to the heart of the distinctions between the ‘gift economy’, as much informal collaboration is described, and the more monetary-focussed or science/technology-related mechanisms used to record and measure knowledge transfer.

Much recent policy has focused on the need for HEIs to commercialise their activities through spin-offs, increase their capacity to undertake paid consultancy and attract licensing income. But commentators have suggested that the prominence attributed to intellectual property or measures of income in some accounts of knowledge transfer is in danger of privatising what is essentially a ‘commons of the mind’. In response, a recent report on innovation calls for HEIs to back away from commercialisation and return to an older model in which the university facilitates inter-organisational relationships.

That is not to say, however, that people engaging in specific collaborations do not seek some advantage. Several of our case studies represent projects driven by a mix of personal enthusiasms and institutional needs, but ideas do not have to be monetised to provoke a sense of ownership. The conflation of the Inspiring Learning for All Framework with the Generic Learning Outcomes (Snapshot 54) is a good example of this: the lead researcher involved in this collaboration was concerned about the misrepresentation of her team’s work, not about payment implications. Likewise, brokering organisations like the Watershed (Case Study 2) are keen not to monetise some aspects of their activities for fear of losing the trusted status that brokerage requires.

However, policymakers at DIUS interviewed for this research remain unconvinced that measures of interaction (meetings, addressing conferences, public lectures and so on) constitute appropriate measures of activity, as has been suggested by those in the field. Their preference is still for monetised measures such as consultancy or licensing income, even though, as our interviewees recognised, this may disadvantage both HEIs and cultural organisations that undertake uncommodifiable interactions.

Another issue for arts and humanities collaborations, in contrast to science and technology partnerships, is that initiatives tend to be prompted by HEIs, which have the money and are often involved in decision-making and lobbying in relation to the local institutional and economic environment. By comparison, their partner cultural organisations are often relatively small, under-funded, less well connected and lack the formal incentives to pursue such relationships. This is not necessarily a problem, but it determines power relationships within collaborations, and cultural organisations need to ensure they have the capacity to engage on equal terms. As Penney at Watershed pointed out, cultural organisations have to be secure in the funding of their core activities, as well as providing project funding for collaborations. If that security is threatened, they may well withdraw from partnership work (Northern Writers Centre, Snapshot 55).

The AHRC’s creation of Independent Research Organisations provides a welcome counterweight to this power imbalance by supporting research strengths within the cultural sector and encouraging collaborations to take place. But, to date, these only include national museums, libraries and archives, and not other sorts of cultural organisations.

Another concern for the measurement of impacts is that success is often seen in relation to replication. The embedding of successful collaborations within a network of relationships that are often tied to a specific place, as with Pacific Encounters (Case Study 5), means that it is sometimes difficult to transfer or duplicate successful projects in other contexts. This means that even those measures that are not necessarily monetary, but concern for example ‘repeat business’ are, therefore, inappropriate.
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7.4 Models of leadership
The leadership model most evident in this study is that of distributed or collaborative leadership, where the emphasis is in the process of leadership, not necessarily on the leader himself or herself. This was entirely in keeping with the emphasis on informal, even conversational, aspects of collaborations. We understand this notion – not so much as something done by an individual to others, or as a set of actions through which people contribute to an organisation – but as ‘an emergent property of a group or network of individuals in which group members pool their expertise’.257

The notion that leadership is not so much vested in a person or a position, but in a relationship based on trust, obligation and commitment, seems eminently suited to the relationships we examined. 258 This, necessarily, has the effect of placing the focus on the process of leadership, rather than on the characteristics of leaders. It also raises an interesting question about measuring success – not least, in respect of what it might constitute, how it can be identified and where it can be found.

Although the cultural sector is reputed to have favoured charismatic leadership models in the past259 – and there are some examples of charismatic leaders amongst the case studies, such as at Watershed (Case Study 2) and at the University of East Anglia (Case Study 5) – these were few and far between. The culture of academia is, if anything, distrustful of overt leadership, corresponding to Bryman’s notion of reluctant management. 260 This appears to be partly about not wanting to swap professional expertise for what is perceived to be the apparently more banal role of management, but also about more deep-seated resistance to the language of leadership.

While this reluctance to use the language of leadership, and the relatively low-key and distributed approach to the practice of leadership that was clear throughout our case studies, seem to work well for the collaborations, it may be that the sector as whole needs greater leadership in asserting the success of its models of innovation and collaboration. UK innovation policy in general is still seen as heavily tilted towards science and technology261, and work on measuring knowledge transfer continues to pay little attention to the arts and humanities.262

From the perspective of the both the cultural sector and academia it may be that the attempts to strengthen the leadership of collaborative partnerships should be less about individual projects themselves, and more about asserting the particular needs of the overall ecology in which these collaborations take place.

This overall ecology is arguably less healthy than when this research began over a year ago. However, the latest Creative Industries Economic Estimates produced by the DCMS263 only go up to 2007, and therefore precede the recession. These show that between 1997 and 2006 the creative industries (excluding craft and design) grew at a rate of four per cent, compared to an average of three per cent for the whole of the economy; that they exported £16bn worth of services in 2006, 4.3 per cent of all goods and services exported; and that in the summer quarter of 2007, they accounted for just under two million jobs (including creative jobs in businesses outside the sector) – showing a growth of two per cent per annum compared to one per cent for the whole of the economy.

It is unclear at the time of writing whether the anticipated growth in the cultural and creative industries between 2004 and 2014 will be realised264 or whether the recession is more likely to have a detrimental impact on the creative industries and/or the subsidised cultural sector. There are also concerns that a Conservative government would cut spending on the arts, culture and higher education by 10 per cent after 2011.265

Either way, the current financial downturn and the prospect of tighter public spending in the coming years is concentrating minds in both arts organisations and higher education. Although the rhetoric suggests that we are experiencing a ‘credit crunch, not a creative crunch’ and that ‘an ever growing proportion of the new economy will depend on creativity’266, the current situation has considerable implications for leadership in higher education, the cultural sector and collaborations between them. One of our elite interviewees was in no doubt about the implications of this for good practice in leadership in the cultural sector, including the potential for its future collaborative partnerships with HEI:

Over the past nine months, the requirements of cultural leaders have changed, not least because of the recession.

We may need to think twice about massively privileging people who show very particular and charismatic qualities. We need to look for leaders who will ensure that organisations will still be there in the future and who are prepared to maintain them at their present levels …
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Leadership now is probably going to have to be more about constraining possibilities, about rationalising, focusing down on core activities, about being defensive. Our leaders are going to have to be more thoughtful and reflective, and – rather than going their own way – they are going to have to take on a lot more partnerships and collaborations in the future.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Arts Council England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE NW</td>
<td>Arts Council England North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE SE</td>
<td>Arts Council England South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHRB</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRC’s predecessor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHRC</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERR</td>
<td>Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>Department for Business, Innovation and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Burns Owens Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Collaborative Awards in Science and Engineering (UK Research Councils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSkills</td>
<td>Creative and Cultural Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Clore Duffield Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEAD</td>
<td>Council for Higher Education in Arts and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBAS</td>
<td>Creative Industries Business Advice and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>community interest company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Cultural Leadership Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuing Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSDI</td>
<td>Cultural Sector Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>Department for Communities and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSF</td>
<td>Department for Children, Schools and Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Department for Culture Media and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIUS</td>
<td>Department for Innovation, Universities &amp; Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA</td>
<td>David Powell Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTI</td>
<td>Department of Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSRG</td>
<td>Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>European Regional Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>European Social Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRC</td>
<td>Economic and Social Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>Foundation for Art and Creative Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO</td>
<td>generic learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMG</td>
<td>Guardian Media Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE</td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIF</td>
<td>Higher Education Innovation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Treasury</td>
<td>Her Majesty's Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Labs</td>
<td>Hewlett Packard Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>International Media Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARC</td>
<td>Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCACE</td>
<td>The London Centre for Arts and Cultural Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCL</td>
<td>Liverpool City of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDA</td>
<td>London Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFHE</td>
<td>Leadership Foundation for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGMB</td>
<td>Local Government Management Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIER</td>
<td>Manchester Independent Economic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Museums, Libraries and Archives Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIHE</td>
<td>National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERC</td>
<td>Natural Environment Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESTA</td>
<td>National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDF</td>
<td>National Student Drama Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWDA</td>
<td>Northwest Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofcom</td>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Partnerships, Access and Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUSH</td>
<td>Partnership for Urban South Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAE</td>
<td>Research Assessment Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCMG</td>
<td>Research Centre for Museums and Galleries, Department of Museum Studies, University of Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEDA</td>
<td>South East England Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
<td>Small and medium-sized enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRDA</td>
<td>South West of England Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice-over IP</td>
<td>Voice-over internet protocol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Snapshots

Not surprisingly, London dominated the geographic spread of the collaborations that we came across. This is included in the snapshots (Summary table 1).

Summary table 1: snapshots by geographic region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London/South East</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London/South East/Wales/Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE/Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The visual and performing arts dominate the areas of activity. What is perhaps more surprising is the relatively small amount of collaboration around literature (Summary table 2).

Creative industry collaborations alone could perhaps have filled a separate report. We have included them here, but we have not included all the business support activities that HEIs have undertaken in recent years. This is an important area for HEIs, but one of the issues around this type of collaboration is the degree to which it becomes integrated within the mainstream academic life of the HEI and the degree to which it constitutes a business support service which could have been provided elsewhere. In many cases, such services are provided within HEIs because of their status as trusted organisations.

Summary table 2: snapshots by area of activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual arts and design</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative industries/multi and interdisciplinary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note: Some projects involved more than one activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to geography and type of cultural activity, we grouped the snapshots in relation to their primary purpose, recognising that some, of course, have more than one. These are shown in summary table 3.

Summary table 3: typology of snapshots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widening participation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing professionalism and CPD</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business collaboration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting cultural resources and events</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the HEI offer</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note: Some projects involved more than one purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Widening participation: Several collaborations purposefully contribute to universities' widening participation strategies (such as the Performance Summer School described in Snapshot 2). Others were simultaneously outward facing and focused on teaching students (Case Studies 3 and 6: Culture Campus and the Northern Writers’ Centre). This group includes De Montfort University’s partnership with Penguin UK (Snapshot 33) and Salford University’s Channel M (Case Study 9).

Research: HEIs often provide scholarship whose outcomes include exhibitions and performances. Research collaborations described in this report include those supported by AHRC and include Polynesian Visual Arts (Case Study 8). Other research projects are led by cultural organisations and include HEIs amongst their partners, for instance the National Portrait Gallery’s investigation of Tudor and Jacobean portraits (Case Study 2). Collaborations also include long-term collaborations between HEIs and cultural organisations, based around shared intellectual interests. Lancaster University’s Ruskin Centre (Snapshot 15), for example, has close links with the Ruskin Foundation, which is responsible for the care of the Ruskin Collection, and Brantwood, Ruskin’s home in the Lake District.

Consultancy: An example of universities’ contributing to the development of public policy is the University of Leicester’s work on developing and rolling out the Learning Impact Research Project (Case Study 10). Partnerships intended to attract consultancy, such as the Design Lab (Snapshot 27) and Design London (Snapshot 22) are also included.

Continuing Professional Development: Several collaborations are concerned with increasing professionalisation and continuing professional development. Some HEIs provide access to their facilities by artists and
other creative professionals (Snapshots 1 and 21: Artists’ Access and Culture Lab); provide incubators and support for regional SMEs (Case Studies 4 and 5 and Snapshot 14: Watershed, CIBAS and Grow Creative); or are intended to enhance business innovation (Snapshots 22 and 41: Design London and Institute for Creative Enterprise). Others seek to develop practitioners’ professional skills (Snapshots 3, 13, 19, 28 and 40: Dartington Plus, European Opera Centre, CSDI and the Enterprise Centre for Creative Arts, Higher Level Skills Pathfinder) although such projects often prioritise HEIs’ own students and graduates (Snapshot 14: Grow Creative). Other collaborations are intended for those with special needs or to increase graduates’ experience of particular sectors of the community (Snapshot 12: a2a Rockets Initiative).

Less obviously, support is sometimes targeted at those outside the arts and cultural sectors. Collaborations targeted at the medical professions include Queen Mary University of London’s Performing Medicine, which explores the performative elements of a consultation to benefit medical students, and ultimately their patients (Snapshots 35 and 48: Performing Medicine and Operating Theatre).

**Business collaborations:** Several partnerships are explicitly entrepreneurial (Snapshots 22, 27, 29: Design London, Design Lab, Fashion Business Resource Centre).

Several projects are intended to promote collaborations or serve as catalysts. Some provide space for professional interaction (Snapshots 37 and 39: Materials Library and Wearable Futures); others function as a ‘platform for activities’ (Snapshot 20: International Photography Research Network). The London Centre for Arts and Cultural Enterprise (LCACE) was involved in several of the projects included (Snapshots 31, 37 and 38: Favela, Materials Library and Fallujah). Its function is to foster collaboration and promote and support the exchange of knowledge between the consortium’s partners (Birkbeck University of London; City University; the Courtauld Institute of Art; Goldsmiths University of London, Guildhall School of Music and Drama, King's College London; Queen Mary University of London; and Royal Holloway, University of London) and London’s arts and cultural sectors.

**Supporting cultural resources:** Several collaborations are concerned with providing for, or contributing to, cultural resources. The forthcoming Northern Writers’ Centre, for example, intends to provide an identifiable home for several literary activities (Case Study 6).

One collaboration is centred around the display of a University’s art collection (University of Essex’s Collection of Latin American Art, Snapshot 30). A number of projects involve cultural organisations’ staging of work by HEI staff (Snapshots 38 and 50: Fallujah and The Fragmented Orchestra), or explore HEIs’ research findings as the basis for performance or installations (Snapshot 49: Silver Sounds).

Improving HEIs’ offer: A number of collaborations are dedicated to transforming HEIs and their partners (Snapshots 10 and 18: Photoforum, Dance City). Opera North and the University of Leeds’ partnership (Case Study 7) and Liverpool Universities’ Culture Campus (Case Study 3) are examples of this. Although we have not in general included residencies and placements, because they are internal to the university in some cases, we have included a few which we feel are more outward facing (Snapshots 4, 23 and 24: Slung Low Residency, London Consortium, Creative Industries Foundation Degree).

Some of the collaborations we found were positively didactic – addressing social/instrumentalist issues (Snapshots 36 and 32: Favela and Youth Dance and Health Project); raising awareness of sciences (Snapshot 37: Materials Library); and the teaching and learning of disabled students (Snapshot 36: Being Inclusive).

Others partnerships include the hosting of cultural organisations – such as the Courtauld Institute’s hosting of the Public Monuments and Sculpture Association (Snapshot 25).

The content of some collaborations is specifically student generated (such as Snapshot 34: Accidental Festival). The exhibition Freeze, organised by Goldsmiths’ students in 1988, for example, is now regarded as the seminal event for the group of artists later to be identified as the Young British Artists (Snapshot 43).

The texts of snapshots are drawn from sources cited.
### Project: Artists’ Access to Art Colleges (AA2A)

| HEI Partners: | University of Newcastle; University of Sunderland; Hull School of Art and Design; Cleveland College of Art & Design; Leeds College of Art & Design; University of Central Lancashire; University of Salford; Liverpool Community College; University of Derby; Norwich School of Art & Design; University of Wolverhampton; University of Worcester; University Campus Suffolk; Hereford College of Arts; University of Hertfordshire; Barnet College; London Metropolitan University; Camberwell College of Arts; University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury; University of Portsmouth; Plymouth College of Art and Design; City of Bath College; University of Bedfordshire; Birmingham City University; Bradford College; Central St. Martins, University of the Arts London; University of Huddersfield; University of Lincoln; Manchester Metropolitan University; Nottingham Trent University; University of Teesside. |
| Funder: | Arts Council England |
| Timescale: | 1994-96 feasibility study; 1996-98 pilot stage; 1999 onwards |
| Details: | The AA2A project is a national scheme, providing visual artists and designer-makers with the opportunity to undertake a period of research or realise a project, using workshop and supporting facilities in fine art and design departments of higher and further education institutions. Participating artists and makers are given an opportunity to use equipment which otherwise might not be available to them, HEIs attract ideas and techniques which may not otherwise enter their environment. Thirty-two colleges in England currently host AA2A schemes. Each offers places to four artists/makers. As well as workshop access, typical supporting facilities available to artists/makers include college lending libraries, access to lecture programmes, computing facilities, life rooms, etc. Each artist/maker has at least 100 hours’ access which they can use over a period of at least 17 weeks, between October and April. They also receive £220 towards materials and travel. Exhibitions are frequently arranged by the institutions at the end of the scheme. Since 1999 approximately 690 artists/makers have taken part in AA2A. In 2008-09 another 128 worked alongside students using workshop equipment and supporting facilities. Each place costs approximately £700 including all central project costs, salaries, overheads and the grant for materials. After initial research and piloting (managed by Norwich School of Art and Design) the full AA2A project was launched in April 1999. This phase of the project was managed by NAFAE (National Association for Fine Art Education) with three years’ funding through the Arts Council’s A4E Lottery scheme. As the remit of the project was extended to cover areas other than fine art, the management of the AA2A project moved to CHEAD (Council for Higher Education in Art and Design). Funding from the Arts Council’s Grants for the Arts programme was secured until 2009. The project is run by a National Co-ordinator and is managed by a steering group. |
| Source/s: | Padwick & Jones (2005) |
2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Partnerships, Access and Community Engagement (PACE): Performance Art and Creative Industries Summer School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td>Activate Performing Arts; Bournemouth University; Lighthouse Poole; Weymouth College; Departure; Wave Arts Education Agency; Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra; North Dorset District Council; Arts Institute Bournemouth; Bournemouth Borough Council; Dorset County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funder:</strong></td>
<td>Arts Council England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>July-August 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Details:** | PACE’s work brings together a range of activities relating to widening participation, community learning, outreach and collaborative work with partners in academic schools, professional services, partner colleges and organisations. It focuses on building capacity and capability which complements the Aimhigher programme and aims to build progression into and through higher education in the Dorset, South Somerset and South Wiltshire area. Performance Art and Creative Industries Summer School was attended by 47 young people from over 20 schools across Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole and Somerset. For the majority of the day programme, students received tuition specific to their chosen discipline. The sessions across all disciplines focused on identifying strengths, learning new skills and developing existing ones, specifically:  
  • Dance: students were taught by Bawren Tavaziva (State of Emergency); sessions covered dance movements which students developed into routines under the guidance of tutors.  
  • Drama: Gareth Brierley and Bernadette Russell (People Show) guided improvisations working around the theme of ‘lost and found’ from which a series of vignettes evolved.  
  • Music: Sessions were led by Sammy Hurden and Chas Dickie (Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra). Students worked with a range of rhythms and sounds and composed their own work in small groups. Additionally, the whole group, including tutors, contributed to a number of collaborative pieces. Students also received Next Steps sessions which addressed issues such as: progression routes into further and higher education; the practical aspects of student life; the sources of finance available to higher education students and the cost of higher education; how to select an higher education course and institution and how to apply; information on the career opportunities in the performing arts industry. |
| **Evaluation:** | Evaluation began in June 2005, with a view to following students from selection to the end of the summer school. See below. |
### 3.

**Project:** Dartington Plus  
**Partners:** Dartington College of Arts; Dartington Hall Trust (encompassing Dartington ARTS and Dartington International Summer School); King Edward VI Community College  
**Funder:** Arts Council England  
**Timescale:** 2004 onwards  
**Details:** Dartington Plus is one of three national centres of excellence in music and the arts which are core funded by Arts Council England, alongside The Sage Gateshead and Aldeburgh. Dartington Plus works in the south west of England, in Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Gloucestershire, Somerset (including Bristol) and Wiltshire. Dartington Plus is centred on a partnership between The Dartington Hall Trust, Dartington College of Arts and King Edward VI Community College. It delivers a wide and eclectic portfolio with a strong emphasis on music and arts education in all its many forms, benefiting from the skills and experience of each of the partners.  
Through this ‘creative cluster’ – a charitable trust with a strong history of arts and cultural activity, a higher education institution specialising in the arts and a community college with performing arts status – Dartington is developing local, regional, national and international partnerships with a range of arts, educational and community organisations, building on existing activities and Dartington’s rich cultural history and vision. Dartington Plus aims to enable creative practitioners to develop not only their practice but also their business and future careers.  
This partnership approach has created the potential for significant developments by building on the distinctive expertise of the partner organisations. For Dartington Hall Trust this distinctiveness is in programming, for Dartington College of Arts it is support for creative enterprise, and for King Edward VI Community College it is its educational work with young people, particularly in the performing arts.  
**Evaluation:** Done on a project-by-project basis in their individual project reports.  
**Source/s:**  
- [http://www.dartingtonplus.org.uk/info_reports.html](http://www.dartingtonplus.org.uk/info_reports.html)  
- Dartington Plus Five Year Plan 2005-10: [http://www.dartingtonplus.org.uk/about_five_yr_plan.html](http://www.dartingtonplus.org.uk/about_five_yr_plan.html)  

### 4.

**Project:** Residency  
**Partners:** University of Huddersfield; Slung Low Theatre Company  
**Timescale:** 2006 onwards  
**Details:** Slung Low Theatre Company is one of the largest emerging artist companies in the UK. It brings together large and diverse groups of new artists to create original cross-disciplinary, site-specific theatre installations.  
In 2006 Slung Low collaborators directed first-year drama students of the University of Huddersfield in a performance installation. Following the success of that project, Slung Low was invited back to direct again in 2007, and invited to become the Resident Theatre Company. With Slung Low in residence, students have the opportunity to observe, provide feedback and undertake placements with the company. There are even unique opportunities to work alongside professionals as performers, directors’ assistants, or assistant stage managers.  
**Source/s:**  
- University of Huddersfield Annual Review 2006-07: [http://www2.hud.ac.uk/about/annual_review/AnnualReview_06-07.pdf](http://www2.hud.ac.uk/about/annual_review/AnnualReview_06-07.pdf)
5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>National Student Drama Festival (NSDF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td>Hull University Scarborough Campus; National Student Drama Festival; The Stephen Joseph Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong></td>
<td>Arts Council England; Scarborough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>The National Student Drama Festival (NSDF) has operated annually since 1956; it has used Scarborough as its regular home since 1990.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Details:** | The NSDF is a full-time professional theatre company whose main activity is to mount a week-long celebration of theatre, live performance, discussion and special events, built around a programme of student productions that have been selected after a performance on their home ground. About 100 productions from throughout the UK are seen in any one year. Arts Council England provides £52,000 pa and Scarborough Borough Council £7,000.

The spring Festival offers people between the ages of 16 and 25 the chance to attend workshops and discussions covering all aspects of theatre and performance including acting, dance, writing, directing, designing, producing, administration, front of house and all forms of technical support. The Festival takes place in a number of venues in Scarborough: Scarborough Council’s Spa Complex, the Stephen Joseph Theatre and is hosted by Hull University Scarborough campus.

The NSDF also runs a residential training week (at present at the North Wall Theatre, Oxford in July) for invited students from different institutions, the NSDF Ensemble, and a National Workshop Programme, which takes a training programme to campuses and regional theatres, on request. A large NSDF technical team offers opportunities for young people to gain invaluable experience in all areas of backstage work.

NSDF publishes its own daily newspaper, Noises Off, and participants can submit reviews, articles and graphics throughout the Festival.

NSDF is open to everyone: colleges, youth theatres, community organisations and universities. The large majority of participants are not drama or theatre studies students, and many successful entries are from universities without drama courses. Many of those attending do not have a production in performance at the Festival. NSDF is recognised as a stepping stone towards a career in the theatre and creative industries, and alumni are to be found in leadership roles throughout British theatre, film, radio and television.

Students at the University of Hull Scarborough Campus have the opportunity to participate and get involved with the running and organisation of NSDF. They form a team of local organisers who staff the NSDF box office and reception, organise local press and publicity, write for the Festival newspaper and ensure that all runs smoothly at the Festival venues. The NSDF enjoys a very positive relationship with the University of Hull Scarborough Campus, but is not part of the curriculum. The Festival provides a unique opportunity for students to get hands-on experience and to enjoy the performances and participate in workshops. |

**Source/s:** [http://www.nsdf.org.uk](http://www.nsdf.org.uk)
### Project: FuseLeeds

**Partners:** Leeds College of Music; Leeds City Council; Leeds Jazz

**Timescale:** Unknown

**Details:** A unique and vibrant biennial Festival, FuseLeeds is one of the highlights of Leeds' cultural offering, and one which makes a dynamic statement about the city and its residents. FuseLeeds aims to:

- Increase the provision of high quality contemporary music in Leeds and the region.
- Introduce and develop new audiences for contemporary music.
- Commission new works and encourage creative collaborations across musical styles and art forms.
- Promote a unique and vibrant biennial Festival as one of the major highlights of Leeds' cultural offering, and one which makes a dynamic statement about the city and its residents.
- Reach local, national and international audiences.
- Develop creative partnerships with Leeds venues, arts organisations and promoters to maximise expertise and impact.
- Support and publicise local and amateur music-making and increase opportunities for a wide range of people to participate in music.
- Foster and develop two-way creative funding partnerships.

**Source/s:** [http://www.fuseleeds.org.uk](http://www.fuseleeds.org.uk)
### Project: Screen Archive South East

**Partners:** University of Brighton; West Sussex Record Office; Brighton & Hove Museum Service; East Sussex County Council; Kent Archive Service; Surrey History Centre

**Funders:** Screen South

**Timescale:** 1992 onwards

**Details:** Screen Archive South East is a public-sector moving image archive serving the south east of England. Established in 1992 at the University of Brighton as the South East Film & Video Archive, the function of this regional screen archive is to locate, collect, preserve, provide access to and promote screen material related to the south east and of general relevance to screen history.

The screen material in the collection consists of magic lantern slides, film, videotape, digital formats and associated hardware and documentation. There are now over 7,000 films and some 10,000 lantern slides from the nineteenth century as well as a significant collection of apparatus and related artefacts. The film material has come from record offices, museums, businesses, local authorities and private collections across the region. It includes corporate documentaries, promotional material produced for seaside resorts and the military, and work made by cine clubs, independent film-makers and families. These records capture many varied aspects of life, work and creativity from across the twentieth century and therefore serve as a rich and invaluable historical resource.

The archive is part of the [University of Brighton](http://www.brighton.ac.uk) and its primary partner is the [West Sussex Record Office](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk) at Chichester. The Conservation Centre and collection are housed within the Record Office and the office is located at the University.

The mission of Screen Archive South East is to:

- Develop and maintain a public collection of moving images for the benefit of individuals and communities.
- Celebrate screen media as a social and cultural record and as an expression of artistic creativity.
- Preserve, document and promote screen media made in the south east of England and of relevance to the archive's interests in screen history.
- Demonstrate the cultural value of the archive's collection through a range of access and educational activities designed for all ages.
- Develop archive projects with record offices, museums, schools, higher education, libraries, societies, businesses and communities.
- Advance the teaching, learning and research culture of the University of Brighton.
- Create opportunities for artists to use the collection as a catalyst for the production of new work.
- Enhance its work and its service to the public through strategic partnerships with education, heritage and information organisations both nationally and internationally.

**Source/s:** [http://www.brighton.ac.uk/screenarchive.html](http://www.brighton.ac.uk/screenarchive.html)
8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>The Creative Graduate into Companies Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>European Social Fund (ESF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2005-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Details: | The Creative Graduate into Companies Initiative at the University College for the Creative Arts is a south east regional project funded by the ESF. Established in April 2005, the project assists both creative industry small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and unemployed/underemployed graduates living in south east England. The Initiative utilises knowledge developed at the University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester with expertise from regional and national support agencies in order to enhance the employability of creative SMEs and graduates. Provision is available for individuals with physical disabilities, sensory impairment and learning difficulties so that they may participate fully in all aspects of the project. The project provides:  
• A series of graduate workshops which forms part of a BTEC Advanced Award in Creative Industry Personal Career Management with a focus on personal promotion for employment, presentation and communication skills and professional practice.  
• A tailored work placement programme of three to six months matching the skills of qualified graduates with the needs of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the south east of England.  
• The provision of specialist free training courses tailored to meet the learning needs of SMEs and graduates.  
• A conferencing/networking event to connect graduates and SMEs in the creative industries.  
• The development of specialist web resources providing SMEs and graduates with a range of online learning information.  
• The development of a research report into creative business support requirements. |
| Source/s: | http://www.cgci.ucreative.ac.uk/index.cfm?articleid=5821 |

9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Brighton Photo Biennial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Photoworks; Aspex; Brighton Photo Fringe; Charleston Farmhouse; De La Warr Pavilion; Fabrica; Fotonet; Lighthouse; Pallant House Gallery; Photoforum; Photoworks; Screen Archive South East; The Independent Photographers Gallery; The Old Courtroom (Brighton &amp; Hove Museums); University of Brighton Gallery; University of Brighton Design Archives; Winchester Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Arts Council England; University of Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2003 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Brighton Photo Biennial is a celebration of international photographic practice. The University of Brighton plays a key partner role in this international photography festival programmed every two years by a guest curator. The Biennial works with a range of visual arts exhibition spaces in the south east region. The University of Brighton currently provides it with office space and other in-kind resources. Creative Partnerships Hastings and East Sussex have also worked with the Brighton Photo Biennial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Photoforum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>University of Brighton; Photoworks; Kent Institute of Art and Design; Surrey Institute of Art and Design University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Arts Council England; Arts Council England South East; The British Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2001 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>PhotoForum was established to promote critical debate about photography, in particular where this relates to contemporary photography’s role in fine art practices. It was formed through a collaboration between David Green, Joanna Lowry and David Campany – three members of higher education institutions in the south east of England (the University of Brighton, Kent Institute of Art and Design and the Surrey Institute of Art and Design University College) engaged in the teaching and research of photography. Photoforum also works in close association with Photoworks, the independent arts organisation with responsibility for the promotion of photography, the organisation of exhibitions and the commissioning of new photographic work, in the south east. To date Photoforum has been involved in the organisation of conferences and lectures involving photographic practitioners, historians, critics and theorists, the publications of these events and the organisation of exhibitions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>enquire: about learning in galleries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEI partners:</td>
<td>Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia; Institute of Education, University of London; International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies at Newcastle University; Northumbria University; John Moores University; University of Manchester; University of Sussex; Department of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of Exeter; University College Falmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sport; Department for Children, Schools and Families; The Foyle Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2004 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>The enquire programme is being carried out through clusters of galleries and higher education institutions which constitute the national research consortium. The consortium comprises nine clusters: East, London, North East, North West Liverpool; North West Manchester; South East Sussex; South East Kent; South West Devon; South West Cornwall. enquire involves new working partnerships between the galleries and HEIs (except for SE Kent which has no HEI member), each bringing to the programme considerable experience and expertise. These peer groups have worked together and with partner artists and teachers to develop the research focus for their cluster, the programme of projects to be investigated and the methodology to be employed. The programme, which is managed by engage and developed in association with Arts Council England, offers opportunities for extensive training and professional development for gallery educators, teachers, artist educators and HEI researchers. Informal CPD draws on collaborations between the different professional participants, and through formal training in organised courses and seminars. Practice and research methods and the research findings are also shared throughout with the wider gallery sector through engage events and publications. The ‘cluster’ is proving an interesting model, a ‘community of critical enquirers’ to provide peer support, continuous professional development and advocacy for gallery education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. **Project:** a2a Rockets Initiative  
**Partners:** University of Brighton, School of Arts and Communication; Sussex Downs College; Carousel  
**Funder:** Arts Council England South East  
**Timescale:** 2005 onwards  
**Details:**  
The University of Brighton was awarded a grant of £70,000 by ACE SE to fund an artists’ group for the graduates of its Access to Art project that brings art to people with severe learning difficulties. The artists’ group a2a Rockets enables these artists to continue their arts practice and the funding enables the university to recruit more students on to the second Access to Art course.  
a2a Rockets is based at the Phoenix Arts Association, a mainstream community artist studio with many other practising artists. This partnership allows the artists with learning difficulties to become more involved in the arts world and gives the Phoenix artists the opportunity to collaborate and learn from the a2a Rockets. The a2a Rockets accesses university resources with support and advice and help from art students. The initiative provides a progression route into the art world for the Access to Art graduates. For artists with learning disabilities and the wider arts community it exemplifies what can be achieved with support.  
**Evaluation:** A2A Rockets Interim Report 2006: [http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/pdf%20files/a2areportjul06.pdf](http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/pdf%20files/a2areportjul06.pdf)  
**Source/s:** See above  
[http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/projects/a2arockets.htm](http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/projects/a2arockets.htm)

13. **Project:** The European Opera Centre  
**Partners:** Liverpool Hope University; The European Opera Centre  
**Funder:** The European Commission Culture Programme  
**Timescale:** 1997 onwards  
**Details:**  
The European Opera Centre exists to help bridge the gap in training and practical opportunities for those leaving higher education and establishing a career in opera. The centre has a complementary aim of developing audiences for opera across Europe.  
Launched 11 years ago with leadership from major opera houses in Europe, the European Opera Centre provides practical training for singers and other young Europeans intending to develop a career in opera. The centre’s work has received strong political and financial support from the European Union. Intensive courses at the centre’s rehearsal studios at Liverpool Hope University lead to staged productions, concert performances and other projects presented by the centre’s performing company Opera Europe at venues across Europe.  
**Source/s:** [http://www.operaeurope.org](http://www.operaeurope.org)
### 14. Project: Grow Creative

**Funders:** European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), NW Objective 2 programme, 2000-06  
**Timescale:** 2003 onwards  
**Details:** Grow Creative at Lancaster University is a creative industries development project run by the Innovation and Enterprise Unit. It combines the university's Creative Enterprise Action and Development initiative and Creative Awareness Network.  
The aim of Grow Creative is to transfer knowledge, expertise and resource from the university out to the creative sector to enable creative businesses to grow.  
Their purpose is to offer support to creative Lancashire and Cumbria-based SMEs. Beneficiaries will range from start-ups and young companies to established organisations working in advertising; craft; design; designer fashion; film and video; interactive leisure software; marketing; music; performing arts; publishing; television and radio; visual arts.  
Although Create Start Up course are restricted to the university's graduates, other Grow Creative provision is open. These focus on both personal and professional development through a range of free support activities which include commercial awareness workshops consultancies, one-to-one mentoring, the young creative’s network and peer groups.  
**Source/s:** [http://www.grow-creative.co.uk/](http://www.grow-creative.co.uk/)

### 15. Project: The Ruskin Foundation and the Ruskin Centre and Library, Lancaster

**Partners:** Lancaster University; The Ruskin Foundation, Brantwood House  
**Timescale:** Ongoing  
**Details:** The Ruskin Centre is a dedicated research centre based in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Its aim is to carry out research into the writer, artist and social visionary John Ruskin and his circle; to publish the outcomes of that research, and to organise and support exhibitions, conferences and colloquia relating to Ruskin and his circle.  
The Ruskin Centre is the only specialised Ruskin research centre in the country. It works closely with the award-winning Ruskin Library, which houses the foremost collection of Ruskin materials, the Whitehouse Collection, and organises temporary exhibition programme.  
The centre and library are housed in an award-winning building, designed by Sir Richard MacCormac and supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund, which was opened in 1998. At least three themed displays are arranged each year – mainly of works from the collection, but many also include items lent by other institutions and occasional exhibitions of more modern works.  
Both the centre and the library have close links with the Ruskin Foundation which oversees the world’s largest collection of the works of John Ruskin. These assets are housed at the Ruskin Library at Lancaster University, and Ruskin’s former home and estate, Brantwood in the Lake District, where the foundation is based.  
The foundation supports a diverse range of Ruskin-related activities, and has appointed an education and outreach officer to bring the works and beliefs of John Ruskin to a wider audience.  
**Source/s:** [http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/ruskin/about.htm](http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/ruskin/about.htm)  
[http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/ruskinlib/](http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/ruskinlib/)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Professional Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Royal Northern College of Music; Manchester Camerata; Artis; Access to Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>HEFCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2005 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>In January 2005 the Royal Northern College of Music was awarded funding by HEFCE to establish a Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the only UK music conservatoire to receive such an award. The centre is already having an impact on teaching and learning at the Royal Northern College of Music. The centre supports the ongoing development of Supporting Professional Studies, the College's innovative strand of vocational training, and brings £350,000 into the Royal College every year to enhance teaching and learning and help students to develop the skills they need to secure future employment. It also provided a £2m contribution towards the building of the Oxford Road Wing, which has provided state-of-the-art facilities for students and accommodation for the college's professional partnerships with organisations including Access to Music, Artis, Manchester Camerata, Manchester Metropolitan University's Institute of Education (music teacher training provision), Nordoff-Robbins (music therapy) and the Children's University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/s:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rncm.ac.uk/content/view/231/135/">http://www.rncm.ac.uk/content/view/231/135/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>National Glass Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>University of Sunderland; The National Glass Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Heritage Lottery Fund; Arts Council England; Northern Rock Foundation; AHRC; Science Research Investment Fund; Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF); European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>1998 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>The National Glass Centre (which opened in 1998) is dedicated to the development and promotion of excellence in the art and industry of glass. The heart of the centre is the Glass Gallery, 2,500 square feet of specialist exhibition space devoted to glass. The Kaleidoscope gallery takes the visitor on a voyage of discovery through the many properties of glass. The centre has a lively programme of events, a glass shop and a restaurant. The University of Sunderland has been closely involved in the creation of the National Glass Centre which is a centre of international significance in the art and design world. Situated in the City of Sunderland, this spectacular award-winning £15m all-glass building was funded partly by the national lottery and is sited next to the university's St Peter's Campus. The School of Arts, Design and Media has two workshops in the National Glass Centre which are both used for teaching undergraduate students. One is a kiln and cold glass workshop and the other a hot glass workshop. The school will bring in glass blowers of international repute from around the world to demonstrate techniques and styles to students on the BA (Hons) Glass, Architectural Glass, Ceramics course at the University of Sunderland. The government’ 2008 Research Assessment Exercise recognised glass research at this school as being of international standing. The school’s facilities at the National Glass Centre will also be used to further develop research in glass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project: Dance City

**Partners:** Northumbria University; Esmée Fairbairn Foundation; Newcastle City Council; Newcastle Gateshead Initiative; Northern Rock Foundation; One North East; The Trusthouse Charitable Foundation; Youth Dance England

**Funders:** Arts Council England North East; ERDF & ESF funding through Objective 2 via Cultural Sector Development Initiative

**Timescale:** 2005 onwards

**Details:**

Opened in the autumn of 2005, Dance City’s pioneering £7.6m centre for dance has given the organisation the perfect home from which to develop and drive dance forward as one of the most exciting art forms of the twenty-first Century.

One of nine National Dance Agencies, Dance City pursues its remit to develop dance in the region through work in four spheres of dance: artistic support, education, dance performance and participation and regional development.

From classes and workshops to the presentation of work from leading international choreographers to superb educational opportunities through academy and degree courses (in partnership with Northumbria University) Dance City offers the public and professionals alike across the North East of England the opportunity to participate in dance at all levels. BA (Hons) Dance Choreography is run by Northumbria University in collaboration with Dance City.

The main aim of the programme is to prepare reflective, creative and professionally skilled contemporary dance artists who have developed a critical understanding of dance and of themselves as artists in society and culture.

The relationship with Dance City ensures that the curriculum and course content is in constant dialogue with professional performance practices and thus enables students to engage with current and cutting-edge approaches to contemporary dance. Learning and teaching activities occur in an environment of performance, experimentation and artistic exchange.

Throughout the programme students engage in daily technique classes that are designed to enable them to develop as expressive, articulate and professionally skilled dance artists able to work competently in a variety of performance and choreographic contexts. Through the choreography modules, students are encouraged to develop their own approaches that are individually relevant but also referential to or participate in the dialogues of contemporary practices. The degree culminates in students directing a work for a platform performance.

**Source/s:** [http://www.dancecity.co.uk](http://www.dancecity.co.uk)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: The Cultural Sector Development Initiative &amp; U4NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funder:</strong> Objective One (ERDF &amp; ESF) via Cultural Sector Development Initiative (CSDI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong> 2003-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong> Arts Council England North East has led the development of the Cultural Sector Development Initiative (CSDI), a regional umbrella project that enables the cultural and creative sector to benefit from European funding for the delivery of training and development needs. The initiative has been developed in partnership with key agencies such as Government Office for the North East and One NorthEast. Since June 2003, CSDI has ensured a total commitment of £16.2m to cultural sector development. The higher education sector's contribution to the aims of CSDI has been made manifest in the Cultural Sector Development Programme of the partnership of the universities of Northumbria, Newcastle, Teesside and Sunderland (U4NE) and represents a new commitment to collaboration in the delivery of high-level skills in the cultural and creative sector. CSDI has enabled the universities to develop and provide high-level skills training and qualifications for a wide range of people, from those about to embark on a career in creative fields, to professionals looking to polish their skills. Full- and part-time courses have been tailored to suit the needs of beneficiaries and include screenwriting, factual filmmaking, creative writing, master's programmes in cultural management and a range of short courses in glass and ceramics, and design and photography software. To date, the programme has supported over 800 beneficiaries, updating specific skills and providing vocational qualifications. Many courses have resulted in the performance of material, the exhibition of art, or the showing of films, and many events have been organised to raise the profile of cultural industries with the general public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: International Photography Research Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Founding Partners:</strong> Museum Folkwang Germany, University of Leiden/Paradox The Netherlands, University of Jyvaskyla Finland, Dom Fotografie Slovakia and Arts Council England UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong> EU Culture 2000; University of Sunderland; Arts Council England; City of Sunderland; Sunderland arc; Museum Folkwang; City of Essen; Dom Fotografie Slovakia; Ministry of Culture Slovakia; University of Jyvaskyla; Arts Council of Central Finland; City of Jyvaskyla; Leiden University’ Paradox; Mondriaan Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong> 2004 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong> The International Photography Research Network is co-ordinated by The School of Arts, Design, Media &amp; Culture of the University of Sunderland. It was established with an EU Culture 2000 project ‘Changing Faces’ grant of €1.4m, and has established one of the most ambitious photography projects in the UK. It now boasts 84 partner institutions in 22 countries. The Network is an organisation linking the work of art schools, practitioners, academic institutions, museums, galleries and archives internationally. Its mission is to stimulate the quality and presentation of contemporary photographic practice, academic and artistic research and photography-related theory. It seeks to achieve this by providing a platform for international exchange leading to collaborative projects, exhibitions, publications, research, symposia, publication, networking, shared databases and archives. The International Photography Research Network is part of a long-term strategy to further enhance the University of Sunderland's growing reputation in photography education and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source/s:</strong> <a href="http://www.theiprn.org">http://www.theiprn.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Culture Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Northern Stage; The Sage Gateshead; Tyneside Cinema; Audiovisual Arts North East; NESTA North East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Newcastle University; European Commission; AHRC; EPSRC; ESRC; One North East; Arts Council England; Unilever; Microsoft Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2006 onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Details: | Culture Lab is a flagship for Newcastle University’s cultural quarter. Housed in the Grand Assembly Rooms on King's Walk, this unique facility maintains the character of the original Grade II listed building opened in 1879. A £4.5m refurbishment and equipment programme, largely financed by the HEFCE Science Research Investment Fund, has made attractive historical features an integral part of this twenty-first century digital hub for creative interdisciplinary research.

Culture Lab hosts a wide variety of activities in collaboration with researchers from Newcastle's three faculties and external bodies, developing interdisciplinary links in areas such as performance and technology, narrative and interactive structures, digital tools and heritage studies, visual and auditory display systems, pervasive computing, and collaborative authorship and ownership. About 35 doctoral and post-doctoral researchers from a dozen Newcastle University schools are housed in the Lab, along with visiting international artists who give public presentations of their work to enthusiastic audiences. Regional artists intersect with national and international figures at events like ‘Connecting Principle’ and the AV Festival Conference; interdisciplinary symposia in areas ranging from neuroscience to architecture attract highly diverse speakers and attendees.

Advances in auditory environment technologies have been demonstrated by regionally based composers like Trevor Wishart alongside young musicians from all north east universities. Artistic skills are shaping new research agendas, as in an AHRC-EPSRC funded motion capture project in which dancers, musicians, jugglers and composers collaborated with biomechanics, interface development and computing colleagues. Culture Lab is involved in ESRC and EPSRC initiatives to identify sustainable business models for the creative industries. A European Sixth Framework interactive storytelling project draws heritage specialists from the £26m Great North Museum project, and is being used to prototype teaching environments for science students. A ceramics artist creating blue-toothed jewellery is collaborating with Newcastle gerontologists to devise personalised artefacts to enhance communications for older people with memory disorders. |

Source/s: [http://www.ncl.ac.uk/culturelab/about/](http://www.ncl.ac.uk/culturelab/about/)
Announced in 2007, this new venture combines expertise in design from the Royal College of Art, engineering from Imperial College's Faculty of Engineering and the business of innovation from Imperial College's Tanaka Business School. It was established following the Cox Review, which highlighted the need to stir together the scientific, engineering, business and creative design communities to enhance business and public-sector innovation. Design London has four main pillars: creating new teaching programmes, conducting top-level research, incubating new business ideas and pioneering the next generation of innovation technology. Design London at RCA and Imperial is based upon an 'innovation Triangle' which blends design (represented by the Royal College of Art), engineering and technology (represented by Imperial College Faculty of Engineering) and the business of innovation (represented by Imperial's Tanaka Business School). It has initial funding of £5.8m from HEFCE and NESTA. Within this 'innovation triangle', Design London's teaching promotes knowledge interchange between MA, MEng and MBA students from the RCA and Imperial. It is also open to industry and institutional partners, seeking to transform the skills of the professionals, managers and senior executives. Design London explores how design can be more effectively integrated with business and technology to create world-beating products and services. Entrepreneurial graduates, initially from RCA and Imperial, are given the opportunity to develop new ideas in the 'Incubator', a dynamic multidisciplinary environment for business development which will support unique or unexpected collaborations between different disciplines, organisations and places. Students and business partners of RCA and Imperial are able to exploit the Innovation Technology (IvT) Centre which is home to world-leading design, visualisation, modelling and rapid prototyping technology. This can help Design London's students and partners to develop their innovation capacity via simulation exercises, digital tools and facilitation.

**Source/s:** [http://www.designlondon.net](http://www.designlondon.net)
23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>The London Consortium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>The Architectural Association; Birkbeck University of London; ICA; Science Museum; Tate Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>1997 onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Details: | The London Consortium is a multidisciplinary graduate programme in humanities and cultural studies. It is a collaboration between five of London's cultural and educational institutions: the Architectural Association, Birkbeck University of London, the Institute of Contemporary Arts, the Science Museum, and Tate Modern. Students benefit from being taught and supervised by both internationally renowned academics and experienced cultural practitioners working in the constituent institutions. The teaching faculty and supervisors are drawn from a diverse range of institutions and disciplines, and include architectural theorists and designers, specialists in art history and curatorial work, cinema critics and film-makers, historians, literary scholars, artists, political theorists and philosophers. Students work across academic disciplines and are encouraged to make use of the resources of the collaborative institutions, developing ideas for projects through which the Consortium and its institutions can together produce events and work that satisfy the consortium's multidisciplinary, cutting-edge, and challenging ambitions. The London Consortium's aims are to:  
- Provide distinctive and challenging Master's and PhD degrees, which enable students to engage in multi-disciplinary course-work and to research a thesis under careful academic supervision.  
- Help to develop new kinds of intellectuals who have knowledge and competence not only in a number of academic disciplines but also in working within key institutions which are shaping the future direction of the culture.  
The programmes are centred in cultural studies and the humanities and set out to have a strongly contemporary edge. They are:  
- Multidisciplinary, considering broad and complex problems, but on the basis that students must acquire disciplinary competencies.  
- Committed to the study of modern and popular culture, new arts and new media, whilst not rejecting the past, traditional practices of criticism, or high culture.  
- Theoretically grounded and committed to avoiding the pitfalls of relativism with respect to truth and values.  
- Aware of the need to analyse modern culture in its social context and to bring to the analysis of culture the knowledges of the human sciences.  
- Exploratory and committed to combining cultural analysis with cultural production.  
- Dedicated to sharing research into pressing cultural questions with the general public, in the form of conferences. |
| Source/s: | http://www.londonconsortium.com/about/index.php |
### 24. Project:
**Creative Industries Foundation Degree**

**Partners:** The Roundhouse Camden; City University; HEIF

**Timescale:** 2007 onwards

**Details:** A foundation degree in creative industries offered by City University in conjunction with the Roundhouse, Camden. The course has two pathways: ‘community radio and television’ and ‘music events and management’. It includes work placements and a full programme of campus-based lectures and workshops. The degree aims to equip students to work as freelancers or entrepreneurs, or to get jobs in the highly competitive music and media industries. Creative industries employers are involved at every stage of the course: advising on course content and delivery, as visiting lecturers and guest speakers and providing work placements.

Students are able to take advantage of City University’s reputation as a leading university for professional qualifications, as well as the Roundhouse’s state of the art facilities and offer of practical experience. In addition, students will undertake work placements at events and broadcast companies.

This course culminates in a final-year project where students are responsible for either staging or reporting on real live events at the Roundhouse.

**Source/s:** [http://www.city.ac.uk/ell/foundation/whatis.html](http://www.city.ac.uk/ell/foundation/whatis.html)

### 25. Project:
**Public Monuments and Sculpture Association**

**Partners:** Courtauld Institute; Public Monuments and Sculpture Association

**Timescale:** 1991 onwards

**Details:** The Public Monuments and Sculpture Association, established in 1991, aims to bring together individuals and organisations with a mutual interest in public sculptures and monuments, their production, preservation and history. The association hopes to heighten public awareness of Britain’s monumental heritage – past, present and future – through activities, publications and dialogue; and it campaigns for listing, preservation, protection and restoration. The association's website and offices are hosted by the Courtauld Institute.

Since 1991 the Public Monuments and Sculpture Association has initiated the National Recording Project; collaborated with Liverpool University Press on the acclaimed series *Public Sculpture of Britain*, and has established the much-respected bi-annual *Sculpture Journal*. It has set up events, conferences and publications in collaboration with English Heritage, the UK Institute of Conservators, University College Dublin and many other similar institutions. The association operates an advisory service and distributes newsletters and newsheets to its members.

The latest projects include collaboration with a number of organisations and individuals to oversee production of the *Custodians Handbook*, published in 2005 and occasionally updated; and set up the campaign, Save our Sculpture, to encourage concerned members of the public to keep watch over their neighbourhood sculptures, and to report damage or negligence to the association.

**Source/s:** [http://www.pmsa.org.uk](http://www.pmsa.org.uk)
### 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Film Business Academy, Cass Business School, City University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong></td>
<td>UK Film Council; Skillset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>2005 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Film Business Academy, launched in 2005, is the UK's first international centre dedicated to the business of film. Its aim is to bring together the creative energy of the international film industry and global business expertise to create partnerships that will help power the film business into the future. Courses on offer include MBA Specialism in Film Business, MSc Management and Executive Training based on Skillset's Inside Pictures Course. Delivery partners include a wide range of industry practitioners and professional experts including Deloitte, Grant Thornton, Richards Butler and Qwerty Films. The Film Business Academy covers every dimension of the film value chain, from development and finance to distribution, marketing and exhibition. It will help develop talent through high-level business education and enrich the industry's knowledge through research. The Film Business Academy is one of the seven institutions that form the Screen Academy Network, a concept driven by educating and training talent in the audio-visual industries. The network was officially opened in partnership with Skillset, the Sector Skills Council for broadcast, film, video, interactive media and photo imaging. The other institutions include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bournemouth Screen Academy based at the Media School of Bournemouth University and the Arts Institute at Bournemouth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Screen Academy, London College of Communication and Ealing Institute of Media.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Screen Academy at the London Film School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Screen Academy at the National Film and Television School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Screen Academy Wales, which is made up of a consortium of high-level film industry focused education and training providers throughout Wales including The Film Academy at the University of Glamorgan, the International Film School Wales at the University of Wales, Newport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Screen Academy Scotland, a collaboration between Napier University and Edinburgh College of Art.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source/s:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cass.city.ac.uk/filmbusinessacademy/about.html">http://www.cass.city.ac.uk/filmbusinessacademy/about.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>The Design Laboratory, Central St Martins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Saint Martins established the Design Laboratory as a bridge between education and the commercial agenda of industry, consultancy and business. It is a creative, interdisciplinary studio housed at Central Saint Martins Innovation Centre. The laboratory draws on some of the most able and multi-talented of recent graduates from University of the Arts London courses at all levels. Graduates are employed as part of a creative team of designers in a managed, project-orientated, studio environment. They work on commercial briefs with real deadlines, real fees and a wide range of clients with whom to negotiate and to inspire. Projects are in areas such as innovation, branding and communications, product design, strategy and trend forecasting, or any combination of these. Designers work in collaboration with clients as enablers, strategists, leaders, implementers and team players. They are employed as creative, lateral thinkers who can translate concepts into realisable solutions while challenging and initiating change in the real and digital worlds. Clients include: Universal McCann, The Fat Duck Group, Fremantle Media, Intel, Nokia, Adidas, Gucci, V&amp;A, Design Council and Liberty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source/s:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.csm.arts.ac.uk/csm_design_laboratory.htm">http://www.csm.arts.ac.uk/csm_design_laboratory.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 28. Enterprise Centre for Creative Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Enterprise Centre for Creative Arts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td>Arts Council England; ArtQuest; Baxter &amp; Co; Channel 4; Creative London; Department of Media, Culture and Sport; Design Trust; Inland Revenue; London Development Agency; McCabe Partnership; NatWest; NESTA; One London PR21; Purves &amp; Purves; Shell Livewire; Simmons &amp; Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong></td>
<td>London College of Communication, University of the Arts London; HEIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>2000 onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Details:** | In October 2000 the Enterprise Centre for the Creative Arts (ECCA) was established at London College of Communication to provide guidance and support to students and graduates of the University of the Arts London who wish to become (or already are) self-employed. It was originally set up using industry sponsorship, but now gets its core funding from the University of the Arts. The Enterprise Centre offers free creative business services and facilities including:  
- Seminars, workshops, training and events.  
- One-to-one business advice from specialist creative business advisers.  
- Free advice from accountants and tax specialists.  
- Resource library for the small creative business.  
- Website with extensive links to relevant agencies and services.  
- Up-to-date diary of creative industry events.  
- Online fact sheets and podcasts.  
- Access to a creative business support network  
This service is available to students and graduates of the University of the Arts London who have either set up their own business in the last three years, or are thinking about starting one. |
| **Source/s:** | [http://www.ecca-london.org/](http://www.ecca-london.org/) |

### 29. Fashion Business Resource Studio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fashion Business Resource Studio</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td>Fashion Business Resource Studio has been established as a single point of contact sharing the creative, business and technical expertise of London College of Fashion with the fashion and lifestyle industries. It aims to generate a mutually supportive culture dedicated to improving the integration of emerging talent, technical expertise, new knowledge and entrepreneurial advice into industry. In addition to offering short- and long-term work placements in industry for its students and assisting graduate recruitment via its FashionAIM website, the Resource Studio offers: industry support in the form of consultancy; knowledge-transfer partnerships; tailormade training and up-skilling; creative insights; networks; digital fashion - making London College of Fashion’s state of the art technological equipment available to the fashion and lifestyle industries through the bureau services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source/s:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fbrstudio.org.uk/">http://www.fbrstudio.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>firstsite:newsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners</strong></td>
<td>University of Essex; Firstsite:newsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong></td>
<td>Arts Council England; Colchester Borough Council; East of England Development Agency; Essex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>Completion 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td>The University of Essex is a partner in the £16.5m project to develop a purpose-built venue for the contemporary visual arts in Essex. firstsite:newsite in Colchester is designed to be a new kind of cultural building, creating a social space with contemporary art at its heart. Designed by renowned architect Rafael Viñoly, the innovative building includes retail, eating and social areas, alongside spaces for artists, exhibitions and education and learning facilities, including a 200-seat auditorium. It creates a UK hub for the study of Latin American art, working closely with the University of Essex Collection of Latin American Art (UECLAA), which comprises some 700 works. Previously UECLAA's only permanent display space was in the University's Albert Sloman Library, but the partnership with firstsite significantly enriches the range of art from Latin America on public display in the UK. Each year one exhibition at firstsite will focus on Latin American artists, and works from UECLAA will be integrated into other exhibitions or used to contextualise other works on display using the building's museum space. In conjunction with UECLAA, Latin American artists will also have opportunities to inhabit the building's Artist Space and create installations for the entrance foyer. The collaboration with UECLAA represents only part of the university's wider partnership with firstsite, which also provides a town-centre base for a range of university activities across a number of disciplines. These include new postgraduate courses, seminars, conferences, educational outreach and the development of cultural research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source/s:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.firstsite.uk.net">http://www.firstsite.uk.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Favela to the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Grupo Cultural AfroReggae; Asian Dub Foundation Education; Barbican Bite and Barbican Education; Bigga Fish; Contact; Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Language College; Guildhall School of Music and Drama; Hackney Free and Parochial School; Immediate Theatre; Metropolitan Black Police Association; Morpeth School; Newcastle and Gateshead Initiative; Nós Do Morro; Oaklands School; Queen Mary University of London; Rich Mix; Shoreditch Trust; Stoke Newington School: Media, Arts and Science College; Theatre Royal Stratford East; The Learning Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Arts Council England; AHRC; Artventure; Embassy of Brazil in London; The British Council; Queen Mary University of London; LCACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2007-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Based on the inspirational performances of Rio de Janeiro's 'cultural warriors' AfroReggae, Favela to the World is a seven-year programme that aims to strengthen the resistance and resilience of young people in the UK through engagement with art. Led by People's Palace Projects and the Barbican, it is building a unique legacy of performance, knowledge and skills. Favela to the World has established projects in London, Liverpool and Manchester from 2007-12. Each visit is intended to act as a catalyst for an ongoing community-based programme. AfroReggae, forged out of the police massacre of 21 people in their local community in 1993, has gone on to establish an international profile for its pioneering work in taking young people out of the drug, gang and gun culture of Rio de Janeiro's favelas (shantytowns). Grupo Cultural AfroReggae now runs over 70 projects across a range of disciplines including music, dance and theatre, circus, and radio and new media with over 3,000 young people in Rio de Janeiro. It also provides social support mechanisms for young people, guiding many into employment in Rio's mainstream. The AfroReggae UK Partnership aims to develop a programme in which young people can use the arts to explore effective means to change their world. Its mission is to inspire change through the arts. The UK Partnership seeks to create social and cultural legacies that address the long term needs and concerns of young people. People's Palace Projects was founded in 1999 and is based in the historic east London building of the People's Palace at Queen Mary University of London. It conceives large scale, multi-faceted projects authored and shaped around ideas and collaborations motivated by the power of art to progress social justice and change. Paul Heritage, Professor of Drama and Performance at Queen Mary, and Director of People's Palace, is a producer of Favela to the World at the Barbican, and contact Theatre, Manchester, 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 32. Youth Dance and Health Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project:</strong></th>
<th>Youth Dance and Health Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners</strong></td>
<td>Trinity Laban; Hampshire Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong></td>
<td>Joint Investment Fund for the Arts: a partnership between local authorities across Hampshire, Southampton, Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight and Arts Council England, South East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td>A partnership between the Dance Science team of Trinity Laban (Conservatoire for Music and Dance) and Hampshire Dance created a project across several schools in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, which brought creative dance to children aged between 11 and 14 and then measured the results in terms of physical fitness and psychological wellbeing. The project was placed in schools during curriculum time, in order to ensure the inclusion of participants who might not normally choose dance as an activity. This approach enabled 348 young people to participate across nine different schools. The project lasted 10 weeks. During the first and final weeks the team of researchers carried out a series of assessments with each group in their school. The tests were both quantitative and qualitative, and designed to measure both physiological and psychological changes across time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 33. A Million Penguins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project:</strong></th>
<th>A Million Penguins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners</strong></td>
<td>De Montfort University; Penguin UK; Mediawiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td>De Montfort University carried out an experiment – the world’s first collaborative project between a university and a major publisher to write a wiki-based novel. Nearly 1,500 individuals worldwide made 11,000 contributions to the novel and over 75,000 people visited the website. The experiment also gave rise to over 80 pieces of media coverage and blog entries across the world. The academic aim of this project was to provide an opportunity for postgraduate students and researchers to collaborate with a major international publisher on a global experiment designed to answer Penguin UK’s digital publisher, Jeremy Ettinghausen’s, question: ‘can a community write a novel?’ Anyone, anywhere in the world could contribute to and edit the novel, thereby raising awareness of and access to the creative writing process, and students from De Montfort University’s online MA in Creative Writing and New Media worked behind the scenes to preserve the overall content and direction. Award-winning author Kate Pullinger, Reader in Creative Writing and New Media, and Sue Thomas, Professor of New Media, coordinated the project between Penguin and the university’s students. The involvement of MA students, who themselves were based across the world, was an important aspect of the experiment as it involved them directly in ground-breaking practice-based research. In the same spirit, De Montfort University has created a post-doctoral research post to analyse the results, which may lead to further research. The experiment became a global phenomenon, much-cited in international and national media including Newsweek International and Business Week, and was featured on BBC Radio Four’s arts magazine programme, Front Row.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 34.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>The Accidental Festival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA); Central School of Speech and Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2006 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>The Accidental Festival is produced by students of the Performance Arts programme at the Central School of Speech and Drama, University of London. It is now in its third successive year at the ICA. The Festival runs for four days. The festival is wholly student owned. Students accept responsibility for writing its mission statement, ushering duties and all points between. They curate and produce a three-day festival of new performance at the ICA in London. With consultation and advice from relevant officers at the Central School from the Principal’s office down, and a bespoke programme of lectures and workshops to support their learning, the students organise themselves into departments and take responsibility for all aspects of marketing, planning and producing the event. With the guidance of professional counterparts, they deal with budgeting, the booking of professional companies, formulation of contracts, press releases, the setting up of educational outreach programmes, health and safety planning and liaison with the ICA’s technical, box-office and artistic departments. They also establish criteria for selection of student work, and produce much new multidisciplinary new work – much of it involving students from other institutions. The students who will be undertaking the project in the following year are then party to extensive debriefing. The main mode of assessment is through a reflective portfolio and formative verbal discussion of the students’ self-evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/s:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.accidentalfestival.com">http://www.accidentalfestival.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 35.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Performing Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>The Clod Ensemble; Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Arts Council England; LCACE; Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation; AHRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Performing Medicine is led by The Clod Ensemble, a theatre company which ‘makes performance work for traditional theatre spaces, festivals and galleries as well as creating projects and curating work in places where art does not usually or regularly happen including medical schools, day care centres and prisons’. The Clod Ensemble’s work with Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London, is the only initiative of its kind – led by professional artists in collaboration with medical educationalists and health professionals. The project aims to create dialogue across disciplines, between the arts, humanities and medicine; across departments in universities; across institutions; and between artists, scientists and the general public. The intention is to inspire medics to be vital, rigorous, critically engaged, culturally aware doctors and give them skills to help them sustain a highly demanding work practice. The project is based on the belief that engagement with arts can encourage: • Creativity and agility of body and mind. • An awareness of the effect one’s own behaviour has on others. • The ability to construct difficult questions and analyse information that has no simple solution. • A questioning of one’s own cultural and ethical assumptions. Its work covers practical skills, examining cultural and ethical issues through arts and artists working in science and healthcare settings. Courses and workshops for medical students and healthcare professionals are regularly delivered at Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Imperial College London and King’s College London. Professional development training is also provided – most recently at Guy’s and St Thomas’ Hospitals and for Tower Hamlets Primary Care Trust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 36. Being Inclusive in the Creative and Performing Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: Being Inclusive in the Creative and Performing Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **HEI Partners:** The Consortium of Art and Design Institutions in Southern England.  
The Arts Institute at Bournemouth; The Central School of Speech and Drama; Kent Institute of Art & Design; Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication; Rose Bruford College; The Surrey Institute of Art & Design University College; Trinity College of Music; Wimbledon School of Art |
| **Funder:** HEFCE |
| **Timescale:** 2002-05. Project now closed. |
| **Details:** Being Inclusive in the Creative and Performing Arts was a three-year HEFCE-funded project aimed at developing and disseminating resources relating to the learning and teaching of disabled students. The bid was made by the Consortium of Arts and Design Institutions in Southern England. Although it has officially ended, many interest groups and connections still exist and several mergers happened between group members and other institutions. Staff from partner institutions all contributed to the various case studies and to the direction and focus of the project. Case studies included deaf student evaluation within an Art and Design Foundation Course, Making Music Technology Accessible for Disabled Students and A Year in the Life of a Student with a Physical Disability. |
| **Evaluation:** Evaluation of the case studies fed directly into the projects’ resulting Learning & Teaching Tools. See link below. |
| **Source/s:** [http://www.bicpa.ac.uk/home.html](http://www.bicpa.ac.uk/home.html) |

### 37. Materials Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: Materials Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong> LCACE; NESTA; Goldsmiths University of London; Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council; Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation; King's College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong> 2003 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong> The Materials Library was established in 2003 in the Engineering Research Laboratories at King's College London, as a space for interaction between materials scientists and artists, designers and architects. It is a physical archive of more than 800 materials and is growing every month. It specialises in new and advanced materials collected from research laboratories all round the world. The materials are gathered together not only for scientific interest, but also for their ability to fire the imagination and advance conceptualisation. The research hypothesis is that not only do technical details enhance aesthetic experience and deepen understanding, but that physical encounters with matter often generate new ideas. LCACE funded the Materials Library collaboration with the Tate, which was a series of talks and handling events of materials from the library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[http://www.materialslibrary.org.uk](http://www.materialslibrary.org.uk) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Fallujah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>ICA; Embargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>LCACE; Royal Holloway University of London Arts Faculty &amp; Enterprise Unit, Unltd; The Funding Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2007 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Jonathan Holmes, Senior Lecturer in Drama, Royal Holloway, wrote, directed and produced the play, Fallujah, in a specially designed space at the Truman Brewery on Brick Lane. The play was produced by Holmes' company, Ilium, and The Institute of Contemporary Arts; and was accompanied by an original score by Nitin Sawhney and a set by Lucy Orta. The cast included Harriet Walter, Samantha Morton and Imogen Stubbs. The script of Fallujah was published at the same time, and is still the fullest account of the atrocities committed during the 2004-05 sieges of Fallujah. The play has subsequently been performed in Prague, Berlin and Los Angeles, and it is now a set text on US university syllabi. Every word used in the play is verbatim, and taken from two years’ extensive research and interviews, made especially difficult because of the prevention of press reporting from the city. Every event depicted in the play is confirmed by at least two independent sources, and the information uncovered has subsequently been used in military training for conflict prevention scenarios, and to aid the defence in human rights trials. Events that complemented the play’s performances in London, including 22 screenings, talks and educational sessions, were supported by LCACE. Early drafts of the script received readings and workshops in 2006-07 at the ICA, at Central School of Speech and Drama, and at Embargo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fallujah.com">http://www.fallujah.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Wearable Futures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>SCAN; University of Wales, Newport – Smart Clothes and Wearable Technology Research Group; Cardiff Metropolitan University; Selvedge; The Textile Institute; International Weave Design Research; Arts Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Arts Council England; Arts Council Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>14-16 September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Wearable Futures was an interdisciplinary conference, which aimed to bring together practitioners, inventors, and theorists in the field of soft technology and wearables including those concerned with fashion, textiles, sportswear, interaction design, media and live arts, medical textiles, wellness, perception and psychology, intellectual property rights, polymer science, nanotechnology, military, and other relevant research strands. The conference was organised by the Smart Clothes and Wearable Technology Research Group, University of Wales, in association with SCAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/s:</td>
<td><a href="http://artschool.newport.ac.uk/smartclothes/wearablefutures_about.html#top">http://artschool.newport.ac.uk/smartclothes/wearablefutures_about.html#top</a> <a href="http://www.scansite.org">http://www.scansite.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 40. Higher Level Skills Partnership and First Post North West

| **Partners** | For a complete list of partners including Sector Skills Councils; Higher Level Skills Providers; Skills Academies; Regional Cluster Organisations and other partners see [http://www.nwua.ac.uk/pathfinder/partners.aspx](http://www.nwua.ac.uk/pathfinder/partners.aspx) |
| **Funders:** | HEFCE; North West Universities Association |
| **Timescale:** | 2006-09 |
| **Details:** | The North West Higher Level Skills Pathfinder was one of three pilot projects funded by HEFCE as part of its employer engagement activity. It was led by the North West Universities Association, as the representative body of the 15 North West HEIs, in partnership with the North West Development Agency, Government Office North West, and others including NorthWest Vision & Media. First Post North West was a scheme to help postproduction companies train their junior staff. It was designed by industry to train new employees of different postproduction companies in all they need to know to become useful members of their business. It was only for new employees in the industry and was sponsored by their business. The aim was the development of sector-specific flexible learning to support practitioners in the industry sub sectors. This involved a framework specification for accrediting experiential learning and support for leadership, management and entrepreneurial skills and knowledge. The training scheme was open to postproduction staff wanting to gain competencies in all the areas of working in postproduction. The scheme was planned to run over 16 weeks on a day-release basis. The scheme was delivered in partnership with Mancat (New Technology Institute), Futureworks and North West Vision and Media at a central location in Manchester City Centre. |

### 41. Institute for Creative Enterprise, Coventry University

| **Partners** | Coventry School of Art and Design; Centre for Media Arts and Performance; Arts+Media Training; Theatre Absolute; Talking Birds; Imagineer |
| **Funders:** | The Higgs Charity; Advantage West Midlands |
| **Timescale:** | 2008 onwards |
| **Details:** | Opened in April 2008, ICE forms part of a ground-breaking series of initiatives by Coventry University including the Serious Games Institute and the Health Design and Technology Institute. This group of institutes brings together business support, teaching and applied research centred on areas of academic expertise. Working closely with Coventry School of Art and Design, ICE focuses on the creative industries whilst developing links with the other institutes and the Design Hub. It provides:  
- Postgraduate courses in performance, media and digital art.  
- Applied research centre for performing arts, arts practice, media, communication and cultural studies.  
- Business support and desk space for new cultural and creative businesses.  
- Office space for cultural organisations.  
The Institute is a focus for business development support, placements for students, mentoring, information, debate, advice and more. ICE has teaching space, a performance studio, a screening room, and dedicated desks for new businesses. With a café and Wi-Fi throughout, this venture is destined to become the creative hub of the campus. The aim is to develop partnerships and collaborations between the new businesses, postgraduate students, working with academic staff, and the professional cultural organisations based in the institute. |
| **Source/s:** | [http://www.coventry.ac.uk/researchnet/d/299](http://www.coventry.ac.uk/researchnet/d/299) |
### Project: Manchester International Festival liaison

**Partners:** University of Manchester; Manchester Metropolitan University; University of Salford; Arts About Manchester; Théâtre du Châtelet, Paris; State Opera House, Berlin

**Funders:** Manchester City Council; Arts Council England; Millennium Commission; United Utilities; North West Regional Development Agency; Bruntwood

**Timescale:** 2005-07 commissioning period; 2007 onwards biennial event

**Details:** Following a series of three pre-festival commissions presented from late 2005, Manchester’s first biennial festival launched in June 2007, and focused on new music by established and new international musicians.

The University of Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University and the University of Salford have, with the support of the Northwest Regional Development Agency, funded a Higher Education Festival Liaison Manager, Dr Jennifer Cleary, to work as part of the festival team to identify and foster links with the three universities, from programming and staff and student engagement, to volunteering opportunities, placements and other opportunities.

The festival team worked closely with the city’s audience development agency Arts About Manchester to develop innovative ways to engage with local communities and to work in partnership with venues and cultural organisations to develop new audiences. The team is also working with the city’s tourist board Marketing Manchester to target regional, national and international visitors to the festival.

**Source/s:** [http://www.manchesterinternationalfestival.com](http://www.manchesterinternationalfestival.com)

### Project: Freeze

**Sponsors:** London Docklands Development Corporation; Olympia and York

**Timescale:** July 1988

**Details:** Art exhibition organised by Damien Hirst with other students from Goldsmiths University of London, including Angela Bulloch; Mat Collishaw; Ian Davenport; Anya Gallaccio; Gary Hume; Michael Landy; Sarah Lucas; Simon Patterson; and Fiona Rae.

Goldsmiths lecturer Michael Craig-Martin used his influence in the London art world to get Norman Rosenthal, Nicholas Serota and Charles Saatchi to visit the exhibition. Freeze is now seen as the seminal event for the group of artists later to be identified as the YBAs (Young British Artists).

In 2008 the Hospital Club Gallery hosted 20, a multifaceted exhibition of paintings, sculpture and mixed media work by the 16 artists who became the founders of the young British artist revolution 20 years ago.

**Source/s:** Causey A et al (2003) *Blast To Freeze: British Art In The 20Th Century.* Ostfildern, Hatje Cantz Verlag
Royal Academy (1997) *Sensation.* London, Royal Academy
Project: CAPITAL (Creativity And Performance in Teaching and Learning) Centre

**Partners:** University of Warwick; Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC)

**Funder:** HEFCE

**Timescale:** 2005 onwards

**Details:**

The CAPITAL (Creativity And Performance in Teaching and Learning) Centre is based on a partnership between the University of Warwick and the Royal Shakespeare Company. Its focus is performance in the theatrical sense – the development of acting and other stage skills, the engineering of production, theatre history, writing for performance, theatre as a research medium, and the rehearsal process. These are just facets of a much broader commitment by the centre to develop a much wider understanding of the nature and practice of performance.

This partnership was made possible by £4.5m funding from HEFCE's Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning initiative.

Proposed examples of the work of the CAPITAL Centre included:

- **A Warwick/RSC International Playwright in Residence programme**, based at the University of Warwick, working alongside the university's highly regarded Warwick Writing Programme – the largest and most comprehensive programme of its type in Europe. The Playwright in Residence would contribute to the RSC's annual New Works Festival and other new writing projects with the company.

- **New Warwick/RSC Professor of Creativity and Performance** – a unique rotating position to which different staff members would be appointed for periods of six to 12 months to devote themselves to projects exploring the use of performance in teaching and learning.

- **New studio space** on the university campus and an expansion of an on-site commitment in Stratford-upon-Avon to support the centre's work.

- **The RSC's Artists' Development Programme** is a core element of the RSC's vision for the company as a place where research and skills development are central to the process of staging plays. As part of the programme, a section of the rehearsal schedule for one of the RSC's acting companies would be set aside each year so that university teaching staff can provide master-classes and training on the background and context of the play.

- **Warwick research students** would also work with the RSC to add to the company's online educational materials, drawing on a mass of archival, analytical and performance materials from both institutions. The materials would be geared to teachers and students in schools and colleges, as well as to interested theatre goers.

- **Development of workshops** with the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth – building on the RSC's early work with that programme, held during the summer on the University of Warwick campus.

- **The Centre would also exploit sophisticated computing tools** developed by the University of Warwick to produce 3D virtual models of theatres and their performance spaces.

**Source/s:** [http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/newsandevents/pressreleases/NE1000000101323](http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/newsandevents/pressreleases/NE1000000101323)
### Project: The Barbican Campus

**Partners:** Guildhall School of Music & Drama; Barbican Arts Centre; London Symphony Orchestra (LSO)

**Funders:** The City of London Corporation; Heron International

**Timescale:** 2007-08 to 2012-13

**Details:**

The Guildhall School of Music & Drama, Barbican Arts Centre and the LSO are working together to provide the full range of education and training opportunities to participants of all ages. Using the three partners’ performance programme as a basis, they are rationalising and developing provision into six main strands: 3-18 education and outreach; emerging talent; professional training and education at higher education level; young artist development; CPD and knowledge transfer; and new audiences and lifelong learning.

Over the past two years the partners have made progress towards operating as a single organisation:

- They now have conjoined finance and HR departments and are in the process of merging all other back-office activities that are not specific to one partner only (such as registry and student services in the school).
- Planning use of space on a partnership basis – in 2009 the Barbican mounted a Cheek-by-Jowl production in the main theatre.
- Put in place a young artist development programme with the LSO, in which senior musicians present recitals on the Barbican Hall stage at 6 pm before an LSO concert later in the evening.
- The school, the centre and the LSO have made a number of joint applications to funding bodies. The catalyst for the Barbican Campus project is a new building for the Guildhall School, to be opened in 2012. The new facilities (including a 625-seat concert hall and two additional theatres) have been designed to complement and enhance the existing range of venues in the school, the centre and at LSO St Luke’s. Between them, they will have five concert rooms, five theatres, three cinemas, two art galleries, two libraries and a host of other supporting facilities.

The design process has led the partners to conclude that they should be planning, managing and marketing all of the performance and educational programmes in a much more holistic way. They are therefore working towards creating a common platform, so that when Milton Court opens in 2012, they will have created the organisational infrastructure needed to run and manage it within this broader context.

Funding for the new building is in place, and support is being sought from HEFCE and ACE to build various aspects of the common platform.

**Source/s:** Project plan still confidential until agreed by the City Corporation. Enquiries to: barry.ife@gsmd.ac.uk.
### 46. Young People’s engagement with online immersive worlds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>University of Westminster; BBC Future Media and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>AHRC; BBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Part of the AHRC and BBC pilot Knowledge Exchange Programme, this research project (costed at £75,000) has enabled academics from the University of Westminster to show that online worlds developed specifically for children can give them much-needed social and creative skills. This research has also had a real impact on the development of BBC strategy in this area. The Westminster team, working with the BBC, studied the development of the BBC’s new virtual world for children, ‘Adventure Rock’. They found that the children between seven and 11-years-old improved their computer literacy skills, learnt to create mental maps by exploring their new worlds, and rehearsed real-world responsibilities – such as looking after characters and objects in the game. Work showed that children wanted their virtual worlds to offer them the opportunity to interact with others, to be creative, to share media made by other children, and for those worlds to be a place away from adult rules. They also wanted online ‘homes’ – a hotel, house or town – and shops in which they could trade with other users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/s:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundedResearch/CaseStudies/Pages/onlineworlds.aspx">http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundedResearch/CaseStudies/Pages/onlineworlds.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 47. Stonehenge Riverside Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Stonehenge Riverside Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Department of Archaeology, University of Sheffield; School of Arts, Histories and Cultures, University of Manchester; Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Bristol; Department of Anthropology, University College London; School of Conservation Sciences, Bournemouth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Current funders include AHRC, National Geographic Society and English Heritage. Earlier phases received support from the British Academy, the Royal Archaeological Institute, English Heritage, the Prehistoric Society, the Society of Antiquaries and the McDonald Institute. Other contributors include Wessex Archaeology and the University of Cambridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2003 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Stonehenge Riverside Project is a major research project in the Stonehenge area, which has revealed that the monument was part of a larger ritual centre. The Stonehenge Riverside Project is a collaboration between archaeologists from several universities who have unearthed a huge settlement at Durrington Walls, near Stonehenge. To date excavations have revealed an enormous ancient settlement that once housed hundreds of people. Archaeologists believe the houses were constructed and occupied by the builders of nearby Stonehenge, the legendary monument on Salisbury Plain. Radiocarbon puts these settlements at 2600-2500 BC, contemporaneous with Stonehenge. The archaeologists conclude that people who lived in the Durrington Walls houses were responsible for constructing Stonehenge. The houses form the largest Neolithic or new stone age village ever found in Britain. The discoveries help confirm a theory that Stonehenge did not stand in isolation but was part of a much larger religious complex used for funerary ritual. Durrington Walls is the world’s largest known henge – an enclosure with a bank outside it and a ditch inside, usually thought to be ceremonial. It is some 450 metres across and encloses a series of concentric rings of huge timber posts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Operating Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td>Operating Theatre; Institute of Health and Society, The Medical School, University of Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funders:</strong></td>
<td>Institute of Health and Society; Arts Council North; PEALS; The Leverhulme Trust; Gateshead Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td>Operating Theatre exists to explore the natural drama of medical encounters so that empathy and understanding can be engendered between health practitioners, students and patients. Operating Theatre is a group of writers, healthcare professionals, actors and educators who use stories, drama and writing to assist learning on health matters. It particularly focuses on areas of learning where there may be complex emotional issues or communication hurdles both for patients and healthcare professionals. It produces theatre workshops on a range of themes for both student and professional groups and aims to produce theatre productions that can be used as educational tools. The project ‘White Lies’, a training event developed in collaboration with Durham University for second-year undergraduate medical students, based around a play about ‘near miss’ in a neonatal unit, was shortlisted for the THES Awards 2008 for Excellence and Innovation in the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source/s:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncl.ac.uk/operatingtheatre/">http://www.ncl.ac.uk/operatingtheatre/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Silver Sounds: reinterpreting the Queen's University Gallery Silver Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td>The Naughton Gallery at Queen's University Belfast; Sonic Arts Research Centre; Cara Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funder:</strong></td>
<td>NESTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details:</strong></td>
<td>Queen's University Belfast has almost 300 pieces of silver in its collection and, in common with many institutions and museums, this is a diverse collection including seemingly disparate objects of varying quality and use. It includes ceremonial items such as the mace and regalia, dinner suites and table items, medals and trophies and has been amassed almost exclusively through donation and bequest. The overriding common denominator in provenance is the emotion attached to each piece – memory, loss, affection, nostalgia, respect, triumph. Silver is difficult to display in any museum context – its preventative care and security restrictions dictate a very obvious physical barrier. Together with the apparent lack of relevance of silverware to the lives of many people today and the hard, static, reflective quality of the material, particularly when housed en masse, this can distance the visitor, who more often than not is overwhelmed by the opulence but cannot engage meaningfully with the individual items. The provision of meaningful interpretation for objects is also a headache for curators. These problems were exacerbated at Queen's by the unsuitable display cases used for the silver in the Visitors' Centre and, in 2005, all of the Queen's University Silver was removed to the silver vault and has been inaccessible to visitors. It had been clear for some time that the Queen's silver was in need of new display cases for its ongoing care and security and a means of interpretation that would unite the collection and make it as accessible as possible. From the outset it was always important that one of the creative partners in the redisplay project would be a practising silversmith; and the Gallery chose to create an interdisciplinary project, based around latest sound technology, to bring its silver collection to life. Working with the Sonic Arts Research Centre, a newly established centre of excellence, dedicated to the research of music technology, it has brought together 10 internationally recognised experts in the areas of musical composition, signal processing, internet technology and digital hardware to interpret the collection. Silver Sounds was shortlisted for the THES Awards 2008 for Excellence and Innovation in the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source/s:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://silver.fehlr.com/">http://silver.fehlr.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>The Fragmented Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>Faculties of Arts and Research and Innovation, University of Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>The Fragmented Orchestra is a huge distributed musical structure modelled on the firing of neurons within the brain's cortex. It is designed by its composers to perform a profound and unique score to thousands of listeners across the UK. This instrument, a model of a brain, is distributed across 24 diverse locations across the UK, ranging from football stadia, motorway crash barriers, school playgrounds and an offshore buoy with a ringing bell. A small 'neuron unit' is mechanically attached to the resonant surface of an existing physical structure. All of the neuron units are connected to each other, via the internet, to form a tiny 'cortex' and will 'fire' signals back and forth when stimulated by sound. The neuron units will act as a musical interface and gateway into The Fragmented Orchestra. When a neuron fires, fragments of sounds from its location are transmitted to the central venue (FACT, Liverpool) in which each neuron unit is represented by its own loudspeaker. Performers, including individuals and groups from each locality, can play each neuron unit and listeners can hear a unique array of rhythms, timbres and pulses created by the cortex at work. The music at the central venue is also shared with listeners at each of the remote locations through the use of Feonic™ technology, which turns any resonant surface into a high-quality loudspeaker. A website also enables people to tune into each of the neurons as well as the central location. The piece operated continuously over the period of three months. Jane Grant is predominately a visual artist working with film, sound, video and installation, Principal Investigator at the University of Plymouth of an AHRC-funded project, which merges the human voice and breath with neuronal firing patterns shown at ArtSway in 2008. John Matthias, a lecturer in Sonic Arts at University of Plymouth, is a musician and physicist. He has worked with many artists including Radiohead, Matthew Herbert and Coldcut and has performed extensively in Europe including at the Pompidou Centre, Paris. Nick Ryan is a composer, producer and sound designer. He won a BAFTA for his ground breaking interactive radio drama The Dark House, broadcast on BBC Radio 4, and has composed extensively for film and television. Fragmented Orchestra won the Performing Right Society (PRS) Foundation for New Music’s New Music Award 2008 and was shortlisted for the THES Awards 2008 for Excellence and Innovation in the Arts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source/s: | [http://www.arts council.org.uk/takeitaway/stories/news_f0.php](http://www.arts council.org.uk/takeitaway/stories/news_f0.php)  
[http://www.prsfoundation.co.uk/newmusicaward/fragmentedorchestra.htm](http://www.prsfoundation.co.uk/newmusicaward/fragmentedorchestra.htm)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Dare – A collaboration between Opera North and the University of Leeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Opera North; University of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>The University of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>Launched March 2007 – ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Launched in March 2007, Dare is a collaboration between the University of Leeds and Opera North. Based around a series of projects, this four-year formal partnership covers a range of activities including work-based learning; production and performance; talks; conferences and research. The opening of the refurbished Howard Assembly Rooms at Opera North in the centre of Leeds is one manifestation of Dare. Other projects that populate the collaboration are referred to as the ‘The OPERAting Theatre’, characterised as ‘a forum for debate, interaction and experimentation.’ The collaboration is currently home to two AHRC-funded collaborative PhDs and exploratory research includes work on noise exposure for orchestral musicians, and the potential use of algorithms in artistic programming. International research collaborations includes participation in a two-year EU cultural cooperation programme with Finland, Austria and Shanghai. Dare's public activities range from pre-show talks at Opera North to a series of talks and joint conferences associated with Opera North productions. The collaboration has developed a bespoke, work-based learning programme covering student placements, reciprocal staff learning and work with schools. Students and staff from the university are working with Opera North's press and PR departments on documenting elements of the collaboration on film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/s:</td>
<td>Dare website - <a href="http://www.dareyou.org.uk/">http://www.dareyou.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Own-it – London College of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Artquest; RCA; British Design Initiative; Channel 4/Ideas Factory; British Library; London Design Festival; Design Council (for full list see Links below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders:</td>
<td>London Development Agency; University of the Arts London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>2004-ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>Own-it (launched in 2004) is an intellectual property centre, combining a physical drop-in centre with a website, offering free or low-cost advice on intellectual property to small firms in the creative industries. Its aims are to combine both straightforward advice for individual beneficiaries and to educate the wider sector about intellectual property issues. Own-it offers a range of services, from basic to specialist support, through online and face-to-face seminars, workshops and, where appropriate, surgeries with intellectual property lawyers. They work with a network of IP advisers including lawyers and specialists at various trade associations associated with the creative industries in the UK. Most events and activities are free. Own-It is currently developing its services beyond London. It has similar projects on both the north west (partners include the North Edge group of Universities and Skillset North West) and the north east based at the University of Teesside. Own-it is also developing an IP Training for the Creative Industries Trainer with Cranfield University and London College of Communication Centre for Competitive Design. It plans to deliver IP courses for non-London businesses as part of UAL's Economic Challenge Innovation Fund Activities and has also secured funding through the ACE Ambition project to deliver IP and digital training for cultural organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/s:</td>
<td>List of Partners: <a href="http://www.own-it.org/aboutus/partners/">http://www.own-it.org/aboutus/partners/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project:
**CIBAS (Creative Industries Business Advice & Services), Portsmouth and South East Hampshire**

### Funders:
Arts Council England South East; South East Hampshire Area Investment Framework; University of Portsmouth; PUSH (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire)

### Timescale:
2006 onwards

### Details:
CIBAS supports artists and creative businesses to set-up and develop by providing one-to-one creative business advice, professional development training, events and opportunities through:
- Talking through ideas and plans for setting up a creative practice.
- Creating an action plan.
- Defining priorities.
- Identifying sources of information and financial support.
- Providing a creative or business mentor.

CIBAS deals with specific issues that arise from artistic and creative practice. Its creative business advisers provide training days, seminars and networking events based on the needs of the artists and small arts businesses that use the service.

It also provides a resource centre, research and development and a monthly round-up, *Creative News*. It runs up to 45 sessions, of up to two hours, each month. Services are available free to Portsmouth and south east Hampshire-based creatives.

CIBAS is staffed by three people: a part-time director; a full-time adviser, who undertakes most of the one-to-one sessions; and a part-time administrator. The director is responsible to the Head of Research and Knowledge Transfer Services, University of Portsmouth.

Based at the University of Portsmouth, CIBAS is part of the HEI's Purple Door information service which supports development, enterprise and innovation, and to enhance workforce skills. Its market includes businesses, the public and voluntary sector organisations and individual entrepreneurs in the south east and it contributes to the sub-region’s regeneration.

Its contribution to ACE SE lies in the complementary development of additional resources for the arts from non-arts partners – resources meaning funding, skills, research, policy, strategy, partnerships; non-arts partners meaning local government, regional development agency, cultural agencies, corporate sector.

### Source/s:
- [http://www.port.ac.uk/research/cibas](http://www.port.ac.uk/research/cibas)
### The Learning Impact Research Project

**Project:** The Learning Impact Research Project  
**Partners:** Research Centre for Museums and Galleries, University of Leicester; Museums, Libraries and Archives Council  
**Timescale:** 2001 onwards

#### Details:
Commissioned by MLA, the Research Centre for Museums and Galleries (RCMG), Department of Museum Studies, University of Leicester undertook the development of a national framework for learning in museums, libraries and archives. Given that people's learning expectations and outcomes can only be specified broadly, its main achievement was to identify a number of generic learning outcomes (GLOs) as the basis of a framework which would allow a quantitative form of measurement.

RCMG's work on what was known as the Learning Impact Research Project (2001-04) was initially undertaken in two phases:

**Phase 1** comprised the design of a framework for the scheme designed to find evidence of the outcomes and impact of learning in museums, archives and libraries. This identified the central concept of GLOs which pointed to increases in knowledge and understanding; increases in skills; changes in attitudes or values; evidence of enjoyment, inspiration and creativity; evidence of activity, behaviour and progression. It also included a study of definitions of, and approaches to the evaluation of, learning outcomes in formal education and open-learning environments.

**Phase 2** involved piloting the GLOs in 15 museums, archives and libraries to demonstrate their potential for measuring and capturing the learning experiences of users across the sector. That pilot subsequently formed the basis of a web-based toolkit. In the context of a framework, designed to raise organisations' awareness of the effectiveness of the environment for learning that they could provide and provide quantitative evidence of the impact of museums, libraries and archives on learning, nationally. It was launched as part of MLA's Inspiring Learning for All website in 2004.

Within two years of its launch, MLA reported that Inspiring Learning for All was being used as a planning tool and as an evaluation framework by around half of all museums. This was to have been expected, partly as a result of extensive consultation, workshops and ownership; partly as a result of their own, official encouragement. The website was relaunched in spring 2009.

---

#### Source/s:
- Full list of RCMG publications including those related to the Learning Impact Research Project: [http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/research/rcmgpublicationsandprojects.html](http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/research/rcmgpublicationsandprojects.html)
- Toolkit is available at [http://www.inspiringlearningforall.gov.uk/](http://www.inspiringlearningforall.gov.uk/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Northern Writers' Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>School of English Literature, Language and Linguistics, Newcastle University; Cultural Quarter Partnership; New Writing North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>The project started in 2002; the centre is now due to open in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td>The proposed Northern Writers' Centre represents a collaboration between the university and New Writing North. It brought together New Writing North's professional development expertise and Newcastle University's academic research and teaching in creative writing. It was intended to be a flagship venue for writers, young people and literature audiences - the first of its kind in the UK. The centre's potential related to the considerable growth in creative writing courses and literary festivals in general and, more specifically, to the literary strengths of the north east for which it would provide a visible and tangible presence. Opportunities were seen to have opened up as a result of AHRC's increasing receptivity to the support of creative writing, ACE's higher education strategy, and the publication of the Leitch Review of Skills. The main activities of the Northern Writers' Centre partners were to establish its profile in the university and beyond, identify an accessible building to be renovated, launch a fundraising programme and run a creative programme that anticipated the centre's activities. However, the project's timing was inauspicious. Its fundraising launch in September 2007 coincided with the collapse of Northern Rock and the beginning of the economic downturn. In February 2009 the partners met to review progress on the project. New Writing North considered that the project could not be progressed any further at the time and withdrew. The organisation has since moved off-campus to a new venue which will allow it to develop in a new context. For its part university has refocused its efforts on a new Centre for the Literary Arts. This shares many of the same aims as the Northern Writers' Centre, and it will be working with other partners to realise those. It is envisaged that this centre will eventually be housed in a new building. The partnership between the university and New Writing North is currently manifest in two projects, which were originally initiated as milestones in the realisation of the Northern Writers' Centre. 'Even Better Writers' is supported by the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, and is a two-year project dedicated to setting up a professional development programme for teachers and a creative writing programme for primary and secondary schools. The open-access North East Literary History project has enabled New Writing North to work in collaboration with a Knowledge Transfer post from the School of English and with the Digital Media Group at Newcastle University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source/s: [http://www.northernwriterscentre.com](http://www.northernwriterscentre.com)
Appendix 2: Topic guides

Topic guide for case study interviews

1. **Origination and expectations**
   1.1 Brief history of the 'story' of the partnership; how and why it was started, who championed/pioneered it, who the partners are, how partners met, chose each other, or were selected?
   1.2 The original intentions for the partnership/project, and what informed these?
   1.3 Whom was the project intended for?
   1.4 What were the intended outcomes of the project?
   1.5 What kind of involvement was it envisaged that the partners would have?
   1.6 What did they hope to gain from it?

2. **Process**
   2.1 What activities and projects have taken place?
   2.2 How has the partnership been managed and led – who are the key individuals involved, how are decisions taken, how are strategic goals set, who decides how to proceed, and who has final responsibility for the project? Why them?
   2.3 Can you describe the nature of the leadership of this project: unquestioned; cajoling; co-operative, etc?
   2.4 How was the project rolled out?
   2.5 Are there any changes of partners or other components of the project and, if so, why?
   2.6 What criteria guided the project, what were they and whose were they?

3. **Evaluation**
   3.1 Were the intended outcomes met? Were there any unintended outcomes?
   3.2 Has the project been formally evaluated, if so by whom, why them and how? What is their (ie, the interviewees') view of this evaluation?
   3.3 If it was envisaged that the project would be evaluated, how were its outcomes to be measured? At what stage was this built into the management of the project?
   3.4 If no formal evaluation was planned, how are its successes/outcomes assessed – who judges whether it has been effective?
   3.5 What contribution has the project made to the institutions involved, and to arts and culture more widely?
   3.6 How was the partners' experience of working on the project? What impact has the project had on them? What were the pluses and minuses?
   3.7 What seemed to work particularly well/badly in the partnership? What were the perceived problems and barriers, were they overcome and, if so, how?
   3.8 Did partners' attitudes towards the project shift? In what ways and why?
   3.9 What value does it have for the partners now?
   3.10 What impact is it perceived to have had on the target users?
   3.11 Has the project, or have particular aspects of it, been sustainable? In what respects?

4. **Lessons learned**
   4.1 If the project is complete: what brought it to a close eg always time-limited, funding issues etc? Have the partners become involved in any other projects since this one?
   4.2 If the project is incomplete: are there any lessons emerging from the experience of this partnership?

5. **General questions**
   5.1 What elements of public policy were driving the collaboration; were partners aware of this?
   5.2 What do they see as the main issues facing these sorts of collaborations?
   5.3 How/in what ways should policy promote these collaborations (if at all)?

Topic guide for follow-up case study interviews

1. Who is the formal leader in terms of the public face, name on a funding bid etc?
2. Is this formal leader the same person (people) who drive(s) the project forward on a day-to-day basis, who delegate(s) tasks, push(es) deadlines etc?
3. How is leadership designated (ie do specific individuals have responsibility and accountability for specific tasks, or is there a team of individuals who are accountable for the whole project – is this formalised or simply an unsaid agreement)?
4. How are decisions taken, and by whom (and if there is initial disagreement between the HEI and arts/cultural sector organisation, or between individuals – how is agreement and compromise achieved)?
5. How does the collaboration work, what doesn’t work, where have problems been found in working between the HEI and the arts/cultural organisation?
6. Can you distinguish between the
   - leadership of the project itself (perhaps more about the public face of the project, the funding bid etc – political leadership)
   - leadership within the project and how it is run, how decisions are taken, how things actually work (which may be more informal, task-focused) and the formal relationship between the two organisations (ie the collaborative aspect)?
7. How/when did any transitions from collegial or informal leadership to other, more formal, types occur, why and are there any implications of this (either positive or negative)?
Appendix 3: Sources of information about collaborative projects between higher education institutions and the arts and cultural sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Council England, Higher Education Digests (undated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for Higher Education in Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Leadership Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Education and Skills – AimHigher Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Physical Sciences Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Regional Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Social Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Film Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Academy, Art Design Media Subject Centre (Faculty of Arts and Architecture, University of Brighton) and Subject Centre for Dance, Drama and Music (Lancaster Institute for the Contemporary Arts, Lancaster University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Innovation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Centre for Arts and Cultural Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums, Libraries and Archives Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museums: Tate; British Museum; National Portrait Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society for Education in Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Research Investment Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Associations: Association of Universities in the East of England; East Midlands Universities Association; London Higher; Universities for the North East; North West Universities Association; Higher Education South East; Higher Education Regional Development Association (South West); West Midlands Higher Education Association; Yorkshire Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Higher Education Awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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