

# **DEVELOPING DIGITAL PRIORITIES: VISUAL ARTS ORGANISATIONS AND HIGHER EDUCATION COLLABORATION**

Prepared by

**Michael McKinnie  
Louisa Pearson**

Department of Drama  
Queen Mary, University of London

On behalf of

**London Centre for Arts and Cultural Exchange  
as part of the  
Digital Knowledge Research, Workshop and Support Programme  
Funded by Arts Council England, London**

August 2009



**LCACE**  
London Centre for Arts and Cultural Exchange



**Queen Mary**  
University of London

The authors would like to thank Gini Simpson of Queen Mary Innovation and Evelyn Wilson of LCACE for their assistance in preparing this report. They would also like to express their gratitude to the organisations and individuals who provided their views and additional information.

This views in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of LCACE or Arts Council England, London.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.1 Key Research Questions.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.2 Methods .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.3 Brief Overview.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. CURRENT CONTEXTS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1 Public Policy.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.2 Arts Bodies.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3 Higher Education .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.4 Research.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.5 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.6 Recommendations.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3. REGULARLY FUNDED ORGANISATIONS: ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE PROSPECTS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3.1 Prior Experience of Collaboration With HEIs .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.2 Perceived Benefits of Collaboration With HEIs.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.3 Perceived Benefits Over and Above ACE Digital Priorities..</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.4 Views About Appropriate Collaborative Partners .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.5 Concerns About Collaboration With HEIs .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.6 Resources To Facilitate Collaboration.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.7 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.8 Recommendations.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4. LCACE HIGHER EDUCATION PARTNERS: ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE PROSPECTS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.1 Prior Experience of Collaboration With RFOs.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.2 What Are the Strengths of HEIs in Relation to ACE Digital Priorities?.....</b>	<b>25</b>

4.3	Support Structures Provided by HEIs .....	29
4.4	Challenges to HEIs Undertaking Collaboration.....	29
4.5	Conclusion .....	30
4.6	Recommendations .....	32
5.	FUNDING SCHEMES AND CASE STUDIES.....	33
5.1	Funding and Illustrative Case Studies .....	33
5.2	Other HEI Collaborations .....	41
5.3	Conclusion .....	42
5.4	Recommendations .....	44
6.	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	45
	NOTES.....	47
	APPENDIX A: RFOs CONSULTED .....	48
	APPENDIX B: RFO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	49
	APPENDIX C: LCACE PARTNERS CONSULTED.....	50
	APPENDIX D: LCACE PARTNER QUESTIONNAIRE.....	51
	WORKS CITED.....	52
	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	54

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This project responds to recent developments in arts activity, public policy, higher education and academic research. The Arts Council England, London intends to make strategic investments to support digital capacity in the visual arts over the next three years. London-based visual arts RFOs, particularly smaller organisations, are seeking to engage with ACE London's emerging digital priorities. At the same time, HEI are attempting to formulate new types of collaboration with creative industries and exercise influence on public policy. This is a small-scale project that attempts, in the first instance, to clarify the current policy, practice and research context in which collaborations between RFOs and HEIs are taking place, or might take place in the near future. It also maps a range of existing and potential collaborations between HEIs, RFOs and the wider creative industries. Finally, it considers prior experiences of visual arts RFOs when collaborating with HEI (and vice versa) and reflects upon some of the challenges posed for future collaborations, especially related to ACE London's digital priorities.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This research project investigates the scope for further collaboration between Arts Council England (ACE) visual arts Regularly Funded Organisations (RFOs) and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) within the context of ACE London's emerging digital priorities. During the next three years ACE London expects to make strategic investments in the following priority areas:

- Business and audience development using IT and digital resources
- Archiving and collection of electronic media art
- Emergent digital artistic practice
- Curating and producing
- Broadcast and broadband environment

This report is a small-scale project that attempts, in the first instance, to clarify the wider policy, practice and research context in which collaborations between RFOs and HEIs are currently taking place, or might take place in the near future. The project also maps a range of existing and potential collaborations between HEIs, RFOs and the wider creative industries. Furthermore, it considers prior experiences of collaboration between visual arts RFOs and HEIs and reflects upon some of the challenges posed for future collaborations in light of ACE London's digital priorities.

### 1.1 Key Research Questions

This project investigates two main questions:

- How might visual arts RFOs build their digital capacity and infrastructure through strategic collaboration with HEIs?
- What examples of collaboration exist, and how might these stimulate further reflection and discussion?

### 1.2 Methods

This study adopts a mixed methods approach. It has involved:

- One-to-one interviews with selected case studies. This study incorporates data generated through interviews, designed and conducted by the authors, with representatives from a group of visual arts RFOs. A list of the RFOs consulted can be found in Appendix A and the interview questionnaire can be found in Appendix B. The RFOs interviewed were identified by LCACE as having a digital remit and either have experience of collaboration with HEI or might consider such collaboration in the future. As previously indicated, these RFOs are mostly—but not exclusively—small-scale organisations for which

collaboration might enable access to expertise and resources not consistently available within them. These interviews were conducted in June 2009.

- **Written survey.** This report incorporates data gathered through a written survey of HEI activities conducted by LCACE. Please see Appendix C for a list of HEIs consulted and Appendix D for the survey questionnaire. This survey did not attempt to provide an exhaustive account of all RFO-HEI collaboration, but, instead, attempted to identify some activities based within HEIs that might prompt further reflection about the possibilities for, and challenges posed by, collaboration. This survey was conducted in June and July 2009.
- **Mapping.** This report maps some relevant current practices that might inform discussions related to collaboration between visual arts RFOs and HEIs within the context of ACE London's emerging digital priorities.
- **Literature survey.** This project has involved a survey of existing research literature on Knowledge Transfer (KT), arising primarily in scholarly journals from the social sciences.<sup>1</sup>

### **1.3 Brief Overview**

This report responds to recent developments in public policy, research, the arts and higher education (a more extensive discussion of these contexts, along with indicative examples, is offered in sections 2-5). ACE London intends to make strategic investments to support digital capacity in the visual arts over the next three years. London-based visual arts RFOs, particularly smaller organisations, are also engaging with ACE London's emerging digital priorities (including its Art of Digital London initiative). As section 2 indicates, these activities are taking place within a larger public policy context that increasingly emphasises the roles of the creative industries, digital technology and KT within the UK economy. This section also discusses current research on KT and collaboration between HE and industrial partners, an area of study that has grown dramatically in recent years.

Section 3 details current collaborative activities being undertaken by London-based visual arts RFOs with a digital arts interest and points to prospects for future initiatives. Most of these RFOs are smaller-scale organisations for which collaboration with HEIs might permit access to expertise and resources that would not be available within the RFOs themselves. This section documents these RFOs' prior experiences of collaboration with HEIs and the perceived benefits of such collaboration. It also reflects upon some of the concerns and challenges that RFO-HEI collaboration prompts from the perspective of RFOs.

As section 4 outlines, there is a wide variety of collaborations between LCACE HE and non-HE partners. There are also key areas in which collaboration has taken place, or might take place in the future. Like the previous section, this portion of the report also reflects upon concerns and

challenges posed by collaboration, but from the perspective of HEIs. Section 5, in turn, identifies various schemes through which collaborative research is being funded, and documents a number of case studies that illustrate the types of collaborations that are possible.

Section 6 concludes the report and offers a summary of the recommendations of each previous section. These recommendations are directed at RFOs and HEIs, at the wider policy context in which their activities occur and at research concerned with KT.

## 2. CURRENT CONTEXTS

This section offers a discussion of the various policy, practice and research contexts that inform potential RFO/HEI collaboration in light of ACE London's digital priorities.

### 2.1 Public Policy

In the past decade there has been a growing emphasis in public policy on the creative industries and on KT and related forms of engagement between HE and non-HE partners. In a broad sense, public policy-making, driven by HM Treasury but elaborated across a range of government departments, has become increasingly preoccupied with promoting the UK's "knowledge economy." As part of this concern, policy-makers have become particularly interested in the arts and creative industries, for a number of related reasons. First, the arts and creative industries are—rightly or wrongly—seen as models of the innovative, flexible and knowledge-intensive enterprise that government wishes to promote in the wider economy. Second, the creative industries have grown significantly as a sector of the UK economy over the past two decades (though this growth has been somewhat amplified by the fact that the definition of the sector has been progressively expanded during this time).<sup>2</sup> Third, the creative industries have been linked with the Labour government's urban regeneration agenda (both in terms of its desire to encourage community cohesion through participation in arts events and through the role that the arts might play in tourism and other forms of service-sector economic development). Fourth, the creative industries often create objects that circulate internationally or help draw visitors to the UK; as such, they are tied up with national prestige and promotion. This interest in the creative industries is reflected in multi-departmental strategies such as *Creative Britain* (DCMS 2008), successive DCMS mapping documents and, in London, strategies such as the Mayor of London's *Cultural Metropolis* (Mayor of London 2009) and programmes such as the Cultural Olympiad component of the 2012 London Olympics.

Public policy also reflects a growing interest in what might be called the "digital agenda." This interest extends across government departments. Recently, DCMS and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills published the substantial *Digital Britain* report (DCMS 2009). *Digital Britain* is primarily concerned with communications infrastructure such as broadband and broadcasting, but it also notes the extent to which "creative content industries" contribute disproportionately to the UK's digital output (DCMS 2009, 16). Its recommendations include major investments by the public and private sectors and include skills and training aspirations that would necessitate collaboration between creative industries and HE. *Fostering Creative Ambition in the UK Digital Economy*, in turn, offers a more targeted analysis of the challenges facing cultural producers creating digital content and engaging digital technologies (Analysys [sic] Mason 2009). The report argues that cultural producers face distinct challenges, such as difficulties in finding ways to monetise—and therefore create new income streams from—

the content that they are creating. This being said, however, the focus of *Fostering Creative Ambition* is largely for-profit, commercial cultural producers—the report is not primarily interested in not-for-profit and/or arts organisations.

Finally, government has become very keen to encourage HE research that may be transferred to industry and benefit the UK economically. This has led to a number of high-level reviews and strategies related to KT and collaboration between HE and industry partners. The *Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration*, commissioned by HM Treasury, defines collaborative research as occurring when

business and university researchers work together on a shared problem. Collaborative research tends to be more fundamental or pre-competitive in nature than contract research. Industry scientists and engineers will work alongside academic scientists and engineers on the research project. The research is co-funded by business and the university or a public sector body such as one of the Research Councils. (2003, 33)

The Lambert Review argues that “collaborative research is one of the most effective forms of knowledge transfer. By working together on shared problems, the business and university develop mutual trust and share information. They are therefore more likely to make the real breakthroughs” (2003, 38). This rather rosy view of collaboration is tempered, though, by the admission that “[t]he difficulty lies in raising awareness in businesses of the expertise that exists in the UK’s universities” (2003, 33). Furthermore, the rest of this report shows that a lack of awareness is only one challenge that potential collaboration must address, and it may not be the greatest.

Within educational policy, the *Future of Higher Education* White Paper echoes Lambert’s emphasis on collaboration between HE and industry partners (2003). The White Paper resulted in increased funding to the Higher Education Innovation Fund, which is administered by Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and supports knowledge exchange that is intended to benefit the wider UK economy. Significantly for the purposes of this report the White Paper (unlike Lambert) draws attention to forms of collaboration that do not conform to the dominant science and engineering model—a number of its highlighted case studies are what might be termed “creative partnerships” between universities and third sector organisations. Despite their different emphases, however, the Lambert Review and the *Future of Higher Education* White Paper signal a growing investment of strategic and financial resources in collaboration. These investments have also been extended through publicly funded arts and HE bodies (as sections 2.2 and 2.3 discuss).

## **2.2 Arts Bodies**

In its most recent four-year plan, ACE identified “digital opportunity” as one of its four key development priorities for 2008-11 (ACE 2008).<sup>3</sup> This has led to

the creation of its Digital Opportunities Research Programme, which is intended to accomplish three main aims: to understand the ways that digital technology is changing the context in which artists, arts organisations and ACE operate; to provide a sense of the opportunities and challenges that this changing context creates for artists, arts organisations and the public; and to identify where ACE could intervene in order to create most public value. These aims, in turn, are addressed through an investigation of three core issues: the impact of digital technology on how the public perceive, understand and engage with the arts; how digital technology is transforming art and artistic practice; and the implications for content creation, distribution and ownership of digital technology. One of the imperatives behind this research programme is the fact that, as ACE's review of existing evidence of digital participation in the UK suggests, "[t]here is currently fairly limited information about how people use digital information to engage with the arts" (Keaney 2009, 21). Phase one of the research programme, which has recently been completed, involved the commissioning of two research reports: *Digital Content Snapshot* (MTM London 2009), which maps the online presences of ACE RFOs, and *Consuming Digital Arts* (Synovate 2009), which documents public engagement with digital arts. Phase two of the research programme is currently under development.<sup>4</sup>

ACE London's emerging digital priorities relate to several key areas: business and audience development using IT and digital resources; archiving and collection of electronic media art; emergent digital artistic practice; curating and producing; broadcast and broadband environment. ACE London has also recently launched the Art of Digital London initiative. The first two symposia related to this programme—"Organisations 2.0: The RFO in the Digital Age" and "Do the Arts Speak Digital"—were held in London in July 2009.

A more detailed account of how London-based visual arts RFOs are engaging with ACE and ACE London's digital priorities is offered in section 3.

### **2.3 Higher Education**

There has been a growing requirement to measure and articulate the social, economic and cultural impact of HE research. KT has frequently been seen as one way to achieve this impact. As a result, an increasing number of initiatives—at all levels of the university sector—are attempting to stimulate collaboration between HEIs and organisations outside HE. A more detailed account of funding programmes and sample case studies is offered in section 4, but a brief overview of recent moves to encourage KT and other forms of collaborative research in HE can be given here. Funding for universities and higher education colleges in England is governed by HEFCE. HEFCE has made "enhancing the contribution of HE to the economy and society" one of its five core aims in its *Strategic Plan 2006-2011*, and identifies KT as a key way to achieve this (HEFCE 2009). It also operates the Research Excellence Framework (formerly the Research Assessment Exercise), which distributes research funding to HEIs on a competitive basis over a multi-year period. The economic and social impact of research will be a key evaluative criterion in

the upcoming REF (planned for 2013) and one possible way for HEIs to demonstrate this impact will be through KT.

The other major funding sources for HE research are the seven UK research councils. While science and technology-based research councils have a longer history of funding collaborative research, the council whose remit most directly addresses digital arts—the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)—has recently begun to address the “impact agenda” and prioritised KT within its own strategy. The AHRC has adopted its own Impact and Knowledge Transfer Strategies and facilitates HE-partner collaboration through a number of funding programmes as well as shared initiatives with other research councils (such as the Economic and Social Research Council [ESRC]). HEIs themselves are also attempting to formulate new types of collaboration with creative industries and exercise influence on public policy. The work of consortia such as LCACE and universities’ own (variously named) research and enterprise offices supplements and influences these developments.

A more detailed account of how HEIs are engaging with impact and KT agendas is offered in section 4.

## 2.4 Research

There has been a marked increase in research on KT and other forms of HE-partner collaboration in recent years. One 2007 study identified 173 academic articles on collaborative research (or what the authors of the study term “university entrepreneurship”) published worldwide in English-language scholarly journals between 1981 and 2005 (Rothaermel et al. 2007, 692). The majority of these articles were published from 2000 on, and this scholarly interest in collaborative research has only continued since 2005. This study observes that research into collaboration since the late 1990s has tended to be concerned with four main areas: the “entrepreneurial research university”; the “productivity of technology transfer offices” within universities; the new firms created through collaboration; and the “environmental context including networks of innovation” for KT and related activities (Rothaermel et al. 2007, 692-693).

The particular findings of research into KT, however, have been diverse. In the first place, there is no consensus that the recent—and internationally widespread—emphasis on KT actually involves a significant change in the types of activities that universities and partners outside HE undertake. As Geuna and Muscio (2009) note, in the most recent survey of academic literature on KT, “Universities have always been involved in KT (or third stream) activities; they are not something new, ‘somehow’ discovered in recent years” (94). What is new, they claim, “is the *institutionalization* of university-industry linkages through the direct involvement of the university” (94). Geuna and Muscio argue (persuasively, in our view) that the recent emphasis on KT does not represent a revolution in the kind of activities that HE and industry undertake, as some research has suggested, but rather a

step-change in how long-standing activities are institutionally organised as they become more complex and greater in scale:

It would be incorrect to talk of an academic revolution because a real ‘second academic revolution’ (the first being the introduction of research together with teaching in the nineteenth century—see the Humboldtian transformation) would imply that everyone employed in a university is involved in both research and teaching, and third stream activities, which is far from the reality in most universities around the world....The change is in the type of activities undertaken by academic staff (in response to new demands) and their relative importance, and, therefore, the need to support, manage and organize them in a more efficient way. In other words, the scale and complexity of the universities’ activities has increased, moving from what we could define as “craft” production to something more akin to “industrial” production, although it is in only a limited number of institutions that we can see the hallmarks of industrial production. (94)

While it is hard to generalise about the findings of research into KT (the forms it takes and the conditions under which occurs vary enormously) Geuna and Muscio observe that a several key findings emerge from the literature: the importance of previous experience with KT among university administrative staff; the need for KT or research offices to be of a size that allows them to be effective in carrying out the diverse tasks that KT involves (which means appointing “highly qualified and inevitably expensive staff”); the importance of early involvement of academic staff in the project development process; and “the importance of individual researcher characteristics (their social capital) in explaining frequency and success in university-industry relationships” (109-110). Other notable findings in the literature on KT are that “university researchers—on average—attribute higher importance to all knowledge transfer channels than industrial researchers do” (Bekkers and Bodas Freitas 2008, 1848) and that KT is only the latest, “but arguably the most far-reaching,” instance of the tension between the university’s role in “promoting public goods and facilitating private accumulation” (Welsh et al. 2008, 1863). The extent to which research can contribute to the wider public interest may often hinge on the extent to which it is conducted independently of industrial interests, rather than in collaboration with industry (Welsh et al. 2008, 1863).

Within the context of this report, however, it is clear that the existing literature on KT and collaborative research fails to address a number of germane issues. The first is that, with a minority of exceptions, the scholarly stance toward KT is often “cheerleading” and technocratic; that is, the literature tends to assume that KT is a “good thing” (or at least an inevitable thing) and that problems arising from it are largely technical rather than structural in nature (and can, therefore, be “solved” through more efficient management and governance processes). There is little reflection on the extent to which challenges arising from collaborative research may be structural and, for logical reasons, it may not always be possible (or desirable) to reconcile the interests of university and industry partners. There is also little consideration of how KT relates to older, “public service” models of university contribution to

society, and whether or not the category excludes collaborations that may be of public benefit but whose primary aim or outcome is not income generation. Furthermore, even the most cursory review of existing literature on KT reveals that its focus is almost solely on the science and engineering sectors of both university and industry. This is not entirely surprising—university-industry partnerships have historically been much more common in these areas, and public policy tends to highlight them—but we are unaware of any substantial research undertaken on KT and collaborative research in the arts.

Another key, and perhaps related, feature of the literature on KT is that it almost exclusively assumes that the non-HE partner is a for-profit company and that the purpose of any collaboration is revenue maximisation through the commercialisation of products over which private ownership can be claimed (through patents, etc.). This is a particularly problematic assumption within the context of potential collaboration between universities and RFOs: for example, RFOs are generally not-for-profit organisations and, as such, are subject to scrutiny about the types and amount of third stream income they are permitted to generate while still receiving public subsidy from bodies like ACE; the imperative to undertake arts activities is often not an economic one, and it may be difficult (or, in some instances, undesirable) to attempt to commercialise them; and the ultimate benefit of collaboration may not lie in the creation of a product that can be monetised in and of itself but, instead, be realised elsewhere, in ways that are often unanticipated (such as mutual increases in status, the leveraging of collaboration into successful funding applications for other work, and building networks that might generate new ways of thinking and working, for example).

## **2.5 Conclusion**

There is little doubt that KT and related forms of collaboration have received growing interest in public policy, arts, higher education and research spheres in recent years. This collaboration has sometimes been linked to a desire to enhance the contribution of digital technology to the UK economy. At the same time, however, the challenges posed by collaboration are only beginning to be addressed. In the arts, particularly, the range and number of collaborations already underway exceed existing models of KT and do not necessarily conform to dominant ways of measuring the potential benefits of collaboration.

## **2.6 Recommendations**

- There is a need for more research on the role of KT involving arts organisations and universities. Collaborative activities related to the arts and digital technologies are currently outpacing our capacity to grasp and reflect upon them.
- There is a need for more research on KT between universities and not-for-profit organisations. We cannot assume that the purpose of collaboration is commercialisation or that the key benefit of collaboration is revenue generation. A more flexible and complex

analysis is required, in particular one that takes into account the distinct conditions under which not-for-profit organisations operate and the multiple ways in which benefit may be measured and articulated.

- Government must take into account the full implications that its decisions have on the ability of arts organisations and arts departments in universities to undertake collaboration. While HM Treasury, HEFCE and the AHRC emphasise the contribution of the creative industries to the UK, the government's decision to ring-fence funding for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Medicine) subjects in the RAE2008 funding settlement had the knock-on effect of squeezing research funding in arts departments (and this effect was felt particularly acutely in arts departments most committed to KT with industry partners).

### **3. REGULARLY FUNDED ORGANISATIONS: ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE PROSPECTS**

The aim of this section is to understand the preconceptions, aspirations and anxieties of RFOs regarding collaboration with HEIs, and to identify ways in which collaboration between RFOs and HEIs might usefully be facilitated. It also discusses some of the drawbacks and challenges of collaboration from the perspective of visual arts RFOs. More specifically, this section aims to:

- Establish a sense of RFOs' prior experiences of collaboration
- Identify ways in which RFOs believe collaboration with HEIs might help them to achieve ACE digital priorities
- Assess the extent to which RFOs are aware of appropriate collaborative partners
- Identify the perceived challenges of collaboration
- Identify the needs of RFOs in terms of resources and support structures for collaboration

Senior-level representatives from six London-based arts organisations were interviewed:

- Marc Boothe, Managing Director of B3, a media arts agency that provides development, production and distributive support and networking opportunities for emerging digital artists, film makers, visual artists and sound artists.
- Ruth Catlow, Co-director of Furtherfield, an online platform for viewing, creating and discussing socially engaged, technology-based art practices. Furtherfield provides infrastructure for commissions, events, exhibitions, networking and participatory projects, publishing, research, residencies and workshops.
- Ben Cook, Director of Lux, an agency for the development and promotion of artists' moving image work, providing networking opportunities for artists, developing new audiences, and contributing to the discourse around moving image practice.
- Maggie Ellis, Head of Production at Film London, an agency for the development and promotion of film and media in London.
- Brendan Fan, Head of Distribution at Art Monthly, a magazine providing news, features and reviews about contemporary visual art.

- Iain Pate, Programme Manager at Forma, a production agency for contemporary, cross-art form work by British and international artists.

### 3.1 Prior Experience of Collaboration With HEIs

All of the organisations consulted have engaged with HEIs in some way, including teaching and lecturing, co-organising symposia in partnership with academic organisations, offering internships to students and providing information and access to PhD students and academics writing about their work.

Four out of six organisations had not considered collaborating formally with HEIs prior to interview. Of the two organisations that have previously undertaken collaboration, one organisation has initiated a number of “stop-start” collaborative relationships that have not successfully developed past initial stages. Another organisation has been considering undertaking collaboration for some time, but has not known how or with whom to initiate a conversation about the possibility. Investing the time and financial resources required in order to apply for these projects was felt by this organisation to be risky without knowing how long the process is going to take or the chances of successfully obtaining funding.

In general, respondents felt that, since the organisations they worked for already valued and engaged in and supported reflection and research, collaboration with HEIs seemed a natural move. As one respondent stated, “we are very much a research orientated organisation, in the sense that a lot of this kind of work we do already. It’s not a great leap to kind of re-purpose it as research.”

### 3.2 Perceived Benefits of Collaboration With HEIs

Most respondents were intrigued about collaboration with HEIs and were generally optimistic about the potential benefits it might offer, though there were some reservations (see below). A number of suggestions were made about ways in which collaboration with HEIs might help RFOs to fulfill three of ACE’s digital priorities:

- *Archiving and Collection of Electronic Media Art*  
Two respondents expressed an interest in developing archives and displaying collections online, although there is some confusion about what the term “electronic media art” means and a concern that this does not adequately encompass the material these organisations wish to archive and display (such as moving image work and publications). It was suggested that HEIs might usefully provide technical expertise on how to digitize this material, since there is a shortage of skills in this area in the commercial sector. These organisations also expressed an interest in collaborating with HEIs in order to provide critical interpretations of archived materials and online collections.

- *Curating and Producing*  
One organisation was interested in developing a digital programme that can travel with touring exhibitions of digital work and help curators and audiences understand issues around presenting digital practice.
- *Business and Audience Development Using IT and Digital Resources*  
A number of organisations stated an interest in collaborating with HEIs as a means of developing the commercial side of their business, with a view to reducing reliance on public sector funding. Respondents suggested that this might include research investigating the precedence for, and potential of, digital media and moving image work in the arts market, researching opportunities for franchising businesses internationally or examining the impact of digital culture on the environment, in order to inform future programming choices.

### **3.3 Perceived Benefits Over and Above ACE Digital Priorities**

- *Space for Critical Reflection*  
There is a broadly shared interest in the possibility that collaboration with HEIs might provide an opportunity for critical reflection on the practices of organisations. One respondent suggested that an online archive might provide an opportunity for the development of a “creative history” of the organisation. As another respondent put it:

Some of the practices we’ve developed very organically, working very much on an intuitive level and really looking at the practicalities of those ideas and problem solving. We’ve tended to avoid analysing too much the academic side of what we do simply because we haven’t had time but we recognise that the more you do this stuff—some of the projects have been particularly ground-breaking—there are areas of learning that could be very useful.

A number of organisations suggested that such research might be valuable both to themselves and to the wider cultural and academic community. One respondent commented that it is a central objective of their organisation to contribute to discourse in their area of practice, and they see collaboration with HEIs as a necessary means of disseminating their ideas both amongst the wider arts community and academia.

- *Access to Networks and New Technology*  
Collaboration with HEIs is also valued as a means of accessing new research and advances in technology, establishing a more discursive, dialogic relationship with those working in HEIs that can continue outside the formal collaboration.

### 3.4 Views About Appropriate Collaborative Partners

Whilst some respondents suggested HEIs that might be suitable partners with which to undertake collaborative research, no organisation had strong views about potential partners or the kinds of institutions or disciplines partners should be situated in. Respondents expressed openness to cross-disciplinary partnerships, although it was noted that it was especially difficult to locate and forge conversations with those working beyond the arts and humanities. Respondents noted that searching out and forging these relationships independently is highly time-consuming and this is a major barrier to the ability of cultural organisations to undertake collaboration.

### 3.5 Concerns About Collaboration With HEIs

Whilst most respondents felt positive about the potential benefits of collaboration with HEIs, all voiced significant concerns about perceived barriers to, and difficulties of, collaboration:

- *Funding*

All respondents suggested that limitations on funding might be a barrier to undertaking collaboration. It was noted that the time of staff working in small, subsidised arts organisations is invariably limited and over-stretched. Allocating time to applying for funding for collaborative projects that may not eventually be secured is seen as risky. Respondents also expressed concern about their ability to cover expenses such as the staff time required to oversee research students and sustain collaborative relationships. Whilst no one discounted the possibility of contributing financially to a collaborative relationship, respondents stressed that adequate funding for time and resources would need to be provided in order for them to feel confident about entering into collaborative research relationships.

All respondents were concerned that the balance of funding and resources between partners might not be equal. One respondent felt that KT is often seen as a service relationship with knowledge or resources being passed predominantly in one direction from the academic to the non-academic organisation, with the non-academic organisation expected to pay for this service. This respondent argued that there can be rewards on both sides and this needs to be recognised in the funding of collaborative projects. If HEIs can draw down funding, it was argued, non-academic organisations should also be able to do so.

As one respondent highlighted, it is difficult for organisations to commit to funding projects that are, for example, four years long, when funding relationships with primary funding partners such as ACE are shorter term, increasing the financial risk for organisations undertaking collaborative projects.

- *Control*  
All respondents expressed concern that they would not have adequate control over the outcomes of research. All expressed a desire for specific objectives for the project to be set out clearly at the beginning of the project. At the same time, a number of organisations recognised that more open-ended research could be valuable. There is a tension between the value many of the organisations place on open-ended research and what they feel they can justify paying for.

All respondents expressed concern about the issue of intellectual property. There is a desire for strong communication and guidelines regarding what information can and cannot be used for, and the way in which non-academic organisations are credited.

One respondent expressed a concern that their organisation's reputation for independence might be diminished by a partnership with HEI.

- *Bureaucracy of HEIs*  
As one respondent noted, past experience had made their organisation wary of engaging in what they perceived to be the rather inflexible and impenetrable bureaucratic systems of HEIs. This respondent noted that in future it would be important to “go in at the right level,” partnering with individuals in HEIs who could act relatively autonomously and, as much as possible, cut through departmental and institutional bureaucracy.
- *Academia Versus Industry*  
All respondents had reservations about the technical expertise that universities could provide. Whilst the potential to save money by utilising the skills and facilities of HEI is appealing, there is a concern that HEIs may not be as well equipped to provide technical support as industry, and it may be more economical to rely on industry for this.

Whilst five out of six organisations felt that HEIs *could* provide valuable support in terms of business development and reflection on learning from past projects, one respondent suggested that it would be preferable to pay freelance consultants to undertake this work. This respondent was concerned that academic collaborators are not adequately “embedded” in industry to understand or assess the work of organisations in a wider context, or to advise organisations on their practices.

- *Concern About Investing Resources in Fulfilling ACE Digital Priorities*  
Two respondents expressed skepticism about ACE's commitment to its digital priorities and therefore the extent to which organisations should invest time and resources developing them. As one respondent argued:

It's very problematic at the moment because it's not something [ACE] can really take account of in terms of assessment....In the past we have used a lot of resources in terms of time to produce something that people think is really great, but then finding that Arts Council aren't really able to take account of it in a way that balances out their assessment of you, and so in a way it becomes invisible....Each year organisations have to do an annual submission, and...they used to have things like 'hits on the website'...but then they took that out....It's never gone back in again, and I think that's really significant....The Arts Council sees this as sort of secondary activity, in the area of marketing, perhaps. It's a bit of a hard time to know how worthwhile it is putting too many resources into this area. You have to be careful not to get too much ahead of the curve.

### **3.6 Resources To Facilitate Collaboration**

Respondents expressed a desire for more evidence of successful partnerships and beneficial outcomes leading from collaboration. It was suggested that "showcasing" events might be a valuable means of allowing organisations to hear from academic and non-academic partners undertaking collaborative projects in order to expand their knowledge of the possibilities of collaboration, and to avoid repeating the mistakes of others.

All respondents suggested that a mechanism for brokering relationships between RFOs and HEIs would be extremely helpful. Respondents suggested "speed dating" and networking events might allow representatives from both HEIs and RFOs to meet. An online "notice board" where people could post calls for collaborative partners was also suggested. It was also noted that a third party "broker" might usefully introduce suitable partners to one another, reducing the need for RFOs to invest time searching for appropriate partners.

A number of respondents suggested that a formalised supporting framework for collaboration would be helpful. In the experience of one respondent, collaboration with HEIs can involve a lot of "stumbling around on both sides," and time and energy would be saved if "hand holding" could be provided that would guide the interaction. A third party might usefully help to draw up written guidelines or a contract for the project. Such a framework should protect the interests of both parties, in terms of issues of intellectual property, funding and control over the outcomes of the project. It was noted that academic organisations generally have support structures and dedicated staff members in place to support the institution in the collaboration, while there is less support for non-academic partners, and that this imbalance needs to be addressed. A neutral and honest "mediator," someone who could step in to the collaborative relationship in order to sort out tensions should they arise, is viewed as particularly necessary.

### **3.7 Conclusion**

The RFOs consulted view collaboration with HEIs as able to productively contribute to their achievement of ACE's digital priorities in three main ways:

- Business and audience development using IT and digital resources
- Curating and producing
- Archiving and collection of electronic media art

There are two additional ways in which RFOs perceive collaboration to be advantageous:

- A space for critical reflection
- Access to networks and new technology

RFOs stress, however, that they may be interested in collaboration with HEIs for other purposes if they were more informed about the possibilities of collaboration and the expertise and resources available to them in HEIs.

The main barriers to collaboration with HEIs are:

- Lack of awareness of the possibilities
- Lack of knowledge about how to go about setting up a collaboration
- Lack of funds
- Fear of a lack of control over outcomes and IP
- Perceptions about the difficulty of dealing with the bureaucracy of HEIs
- Concerns that the commercial sector can provide more efficient services and value-for-money
- Uncertainty about ACE's commitment to the digital priorities

### **3.8 Recommendations**

- More information could be made accessible to RFOs about the expertise and resources that HEIs can offer and best practice collaborative projects.
- Enhanced mechanisms for brokering collaborative partnerships between RFOs and HEIs could be created.
- Increased guidance could be provided for RFO partners throughout the process of setting up a collaboration, forming contracts and negotiating tensions should they arise during the collaboration.

- ACE digital priorities could be communicated more clearly, with assurance of the significance of these priorities for the allocation of ACE funding and the recognition and rewarding of fulfillment of digital priorities by ACE.

#### **4. LCACE HIGHER EDUCATION PARTNERS: ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE PROSPECTS**

This section aims to identify the extent to which LCACE partners are equipped to offer expertise relating to ACE digital priorities. In order to assess the ways in which HEIs might be suited to collaborating with RFOs a number of representatives from LCACE partner organisations were surveyed about the areas in which they perceived their organisations to have expertise. LCACE partners' previous experience of collaboration and their concerns about collaboration with non-academic organisations were also recorded. The HEIs consulted were Royal Holloway, University of London, Guildhall School of Music and Drama, City University, Goldsmiths, University of London, Courtauld Institute, Queen Mary, University of London, Kings College London, Birkbeck, University of London and the University of the Arts.

##### **4.1 Prior Experience of Collaboration With RFOs**

Feedback from LCACE partners revealed that all partners have significant experience in collaborating with non-academic organisations. Organisations with which HEIs have collaborated with include:

Whitechapel Gallery  
Tate Britain  
Tate Modern  
Hayward Gallery  
National Portrait Gallery  
National Gallery  
Barbican  
Roundhouse  
BFI  
BBC  
V&A  
ICA  
Space studio  
Yorkshire Sculpture Park  
Henry Moore Institute  
Royal Opera House  
RCA  
LIFT  
Gran Teatre del Liceu  
Afroreggae  
Shakespeare's Globe Theatre  
Artangel  
Film London  
David Lean Foundation

It is clear from this list that the connections between LCACE partners and non-academic cultural organisations are extensive and wide-ranging, and LCACE partners have a clear interest in collaborating with organisations

specialising in the visual arts. Through this prior experience of collaboration, it is reasonable to assume that HEIs will be equipped to approach collaborative relationships with an awareness of how potential pitfalls of collaboration can be avoided and how collaborative research can be undertaken in the most productive way possible.

It is notable, however, that the organisations listed above are clearly of a specific type. These organisations are generally well established and often large in scale. This may indicate a number of things. Smaller organisations may not be inclined to approach HEIs, perhaps feeling that the resources and funds required to sustain a collaborative project with an HEI are unrealistic. This feeling is certainly evident in the interviews with representatives from RFOs cited in section 3. It may be difficult for HEIs to maintain an awareness of the activities and interests of smaller organisations; larger organisations have greater resources to build networks and to communicate and advertise their interests to others. Of course, for HEIs there is also credit to be gained from collaborating with a high-profile cultural organisation, and this may also explain the predominance of this type of organisation in the list above. In considering how to support collaboration, a particular focus should be developing ways of building networks and brokering collaborations between small RFOs and HEIs.

#### **4.2 What Are the Strengths of HEIs in Relation to ACE Digital Priorities?**

It is clear from feedback from LCACE partners that HEIs are keen to undertake collaboration with arts organisations and, more particularly, with those working in the visual arts and digital media:

- *Archiving and Collection of Electronic Media Art*
  - The Technology Education Research Unit [TERU] at Goldsmiths explores approaches to teaching design and technology in workshops, studios and classrooms. Project e-scape was sponsored by the DfES, QCA, Edexcel and AQA. The project sought to develop a way in which design students could create real-time web-portfolios, involving documentation of design processes using photographs, drawings, voice files and texts.
  - Reflected in their collaboration with the Tate (see Section 5), staff in Goldsmiths' Department of Computing have expertise in the creation of online digital archives of talks, events and performances.
  - Academics in the Department of Media Art, Royal Holloway have expertise in creating digital online archives of television programme content (see section 5).
  - Two AHRC funded research projects being undertaken at Queen Mary, a Collaborative Doctoral Award with Artangel, supervised by Dr. Jen Harvie, and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith's archiving project with

the BFI (see section 5), are concerned with the creation and theorisation of digital archives of film and visual arts.

- *Curating and Producing / Developing Emergent Digital Artistic Practices*
  - Members of staff at Birkbeck's School of History of Art, Film and Visual Media specialise in contemporary visual media. The research of Dr. Nick Lambert focuses on computer art and the increasing role of computer imagery in the creative industries. Dr. Jeremy Gardiner's work focuses on painting and digital media and emerging technologies. Both have exhibited their own artwork in these mediums, and are currently working on the Computer Art and Technocultures research project with the V&A (see section 5).
  - The English Department at Kings collaborated on the curation of the *Brilliant Women: 18<sup>th</sup> Century Bluestockings* exhibit at the National Portrait Gallery.
  - The Computing Department at Goldsmiths is home to Digital Studios, which seeks to develop and engage critically with digital technologies, as well as to forge links between digital technologies and artistic practice. The department is well-equipped for collaboration, working closely with a range of artists and digital media professionals from the culture industries, film production, design consultancies, museums and galleries, interactive media content providers, software development houses, and hardware design laboratories (See section 5 for information about the Culture Mining project, an example of the work of the Studios).
  - A number of scholars working in Goldsmiths' Department of Art are experts in curatorial practice relating to contemporary art. The department maintains links with a number of prestigious institutions and art departments internationally.
  - The Department of Media and Communications at Goldsmiths is one of the UK's leaders in the field of media theory and media practice. The RAE2008 placed the department among the top four in the country for this subject area. Research at the Centre for the study of Global Media and Democracy includes digital media and the renewal of local democracy and global social movements, advocacy organisations and new media and media ethics.
  - The Media Arts and Technologies Research Centre at Queen Mary researches and provides training in new technologies that are employed in the creative industries, and experiments with ways in which emerging technologies can be applied in the context of creative practice. An industrial steering group, comprised of large-

scale partners alongside small arts organisations, oversees the research activities of the centre.

- Based at Camberwell College of Arts, SCIRIA (Sensory Computer Interface Research and Innovation for the Arts) is an interdisciplinary collaboration between arts and science researchers that aims to achieve outcomes of core relevance and usefulness in the fields of art, design, craft and heritage. Research at the Unit focuses on the core themes of technologically facilitated fine art practice, cultural heritage visualisation and computer interaction innovation. Technologies of particular focus in current research include multi-touch technologies, computer vision, wireless communication tools, 3D remote sensing, numerical modeling, real-time rendering and biometrics.
- FADE (Fine Art Digital Environment) is a joint research project between Camberwell College of Arts and Chelsea College of Art & Design which seeks to investigate the impact of digital technologies on fine art practice.
- *Broadcast and Broadband Environments*
  - City University is home to new multimedia facilities, including television and audio recording studios, digital media and video production labs.
  - The Centre for Culture, Media and Creative Industries at Kings undertakes research into the cultural and creative industries, including the visual and performing arts and the media, publishing and film industries.
  - Tim Markham is based in Birkbeck's School of Continuing Education. His work explores issues of media consumption and public engagement and the potentially democratising effects of developing forms of journalistic production that utilise new media.
  - A key research interest at Goldsmiths' Centre for Cultural Studies is multimedia in the current socio-political context (see section 5 for information on the Protocol TV project, which was lead by researchers at the Centre).
  - Goldsmiths' Leverhulme Media Research Centre examines the implications of new and transforming media spaces for public life and social relations. The Centre studies the boundaries of mediated and non-mediated spaces and the ways in which people engage with new forms of media.
- *Business and Audience Development Using IT and Digital Resources*

- As well as theorising and exploring digital arts practices, Goldsmiths Digital Studios aims to develop commercially viable, sustainable software products.
- i2 Media is a spin-off company from the Department of Psychology at Goldsmiths. It specialises in digital consumer research, with a focus on future media and innovation, including broadcast, internet, mobile, games, virtual and mixed reality.
- Scholars in the Department of Drama at Queen Mary have expertise in cultural value and cultural policy. The department was ranked top out of all Drama departments in the UK in RAE2008.
- Members of staff in Queen Mary's School of Business and Management have considerable expertise in the creative and cultural industries. This is an expanding area of activity and the School is keen to develop working relationships with arts organisations based in East London through collaborative research and pragmatic, low cost/free business consultancy.
- Queen Mary's School of Laws has extensive expertise in the areas of digital rights management and IP. The School runs Law for the Arts, a free face-to-face legal advice service for arts organisations in London.
- The Department of Cultural Policy and Management at City University has a strong history of undertaking research that speaks to, and is used by, policy makers and those working in the subsidised cultural sector. Researchers in the department have significant expertise in audience development and evaluation and digital media practices.
- Based at City University, Cass Business School's Film, Media and Entertainment Research Centre is a multi-disciplinary site for research on organisations and institutions that operate in the film, media, and entertainment sector, focusing on the commercial potential of these industries. The Centre seeks to build connections between practitioners and researchers.
- The Centre for Human Computer Interaction Design at City University aims to explore the relationship between technology and users with a view to understanding and improving the design, usability and accessibility of new technology and media.
- The Centre for Computing in the Humanities at Kings focuses on the application of technology in arts and humanities contexts. Initiatives based in the Centre include the King's Visualisation Laboratory (KVL), a group of researchers who specialise in 3D visualisation, including Virtual Reality reconstructions.

### 4.3 Support Structures Provided by HEIs

All of the HEIs named above have business/innovation and enterprise offices in which specialist members of staff are employed to assist with the development of industry networks, knowledge transfer and other forms of collaboration, the completion of funding applications and contracts, advice on IP and support to those involved in collaborative relationships. LCACE partner institutions are also home to LCACE Cultural Development Managers who have a responsibility to carry out this work.

### 4.4 Challenges to HEIs Undertaking Collaboration

Below are some of the central barriers to HEIs taking part in collaboration. While these issues do not apply to every potential HEI partner, broad issues of concern can be identified.

- *Differing Timescales*  
Those working in HEIs tend to develop research projects according to a less restricted time frame than RFOs, which allows for long application lead times and extensive strategic planning. Moreover, the ongoing critical reflection that academic research involves can mean that the duration of that research, once underway, is longer than the more short-term, task-oriented work commonly undertaken in RFOs. Academic grant applications also generally require a great deal of advance planning and the period of adjudication is often longer than for arts grants. Put simply, the different temporalities of HEIs and RFOs are not always compatible with one another.
- *Restricted Funds for the Arts and Humanities Within HEIs.*  
There is a concern that funding is being directed to support research and collaboration in sciences and technology at the expense of the arts and humanities. As noted in section 2, funding for STEM subjects from RAE2008 was ring-fenced, which meant a reduced share of the allocation for other subjects. Of course, there may be ways in which those working in RFOs can negotiate this, forming collaborations with disciplines outside of the arts and humanities. But given that there has been only a limited number of collaborative research projects between small, subsidised arts organisations and those working in technology or social science-related disciplines in HEIs, these funding restrictions pose a significant threat to the potential for collaboration between RFOs and HEIs. The AHRC is also funded at significantly lower levels than the other research councils, which means that, however keen the council is to encourage collaborative research, its capacity to support it financially is circumscribed.
- *Differences Between HE and Industrial Cultures*  
Tensions can arise due to differences in academic and industrial cultures that can be difficult to reconcile. Academic staff tend not to undertake research under the same financial and time pressures as

those working in RFOs (such pressures are arguably felt more acutely in academics' teaching and administration); HEI partners can lack awareness of the limitations these pressures place on the involvement of RFO partners in collaborative research, while, at the same time, overestimating the financial resources that departments have to share with external partners. RFO partners may enter into collaboration with a view to increasing profits or attracting sponsorship (and a number of funding schemes also stipulate that economic value should be a central outcome of collaborative research). Academic partners, however, may not prioritise economic objectives to the same degree. Furthermore, whilst academic partners may be committed to undertaking institutional critique, RFOs may be more interested in collaborative research as a means of advocating their activities to funders, audiences or service-users, which may compromise the critical autonomy of academic partners. An imperative to define objectives may cause tension: HEI partners may feel that academic research requires an element of freedom and experimentation and space to develop and adjust objectives as the research process progresses. Yet RFO partners may not be willing to be as flexible with project objectives, since entering into collaboration is likely to require RFOs to invest significant resources. Finally, HE institutions are complex and the training process for academic staff takes many years; as a result, acculturated ways of working can be difficult—and not always desirable—to change, especially since academic staff must balance research aspirations against their other teaching and administrative commitments.

- *Lack of Awareness and Understanding of Knowledge Transfer/Exchange*

We might assume that attention should be focused on informing non-academic organisations of the funding opportunities available for knowledge transfer and exchange. But those working in HEIs are often unaware of the different funding schemes that support collaborative work and the potential benefits and possibilities of collaborative research.

- *Over-Stretched Innovation and Enterprise Offices and Officers*

While HEIs may appear to be well-prepared to support collaborative research through innovation and enterprise offices, these offices are often understaffed and officers can be over-stretched. While the existence of these offices implies a clear aspiration to undertake collaborative research, HEIs do not always have adequate administrative capacity to realise this aspiration as fully as partners might desire.

## **4.5 Conclusion**

It is clear that LCACE partners are well equipped to collaborate with RFOs in relation to all of ACE's digital priorities. The scope of the disciplines that could undertake collaboration with RFOs is impressive. This conclusion highlights

convergent interests of the RFOs and HEIs consulted (see previous section for summary of RFO interests and aspirations).

- RFOs expressed an interest in the creation of online archives of moving image work and publications. It was suggested that HEIs might usefully provide technical expertise on how to digitize this material, since there is a shortage of skills in this area in the commercial sector. Projects developed at Royal Holloway, Queen Mary and Goldsmiths make these institutions ideally suited to collaborating in this kind of work. RFOs also expressed an interest in collaborating with HEIs in order to provide critical interpretations of archived materials and online collections. There is significant potential for this; Queen Mary, Royal Holloway, Birkbeck and Goldsmiths are ideally suited to undertaking analysis and critique of contemporary visual artwork and film.
- One RFO cited an interest in developing a digital programme that can travel with touring exhibitions of digital work and help curators and audiences understand issues around presenting digital practice. It is apparent that researchers at Goldsmiths and Queen Mary are suitably equipped to develop such a programme.
- A number of RFOs stated an interest in collaborating with HEIs as a means of developing the commercial side of their business, and this is an area in which LCACE partners have much to contribute. Cass Business School's Film, Media and Entertainment Research Centre and Goldsmiths Digital Studios and i2 Media are particularly well equipped to work with RFOs in this way.

There are two elements of the ACE digital priorities in which the RFOs consulted did not show significant interest but in which LCACE partners are well placed to provide resources and expertise.

- A number of HEIs are well equipped to collaborate on the development of broadcast and broadband environments.
- RFOs do not state a significant interest in collaborating with HEIs in order to develop and produce creative practice itself or explore emerging digital media. It is clear, however, that HEIs have much to offer in this respect, not only in terms of resources, but also in terms of expertise.

It is important to stress that knowledge may be transferable from one area of research to another in unexpected ways. Scholars are often highly able and willing to build on their existing expertise to incorporate new knowledge and research necessary to engage with the particular interests of RFOs. Collaborative research is inevitably a learning process for both RFO and HEI partners, though some prior and related expertise on the part of the HEI partner is arguably necessary for the collaboration to be as productive as possible.

As noted in section 3, concern was expressed by one RFO representative that those working in HEIs are not sufficiently “embedded” in the creative industries to understand or assess the work of RFOs in a wider context, or to advise organisations on their practices. LCACE has also observed that, in general, HEIs tend to lack a full understanding about the processes and practices of the cultural sector. LCACE partner institutions, however, demonstrate a high level of engagement—and willingness to engage further—with the wider cultural sector. Cass Business School, Goldsmith’s Digital Studios and i2 Media are focused on understanding the market for digital practices and supporting the development of new practices within this context. Academics based at City University’s Department of Cultural Policy and Management are highly practiced in analysing contemporary cultural policy and providing in-depth and high quality evaluation and audience development research to non-academic organisations. The Media Arts and Technologies Research Centre at Queen Mary is focused on developing and exploring the potential of cutting edge technologies for creative practice, and leading academics working at Birkbeck, Queen Mary and Goldsmiths are adept at critiquing and analysing the latest cultural trends and emerging creative practices.

#### **4.6 Recommendations**

- Specific consideration of the issues arising from collaboration for small or medium scale partner organisations and developing ways of addressing and resolving these issues
- A particular focus on developing ways of building networks and brokering collaborations between small RFOs and HEIs
- Initiatives like ACE London’s digital priorities need to be published and disseminated if HEs are going to be involved at an early stage. Arts organisations may have informal access to information about initiatives through their arts officers, but HEIs rely on more formalised, or at least different networks of, communication.

## 5. FUNDING SCHEMES AND CASE STUDIES

The information provided in this section indicates the range of funding schemes with the purpose of supporting collaboration between RFOs and HEIs. A number of projects are highlighted in order to illustrate the types of research that is supported by these funding schemes.

### 5.1 Funding and Illustrative Case Studies

#### *AHRC/ESRC Knowledge Transfer Partnerships*

Both the AHRC and the ESRC sponsor Knowledge Transfer Partnerships, which aim to enable research organisations to apply knowledge in the social sciences to business problems. KTP projects are carried out by an Associate (recent graduate or postgraduate) who is jointly supervised by both partners. KTPs are administered by a contracted body, and the same guidelines largely apply for applications made through both funding councils (though academic partners must be from social science disciplines or arts and humanities disciplines, respectively).

The AHRC and the ESRC highlight a number of potential benefits of KTPs: businesses are able to access cutting edge research and independent and impartial advice and to reduce the investment required to carry out research “in-house.” Researchers are able to benefit from the expertise and feedback of those who will use research, informing and improving the quality of research, developing networks, improving career opportunities and increasing the prospects of research being applied in practice. The Associate also benefits from an organised training programme. A significant proportion of KTPs involve digital technology.

#### **Case Study**

Partner Organisations: The University of the Arts London and the Press Association, 2008-2010

As the Press Association transforms from being a print and image provider to being an information broker, this KTP project examines the role of video, web and mobile technologies in the news environment to keep them at the forefront of an ever-changing media landscape. The Press Association is using the skills of three Associates – a journalist, a media strategist and a technologist – to help PA achieve their goals. The Associates are now researching and testing journalistic practice and finding novel ways to incorporate new forms of play and social interaction into the news in future.

Projects may be supported for up to 2 years in duration. The non-academic partner takes on the role of “lead” supervisor while the knowledge-base partner must spend half a day with the Associate each week at the company premises. The amount awarded by research councils depends on the costs of

the project. In most cases, part of the costs of the KTP is awarded. The company partner is expected to contribute additional costs once the research grant has been deducted from the total cost of the project. Non-academic partners are expected to cover the full costs of their participation in the partnership, including management and supervision, resources and materials. If the non-academic partner is providing the Associate, it is expected to meet the Associate's employment costs in full.

### *AHRC Knowledge Transfer Fellowships*

The Knowledge Transfer Fellowship programme supports projects that apply existing arts or humanities research beyond the world of academia. KT Fellows may work individually or as part of an academic team. The aim of the scheme is to bring tangible benefits to non-academic organisations through collaboration and knowledge exchange. These benefits may be economic, social or cultural in nature.

### **Case Study**

#### **Project Title: Documenting the History of the British Film Institute – An Online Resource**

Partner Organisations: Department of History, Queen Mary, University of London and the British Film Institute, 2008-2009

Since 2004, Professor Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, assisted by Dr Christophe Dupin, has been researching the BFI's history in detail. The scholarly outcome of this work will appear in a book, to be published in 2010. The project, undertaken through the AHRC Knowledge Transfer Fellowship scheme, makes the BFI a partner organisation in a plan to make the knowledge accumulated in the course of the research available in a different and distinctive way: as an instrument for BFI to understand more about its own history and, taking advantage of advances in digital technology, as a means to communicate with a far larger public than would be reached by a scholarly monograph. The database created will contain written, photographic and audiovisual materials relating to the entire history of the BFI from its foundation onwards. There will be audio and video interviews with former BFI staff and others who have shaped its destiny over the years, film/TV/video material relating to the BFI and a photo archive of BFI premises, staff and distinguished visitors.

### *AHRC Knowledge Catalyst Scheme*

The Knowledge Catalyst scheme funds collaborations between universities and non-academic partners including business, charities, not-for-profit organisations and some publicly funded bodies. This funding enables non-academic organisations to utilise expertise and resources in HEIs for commercial and/or cultural gain. The scheme is aimed at organisations for

which the KTP scheme is not appropriate. A recent graduate is employed to work on a Knowledge Catalyst project and receives a market-rate salary. This graduate is supervised by an academic. Projects of between 3 and 15 months can be supported and the AHRC will fund 60% of the cost of projects.

### **Case study: EVA – Alternative Game Reality**

Partner Organisations: University of West of England, School of Art, Media and Design and Licorice Films Ltd, 2007

Alternate Reality Games are the latest incarnation of player-led internet narratives. They present a fictional reality with a narrative played out over a period of time, over a series of linked websites, posing as real businesses, organisations, blogs or other sources of information. Tom Abba of UWE led a five-month Knowledge Catalyst project to research the possibility of producing a high quality new Alternative Reality game, free of commercial constraints. The research team employed a recent UWE graduate full-time and produced an immersive experience for the player participants. It is intended that the project will become a model for game development outside of the established route of studio sponsorship.

### *Technology Strategy Board*

The TSB exists to promote and fund collaborative research and development involving researchers and businesses in a wide range of sectors. It runs a number of competitions, focused on developing specific areas of technology in particular sectors. TSB funding competitions support projects of varying sizes and time-scales. A recent report published by the TSB recommends that future funding should be allocated to support research and development of two key areas in the creative industries: Metadata and Cross Platform production.

### *ESRC Business Placement Fellowship Scheme*

This scheme allows a researcher to spend time working in a business organisation on a specific project. It also provides an opportunity for a member of a business organisation to spend time developing a project that is relevant to their business in an academic institution. The creative industries are a priority area for this funding scheme. Funding is available for projects lasting from between one and twelve months. Fellows are expected to spend at least 50% of their time working in the host organisation's offices. Up to £25,000 may be awarded.

### *ESRC Business Engagement Scheme*

This scheme enables social science researchers to work collaboratively with a business to assist business sustainability. The ESRC particularly welcomes projects that involve third sector organisations and small businesses. Funding

of up to £100,000 per application is available for a combination of activities, ideally with co-funding partners. The scheme aims to:

- Promote the transfer and exchange of knowledge between social science researchers and business sectors and staff within them.
- Respond to the knowledge needs of business through a range of knowledge exchange mechanisms.
- Expand networks for business sectors into academia and vice versa.
- Provide business sectors with research-informed evidence to develop and review operational and management practices.
- Enable all parties, including the ESRC, to develop their understanding of the interaction between research and the development of operational and management practices within business sectors.
- Contribute to the delivery of the Government's Science and Innovation Investment Framework and support the initiatives being undertaken by the Technology Strategy Board.

### **Case Study: Identifying and Promoting Sustainable Business Models in Creative Industries**

Partner organisations: Newcastle University, Centre for Knowledge, Innovation, Technology and Enterprise and the Northern Cultural Skills Partnership

This project brings together researchers from three distinctive areas: Professor Feng Li and Dr Sally Jane Norman of the Culture Lab, Joanna Berry of Newcastle University's Business School, David Butler of the University's School of Arts and Culture, and Judy Seymour of Northern Cultural Skills Partnership. In response to claims by NESTA that business growth in the creative sector is slow in comparison to other sectors, this project seeks to identify and evaluate sustainable business models in creative industries, and promotes their adoption through close engagement with members of the Northern Cultural Skills Partnership and other businesses in the creative industries.

### *AHRC CDA/ESRC CASE Studentships*

A Collaborative Doctoral Award (AHRC), or a CASE studentship (ESRC), enables a student, supervised by co-investigators from both an academic and a non-academic organisation, to undertake research of mutual interest to both partners and achieve a doctoral qualification at the end of the award. The ESRC suggests that collaborative studentships are valuable in a number of ways. Studentships provide non-academic organisations with valuable

'background' research that it is not possible or affordable to carry out 'in-house' and studentships allow non-academic organisations to test the value of collaborations without significant financial outlay. Moreover, it is argued these projects can help to build networks and future collaborations between HEIs and non-academic organisations. For academic organisations, studentships can provide insight into the needs and perspectives of specific industries and sectors. For students, this work can provide valuable training, contacts and experience for careers both inside and outside of academia.

Awards are allocated to HEIs who must take the lead in applying for funds. The ESRC highlights a number of ways in which collaborative studentships tend to be initiated:

- An academic researcher identifies a topic they wish to research and contacts relevant partner organisations to invite interest.
- A student develops a project that is then submitted to a relevant external organisation for support.
- Where a student has undertaken placement work in a company through which a good relationship has grown between the company, the student and the academic, the studentship may enable follow-on research.

Awards are normally granted for projects lasting for 3 years, though students have a maximum of 4 years to complete the project. In addition to grants to students provided by funding councils, non-academic partners are expected to make an annual maintenance payment to the student. The AHRC stipulates that this should be in the region of £1000. In the ESRC scheme, the standard non-academic partners minimum contribution in 2009 to both 'full time' students and the academic partner is £4,000 per annum (£2,000 to the student and £2,000 to the academic partner organisation). The contribution to the student by the non-academic partner is optional, however, and the contribution to the academic partner can be negotiated if the non-academic organisation cannot afford the full financial contribution.

### **Case Study: Representing Artangel: Creative Translation between Event and Internet**

Partner Organisations: Department of Drama, Queen Mary, University of London and Artangel

This research is being carried out by collaborative doctoral student Stephanie Delcroix, under the supervision of Dr. Jen Harvie (Queen Mary), Michael Morris and James Lingwood (Artangel). *Stephanie Delcroix writes:* "My project consists of developing an interactive platform for the online representation of Artangel's commissions, most of which are ephemeral and site-specific. This research entails a critical enquiry into how to best approach the online representation of these works, given their particular nature. It

proposes to further the impact of these works on the cultural and social spheres by providing both a growing documentary resource and a site for informed debate and ongoing critical exchange. I aim to translate a selection of Artangel events from their first incarnation into new, networked forms and to extend and 'entertain' their second life for the benefit of primary and secondary audiences."

### *Digital Economy Research in the Wild*

Administered by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, this short-term funding scheme is part of the Digital Economy Programme, which aims to encourage the use of ICT in all aspects of business, society and government. The EPSRC is working with the Medical Research Council, the ESRC, and the AHRC to deliver the programme. This funding provides an opportunity for researchers to test out their ideas "in the wild"—with individuals or businesses – to increase the potential for research ideas to be realised and utilised by individuals and industries. Funding is provided for projects lasting up to 18 months.

### *AHRC Fellowships in the Creative and Performing Arts*

This scheme supports artists as research fellows in an academic organisation, in order to undertake practice-led research. The scheme aims to enable artists to develop their skills as researchers and to facilitate the transfer of knowledge between the creative and performing arts and the research community. Either artists or academic institutions may initiate the project. This scheme provides a salary for the fellows of between £27,000 and £45,000 pro rata depending on their experience. Fellowships are funded for 2 or 3 years full time or 5 years part time.

### **Case Study: Bobby Baker's Creative Fellowship in the Department of Drama, Queen Mary, University of London, 2005-2008**

#### **Project Title: A Model Family**

*Bobby Baker writes:* "My fellowship used the processes and practices of performance to research 'model' qualities of family life, contributing to the development of *A Model Family*, a live and web-based artwork aimed at exploring and provoking debate about contemporary family life. *Bobby Baker: Redeeming Features of Daily Life* was published in 2007 and brought together for the first time an account of my career as an artist with critical commentary by reviewers and academics. This book was part of a Bumper Package which included nine re-digitised DVDs of previous shows and my website has been extensively upgraded. My research has involved collaborations with trainee doctors, psychologists and theatre practitioners. I have been involved in developing training programmes for mental health professionals and have undertaken a number of academic and public talks and performances on issues of mental health. I have also worked closely with the Department of Geography, taking part in seminars and leading workshops for graduate

students in social geography. Geography Dog will be a cross-disciplinary project involving the departments of Geography, Drama and Computer Science. In collaboration with a web artist and experts in Flash technology I will create a virtual map, recording the responses of walkers during walks around the neighbourhood of Queen Mary. All the walks will be recorded through the eyes of a dog that will accompany me on the walks.

Without this fellowship it is unlikely that I would have been able to achieve many of the things I have over the last few years: publishing my book, developing my website and starting projects such as Geography Dog. The fellowship has also allowed me time to experiment in a way I haven't been able to for a long time and to expand my knowledge in disciplines such as geography and medicine."

### **Case Study: Tony Flaxton's Creative Fellowship in the Department of Drama: Theatre, Film and Television, University of Bristol**

#### **Project Title: High Definition Imaging: An Investigation into the Actual, the Virtual and the Hyper Real**

*Tony Flaxton writes:* "The aim of this project is to investigate - in practice and in theory - what is happening to the audience gaze as it shifts from the analogue to the digital to the higher resolution. This impending change has focused my artistic and technical concerns into the following fundamental question:

- How will High Definition Imaging affect the nature of art and entertainment from the point of view of both practitioners and audiences?

This question elicits the following associated questions:

- In what ways will High Definition Imaging change the work that is produced in the convergence of live art and visual technologies?
- In what ways will High Definition Imaging affect the design of exhibition spaces and our experiences of them?

The aim of the fellowship is to create new knowledge about the aesthetics and techniques of high definition through a production-led process. Production will occur in dialogue with practitioners and educationalists. With these aims in mind, my objectives are to produce a series of installation pieces, as well as a series of articles which I aim to develop into a book on the history surrounding the concept of an image making medium that is higher in resolution and therefore in some ways better than its predecessors. The discussion here will concentrate on how emerging technologies shape, as much as they are shaped by, our views of the world. Being a cinematographer by trade I will wherever possible work through moving image and sound to complement text. As I research the book, I shall engage in a series of recorded interviews with

artists and cinematographer/ practitioners which will be gathered together and could form the basis of web and DVD resources. At the centre of the project is the aim to bring the industrial, the academic and the theoretical together through practical and creative investigations.”

### *LCACE Knowledge Exchange Seed Fund*

LCACE operates an annual fund of £80,000 to support the development of knowledge transfer and exchange projects in its partner institutions. The purpose of the fund is:

- To support academics from any discipline to undertake knowledge exchange with the arts and cultural sectors.
- To pump prime arts/cultural projects with potential to attract future funding, and/or commercial revenue.
- To benefit LCACE partner institutions and the arts/cultural sector.
- To support innovative activity which might not be funded by traditional research routes.
- To create a positive impact in one or more of the following areas: Institution impact, network impact, knowledge impact and/or personal impact.
- To create an opportunity to raise LCACE’s profile within award holder’s institution.

Individual academics from the LCACE partner institutions (except for University of the Arts which runs its own seed fund initiatives) may apply. The fund will support projects by up to 75% or £5,000 of the project costs, whichever is the smaller. LCACE may also offer partial funding for projects depending on the demand for support.

### **Case Study: Resonance104.4fm Collaboration**

Partner Organisations: Guildhall School of Music and Drama and Resonance104.4fm

Under the guidance of staff from Resonance104.4fm, composition and electronic music students from the Guildhall School of Music and Drama made experimental shows of up to 15 minutes with links to African culture. The shows, aired on Resonance104.4fm, drew broadly on subjects such as African music, food and films with a view to pushing the boundaries of radio art. Seminars were led by Richard Thomas, content manager at Resonance104.4fm, and Lyndon Jones, a freelance radio producer. The collaboration encouraged students to think about radio as an art form and provided them with training in skills such as recording, editing and interviewing.

## 5.2 Other HEI Collaborations

The projects highlighted below indicate further possible funding sources, although some of these funding sources have ceased to exist or are not as accessible or widely relevant as those cited above. The main purpose of citing these projects is once more to highlight the potential for collaboration between HEIs and arts organisations in relation to digital technology. Broadly speaking, similar projects to those listed below would be eligible to apply for funding from the funding sources previously listed in this section.

### **Case Study: Computer Art and Technocultures**

Partner Organisations: School of Art, Film and Visual Media, Birkbeck, University of London and the Victoria and Albert Museum, 2007-2010

Funding: AHRC Resource Enhancement Scheme (scheme no longer operating)

This project, led by Dr. Nick Lambert and Professor Jeremy Gardiner from Birkbeck and Douglas Dodds and Honor Bedard from the V&A, examines the development of computer-based art from the late 1970s to the 1990s. It focuses on the collection of artworks, publications and ephemera assembled by Patric Prince, an American art historian who comprehensively chronicled the Computer Art scene. Project staff are documenting and evaluating the Patric Prince Collection's contents, using it to establish a framework for understanding the medium in its art historical, cultural and technological context. This project also seeks to link these historic developments with areas of contemporary practice in the digital arts. An outcome of this project will be a display at the V&A, showcasing the evolution of computer art, to run alongside a forthcoming digitally focused exhibition at the museum. The team will also produce an online database of images from the collection, and there will be a conference and study days linked to the project and the V&A display.

### **Case Study: Broadband: Interactive Media in a Cross-Platform Environment**

Partner Organisations: Centre for Culture Studies, Goldsmiths, University of London, Archangel, Hildebrand and Video Networks/Home Choice

Funding: DTI/ESRC, PACCIT/Link funding (scheme no longer operating), 2003-2006

Researchers joined forces with three London-based media companies to produce new forms of television, tailor-made for IPTV (Internet Protocol based TV). Researchers Scott Lash, Celia Lury, Andreas Wittel and Goetz Bachmann focused on how partners worked together to make the programme; conducted a year long ethnographic study of the use of broadband media in 21 households; and undertook interviews with technology

experts from UK, Japan and South Korea about likely future developments in broadband and related media technologies.

### **Case Study: Video Active**

Partner Organisations: Department of Media Arts, Royal Holloway, University of London, University of Utrecht and 11 European Archives Including the BBC

Funding: eContent*plus* Programme, European Commission

Royal Holloway researchers John Ellis, Cathy Johnson and Rob Turnock took part in Video Active. The project aimed to create access to digitised television programme content from archives around Europe via a specially designed web portal. The team from Royal Holloway were responsible for developing content selection strategy and policy for the project.

### **Case Study: Culture Mining**

Partner Organisations: Department of Computing, Goldsmiths, University of London and Tate Research

Funding: AHRC Resource Enhancement Scheme (scheme no longer operating)

This project aims to produce an open source application for searching and retrieving audio/video content online. The focus of the project is the Tate's online Events Archive, which contains 500 hours of artists talks, cultural theory lectures, symposia, music and performance events, and continues to produce over 100 hours each year. The project aims to develop a tool with which users of the archive will be able to search and retrieve fragments of long-recordings that are relevant to their interests. The research team is Kelly Dipple from the Tate, and Adrian Passow, Dr. Tina Sherwell, Dr. Dan Tidhar, Dr. Marian Ursu and Professor Robert Zimmer from Goldsmiths' Department of Computing.

## **5.3 Conclusion**

This broad overview of available funding sources reveals that there are a large number of schemes that will support collaboration between arts organisations and HEIs, and that these funding schemes are wide ranging in terms of length, funds available, outcomes, academic disciplines and scale of partner organisations.

The AHRC has a number of funding schemes that are applicable to RFO/HEI collaboration. Notably, the ESRC also supports a number of funding streams that may be applicable to RFOs, particularly those interested in business development opportunities. But if the ESRC cites third sector and creative industries as priority areas for funding (with an emphasis on small

organisations) there have been few projects involving not-for-profit, small-scale organisations from the creative industries. This may reflect a lack of awareness of the potential value of knowledge transfer between the social sciences and arts organisations on the part of some funders, RFOs or HEIs. Indeed, Sally Taylor, Chief Executive of LCACE, has suggested that whilst funding bodies such as the Technology Strategy Board declare an interest in funding collaboration in the creative industries, there is a mismatch in the interests of funders and the needs of those working in the create industries. Taylor states:

The Technology Strategy Board has opened its coffers to applications from the creative industries, but it is extremely difficult to make the case in their terms....In the creative industries, the answer might not be cutting-edge technology but the application of existing technology in a different area. What we are lobbying for is more flexibility in how they apply the application of technology to the creative industries—can you look at it on our terms rather than ones that are set up to deal with sewage or house-building? (Tahir 2009, Education 7)

Moreover, the cost of supporting a collaborative project is likely to be a significant factor in the relatively low numbers of small and medium scale arts organisations that have been involved in knowledge transfer schemes so far. Targeted largely at profit-making private sector organisations, ESRC Knowledge Transfer, Business Placement and Business Engagement schemes provide only a proportion of the costs of a research project, meaning that organisations must either apply for funding from elsewhere or put forward the funds for the research themselves. Where it falls to non-academic partner organisations to contribute funding it is unlikely that small or medium scale arts organisations will be able to contribute in this way. The ESRC recognises the particular capabilities and needs of not-for-profit organisations and plans to develop a placement scheme specifically for third sector organisations, with a pilot of this scheme intended for later this year. The ESRC stresses that they welcome enquiries regarding the scope and eligibility of collaboration involving not-for-profit arts organisations. Of course, this is also a consideration for those thinking about applying for AHRC funding such as Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and the Knowledge Catalyst scheme, which also contribute only a proportion of the overall costs of a research project.

Locating necessary information may also be a barrier to participation. If organisations know what they are looking for, information about available funding streams is very easy to locate on the internet. For organisations (both RFOs and HEIs) with little knowledge of the funding opportunities available to them, however, searching for these funding sources is likely to be extremely confusing and time consuming, and this may be off-putting to organisations considering undertaking collaboration. Information becomes out of date very quickly and it is difficult to know what funding is current and what is no longer available.

All of these projects involve academic partners taking the lead in applying for funds from the research councils and carrying out administrative activities

during the research project. Whilst this seems to be the most logical way of doing things, in that administrative responsibility does not lie with potentially over-stretched small-scale RFO partners, this may also fan the fears of RFOs about the potential imbalance of power and control in collaboration with HEIs, and may reinforce the assumption that the benefits of collaboration lie largely with the academic partner. Of course, academic partners may also feel over-stretched, and the burden to apply for funds and take the administrative lead may discourage them from entering into a collaborative research project. The balance of administrative responsibility during research projects might, therefore, be productively reconsidered, although ensuring an appropriate sharing of control and responsibility whilst protecting small-scale non-academic partners from increased bureaucracy and administrative pressure is potentially difficult to achieve in practice.

#### **5.4 Recommendations**

- Face-to-face advice from a third party with a comprehensive overview of available funding streams about which funding schemes are most appropriate to potential applicants.
- The broad overview of available funding streams provided in this report could usefully be expanded and a more comprehensive outline of available funding streams made available online. This database should be updated regularly.
- As an increasing number of collaborative projects are completed, a bank of case studies should be created, drawing attention to the outcomes of projects and the benefits to both partners where benefits exist.
- Funding councils might usefully consider the funding arrangements for collaborative projects when the non-academic partner is a small or medium scale not-for-profit arts organisation.

## 6. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This section brings together the major recommendations made in each section of the report. We have begun a process of sharing ideas and reflecting upon the possibilities of collaboration, but this could be built upon to a greater extent in the future (e.g. by collecting examples of collaborations between visual arts RFOs and HEIs and doing more in-depth analysis of those case studies so that we can learn from them). The recommendations made in each section of the report should be seen, then, as a way of encouraging further developments.

1. A continually updated “digital data bank” could be made accessible to visual arts RFOs that outlines the expertise and resources (including both technical and critically reflective elements) that HEIs can offer and documents collaborative projects. This would help visual arts RFOs identify which potential HE partners have experience of collaboration with the cultural sector generally, and which particular HEIs (and which units within those HEIs) might be best placed to pursue activities related to digital technology. As an increasing number of collaborative projects are completed, each should be added to the data bank, drawing attention to the nature and outcomes of research projects and the benefits of research to both partners.
2. Mechanisms for brokering collaborative partnerships between visual arts RFOs and HEIs should be enhanced (or, where applicable, created). These could include increased guidance being provided for visual arts RFO partners throughout the process of setting up a collaboration, as well as advice on forming contracts and assistance negotiating tensions should they arise during the collaboration. Visual arts RFOs should be able to access face-to-face advice about which funding schemes—particularly those outside conventional arts funding streams—are most appropriate to potential applicants.
3. The broad overview of available funding streams provided in this report could usefully be expanded and a more comprehensive outline of available funding streams made available online. This database should be updated regularly.
4. Visual arts RFOs are most likely to increase their digital capacity if ACE digital priorities are communicated clearly and interpreted flexibly. This involves assurance from ACE that these priorities are taken into account for the purposes of ACE funding allocation, along with corresponding financial recognition by ACE when visual arts RFOs address digital priorities. At the same time, digital priorities should be interpreted in such a way that accommodates a wide variety of practices, processes and outcomes undertaken by RFOs.
5. Initiatives like ACE London’s digital priorities should be published and disseminated to university research and enterprise offices if HEIs are going to undertake capacity-building collaborations with visual arts RFOs.

Visual arts organisations may have informal access to information about initiatives through their arts officers, but HEIs rely on more formalised (or at least different networks of) communication.

6. University research and enterprise offices should continue to develop networks and broker collaborations between small and medium-sized visual arts RFOs and HEIs. While larger arts organisations are well represented within the portfolio of partners with which HEIs collaborate, an increased emphasis on working with small and medium-sized arts organisations would benefit visual arts organisations engaged with digital technology, many of which are of a modest size.
7. There is a need for more research on the role of KT involving arts organisations and universities. Collaborative activities related to the arts and digital technologies are currently outpacing our capacity to grasp and reflect upon them. While research councils are actively encouraging KT activities between arts organisations and HEIs, there is little research into the challenges posed by such collaborations.
8. There is a need for more research on KT between universities and not-for-profit organisations. We cannot assume that the purpose of collaboration is commercialisation or that the key benefit of collaboration is revenue generation. A more flexible and complex analysis is required, in particular one that takes into account the distinct conditions under which not-for-profit organisations such as visual arts RFOs operate and the multiple ways in which benefit may be measured and articulated.
9. While the contribution of the creative industries to the UK is widely recognised, the government's decision to ring-fence funding for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Medicine) subjects has had the knock-on effect of squeezing research funding for arts departments most committed to KT with industry partners. All parties with an interest in collaboration between visual arts RFOs and HEIs (including ACE, arts organisations, universities, and research funding councils) should seek to impress upon government the full implications that such decisions have on the ability of visual arts RFOs and HEIs to build digital capacity collaboratively.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The term Knowledge Exchange (KE) is used synonymously with Knowledge Transfer. While the term (perhaps) implies a more reciprocal relationship between collaborating partners than KT, it is not yet in as wide use. As a result, this report will employ the term Knowledge Transfer throughout.

<sup>2</sup> For an analysis of the shifting ways in which the cultural or creative industries have been measured in the UK during the past two decades, see McKinnie 2004.

<sup>3</sup> It is also worth noting that another of ACE's priorities during the period is Visual Arts.

<sup>4</sup> For further information about the Digital Opportunities Research Programme, see:  
[http://www.arts.org.uk/aboutus/project\\_detail.php?rid=0&sid=&browse=recent&id=1091#pone](http://www.arts.org.uk/aboutus/project_detail.php?rid=0&sid=&browse=recent&id=1091#pone)

## **APPENDIX A: RFOs CONSULTED**

*Art Monthly* [www.artmonthly.co.uk](http://www.artmonthly.co.uk)  
B3 Media [www.b3media.net](http://www.b3media.net)  
Film London [www.filmlondon.org.uk](http://www.filmlondon.org.uk)  
Forma [www.forma.org.uk](http://www.forma.org.uk)  
Furtherfield [www.furtherfield.org](http://www.furtherfield.org)  
Lux [www.lux.org.uk](http://www.lux.org.uk)

## APPENDIX B: RFO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interviews were based on the template below. Follow-on questions were employed as prompted by the respondent.

1. How do your existing, planned and desired activities relate to ACE's digital priorities? Please consider your short, medium and long term plans.
2. Has your organisation collaborated with any HEIs in the past?
  - If yes, what form has this collaboration taken?
  - If not, why not?
3. What kind of collaboration might your organisation find valuable in helping to facilitate your goals? (Consider, for example, outcomes of evaluation, time-scales)
4. Are you aware of a specific institution with which you would like to collaborate?
  - If yes, why are you attracted to this institution in particular?
  - If no, what kind of HEI would you like to collaborate with? (E.g. art colleges, universities, small/medium/large scale). Why?
5. Which academic disciplines would you like to collaborate with?
6. Are there any other parts of the university with which you might want to engage that you may not have previously considered? (E.g. business schools, sciences, geography, languages)
7. In your view, what challenges might collaboration with HEIs present?
8. How might the nature of your organisation present challenges to collaboration? (E.g. funding, size of organisation, staffing, time and resources)
9. In your view, what kinds of resources might support collaboration between RFOs and HEIs? (E.g. availability of best practice examples, networking events for RFO and HEI representatives, information about HEI research specialisms and resources, templates for "partnership agreements")

## **APPENDIX C: LCACE PARTNERS CONSULTED**

Birkbeck, University of London  
City University  
Courtauld Institute  
Goldsmiths, University of London  
Guildhall School of Music and Drama  
Kings College London  
Queen Mary, University of London  
Royal Holloway, University of London  
University of the Arts

## APPENDIX D: LCACE PARTNER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please provide details about departments or research centres with research expertise in the following:  
  
Business and audience development using IT and digital resources  
Archiving and collection of electronic media art  
Emergent digital artistic practice  
Curating and producing  
Broadcast and broadband environment  
  
If known, can you also please name the relevant academics and research students?
2. Within your institution, does there exist any formal knowledge transfer collaborations (e.g. CDAs, KTPs, KTFs and the like) or other less formalised collaborations between academics and visual arts organisations that might be either directly or indirectly of interest or relevance to this programme? Could you please list?
3. Do you think there may be other departments or key individuals who could be interested in this programme and the potential it might hold to develop new relationships with visual arts organisations. Yes/No. Can you please give some more information?
4. Would you be interested in supporting the programme in the coming months by for example:
  - a. Running a workshop on what makes a robust knowledge exchange or research application on May 12<sup>th</sup> seminar
  - b. Hosting a visit to your institution to meet informally with academics
  - c. Drawing to our attention relevant recent research that might be of interest to the group
  - d. General networking at the forthcoming events
  - e. Other
5. What other relationships or partnerships exist between your institution and the Visual Arts sector in London more generally? (Not including the Museum sector). Please list
6. Could you describe what, if any, role you may have played in the establishment of the relationships?
7. If you have any other suggestions or ideas with specific regard to this work that you'd like to draw to our attention, please list
8. Would you be willing to talk further to us if necessary?

## WORKS CITED

- Analysys Mason. 2009. *Fostering Creative Ambition in the UK Digital Economy: Analysis and Development of Policy Recommendations*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS].
- Arts Council England. 2008. *Great Art for Everyone 2008-2011*. London: Arts Council England.
- Bekkers, Rudi and Isabel Maria Bodas Freitas. 2008. "Analysing Knowledge Transfer Channels Between Universities and Industry: To What Degree Do Sectors Also Matter?" *Research Policy* 37: 1837-1853.
- DCMS et al. 2008. *Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy*. London: DCMS.
- DCMS and Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. 2009. *Digital Britain*. London: Office of Public Sector Information.
- Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills. 2003. *The Future of Higher Education*. London: HMSO.
- Geuna, Aldo and Alessandro Muscio. 2009. "The Governance of University Knowledge Transfer: A Critical Review of the Literature." *Minerva* 47: 93-114.
- Higher Education Funding Council for England [HEFCE]. 2009. *Strategic Plan 2006-2011*. Updated June 2009. London: Higher Education Funding Council for England.
- HM Treasury. 2003. *Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration*. London: HMSO.
- Keaney, Emily. 2009. "The Digital World: A Review of the Evidence." London: Arts Council England.
- Mayor of London. 2008. *Cultural Metropolis*. London: Greater London Authority.
- McKinnie, Michael. 2004. "A Sympathy for Art: The Sentimental Economies Of New Labour's Arts Policy." *Blairism and the War of Persuasion: Labour's Passive Revolution*. Richard Johnson and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, eds. London: Laurence and Wishart: 186-203.
- MTM London. 2009. *Digital Content Snapshot*. London: Arts Council England.
- Rothaermel, Frank T. et al. 2007. "University Entrepreneurship: A

Taxonomy of the Literature." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 16.4: 691-791.

Synovate. 2009. *Consuming Digital Arts*. London: Arts Council England.

Welsh, Rick et al. 2008. "Close Enough But Not Too Far: Assessing the Effects of University-Industry Research Relationships and the Rise of Academic Capitalism." *Research Policy* 37: 1854-1864.

Tahir, Tariq. 2009. "It's a Cinch." *The Guardian*. 14 July: Education 7.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Michael McKinnie is Senior Lecturer in Drama at Queen Mary, University of London. He is the author of *City Stages: Theatre and Urban Space in a Global City* (University of Toronto Press), the editor of *Space and the Geographies of Theatre* (Playwrights Canada Press), and numerous articles and reviews in scholarly journals and edited collections. His research focuses on performance and urban space and the arts and the state.

Louisa Pearson is completing an Arts and Humanities Research Council-funded PhD in Drama at Queen Mary, University of London in collaboration with Lift. Her project, entitled “Lift: Cultural Value, Cultural Politics, Cultural Production,” examines the relationship between contemporary performance practice and broader regimes of cultural policy and cultural value.



Michael McKinnie  
Department of Drama  
School of English and Drama  
Queen Mary, University of London  
London E1 4NS  
m.mckinnie@qmul.ac.uk