

**“What is to be Done?”:
Cultural Leadership and Public Engagement
in Art and Design Education**

“What is to be Done?”:
Cultural Leadership and Public Engagement
in Art and Design Education

Edited by

Steve Swindells and Anna Powell

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

“What is to be Done?”:
Cultural Leadership and Public Engagement in Art and Design Education,
Edited by Steve Swindells and Anna Powell

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Steve Swindells, Anna Powell and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5890-0, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5890-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| List of Illustrations | vii |
| Acknowledgements | ix |
| Part One: Defining the Landscape: Public Engagement in Context | |
| Introduction to Part One | 3 |
| I Say Aesthetic = Human Being Steve Swindells and Anna Powell | |
| Chapter One..... | 19 |
| Creating #havoc: A Holistic Approach to Valuing Our Culture Claire Donovan | |
| Chapter Two | 29 |
| The Renaissance of University Galleries? Sarah Shalgosky and Stephanie James | |
| Chapter Three | 37 |
| Public Engagement, Impact, and the 21 st Century University: A Guide for the Bewildered Paul Manners | |
| Part Two: Dialogues Present and Past..... | 51 |
| Part Three: Mapping the Landscape: Application, Measurement, Articulation | |
| Introduction to Part Three..... | 63 |
| Measuring the Immeasurable? Steve Swindells and Anna Powell | |

| | |
|---|----|
| Chapter Four | 73 |
| Post-REF: Collecting Evidence from Public Engagement. Necessity with Unforeseen Consequences? Rosa Scoble | |
| Chapter Five | 81 |
| Bridging the Divide: Articulating the Value of Creativity to Politicos Jocelyn Bailey | |
| Where Are We Now? | 89 |
| Steve Swindells and Anna Powell | |
| Editors | 95 |
| Contributors..... | 97 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Paul Manners: clusters of questions and theoretical framings into researcher/community interactions.
2. Image from the ICA Symposium, *Public Engagement and Impact, Articulating Value in Art and Design*, 2013. Placards showing event Twitter ‘hashtag’ used for collecting at-event feedback.
3. Image from the ICA Symposium, *Public Engagement and Impact, Articulating Value in Art and Design*, 2013. Panel discussion. From left to right – Ailbhe MacNabola (Design Council), Rosa Scoble (Brunel University), Helen Phebey (Yorkshire Sculpture Park), Stephanie James (Arts University Bournemouth) and Sarah Shalgosky (curator, Mead Gallery, University of Warwick).
4. Image from the ICA Symposium, *Public Engagement and Impact, Articulating Value in Art and Design*, 2013. Panel discussion. From left to right - Sarah Shalgosky (curator, Mead Gallery, University of Warwick), Paul Manners (Director NCCPE).
5. Image from the ICA Symposium, *Public Engagement and Impact, Articulating Value in Art and Design*, 2013. Plenary discussion, creating mind-maps around key words (‘impact’, ‘public engagement’, ‘value’).
6. Bob and Roberta Smith performative presentation at the ICA symposium *Public Engagement and Impact, Articulating Value in Art and Design*.
7. Bob and Roberta Smith, sketch featuring the words “Art Makes People Powerful”, created during presentation at the ICA symposium *Public Engagement and Impact, Articulating Value in Art and Design*.
8. University College London, example of an *Evaluation Toolkit*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to offer our sincere thanks and appreciation to the following people and organisations: Huddersfield Art Gallery and Kirklees Council Cultural and Leisure Services, including Ruth Gamble, Richard Butterfield, Grant Scanlon, Andrew Charlesworth and Kimyo Rickett; ICA, London, including Sumitra Upham and Karen Turner; colleagues from the University of Huddersfield, School of Art, Design and Architecture contributing to the ROTOR programme, including Dr Catriona McAra and Stephen Calcutt; and finally a special thank you to all who took part in the ICA symposium (May 2013), including the contributors to this publication.

PART ONE:

DEFINING THE LANDSCAPE: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IN CONTEXT

INTRODUCTION TO PART ONE

I SAY AESTHETICS = HUMAN BEING

STEVE SWINDELLS AND ANNA POWELL

“I say aesthetics = human being”.
—Joseph Beuys, 1973.¹

While serving a life sentence for murder in a Scottish jail, the artist Jimmy Boyle viewed photographs of Joseph Beuys’ performance with a coyote, entitled “I like America and America Likes Me” (1974), in which the artist had locked himself in a cage with a coyote for a week. After viewing the photos, Boyle commented on how the then current art (of the 1970s) was trying to engage with the whole of society but, he suggested, was failing to do so because of its subjectivity and conceptual positions which continued to alienate people. Boyle cites Beuys’ performance with the coyote – despite the conceptual nature of the practice – as a laudable attempt by Beuys to clarify his position regarding the role of the artist in society. Boyle went on to assert that:

The only worthwhile statement that has had any effect on me and others in my [prison] environment has been Joseph Beuys’ dialogue with a coyote. The others pass over the head of society and lose their impact [...].²

Boyle, confined in prison, recognised that Beuys’ work attempted to harness a group consciousness, while retaining a sense of individual freedom, as a way of attempting to resolve or emancipate people from social ills.

In his text “Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy” (2010) Gert Biesta, Professor of Educational Theory and Policy at the University of Luxembourg, is seriously concerned with the instrumentalisation of education. In particular he is interested in the

¹ Joseph Beuys, “I am searching for field character” (1973), in *Energy Plan for the Western man - Joseph Beuys in America*, ed. by C. Kuoni (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1993), 34.

² Caroline Tisdall, *Joseph Beuys: Coyote* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2008), 5.

idea that relentless auditing might be reframing educational practices, and asks whether the current fixation with accountability might in fact be exacerbating the normative question, “what is good education?” A key concern for Biesta is whether modes of measurement can be tamed and utilised as a way of effectively recognising “good education”, particularly in relation to democratic citizenship.³

So, do Beuys and Biesta have something in common or, indeed, might there be some commonality between Beuys’ relationship with the coyote and Biesta’s vision of a refined, more discursive measurement system? Beuys wasn’t trying to tame the coyote as such, merely to establish a dialogue with a sense of “the wild”, in order to rejuvenate humanity. Biesta does not suggest that the notion of measurement is wrong, but seemingly perverse in its current application and in need of dialogue. Beuys believed Western society had become spiritually bankrupt, and his coined motif “show your wounds” became an approach to transform society through what he called “Social Sculpture”: the shaping of society through the collective creativity of its members.⁴ Biesta is likewise concerned with the interrelationships between learning, identity and agency in people’s lives, and in the ways in which cultural citizenship and education might be able to respond to the complexities of contemporary societies. Their commonality, then, might reside in their mutual concern for promoting both dialogue and democratic citizenship, where Biesta’s ideas about the instrumentalisation of education through relentless auditing appear to bear out Beuys’ concern that Western society lacks meaningful agency, and continues to be spiritually bankrupt.

In 2011 we commenced a formal partnership with Huddersfield Art Gallery to offer a programme of art and design exhibitions featuring the work of our colleagues at the University of Huddersfield. Through this ongoing programme, we continue to ask the question of how art and design practices might engage, and impact upon the locale, and what we should be looking for in order to better understand this impact and its value. Biesta might have responded to these questions with, “it depends”; it depends whether all gazes can be invited, encouraged and equalised

³ Gert Biesta, *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy (Interventions: Education, Philosophy, and Culture)* (Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers, 2010), 1.

⁴ See Gregory L. Ulmer, *Electronic Monuments* (University of Minnesota Press: 2005), 27.

through the interpretation and mediation of “the exhibition”.⁵ Across the board, artists, curators, universities and research councils are now considering what it means to be “engaged”, and as the concept of engagement grows into different conversations, so the possibilities expand for embedding public engagement within research practices and processes. In the context of an art and design school within a university, we too are encountering a complex series of questions and ideas about the role of the university sector in contributing to cultural leadership within a town locale and its surrounding region. Some of these questions and ideas are addressed in this publication, and some will form the basis of future research.

As Vice Chancellors across the UK position their institutions’ identities and future trajectories in the context of national and international league tables, John Goddard (OBE)⁶, proposes the notion of the “civic” university as a “place embedded” institution; one that is committed to “place making”. The civic university has deep institutional connections with different social, cultural and economic spheres within its locality and beyond. In this respect, the hierarchical research ratings between “old” and “new” (post-92) universities⁷ need not concern the civic university, as practice-led research in the arts, design and humanities aligns them more closely with the broader impact mission of the Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE). Further, those academics with established lasting cultural partnerships might look to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) impact agenda as a long-awaited means of acknowledgement of their civic-centred work in their respective sectors.⁸ As cultural policy becomes an ever increasing component in economic and physical regeneration, what will be the cultural legacy of the university sector, with its expanding campuses and burgeoning building programmes for future generations? It is widely acknowledged that Vice Chancellors continue to face unprecedented challenges. However, perhaps, for those

⁵ See Gert Biesta, “Learning in Public Places: Civic Learning for the 21st Century” (*Inaugural Lecture*) accessed 3rd December 2013, <http://www.ugent.be/pp/socialeagogiek/nl/inaugural>

⁶ Emeritus Professor of Regional Development Studies at the Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies, Newcastle University.

⁷ Former polytechnics or colleges of higher education were given university status by the Conservative Government in 1992 through the Further and Higher Education Act.

⁸ The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the current system for assessing the quality of research in UK higher education institutions (HEIs), see: <http://www.ref.ac.uk>

who can look beyond the incessant demands of instrumentalisation, an opportunity exists to make a lasting contribution to the cultural legacies of the moment. In a period of austerity, which is felt no more intensely than in the arts and cultural sectors, there is now a clear need for universities to further their contribution to civic society, helping to sustain the cultural life of towns and cities across the UK. The sentiments in this publication have been inspired by the Arts Council England's *Achieving Great Art for Everyone*⁹ publication, and the subsequent second edition entitled *Great Art and Culture for Everyone: 10-Year Strategic Framework 2010-2020*.¹⁰ With universities, funding bodies, government bodies and cultural organisations such as the Arts Council all immersed in developing strategic frameworks towards 2020; so the rationale for this publication is to intimate and explore emerging points of convergence and mutual understanding within and across these different agendas.

Across the UK, academics in art and design fields, and arts and culture organisations, are increasingly facing pressure to demonstrate, by way of “knowledge exchange”¹¹ the impact and value of their research upon the public. With the difficult challenge of articulating this in a meaningful way and in an accessible language, and with “public engagement” being the current buzzword in both cultural and education sectors, the foundations of these debates include John Myerscough 1988¹² with regard to economic impact, and François Matarasso 1997¹³ in relation to social impact. “Public engagement”, in the context of art and design, is often used as an all-inclusive term for an assumed ability to engage with and positively affect society. Regardless of its common usage across the university and cultural sectors, however, it remains a contested concept. In relation to the REF assessment for HEIs, public engagement is considered one of the valid examples of research impact identified by HEFCE; a potentially valuable means of identifying the benefits to society of art and

⁹ Arts Council England, *Achieving Great Art for Everyone: A Strategic Framework for the Arts*, 2010, see

http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/media/uploads/achieving_great_art_for_everyone.pdf

¹⁰ Arts Council England, *Great Art and Culture for Everyone: 10-Year Strategic Framework 2010-2020*, 2nd edition, revised 2013.

¹¹ See “Knowledge Exchange and Impact”, *Research Councils UK*, at <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/kei/Pages/home.aspx>.

¹² John Myerscough, *The economic importance of the arts in Britain* (University of California: Policy Studies Institute, 1988).

¹³ François Matarasso, *USE OR ORNAMENT?, The social impact of participation in the arts* (Comedia, 1997).

design research activity. This publication presents “public engagement” as a flexible term for variant modes of relational impact, whatever form that impact might take.¹⁴ It is written in light of the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (DBIS)’ *Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research 2013*, whose set of principles sets out the significance and value of enabling effective public engagement with research,¹⁵ and which underlines the extent to which “engaging the public with research helps empower people, broadens attitudes and ensures that the work of universities and research organisations is relevant to today’s society”.¹⁶

Part One of this publication introduces and highlights the landscape of public engagement and cultural leadership in art and design higher education. The essays were conceived during a symposium which was hosted by the University of Huddersfield at the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, in the summer of 2013, entitled *Public Engagement and Impact: Articulating Value in Art and Design*.¹⁷ The symposium sought to explore and provide insight into mechanisms for overcoming socio-cultural barriers to public engagement. It was also both a response to, and an exploration of the concepts of “impact” and “cultural value”.¹⁸ In the spirit of public engagement it was our intention to make these proceedings accessible to a wide readership. It is hoped that they will be of interest to those working in both higher education and the cultural industries. Contributions are provided by a range of individuals including artists, designers, curators and academics. Their essays introduce a myriad of concerns, debates and viewpoints which together demonstrate the complexity of the landscape – which was another of the publication’s aims, and one of the things which at its outset caught, and continues to

¹⁴ See Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* (Paris: Les Presses du Réel, 2002).

¹⁵ See “Inspiration to Engage”, *Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research*, Research Councils UK, <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/scisoc/ConcordatforEngagingthePublicwithResearch.pdf>

¹⁶ See *Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research*, Research Councils UK, <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/Documents/publications/ConcordatInspiration.pdf> p. 5.

¹⁷ Hereafter referred to as the ICA symposium.

¹⁸ See the Arts and Humanities Research Council, *The AHRC Cultural Value Project* (http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/Funded-Research/Funded-themes-and-programmes/Cultural-Value-Project/Documents/Cultural_Value_Project.pdf), and <http://culturalvalueproject.wordpress.com/>), and REF2014, *Decisions On Assessing Research Impact*, March 2011 http://www.ref.ac.uk/media/ref/content/pub/decisionsonassessingresearchimpact/01_11.pdf.

catch our imagination. In this respect, the publication does not try to provide a comprehensive account on all fronts. Rather, it aims to introduce different perspectives on the public engagement and cultural leadership environment, and its challenges and complexities. We hope it will enable the reader to discover future focus and pursue further reading in relation to this multifaceted subject. A fundamental concern of this research, and one which was implemented through the ICA symposium is the nurturing of existing, and the development of new collaborations with cultural partners. This collection of essays also aims to mirror the symposium's ethos of collaboration, and it is hoped that it will provide a useful insight into some of the challenges and benefits of partnership working. In view of the escalating number of HEI-cultural organisation partnerships, we hope that this publication will also prove useful to those already working collaboratively.

A national perspective: ICA symposium

The University of Huddersfield formed its partnership with the ICA in 2012. The ICA has since worked collaboratively with the University in developing joint projects and research, designed to engage and promote greater fluidity and collaborative opportunities between university students, teaching staff and its public programmes. The ICA symposium addressed the ways in which recognisable impact, beyond academia, could be achieved through the effective delivery, measurement and dissemination of public engagement activity across art and design practices. The call for participation was framed around the following problematic questions:

- What do we mean when we discuss “public engagement” in relation to contemporary art and design?
- How do we overcome some of the issues arising as we are increasingly encouraged to quantify the value of contemporary art and design research, and its exhibition within the public realm?
- If we are able to create a framework for assessing this value, how then do we go about capturing, measuring and communicating it?
- How can this information be used to help plan for the future of art and design research in UK cultural and education sectors?

The ICA symposium was also born of a desire to tackle some of the often ambiguous language that surrounds these questions. It presented a platform for sharing ideas and good practice, while encouraging dynamic discussion through the inclusion of interactive and creative plenary

sessions. It also functioned reflexively; simultaneously providing – and requesting feedback on – a model of public engagement in itself. Speakers at the symposium were selected from a range of UK organisations and institutions, and they explored a breadth of approaches to public engagement, from critical explorations of the very term itself, to practical examples of its application and the challenges it can present. Each paper preceded an open floor discussion soliciting input from delegates, while a live Twitter feed and event questionnaires helped to draw together common threads and highlight areas of collective opinion. In addition to discussing strategies for public engagement, papers also included a debate which countered the perceived assumption that the public is disengaged from art: Based on her PhD and subsequent research at Yorkshire Sculpture Park (YSP), Curator Helen Pheby, and founding Director Peter Murray (CBE) traced the relationship between art and its publics, and the critical role public engagement and interpretation have played at YSP in relation to audience development. Their discussion included a consideration of how the engaged public is perceived and celebrated from a curator's perspective. Artist Bob and Roberta Smith's performative presentation also placed existing audiences at the core of his argument. Using art as both a medium for free speech and as a way of exploring new futures, Bob and Roberta Smith believes 'Art' allows people to get out of the trench of existence and to see how the land really lies, and his presentation underlined this, demonstrating how art can play a powerful role in democratic systems.

Sumitra Upham, Assistant Curator – Education at the ICA commented on the mutual benefits of the collaborative events, stating, "We were delighted to work collaboratively with the University of Huddersfield [...] [as] we continuously question notions of 'public', 'impact', and 'engagement' in relation to visual arts practice through our interdisciplinary programme of exhibitions, projects and events," adding:

Public engagement is increasingly becoming important for cultural rights, arts education, audience participation, social cohesion, and cultural diversity. As a public institution we recognise the importance of public engagement in the visual arts and are concerned with how we effectively communicate and learn from our public/s. We hope to develop further a programme that actively engages a diverse audience across the arts [...] responding to public feedback and societal concerns.¹⁹

¹⁹ Sumitra Upham, Associate Curator, Education, Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, January 2013.

Closer to home: ROTOЯ

Our interest in exploring public engagement – despite its currency within REF, and other cultural policy rhetoric – goes far beyond the seeming bureaucracies of governmental impact agendas. Rather, it stems from a sense of responsibility for bringing together members of the public with staff from the School of Art, Design and Architecture and their research, in order to enable “shared access to knowledge and information”.²⁰ This objective can be recognised in an initiative which developed from an ardent period of work with Huddersfield Art Gallery, entitled “ROTOЯ: transdisciplinary dialogue and debate”. ROTOЯ is an on-going programme of exhibitions, public events and talks, and acts as a platform for disseminating and communicating practice-based-research, showcasing a community of artists, designers and curators whose ideas and connective practices migrate and span art and design production. Our intention with ROTOЯ is to locate the interpretation of the exhibition content at the pivot between academic research and public engagement, where points of intersection are considered and debated from multiple perspectives. To initiate ROTOЯ, a two year Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed between the University of Huddersfield and Kirklees Culture and Leisure Services. The MOU was founded upon the Arts Council England (ACE)’s strategic framework 2010²¹ to help in the successful development of conversations between the University, the Gallery and the public. The ROTOЯ programme also reflects elements of the University’s aforementioned partnership with the ICA, namely in its innovative and challenging approach to visual arts programming, as well as its incorporation of contemporary music, international cinema, performance, live arts, talks and debates, all of which provide exemplary models of public engagement. Of particular relevance to ROTOЯ is the ICA’s Student Forum which encourages long-term engagement between the organisation and emerging practitioners. One of its key aims is to “interrogate, subvert and re-define traditional pedagogical terminology in response to academic research and public engagement with art, within the

²⁰ Nicola Dandridge, Chief Executive of Universities UK, speaking at *The Cultural Knowledge Ecology - Universities, Arts and Cultural Partnerships - a one-day conference*, 5th February 2014, Liverpool John Moores University.

²¹ Arts Council England, *Achieving Great Art for Everyone: A Strategic Framework for the Arts*, 2010, see http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/media/uploads/achieving_great_art_for_everyone.pdf.

context of an arts institution”.²² ROTOЯ mirrors some of these elements and, as with the ICA partnership, provides opportunities for creative exchange, investigation and discussion between practitioners and audiences, as well as a “fruitful dialogue with students engaged in critical thinking around contemporary practice.”²³ Alongside the ROTOЯ programme, we also decided to focus our concurrent edition of the School’s journal; *radar 4*, on some of the questions posed above. *radar* is the Review of Art, Design and Architecture Research, and in *radar 4* we aimed to present reflexive a means of querying different understandings of the terms “public”, “engagement”, “impact” and the “contemporary” in relation to art and design. *radar 4* aims to:

[...] address recent trends and issues in the social, political and cultural life of the University, while tracing their relationship to those art, design and architecture practices happening beyond the University [...]. The current issue of *radar* situates itself at the interface between the research-orientated arena of the University and the broader [...] public sphere.²⁴

ROTOЯ has now established its own identity and presence in the Kirklees community and responses from visitors to the exhibitions have been very encouraging, demonstrating people to be taking something positive from their experience of encountering art and design research in a municipal gallery environment. Interestingly, from a research perspective, it has been difficult for visitors – and equally for us – to be able to articulate this; to put into words exactly what caused or comprised the positive experiences they refer to in written and verbal feedback. We want to be able to further (understand) our contribution to culture in Huddersfield, and so this problem – one which is broadly prevalent across the museums and galleries sector – is influencing our current and future research.²⁵

²² Sumitra Upham, Associate Curator, Education, speaking at the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, January 2013.

²³ Sumitra Upham, Associate Curator, Education, speaking at the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, January 2013.

²⁴ *radar*, ed. by Catriona McAra and Anna Powell (Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield Press, 2014).

²⁵ Future research plans include the development of a project which will consider the ways in which empirical psychology might be used to test the immediate experience of art and design upon the viewer, in the context of its impact upon society. See Rolf Reber, “Art in Its Experience: Can Empirical Psychology Help Assess Artistic Value?” *Leonardo*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (August 2008): 367-372.

Back to the future: STEAM

In her 2009 paper, “Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts” Susan Galloway proposed that:

[...] despite the ubiquitous calls, the political likelihood and ethical justification for investing substantial resources in large-scale longitudinal evaluations [for measuring the social impact of the arts] remains slim. [...] A key question remains how best to learn from the aggregation of smaller studies.²⁶

In 2009 it would have been difficult for Galloway and others to predict just how prominent and problematic the question of measuring “impact” would be in the lead up to the REF2014. At the point of writing the outcomes of the REF exercise – in relation to the impact of art and design upon society – remains unknown. It will be interesting for those involved to learn whether post-REF analyses of impact case studies will, collectively, be taken as an opportunity to meet Galloway’s suggestion of aggregation. Beyond REF, another scheme now within the current sights of those working in academia is *Horizon 2020*, which is:

[...] the biggest EU Research and Innovation programme ever, with nearly €80 billion of funding available over 7 years (2014 to 2020) – in addition to the private investment that this money will attract. [...] EU funding for research [...] [is] seen as a means to drive economic growth and create jobs, Horizon 2020 has the political backing of Europe’s leaders and the Members of the European Parliament. They [...] put [Horizon 2020] at the heart of the EU’s blueprint for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and jobs. By coupling research and innovation, Horizon 2020 is helping to achieve this with its emphasis on excellent science, industrial leadership and tackling societal challenges. The goal is to ensure Europe produces world-class science, removes barriers to innovation and makes it easier for the public and private sectors to work together in delivering innovation.²⁷

It is notable, however, that the arts and humanities do not feature prominently within this substantial and broad-reaching incentive for driving economic growth, especially considering the significant contribution

²⁶ Susan Galloway, “Theory-Based Evaluation and the Social Impact of the Arts”, in *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (June 2009), 143.

²⁷ *Horizon 2020: The EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation*, accessed 12th January 2014 <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/what-horizon-2020>.

of the cultural sector to EU economies.²⁸ Similarly, the organisation Arts & Business,²⁹ as well as a European Commission Executive Summary, found that the growth of the cultural and creative sector in Europe from 1999 to 2003 was 12.3% higher than the growth of each nation's general economy. In 2003 the cultural and creative sector generated a turnover of more than € 654 billion, which in 2003 amounted to 2.6% of the EU GDP.³⁰ The European Parliamentary Research Service noted in 2013:

The economic performance of the cultural and creative sectors in the EU account for 3.3% of GDP and employ 6.7 million people (3 % of total employment). Figures are also important if one considers fashion and high-end industries, which account for 3% of the EU GDP each and employ respectively 5 and 1 million people.³¹

Nicola Dandridge, Chief Executive of Universities UK, notes the extent of the arts' contribution to the economy when she states, "The arts are absolutely not marginal – they are core business".³² John Maynard Keynes, arguably one of the most influential economists of the 20th century and founder of the Arts Council of Great Britain, also recognised the value of state investment in the arts.³³ It was largely Keynes who, back

²⁸ See *Horizon 2020: The EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation*, accessed 12th January 2014

<http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/what-horizon-2020>.

²⁹ Arts and Business, *The value of the Creative Industries & Culture*, 2007/08, 70. Accessed 17th February 2014

http://www.artsandbusinessni.org.uk/documents/2012-05-16-14-04-07-70-09Jul_REI_PICS0708_Chap3.pdf.

³⁰ "Mapping out the economy of culture in figures", in *The Economy of Culture in Europe, Study prepared for the European Commission* (Directorate-General for Education and Culture), 65, accessed 12th January 2013

http://ec.europa.eu/culture/pdf/doc887_en.pdf.

³¹ "European Cultural & Creative Sectors as Sources for Economic Growth & Jobs", *European Parliamentary Research Service*, 17th April 2013, accessed 15th June 2013 <http://epthinktank.eu/2013/04/17/european-cultural-creative-sectors-as-sources-for-economic-growth-jobs/>.

³² Nicola Dandridge, Chief Executive of Universities UK, speaking at *The Cultural Knowledge Ecology - Universities, Arts and Cultural Partnerships - a one-day conference*, 5th February 2014, Liverpool John Moores University.

³³ John Maynard Keynes, 1st Baron Keynes, CB, FBA (5 June 1883 – 21 April 1946). His ideas are the basis for the school of thought known as Keynesian economics, which advocates a mixed economy, which consists predominantly of private sector, but where there exists a role for government intervention during recessions.

in the 1940s, conceived of the model of mixed economy funding for the arts that has been adopted around the world today. How then, today, do we ensure the arts and STEM³⁴ are given equal regard, when often the arts are overshadowed by the assumed greater social and economic benefits of STEM? One scheme currently being adopted in the United States, and of particular relevance to innovation within science and technology, is the inclusion of art and design practices into STEM; where “STEM + Art = STEAM.”³⁵ STEAM has the potential to open new spaces for thought and debate, where art and science are not considered mutually exclusive but inextricably connected.

True public engagement in art and design encompasses all of society, which necessarily includes scientists, engineers, technologists and industrialists, as well as artists, curators and designers. Maintaining a vibrant cultural infrastructure enables lateral thought and creative thinking. This is not to suggest that public engagement within the cultural sector is the only facilitator for inclusivity and resolving societal needs, neither is it the only barometer for measuring public thinking. Nevertheless, large scale European research funds have an essential role to play in addressing questions of individual and collective identity across Europe, in particular where political agendas on civic cohesion are concerned. Take, for example, youth unemployment. Relatively, across Europe the creative and cultural sectors are responsible for employing a high percentage of young people. Between 2008 and 2011 growth rates in employment were evidenced in the cultural and creative sectors,³⁶ and yet “youth unemployment in Europe has reached 23.8%” to date.³⁷

Taking Galloway’s suggestion that we need to aggregate a breadth of research to find an effective way of assessing the social impact of art and design upon society, and Arts & Business’s views on the wider economic significance of the cultural industries, herein might lie an opportunity for future European research funds. These interrelated positions and, indeed,

³⁴ Science, technology, engineering and maths.

³⁵ “STEAM” is “a movement championed by Rhode Island School of Design (RISD) and widely adopted by institutions, corporations and individuals.” See <http://stemtosteam.org/>.

³⁶ “European Cultural & Creative Sectors as Sources for Economic Growth & Jobs”, *European Parliamentary Research Service*, 17th April 2013, accessed 15th June 2013 <http://epthinktank.eu/2013/04/17/european-cultural-creative-sectors-as-sources-for-economic-growth-jobs/>.

³⁷ Kate Hodge, “Beating Unemployment in Europe: Careers advice surgery”, in *Guardian Professional* (2nd July 2013), accessed 5th September 2013 <http://careers.theguardian.com/unemployment-in-europe-careers-advice>.

the essays contained within this publication, reiterate the extent to which future debates around measuring cultural engagement in the arts need to equate both its social and economic impacts, as well as recognising the significance of the arts both *to*, as well as *alongside*, STEM.

The essays

The Cultural Leadership Handbook (2011) provides a comprehensive definition of public engagement, which it describes as:

The interaction between an organisation and its audience when it mounts a performance, stages an exhibition, issues a publication or provides a service of some kind –in other words, what it does when it performs its self-defined function as a cultural organisation. More and more, this is a two-way process: it is launched by the organisation, but has to be genuinely responsive to the needs and opinions of the audience. To really work, this engagement has to be judged successful by both the organisation and its public. And that will depend not only on the competence of the organisation and its willingness to respond, but the creative way in which it approaches that engagement.³⁸

The following papers address these ideas from a variety of viewpoints. In her essay “A Holistic Approach to Valuing Our Culture”, Dr Claire Donovan, Reader in Assessing Research Impact and member of the Health Economics Research Group at Brunel University, provides a summary of a programme of work carried out for an AHRC/ESRC³⁹ Public Service Placement Fellowship entitled “Measuring Cultural Value (Phase Two)” based at the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Donovan’s essay provides a detailed analysis of the issues addressed in her report; which engaged directly with representatives of the cultural sector.

Sarah Shalgosky is Curator of the University of Warwick’s Art Gallery – MEAD, and Professor Stephanie James is Associate Dean and Head of the School of Visual Arts at the Arts University Bournemouth, as well as a practising artist. In their essay, entitled “Peer Pressure”, Shalgosky and James discuss the significant expansion of university art galleries across the UK within the last five years. With reference to 2013 conferences at the Universities of Cork, Warwick and Bournemouth which critically examined the roles of the university art gallery, they explore the capacity

³⁸ Robert Hewison and John Holden, *The Cultural Leadership Handbook: How to Run a Creative Organization* (Surrey: Gower, 2011), 180.

³⁹ Arts and Humanities Research Council/Economic and Social Research Council.

for these spaces to become embedded in a range of strategic objectives, including the development of research impact; supporting the delivery of a high calibre student experience; widening participation and improving the university's overall profile.

Paul Manners, Associate Professor in Public Engagement at the University of West England, and Director of the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement presents his essay entitled "Public engagement, impact, and the 21st Century University: a guide for the bewildered". In this essay he teases out the different meanings and motivations which underpin current trends relating to public engagement which are currently high on the agendas of university funders and policy makers, as well as across the wider cultural and public spheres.

References

- Araeen, Rasheed *et al* (eds.), *The Third Text Reader: on Art, Culture and Theory*, (London & New York: Continuum, 2002).
- Arts and Business, *The value of the Creative Industries & Culture*, 2007/08, 70. Accessed 17th February 2014.
- Arts and Humanities Research Council, *The AHRC Cultural Value Project* (http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/Funded-Research/Funded-themes-and-programmes/Cultural-Value-Project/Documents/Cultural_Value_Project.pdf).
- Arts Council England, *Achieving Great Art for Everyone: A Strategic Framework for the Arts*, 2010.
- Arts Council England, *Great Art and Culture for Everyone: 10-Year Strategic Framework 2010-2020*, 2nd edition, revised 2013.
- Biesta, Gert, "Learning in Public Places: Civic Learning for the 21st Century" (*Inaugural Lecture*) accessed 3rd December 2013, <http://www.ugent.be/pp/sociale-agogiek/nl/inaugural>
- Biesta, Gert, *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy (Interventions: Education, Philosophy, and Culture)* (Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers, 2010).
- Bourriaud, Nicolas, *Relational Aesthetics* (Paris: Les Presses du Réel, 2002).
- Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research*, Research Councils UK. *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (June 2009).
- Dandridge, Nicola, Chief Executive of Universities UK, speaking at *The Cultural Knowledge Ecology - Universities, Arts and Cultural Partnerships - a one-day conference*, 5th February 2014, Liverpool John Moores University.
- European Parliamentary Research Service*, 17th April 2013.
- Guardian Professional* (2nd July 2013) <http://careers.theguardian.com/unemployment-in-europe-careers-advice>.
- Hewison, Robert and Holden, John, *The Cultural Leadership Handbook: How to Run a Creative Organization* (Surrey: Gower, 2011).
- Horizon 2020: The EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation*, <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/what-horizon-2020>.
- Knowledge Exchange and Impact, *Research Councils UK*, <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/kei/Pages/home.aspx>.
- Kuoni, C., (ed.), *Energy Plan for the Western man - Joseph Beuys in America*, (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1993).

- Leonardo*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (August 2008).
- Matarasso, François, *USE OR ORNAMENT?, The social impact of participation in the arts* (Comedia, 1997).
- Matzner, Florian (ed.), *Public Art: A Reader*, ed. (Germany: Hantje Cantz Publishers, 2004).
- McAra, Catriona and Powell, Anna (eds.), *radar*, Vol. 4 (Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield Press, 2014) .
- Mulgan, Geoff and Leadbetter, Charlie, *Systems Innovation: Discussion Paper* (Nesta, January 2013).
- Myerscough, John, *The economic importance of the arts in Britain* (University of California: Policy Studies Institute, 1988).
- REF2014, *Decisions On Assessing Research Impact*, March 2011.
- The Economy of Culture in Europe, Study prepared for the European Commission* (Directorate-General for Education and Culture), 65, 2013.
- Tisdall, Caroline, *Joseph Beuys: Coyote* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2008).
- Ulmer, Gregory L., *Electronic Monuments* (University of Minnesota Press: 2005).
- Upham, Sumitra, Associate Curator, Education, Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, by email, January 2013.
- <http://stemtosteam.org/>.

CHAPTER ONE

CREATING #HAVOC: A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO VALUING OUR CULTURE

CLAIRE DONOVAN

A central theme of the symposium *Public Engagement and Impact: Articulating Value in Art and Design* was the question of how the cultural sector might most effectively respond to increased bureaucratic pressure to supply evidence of the value of culture. This essay proposes a holistic solution, based on the findings of a research project which directly engaged with the cultural sector's views on the idea of measuring cultural value.¹ The project was Phase Two of an initiative funded by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), and its end product was a report to the DCMS, *A Holistic Approach to Valuing Our Culture*.²

This essay provides a summary of the findings of the Phase One report, which recommended that the cultural sector should embrace the use of a

¹ The essay is based on research conducted during a Public Service Placement Fellowship “Measuring Cultural Value (Phase 2)” funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), grant reference ES/J008265/1. The views and opinions expressed in the essay do not necessarily reflect the official views of the AHRC, ESRC or DCMS. An earlier version, “Is there a third way? Going beyond instrumentalism versus intrinsic value”, was presented at a St. George's House Consultation (in partnership with the Institute of Ideas) on *The Value of Culture and the Crisis of Judgement*, Windsor Castle, 11-12 December 2012.

² The report's original title was *A Holistic Approach to Valuing Culture* but was modified when a Twitter user suggested adding the word *Our* as this not only captured the inclusive nature of the report's recommendations but also produced the acronym HAVOC (or #havoc).

specific range of economic valuation techniques.³ It also underlines some serious ideological and practical shortcomings with applying these measures: the most conspicuous being that the costs and expertise involved are beyond the means of most cultural sector organisations. It goes on to outline the Phase Two work that sought to test the principle of adopting an additional range of alternative approaches (quantitative, qualitative and narrative), which were accessible to the whole cultural sector. The essay then offers a brief account of the cultural value debate, which concerns long-running conceptual wrangling over the instrumental or economic value of culture versus its intrinsic or “spiritual” value. It explains how, by finding unanimous cultural sector approval for a holistic approach to valuing culture, the Phase Two project was able to transcend this divide. It maintains that a holistic approach to measuring cultural value can capture the value that is unique to the cultural sector; can be applied to the full range and scale of cultural sector organisations including economic and non-economic data; and can be used to inform funding decisions at local, regional and national levels. Finally, it concludes that the time is right for the cultural sector to press for funding agencies and government to adopt a more meaningful, inclusive, and holistic approach valuing our culture.

Measure for Measure⁴

The Phase One report *Measuring the Value of Culture* argued that,

...the cultural sector will need to use the tools and concepts of economics to fully state their benefits in the prevailing language of policy appraisal and evaluation.⁵

³ Dave O’Brien, *Measuring the value of culture: a report to the Department for Culture Media and Sport* (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 15th December 2010).

⁴ The symposium talk upon which the essay is based was accompanied by images projected onto a cinema screen. The first was a picture of the back of a £20 note (which depicts the balcony scene from *Romeo and Juliet* with a pensive-looking Shakespeare in the foreground) to symbolise the intrinsic/economic divide present in the cultural value debate. Each section of the talk was accompanied by images representing titles of well-known Shakespeare plays, including products and artefacts such as CD covers, book covers, and a variety of posters for films, stage plays, festivals, and Shakespeare in the park. The essay uses the play titles for its subheadings. The animation used at the symposium can be found online at <http://bit.ly/1a9vzvD>.