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Foreword

The Higher Education Academy has always viewed teaching, the curriculum and assessment as central to the student learning experience. The Academy was pleased to support the Group for Learning in Art and Design (GLAD) in their 2007 conference *The student experience in art, design and media education: the drivers for change*.

Conference delegates were invited to represent UK and international academic practitioners and managers across a range of art, design and media disciplines and subjects. They used open space technology to identify broad drivers of change: policy, pedagogy, research, leadership and management. These are striking for their congruence with the forthcoming Academy conference in 2008 on the subject of Transforming the Student Experience – which will engage with the six broad themes of policy and leadership; student feedback and engagement; learning and teaching; employment, entrepreneurship and recruitment; internationalisation; and assessment.

The GLAD Conference participants produced seven chapters that consider, amongst other things, the types of institutions that might deliver art, design and media education in the future; styles of leadership appropriate to the disciplines; how practice-based learning influences the learning environment; the implications of internationalisation; and pedagogical models appropriate to future developments. In these chapters, we are invited to consider new teaching strategies, the types of leadership and institutional structures that might facilitate students’ learning, and the implications of internationalisation for curriculum design.

Taken as whole, the book offers a well-researched and informed view of the subjects from leading contemporary figures in higher education and will be a valuable, and at times provocative, invitation to all academics to consider future models for enhancing the student experience in the future decades. On a practical level, GLAD will use these chapters as trigger papers at their next conference, where academics and researchers will be invited to consider how teaching methods and styles might be adopted to support the student experience in art, design and media in the future.

I am delighted that the Academy has been instrumental in supporting this work and recommend this book to all those with an interest in the future of art, design and media education.

Paul Ramsden
Chief Executive
Higher Education Academy
Preface

Supported by the Higher Education Academy’s Subject Centre for Art, Design, Media this conference assembled academic practitioners from around the world, so presenting a unique opportunity for sustained and focused discussions. Organised by the Group for Learning in Art and Design (GLAD) it used ‘open space’ to form agendas that challenged delegates to review research and policy issues within the global context of art, design and media higher education. The debates ranged from widening participation and the international curriculum to creative industry growth and the shift of developed nations to a knowledge economy. These issues, their relationships and potential impacts on teaching, learning and the curriculum were considered in the context of changes from elite to mass education in the tertiary sector, radical changes in the ways education is procured along with the move to managed learning environments.

The delegates worked in teams to explore and debate ideas. They reviewed the available literature, including research papers, policy documents and publications from sector agencies, and drew on their own extensive experience as teachers, curriculum developers, researchers and managers to articulate the field and to propose ways in which we could move forwards. Some chapters are propositional and others reflective and summary. They range across issues as diverse as research and creativity, policy development, succession planning, internationalisation, collaborative practices and emotion in the studio. Some chapters invite the reader to consider new approaches to familiar problems, others propose strategies optimising emerging opportunities. For example, recent work in areas of business and enterprise has shown that, contrary to popular opinion, there has been growth in the focus and opportunity for students to participate in work-based learning. Across the subjects there is also a greater emphasis on research, and sustaining research infrastructures and cultures — but there are also concerns that this is dividing our faculties and promoting greater distance from the world of work.

And there are new challenges too — not only for the current managers and leaders in the field of art, design and media education but for those who will take these roles in the future. The growing culture of compliance and audit could overwhelm teachers and curriculum managers and suppress their capacity to deliver high quality discovery learning. Finally there are shifting expectations of our graduates and there is change in the situations in which they learn and work. Globalisation is a challenge and an opportunity. We are challenged to prepare graduates for work in a global economy and to inflect this into an internationalised curriculum. This demand drives change, not only in curriculum content but in new situations that acknowledge novel productive relationships between learner, teacher and consumers.

The chapters in this book draw together a wide range of evidence, opinion and discussion from research, policy and practice in learning and teaching. In doing so they emanate from a set of related disciplines in the higher education sector that are mature,
reflective and abound with lively debate on contemporary issues affecting practice in education and creative and cultural enterprise. The disciplines of art, design and media embody some of the most innovative and effective teaching and learning practices in the sector that are still in a process of articulation. This conference has made a significant contribution to the task of excavating and explicating these distinctive practices for them to be more widely shared and discussed. So this book will provide a valuable resource to help sustain the debate and, hopefully, be read by others within higher education and beyond — offering new insights and pointers to the ways in which the creative and cultural industries may develop. I am pleased that the Subject Centre has supported the GLAD conference in 2007 and I am looking forward to the 2008 conference where this book will underpin continuing debates on the range of issues it presents.

Professor Bruce Brown
Co-Director
Art, Design and Media Subject Centre
Higher Education Academy
and
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)
University of Brighton
Keynote: Confident, connected but never complacent

I was honoured to be invited to address the GLAD’07 Conference in Cambridge, and mildly amused to find that my contribution would be the only invited paper. I was more intrigued to discover that participants included fifty of the art and design higher education sector’s leaders and that they were going to use that week in Cambridge to shape their thoughts on the student experience into the collaborative production of an edited book. After some scrupulous planning, rigorous peer review and editing, I’m pleased to see the finished production and witness the influence of some of the provocative ideas we proposed and discussed at the opening of the conference.

What makes an impact is the range of experience and international prominence of the authors and their ability to run with and develop the issues of concern to the sector in many different ways. Themes in the keynote address are unashamedly reflected in this book of the conference, mostly because they are genuine concerns and stimuli to the sector. I would encourage specialist department heads and other university managers actively to consider their position on some of the themes explored here, to agree, to take action or to contest their arguments.

I would like to reiterate some of the themes from the opening address to the conference, partly to introduce some of the themes which are contained in this edited volume but also to air some views which still remain contested territory for the sector.

Skills and the creative industries

The journey represented by the development of the art and design sector in the UK has been fast, frantic and a success. Our society has from time immemorial been obsessed with academic rather than vocational education. But finally there are signs that education with a vocational bias is becoming valued; that higher quality vocational qualifications are becoming available and that young people are being encouraged to take seriously vocational options though programmes like specialist diplomas. One obvious danger however is that the new recognition of all things vocational becomes preoccupied with the utilitarian skills based agenda — and that as a consequence the sector is cajoled towards narrowly based skills programmes.

There is evidence from our experience that successful designers and creative artists are not just rich in technical skills but have the ability to think conceptually; to understand the context in which they work and possess the capacity to challenge accepted norms. These necessary high-level intellectual skills are seriously in danger of now being undervalued by a skills lobby which is seeking to position itself between government, the funding agencies and the sector.

The irony of this development is not just that the traditionally cherished academic/intellectual skills may be undervalued but also that a sector that has done
more than most to align itself with and stay close to industry is being caricatured by
some as detached and unable to deliver the competencies required by business. It is
perhaps time to remind the new skills police that the creative industries are hugely
successful because of, not in spite of, the art, design and communication learning sector.
And the task will be achieved more effectively if we are to mobilise some of those in the
industry who appreciate the contribution which this learning community has made.

None of this is to suggest that we, the specialist institutions, can afford to be
complacent about our relevance. We do need to find yet stronger ways of involving
business in the design and development of curricula and in the evaluation of programme
 provision. And we need to be more radical and imaginative in breaking down the
barriers between subject disciplines reflecting what is happening in the non-academic
world beyond graduation. And if we fail to do that we not only fail to equip our
students for life after graduation but we turn our backs on new opportunities for
creativity within the sector which derive from new connections and collaborations. So
we cannot afford to be complacent.

But we do need to be confident enough to say on occasions that our mission is not
solely to fuel the success of our creative industries. Like any other academic institutions
we exist to push forward the boundaries of knowledge and enable our students through
education to fulfil their personal potential in all aspects of their lives. We need to be
confident enough also to say that success for us is not being accepted as just another
university in the way that Coldstream suggested all those years ago because we are
different and proud to be so. Our models of teaching, learning and research should
never slavishly mirror other subjects and we should forever remain rooted in practice.

**International**

Many universities are successful at recruiting international students, at the University of
the Arts London they now represent 30% of the student body. I have consistently said
their presence is not just financially advantageous. They also crucially bring the cultural
diversity which so often sparks creativity which is a central reason why we need to
become more, not less, international. But in addition, our subjects are increasingly
defined within a global environment and we need to be perceived to be international
institutions if we are to remain relevant. And, of course, recruiting large numbers of
international students does not make us international. We need many more international
faculty to influence our curricula so that it is not so western centric and to provide role
models for students — domestic as well as international. My belief is that we are still too
introspective, too risk averse and receive too little support from our respective
governments to establish our international credentials.

**Leadership**

There is a resistance towards management as a discipline (in this sector and others
within academe). It may be because we have not done enough to develop leadership
management skills alongside subject knowledge. It may be because we remain a
relatively small self-contained sector which does not easily import people who might
have transferable skills. Whatever the reasons, the problem is real and we need to do
more to tackle it. If art and design pedagogy needs to raise its profile higher then so does the scholarship of art and design leadership and the efforts of some organisations, notably the European League of Institutes of the Art (ELIA), worthy though they have been, have not yet made a significant contribution to solving the problem. More development opportunities for staff are needed; more incentives; more signs that good leadership is recognised and valued. More empirical research and scholarship is needed focusing on the particular needs of a leader in creative arts institutions.

My heart is still lifted when I see leaders who are passionate about their subject and who encourage others to proclaim their passion; leaders who celebrate success and measure themselves by achievement; who really focus on students and develop effective teams. Leadership in the arts is about much more than counting beans and we need to develop great leaders, not hope that they will materialise through some process of osmosis.

**Schools**

I am not sure that we do anywhere near enough to work with and influence the schools system to ensure that the creative arts and creative skills are properly represented on the curriculum. The reality is that outside of design and technology our subject areas are no longer well represented or well taught in primary or secondary schools. The resulting problem is that too few young people leave school with significant creative skills, or indeed an appreciation of the arts.

**Widening access**

We all accept that too few students from non-traditional families gain entry into our institutions. Of course there is no simple answer but I do still detect some complacency and I do observe a lot of well-intentioned energy-consuming activity which is pretty unlikely to change the face of our student body. So a challenge for the sector is to try and focus our efforts on initiatives which are likely to make a difference and stop funding some of the others.

**Student experience**

We all know that the performance of the sector in the early National Student Survey (NSS UK) has, with honourable exceptions been pretty lamentable. And although we may all have good cause increasingly to question the reliability of that data we would be foolish not to focus on improving the experience of our students, simply because however good or bad it is the successful universities of the 21st century will be those which are continually improving that experience. Central to that experience is the quality of teaching and learning and our particular challenge is to ensure that the very many part-time teachers we employ can teach to standards which does require some training and accreditation. But the student experience is also about the way we manage and organise our programmes; the quality of our resources; the effectiveness of our communications; the fairness of our admissions process; the quality of feedback and assessment; the availability of social and recreational and the perceived relevance of the curricula.
Enterprise
We have to acknowledge that this generation and their parents will be more than ever concerned about value for academic investment and the availability of career opportunities which means that we should be enhancing the support we provide for students not just during their period of study but on graduation too. If we are to thrive in the future this kind of initiative is not a desirable extra but part of the core package that we offer to students joining our colleges. A student’s relationship with us is one which starts with an undergraduate/further education experience, but it is ideally a relationship for life. We can play a vital part in mobilising networks of artists and designers to provide support for our graduates from a community which is, by and large, more aware of the need to develop neutral support mechanisms than most others.

Interdisciplinarity
Interdisciplinarity is the ambition of most universities. But for us it has a special importance for two reasons. The first is the need for us to reflect the way in which creative businesses are breaking down the boundaries between disciplines if we are to stay relevant. The blurring of the lines between graphic design and animation; between fine art, textiles and fashion and between sculpture and ceramics, all illustrate the point. But the second reason for us to seek out interdisciplinarity is to guard against our own isolation. The fact that many of us exist as specialist creative arts institutions increases the need for us to seek partnerships beyond the world of the creative arts.

Self critical cultures
I have referred to the danger of complacency and I want to stress the importance of the sector and its individual institutions developing a strong culture of self-critical appraisal. All of the successful people and institutions I have encountered in my life demonstrate belief, confidence and a passion for being self-critical. They are never satisfied with their performance and, whilst able to celebrate the successes of the past, quickly revert to a focus on the future. Maybe we have a tendency to be positive and optimistic but without becoming excessively pessimistic we need to demonstrate the same questioning approach to our work that we demand of our students.

All of the various challenges I referred to are not about saving the art and design sector from impending doom; they are about building on the huge progress which has been made during the past 25 years.

This book reflects on the discussions held at the conference, including how best to take advantage of the opportunities we do have. As such it should be expansive, imaginative and fun. We represent and teach subjects which enable people to create, to explore, be joyous and enjoy a better quality of life. We should be equally creative and passionate about our vocation!

Sir Michael Bichard
Rector, University of the Arts London
Chapter 1

How the GLAD’07 Conference happened

Linda Drew
University of the Arts London
Chair of the Planning Committee
My experience of the Cambridge Conference 2003

It all started with a letter ‘out of the blue’ from someone at Cambridge University in late 2002. How did they know me? I don’t know anybody at Cambridge — do I? The letter was to the point; I had been invited to a week-long conference to discuss issues of engagement in academic development in higher education, because of my experience as an academic developer and my role (in 2002), leading the Subject Centre for Art, Design and Communication at the University of Brighton. The form of address and the topic interested me; I had to promise to book out a whole week in September of 2003 and to stay committed to the idea despite the advance notice. The conference organisers contacted me regularly after I’d made my expression of interest and I was hooked, being sent a pack of ‘trigger papers’ to read before the event made the theme and process seem even more exciting.

The week was great, one of those ‘you had to be there’ events, stimulating company, fantastic organisation, serious and distracting debate and all in the beautiful surrounds of Cambridge in September, college grounds and lawns, water lapping at the backs, and the sound of feet on cobble stones. The group I worked with during the week collaborated after the conference to present our paper to two conferences (Breslow et al, 2004a and 2004b) concerned with the scholarship of teaching, one in San Diego and one in London. When the book of the Cambridge Conference 2003 was published (Elvidge, 2004) there was yet more evidence that this approach had been very fruitful for a group of 50+ academics from across the globe.

Convincing GLAD to do a ‘Cambridge Conference’

In early autumn each year the Group for Learning in Art and Design (GLAD) get together for a residential discussion session known as the GLAD Awayday. I was hosting the GLAD Awayday in September 2005 at Chelsea College of Art and Design where I was then the Dean of Academic Development. We had invited Professor Paul Ramsden, the then recently appointed Chief Executive of the Higher Education Academy to join us for our discussions.

The student experience – common ground

We discussed the National Student Survey (NSS) with passion and energy, we considered the issues in art and design education which seemed to indicate that student experience, particularly of assessment and assessment feedback was worrying. I introduced the idea that we might use the Cambridge Conference idea to take a ‘think-tank’ approach to this and other issues related to the student experience. When Paul seemed inspired by the idea, enough to offer funding jointly with the Subject Centre (ADM-HEA), and GLAD colleagues enthused, we realised we had a different type of GLAD conference to plan.
Discussions with Liz Elvidge of Cambridge University

I arranged a lunch with Liz Elvidge, instigator of the Cambridge Conference 2003, to discuss the organisation issues and the suitability of the conference model for our needs. We concluded our discussions both enthusiastic about the possibilities and also fully aware of some of the potential pitfalls. Liz encouraged me to pursue discussions with the Cambridge based company who had managed the organisation of the 2003 conference (and subsequently another in 2005 jointly with the Leadership Foundation). We concluded funding discussions with the Higher Education Academy to subsidise each place on the week-long residential event. We also had discussions with the Council for Higher Education in Art and Design (CHEAD) to contribute toward the production of this book, a key outcome of the conference.

The concept of the Cambridge Conference

I hadn’t realised until I attended the conference in 2003 that the idea of a presentation-free conference is not new. A well-established conference in medical education has been running for more than twenty years (Wakeford, 1985) and has maintained momentum by identifying new themes whilst retaining the ‘think-tank’, presentation-free format. The significant features of this model are:

1. Choose a topic of high importance.

2. Invite a small, preferably research orientated, group of people knowledgeable about this topic from around the world.

3. Add a group of ‘users’ or policy shapers.

4. Supplement them with good facilitation and working conditions.

5. Add a sprinkling of what might be described as ‘new researchers’ or ‘young blood’ in the field, to keep more esoteric delegates’ feet on the ground.

6. Set the delegates some specific goals. These usually include reviewing the ‘state of the art’ of a particular area, commenting on what research might collectively say about these issues, generating further questions for investigation and encouraging the delegates to publish their findings (Hays, et al, 2000, p. 783).

The facilitation approach used at GLAD’07 was derived from open space technology (Owen, 1997). OST is essentially a methodology or ‘tool’, which can be adapted to a range of contexts, for example, meetings, conferences, staff development events. It encourages participants to engage actively and take responsibility for the process, hence drawing comparisons with ‘student-centred’ and ‘deep’ approaches to learning (MacDonald, 2007). Feedback and reflection from participants generally references the importance and quality of ‘personal learning’ as an outcome. Open space technology can be used to address complex and wide ranging issues and achieve meaningful
outcomes. It can be particularly successful where the people involved and ideas are
diverse, and traditional facilitator-led approaches may be less productive. The focus,
assimilating individuals’ expert knowledge and experiences creates a greater
understanding of issues and realistic practical solutions.

The planning committee

Agreeing the planning committee once we had agreed the conference theme and
process seemed very straightforward. Those members of GLAD who had a passion for
the theme and some experience in working with it as well as those with a development
background were the first to come forward, and an experienced member of the group
made the fabulous foursome complete:

- Professor Linda Drew (chair) University of the Arts London
- John Last Arts Institute at Bournemouth
- Professor Simon Lewis Nottingham Trent University
- Sally Wade University of Huddersfield
  (then at University of Central Lancashire)

Creating the invitation list

The group, together with David Vaughan as Chair of GLAD, agreed the principles for the
invitation process. We knew we wanted to invite a range of academics, senior managers
and researchers, with similar passions about the student experience and additionally
either an ability to write, work as part of a team or complete projects was deemed
essential. We started nominating up to 10 participants each until we had a good mix
and a fair percentage of international voices among the participants. The invitation was
clearly targeted and we had a clear aim.

The aim of the GLAD’07 Conference is to produce a collection of papers which will
drive forward the debate on how higher education can prepare art and design
students for the challenges of the future. The key resources which will ensure the
conference’s success are the collective experience and ideas of all the invited
delegates, drawn from the art and design higher education arena.

The resource pack and trigger papers

Like the 2003 conference, it was decided that some pre-reading in the form of
commissioned trigger papers was a good way to prepare participants for some of the
themes and issues before arriving at the conference. The planning committee also
decided that some published papers should accompany these trigger papers in order to
fully expose participants to a contemporaneous range of views. The aim of this pack was to support participants, by providing additional stimuli for debate, and research materials to inform discussions. The articles were not intended to form a comprehensive collection, nor to limit debate. They merely represented a selection of policy statements, research papers and personal opinions, produced within the previous two years, which the conference organisers believed addressed some of the key issues which were likely to influence the future direction of art and design higher education, in the UK and internationally. The articles range from the local — what do our students think about their educational experience? — to the global — where will the designers of the future come from?

The resource pack started from the student experience and included familiar material, but also some new research and less well-known individual viewpoints. We recognised that every conference participant was busy, and there would not be time at the conference for hours of detailed study. Therefore the selection was focussed on short articles and reports. In a few cases, executive summaries of longer documents were included, but website references were also given, for anyone interested in reading a whole report.

**Commissioned trigger papers**


2. In a further report, compiled for GLAD from work commissioned by the Higher Education Academy, Mantz Yorke (2007) compared the results for art and design with other subjects, from a survey of first year higher education students in the UK. This study also made comparisons with the NSS.

3. A key current driver for change within art and design higher education — widening participation was explored by Eileen Reid (2007) who reflected on her experience of engaging with this agenda and the implications for the sector.

4. Aspects of the relationship between design education and the creative industries which provide career paths for graduates were analysed by David Clews (2006) who presented the results of a study, produced by ADM-HEA and the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship, into entrepreneurship education for the creative industries. He analysed the type of entrepreneurial experience provided to students in art and design higher education, and identified the need to define the concept more clearly and promote it more openly within the curriculum.

The trigger papers from GLAD’07 are available at:
http://www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk/links/group-for-learning-and-teaching-glad
The structure of the week

We followed the overall plan of the Cambridge Conference 2003 and adapted this to suit our needs, for example by introducing a keynote address at the beginning of the week to stimulate debate and response. We gathered participants to Cambridge for the Sunday afternoon and got to know each other through introductory exercises, a hands-on icebreaker and the taking of photographs for a delegate handbook. We reiterated that the need to take time to think, talk and reflect was paramount including the discussion of ideas in depth and that we were not necessarily looking for consensus in those discussions. The main non-negotiable was the conference outcome, the production of an edited book, the draft chapters of which would be ready to take away on the Friday afternoon.

The plan of the week therefore was to begin with the key speaker: Sir Michael Bichard with time for discussion and questions. This was followed by the identification of themes in brainstorming groups. An in-depth discussion of themes and ideas was then narrowed down by the paired group critiquing of themes and ideas. Final chapter groups were then confirmed. Discussions continued through the remainder of the week to include a plan of chapter structure and outcomes, the beginning of draft papers followed again by paired group critiquing. By the end of the week chapter contacts had been assigned in each of the seven chapter groups, each of these contacts were given a brief for pulling together the chapter both during and after the conference and being responsible for coordinating peer review and editing drafts of the chapter until the final publication stage. Clearly the chapter contacts (listed overleaf) were crucial people and they should take credit and pride in the professionalism with which they carried out their task as they have performed a central role in this collaborative production.

Editing

Editing a book with 50 authors presents some logistical challenges. I was confident that the chapter contacts and authors were equal to the task in hand and would take seriously the very strict deadlines we set for ourselves to make the production and editing jobs achievable. After the conference, draft chapters were completed and submitted for peer review to reviewers from other chapter groups. Once peer review comments had been received the chapter contacts consulted on changes or clarifications to the text with their chapter groups then reviewed each text making comments and changes, particularly to chapter structures and also to references, attributions and writing clarity. Further copy editing of each chapter was carried out by the conference organising team. Editing guidance was gratefully received at GLAD meetings in order to agree principles for the edit and also the structure of the book.
Conclusion

As I have now concluded editing the book I wonder if we have provided a ‘blueprint to meet future art and design challenges’ as our press release exhorted. We have certainly identified the challenges, and we have discussed ways forward within each chapter. However, the audience for this book will be vital to ensuring that this debate begins to meet and address the challenges. If we are talking to ourselves then that is a beginning, but it is not good enough, for our ambition was to stir the policy formers to respond to our assertions about the student experience in art and design. The UK National Student Survey group should be awaiting our views on contributing factors and the leadership capabilities necessary to address them. This is why the GLAD’08 Conference in Nottingham will be a vital next step, to engage department heads, course directors and leaders, policy formers and their advisors in higher education. The spirit of co-creation will continue on from its strong foundations in Cambridge 2007 and I hope that we can look back on this process in years to come and acknowledge even a fraction of the impact achieved by Cambridge Conferences in other fields.
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Chapter 2

Working without a script –

rethinking how academics can work collaboratively in changing contexts

Roni Brown University College for the Creative Arts, Farnham
Richard Heatly Hereford College of Arts
John Last The Arts Institute at Bournemouth
Fiona Powley University of Cumbria
Barbara Thomas University of Bolton
Jo Walter University of Wales
Shân Wareing University of the Arts London

Abstract

This chapter argues that the scope of the academic role in art, design and media has shifted in recent years from predominantly teaching, practice and research to one that places greater emphasis on administration and other tasks, as a consequence of the wide range of policy, legislative and audit pressures to which institutions have had to respond. As a result academics are experiencing role fragmentation. This is particularly accentuated in the context of art, design and media higher education, where logistical and identity tensions already exist between the roles of practitioner and academic. The impact of increased pressures on the academic role is apparent through the stress levels documented for staff in the sector.

The authors propose that it is necessary to re-establish congruence between institutional mission and individual identity through a re-framing of the
employment context of higher education by individuals and institutions. Potential models for such new working practices include ‘co-creation’.

The issues raised in this chapter will be of relevance to policy formers and makers, practitioners, those who manage and develop staff, new entrants, practitioners and teachers of art and design, and staff undertaking postgraduate qualifications in learning and teaching for higher education.
In the past 15 years UK government policy and legislation have exerted considerable influence on the higher education sector. All higher education institutions are now expected to deliver economic and social functions such as knowledge transfer, widening participation, community and voluntary activities, income generation and regional development in addition to the traditional activities of teaching and supervising students and undertaking research. These traditional activities have also experienced change. The number of students in the system has increased substantially over recent decades without a similar increase in staffing or, in many cases, a commensurate increase in teaching space. As Becher and Trowler (2001) note:

‘… changes in the higher education system have meant a growth in the strength and number of forces acting on academic cultures, enhancing the externalist rather than internalist character of the influences on them.’

(Preface to the 2001 edition)

These changes have taken place in a society which Barnett has argued is ‘supercomplex’, by which he means that individuals in contemporary society need to operate with multiple frames of understanding, self-identity and action, all of which are continually under challenge, and that we do so in a ‘radically unknowable world’, due to the rate of change and the complexity of our environment (Barnett, 2006).

Legislative requirements which affect university practices include the need to comply with statutes related to, in particular, equal opportunities and employment conditions. Institutions also have to participate in externally driven quality assurance processes, such as QAA Audit, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) National Student Survey (NSS) (2006) and other time-consuming and demanding processes within the national quality assurance and enhancement agenda. This impacts significantly on the roles and identities of staff who can feel themselves to be subject to evaluation and audit in every aspect of their work.

There is also an increasing expectation of, and requirement for, the involvement of academic staff in professional development activities. These are made explicit through institutional personal and professional development structures, and managed through staff review and appraisal. Again, this is part of a national landscape which includes, for example, the Professional Standards Framework (PSF) developed by the Higher Education Academy (HEA) (2006) for staff with teaching roles in higher education. The value that is assigned to professional practice within art, design and media as underpinning teaching is articulated through the PSF’s areas of activity, core knowledge and professional values. While valuable and to be welcomed, it must also be acknowledged that with every further articulation of expectation and standards, the demands placed on staff increase, and individuals’ sense of autonomy can diminish.
The impact on staff and role definition

The multiple expectations of an academic role include a variety of elements. Despite the complexity of this picture, the elements described below are by no means exhaustive.

The ‘massification’ of higher education has resulted in greater workloads, not least due to increased student numbers. Greater specificity around standards for teaching, learning and assessment has resulted in more explicit course and session planning; preparation of timetables; project briefs; handbooks; and written feedback to students on formative and summative assessment. The incorporation of work-based learning and placements into the curriculum require placement identification and support, building and maintaining relationships with employers, health and safety training and risk assessments.

Quality assurance and enhancement processes have resulted in more demanding procedures for course development and validation, requiring servicing by colleagues through peer review. Staff also participate in QAA review and audit; annual monitoring and self-evaluation reports; institutional committee meetings; programme level committees; gathering, analysing and responding to student feedback; dealing with student complaints; and identifying and managing academic misconduct.

Research has grown into an expectation in many academic roles, driven by the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), which itself consumes institutional time and resources on a substantial scale. Staff may also be involved in pedagogic research, investigating their own practice, and scholarship in order to keep up-to-date with their subject and contemporary teaching practices.

Staff are also expected to participate in knowledge transfer, through community activity; commercial links and special initiatives; and in income generation and consultancy, through enterprise activities; project applications; research funding; course development through the European Social Fund; and similar initiatives. Projects promoting regional development and collaboration require staff to understand regional agendas; build partnerships; develop accord agreements; and contribute to targets.

Professional development courses to support new staff including part-time lecturers are a requirement in most higher education institutions, and increasingly there is an expectation of continuing professional development.

Student recruitment involves interviewing, open days, school visits, further education links and design of marketing materials. Student admissions include processing paperwork, planning and delivering induction programmes. Widening participation requires staff to be familiar with national initiatives such as AimHigher and 14-19 Diplomas, and to understanding diversity theories and statistics around student diversity. If undertaken conscientiously, it involves curriculum redesign, changes to delivery methods and increased study support. Growing internationalisation results in the need to understand and accommodate cultural diversity in the classroom, and sometimes to develop and deliver overseas provision. Students’ entitlements to pastoral support have
become increasingly explicit, resulting in many staff spending more time on giving and documenting tutorials and becoming increasingly informed about services to which students can be referred.

These new areas of activity result in an increase in administration, such as timetabling, organising resources (such as booking rooms and equipment), undertaking risk assessments, record keeping, budget management, evaluation and feedback procedures.

Certainly all these initiatives have some, and in many cases considerable, value; many potentially contribute to improvements in education and society. However, they have undoubtedly increased the demands made on staff and the consequential complexity of individual and institutional roles. This has resulted in individual experiences of role fragmentation, dissonance and lack of clarity around definitions and boundaries of academic activity. The consequences may be loss of engagement, alienation, stressed staff and inefficient organisations. There has been emerging evidence of employee stress in the sector, and increased numbers of allegations of bullying and harassment and contractual challenges by staff.

A Universities and Colleges Union (UCU) (2007) survey of academic staff conducted in October 2006 found that up to 58% of respondents had experienced symptoms of stress, with long working hours, increased timetabled contact with students and lack of control over demands made upon them being cited as key contributors to their anxiety. Fifty per cent of respondents said their health had been adversely affected by their work, with bureaucracy cited as a key source of stress. There is, in addition, growing evidence of staff being subject to abuse and harassment by students, with Lee (2006) giving a disturbing account of the levels of this problem and the distress caused not just to staff within higher education.

The result of increased role responsibilities is illustrated in the following model.

**Figure 1: The relationship between skill, confidence and role stability**

The straight lines represent the steady gain in skills and confidence someone experiences when their role remains stable. The pinch points at the turns represent the sudden pressure generated when a new role is adopted or assigned, when the individual has a
lack of familiarity with the problems and issues encountered, and new knowledge and skills are required. In time, new skills are developed, the context becomes more familiar, and the steady increase in confidence, knowledge and skills resumes. Due to the demands on institutions, changes in role expectations of individual staff are likely to happen more frequently and to more people, with resultant increase in stress and loss of confidence.

Changes experienced in academic roles are widely recognised. There have been explicit moves on the part of higher education institutions in recent years to analyse the academic role through systematic processes such as the Higher Education Role Analysis (HERA). Processes such as HERA attempt to specify and define the roles undertaken by academics and grade them against a national framework. Such an approach acknowledges and articulates the breadth of tasks and responsibilities required of those working in higher education, and can assist in ensuring equal pay for work of equal value across institutions.

The changes and pressures outlined above are in addition to the tensions created when staff begin working in higher education and change from being primarily a practitioner in art, design and media to a professional role which encompasses teacher/academic/researcher. Individuals begin to alter their self-definition and to understand the implications of such a transition. This can be a difficult and uncomfortable process, particularly when the context of higher education and the academic role is perceived to be in flux. The ‘psychological contract’ is the term used to describe what staff believe they are employed to do by their institution; the psychological contract does not necessarily reflect the detail of the legal contract or job description. This can be a source of particular dissonance for staff, given the existing tension discussed above between the role of practitioner and the role of teacher, and inherent instability in the boundaries of the role of an academic due to sectoral changes.

In art, design and media education, this is exacerbated due to the large numbers of part-time and hourly paid staff who combine practice with teaching. The contribution of part-time staff is vital and highly valued within art, design and media due to the currency which professional practice brings to the curriculum. However, it also makes communication across groups of staff much more difficult and reduces the opportunities to develop a community and network which can support staff in their role. Furthermore, due to high numbers of part-time staff in art, design and media, there is a reciprocally lower proportion of full-time staff to manage the ever-increasing workloads generated by the initiatives discussed above which are outside the remit of hourly paid staff.

Part-time staff can experience particular stress in their roles because, in addition to the factors already discussed, they may be provided with lower levels of support. They may also have limited opportunity to participate in staff development activities, as a result of their personal working patterns and due to lack of financial support from the institution to enable that engagement. This problem was recognised in the work of the 2005 Art and Design: Enabling Part-time Teachers (ADEPTT) project, (Higher Education Academy, 2005) supported by the Fund for Development of Teaching and Learning Phase 4
(FDTL4), which created a website with structured and practical models for supporting part-time tutors (www.adepitt.ac.uk/).

There appears to have been little significant analysis of the ways in which support for academic staff in their more complex and fragmented roles can be improved, although the 2001 Association of University Teachers (AUT) report *Building the Academic Team* is a positive analysis of the benefits of reconsidering the roles of those involved in supporting academics. For example, where resources permit, the role of administrative staff and their relationship to academic functions may well be part of the solution to the increasing tensions within the sector. Further review of the location of administrative and technical staff and their increasing professionalisation and parity with academic staff within operational contexts may be essential. Similarly, debates around the role and responsibilities of technical support staff have been taking place for many years and the technical demonstrator role can be a vital bridge between support staff and teaching staff in relation to the student learning experience. However, both of these solutions assume a staffing budget which enables an increase in the number and status of administrators and technicians, and in the experience of many departments, this is unrealistic.

**Thinking about solutions**

The purpose of this chapter is to suggest some of the ways in which individuals, departments and institutions can mediate the negative impact of the changes and the working context of higher education, and find productive ways of working which provide personal satisfaction as well as fulfilling the educational, social and economic functions of higher education. Becher and Trowler note that:

‘Academics in general, and those in the UK in particular, are struggling to hold on to values and practices from the past … These will include not only negativity and resistance … but the enthusiastic adoption of change in some cases and the strategic undermining and reworking of it in others.’

(Becher and Trowler, 2001, p. 16)

We recognise both positions indicated in this quotation, and the remainder of this chapter will be concerned with how to promote ways of working which are satisfying for individuals and effective and efficient for institutions.

Faced with a working context we have described as ‘supercomplex’, in which the range and type of tasks that may be expected of academic staff in any one day or week can be multiple, diverse and difficult to predict and plan for, what are the options for action? How are individuals to keep their sense of self?

A number of responses can be seen on the part of academics as a means of coping with, or making sense of, the role. Where these responses are adaptive (i.e. the individual tries to cope without aiming to change either the environment or themselves), these responses can have negative repercussions for the individual and for the
organisation, with a consequent perceived or actual loss of self-control and self-direction. In these circumstances, individuals feel alienated from the core values and identities they hold as academic practitioners and find themselves in situations that seem to fracture their sense of self-identity and to generate feelings of anger, frustration and loss.

Such reactions are made more understandable when they are put into the context of what we might call the ‘utopian perspective’ of academic work. This utopia is located in a mythical past, when academic life is believed to have allowed time for practice, reflection, teaching and research and where, in consequence, staff were fulfilled and happy. This may indeed have been the experience of a small number of staff when only an elite minority of the population entered higher education. However, if the higher education system had stayed as it was at the end of the 1960s, it would be of a sufficient size to accommodate the academic careers that exist today! The juxtaposition of this folk memory of a simpler, happier life with the current complexity and financial and quality pressures of higher education adds to feelings of loss of power and estrangement.

These feelings of loss of power and being unable to recognise one’s personal values in the work of the institution are not minor problems. Fulfilment at work gives the individual a sense of ownership and effectiveness which is of benefit both to the individual and the institution. In consequence, positive energy is generated and available in the working context. We can see examples of how this ownership concept still engenders a positive experience in higher education institutions through, for example, ways that course teams operate effectively together.

However, strategies for survival can resist institutional drivers for change where dissonance exists. In such circumstances teams can establish a discrete set of values and shared meanings to secure enjoyment at work at the level of the team. This is one of the contexts in which ‘situated learning’ occurs, as described by Lave and Wenger (1991) in their concept of ‘communities of practice’. Through ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ in a community of practice, a new member of staff gains the knowledge and practices they need to survive in their role through informal learning in context. This has been shown by Wenger (1998) to be a highly effective and efficient way to share knowledge and to ensure practices are carried out according to local norms. It also creates a cohesive, supportive community which can provide individuals with the companionship and enjoyment in the workplace that they need. Communities of practice can provide a sense of belonging and be a repository of shared knowledge, providing individuals with security and identity whilst also enabling tasks to be undertaken and accomplished more speedily. They can provide a basis for the rapid exchange of knowledge and ideas (as described in the 2006 report by Knight, Tait and Yorke on professional learning which highlights the primary role of situated learning).

However, the downside to departmental culture being transmitted through communities of practice, is that existing patterns of behaviour, interpretations and responses to situations may be reinforced and legitimised, and in times of rapid, social and institutional change these responses may be inherently conservative and therefore, do
not help individuals and teams make the most of the current and future environment. Interpreting a new situation within known and assumed paradigms can be an effective, if implicit, method of resisting change. In these ways the stability of the community of practice can be a way for staff to cope with complexity and stress. However, it can also contribute to work overload and stress by not enabling individuals to develop productive new ways of being and working in the higher education environment, contributing to discontentment rather than happiness at work in the longer term.

Another coping strategy can be to simply withdraw, with a consequential loss of individual and institutional energy. This may be seen in a spectrum of responses, from a pragmatic approach to dealing with issues and problems as they arise, to a ‘jobsworth’ mentality that throws up a defensive cordon around the individual who refuses to act outside narrowly set limits. Another recognisable pattern is for individuals to focus their attention on research, as a task which (at the time of production, though not at the time of evaluation) is relatively free from institutional interference, and in many cases can be conducted independently of colleagues and away from the office. This route has the added advantage of offering a path to promotion and greater independence, so it is understandable when staff chose it as a way out of the perceived messiness of institutional life.

These can be understood as typical responses to situations in which individuals feel powerless and isolated. As discussed above, the sense of powerlessness can be mitigated by a reassertion of control within narrowly drawn or restricted limits, or even by a partial or complete withdrawal from the perceived space of conflict and source of stress. The isolation can be dealt with through the creation and iterative reinforcement of bonds with a smaller community, formed and focused around a particular definition or version of practice. Such communities can negotiate uncertainty and the unknown through the mutual reinforcement of their own narratives which present versions of the world in which they operate. However these ‘world views’, comfortable and supportive as they may be, can divert and dissipate energy within the team and organisation. Staff can feel disempowered, disengaged and unable to control their own work with a consequent loss of efficiency to the institution as a whole.

In the academic context this can be played out as a scenario in which, for example, groups of academic staff perceive certain tasks as falling outside their role: for example, student recruitment or admissions, writing references, administrative work such as filing or distributing assessment feedback or tutorial records including a whole complex of demands often characterised collectively as ‘administration’. This work can therefore be described in terms that reinforce it to other members of the group as onerous, additional, time-consuming and ultimately stressful. Alternatively, certain factors can be recognised and naturalised as specific sources of difficulty or as irrelevant to the key focus of the role: perhaps students are perceived to be not as able or as focused as they once were; perhaps management, often characterised as ‘the other’, is seen to make ever greater and more unreasonable demands; perhaps legislative pressures are seen to impose requirements such as health and safety compliance, risk assessments and so on.
There is a need to find new ways of conceptualising working relationships and structures that distribute the workload of academic staff and find better ways to share expertise within our institutions. We will consider this from two perspectives: what individual lecturers can do, and what managers (heads of department or institutional leaders) can do.

**Action at the individual level**

The most significant actions an individual can take to be effective, to have a sense of self-efficacy in an environment and to be content at work, are to learn as much as they can about the environment, to identify and undertake routes to develop the skills necessary for that environment, and to establish support networks at work. For people already under time pressure these may seem unhelpful suggestions, but the investment of time in professional development, learning about the environment and building good relationships at work have a rapid and profound return in terms of sense of restoration, of a sense of control and autonomy, and release of stress, resulting in better motivation and capacity to manage time and tasks.

For these reasons, it is worth investigating new staff programmes that an institution runs, such as a postgraduate certificate in learning and teaching if one is available. There may be other forms of professional development available that are relevant to your role, and the department or institution may also have formal systems to provide you with a mentor. If none exist, building an informal relationship that provides mentorship is very valuable. The institutional website is worth searching for information about services available and activities taking place.

Ensuring participation in the academic community as much as is possible is always worthwhile. Communities are sources of considerable amounts of informally exchanged information, as discussed above, as well as sources of friendship and support. Getting involved with departmental and institutional projects is an excellent way to become better known to your colleagues and get to know them better. All these suggestions are founded on the belief that personal networks and relationships are key to contentment at work and to information exchange, that professional development activities increase confidence and effectiveness and decrease stress and that the more you know about your environment, the better informed your decisions and actions will be.

It is also worth identifying and reflecting on your own values and the extent to which they coincide with those around you — amongst your immediate colleagues, in the wider department and in the institution. Finding areas of shared values are the ground on which to build relationships and trust. Being clear about areas of divergent values will help you manage these areas, or else focus on a move to employment, or area of practice, that is more clearly aligned with your personal values.

By and large, these actions and pathways are established within institutions and, provided a staff member can gain access to the necessary services and resources, they
are not contentious. The remainder of the chapter considers the institutional role in addressing the changing context and the accompanying stress experienced by individuals, as here it is far less clear or straightforward what actions can be undertaken.

**Action at the institutional level**

In this respect we think there is a value in exploring the idea of co-creation, a model of organisational learning that emerged within business settings as a response to the difficulties organisations face in releasing the creativity and energies of staff working within structured, hierarchical and complex environments. John Winsor (2006, p. 17) describes co-creation as ways of working collaboratively and creatively to bring about innovation, claiming that linear working methodologies and hierarchical structures are insufficiently organic, flexible and adaptive to respond to the conditions of change.

Co-creation is by no means an original concept. However, it brings together a number of working models and approaches that challenge organisational structure, but more importantly, organisational culture. The chief problem Winsor poses for organisations is how to innovate quickly and effectively. Learning to communicate in qualitatively different ways is perceived as critical to the innovation process. Winsor discusses the need to develop the concept of dialogue within organisations: to re-examine communication methods in such ways as to build open, trusting and intuitive forms of communication. Winsor suggests this is the only way to increase the likelihood of expertise and ideas being shared across an organisation. Developing the right kind of innovative environment is a further means to improve the speed and quantity of communication and it is also an opportunity to re-think the proximities, types and range of expertise within an organisation.

Areas such as theatre and community self-build have long histories in using co-creation to exploit co-operative, performative and improvisation strategies to fundamentally change the process and arguably, the reception of creative work. In devised theatre for example, there is only a simple outline structure and core idea from which actors, director, writer and production team co-write and direct, allowing the script to emerge as ideas are tried and tested through improvisation.

Self-build schemes such as those pioneered by Segal and Habraken in the 1970s were based on the concept of flexible building systems that enable the future occupants of the scheme to construct housing that is specific to their needs. In both examples, traditional professional roles are conceived flexibly: actors directly assist the writing process, the architect becomes facilitator and householders become producers rather than passive consumers of the built environment. In these examples, the co-creation process can be seen as one which is dependent on specialist skills and knowledge but wherein historical hierarchical constructs of production (and consumption) are fundamentally challenged and problems and decisions are owned and distributed within teams.
To return to examples of co-creation used in business, the advertising agency Mother (www.motherlondon.com) uses the concept of ‘the table’ as a metaphor for open communication, dialogue, connectivity and equality. The table provides a working space for all functions of employee whether copywriter, finance, design or print production, and all grades of staff, including the partners of the firm. Although the original concept of the table grew from an evolving and limited working space, the company saw the table as a vital means to bring about rapid dialogue between staff and perceived this to be essential for creating an environment of innovation.

‘In a larger, philosophical sense, when things go wrong in most companies and departments, it’s usually because people start thinking that only one thing is their job, like making a rivet. When you sit at one table, you see the whole picture … you’re making an airplane.’
(DeFlorio, 2006, p. 24)

‘The table’ concept might pose significant logistical and cultural difficulties within many organisations. However, the essence of ‘the table’ concept is that, by sustaining connectivity and channelling problems through multidisciplinary teams, problems can be perceived holistically and solutions conceptualised simultaneously.

The design firm IDEO (www.ideo.com) provides a very compelling case for the adoption of multidisciplinary teams, comprising anthropologists, psychologists, designers, engineers and business specialists so that a complex understanding of clients’ needs can be quickly and comprehensively conceived. IDEO describes its approach as a collaborative methodology that simultaneously examines desirability, technical feasibility and business viability through the use of multidisciplinary teams.

A further aspect of co-creation is recognition that little genuinely innovative activity occurs in isolation and an organisation’s ability to harness new relationships is likely to increase the chances for, and the quality of, innovation. In business settings there has been something of a paradigm shift in re-thinking the relationship of organisations to their customers, perceiving consumers to have a wealth of cultural and intellectual capital as well as vested interest. The concept of ‘value creation’ from Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004, pp. 5-14) describes the shift from a ‘product or firm-centric’ view of value, to one which places value in the context of the consumers’ experience. ‘As value shifts to experiences, the market is becoming a forum for conversation and interactions between consumers, consumer communities, and firms’ (ibid). Such a view re-conceptualises consumers as having a productive and co-creative role in society and the economy, acknowledging that expert knowledge is distributed both within, and external to, the organisation constituting much untapped capital and potential for innovation. Many of the organisations that have used the idea of customer-made successfully are among the creative industries, particularly advertising agencies and product design companies.

The design competitions set up by Nokia and Electrolux exploit the global capabilities of designers and design students and have resulted in significant new product development for these organisations. This approach recognises that consumers have diverse and
extensive intellectual capital and insight into their future needs. Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004) describe the affects of this model as ‘value creation’, a departure from firm-centric innovation models common to most corporations. Co-creation with consumers is not synonymous with DIY or personalisation, as these involve consumers after production decisions are made. While there are many examples of companies asking consumers to send in their ideas, others have used the customer-made approach in a rigorous way to bring about innovation. The use of design contests for Nokia’s Concept Lounge (2005) (www.designawards.nl) resulted in the wristband phone, the ‘Nokia 888’ and Electrolux’s Design Lab (www.electrolux.com/designlab) now in its 5th edition receives many thousands of entries each year for new product concepts.

In the context of higher education, co-creation would need to be interpreted as working much more closely with students, as well as with staff across functions (academic, administrative, technical, and managerial) in order to develop solutions, and more time-efficient ways of working. Perhaps most importantly this would differ from existing committee structures by ensuring that authority for decision making rested with the team that shares a close and comprehensive insight of the ‘user’ or ‘customer’ perspective (which is unlikely to reside at committee level). This would require committees and management groups to sponsor solution-finding groups providing them with the resources, support structures and reporting opportunities to bring about change. Institutions accepting the influencing power of such groups would equally consider their status and value in developing organisational culture and change, alongside recognition of the professional development opportunities they provide for staff including the building of cross-institutional networks.

We would argue that all the illustrations given above already have some parallels within institutions.

One such example is open source culture, a social and cultural movement making information accessible across the internet, allowing content to be widely shared, modified and re-distributed. It can be harnessed within institutions to improve participation and communication. Wikis, blogs, weblogs and message boards have stimulated unprecedented peer-to-peer discussion and the sharing of expertise between communities across the world. Wikipedia (www.wikipedia.org) provides an example of the way in which open source technology has assisted with the co-creation of the internet based encyclopaedia which allows expert volunteers to collaboratively create and edit articles amounting to the 7.2 million articles that exist on the site today. Despite the concerns that the editorial process of Wikipedia brings with it uneven consistency and quality, research by Rosenzweig (2006, pp. 117-146) suggests that it is as accurate as other encyclopaedias and ranks among the top 15 most visited websites.

Other ways co-creation is realised within institutions include informal networks which spread new ideas and innovative practices organically rather than hierarchically. The importance of this is recognised by Senge et al. (2001, p. 17), who identify leadership communities within organisations. Similarly, discussing organisational change, Quinn (2004, p. 63) sees highly productive communities as nurturing places, transformed by
individuals; this in turn attracts people to empower themselves, leading to what he terms emergent organisations, which have many leaders rather than one traditional leader.

This is demonstrated in a further example that has been applied in higher education. World Café is a growing global movement predicated on the assumption that individuals possess the knowledge and creativity to confront challenges, to be shared through ‘a living network of collaborative dialogue’. The background to the World Café movement, developed by Juanita Brown, is given on her website with resources and case studies (www.theworldcafe.com/). The Higher Education Academy’s Change Academy (www.heacademy.ac.uk/ourwork/institutions/change) promotes this model along with other team-based learning approaches in the belief that achieving complex institutional change is a collective enterprise.

For our organisations to be effective we need to build relationships with diverse groups of people to encourage meaningful communication and problem solving. Complex change requires that we are not afraid to confront problems or challenges that do not have ready solutions. Change leadership literature puts relationships and lateral communication at the centre of complex organisations. In proposing a framework for Leading in a Culture of Change, Fullan acknowledges that when change initiatives are successful relationships improve and ‘if relationships improve, things get better’ (Fullan, 2001, p. 5). A collaborative work culture with ‘purposeful interaction between diverse groups of people’ (Fullan, 2001, p.5) is a key driver for successful knowledge sharing and innovation.

If fostering genuine relationships and interaction between groups is needed for successful organisational change, how can the art, design and media sector contribute to the changing organisational culture within UK higher education? Can the value of working creatively and collaboratively be promoted within a culture of continuous improvement as our academic learning communities move away from more formal organisational models?

The cross-disciplinary Creativity or Conformity?: building cultures of creativity in higher education conference (www.creativityconference.org/) hosted in January 2007 by Cardiff School of Art and Design at the University of Wales in Cardiff (UWIC) included specialists from education, psychology, biology, engineering, literature and health, in addition to art, design and media. Contributors considered how to promote a creative environment and how to embed this in higher education policy to counteract growing bureaucracy, looking ‘to defend academic creativity against the perceived onslaught of red tape and bullying managers’ (Tysome, 2007).

Within academic communities, collaborative working and knowledge sharing with staff from across the institution breaks down barriers and releases energy in an open and flexible environment. Glasgow School of Art presents itself as a ‘creative hothouse’ where the diverse community of all staff (including maintenance, administrative, support, academic and technical staff) and their commitment to continuous learning and innovation are essential to its culture. The sense of community and emphasis on
consultation and dialogue with staff ‘to share best practice and find new ways of doing things’ are clearly regarded as key strengths and drivers for change (Glasgow School of Art, 2004, pp. 10-11).

Similarly boundaries are crossed and exciting creative breakthroughs are made when staff form networks both across institutions and with external agencies and partners, regionally, nationally and outside the UK. When staff from all the art and design higher education institutions in Scotland met to debate enhancement themes, QAA joined the discussion and responded to innovative developments being reported. Funded projects are providing alternative opportunities for collaborative working and creative networks which motivate and engage staff, both within and across, institutions. The North West Network Project for research-informed teaching and supporting new academic staff is one example. The North West Network are six higher education institutions who work as part of the Supporting New Academic Staff (SNAS) project based at the Higher Education Academy (HEA). This project specifically focuses on the link between disciplinary research and teaching in art, design and media, but does not exclude pedagogic research in this context. The project was an opportunity for a group of staff interested in research informed teaching to work together and produce sector wide outcomes. The case studies can be accessed at: www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk/projects/adm-hea-projects/snas-nw-network

Writing Purposely in Art and Design (Writing-PAD) has proliferated as ‘a grass roots movement which has grown and developed organically’ across the UK, principally in 40 institutions in England and now being extended to Scotland and Wales. This HEFCE funded project has created a network for staff from across disciplines and roles and provided an arena for debate and exchange of practice in writing in art, design and media. Writing-PAD has generated a variety of models which can be viewed on: www.writing-pad.ac.uk

Colleagues in the sector may well recognise some of the working practices described within their institutions, drawing on ideas of co-creation and non-linear organisations. Task groups, problem-solving sets and project teams established to work intensively on thematic issues, such as widening participation and sustainability, are often cross departmental and involve colleagues of differing degrees of seniority. Collaborative projects across higher education institutions, and between higher education institutions, industry and other sectors and agencies, can harness the potential of working in new team configurations and across traditional subject boundaries. However, such instances usually arise as a result of a need to take action on issues that are a source of cross-institutional anxiety, or where the problem is perceived to reside across a number of departments. Many institutions remain essentially committed to structures that are reliant on linear models of communication, including the positioning of students as consumers rather than active ‘producers’ of the next generation of higher education provision. Co-creative ways of working have to date had little impact on the day-to-day experiences of academic teams managing both complexity and bureaucracy. Higher education should look to the creative industries which are adopting innovative strategies for dealing with complexity and change.
Conclusion

Staff in higher education find that expanded roles, rapid change, external requirements, resourcing pressures and a high level of monitoring, contribute to a stressful working environment. Within art, design and media education, this is exacerbated by the logistical and identity tensions between being a practitioner and being an academic, by the high numbers of part-time staff which make communication, developing a staff community and professional development more difficult, and increase the load on full-time members of staff.

Some of the most frequent ways of coping with stress can, in fact, increase the difficulties for individuals and institutions. These include creating an oppositional sub-culture within a team or department, withdrawing from the community or ring fencing what the individual will and will not do. Individuals can help restore a sense of autonomy and self-control through professional development, social networks at work, and increased understanding of the institution. Institutions can, at least in part, improve the situation by exploring non-hierarchical methods of communication, and planning and problem resolution across all staff and students, as adopted by some successful and fast responding creative companies.
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Abstract  
Proceeding from the assumption that there is, and has been, inadequate emphasis on appropriate leadership development and support, at all levels since incorporation; this chapter examines contemporary evidence and experiences to test those assumptions. The 12 case studies underpinning this chapter were conducted during and after the GLAD Conference at Cambridge in 2007. They were conducted using a template of questions and their sources remain confidential to the authors of this chapter. Direct quotations from the interviews illustrate or evidence claims and commentary in the text, and are anonymous. Those selected for interview as case studies represent a balance of gender and age. They are drawn from a range of academic backgrounds including research, teaching and learning and professional practice. They currently hold, or have held, a range of posts considered appropriate to this study, including; module leader, course tutor, head of department, associate dean, dean, pro-vice-chancellor, reader and professor. The individuals interviewed work in specialist art and design colleges, universities in the UK and overseas.

The case studies provide evidence of experience and perceptions of the nature of the challenges and demands faced by those in roles from entry to higher education, through to senior art and design leaders. They are used to identify future challenges whilst examining the experience of leaders and managers at
different points in their careers and key issues, which are associated with entry to and progression through the various levels.

Whilst a growing amount of research in pedagogy explores discipline-related differences and identities, most of the available literature on leadership and management development in higher education is generic. This chapter considers some aspects of the alignment of a discipline-oriented identity with leadership and management characteristics and capabilities, in order to characterise the nature of effective leadership and management in art and design higher education.

The chapter is organised around an exploration of context, followed by three sections aligned to the life cycle of a typical leadership and management career: early years, mid-life, and senior professional. The concluding section features key considerations and recommendations.
Introduction

In his keynote address at the Group for Learning in Art and Design (GLAD) Conference held at Cambridge University in 2007, Sir Michael Bichard stated that ‘leadership and management talent in the sector is shallow and there is insufficient formal development. Good leadership is not about bureaucracy, but about increasing energy at all levels and energy is really needed now. Energy, passion and belief are really important’.

This observation was offered as part of what Sir Michael described as an emerging ‘golden age’ for art and design higher education in the UK. He placed this in the context of significant change which has seen art and design higher education in the UK move from peripheral, small scale and specialist, into a mass provision with the largest numbers of art and design students concentrated in the modern universities.

In his description and analysis of the challenges and opportunities of this golden age, Bichard identified the need to develop leadership as one of the keys to future success. It can be argued that some aspects of the relatively poor outcomes of the recent National Student Survey (NSS), which placed art and design near the bottom of the subject league tables in terms of student satisfaction, might be attributed to deficiencies in the management and leadership of our discipline at all levels. This is not particular to the UK, as art and design features in similar positions in surveys of students conducted in other countries; New Zealand and Australia being two examples. However, the position of art and design in the NSS is not in line with the claims we make as providers for a high quality and specialist provision which we like to identify as world class. Especially pertinent are levels of student dissatisfaction with elements of course organisation, management and delivery, the availability of teaching staff, the transparency of assessment procedures and criteria, and arrangements for placements.

The challenges to those responsible for the leadership and management of art and design higher education are complex and urgent. Whilst the sector is still in a state of transition, some things are becoming clearer. Several of the ex-polytechnics’ faculties of art and design have moved from the edge into the very heart of new corporate institutions — ‘from the showroom to the engine room’. In these universities the role of senior art and design managers has also shifted. These individuals are no longer general managers of the art and design ‘small factory’ model of provision, but are supported by professionals within faculty executive teams, including accountants, human resource experts and business development managers. Senior managers of art and design are now expected to work ‘from’ and ‘in’ their discipline at a corporate level, using lateral thinking to operate within interdisciplinary teams inside and beyond their institutions. They may be required to work with external partners to bring to bear art and design expertise and capabilities that span the design and delivery of educational courses to the recreation of new or evolved cities in which higher education is the dominant industry.

Alongside this the tight definitions of ‘new’ and ‘old’ universities have been blurred as the ex-polytechnic directors who became vice-chancellors in 1992 have retired, taking with them the last vestiges of local authority thinking and have been replaced by a less
clearly defined set of leaders and managers who have moved between old and new institutions and between industry, research and academia. The same period has seen the emergence of the large art and design monotechnics, significantly, the University of the Arts London, and colleges of higher education who have achieved university status, plus the demise of the small independent art and design colleges through merger or integration into other institutions. In addition further education colleges now have the capacity to award foundation degrees, a development which comes on top of the rapid increase in further education colleges offering full degrees validated by partner universities, often with little experience of art and design higher education.

In this context Sir Michael Bichard identified the positive aspects of the value currently being given to vocational qualifications, the apparently buoyant demand for art and design higher education provision and the current success of the creative and cultural industries which has greatly benefited from the strength of art and design provision in the UK. He identified key challenges as being the need to extend the boundaries of knowledge and embrace the potential of interdisciplinarity whilst remaining strongly rooted in practice, alongside the need to achieve internationalisation, foster a stronger base for art and design in schools, and develop more effective leadership capacity. Bichard argued that bad leaders waste energy but good leaders release energy, and that effective leaders are passionate about their subjects, endorse success and slim down bureaucracy.

In considering issues of leadership we were aware of the relationship and the differences between leadership and management. Much has been written on the topic and in relation to exact definitions of the two. We do not see the value in rehearsing this work, but do believe that the following quotes reflect something of the art and design approach to such matters.

‘Organisations need both managers and leaders to succeed but developing both requires a reduced focus on logic and strategic exercises in favour of an environment where creativity and imagination are allowed to flourish.’

In referring to leadership and management we include any academic in an informal or formal role working in art and design higher education.

Leadership: ‘It’s when you know that the people who are working for you or with you, you can sense their respect. And you can sense that they want to work with you, they know you are doing something good and you can sense that you are energising them and taking them with you.’

‘Good leadership is actually very simple, it’s about allowing people to grow, to know they will be supported so that they can make difficult decisions and gain the confidence to feel that if they fail it is not the end of the world and thus be able to learn from failure.’
Context

In June 1970 the Department of Education and Science published a report entitled *The Structure of Art and Design Education*. The report commissioned by the then Secretary of State for Education and Science, Margaret Thatcher, was compiled by a joint committee of the National Advisory Council of Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design under the Chairmanship of Sir William Coldstream (Coldstream, 1970).

The purpose of the report was to map out the future direction and structure of art and design education at a pivotal moment in the development of the higher education sector in the UK, at a time when the independent and autonomous local authority funded and focused art schools began to be absorbed into the new polytechnics alongside local technical colleges and teacher training provision.

The report that runs to 55 pages and some 166 paragraphs, when read with hindsight, makes for instructive reading and a sense of considerable déjà vu for anyone who has been engaged in the higher education sector for art and design during the last nearly 40 years. The then new diplomas in art and design (DipAD) introduced in 1965 are reviewed in depth and a series of far reaching educational proposals made for their further development to achieve parity and ultimately conversion to Batchelor of Arts qualifications in the early 1970s. The report focuses on much that is familiar to those who have followed the debates around fitness for purpose; employer engagement, widening participation, regional and national development, the value of creativity and innovation to the national economy, the arts as regional and national economic generators, cultural intervention for the wellbeing of society alongside the need for greater interdisciplinarity, the need for vocational and technical educational training and much more. The nomenclature has changed but the thrust of the report and the strategic imperatives’ identified are little different today from those identified by Coldstream in his 1970s report. This was at a time when fewer than 7,000 students in the whole of the UK were enrolled on the diploma for art and design, see Table 1 below.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine art</td>
<td>2,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic design</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three dimensional design</td>
<td>1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles and fashion</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What has changed out of all recognition is the context within which the education process envisaged by Coldstream is now delivered. The following numbers were enrolled on art and design BA programmes in the UK in 2005/2006. See table 2 below.

Table 2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine art</td>
<td>18,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design studies</td>
<td>55,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in the creative arts</td>
<td>5,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Coldstream report makes reference to the far-reaching changes that might result from independent art schools becoming founding members of the new polytechnics but is ambivalent on what that would really mean. It assumes a continued place in the sector for the independent art school as specialist provision that would continue more or less unchanged, alongside new hybrids that might emerge within the new polytechnic sector. The report speaks of expansion but has no foresight of the size and breadth of provision that would so rapidly emerge in the polytechnics in the 1970s and 1980s and the resultant pressure on resources to support the expansion of a complex resource intensive system where learning by doing and making remains a central tenant of art and design education in the UK.

In 1984-1985 a National Advisory Body was established under the Chairmanship of Tom Bromley OBE. This body was tasked with, among other things, coming up with a rationalisation of a system of art and design education that was now large, complex and a major part of the polytechnic sector whose very success was creating evermore pressure on finite resources. The National Advisory Body’s solution of differentiating provision between that which was to be designated as specialist and therefore limited, and that which was to be non-specialist and thus open to expansion, was a solution that addressed the questions of constrained resourcing. However, it significantly failed to address the ever-expanding and developing educational context.

In 1992 Kenneth Clark, the then Secretary of State for Education and Science, having recognised the success of the polytechnics in delivering their mission and also recognising a public perception of a two tier higher education provision where the university title was perceived as superior, legislated for all higher education institutions who met appropriate criteria to use the university designation.

Alongside this change of title, incorporation also freed the polytechnics from local authority control and funding and the close scrutiny of the Council for National
Academic Awards (CNAA), which had national oversight and responsibility for the maintenance of the quality of all the degree awarding programmes in the non-university sector.

The move to incorporated status had an arguably greater effect on the independent and specialist colleges in terms of impact on leadership and management issues. At relatively short notice all the institutions assumed responsibility for many of the functions that had previously been provided from the Local Education Authorities. These functions ranged from leadership advice and guidance through directors of education and education committees, through human resource and finance functions to staff development. The leaders of the independent colleges spent time that might have been better utilised in strategic consideration, making good deficits in basic functions and time that should have been devoted to real leadership was often devoted to managerial compliance. On the other hand, some lecturers and middle managers had their first experience of thinking about the necessary management functions for their colleges in implementing these new services, and this led some of these people to consider management issues formally for more or less the first time.

Now, in 2007, the art and design disciplines are delivered mainly within the post-1992 university sector, a tiny and ever-diminishing handful of independent art schools, mostly in some form of partnership with a large university organisation and the UK now has two art and design universities, in the University of the Arts London and the soon to be University of the Creative Arts at Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester — both of these themselves being conglomerates of a number of previously separate art and design institutions.

This context of change within the higher education sector over the last 40 years has been mirrored by significant change of the values of an education through the art and design disciplines to, not only the national economy, but also social cohesion and the cultural wellbeing of the nation. Over the last 10 years and particularly since the millennium, numerous reports from a variety of government ministries and agencies have highlighted the importance of developing the creativity and innovation of our population as being one of the nation’s fundamental strengths and the attribute most valuable to our future national economic success and social wellbeing.

The Creative Industries Task Force (1998), Robinson (1999), Clark (1998), the Cox Report (2005), the NESTA report (October 2006), The Leitch Report (December 2006), all lay great emphasis on the importance to our future economic health and wellbeing of the internationally pre-eminent areas of the British economy now referred to as the creative industries. These industries, ranging across all aspects of the mass media and innovative design-led UK and global companies serving a sophisticated urban consumer society which is now highly conscious of brand and design identity, are populated, served and enabled by graduates of the British art and design education system. These industries, which are mainly composed of dynamic, fast-moving small and medium sized enterprises, express views on the quality of these graduates and how that quality might be improved yet further, but none suggest that they would be more successful without
this continuous supply of talent which is now not only driving this important sector of the UK economy, but also being employed by our global economic competitors.

In broad outline this is the context for the golden age for art and design education that Bichard identified. This context of change has led art and design higher education from peripheral small scale activity, catering to a separatist student community who would characterise themselves as outsiders or educational misfits who found the free-flowing, largely anarchic culture of an art school environment with fine art at its centre, a natural and supportive environment in which to grow, to a context of mass higher education of large, resource intensive, technologically sophisticated university faculties of art and design, where a greatly expanded design provision now predominates and fine art is no longer at the apex of the pantheon. The challenges for the delivery of the art and design disciplines in this context are numerous and complex but the challenges to leadership and management of these disciplines in this new context are particular and derive from the success that the sector has enjoyed.

Reference in numerous government reports can be found for the need for improved management and leadership of the design process and its interface with business communities using design, alongside the requirement for artists to lead and manage the interface of artistic practice with communities and agencies which commission their activity. However, very little has been written about the need for the development of the leadership and management skills of those now heading the educational provision for art and design. Sir Michael Bichard and others have indicated that leadership and management in the sector is shallow and there is insufficient formal development for those who wish to pursue their academic career in this direction. This is probably true for the whole of higher education, but is particularly stark in a sector where professional development has always been seen as subject specific and practice related and where a large proportion of academic staff prefer an associate or part-time relationship with the academy.

The 1970 Coldstream Report says nothing of the need for development in this area. It implicitly assumes that the artist teacher may need pedagogic assistance through attendance at short courses, to improve their teaching skills, but offers no recommendations for the development of the future leaders. The assumption is that the dedicated artist, or more rarely, design practitioner, with a love of subject and commitment to the value of education through art as intrinsically good, is all that is required. At that time this was probably true and there have certainly been some very charismatic educationally and artistically sophisticated eccentric and innovative art school principals in the history of the British art schools. All those characteristics are important and should continue to be valued but now a broader range of high level leadership skills are required. The educational process that art and design embraces from which our leaders are drawn, alongside the corporate environment of a modern university, creates particular tensions for which leaders need to be well prepared and enabled. It is no longer sufficient for strength of character and individual will, coupled with passion and belief in the value of our subjects, to be the only attributes that a leader and manager has to deploy.
Early years

Good departments are the main training ground for young academics, establishing codes of academic behaviour, acculturating them into what constitutes good performance, providing them with the professional equipment to succeed in an academic career, and giving them an identity, which ensures that they make their mark in the wider world of scholars in their field.

The department plays a vital role in sustaining institutional academic success because it provides the nursery for academic talent and creates the next generation of academic leaders by nurturing their early academic successes (Shattock, 2003).

Within the context of the increasing internationalisation of higher education, our current students are the potential leaders for the future. There is a need to develop future academic leaders, encouraged into positions of power and influence that are representative of society as a whole and able to influence decision making within our universities for the benefit of tomorrow’s students. Despite the recent expansion in higher education and an increase in the home and overseas student population, there are marked variances between the different social groups and subjects studied. People from lower social classes and ethnic minorities are not entering higher education in significant numbers. Social barriers relating to class, ethnicity and gender prohibit participation in education and therefore from achieving educational success, this prevents people from some social groups entering teaching as a profession and therefore contributing to the academic decision-making and institutional governance of our universities.

Widening participation in higher education is critical so that we can recruit academic staff representative of society generally who can then be involved in the development of the curriculum, teaching and learning and research strategies of our universities. Widening participation remains high on the government agenda and is likely to be a priority for the new Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS) and new guidance from Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) requires universities to develop outreach strategies which prioritise young people from ‘communities currently under-represented in higher education’.

Whilst senior organisational leadership is understood throughout institutions, there is a need for a model of ‘distributed leadership’ (Middlehurst and Kennie, 1997).

As the role of the academic in a modern university shifts from that of the individual or team engaged in the advancement of the subject to a position which is increasingly focused towards the needs of students, funding bodies and stakeholders, acknowledging and nurturing ‘distributed leadership’ is a means of developing future leaders from within course teams where leadership skills are initially acknowledged in roles such as module leader or year tutor. ‘Distributed leadership’ requires the development of new skills recognised and nurtured early in an academic career, developed at induction, and supported through mentoring. Early career academics will be better served by a clearer understanding of the needs of client groups and the
balance required between teaching, research and administration.

‘I think mentoring is important. We are not particularly good in terms of enabling people to understand the tools that are needed in educational management — we have a lot of leaders and managers who have just fallen into leadership roles’.

The senior leaders in the study all felt that they had progressed with little formal training and almost without exception had wished for some intervention early in their careers. Most said that they needed an induction and would have benefited from mentoring, coaching, and training. Many early career art and design academics seek part-time teaching or technician roles in higher education as a regular source of income whilst maintaining their own practice. The role of the practitioner teacher is still valued in art and design and cited in its ability to maintain currency within the curriculum and to respond to industry needs.

‘I trained at art school, where a common expectation was to teach part-time. I wanted to work part-time so that I could develop my own work in my studio. Because part-time teaching was hard to find I took a job as a technician in the first instance’.

‘I was offered a job doing a day or two’s teaching. I came in as part-time teacher and was also a practitioner. It was very nice because I was able to be certain about having a regular income, such as it was … I was able to produce collections and then go out and sell them, and also do some teaching. The one day went to two days; the two days went to three days … ’

The Dearing Inquiry into higher education recommended that ‘ … all institutions should identify and remove all barriers which inhibit recruitment and progression for particular groups and monitor and publish their progress towards greater equality of opportunity for all groups’ (Dearing, 1997).

The legislative framework for racial equality in the UK is the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. Another significant piece of relevant legislation is the Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations as well as other European race equality laws. The Commission for Racial Equality has also published a non-statutory code of practice. HEFCE’s statutory duties to promote equality in disability and gender are the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 and the Equality Act 2006. Currently, The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 requires higher education institutions to monitor staff equal opportunities on the grounds of race and the Commission for Equality and Human Rights requires further staff monitoring within other diversity strands. There are a number of organisations that work at a national level to promote equality. HEFCE with support from the Equality Challenge Unit, Equal Opportunities Commission, Action on Access, the Higher Education Academy and the Leadership Foundation, aims to support universities by developing a diverse staff and student body and improving employment.
policies to assist higher education institutions to create future leaders from minority ethnic groups. Although some progress has been made on gender equality within the sector this is not the case for racial equality. The percentage of all home ethnic minority students is not reflected in the composition of teaching staff and those in senior administrative positions and there is a need to close the gap.

There is an expectation that academic staff will hold higher postgraduate qualifications. The 2008 research assessment exercise will impact on the research profile and therefore career opportunities of individual members of academic staff. There is a need to challenge stereotypes about who studies art and design. The lack of diversity in the curriculum is particularly important because of the significance of the creative industries to the economy. Universities will need to do more than comply with legislation. The responsibility for improving equal opportunities lies with individual institutions working with the funding councils and national agencies to make progress on issues of under-representation in the workforce.

The 2005/06 Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data indicates that although 36.6% of full-time academic staff are female, the percentage of female staff in more senior roles decreases to 31% of senior lecturers and researchers, and 16.5% of professors. Ninety one per cent of full-time academic staff declared their ethnicity, and of those 11.5% full-time academic staff were from an ethnic minority. The percentage of ethnic minority staff in senior roles also decreases to 30.8% senior lecturers and researchers, and 16.5% of professors.

The case studies revealed evidence that the attitude of senior managers to new and younger staff is a crucial factor in the key decision about whether to get involved in leadership and management or to stay with the safer option of remaining in a teaching team led by someone else. Several of those interviewed gave examples of more senior managers ‘talent spotting’ possible leaders and encouraging them to move forward.

**CASE STUDY 6**

‘I was identified quite early on by the head of department, and subsequently a new dean of school, as somebody who was interested in moving things on, and was made course leader for the new fine art course.’

However, other interviewees described blocks at this early stage, which were often only overcome by moving institutions.

**CASE STUDY 3**

‘Yes, I think there were barriers. I had a profound sense in one institution that women did not progress. I think it’s very difficult to put your finger on it, but a sense that you get close to something and then somebody would undermine you.

Again at another point, when they were looking at the annual, reward review and they suggested that a male colleague had an upgrade for doing what I had been doing for the last three years and no-one had ever spoken to me about an increment reward.'
I had been knocked back for promotion and within a year I had made two jumps, by moving institutions. At ‘X’ I only wanted to be an old university senior lecturer but ‘Y’ wanted to make me a professor.

‘I was approached again and accepted the role of course leader, but I was told by the vice-principal that I would have to remain as a lecturer. I knew all the other course leaders were on a senior lecturer scale. I thought it was such an awful thing to do and decided to move.’

Other interviewees took the decision to move forward and lead a team because they are ambivalent about being managed by someone else in the team, indicating a preference to manage rather than be managed, or because no one else wished to take that responsibility.

‘I suppose I became the year 1 tutor because no-one else wanted to do it, or would do it, but I wanted to do it because I wanted to be in charge. I wanted to change things.’

‘I thought it would be more of a challenge but it was boredom more than anything else, and my head of department was very positive about it. That was when I moved to become a senior lecturer.

I took it over because there had been someone acting, looking after textiles, and was hopeless. I was so frustrated and I just felt that I could do it better.

My head of department just trusted people to do things and would let you get on with them, and he was always very approachable. I think the thing I learnt most from him was the way in which he dealt with people. He was very encouraging about management and about women in management.’

Growing into a leadership position from the first hesitant steps has similarities to the teenage years where a mix of emotions and experiences direct an individual in their outlook on life, and in the case of higher education, their management and leadership skills and approaches. A self-conscious approach to being the manager and leader means that feelings associated with this position relate to finding out about oneself, self-belief and being aware of the need to remain within the discipline and draw upon skills of a self-reflective practitioner. These characteristics are often stumbled upon, and reflected in the case studies, where more often than not there is a lack of self-confidence identified.

‘I suppose that some people would say I had no personal ambition, which in terms of climbing the career ladder within higher education is absolutely spot on. There is a bit of self doubt that will always be with me.’
The process of becoming a leader and its identity has been a crucial development in higher education over the last few years, when the former Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown was openly critical of higher education leadership and led to the formation of the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. Added to this he commissioned the Cox report on the creative industries (Cox, 2005) which gave a much-needed impetus to put leadership of creative education into the heart of the higher education agenda. Developing leadership skills in the current environment is possibly more acceptable than it was in the past as the case studies demonstrate. The growing need for design education has not diminished since the municipal art colleges were first introduced in the Victorian era, and as a consequence there is a growing skill set emerging for leadership development.

CASE STUDY 5

‘I now became more interested in the organisation of the curriculum; the management of people, making the best of the limited resources that were available. I realised that I needed to know about other things, and at that point my practice started to suffer because I did not know enough to do the job.’

The process of becoming a leader is full of growing pains as the boundaries move and change and experience becomes an essential part of development. Institutions conscious of this need have put more management and leadership training in place for newly appointed staff in positions regardless of the role they play as it is now widely understood that ‘leadership not just happens at the top, but is integral to the whole organisation and practised at a variety of levels’ (Elvidge, 2005).

Art and design practitioners in education however, seem to adapt to the changes and realisation that impact is possible by drawing on a range of skills developed within the discipline. A general criticism of higher education management and its difference with the highly polished private sector is that it is often regarded as ‘untidy’ (Elvidge, 2005) with too many self managed professional academics who have little regard for the sense of unity and organisation as it has little to do with them personally. It is probably a real strength that characteristics of art and design educators fit well in a system that relies on people being able to constantly embrace change, instability and ambiguity.

CASE STUDY 5

‘I have been able to recognise the changes that have affected me in relation to the roles I have taken on. I have loved it all really, it’s got harder and harder and I think it is the responsibility that makes it hard.’

A major realisation when entering a leadership role is the power of the organisational culture and the impact this has on an individual’s ability to manage change. Making changes now becomes a complex issue with often a set of conflicting priorities. A set of discipline cultures in art and design and within the institution itself refers to the cultural web in which managers operate (Johnson and Scholes, 1997). Strategic decision making becomes more difficult to implement as responding to different cultures within and through the institution can have a significant impact on the growing leader and their ability to adapt to change and the realisation that the external world is looking at what you do.
'It also alerted me to the fact that a lot of people on the outside were going to be looking at what I was going to do in terms of working in this institution, and in particular within this department.'

However, through this process the leader grows in ability and forms a dedicated set of attitudes, beliefs and behaviours that begins to set them apart from junior colleagues and moves towards a growing relationship with senior colleagues. ‘Managers rely heavily on frames of reference which are built up over a period of time and which are especially important at a collective organisational level’ (Johnson and Scholes, 1997) and a realisation that leadership is between people at all levels and the sense of responsibility grows as the leader moves into more generic areas.

‘Concepts of effective management and leadership might be contingent on the academic discipline involved, lack of affiliation or sense of belonging to university may have been fostered by the management in which academic careers are constructed.’ (Elvidge, 2005)

‘I first became aware of letting go of my students when I read a paper in the early 90s by Biggs on deep and surface approaches to learning, and I became really interested in the wider context of the student experience.’

But it is the contention that within art and design the skills base should not be seen to be lost or irrelevant to more senior roles because of the developing importance of creative subjects being mainstreamed within large institutions.

‘In a large metropolitan university they become an enormous force for change and creativity across all the subject disciplines within those organisations.’

A changing approach to management and leadership training might be developed using core competencies from art and design to manage this transition. One of the biggest requests from the case studies was to have a mentor, someone to work with, to share ideas, to discuss concepts and ambitions, rather than a set of traditional management training sessions. Active learning sets were also described as being of extreme importance in developing skills and relationships. This fits neatly with methods of work in which we are familiar, critiques, reflective practice, ideas development and implementation and problem solving.

‘As an artist you embrace uncertainty, you follow your imagination, you seek out your creativity, you think laterally and you are a problem solver, and you always have to have a strategic view on where you wish to go. So apart from being a change agent I know that these are attributes that some of my PVC colleagues value in me.’
These attributes lead to a clear career trajectory and the ability to be responsible for change and to manage our own destinies to improve the academic excellence and student experience necessary for today’s society.

**CASE STUDY 2**  ‘The vision embodied a dynamic energetic form of education that put the student at its very centre and valued learning through doing and making.’

Interestingly few of our case studies had ambitions to be the first vice-chancellor from an art and design discipline. As the impact of leadership in institutions is changing the nature of the top jobs change, but there is great scope for the traits of entrepreneurship and creativity forming the basis for strong leadership at the top. However, there is clearly a need to be more explicit as the subject grows in importance against other sector disciplines.

**CASE STUDY 5**  ‘Your actions can actually affect a lot of people. I think that everybody in a senior position within an institution has to think very carefully, not be risk adverse, but you do have to think, you do have to know what is going on, and you do have to be informed not only about your own immediate job, but informed about the bigger picture too. You need to know about initiatives that will change our industries, and the initiatives that will change the way in which we work within universities.’

**Mid-life**

The term ‘mid-life’ has been adopted to describe a career stage characterised in a number of different ways, broadly speaking this is the point in an academic career involving progression beyond the role of course tutor or programme leader. In terms of an academic management route, this stage is identifiable by titles such as head of programmes, head of department and associate dean, although these titles are not exclusive. More recently, in art and design opportunities to progress to what we describe as a ‘mid-life’ career stage now exist through other routes for staff with specific expertise, for example, research or knowledge transfer.

Although this definition is not precise and finite it parallels that of the ‘middle manager’ in higher education (Handcock and Hellawell, 2003, Clegg and McAuley, 2005) and the assumptions and perceptions about ‘mid-life’ identified from our discussions and the case studies evidence this.

One of the perceptions about moving to ‘mid-life’ is that it inevitably means an increasing disassociation from the subject; immersion on a daily basis becomes impossible and the ‘mid-lifer’ has to learn to ‘let go’. For staff involved in creative practice this can be a tension and potential deterrent to taking this next ‘career step’.
'I worked extremely hard but my practice actually suffered because I needed to become a different type of person to do a very different type of job, I could actually feel the change happening to me.'

The ‘change’ described here requires some consideration. Traditionally, much academic practice and pedagogy in art and design is practice-based and it is through their ‘own work’, however articulated, that staff establish credibility with both their peers and students. Cultural capital is developed and maintained through this process. Consequently, moving forward potentially threatens academic status and involves increased isolation from the peer group or ‘tribe’ with no apparent new ‘tribe’ to join.

Existing literature defines the ‘middle management’ role as potentially alienated and marginal, with a loss of personal and professional freedom, coupled with an exclusion from decision-making (Handcock and Hellawell, 2003, Clegg and McAuley, 2005). Our own discussions added the following, an apparent increased workload and responsibility, little additional financial reward, possible lack of support. In all, powerful deterrents for the prospective art and design leader moving forward to ‘mid-life’.

Induction to the role typified as ‘mid-life’ appears to be virtually non-existent; there is little formal staff development or management training evident from the case studies. However, there was evidence of support and this was usually in the form of a key individual in a more senior position, an informal, unacknowledged mentoring. It would appear that their approach, ‘hands either on or off’ enabled the newly appointed ‘mid-lifer’ to adapt and develop in the role.

‘He was a great confidence builder... he let me run my department and supported me and what he also did was fight your corner in the wider university. All the time you felt that if push came to shove, he would be there to support you and that was great. I learnt a lot from him.’

‘I’ve had three managers who have developed me — because I’ve been useful to them and they’ve needed me, but nonetheless they’ve been quite careful they haven’t just used me.

I always took every opportunity to attend anything that I thought would be useful. I have never been knocked back in my career for a request to attend a conference or an event, and I don’t think that is untypical because I run staff development for my faculty and I very rarely refuse any request, but people don’t come forward, they say “I haven’t got time” or “I do not want to do any extra”. I was eager to network, I found it supportive in times of difficulty in my institution or my career, to have a peer group to call on, and then mid career I evolved a female peer group which I call on now’.
Being allowed to ‘do the job’ and feeling empowered is a thread throughout the case studies. Through this ‘mid-lifers’ appear to gain satisfaction from their new, demanding roles. There is recognition that mistakes do happen and this forms an important part of the learning process. This concept has much in common with ‘learning by doing’ as articulated by Schön, which is intrinsic to art and design pedagogy and is perhaps equally significant in developing leadership capabilities. The observation here indicates this is fundamental, even more important than the ‘supportive’ senior manager.

CASE STUDY 8  ‘In my new job I had lots of freedom and responsibility and I thrived on it. I did some international collaboration and recruitment and some engagement with the centre. There was no formal support and I had the worst dean I ever encountered’.

Engagement with the ‘centre’ brings an increasing awareness of the institutional contexts within which art and design operates. In addition, the extended remit of mid-life roles, engaging with the wider community, external agencies, national and international collaboration develops a strong sense of responsibility.

It is the broader remit of these roles, which can make this stage interesting and challenging. For the new mid-lifer this rapid introduction to the wider context is a steep learning curve requiring new skills and the ability to adapt quickly. In addition to this exposure, the mid-life role still includes day-to-day operational activity, quality assurance, and human and financial resource management. In discussion, there was acknowledgement of the transferability of ‘creative skills’, particularly ‘creative thinking’ to different contexts, beyond the discipline and subject. Arguably, at this stage this becomes crucial to both job satisfaction and survival.

CASE STUDY 2  ‘I learnt a lot about how to be an entrepreneur from him, how to make money for your school and department something that I hadn’t been able to do in [institution A]; there wasn’t any money or opportunity. But [institution B] has opportunities, and that is part of my present job I enjoy, so in other words being able to use my entrepreneurship has been something that has been nascent from way back in my career.’

For some, this stage is the first opportunity to develop individual interests and demonstrate leadership in particular areas, such as learning and teaching, marketing or international development. These opportunities are empowering, coupled with the successful adaptation to increased responsibility and understanding of the ‘bigger picture’ may be just the motivation some ‘mid-lifers’ need to progress their careers further. For others there may need to be a little prompting.

CASE STUDY 5  ‘My predecessor (as dean), who I had a great deal of respect for said to me “you are going to have to think about what you are going to do”. It was like someone dragging a stick along a bird cage and I thought “don’t say that I am busy doing this ... don’t say that, don’t myther me with that, I have things to do here.”’
Senior professional

We are using this term to describe individuals in posts such as pro-vice-chancellor, dean, rector, pro-rector and head of college.

At this level leaders of art and design higher education appear to have far greater autonomy, and possess the means to realise their vision through the management of staff, physical resources and longer term strategic planning. They are also required to contribute to institutional missions and strategies, and thus work with the art and design team as a leader, whilst also operating as a leader at an institutional level. Here they can contribute to the ethos and culture of their university, and are empowered to develop and realise their own style within the context of a team of leaders drawn from a range of backgrounds which normally include the humanities and science. The particular make up of the senior team impacts strongly upon the art and design leader and can either enable them to work to personal and discipline strength or mitigate against that, often because of hierarchical perceptions of subjects and the value those have in the academy.

‘I’m in a senior team with three people — we’ve all got complementary personalities. You have to have the strength of character to say this is what I believe in and this is how we should do it, because that’s leadership and that’s what people are looking for. But you’ve got to listen and pick out what you think is a valuable comment and then adapt it and go back to people and consult again, otherwise you don’t take people with you.’

‘I’m not the logical data driven scientific kind of leader — I’m an emotional leader. I lead through a passion for art and design education, and people want to follow me.’

It is worth noting how the shift of focus from subjects and knowledge, to students as clients, within universities has impacted onto and the hierarchy of value associated with different disciplines. This has allowed for greater recognition of so called ‘softer’ subjects such as art and design, media practice and the performing arts within the unified sector. This is exemplified by the rise in art and design applications as opposed to the demise of engineering courses, and the resultant hybrid design engineering courses that have arisen as an attempt to use the attractiveness of design to support endangered engineering disciplines. However, the impact of this shift is restricted to the modern universities, as opposed to old universities, where the growth of art and design student numbers has had little appreciable impact. In addition we must recognise that networking outside of one’s own institution or the art and design professional bodies, at a senior level is severely hampered by the dominance of the old universities (where art and design is extremely small) in many for, and on national committees. This imbalance of representation can make operating at this level a more isolated experience, and can also mean that government agendas can impact negatively into art and design provision.
‘Since I became pro-rector, I joined the pro-vice-chancellor network and the HEA pro-vice-chancellors network and I find that quite interesting, speaking to people at the same level as me but in other contexts.’

Working at a senior level is increasingly demanding the capacity to work with external agencies; city councils, RDAs and industry, both in terms of art and design initiatives, but also multidisciplinary projects in such areas as health technology design, life long learning networks or civic regeneration. A breadth of understanding across art and design and beyond, for instance, into built environment, computing or engineering is demanded. Individuals at this level need to be confident in communicating the virtues of art and design to colleagues from other backgrounds both within and beyond their institution.

‘Pro-vice-chancellors are increasingly perceived as senior executives, not colleagues, in the corporate world of the university and to realise this change academic or disciplinary orientation may need to be relegated behind other priorities.’

(Smith, Adams and Mount, 2006)

www.lfhe.ac.uk/publications/newsletters.html/engage7.pdf

There is a generally held myth in art and design that moving up through the leadership route equates with leaving your subject behind, the notion of ‘the stained glass ceiling’ — and that the specific nature of the art and design disciplines as practice, makes this a particularly difficult decision.

However, the case studies reveal that the reality of experience of some of those in senior positions, is that as a dean or pro-vice-chancellor you are enabled to work from art and design on a very large canvas, and that far from leaving their subject behind senior leaders from art and design are increasingly able to take their subject with them, and locate it centrally within the modern university sector. This offers the current and upcoming generation of leaders the opportunity to enhance the higher education sector through the essential characteristics of art and design; learning through making, a positive approach to change and to risk, and achieving the manifestation of ideas as artefact or image. Given the power of images and of branding within contemporary society, art and design brings potent capacities to enhance our 21st century higher education institutions.

There is a clear move away from the notion that higher management means general management. It is arguable that in the move from specialist colleges into the polytechnic sector in the 1970s, that ‘safe pairs of hands’ were selected as leaders of art and design to ensure that the natural volatility characteristic of our disciplines did not threaten the new arrangements. It is because of our history within specialist colleges that many still speak of art and design as a young subject within the university sector. This is most often quoted in relation to research and postgraduate qualifications. However, the last 25 years have seen significant growth in art and design, as described in the context section of this paper. In addition the period between 1998 and 2002 can be viewed as a critical moment in the coming of age of our disciplines within the modern university sector.
sector. From 1998 to 2000 art and design in the UK underwent a process of review as required by higher education funding bodies and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). There was evidence of strength across the art and design providers with the majority getting high or excellence ratings. In the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise, art and design did well in securing funding both through the achievement of 4 and 5 grades, but also through capability funding for 3a graded returns, by returning relatively healthy numbers of researchers.

‘In the 1980s I became aware of the possibilities for research in art and design. I anticipated a growing role for research as polytechnics became closer to, and then merged with universities. At that point I began planning my career towards participating in the emergent field of research. I was ambitious and expected that leadership would come as part of a successful career but it was not a goal in itself.’

The QAA and RAE results together offered senior colleagues from outwith art and design, forms of evidence of the health and credibility of art and design, and established a platform of trust and acceptance from which senior managers are now able to operate, and forms the underpinning for Sir Michael Bichard’s claim that we are entering a ‘golden age’.

**Conclusion**

The following emerge as key considerations for successful leadership in art and design higher education:

- mentoring — both informal and formal, is particularly key at early, ‘teenage’ and mid-life points
- a capacity to continue to learn from others who either have other skills or are more experienced
- the confidence to take risks within a supportive environment
- feeling empowered to take on full responsibility to ‘do the job’ and to make and learn from mistakes without fear of censure
- a passion for, and real connection with the disciplines
- a capacity for lateral thinking
- the ability to foster one’s own creativity and that of others
- an understanding of the complex interrelationship of physical and human resource management required in an art and design provision
- experience and knowledge of the creative and cultural industries sector
- the desire and the ability to take your discipline with you and to apply discipline capabilities in unfamiliar contexts.
Key traits, practices and capabilities include:

- depth of knowledge of the discipline through a strong grounding in practice as a teacher
- extensive experience of the practices of making and doing and the accompanying reflective processes
- knowledge and understanding of the higher education environment and wider contexts including regional and community agendas, government policies and international trends
- the confidence to work from experience and use one’s intuition
- the capacity to work within as well as lead a team, understanding one’s own and others’ roles
- the ability to construct strong effective teams; to be a good judge of character, and to appoint exceptional people
- the confidence to work to strengths reinforcing success at both personal and group levels
- the ability to challenge other’s actions and thinking – not being easily intimidated
- the capacity to balance focus and flexibility in order to negotiate shifting policies, needs and goals
- the capacity to articulate and demonstrate respect for staff and the particular contributions they can make
- a strong interest in people and an understanding of what motivates colleagues in the art and design disciplines
- integrity, and transparency of processes
- a strong sense of commitment to opening opportunities for staff and students
- a capacity to harness creative energies and use discipline volatility as a positive force; passion in action
- a genuine interest in students and an understanding of their desires, needs and motivations
- a high degree of self awareness and recognition of the impact of one’s decisions on others, and a willingness to take responsibility for one’s own and others’ actions and directions.

The case studies revealed that in order to progress, individuals often have to move from one institution to another, key triggers to such a move included:

- financial; working in higher education where resources did not meet an acceptable threshold for effective delivery or a positive student experience
- issues of integrity; an institution moving in a direction, which is unacceptable to an individual
- problems with a line manager; blocking progress, exclusion.
Other key factors, which emerged, are the shallowness of the pool of new staff entering art and design, and thus those who can be developed on to leadership and management roles. Some of those at entry level display inappropriate expectations of progress in relation to performance and are prone to disengage and become disillusioned at the level of course leader or head of department, regressing into a ‘them and us’ position. In addition, greater consideration by younger staff of the work/life balance, and a perception that more work does not equate with appropriate levels of more pay, seem to inhibit progression from lecturer grade to senior spine positions.

In order to address the challenges of leadership for future success in art and design higher education, those currently in positions of leadership must work in the sector and in their own institutions to alter the perceptions of leadership and management by those operating at lower levels. Some of this will involve questioning myths about progression, for example, that management equates to administration — all meetings and paperwork that it puts you at a distance from students, and most importantly takes you out of your own community of practice. In addition there is an incorrect perception that is not borne out by RAE returns that senior staff cease to be active in their own discipline.

Managers at all levels need to make visible and articulate the process of moving from team to team and the excitement of creating new networks which this affords if they are to act as role models.

Alongside this, we in the art and design sector should desist from our historical separateness — the ‘art and design is different’ argument of the polytechnic era and specialist providers — to demonstrations of how art and design is better, and offers an appropriate model to other disciplines, through its deep understanding of methods of learning by doing. It is important for art and design staff at various levels in universities to work with colleagues from other disciplines and not rely on senior managers to network across disciplines. Leaders must feel confident in sending staff to central committees, working parties, and development units, and resist the protective paternalistic approach of sheltering colleagues in art and design from the educational worlds beyond their own.

Skills of delegation and empowerment are essential, as is the articulation of vision at a senior and institutional level. These three capabilities come together with a deep understanding of learning by doing to form the creative process which will be essential to the new generation of senior art and design leaders.

We recognise that there is much work to be done to strengthen leadership potential in our discipline and recommend that key bodies such as GLAD work with the Leadership Foundation to establish an art and design mentoring and development scheme to bring forward the next generation of leaders.
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Abstract

This chapter is an attempt to articulate a shared unease about whether art and design in higher education is adequately addressing the creativity agenda as described in *The Innovation Gap* (National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts, October 2006). In particular, we wondered if our tried and tested 20th century curricular structures were still effective in a 21st century world.

Very early in our deliberations we identified a shared anxiety about the ways in which our subject and its constituent disciplines are currently described and we questioned the cultures of learning associated with them. We agreed that the term ‘subject’ should describe the overarching configuration of subject titles — art, design, media, communication; while the constituent specialisms — sculpture, graphic design, fashion and so on, should be described as ‘disciplines’.

The Bau-Wow in our title began as an affectionate working title but was, in the end, retained because it seemed both to capture our distinguished pedagogic past and imply art and design’s continuing duty to foster wonderment — our chapter asks if our prevailing educational structures are becoming less able to deliver the unexpected.
Questioning current learning cultures in art, design, media and communication

David Hayward

It is almost half a century since the Coldstream and Summerson reports paved the way for art and design to be admitted into the halls of academe. Since then, and especially since the incorporation of polytechnics in the early 1990s, the number and variety of undergraduate courses has grown exponentially. Subjects such as fashion, graphics and 3D design have, over the years, divided and subdivided to produce an ever-widening taxonomy of new-variant specialisms.

With the government’s drive to increase participation still further through new, vocationally focused foundation degrees and the targeted expansion of higher education delivered in colleges of further education, it is not surprising that collectively, providers have responded by introducing more and more courses designed to corner ever more specialist niche markets. Students are now having to make life-defining decisions by choosing specialist courses that would have been undreamed of by earlier generations.

It is our view that this proliferation of highly specialised courses is creating a new set of educational dilemmas. The world outside is changing more quickly and more profoundly than ever before. New ways of being creative are appearing, interbreeding, mutating or disappearing far faster than universities can spot them, let alone nail them down with a validation. Nowadays there is an increasing fluidity of knowledge and skill that cannot be easily apprehended within our current idea of cognate disciplines.

Moreover, the need for high level craft skills is being eroded by new technologies and this is likely to continue apace. Sophisticated manipulation of image and form can be achieved through software, smart technology and rapid prototyping. Out there, creativity-for-all is being built into every mobile phone, home computer and interactive game. Future-proofing is now perhaps the most serious academic concern for those of us who are preparing students to engage with the creative needs of the 21st century.

It is our view that the primacy of specialist disciplines within our art school structures has, in many ways, confined staff expertise, limited student expectations and restricted fields of creativity to implied and predictable sets of teaching and learning outcomes. We certainly try hard to offset narrowness by providing opportunities for developing transferable skills, encouraging self-directed learning and providing ‘real-world’ experiences through placements, exchanges and electives. However, we have to admit that our overriding desire is to equip our undergraduate students with unique, advanced and hard-won skills and understandings that are specific to our perception of ‘discipline’. But, by continuing to champion the sovereignty of specialist disciplines, we should also acknowledge that we may be painting a sizeable proportion of our students into ever tighter and non-viable occupational corners.

In this chapter, we argue that it is time to re-think our old art school allegiances to disciplinary territories, departmental resources and course team loyalties. If the visual arts
are to have a stake in the future, then we must extend the teaching of creativity through planned provision that celebrates and nurtures the kinds of innovative connectivity that students are already engaged with outside their academic lives.

Networking sites like wikis, blogs, MySpace, YouTube, and other web 2 technologies, together with modern persistent virtual environments, such as Second Life, have created dynamic interactive communities that can communicate instantly and creatively through a fluid and sophisticated mixture of image, word and sound that is no longer dependent on hard earned knowledge. The web is stealing the authority of academics. Students are raiding and recycling ideas and information and challenging notions of intellectual property. Whether we like it or not, software is making everything ‘easy’. What is important now is the ability to connect, stitch, cut and paste with agility, purpose and judgment. What is important now is to be trans-disciplinary and creatively mobile.

The increasing mutability between the virtual and the haptic and between art and non-art may well threaten many of our current teaching and learning methods. But, if we rethink and broaden our understanding of creativity, then it offers enormous possibilities. In its recent report *The Innovation Gap* (October 2006), the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA) states:

> ‘Innovation policy needs to be imaginative and encompass a wide range of interventions that are relevant to stimulating and supporting innovation. It would be useful to focus more on the multi-directional flows within and between science and technology, architects and developers, designers and producers, government and industry, management and engineering, universities and industry, and customers and suppliers’ (p. 5).

It is time to ask ourselves whether old discipline-based loyalties are holding us back from embracing new approaches to the teaching of creativity. Has the sovereignty of ‘the course’ locked us into outmoded pedagogic cultures and our students into increasingly compartmentalised sets of learning experiences? Is it time to admit that art schools are becoming surprisingly conservative places?

We suggest that now is the time to develop an alternative pedagogy for creativity that that will by-pass the old tensions that lie between academic tribalism and specialist territory. Art has often led the educational field in developing new teaching and learning strategies. With a little confidence, it is well placed to begin to find new ways to be in the vanguard of an education that will channel and exploit the creative potential that is emerging in the spaces between disciplines, and build the kinds of academic links and bridges that will be so vital in tomorrow’s world. In short, art and design students need to be given more opportunity to rub academic shoulders with each other and with those from other academic communities.

To achieve this we need to relax our allegiances to courses based on specialist disciplines by designing new educational arenas in which staff and students interact creatively and in a sustained way with those from other areas of expertise. We need to break down the paradigm of students spending three undergraduate years working within unchanging,
homogenous course cohorts. As an alternative, we should develop more fluid, less linear curricular structures in which teaching teams and student groups form and re-form in ways that genuinely recognise and respond to the transience, speed and unpredictability of the 21st century.

Specialist staff with different skills and disciplinary backgrounds would form transitory project teams that would convene multi-directional learning opportunities through the proposal of challenging scenarios or issue-driven agendas. In this way, visual arts students could engage more dynamically with their counterparts in other creative and academic communities and learn to interact more potently within the broader flux and flow of cross-disciplinary innovation.

Historical and contemporary contexts
Tim Dunbar

At this point we want to consider some of the precedents for this proposal. We want to show both how the proposal has been informed by the more radical developments in the pedagogy of art and design over the last fifty years, and also to underline its distinctiveness from them.

Historical context

In the early stages of our discussions the iconic curriculum diagram associated with the Bauhaus was often referenced and became the visual model for our deliberations (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Original Bauhaus curriculum diagram
(Gropius, 1923)
If we consider the Bauhaus further, our model shares a number of features that were included by Gropius in the First Proclamation of the Weimar Bauhaus in 1919 (Gropius, 1919).

Firstly, the Bauhaus educational model was grounded on a set of critical making and thinking skills, derived from the spiritually imbued visuality of early modernism, introduced and positioned at the core of the curriculum. Gropius’ use of the term ‘complete building’ can be considered as the equivalent to our notion of the issue/thematic-based project operating as the focal point of the curriculum. His notion of ‘cooperative effort of all craftsmen’ suggests an approach to learning that involves some kind of cross-disciplinary, non hierarchical engagement with materials and ideas, while the notion of being ‘absorbed by the workshop’, reinforces the centrality of the acquisition of essential thinking and making skills, described in our proposal as key attributes. The assertion that ‘art cannot be taught’ echoes something that is fundamental to our proposal in that we consider that education, both in and through art and design, must be explicitly and emphatically experiential as a lived experience of, and through, the project and its related contexts.

Since the Bauhaus, a number of institutions have attempted to question not only the nature of art and design as a subject, but also the shifting nature — the ‘elasticity’ of its learning culture. Indicative examples of these institutions are Black Mountain College, Alverno College, both from the United States and the work of Roy Ascott from the United Kingdom.

Black Mountain College, was founded in 1933 by John Andrew Rice and went on to become one of the most important experimental institutions in arts education and practice with an expansive curriculum, experimental in nature and committed to an interdisciplinary approach across the visual, literary, and performing arts. It has connections back to the Bauhaus through the influential teaching of Josef Albers who taught there with his wife Anni Albers during the 1930s. Its key ambitions have been outlined by Harris (2005):

- to foster initiative, cooperation and ingenuity …
- to learn not just information but a method of dealing with that information and values were to be tested as rigorously as ideas …
- the arts were to be an integral part of community life and the learning process …
- through the practice of the arts the student would learn discipline, initiative and responsibility as well as imaginative, creative approach to problem solving whether he or she became an artist, banker, a professor or a farmer.

The more recent emergence of Alverno College, a women’s arts college in Milwaukee, also demonstrates another highly distinctive and radical approach to student learning. The community of learning that has been developed there since the 1970s takes the form of an ability-based education. The specific abilities are described in Making Connections (Alverno College, 2007): ‘communication, analysis, problem solving, value
in decision-making, social interaction, developing a global perspective, effective citizenship, aesthetic engagement’. In practice this means that students will:

- make connections between the ideas they are studying and their own lives as individuals, citizens, and professionals …
- see the classroom as a place for students to practise the kinds of thinking and doing that they will need in their lives …
- learning draws from and takes place beyond the classroom in contexts where students put their studies to use.

The work of Roy Ascott as an educator and practitioner over the last 40 years provides an example of how a radicalised approach to new technologies can generate a similar paradigm shift in art and design education. His early work in setting up the Ground Course at Ealing College of Art and Design in 1961 was built on his interests in a cybernetic exchange between his arts practice and pedagogy, drawing together artists and scientists in a cohesive teaching team. Ascott went on to be President of the Ontario School of Art and Design in Toronto where for a year he set about challenging the existing curriculum and pedagogic approaches with an approach based on cybernetic principles. He later set up, and was Director of the Centre for Advanced Learning in the Interactive Arts in Newport. He is now President of the Planetary Collegium based in the University of Plymouth. The ambitions of the Planetary Collegium are described in its mission statement (www.planetary-collegium.net) as:

- old academic structures are being replaced by research organisms fitted to the telematic, post-biological society …
- combines the physical face-to-face transdisciplinary association of individuals with the nomadic, trans-cultural requirements of a networking community …
- a transdisciplinary perspective which seeks the integration of art, science, technology, and consciousness research within a post-biological culture.

**Contemporary context**

More recently other radical approaches to subject definition and associated learning cultures have emerged in a number of major institutions who share a concern to change an over prescriptive definition of the subject and related specialist disciplines of art and design. The following extract from a paper by Daniel Boyarski (1998) summarises the nature of this concern.

‘The design disciplines are currently in a state of flux …

… a partnering, not just with each other, but with the technological, humanistic, and business fields in the development of new products — real and virtual.

It will take an attitude of openness, cooperation, and exploration on the part of educators, administrators, students, professional designers, company executives, and funding agencies — with new and continuing education as the goal. New methods of working together will evolve, as will evaluation and discussion of such practices.’
Examples of this openness of approach and exploration of subject definition and learning culture can be found at the d-school at Stanford University; the Cambridge Crucible Initiative; and the Royal College of Art in London.

**The d-school** is based in the Institute of Design at Stanford University. The manifesto of the d-school was originally written on a table napkin and has four primary ambitions beyond its explicit intention to create the ‘best design school, period’. It will prepare ‘future innovators’ who will use ‘design thinking’ to inspire multidisciplinary teams, who will then foster ‘radical collaboration’ between students, faculty and industry in order to tackle ‘big projects’.

These fundamental ambitions are expanded in the school’s website (www.stanford.edu/group/dschool) where the following issues are highlighted:

- strong multidisciplinary groups come together, build a collaborative culture, and explore the intersection of their different points of view
- designers in the mix is key to success in multidisciplinary collaboration and critical to uncovering unexplored areas of innovation
- teams have greater impact when their ideas integrate human, business and technical factors
- brings together diverse teams of experts that would otherwise never collaborate
- radical collaboration creates a culture of innovation
- project teams to tackle difficult, messy problems and tackle hard industry problems that demand interdisciplinary solutions.

**Cambridge Crucible Initiative** is a research network within and around the University of Cambridge. The Crucible website (www.crucible.cl.cam.ac.uk) describes its primary purpose:

‘… to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration of technologists with researchers in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (AH&SS).

… with its main focus on design as a meeting point for widely differing research disciplines.

This approach avoids the traditional suspicion between disciplines by using a strategy that invokes the goal of reflective and interdisciplinary design as a meeting point for researchers.’

In a more general sense, this will also shift the position of the skilled, specialist designer so that they become a part of the whole product cycle within its related social context.

**InnovationRCA** is a new network set up by the Royal College of Art (RCA) in collaboration with Imperial College London. One of its aims is to link recent RCA design graduates with Imperial business and technology expertise in an ‘innovation triangle’. This involves programmes in applied research, product development and creative business that support students and graduates to work with business and technology partners in a more innovative and effective manner.
A wider aim is to help business organisations of all kinds to innovate by introducing new knowledge, new products and new practices from the multidisciplinary community of designers, artists and researchers at the Royal College of Art (see www.innovation.rca.ac.uk).

It is clear that our proposal shares a model or paradigm of a radicalised learning culture for art and design with a number of institutions and individuals. But, we believe that the degree of paradigm shift we are proposing gives our proposal a distinctive edge. This distinctiveness is about a ‘potential for transferability’. The d-school, for example, has many shared positions regarding multi/interdisciplinary approaches to ‘big and messy’ projects but it is very much located by its institutional position. Our proposal has been developed as a model with absolute transferability. It is structured around a set of curriculum features that require an extreme ‘elasticity’ of its learning culture, but it has the capacity to be deployed, either formally or informally, in almost all educational situations.

**A proposal for an alternative model to support creative practice, thinking, learning, research and innovation in the 21st century**

Alan Cummings

As we have illustrated above in *Historical and contemporary contexts*, initiatives in which learning, teaching, research and practice happen in interdisciplinary environments are not uncommon. Similarly, there are both historical precedents and ongoing examples of situations where issues and ‘life skills’ rather than ‘subjects’ drive the learning process. Currently, the RCA is developing new initiatives, which aim to bring design, technology and business together in learning, or more often research, and innovation environments — see: *Innovation RCA and Design-London* at: www.designlondon.net. There are other examples where the aim is to release the potential of multi-level collaboration, perhaps involving school children, university students and professional practitioners, i.e. *Joined Up Design* (see www.thesorrellfoundation.com). However, all the examples of which we are aware are either not directed specifically towards the arts and design or go only part of the way in exploring liberation from the pedagogic traditions of art and design in a higher education environment.

Any proposal for an alternative approach to learning starts from the observation or feeling that the prevailing approach is failing in some way. Our proposal emerged from a mutual concern that the traditional, discipline and level dominated approach to art and design education is failing to nurture the individual and collective creativity and the many other important attributes which can flourish in the space where disciplines, generations and cultures meet. What we propose here, from an art and design perspective, is simply to extend the kind of thinking many people have done before to its ultimate (and dauntingly ambitious) conclusion.
Our collective thinking process is summarised in Figure 2. Our starting point was that ‘art and design’ should not be our starting point. We suggest that our primary concern as educators for the cultural and creative industries of the 21st century should be creativity itself, nurtured within a broadly defined sphere of activity described as ‘creative practice’. Alongside creativity should go the ability to reflect on the processes and outcomes of creative practice and the ability to apply individual and collective creativity in innovation.

**Figure 2: The collective thought process**

- **LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGIES**
  - would include existing and evolving approaches: peer learning, seminars, lectures, crits, tutorials, exchanges, placements, independent learning, team learning, studio and workshop practice, demonstrations, blended learning, e-learning, virtual communities

- **KEY ATTRIBUTES FOR STUDENTS**
  - the primary aims would be to develop students’ entrepreneurialism, versatility, critical, reflective and evaluative skills, risk-taking, teamworking, motivation, networking skills, general and cross-disciplinary communication skills, confidence, independence, potential for leadership, contextual awareness, technical competences, research skills, ability to extend their own learning

- **RELEVANT EXPERTISE FOR PROJECT TEAMS**
  - might include, for example: science and technology, engineering, medicine, built environment, fine art, design, performance moving image, sound design and music, social sciences, ethnography, anthropology, service and system design, ecology, writing, or business

- **ISSUES AND DRIVERS**
  - include: sustainability and environment, new materials and technologies, internationalism, globalisation, multi-culturalism creative industries and innovation agenda; employer agenda: skills versus versatility

- **FORMS OF DISCIPLINE ENGAGEMENT**
  - would be inclusive all forms of activity could be embraced within a project: monodisciplinary, multidisciplinary, intradisciplinary, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, neodisciplinary

- **MODES AND LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION**
  - would be inclusive project teams could include participants of all types: undergraduate, postgraduate (training and research), post-doctoral, professional cpd, part and full-time

- **APPROACH TO EDUCATION**
  - is, however: to drive learning through issue and theme-based projects, always with multi-disciplinary participation NOT through sustained, specialist discipline-based curricula. Learning remains student-centred, project- and practice-based but the vehicle is the project not the department or the discipline

- **CORE HIGHER EDUCATION ACTIVITIES**
  - continue to be: learning and teaching, research, practice knowledge transfer
Just as we question the appropriateness of ‘art and design’ as a descriptor of the territory in which people (in particular, young people) aspire to explore and develop their creativity today, so we also question the dominance of ‘the specialism’ or the ‘discipline’ as the vehicle for creative development. The fundamental responsibilities of an educational institution involved in the ‘creative arts and design’ remain teaching, supporting learning and practice, researching, and working symbiotically with the cultural and creative industries. However, we argue that these activities could just as well be conducted in a multidisciplinary environment where the curriculum is driven by issues, themes and projects as in the current environment where the curriculum is driven by specialist disciplines and the academic departments which represent them.

We also argue that the strong pedagogic traditions of art and design (student-centred, project- and practice-based learning) could be sustained in such a multidisciplinary environment. A key element of the student experience in this scenario would be the need for each participant to plan, negotiate, document and appraise personal learning and development through each project and in their progression through a series of projects. In this process, participants could pursue an educational pathway that balances intradisciplinary, interdisciplinary and transferable skills development in a way which suits them best as individuals and prepares them best for their target careers.

As well as envisaging an environment where a range of disciplines would be represented, appropriate to each project being undertaken, we suggest that a curriculum driven by issues and themes would encourage more diverse participation, since project themes could be consciously selected to appeal to a broader socio-economic, cultural, educational and ethnic mix. Similarly, we envisage the design of projects which could accommodate, and benefit from, the participation of people at widely varying points in their educational development — from GCSE music student to post-doctoral film historian, from undergraduate computer science student to retired fine art lecturer, from postgraduate designer to mid-career entrepreneur.

We acknowledge this model would best suit participants who wish to actively pursue, rather than marginalise, the acquisition of such transferable skills as teamworking, networking, lateral thinking and the ability to communicate across discipline and cultural boundaries. We are proposing an environment in which motivation, confidence, independence, versatility, entrepreneurialism, self-appraisal and the ability to extend one’s own learning within and across disciplines are not considered to be secondary attributes. They are seen to be just as significant for creativity and innovation in the 21st century as highly specialised skills, knowledge and practice.

We recognise, of course, that there are many students in art and design for whom a more insular, discipline-specific learning experience has particular appeal. This will always be the case and there will always be a need for the kind of person with this degree of focus who goes on to develop expert knowledge and skills in a highly specialised area of creative practice. It is important to note that, in proposing a very different educational model, we are suggesting an approach that would complement the traditional approach to art and design education rather than displace it.
As regards the learning and teaching strategies to be employed within this model, we anticipate that the established methods of art and design education will continue to be highly appropriate (peer learning, seminars, lectures, crits, tutorials, exchanges, placements, independent learning, team learning, studio and workshop practice, demonstrations etc.). However, the learning, research and practice space for each project would extend well beyond whatever physical space acted as ‘home’ for the project, into other physical environments (workshops, laboratories, manufacturing facilities etc.) and into virtual environments. The rapid development and exploitation of the web to build virtual communities and engage in real-time interaction, to deliver on-line learning and research experience and to provide easy access to vast resources, presents an enormous opportunity. Each project will rely on the formation of teams who collaborate in both real and virtual space.

It is not possible to generalise about the scale at which this model might be introduced in an institutional context. The most radical scenario might involve a large arts faculty in a polytechnic university switching entirely from a discipline-based approach to a situation where hundreds of participants engage in tens of issue-driven multidisciplinary projects simultaneously. A more likely scenario would be where a faculty or specialist institution has an opportunity for modest expansion, and chooses to explore a new approach on a limited scale, to complement existing discipline-based provision and provide an alternative learning culture for its students. In this case, perhaps only one project would progress at a time.

Figure 3 represents our collective thinking as to how a centre for creative practice, large enough to run a number of projects simultaneously, would operate. The central rectangle sums up the key principles on which learning, research and practice would proceed within a series of (real and virtual) ‘project spaces’. Supporting the whole endeavour there would need to be a team of core staff, as indicated at the lower right. Perhaps the key players in this scenario would be the ‘project leaders’. Their responsibility would be to identify, filter and draw up specifications for each potential project (rationale, aims, objectives for participants, outputs, timescale, finance and so on, and then lead their projects to success).

Depending on the scale, there might be dedicated technical facilities and technical staff, or reliance on collaborations to provide access to facilities and staff outside the centre. Similarly, the level of dedicated academic, administrative and learning support staff (as opposed to collaborators from elsewhere), would be tuned to the scale of the centre as a whole.

At the top right of the diagram, we indicate the kinds of people who would be recruited on a temporary basis, and on the basis of relevant expertise, for the duration of particular projects (which could be anything between three months and three years). At the left of the diagram, three boxes illustrate the wide range of ‘students’ which could be represented in any diverse, multi-level ‘project team’.

In our discussions about the ‘ideal’ number of participants for a project, we settled on a very modest figure of 30 (FTE). This was a number we felt would provide critical mass
but permit a sense of community. However, this is entirely supposition. In reality, the number and diversity of ‘students’ could vary considerably from project to project. We recognise, of course, that numbers would also be dictated by the need for a sustainable business plan. On the other hand, we envisaged many projects being initiated and supported by corporate partners and other organisations.

We are conscious that this brief, arguably idealistic and rather abstract, takes account of what a ‘centre for creative practice’ would be, and what it would not be, will leave the reader asking for examples of how it might all work in the real world. In anticipation of this, and to satisfy our own imaginations, we have explored a series of ‘scenarios’ which can be found at the end of this chapter. Each of these takes an imaginary (but plausible) student and places them in an imaginary (but plausible) institutional context as a member of a team engaged in an imaginary (but plausible) project.

In summary, we propose a new educational model which could, in some circumstances, displace existing provision in art and design within an institution and in other
circumstances complement existing provision. We do not undervalue the role and the strengths of traditional approaches to art and design education. We do suggest that the sector, our future students and our cultural and creative industries would benefit from the availability of such an alternative model. We suggest that the model could be applied not only within UK higher education institutions, serving regional and national ambitions, but also on an international basis. In this case the effective exploitation of on-line learning and interaction would be vital.

Implications for participation, inclusion and diversity

Participation in higher education in the creative arts as currently organised is predominantly white, female and middle class (Hudson, 2006). The great majority of students have followed traditional routes into art, design and communications courses. They have acquired ‘A’ levels, usually in relevant subjects and attended a foundation studies course prior to entry into a BA course, either at a specialist institution or in a polytechnic university. The same pattern inevitably continues at postgraduate level where the great majority of students have acquired a first degree, usually in a directly relevant subject area.

Among these traditional students there are no doubt many who seek and welcome what the traditional approaches to art and design education offer — the opportunity to move progressively from a broad range of practice and learning, with a relatively high level of guidance, to self-directed, focused enquiry and a highly specialised area of practice.

Along this traditional pathway, students primarily acquire, through the discipline-specific projects they pursue, a set of skills, knowledge and understanding within their chosen discipline or, more likely, within a narrow and particular area of their chosen discipline. They also develop a range of generic skills and attributes such as the ability to communicate, to research, to extend their own learning and to work in a team, which are useful in any post-educational context. However, the extent to which this is achieved is highly variable.

If we take the, in our view, rather crude metaphor of the T-shape (Rigby, 2006) as a target profile for the graduate or postgraduate artist or designer (Figure 4: a), many will fail to
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match up to the required shape. They will be long and tapering in the discipline-specific stem and narrow and shallow in the transferable skills cross-bar (Figure 4: b).

There is, of course, nothing wrong with looking like Figure 4: b. The student who makes a conscious decision to focus increasingly tightly, who invests all their time and energy in developing very particular skills and knowledge, to produce a particular kind of work, deserves our admiration and respect — even if it means the breadth, transferable and interpersonal skills are somewhat lacking. However, if students end up with this profile not because they are determined to do so, but because the system gives them little choice in the matter, we have something to worry about. If we wish to create students who offer an interesting and useful range of profiles (Figure 4: c, d, e, f) and to attract students who want to be these interesting shapes, we need to provide situations which positively encourage this to happen.

Do we do this already? Not in the view of the contributors to this proposal. The powerful forces in the learning experience of an art or design student are the department in which they reside, the course they signed up to and the discipline-specific curriculum they are expected to follow. We are not, of course, asserting that all the curricula in all our art and design courses are entirely devoid of opportunities to interact with other disciplines or to work in teams or to encounter the professional world. But it is our collective view that the invisible walls around departments, disciplines and local curricula are difficult for students to break through. They inhibit interdisciplinary initiatives and they limit exposure to the thinking and vocabularies of other disciplines both within and beyond art and design. They inhibit the development of ‘connectedness’ and some of the most valuable transferable skills. They inhibit the development of the cross-bar on the T.

All this is of relevance for participation, inclusion and diversity. A model of education which uses the multidisciplinary, issue-driven project as the vehicle for learning and personal development opens the door to several new categories of potential students. There are those who are saying ‘I am a highly creative person. I can show you all the things I have been doing with video and music and my website and my clothes and the
stories I write. I want to do something creative with my life. I want to change the world (or make a lot of money), but I can’t see myself as a dedicated photographer or a jewellery-maker or a textile designer. There are those who want to do something which allows them to sustain, and ultimately employ, their interests in art and design and science and music and ecology. Our view is that such multi-oriented people have the potential to contribute something special to the creative and cultural industries. The model we propose would embrace them rather than put them off or turn them away.

Inclusion and diversity are words which usually signal a different set of concerns. In what way can our proposed model address the issues raised in the opening paragraph of this section — the prevalence of white middle-class students in art and design? How also could it address the low representation of non-traditional students — those who have not followed a conventional educational pathway — and students with disabilities? Although international students and dyslexic students are well-represented in higher education art and design, it is also worth considering these here.

The key here is the ability within our proposal to design projects which can appeal to students in these groups by directly confronting some of the issues they represent. It would be an immense undertaking to re-orientate the curriculum in every course in an art school to take on board the social concerns, cultural interests, qualities and aspirations of Afro-Caribbean students or Asian students or deaf students or students who have work experience but no academic qualifications. However, it is an essential aspect of our proposal that, at any time, a number of the ongoing projects would be driven by such issues as diversity, globalisation and inclusivity. The need to consider these matters would be built in to project design and specification — alongside social, cultural, environmental and economic considerations.

Finally, on the matter of participation, we believe our proposal will create opportunities to engage others in projects who are not pursuing awards and would be involved for limited periods of time. For example, there are many possibilities for relating projects to both primary and secondary education. These would create opportunities to involve pupils and teachers, which would have obvious benefits in influencing education at pre-higher education levels and stimulating applications in the longer term. Industry and business would second members of staff to project teams to help develop their understanding of creative processes, innovation and interdisciplinary teamworking. Visiting staff and students from other institutions would be attracted to participate in projects of specific interest. The resulting connections to institutions in both the UK and abroad would also be of great value.

In conclusion, we see no reason why the proposed model should inhibit the participation of the great majority of potential students who are seeking to become, and succeed as, creative practitioners. The exception would be those who are absolutely committed to the idea of avoiding working with others and who have no interest in developing the versatility and transferable skills which are of such obvious importance to the great majority of graduates moving into the creative and cultural industries. As the scenarios presented at the end of this chapter indicate, we envisage a situation where students
who wish to ‘prioritise’ the development of specialised knowledge and skills will be able to do so, but within the context of a series of multidisciplinary projects. Alternatively we envisage a situation where such students will be able to spend some time learning within our proposed model and some in a traditional art and design educational environment. The evolution of a CAT scheme for art and design would enhance the possibilities in this area. Our overall aim in this proposal, however, is to suggest an alternative learning culture in which students can develop and emerge as the shape they choose to be, or the shape that suits them best.

Redefining the project
Bernadette Blair

‘That subjects and knowledges do not live in a simple state of productive harmony is the unspoken dimension of the contemporary debate on education, unspoken because it counters the aims to uniformly instrumentalise education towards a set of predetermined outcomes.’
(Rogoff, 2006)

The project is an established and universal vehicle used by tutors to teach and for students to explore studio curriculum agendas in art, design, media and communication. At one end of the project spectrum is the ‘traditional’ format where projects are used by tutors and students as the primary curriculum vehicle. Projects can be a single or a set of problems usually set by tutors and/or agreed or negotiated with students. Such projects are often linear in specification and linked to the tutor’s perception of the learning needs of students at a specified stage in their course. Projects can be self-initiated by students within an accepted learning outcomes framework — such as those often found in fine art or level 6 or, as is more usual in design and media, set by tutors and/or external clients and tutors.

Traditionally, because of the assessment frameworks currently in place, it is unusual for projects to transgress levels of courses, i.e. postgraduate and undergraduate students working together or level 4 students working with level 6 students on joint projects. Generally, projects can be developed and carried out by an individual student or students working in groups, but even in group projects the outcomes are normally individual to the student and often, because of the limitations of project briefs, they can often be restricted in their range of solutions — ‘thinking outside the box’ is not made easy.

In tutor led projects, all the students answer the same project brief and learning outcomes. This gives a ‘comfortable’ assessment base for tutors across a project group. Even within self-initiated projects, there are limitations dependent on the specified learning outcomes, weighting of the project in the unit/module and level of the student. The majority of self-initiated projects are carried out by an individual or occasionally in
pairs or small groups, usually within the same discipline area and almost always from the same level.

Very occasionally, projects are devised between courses or departments. Here students from different levels may work together or work with students from other usually related disciplines, but students on the whole retain their specialist identity and autonomy and projects remains driven by the requirements of the curriculum.

Our proposal is to disrupt the ‘traditional’ process — to extend the strengths of the traditional project and create a more multi-dimensional scaffolding for students to develop new and previously unforeseen insights, structures and solutions.

The re-defined project could become, as de Biere et al. (2006) state:

‘A potentiality of learning and teaching to encourage new ways in which the experience of knowledge and enquiry can be defined.’

The balance between traditional project-based learning, where the tutor sets the project, supervises often structured/semi-structured tasks and where students are required to produce an outcome or a strategy (Savin-Baden and Howell Major, 2004) would be substituted by a process (problem-based learning) where the project is the curriculum; the project is the container for debate, learning, practice, development and research of all participants. A problem-based learning approach works from the premise that learning necessarily will occur across disciplinary boundaries, even at the beginning of a course (de Graaff and Kolmos, 2007).

The philosophy behind problem-based learning is utilised by many tutors in the art, design and communications sector. In the literature, credit for originally pioneering problem-based learning was referenced in medical schools and health-related subject areas during the 1980s. Today there are further examples of practice in architecture, economics, law, engineering and social work, etc. (de Graaff and Kolmos, 2007) — see Maastricht University, Aalborg University in Denmark, which use both a problem-orientated and project-based approach and Alverno College which has piloted a task-based learning framework. With the exception of architecture, there is surprisingly little written evidence of this practice in our sector (Sayer et al., 2006). We are proposing in this paper a move to a more overtly problem-based learning philosophy within a new project framework. Sayer et al. (2006) in their article on this study pose that problem-based learning:

‘... reflects the way people learn in real life, allowing students to solve problems using whatever resources are at hand and it can be successfully implemented as single units or across whole academic programmes’ (p. 158).

What we are proposing is a radicalisation of the definition of a project. We envisage projects that are multidisciplinary involving students from a broad range of subject experiences, backgrounds and levels working alongside tutors and industrial partners. Projects would be largely issue-based and relate to the external world. Projects would always raise questions and the outcomes would always be unpredictable and often
speculative. Each project group would identify thematic issues that would become the
catalyst for presenting, framing or describing an identified agenda. This would allow the
project the flexibility to be a developmental, structural process that would both question
and/or disrupt established ways of thinking and practice. The multidisciplinary nature of
the project grouping establishes and scopes a ‘discursive space’ — creating a discourse
that would inform and generate practice or proposal models and allow a transferability
of process (see reference to d-school in the section in this chapter entitled: Historical and
contemporary context).

What we are proposing is a challenge to both our traditional teaching and student
learning methodologies. As educators and tutors, we will need to consider how we can
establish and maintain the constructivist stance required by a problem-based approach,
whilst working within the audit and benchmark frameworks of UK higher education.

A second challenge to the success of this proposal lies in remedying the current prior
learning patterns of our students. In secondary education, most students are streamed
from an early age and, as they progress, their subject choices become increasingly
restricted. This means that from the age of fourteen, students are left little option but to
cut their academic ties with peers of a different academic persuasion. Little wonder then
that there has evolved a paralysing dislocation between the arts and sciences. In primary
education the project is used as the learning tool with a number of separate subject
activities clustered around a project topic. However, even at this level, an increasingly
pernicious audit culture is moving even pre-school programmes away from a model of
problem-based learning (Dewey, 1977) to one of performing for tests (Savin-Baden,
2006).

There are examples emerging both here in the UK and in Italy, of an emergence once
again of what Rinaldi, (2001) calls ‘a pedagogy of listening’ where the curriculum is once
again ‘child-orientated and teacher-framed’. Unfortunately at present in the UK,
secondary level education forces students into a selection and specialism culture which
cuts off a variety of experiences and limits the making of possible connections. Projects
such as The Young Design programme run by the Sorrell Foundation is an example
which utilises project/problem-based learning and where children work in teams
alongside professional designers and design students and where the children are the
client and identify and set the project.

Our proposal has the potential to rebuild academic links that have been lost, defuse
tensions between cultures and cultivate new challenges for educators, the creative
industries and the entrepreneurial student.
Implications of the project-based model for the student experience and personal development

John Woodman

A distinctive strength of the proposed learning model is in the synergetic learning experience it will offer students through an exploration of inter-, multi- and transdisciplinary approaches. It will provide an alternative, rather than a replacement, to the discipline-based curriculum which will continue to fulfil the need for specialisation. The proposed model will focus on extending students’ creative and innovative potential and will give a greater priority to the acquisition of those abilities which will fully engage students in the challenging processes of self-awareness and personal development, and will help enhance their capacity for learning and employment. These include the development of entrepreneurialism, versatility, critical, reflective and evaluative skills, risk taking, team and networking, skills, cross disciplinary and communication skills, the potential for leadership and project management, contextual awareness, technical competencies, research and strategic thinking abilities and the potential to extend their own learning beyond their expectations.

E-learning and the utilisation of e-technologies could be exploited to the fullest in this learning model. Virtual learning environments and blended learning could support and drive projects and reshape approaches to research and networking. Students would be encouraged to familiarise themselves with the potential of electronic information fluency, access and communication and to share dialogue and enquiry in a multi-networked environment, helping to break down patterns of predictability.

Personal learning profiles would enable each student to map and critically reflect on the development of their practice as each project progresses. However, there is no doubt that this model would present considerable challenges to our existing assessment procedures. Since project teams would be likely to consist of participants from differing educational levels and disciplinary cultures, and because learning outcomes would be less predictable, methods of assessment and guidance would have to be re-thought. But this would be an exciting opportunity to re-examine our current methods for assessing creativity and give us the opportunity to change a system that makes many of us uncomfortable.

For example, a student enrolled at level C or level I may, in some or all aspects of their work, be performing at level H. However, currently we would not be able to recognise this because marks are locked into levels. In reality, many creative individuals are likely to have ‘spiky’ achievement profiles — a quality our grading and classification systems do not like. Currently students have to map their performance against a pre-existing list of unit or stage outcomes. This, too often, can lead to a complicit and sometimes cynically formulaic approach to meeting progression and award criteria. We suggest that in our proposed model, a *tabula rasa* approach to assessing student achievement would be more appropriate. ‘Clean slate’ assessment would mean shifting our focus away from predetermined, level-led outcomes and onto the identification of the student’s actual
outcomes. Each student would exit a project with a transcript that would, we argue, provide a more genuine audit of the range and levels of the skills and attributes that have emerged or been developed through engagement with the project(s).

Teamwork would also provide the opportunity for students to experience unfamiliar roles and challenges as well as contribute their own areas of knowledge, expertise and ideas. At the core of this learning model is the facilitation of inter-, multi- and transdisciplinary collaboration in which participants would be able to substantially increase their awareness and understanding of different methodologies and practices as well as experiencing multi-perspective viewpoints and opinions of the same issue or problem. The inclusive nature of this project-based approach will also enable life skills, experience, culture and knowledge offered from each participant to be transferred and exchanged with others in the group. This team approach would help to ensure that a supportive learning community is developed for each project. Such a learning model would provide a holistic and multi-layered experience for students. By blurring conventional subject boundaries, students and staff could begin to define new roles and develop unexpected expertise.

As a way of illustrating the kinds of student experience that we would expect to ensue from our proposed model, we offer the following fictional but plausible student scenarios.

**Scenario 1**
**Student interview: Alisha**

Alisha is 19 years old, of African descent and lives in South East London. She originally enrolled on a full-time BA(Hons) Textiles programme but transferred after the first semester to join the Bau-Wow Unit. She is currently in her final year.

Transferring to the Bau-Wow Unit was the best move I ever made. I knew I enjoyed doing textiles but I was interested in other stuff as well. My boyfriend is a TV sound engineer and I go along to some of the shoots and I get to meet lots of different people. I like the mix and the fact that everyone works together to get things sorted.

Anyway, after a term or so of my textiles course I began to feel a bit unsure that I was doing the right thing for me. Don’t get me wrong, it was a great course with a good reputation but I don’t think I have the patience to concentrate on just one thing and I was always more interested in what the other students were doing. I suppose the bottom line was that I didn’t have enough faith in my own work.

I already knew about the Bau-Wow Unit but, when I first mentioned I was thinking to transfer, my tutor warned me that I would become a Jack of all trades but master of none. That worried me at first but then I thought about all
the people I get to meet at my boyfriend’s work and most of them are working on stuff they didn’t study at college. So I went ahead and transferred.

At the beginning it was really difficult because I was working with types of people that I had never met before. For a start they were a mix of different years, there were even MA students working with us. They were from different backgrounds — not just art and design but also people that were into other stuff like computing or philosophy. Some had transferred from degree courses like electronics or business studies and others had given up careers to do the course. It was weird at first and I thought I’d made a big mistake. But as soon as I started the first project it all started to make sense. What struck me most was that the objectives were very clear though they never seemed to mention art and design — they were always about achieving something specific like staging an event or raising a sum of money or changing someone’s attitude and each time we opted for a new project we worked with a different mix of people.

Right now I’m in the middle of an amazing project. I’ve joined the climate change project team. Basically, what we are doing is working on scenarios to predict the various needs we will have to deal with if global warming really does kick in. We have had discussions and seminars on water shortages, population displacement and immigration, communication across languages and cultures, housing and food production. I’m working on trying to figure out what roles textiles will need to play in the scenario and it’s really opened my eyes to just how important textiles are.

At the moment I’m researching lightweight materials made from natural fibres. In particular, I’m interested in properties such as heat deflection and retention, U.V. protection and the water resistance of different materials that could be used for clothing or perhaps shelter.

I’ve had a lot of help from one of my old textile tutors and I’ve made a really good contact in our physics department. Through her I’ve already begun testing the way different fibres and weaves deflect solar radiation and I’m finding out a lot about developments in ‘smart’ fibres that respond to changes in light intensity or humidity. I’ve had conversations with a dermatologist about skin types and an anthropologist about clothing and custom and of course I will have to look at production methods, the supply of raw materials, costs and things like that. One of the project team tutors is an architect and he wants me to research fabrics that would be suitable for temporary shelters, which would be tear and wind resistant, waterproof and insect proof.

One of my friends on this project is a graphic designer and he’s working on the problems of mass communication within shifting populations — he’s working with a journalist and a linguist and he’s been visiting immigration centres and testing the transmission of information by images and icons among economic migrants and asylum seekers. Another friend, who transferred from industrial design, is looking at ways to purify and conserve water. He’s come up with some
really interesting stuff about membranes which I’m sure I’ll be able to use and I’ve told him about fibres with natural antiseptic qualities which has got us both excited. We’ve just contacted the Red Cross and Médecins Sans Frontières and we’re hoping they may be interested in some of our ideas.

We all meet up regularly at project team meetings to share our progress and it’s amazing how we all come up with ideas to help each other. It’s made me realise that creativity is all about making things work better rather than just look better. I may not have the most beautiful textile folder in the world but I feel it has a sense of worth and purpose. I have also gained a lot of confidence to work with people I would normally never mix with. I’m really proud of the way things are turning out and I think I’m already a lot more employable.

Shortly after this interview, Alisha spent a month in East Africa working in a refugee camp for Oxfam. While there she researched local textile designs and weaving techniques. She is progressing to an MA course where she intends to work with a pharmacist to develop medicinal fabrics that have insect repellent and anti-bacterial properties for use in field hospitals and postnatal clinics.

Scenario 2
Student interview: Peter

Mode of participation: One year, two days per week BPC (Bau-Wow Professional Certificate); one day per week informal participation in Technical History of Art and Design MA Course, School of Humanities.

Peter (age 60) has worked in art education for thirty-five years, progressing from a part-time teaching role to a senior role in academic management at a large fine art faculty in a polytechnic university. In parallel, he has achieved substantial success in the UK as an exhibiting artist. Throughout his career he has worked within the material traditions of painting (oil and canvas) and declares a life-long obsession with the ‘physicality of paint’.

Peter retired three months ago. He has some family commitments (including three grandchildren aged between six and fourteen) but decided he could devote three days per week to ‘a new challenge’. He has savings and a good pension so finance is not a major obstacle. He had read about our Bau-Wow initiative in a Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) article and was curious to see what projects we had planned for this academic year. On the web, he read about the project we have started with CCGames, ‘SecretlyLearning’, to develop concepts and visual content for on-line games that seek to educate (albeit covertly) as much as they entertain. Peter shares the concern of many parents and grandparents about the dominance of games designed for 12 to 16 year olds, which rely on mindless virtual violence, aggression and mayhem as the
‘hook’. This made ‘SecretlyLearning’ an attractive proposition and a very new challenge for Peter as a fine artist. However, it conflicted with a very different ambition he has had for some time. Having ‘played’, as he describes it, with paint for over thirty years, he wants to devote some of his time to developing deeper knowledge and understanding of traditional and historical fine art practices. His question at interview was ‘Is there a way I can do both things and possibly combine them?’ Our answer was ‘Frankly ... no idea! Why don’t you try?’

Now, a month into the project, Peter’s rather conflicting aspirations are being fulfilled in parallel. He is a very active member of the ‘SecretlyLearning’ project team for two days per week. On his third day, he has joined, on an informal basis, the technical studies in art and design course we started two years ago. He is energised, committed and sparkling with ideas. He has not managed to pull his ‘painting techniques’ and ‘learning through gaming’ endeavours together yet but he is beginning to see how each might feed into the other. He also claims he can see an analogy between the systematic, layered approaches and material choices of many old master painters and the kind of thinking required to create a successful game. ‘It’s a question of working from the deepest layers to what you actually see on the surface’ he says.

In the initial brainstorming sessions for ‘SecretlyLearning’, Peter was in a sub-group with nine other participants. These included: a games specialist on secondment from CCGames; an educationalist doing a PhD on alternative pedagogies for the art and design from the Institute of Education; a teacher from one of the comprehensives we work with in our schools outreach programme; an undergraduate computer scientist from our neighbouring institution doing his final year project (who seems to have spent most of his formative life playing Grand Theft Auto); two second year MA students who spent their first year in other departments in the college (communication art and design and design products); a full-time Bau-Wow student with a first degree in animation; a part-time Bau-Wow MA student who previously did an MBA at the London Business School and is looking to make a fortune in the creative industries; and a post-doctoral psychologist who has a special interest in the relationship between violence on screen and children’s behaviour.

This group has proposed the development of a game (for the moment called ‘Making It’) which has similarities with SIMS and The Movies. The game is built around characters with qualities and attributes which can be pre-defined by the player. These characters interact in social and professional situations. They succeed or fail depending on their original profiles, their accumulating learning and experience, their luck and the response of other virtual characters to what they are and do. The difference is that these characters are all aiming for success in the ‘creative industries’. They can pursue careers (and become rich and famous, bankrupt and derelict, happy or sad) as fine artists, designers (fashion, magazines, products etc.) or entrepreneurs (gallerists, product manufacturers,
fashion retail etc.). In the game, they socialise and have the opportunity to recruit like-minded and useful colleagues in joint endeavours. Underpinning these endeavours there has to be a product to sell. On screen they have to develop, within a team or alone, a new series of paintings, or a range of fashion accessories, or a new magazine, or a gallery with a target audience in mind. The game is played online by a large community of players, each of whom represents a set of virtual characters. The success or failure of any endeavour depends on the take-up of the ‘product’ by this community.

Within this sub-group, Peter has found a perhaps surprisingly strong and confident voice. It turns out he has an unexpected level of familiarity with gaming, having indulged both granddaughters and his grandson by joining them for hours in building virtual theme parks, driving fast virtual cars around cities and killing virtual terrorists with his bare hands. He also has a deep understanding of the professional and commercial worlds of art and design and can sketch an idea with remarkable accuracy and fluidity. As the project progresses, he would like to be involved in the design of the modules of the game which deal with being an artist and making art. This is where he sees some possibility of applying his knowledge of painting techniques to the gaming world. He wants to make the painting process within the game as real and physical as is virtually possible.

The project is scheduled (and funded) to last one year. The outcome will be a series of game proposals presented in a variety of media with commentary reflecting commercial, educational, social and psychological perspectives. We fully expect Peter to sustain his commitment and contribution for the whole year and to succeed in his own ambitions for new learning and personal development.

Scenario 3

Student Interview: Taz

Taz is a 19-year old male student of Asian Muslim parentage. He is the 1st generation born in the UK in his family who come from Pakistan. His parents are both doctors and he has two older siblings who are at university training in medicine/pharmacy and accountancy. At school he achieved two good ‘A’ levels in art and design technology and wanted to do something where he could use both of these subjects and also his good computer skills. He loves playing computer games online and has also set up websites for friends of his who are into customising their cars and are setting up a body painting business. He was advised by his art teacher to do a foundation diploma in art and design to find out more about what was open to him in further careers. After much persuasion he convinced his parents that taking this route could eventually lead to an accepted profession where he would bring in a good salary, and eventually they allowed him to
do the year on the proviso that they reviewed and discussed his career path for the following year when this decision had to be made.

I loved doing the foundation and tried lots of different things I didn’t know existed and our tutors challenged our thinking which, at the start, was sometimes difficult to deal with but was a real buzz when projects came together. Whilst on the foundation, I looked at courses around universities and although I had discussed with my parents doing something with computers and digital media I felt that after the experience of the foundation a straight digital media course could be limiting my options and I felt I wasn’t ready to specialise. I heard about this new place called the ‘Bau-Wow’ which is a creative practice centre offering an alternative to traditional specialist courses.

What excited me about the centre, apart from the facilities, was the opportunity to work with other students and tutors from disciplines other than just art and design, both inside and outside the university. I convinced my parents that this was a better option than taking a specialist design course although they still wanted me to be a graphic or a web designer and are still worried I may become an expert at nothing!

Since joining the Bau-Wow Unit I have been working on projects with students from engineering, science and humanities subjects, some in their first year like me but also with students in their final undergraduate year and some postgraduate and research students. At first I found this rather daunting and didn’t think I would be able to contribute to discussions with people who had more experience than me. I did panic during the first couple of weeks as to whether I had made the right choice but my tutors were great and all the students were really nice and I was encouraged to bring my own perspective to the projects we worked on. From the start I learnt how to track and plan my own progress and development.

Recently I have been working on a project called ‘Images of Islam’. When we got this project I thought this is one I know something about because of my family background and felt I would have a lot of the answers needed. I also thought it would be an opportunity for other people to find out more about this culture which seems to just get bad press in the media at the moment. To begin with people focused on what Islam meant and their understanding of the Muslim religion. I think many people were surprised how large the Islamic community is and how many continents it stretched over. We looked at the symbolism and imagery, both traditional and contemporary. We are lucky in London that we have the V&A Museum with its newly opened Jameel Gallery for Islamic Art which we visited and where a curator talked to us about the artefacts. Also there was an exhibition of contemporary Islamic work in the John Addis Gallery at the British Museum during the summer which again we had access to. An architect came into the centre and showed us not just traditional Islamic buildings but how elements of the culture were being fitted into modern structures.
worldwide. We were able to attend a lecture by Zaha Hadid which was truly inspirational and showed how her buildings have influenced architectural thinking and structure globally.

I found there were a lot of aspects of Islam I did not know about. I learned that Islam led the world in medical advancement in the middle ages and invented many of the operating instruments used later by European surgeons. I talked to a medical student who was also working on the project and together we were able to go and interview surgeons who were currently pioneering new techniques for transplant surgery. I became very interested in how computers were often a major ‘tool’ in operations. I suppose I'd never thought about it before but so much keyhole and exploratory work is done looking at a screen. I became interested in how doctors and medical students learnt these techniques and if I could develop something visually for teaching some of the basic techniques. Although my IT skills are excellent this is going into completely new areas for me which is really exciting. This initiative has been enthusiastically received by my tutors and I am currently researching this with a research science student and a second year medical student with a lot of help from our IT specialists. It is really exciting to be working on a project which may lead to something to help others.

Scenario 4
Student Interview: Steve

We have asked Steve to talk about his experiences working on one of the Bau-Wow projects offered by the Northern Centre for Creative Practice, Learning and Research (NCCPLR). Steve originally studied classics at the University of Leeds where he developed a particular interest in the sound of language. He went on to work for one of the largest media and public relations companies in the North of England concentrating on the way language could be used in web-based marketing campaigns. He came to the NCCPLR specifically to join a project team looking at waiting environments for patients in anxiety-creating situations.

I’d enjoyed studying Classics. This sounds a bit odd when my other passion was dance music especially Northern Soul. So I left university with the most eccentric mix of interests — the poetic language of Greek theatre combined with the hectic passion of clubs. Anyway I seemed to find the perfect job that would allow me use this eccentricity in a positive way. Working in the design department of a web-based marketing organisation, which had many clients from the world of music and entertainment. So my first few years working there were very happy. I could use my analytical fascination with language to celebrate the music of Edwin Starr. But then I grew frustrated. I think I became more and
more conscious that I was allowing my idiosyncratic character to be subsumed in what was simply a commercial endeavour. I wanted and needed more.

It was then that I discovered the Bau-Wow Centre on the internet. I was at the same time alarmed and excited by its ambition. I couldn’t believe that a place that questioned both the way we learn and how learning should explicitly connect to the real world, could exist. But it did and it was just across the Pennines so I went to visit and within a couple of weeks I had signed up for one of their projects. My company was very supportive. They had recognised I had become bored and needed a more creative challenge. But they also wanted to keep me on board. So we agreed a period of unpaid leave. I had some savings so I was able to fund myself for the one project that was planned to last about nine months (in the end I worked on it for nearly eighteen months).

When I first visited the Centre there were six projects available. I was immediately attracted to the waiting environments one because it seemed to have a clear sense of social engagement. I think the periods I had recently spent waiting in the non-spaces of hospitals while my dad had been ill were still influential on my thinking. I was also fascinated by the project management team. It was led by a German sound artist (who, I found out later, had played saxophone in a soul band) and included an interior designer, a psychologist with a research background in colour therapy and a poet. I found the richness of the chemistry of that team impossible to ignore. So I joined, along with a couple of second year architecture students from the School of Architecture, a final year sculptor, a textile artist who had recently retired from teaching, two MA students from a very distinctive course called Arts in the Environment (I think), a doctoral student involved in research into Deleuze and abstract painting and about six final year students from the School of Subjects Allied to Medicine. There must have been at any one time about ten or twelve active members of the project team working with members of the management team. One of the things I really enjoyed was the work we did with kids. All the projects taken on by the Centre are required to have some form of connection with the school curriculum, so every two weeks we ran events with groups from a primary school and some 6th form students. As the project progressed we found these experiences more and more useful. The kids with their age range and different social backgrounds were ideal for us to test out prototypes and consider alternative directions for our work.

The way we approached the project was very interesting, and totally new for me. I had no background in art or design but found I was able to use my real interests in music and language in a way that was truly creative. At no time did I feel in any way limited by my apparent lack of conventional design experience. We were encouraged to believe in a more intrinsic idea of creativity, not one that was the preserve of art alone, but something that we all had and were capable of exploiting.

When we began thinking about the issues associated with such spaces as waiting
rooms or those places where you waited before you enter into more frightening situations such as full body scanners — we did what I had originally thought of as brainstorming. But here it was different. It was much more democratic. All of our backgrounds were brought into the discussion, including many of the kids and even their parents. This became for me a truly inspirational experience. I was part of a real team. A multidisciplinary team but something much more than the kinds of teams I had experienced in my other jobs. Someone called it interdisciplinary, which seemed to make sense given our shared focus on the problems and issues we had identified. One of the PhD students referred to it as ‘radical collaboration’, a term he’d picked up while studying in the states. It was all of these but more. I felt I was part of a completely unified but organic whole. We acted together, identified problems, addressed them, resolved some of them, made some things, used our individual skills and experience where we needed to, but always operated as part of a cohesive unit.

In the end I arranged to stay on the project for an extra six months. Our ideas were included in the strategic plans of our Regional Health Authority and became a significant factor in the re-design of many of the waiting areas we had investigated.

Scenario 5
Student interview: Liz

Liz is 24 years old and has just completed her first year working in the Bau-Wow Centre for Creative Practice. Her background is in material science and she has recently completed a PhD specialising in polymers.

Although my background is in the sciences, I also have a strong interest in composing music using digital software. This has inspired me to want to develop my creative abilities but did not know how to make the change from the sciences to the creative arts.

My other interest is in the environment and, like many of us I am concerned about the future of the planet and feel that we have an ethical and moral responsibility to contribute to the development of more sustainable approaches. I have joined campaigns and written articles to promote this viewpoint.

I searched the internet to find the Centre for Creative Practice. I liked the philosophy of inviting participants from different backgrounds and disciplines to join project teams to work on ‘cutting edge’ creative and innovative responses to ‘real world’ environmental issues.

Staff and students came from each of the university’s five faculties in arts, business, education, health and science and technology and there were also
participants from industry and business.

Having worked in virtual isolation while studying for my PhD, I became excited about being able to contribute some of my personal skills and research knowledge and methodologies to the project and wanted also to learn something from others in the same way. There was a range of projects to choose from and I was accepted on to the project for the ‘regeneration of the Golden Mile’ in Blackpool.

I soon discovered that I was the only member of the team to have experience in composing with digital software and was encouraged by the team, as one of the project strands, to develop an idea of interactive sound pieces which respond to the movements of people, the sun and the tide in different places along the Golden Mile.

I felt very comfortable as part of the project team working with this holistic approach and didn’t feel any intimidation in working alongside landscape architects and planners, technologists and sociologists and other professionals who joined the project team from industry. Neither did other students and team members without specialist subject skills. The inclusive approach meant that each team member could contribute according to their skill, knowledge level and ability.

In this respect we were also encouraged to contribute our ‘total’ experience and expertise of our ‘life skills’, to the project’s development, which not only enabled us to shed our ‘subject straight jacket’, but also generated a climate of mutual respect and integrity within the team. This ‘whole’ person approach helped to provide a synergy and a dynamic within the team, which enabled us to resolve our differences in a creative and supportive way, and helped with the generation of innovative solutions to the design challenge.

The year has surpassed my expectations. I was able to contribute more than I expected to the project team. My research abilities proved useful to the project and subject and discipline boundaries melted into the background. I also realised that it is not necessary to be constrained within a subject boundary, or discipline, for creativity and innovation to flourish. However, what I did not foresee was the improvement it made to my self-confidence and self-esteem even though I was entering into what, for me, was an unknown and unpredictable situation.

Being involved in this integrated approach to project-based learning has been for me an exciting and fulfilling experience. My engagement in the process has enabled me to recognise my strengths and my weaknesses, but importantly I have developed abilities in areas that I had not previously recognised. Together with the improvement in self-confidence and esteem, I have also developed strengths in what others in the project team have called entrepreneurship, also in interpersonal communication and in project leadership and management, having managed the ‘regeneration’ project for a period of time. Of great
importance to me has been the ‘door’ that has opened to a continuous process of self-awareness and personal development through team work and through personal reflection and reflection on practice.

Teaching has been extremely good in an unconventional way. The tutors have taken the role in a variety of different ways i.e. mentors, facilitators, or enablers. Most of the hard work within the team concerning learning and development has been done through self-reflection, critical evaluation and the mapping of our own achievements.

Note:
At the time of the GLAD’07 conference David Hayward was Deputy Head of College, University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury. Immediately following the conference he took up his post as Head of Visual Arts, Canterbury Christ Church University.
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Abstract  Creativity is now perceived as a ‘good thing’ by government, statutory bodies and industry and, along with research, is recognised as a high priority and a key to the future development and success of post-industrialised economies. It is thus timely to examine some of the assumptions about research and creativity that have emerged through policy papers and other forms of public debate, and which constitute a set of myths, assumptions and values within the sector itself.

This chapter focuses on research and creativity in art and design higher education, specifically upon what we term the research:creativity nexus, where enquiry, the search for new knowledge, meets innovation, which is the recognition of new understandings. Close parallels between the roles and functions of research and creativity in creative disciplines are recognised. We began with two explicit assumptions: that creativity is a core concept in art and design; and that research is a core practice in higher education. To articulate the potential impact of this nexus upon future student experience, it is essential to clarify the understanding of creativity and research within art and design higher education.

While the practices of the art and design disciplines are those generally understood as creative, the study or awareness of creativity as a human
attribute has not played a significant role in the research agenda within our field. Our understanding within art and design education can benefit from examining emerging models of creativity from a range of other disciplines, models that can inform the field’s conception of creativity, and re-align disciplinary values with a coherent framing of research within the academic context.

As art and design has become established in the university research landscape, there has been considerable development of infrastructure, culture and understanding which enables us to recognise the ‘research engine’. The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) definition of research as ‘original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and understanding..., which includes the invention and generation of ..., artefacts including design..., where these lead to new or substantially improved insights’ (RAE 01/2006 (O), p. 80), is becoming more familiar in the art and design field although, as with the term ‘creativity’, informal or everyday interpretations continue to be operational. The distinction is drawn between professional practice within disciplines and research practice that seeks to advance disciplines. There is a tension between views of the latter as the primary focus within higher education, and the historic focus of art and design schools as providing preparation for advanced practice in the former. However we acknowledge that this tension is being reconciled and that an emerging positive consensus in relation to research is now evident in the creative disciplines.

It is our contention that the student learning experience can benefit from research into creativity within art and design, as well as from research that is itself informed by creative input. This examination of the research:creativity nexus will suggest repositioning our understanding of creativity and learning, of research in our field, and of the impact research in creative disciplines has beyond the academic field. We consider the research:creativity nexus through examination of the different perspectives and understandings of its constituents parts, before discussing how curriculum and learning models engage with the elements, and then outlining the strategic imperatives and benefits of engaging with the nexus model.
Repositioning understanding

If creativity is a core concept for art and design, then our concept has to accommodate current thinking from relevant perspectives. Similarly, if research is a core practice in higher education, then our understanding of that practice should have general applicability beyond the local context of a particular disciplinary field.

Discussions about creativity and economic regeneration, including perspectives on creativity from government and other public agencies, and new models of creativity from the human sciences, offer perspectives that might usefully be acknowledged by the art and design field. Both reinforce the model of the research:creativity nexus.

A brief review of how research has developed highlights where assumptions and misconceptions made the research:creativity nexus problematic. The emergence of art and design research activity, first under the Council for National Academic Awards and, since 1992, the RAE, shows how values from creative practice led to particularised conceptions of research.

Creativity, education and the economy

The value of the ‘creative economy’ was recognised through the regeneration of UK cities in the late 1980s (Landry, 1990). The Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Creative Industry Mapping Document (DCMS, 1998, 2001) identified creative industry as the fastest growing sector of UK industry and explicitly linked creativity with economic growth. However, it is important to acknowledge that the DCMS definition for the creative industries is problematic, and research papers are articulating some of the difficulties with this definition. This falls outside our discussion but for further reading on this see Galloway and Dunlop’s critique of definitions paper (2007) and NESTA’s Creating Growth report (2006). Although the precursors to recognition of the economic importance of creativity may have arisen from harnessing creative and cultural enterprise as a catalyst for regeneration (Landry, 2006), there has also been a focus on creativity in organisations, though the work of thinkers such as Charles Handy and Peter Drucker.

Many definitions for learning creativity or learning for creativity have been suggested: Taylor (1988) traced some 50 to 60 definitions of creativity itself, while Robinson and the National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education proposed just four characteristics of creative processes, of which the first is that ‘they always involve thinking or behaving imaginatively’ (DfEE, 1999, p. 29). The definition of creativity from the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) is also grounded in the model of associative thinking. They highlight appropriate ways of thinking and practising by suggesting that creativity involves ‘questioning and challenging; making connections, seeing relationships; envisaging what might be (visualising); exploring ideas and keeping options open; reflecting critically on ideas, actions and outcomes.’ (QCA, 2001). Art and design also appears to have held on to the models of creativity that gained currency in the immediate pre- and post-Coldstream era, when models of creative synthesis stressed the importance of unconscious strategies, exploiting and guided by backward reasoning.
and the generation of analogues. Singerman notes the emphasis on strategies for stimulating creativity by letting go of past assumptions, ‘creativity without preconception’, or ‘the removal of method or model’ in his discussion of art schools in the American higher education system (Singerman, 1999, p. 107).

The assumption that creativity might not be teachable is thought to have its origin in the model which understands creativity as arising from unconscious thinking (Weisberg, 2006, p. 91). However more recent work within the cognitive sciences has established that there are conditions for creativity which could be applied to the educational context. Lubart and Sternberg (1995) established that there are six attributes required to support creative activity: by 1999 they had refined this set of required conditions as knowledge, accompanied by intellectual ability, thinking style, personality, motivation and environment (Sternberg and Lubart, 1999, p. 11). Weisberg’s recent review of studies on creativity and innovation across disciplines (2006) is particularly useful in elucidating the research:creativity nexus: expertise, practice and motivation are clearly implicated in creative performance and the ‘tension view’, that too much knowledge impedes creativity, is successfully challenged.

What distinguished the new models of creativity arising by the 1990s was a view that it was a normal attribute of human endeavour, rather than a special gift. This perspective was embedded in the discussion of creative cities, in the literature of psychology, and in neuroscience (Landry, 2006; Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Wilson 1998). Thinking in the field of psychology has still not resolved if specific thought processes are involved in creative thinking, with some people just being better at using those processes than others, or whether the thought processes involved in creativity are just the same ones involved in ordinary activity (Weisberg, 2006, p. 118). However, it is appropriate for education in ‘creative’ subjects such as design and other practical arts, to take note of what might be learnt from this work. Csikszentmihalyi notes that knowledge must be intentionally passed on and learned (1996, p. 37). He also notes that to be creative, one ‘must first understand the domain’ (1996, p. 340) in order to recognise novelty. This does reflect a commonly held expectation within art and design education that students should become familiar with current work in the field.

In parallel to the conception of creativity as a normal human attribute being shared across the current thinking of several disciplines, the importance of contextual conditions has also been identified in the economic field. Jeffcut and Pratt (2002), in tracing the growth in interest in economic policy for creative and cultural industries, make a number of key assertions. Firstly, that policy assumes downward pressure on costs in growing international markets can not, in the developed world, be met by reduction in labour costs, but that competitiveness will be maintained through cycles of innovation in products and services, innovation that ‘relies on creativity’ (Jeffcut and Pratt, 2002, p. 225). Secondly, that from ‘a social constructivist point of view’ (ibid, p. 226) organisational form constructs creativity in a particular setting and that creative industries are such a particularity. In other words, the kinds of creativity and the conditions that sustain it are related to the situation of practice. Finally they assert that creativity is ‘a process requiring knowledge, networks and technologies’ (ibid, p. 226).
This underpins the work of Csikszentmihalyi and others but more importantly suggests that efforts to raise the ‘creativity quotient’ in individuals needs to attend to the conditions and context in which it learned and practised.

The combination of these claims for the potential economic contribution of creativity and creative disciplines, together with the revised conceptions of conditions for creativity that could form the focus for education in these fields, provides a persuasive basis for reflection on the extent to which current practice operates.

**Research in art and design**

From looking at creativity, we have highlighted gaps between disciplinary perceptions, assertions or claims by public agencies and others, and emerging theoretical models. In relation to research, we will also gain a better understanding of the nexus by reviewing the different strands of thinking that influence the field. We examine the emergence of doctoral activity in art and design, the role of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA), and the impact of the Research Assessment Exercise on ideas about research that have shaped activity to date.

Within the UK, the notion that a research degree might be an opportunity for the art and design field became apparent following the inclusion of the subject fields within the academic degree-awarding system of the CNAA in the early 1960s. Prior to 1992, most research degrees in art and design were awarded by established universities, with some pioneering work in the polytechnic sector under the auspices of the CNAA. Fisher and Mottram (2006, p. 5) report that among the 100 art and design PhDs awarded between 1976 and 1985, only 23 were from the CNAA. Following 1992, awareness of doctoral study became more widespread in art and design, when the former polytechnics, home to most art and design schools, became part of the new university system and were given the power to award their own research degrees. For most university and polytechnic disciplines, the research degree had already become the generic terminal degree associated with entry into academia.

The CNAA Research Committee for Art and Design had supported the emergence of research degree activity before 1992, with a series of conferences reporting on early work in the field and exploring emerging issues of infrastructure and scope. In 1984 the CNAA recognised the importance of research in staff development, noting that involvement in ‘research and related activities’ enabled lecturers to infuse teaching with a sense of critical enquiry. The 1984 CNAA paper reproduced in the publication for the 1988 conference (Bourgourd, Evans, and Gronberg, 1989) noted these activities included the following:

‘... academic research, applied research, consultancy, professional practice, scholarship, creative work, curriculum and pedagogic research, and the development of applied, interdisciplinary and collaborative activities that are responsive to industrial and community needs.’
Examination of subsequent statements in the Research Committee report suggests the CNAA intended to differentiate between two sets of activities which infuse teaching, namely ‘research’ which might be understood as that particular sort of academic enquiry (academic, applied, curriculum or pedagogic research), and ‘related activities’ (consultancy, professional practice, scholarship, creative work, and applied, interdisciplinary and collaborative activities). Clearly there has been some confusion about the relationship of research and creative practice within the English-speaking world (Fisher and Mottram, 2006, p. 5).

The 1988 Matrix conference publication included a 1989 paper from the CNAA Research Committee for Art and Design, which clearly stated that they did not accept creative work as scholarly activity, but recognised rapid growth in the reporting of such activity. The Committee debated whether alternative awards were needed to recognise advanced creative work, making a clear distinction between advanced creative work, which has long been held as an important component in the teaching of the creative arts, and the growing interest in research degrees. The CNAA recognised the emergence of some confusion about the relationship of advanced creative practice to research, and the seeds for conflating research with creative practice could be traced back to this point.

By 1992, the rapid growth of creative activity being reported under the ‘research and related activities’ performance indicator of the CNAA (but not accepted by them as ‘legitimate scholarly activity’) was entered into the UK Research Assessment Exercise. The definition for research for the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) assessment exercise took on the CNAA ‘subject health’ performance indicator and repackaged it as the definition for outputs that would be reviewed under the RAE. Art and design, as the ‘new kids on the research-block’ (Brown, Gough and Roddis, 2004), were the saviours of the new universities. The volume of activity submitted by art and design created a climate in which these activities and outcomes generated significant income streams for several universities. Brown et al. note that much of the activity reported at that 1992 RAE was applied work undertaken within professional or industrial contexts, and that it was the sort of activity described mostly as ‘professional practice’. Thus it was probably the sort of activity the by-now-disbanded CNAA would have described as ‘related activities’ rather than ‘legitimate scholarly activity’.

The proposition of equivalence was thus tentatively established, and this model has since influenced perceptions of activities that might be appropriate for the field. What had not happened at this point, and might still be required, is the identification of the areas of activity that might usefully be investigated from within the field, as called for by the 1988 Matrix conference.

Ways of explaining the equivalence model have been developed. In 1993, Christopher Frayling first applied Herbert Read’s model of teaching for, through and into a discipline to research (Frayling, 1993). He noted that research could be for practice, as in Picasso gathering source material for the making of a painting such as ‘Les desmoiselles d’Avignon’. He saw research through practice as being exemplified by the interactive process of making a working prototype, testing and amending that model, and research
into practice as including observations of practising artists at work. The particularly tricky point of this triad is the emphasis placed within undergraduate programmes upon research which forms an integral part of many creative processes. The extent to which this becomes more than the compilation of material intended to stimulate studio work may be questionable. The collection of ‘stuff’ indicates very little about the capacity of the collector to organise, evaluate or interpret, although the counter-argument is that it is the resulting art object that articulates this evaluation and interpretation. The goal of this collection of stuff is art, and ‘as much about autobiography and personal development as communicable knowledge’ (Frayling, 1993, p. 5).

The emphasis and value placed on the end product of making is enshrined in the professional and educational frameworks in art and design. The ‘final show’ has been a key evaluation point within the educational context, and exhibitions the key dissemination of artefacts for stakeholder evaluation. These are the roots of a propositional problem, where we have outcomes of creative practice being presented in a manner which claims embodied evidence or argumentation. As Frayling said: ‘no scientist would ever say that contents of a test-tube changing colour speaks for itself’ (Frayling et al., 1998, p. 10). Linking creative innovation to knowledge acquisition or to research intentions is seen to be at the heart of the opportunity to generate a more credible framework for the research:creativity nexus.

Snagging the nexus

Despite considerable investment on the assumption that research in the creative disciplines will yield economic benefits, there are gaps in the evidence to support this. JM Consulting’s examination of the research infrastructure for arts and humanities (HEFCE, 2002) noted that arts and humanities research had a ‘vital role’ underpinning ‘the UK’s leading position in the creative, cultural, and heritage industries’, which were among ‘the fastest-growing and most important export earners for the UK’ (HEFCE, 2002, p. 35). However, the extent of links between higher education institutions (HEIs) and those industries is uncertain. The first finding reports by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI, 2005) suggest that only 30% of ‘innovation active’ businesses have formal collaborations with HEIs and of them only 2% claim that their innovation is dependent on these collaborations. These innovation-active businesses are predominantly in the science and technology-driven sectors and the contribution made by creative disciplines in the HEIs is not clear.

While there is considerable and growing work on the research-teaching nexus (see Hattie and Marsh, 1996; Jenkins et al., 2007) clear evidence has yet to demonstrate benefits to students’ learning experience. Where research is conceived as high-level ‘discovery’ research (Boyer, 1990), abstracted from any concern for student learning, it has been shown to negatively impact on staffs’ concerns for teaching and can result in a structural separation of course design and delivery from staff research (Hattie and Marsh, 1996). Anecdotal evidence suggests that students often feel their teachers are distracted from teaching by the emphasis of the institution on research.
Parallel with the growth in activity reported as research within art and design noted above, has been the sharp growth in the number of doctoral completions in comparison with other disciplines. While the number of doctoral completions each year across all disciplines has grown by a factor of nine (from 1,385 to 12,950) between 1995 and 2006, the rise in creative arts and design PhDs in the same period has increased by a factor of nineteen (from 17 to 320 in a year) (HESA, 2007). However the extent to which this engagement in advanced study has had an impact upon the candidates or their subsequent social or economic contribution has not yet been recorded.

Despite the uncertainly about the extent to which university research in art and design has economic impact, and about the impact of research upon the student learning experience, the creative sectors are clearly important to the UK. Before looking at the strategic arguments for strengthening the research:creativity nexus, the following two sections discuss some current perspectives on how research and creativity relate to the current student learning experience in art and design.

Research, the curriculum and learning

If we surmise that practice-based research is undertaken by most art and design lecturers, and if that research is directed toward a transforming practice (e.g. of the art and design world debates, etc.), we should expect research to increasingly underpin delivery and content of taught degrees. It is generally assumed and made manifest in the Art and Design Benchmark Statement (QAA, 2007), that for undergraduate courses, ‘primacy is given to the preparation of students for professional, creative practice’. If teaching staff frame course content and delivery in relation to their own practice-based research, then students will be engaged with research from the outset (Drew, 2007). However, this position carries three assumptions: first is the level of engagement in practice-based research; second is to assume engagement in research, creative or scholarly practice; and the third is that research in this field necessarily involves the researcher in practice. Instead of focusing on the distinctions between research and practice-based research, curricula may need to articulate the distinctions between practice, practice-based research and research-based practice.

The principal distinction between practice-based research and practice is that in the former there is more public engagement of the practitioner with the theories and ideas underpinning creative work. This is manifested in the art and design world debates, which encompass both linguistic and visual modes of exchange, and generally take place within a market context. In the progression from Bachelors to Masters through to PhD, we should expect students to be engaged in this way at increasing depth, rigour and intellectual sophistication, and to increasing productive consequence. As such, this engagement can be seen as replicating, reflecting and even contributing to the exchange, or discourse, largely taking place within the wider academic and non-academic art and design worlds. This then is the equivalence with knowledge of
the field identified in models of creativity from other fields, and, in a reflexive mode, scholarly enquiry into this knowledge of the field can provide a basis also for research-based practice. The extent to which any of these approaches to research and creative practice are made explicit or evidenced in curriculum design or content rests upon the intentionality with which they are employed.

There is emerging evidence that proto-research, or research-like learning, is beginning to be employed intentionally within the field. This includes exploring topics and approaches new for students although not new knowledge in the field. Examples documenting such approaches include projects at the University of Sydney (USYD project), Oxford University (Oxford Learning Institute) and Project Link (Oxford Brookes University). The use and consideration of such strategies within art and design includes the conference and review model of a multimedia course at Southampton and recent work where research and enquiry based approaches — ‘like the ones used in research’ — have been linked to high level learning outcomes in design courses (Shreeve, Bailey and Drew, 2004).

In enquiry-based learning (EBL) environments, which are understood to encourage learner autonomy and higher level learning outcomes (Brew, 2003), learning is driven by a process of enquiry owned by the student. The identification of issues and questions and the examination of the resources to conduct the investigation incorporate the requisite knowledge acquisition. Knowledge is retained because it is acquired by experience in relation to a real problem, and leads to fluency with the skills and practices which engender employability and induction into the culture and community of researchers, in other words, engagement in activities which mirror the research process.

The embedding of research in art and design within the curriculum does require introducing the domain and its knowledge base through an introduction to research cultures and backgrounds. The emphasis at undergraduate level is more upon ‘research’ that is fundamentally searching for material to support their practice but, since the mid-1990s, postgraduate curricula have included introductions to research methods. To support this, the learning environment must include channels for continual exchange between a department or school and the wider academic and professional community. At one level this is the preserve of the well-found laboratory and library, but when facing the market the following primary mechanisms are also necessary: internet presence, accessible and well-documented events, publications, exhibitions, and collaborative networks with research and professional peers. Research-aligned teaching requires the learning experience to be organised around the research strengths and interests of the staff (including pedagogical research) and the curriculum to be aligned with those strengths. The more research is embedded in the institution, the more pervasive is the influence of these research areas on the curriculum. Explicit links from research to learning have to be made as strategic choices for research affect the subjects that are taught. Healey has noted that ‘in constructing links between research and teaching the discipline is an important mediator’ (2005, p. 67), and this privileging of disciplinary knowledge is an important reminder to academic professionals to value the inherent currency of the field within the knowledge economy, rather than privileging the value of
the discipline within its cultural marketplace. While it is clear that a high level and quality of communication about research and its implications for subject development and educational process is key to a culture of scholarship within the art and design subject field, if we are to argue that research is a core practice in our disciplines, we need the support of a recognised evidence base and a shared terminology.

Creativity and the curriculum

Recognition of the desirability of incorporating creativity within the general education curriculum first surfaced in the 1960s, and has resurfaced again strongly since the 1990s. Early work drew heavily upon the post-Freudian models of unconscious strategies that still appear to inform much thinking about creativity in the art and design sector. The period since 1995 has seen a growing recognition from government, policy-makers and commentators that creativity is an extremely important aim for education, given the economic imperative to foster it in and for business. The majority of the work on creativity in education has focused upon primary and secondary education, and has not necessarily been focused on creativity within the disciplines of ‘creative’ practices. This section considers current modeling of creativity within the art and design field, issues relating to the assessment of creativity, and the fit between traditional heuristics of art and design education and emerging models of the conditions for creativity.

It is widely assumed that the art and design disciplines are, de facto, inherently creative. What is less clear is how this fits with the model of creativity as a normal attribute of ordinary human brain activity, where the idea of giftedness or talent ceases to be such an active component in creative expression. Advanced practice in any field is seen as more closely connected to investment models of creativity through deliberate practice and familiarity with past achievement rather than to divine inspiration. Social constructivist models of innovation and achievement are identifying connections and networks as key determinants for the positive recognition of new contributions to the field, theorising the models of reputation development that have motivated the social networking of artists and clients throughout history. However, the art and design field is one where creative activity can generate contributions to that field that are recognised and valued because they are seen to be different from previous contributions. Novelty becomes a key feature, but one where the connections to context and previous work in the field, and to intentionality, are essential.

While the definition of creativity has proved elusive, most of the dominant writers acknowledge a broad spectrum of activity (Spiel and von Korff, 1998). One clear and major distinction made by some analysts is that between ‘high’ creativity and ‘ordinary’ or ‘democratic’ creativity. High creativity is identified as the sort of publicly acclaimed creativity such as ‘the achievement of something remarkable and new, something which transforms and changes a field of endeavor in a significant way ... the kinds of things that people do that change the world’ (Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi and Gardner, 1994, p. 1). Again we see congruence across disciplinary boundaries, with researchers in
cognitive and computing science such as Margaret Boden (1990) suggesting a model similar to that proposed by Vernon (1984) and the above authors. Boden saw little difference in type, merely scale, between this high creativity and the ordinary or democratic creativity that is essentially the innate human capacity for solving everyday dilemmas as well as more complex problems. Her position gets over the difficulty of the focus on extraordinary or high creativity in its propensity to be applied only to extremely talented people, which may be of little or no relevance when used in the context of a comprehensive and general education environment. The phrase ‘democratic’ creativity was coined in *All our Futures* (DfEE, 1999) to mean the creativity of the ordinary person, and in the same year the National Curriculum Handbook included creativity within the section on thinking skills. They defined these skills as the attributes which ‘enable pupils to generate and extend ideas, to suggest hypotheses, to apply imagination, and to look for alternative innovative outcomes’ (National Curriculum Handbook for Primary and Secondary Teachers, 1999).

The question arises of whether we can consider creativity within a domain specific context, or whether we should be referring to creativity as a generic attribute. Models of creativity as a normal human attribute sit more comfortably with this chapter’s assertion of the generality of research practices, but do not deny the position of creativity as a core concept within the practices of art and design. When it comes to reviewing the extent to which creativity is explicit in the curriculum for art and design, there is little evidence of the field intentionally addressing it as a curricular topic, apart from within discussion of assessment. It is perhaps of note that the field itself does not see fit to address one of its distinguishing characteristics as a part of its domain knowledge.

**Assessment and creativity in art and design**

Creativity assessment tools have focused on the recognition or identification of creative characteristics or abilities among people, or understanding of their creative strengths and potentials, rather that engaging with the outputs of creative practice within terms more familiar to the art and design field. While many tests, inventories, rating scales, and checklists have been created to assess various aspects of creativity — Isaksen et al. (1993) identified more than 200 — there is little evidence of any interest in using such instruments within art and design. Some argue that the complex and multidimensional nature of creativity cannot be assessed effectively and comprehensively by any single instrument or analytical procedure. Jackson’s 1997 summary of art and design lecturer views on this matter suggests four main perspectives: that creativity is evaluated through explicit criteria; secondly, that insufficient attention is given to recognising students’ creativity and that at best the evaluation and recognition is implicit; third, that it is not possible and/or desirable to assess creativity; and finally, there are those who value creativity but do not know how to assess it. Although Jackson believes that most teachers ‘with appropriate support, guidance and cultural encouragement could and would assess creativity in students’ higher education learning’, there are clearly barriers to its identification and quantification.
The reluctance to assess or measure creativity is probably based on the dominance of ‘confluence’ models of creativity, where creativity is causally linked to personality type. If we attempt to assess creativity, are we presuming to assess personality type rather than creative outputs? This model does not fit the more open view of creativity as a core human attribute, but instead has more congruence with outmoded notions of creativity as a special ‘gift’. Confluence models assume ‘a tension between past experience and creativity’ (Weisberg, 2006, p. 203), where too much knowledge or too much expertise is believed to inhibit creative action. Such action is believed to come about only by ‘breaking away from expertise’. However close scrutiny of creative achievements by Weisberg and Csikszentmihalyi has demonstrated that innovation does build upon previously acquired knowledge and expertise.

By focusing on the creative outcomes, rather than upon personality, Besemer and O’Quin’s framework for assessing creative products in higher education appears to provide a feasible model for evaluating creative products (1987). They proposed working within the three domains of ‘novelty, resolution and elaboration/synthesis’. Originality, ‘germinality’ and ‘transformationality’ of outputs are the characteristics of novelty. Resolution was characterised by levels of adequacy, appropriateness, usefulness, value and logic, all attributes clearly possible to relate to the already known. Elaboration and synthesis were seen to relate to well-craftedness, attractiveness, expressiveness, complexity, elegance and unity. What such a model provides is a framework that maps reasonably well onto the types of criteria that are used within the professional context, with social constructivist models of innovation recognition, and with historic accounts of the attributes of recognised exemplar works.

Despite Craft’s analysis that there is minimal literature on the recording and assessing of creativity (2001), it is important to move beyond discussion of reasons to not tackle the task if we do value creativity within our disciplines. Even Torrance’s simple model of the four components by which individual creativity (or creative outputs) could be assessed (Torrance, 1974) has a remarkable resonance with the in-built values of post-Coldstream (NACAE, 1962), but pre-Post-Modern, art and design education. He suggested the following criteria to assess creativity: the fluency of idea production, the ability to generate various and flexible ideas, to elaborate or develop ideas, and to generate ideas that are original.

Creativity and the heuristics of art and design learning

If we accept the notion of creativity as a normal human trait, together with conditions that have been identified as supporting creative action — motivation, deliberate practice and expert knowledge — we can review the historic methods of art and design education in a new light. Mottram notes that contemporary explanations for creativity, vision and other human functions, are reflecting ‘behaviours that were once commonly known and understood as central to training artisans’ (Mottram, 2007). Deliberate and intentional practice based on the repetition of tasks is still understood in many fields to be an important foundation for expert achievement, but this emphasis on task repetition in training artists and designers has declined as new technological tools present...
alternative means to achieve coherent representations previously achieved as a result of fluency developed through practice.

The investment in practising how to manipulate materials, to enable processing from natural form through to another state, becomes less relevant as production becomes more about specification and outsourcing fabrication. Within the fine arts particularly, disciplinary expertise has been subsumed by a professionalising that severs tactile engagement with the materials of the disciplines and give a greater emphasis to strategic knowledge. There is still an embedded recognition of the importance of tacit knowledge, that understanding of how it feels to wield the chisel, drape the fabric, or draw the connection. Within art and design, this tacit knowledge is what is distinctive and does form the key rationale for a continuing focus on learning through doing.

While tacit knowledge cannot be fully acquired from books, domain knowledge is important for stimulating and recognising creativity. The body of domain knowledge, sometimes called the canon or our ‘cultural inheritance’ (Jones, 1999, p. 162), is the basis of understanding what has been done and is essential for the evaluation of innovation. Familiarity with the field, or curiosity about what colleagues are making, seems almost a fundamental attribute of artists and designers and creativity models reinforce its importance. The rejection of the tension view that too much knowledge inhibits creativity is a reminder that knowledge of the achievements of the past continues to be important to support innovation in the future.

The importance of intuition for designers (Durling, 1999) can be accommodated in the framework of tacit, strategic and domain knowledge. While a designer’s particular brand of originality has been connected with divergent thinking (coupled with ideation and unusual associations) rather than convergent thinking, counter arguments stress that past creative achievements have actually been linked to accumulated wisdom and the accretion of influences from a wide range of sources (for example, the case studies conducted by Weisberg, 2006). However we describe the ability to be flexible in thinking or open to experience or ideas, the need to embed the tools for creative thinking and action is clearly a key aspect of the learning experience in art and design. We need to understand how to provide the appropriate context where students can develop their distinct set of transferable and subject specific skills and the knowledge base from which to leverage their creativity.

**Strategic considerations for the research:creativity nexus**

This section considers the strategic development of research and creativity in the creative disciplines in higher education in the UK. This includes policy steer from government and funders, issues of environment and planning, infrastructure and academic replenishment, and links between research and teaching.
Research, creativity and policy

A consideration of national policy relating to research and creativity in art and design draws on studies that articulate how they inform economic and education activity. The key policy driver for research is the articulation of the knowledge economy which implicates all research as having potential for exploitation. This view lies at the heart of the research funding mechanism for UK universities, and its corollary to give equal importance to creativity.

Research is recognised as a foundation of innovation in society ‘which is central to improved growth, productivity and quality of life’ (DfES, 2003, p. 23). There is growing recognition that this applies ‘not only to scientific and technical knowledge’ (DfES, 2003, p. 23), but also to the arts and humanities which can also benefit the economy in addition to enriching culture.

The focus on creativity in relation to local and international economic activity since the 1990s has been sustained by various publications and government initiatives including, in 2002, Richard Florida’s influential, The Rise of the Creative Class. Policy makers have declared that creative industries have an important international impact and have claimed the UK is the ‘world’s creative hub’ (Purnell, 2005). The DCMS creative industries map has been adapted by United Nations Conference on Trade and Development Panel on Creative Industries (UNCTAD, 2004) and in 2005 the International Network for Cultural Diversity (Sagnia, 2005) claimed the creative industries as one of the fastest growing sectors of the global economy.

Government departments have not drawn an explicit relationship between creativity and research, but successive reports have claimed relationships between research carried out in universities, the capacity of graduates to be creative, and enhancements to the UK economy, with benefits to wider communities, including social enterprise, regeneration and public subsidy enterprise. The Lambert Review urged universities to enhance the intensity of their collaboration with industry (DTI, 2003) and more recently Cox (2005) claimed that UK businesses will benefit from harnessing the creativity capacity of design graduates. Attention by all UK governments towards these issues is articulated in the policy strategies of those agencies shaping higher education. The QAA makes specific reference to the value of creativity as an outcome of graduate programmes (Buss, 2007), and the Higher Education Funding Councils of England, Wales and Scotland have initiatives linked to research and to creativity. The QAA in Scotland has made the link between research and learning one of their five enhancement themes and the Higher Education Academy has undertaken work on research-teaching nexus. The Arts and Humanities Research Council has, in its new strategy (AHRC, 2006) made links between funded research undertaken in universities and benefits to creative industries.

Several key papers have reinforced the importance of thinking further about creativity in art and design education. The DCMS task force on further and higher education (DCMS, 2006) claims a direct link between creativity and entrepreneurship in the creative industries. The Cox Review (Cox, 2005) describes how the creative skills of design graduates could contribute to improving performance in non design-based commercial
enterprises. Models for creativity have been articulated (see Massey, 2006; Felmingham, 2007) but few of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Subject Benchmark Statements for undergraduate programmes include specific references to creativity (Buss, 2007). The Arts Council’s paper *The Power of Art* (ACE, 2006) shows how the visual arts contributes to communities beyond education, and recent work undertaken by the Design Council and Creative and Cultural Skills identifies creativity as a major driver of creative industry. NESTA, in a series of recent papers, suggests powerful links between the creative capacity of individual owner-managers of creative enterprises and sustained growth of the creative industries. Finally, *Creating Entrepreneurship* (ADM-HEA, 2007) argues for greater differentiation in developing creative entrepreneurship in arts, design and media education.

The importance of research for knowledge generation, the development of academic disciplines and for the wellbeing of the economy has never been in doubt. However the strategic implications of engagement in research, and of the relationship between research, creativity, the creative disciplines and the experience of art and design students remains under-explored. Given this recognition of the importance of creative disciplines research, HEIs are faced with major challenges and responsibilities, as well as opportunities in strategically developing the relationships between research and creativity. The strategic challenge going forward will be to evidence the impact of our fields upon economic growth and to embed sustainable strategies for developing the student experience in art and design. Both might require the sector to engage in more extensive tracking and categorisation of activity and its impact.

**Environment**

Research in the creative disciplines, as a fundamental function of an HEI, continues to undergo change. Recent decades have seen the basic functions of creative education expand to encompass the ability to award research degrees in creative subjects. The award of university title has also been given to HEIs dedicated to the provision of creative education, recognising the active research culture and doctoral level study in our subjects (see QAA(a)).

The environment has shifted in terms of the accessibility of creativity. Sir George Cox calls for creativity to be integrated into higher education in the sciences, arts and business programmes, to overcome the perception of creativity as the province of the few. ‘Creativity needs to pervade the whole of an organisation and, for this reason, the nature and value of creativity needs to be an integral part of all learning’ (Cox, 2005). For him the requirement is simple: ‘We need business people who understand creativity, who know when and how to use the specialist, and who can manage innovation; creative specialists who understand the environment in which their talents will be used and who can talk the same language as their clients and business colleagues; and engineers and technologists who understand the design process and can talk the language of business.’ This new environment clearly signals the responsibility to ensure we continue to investigate the nature of creativity.
Planning
Access to research funding is a key factor in the growth of research capacity and volume of activity, but the strategic development of creative disciplines research also needs institutional commitment to, and organisation of, the development of a sustainable research base, leadership, environment, and disciplinary knowledge. These principles were enunciated over a decade ago in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, chaired by Sir Ron Dearing (the ‘Dearing Report’), which recognised higher education as embracing teaching, learning, scholarship and research, with the latter’s key role being to provide ‘the long-term foundations for innovation … central to improved growth, productivity and quality of life’ (Dearing, 1997). This research role is not confined to science and technology: ‘Research in the social sciences, and in the arts and humanities can also benefit the economy … not to speak of enriching our culture more widely’ (Dearing, 1997).

Infrastructure
The development of the infrastructure to support increasing research activity in the creative disciplines has been uneven. Specific discipline strengths are emerging in some centres, with research projects, publications and doctoral student activity but low levels of external funding, underdeveloped departmental and management infrastructures, and less developed research ethos and expertise have been compounded by lack of critical mass, researchers working in isolation, and a large number of short-term contracts (SHEFC, 2004, p. 81). If the relationship between research and creativity is to prosper, the sustainability of the research infrastructure remains key: JM Consulting noted the ‘extent of remedial investment required’ and set out the ‘conditions needed to manage this infrastructure on a sustainable basis’ (HEFCE, 2002/35, para 2.18). Significant obstacles highlighted included lack of research space, research squeezed to the margins by teaching, and poor facilities leading to researchers conducting their research outside the institution. The inevitable conclusion is that substantial investment is required to remedy the low expectations of staff and the ‘culture of “excellence in poverty”… [which] leads to sub-optimal performance, and lowered expectations and ambitions for the future.’

Academic replenishment
The infrastructure also includes the supply of suitably qualified art and design practitioners who are able to meet the existing and future needs of the cultural industries and the academic profession. The main findings of a 2001 British Academy review of graduate studies suggested a significant gap between demand and supply in the creative and performing arts because of the projected increase in the number of professionals reaching retirement age. In three target years in 1994/5, 1996/7, and 1998/9 they showed that the number of academic staff leaving HEIs exceeded the number of awarded doctorates (Britac, 2001, p. 27). This report notes that the shortfall in the supply of suitably qualified researchers is so marked in most of the creative and
performing arts that the ratio is likely to fall well below the threshold determined by HEFCE.

The 1996 Review of Postgraduate Education by Sir Martin Harris had found that between 1979 and 1994-5, postgraduate students as a proportion of overall student numbers rose sharply from 13% to 21% (Harris, 1996). Although creative arts and design students account for 9.9% of all undergraduate awards in 2006, only 5% of postgraduate awards were in this field, and 1.9% of the doctorates (HESA, 2007). There are also low numbers of academics with a doctoral qualification in art and design departments, which means few role models for further study. The Art and Design Index to Theses (ADIT) includes less than 1000 records of PhDs completed since 1957, with an average of fifty completions each year by 2000 (Fisher and Mottram, 2006). If the concerns of the British Academy review of graduate studies are to be addressed, there is a clear imperative to consider whether doctoral study is a prerequisite for entry into the academic profession in art and design, or whether there is a strategic imperative to increase the pool of doctorally qualified candidates in this field.

**Links between research and teaching**

The need to make explicit links between the development of curricula and academic programmes with the new knowledge produced by research has been recognised. In particular, there are benefits to be drawn from the developing research cultures and expertise. Efforts have been focused increasingly on ensuring that new subject knowledge impacts directly on what students learn and, perhaps more importantly, to encourage ‘research-like learning’ amongst students, even at undergraduate level. The Roberts Report highlighted inadequate training of postgraduates in HEIs: ‘The amount of training – particularly in transferable skills – available to postgraduates was criticised as inadequate, contributing to many employers not valuing a postgraduate student significantly more than a first degree graduate’ (Roberts, 2002).

In seeking ways to address this situation, Roberts drew attention to the recent development of Master of Research (MRes) programmes as a step in the right direction, stating their purpose as ‘... to offer high quality postgraduate training in the methods and practice of research and in relevant transferable skills ...’ (Roberts, 2002, p. 113), claiming that a postgraduate qualification can boost career and earning prospects. In 2001 the UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) published a report on the first five years of the MRes degree, which recommended the full integration of MRes programmes within HEIs’ portfolios of postgraduate programmes, particularly given the positive experience of the MRes in raising the profile of transferable skills to the top of the postgraduate training agenda.

Following the Roberts Review, the four UK higher education funding councils, concerned about the development of research and other skills, issued a formal consultation in 2003 on proposals for minimum threshold standards for postgraduate research degree programmes which contributed to the development of the revised QAA Code of Practice on postgraduate research programmes.
In the Scottish Enhancement Themes initiative, recognition of its significance led to acceleration of the original schedule and additional focus on the learning experiences of students on taught programmes, and how ‘research-teaching linkages’ enhance graduate attributes. A subject-based approach has been adopted, with the research practices of particular disciplines being examined for their influence on the learning environment of their students. The interpretation of research is broad and the initial definitions include ‘practice/consultancy led research; research of local economic significance; contributions to the work of associated research institutes or other universities and various types of practice-based and applied research including performances; creative works; and industrial or professional secondments’ (Enhancement Themes, 2007). Reflecting interest in the potential impact on student experience in this area, the Higher Education Academy Subject Centres in Art, Design Media (ADM-HEA) and, Dance, Drama and Music (PALATINE) are also due to report on research-teaching linkages in Creative and Cultural Practices in 2008.

Summary

Through exploring the research:creativity nexus in art and design, we suggest that there are clear drivers to reposition our understanding of those two separate elements, and how they might impact upon student experience. We see that their nexus could then provide clear goals for a future vision for art and design within the context of UK higher education.

We noted that the linkages between creativity and economic regeneration are now being substantiated, although there continues to be some dispute on exact definitions and professional boundaries. The problem of definitions was also seen in relation to creativity. New models of setting the conditions for creativity were seen to provide more useable frameworks where creativity was seen as a normal human attribute rather than as a special gift for a privileged few. The notion of conditions for creativity applies to the economic as well as educational context, suggesting that reflection on current practice is timely.

Tracking the development of the research degree in art and design helps model how conceptions of research activity have developed. The CNAA frameworks were influential in stimulating early doctoral work and instigating the process of reporting on staff engagement in professional creative practice beyond the university or art and design school. The RAE in 1992 was a pivotal moment in attributing a value to the professional creative practice reported by the field. However it is suggested that this point, when equivalence became a dominant model, was when art and design lost clear sight of the applicability of research beyond the local context. The 1990s saw some attempts to frame alternatives to equivalence which had more general applicability, but the propositional notion of embodied evidence continues to be problematic.

To a certain extent this mirrors the claims for linkages between creative graduates and the economy, or between university research and economic development. The base
problem identified is lack of evidence: of innovative businesses linking with universities; of research ratings impacting on student experiences; on reasons for increasing numbers of doctoral students. The lack of evidence and continuing fluidity of definitions are seen as two key reasons to look more closely at repositioning our understanding of the research:creativity nexus.

The focus on valuing engagement in practice has led to a view that all research in art and design is necessarily practice-based. This does not present the full picture, although it does provide one model for comprehension of a logical relationship between staff engagement in research and the student replication of that. The distinguishing feature of research orientated practice is the level of public engagement in art and design world debates, and the productive consequences of that. This model of research replicates the general understanding of contributing to a field, but does require the development of abilities to discern supportable claims, to recognise innovation and to engage in enquiry-based learning.

We suggest that a research culture needs to be appropriately supportive of teachers in order for professional learning to continue to occur in a reflective environment, where analysis and evaluation can become embedded as tools to support enquiry. This again picks up the strategic need to consider academic replenishment.

The learning environment of a research-orientated curriculum needs to be organised such that there are foci of enquiry, reflecting the idea that we need to look longer term at the development of the research agenda. Emerging foci at institutional level can be built from existing or new interests, and enable the culture to become developmental and transformational. PhD students are seen as central to this but it is vital to enhance the links between research and undergraduate and postgraduate students to inspire the next generations to aspire to progress to PhD.

A creative approach to conceiving the educational offer as well as understanding how creativity works is seen as a central plank for developing future provision. By reviewing thinking about creative practice and the conditions for that practice, we are confident that art and design disciplines can deliver the graduates who will penetrate all disciplinary fields within our economy. The perceived limitations of assessing creativity are seen to be ably challenged by the adoption of proto-professional models of peer and stakeholder review. The focus on causal links between student personality type and creative achievement do not provide useful models for positive impact on the student experience. Instead, the focus on setting the conditions for creativity appears as a more optimistic context that can be modelled from within the field. The historic methods of the atelier were seen to coincide with recent suggestions of the right conditions to support creativity. The emphasis on knowledge of the field, on deliberate practice, and on being in the right supportive context, seems to mirror closely the characteristics of earlier models of art and design training. We suggest that it is vitally important to be cognisant of the full range of knowledge required for creative expertise. It is not just the tacit knowledge or skills of how to wield the tools of the field. In addition, the domain knowledge to recognise innovation and the strategic knowledge of how the field
operates, are required to complement the ability to generate inventive contributions to objects, knowledge and understanding of art and design.

In strategic terms, it is clearly important to understand how research in art and design is benefiting the economy, and how engagement in creative practice can influence the integration of creativity more generally within higher education across all disciplines. This needs long term planning, to build the capacity to engage with outstanding questions of definition and evidence, as well as to identify issues of strategic importance for future enquiry. The need to determine a coherent approach to academic replenishment has been identified as a key challenge. Despite the growth in postgraduate doctoral numbers in recent years, the proportion of staff holding PhDs across the art and design sector is low. The involvement in creative practice that CNAA recognised as contributing to the quality of the student experience has remained the dominant model in art and design. The increasing emphasis on research and the establishment of the AHRC has had a dramatic impact on the way research, scholarly activity and creative professional practice have been integrated into the life of art and design academics, but the linkages which then impact upon the student experience are still developing pace.

Despite the emergence of creativity as a recognised factor in research and learning, which is valued in practice beyond education and in both commercial and social enterprise, it is uncertain whether this has yet been successfully articulated in the curriculum. In addition, the extent to which we can predict or measure the effects of greater creative capacity in graduates is also as yet unclear. Creativity does remain as a core concept, but thinking within the field appears to be either confused or generalised. While research practice is growing, there are still areas where we are not in control of our own definitions and have not established consensus on the important questions for the field. The role of research as a core practice in universities is embedded, but there is still some pressure to argue for special circumstances or practices. These gaps suggest that a review of how we engage with the research:creativity nexus is a useful contribution to make to the field.

It was intended that this chapter would provide useful insights for delivering a vision for art and design higher education that meets both our aspirations and strategic needs, based on the collective responsibility we share for owning our understanding of creativity and research within the creative disciplines. We hope our suggestions are seen as both reasonable and deliverable, with respect to the differential capacities of institutions, research cultures and individuals to realise the vision.
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Abstract
This chapter explores the nature and impact of student and tutor expectations and identifies a number of gaps between these expectations that offer particular pedagogic challenges. Commonly these gaps are attributed to student failure to adapt or understand the challenges presented to them within the art and design higher education environment. However, we would argue that in not accepting the responsibility to provide a ‘safe’ transitional framework, we may be failing some students.

This chapter describes a series of transitions that art and design students must negotiate as they move between the compulsory and post-compulsory education sector and between higher education and employment within the creative industries sector. These transitions are key points where gaps in expectations become evident and where we as educators need to undertake further work to support our students as they enter and exit further and higher education. The authors discuss those expectations, illustrated with a student vignette, and propose some ways forward for the ‘wicked problems’ of the often ambiguous and open-ended nature of learning tasks in art and design.
Introduction

Students entering higher education often seek ‘clarity’, but a central, although largely unspoken, tenet of art and design pedagogy would appear to be the centrality of ‘ambiguity’ to the creative process. However, the fact that this value is implicit rather than explicit in our teaching practices creates vagueness and insecurity for many of our first year students who have expectations based on the concrete and the certain.

Art and design pedagogy is concerned with the importance of students interacting with openness and uncertainty to enable them, on graduation, to negotiate the complex and unpredictable demands of the creative industries. The kind of knowledge that art and design deals with is procedural, provisional, socially constructed and ever changing. There are few laws, formulae and tangible content lists that form a visible curriculum. In the creative industries practitioners and consumers construct what is appropriate, new and innovative. The pedagogies of art and design relate to these kinds of knowledge; where many ‘right’ answers exist and where there is difficulty in articulating in advance what an appropriate response might look like: ‘I know it when I see it’.

In constructing this argument we have to consider both the evidenced and perceived range of expectations held by both students and their tutors. As Raphael Samuel proposed in The Myths We Live By (Samuel and Thompson, 1990), our perceptions form ‘truths’ which are as powerful as the ‘facts’ we gather. Certainly in this debate we are very aware of the power of these myths in the forming of academic practices in art and design.

We note a tendency in certain sectors of higher education to problematise this difference in expectations between tutors and students in terms of the students. For example, we have to ‘manage their expectations’, as if by constructing the student expectations in a particular way prior to entry to further and higher education students will no longer be disappointed or expect the impossible. We would like to begin our discussion by inverting this assumption that the student is to be managed, and problematise it by examining instead our own preferred pedagogic approaches.

Context

Tutor, student and industry expectations exist in, and are constructed by, our social and political contexts. The authors of this chapter come from Australia, Israel, New Zealand and the UK and our thinking is constructed in the context of cultures and policies in these countries. It is worth noting however, that while higher education in Australia and New Zealand largely share the same origins as the UK, Israeli higher education seems rooted in mainland European traditions and now operates a mixed economy model where there are art and design academic programmes within universities as well as a significant number of semi-private higher education institutions (HEIs) which are more explicitly market driven. We also come from various levels of education; from further
education, undergraduate, postgraduate and from different sizes and types of institutions, different regions as well as countries, and so offer a diverse picture of higher education.

Contemporary policy drivers include the increasing importance given by governments to measures of student satisfaction. In the UK the National Student Survey (NSS) has sent a shudder through the art and design sector as a result of poor performance in comparison with other disciplines. In Australia the well-established Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) is now linked to funding so that ‘good teaching’ (as measured by the CEQ) is one of three weighted measures, along with graduate destinations and retention rates, used to decide the distribution of the Learning and Teaching Fund, (worth approximately $82 million AUD in 2007, the equivalent to just under £35 million sterling). In New Zealand there is some discussion of moving to a national student satisfaction survey and currently each New Zealand university has a student satisfaction evaluation process at the end of each paper (module/unit) with staff performance in this system linking closely to promotion prospects. Arguably the rise of the student satisfaction survey, at least in the UK, is a result of concerns about the ability of higher education to deliver satisfactory education in a context of increasing student numbers and declining resources.

For the last 20 years or so we have also been operating within an audit culture (Power, 1994) where experiences that are complex and nuanced are conflated with the measurable. Tools for measuring student satisfaction become reifications of more intangible processes and perceptions. Additionally there is an increased requirement and expectation that higher education will produce more public information about its quality measures and achievements. This can be seen as a response to an increasingly consumerist approach from students and parents related to quite widespread western policies of moving the burden of cost of higher education from the state to the private world of individuals and families.

There are tensions in this context. Government equity policies have increased institutional awareness of differences in access to, and experience of, higher education for diverse student groups. In New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi embeds biculturalism in the constitution. In Australia there are Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for percentages of both indigenous students enrolled and staff employed, and targets around enrolments of students from disadvantaged socio-economic (low student employment services) groups. In the UK widening participation is a key policy driver. Consequently there is a commitment, at least in the discourse, to address these issues. This is not only a top-down driver. The increasing literature on higher education student access and experience in relation to issues of power relations, habitus and social justice (see for example Archer et al., 2003; Hayton and Paczuska, 2002; Leathwood and O’Connell, 2003; and McManus, 2006) is beginning to affect the discourse and thinking of the higher education sector. One hears more now about the role of cultural capital and the socially constructed nature of aesthetics and taste (Bourdieu, 1984, 1997) yet this awareness constantly bumps up against the context of mass higher education where there is still a strong element of selection.
At the other end of the education experience, when students graduate, industry and government representatives express concern that there is another ‘gap’.

In the UK industry-led skills development has been highlighted by the recent Leitch report, and is a central part of the government’s strategy to improve the UK economy:

‘In the 21st century, our natural resource is our people—and their potential is both untapped and vast. Skills will unlock that potential.’
(Leitch, 2006, p. 1)

In the UK, the three Sector Skills Councils (SSCs) operating within this area (Creative and Cultural Skills (CCS), Skillfast-UK and Skillset), have highlighted their concerns about the mismatch of expectations from the large numbers of students studying art, design, media and communication and the appropriateness of the skills gained from the variety of courses available. A recent report from CCS indicates that design education in the UK has strong foundations, but notes concern of over-supply and gaps in skills and knowledge:

‘Industry and education need to work together to develop a positive strategy to address this apparent mismatch between the number of design graduates and jobs in the industry. Such a strategy must also address the fact that some new graduates do not have the right skills to meet industry needs.’

The CCS Development Plan also indicates areas for improvement within the curriculum to ensure that graduates will have appropriate skills to meet their career expectations:

‘A key area to address is the content of design skills in schools, colleges and universities. Design is a popular subject in secondary and tertiary education - so popular that there is an apparent ‘over-supply’ of new designers. This means it is necessary to make the value and transferability of design skills more explicit, while also providing excellent careers advice.

As well as their core design capabilities in specialist disciplines, students will need complementary skills such as business management and communication, alongside experience of working in multi-disciplinary teams and knowledge of global markets and supply chains.’
(Design Council and Creative & Cultural Skills Development Plan, 2007, p. 5)

Skillset and Skillfast-UK support this view, with the former welcoming ‘the recommendations of the Leitch Review and its endorsement of the Sector Skills Councils and the industry-led approach to tackling skills and training issues’. Skillfast-UK indicates clearly that the expectations of employers are not being met, noting:

‘Employers express reservations concerning the skills held by many design graduates and question the industry relevance of some courses. This reflects employers’ general concern that young people lack a proper understanding of the sector and the career opportunities it offers.’
(Skillfast-UK, 2006, p. 3)
Whilst in some contexts the SSCs acknowledge that education in the UK has been a major factor in the success of the creative industries, their focus on finding solutions to education and skills problems largely ignores the existing excellent examples of collaboration between courses and employers. Examples are not hard to find, with the majority of institutions keen to ensure that employers are invited to participate in the design and delivery of the curriculum. Centres such as the Fashion Business Resource Studio at the London College of Fashion provide platforms for interaction with industry through work placements and industry-sponsored student projects.

The rich educational experience offered to many students focuses on more than skills acquisition. Large numbers of tutors are also practising artists and designers, and students access ‘real’ learning experiences such as work placements in the industry or have opportunities to work with industry partners in colleges. Students develop many kinds of skills and abilities; they learn to become practitioners and what it means to be part of the creative industries. They learn what Wenger (1998) would describe as a regime of competence allied to a context of meaning. They do not learn by rote or by formula, but by developing an understanding of the context in which work is made. Education in the creative industries however, does not provide a specific training that will fit every student for the many and varied potential roles they will meet in those creative industries. Nor is it possible to provide this in the context of mass education. We would argue that art and design pedagogies provide ways to approach complexity, to maximise opportunities that arise for students in the workplace and to point to ways to become successful practitioners. These approaches are based on what we might call our pedagogy of ambiguity, where skills are not simply competencies, but the ability to operate in the complexities of uncertainty.

**Dealing with expectations**

Expectations are basic human phenomena. However we believe that both tutors and students hold expectations which are specific to, or more significant in, art and design pedagogy. Amongst these are expectations to produce original artefacts, to graduate with sufficient skills, to become an innovative artist/designer who explores new frontiers or to realise the expectation of ‘making it’, i.e. becoming a star designer, ‘not like anything else that we have seen before’.

Institutions are expected to provide programmes which will enable the majority of the students to become successful practitioners, tutors are expected to coach and support them and graduates are expected to prove themselves worthy of becoming part of the creative industries. It is not difficult to see that gaps between these high expectations and actual performance in the real world are almost inevitable.

To illustrate the gap between what the student imagines (what could or should have been) and the real world the student faces, we offer a vignette based on an actual complaint. This vignette also illustrates the gap between student expectations and tutor expectations. Tutors have a unique role in art and design courses and so their intentions
for and expectations of students draw students’ attention: ‘expectations gaps’ may lead
to conflicts as shown in this case.

We suggest that the content of the narrative of the complaint and response is
recognisable to the point where it stands as a pertinent exemplar, or case study,
providing useful points for analysis.

**Vignette**

A student who had enrolled on a degree level fine arts course became so distressed by
his experience in the first few weeks that a complaint was lodged, by one of his parents,
to the university vice-chancellor. In this complaint a number of interesting issues around
what we would call ‘communities of expectation’, ‘pedagogies of ambiguity’, and ‘gaps’
or ‘transitions’, are revealed.

First, we become aware of the expectations of a particular student, then those of his
parent. Second, we become aware of the expectations of the tutor coordinating one of
the modules. What is not illuminated, of course, are the expectations of other students
undergoing the same learning experience, who have either experienced it differently and
positively, or for reasons to do with culture, class, gender, age, or a multiplicity of other
factors, have not felt inclined or able to complain.

In his letter the student’s father introduced himself as a primary school teacher, shared
the fact that his son had been studying at the institution for four weeks, and was only
happy with one of the three modules he was studying. In that module, he explained, the
tutors had demonstrated and explained techniques, and given the student clear
instructions on how he might improve. He added ‘This is what we had expected of [your
institution].’

He listed what had occurred in the other modules that ‘failed to comply’ with their
expectations. This included the following points:

- the openness of the brief leads to little or no direction
- when students ask if they are on track they get no direct answer, therefore students
  are constantly unsure whether they are performing to standard
- there is no ongoing evaluation or critiquing of student work
- there appears to be no planning of tutorials, so a lot of time is wasted.

In these short statements we can see the expectations of the father and his son of a
particular kind of pedagogy, one that might be characterised as assessment-driven
‘knowledge or skill gathering’, where standards are explicit and non-negotiable and
learning parameters are clearly defined.

The response from the tutor reveals quite a different perception of the experience and a
radically different notion of appropriate pedagogy. This might be summed up in her
response to the second bullet point above, where she wonders whether this may be:
'Because of the open nature of the brief and the desire of students to be directed. Students will often ask if what they are doing is ‘right’ and our response will be to explain that rather than ‘right’ or ‘wrong,’ we are expecting students to engage with the themes of the brief and develop a position in response to that engagement.'

At the crux of the tutor’s response is revealed the implicit ‘pedagogy of ambiguity’ held dear by art and design educators. We can easily argue that we base our delivery on a current, student-centred, ‘active learning’ approach to education. Openness of brief, where the student has to engage in active negotiation and problem solving would seem to be key in this approach, as is a more frequent use of modes of ‘formative assessment’ through informal discussion and critique. Essential to all this is the often unspoken requirement that students experiment, take risks, learn to assess the appropriateness of solutions according to context, and engage in a longer and more open-ended process of enquiry than they may have been used to previously.

In this vignette two, or perhaps three, sets of expectations clash. First there is the expectation of the parent that his child will receive an education based on a particular kind of pedagogy. Second is the tutor’s expectation that the student will navigate through the difficulty of ‘ambiguity’ as a kind of initiation, which he will pass or fail based on his own strength of character. Finally, caught between these two positions, is the third expectation: that of the student. He finds himself conflicted between the explicit expectations of the father, and the tacit expectations of the tutor. What the student has the right to expect is that he will be given an appropriate learning experience and the means by which to negotiate that experience.

This story illustrates that often we do not succeed in making explicit to ourselves, or our students, the tacit pedagogic framework in which we, as art and design educators, function. As the vignette shows, we value a ‘pedagogy of ambiguity’, but we may fail to transition students from the safety of the ‘concrete’ or ‘expected’ to the ambiguous and contingent, in a way that makes them feel safe or enabled.

It is a minefield of good intentions: as we must be careful not to mythologise the ‘ideal student’ one who is instantly comfortable with the equivocal and contingent nature of a pedagogy of creativity, so we must also be careful not to mythologise and demonise tutors who believe so strongly in an approach to learning that goes beyond ‘right’ and ‘wrong’. We do not want to suggest that art and design pedagogy fails its students. There are many examples of good practice in the sector and many success stories. However, when it goes wrong, the failure is often based on an overestimation of a student’s ability to access an unspoken set of values.
What are students’ expectations and what shapes them?

Our discussion around the nature and impact of expectation has been diverse and wide-ranging. Given that the authors come from diverse backgrounds, interests and foci — albeit from an overarching commitment to investigating the nature of art and design education, what we propose here are a number of facets of a psychological, socially-constructed phenomenon that is deeply human.

We define an ‘expectation’ as a ‘belief about (or mental picture of) the future; anticipation: wishing with confidence of fulfilment; the feeling that something is about to happen’ (wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn). This can include things we are wishful of achieving for ourselves, expectations of other people or for other people, and situations outside ourselves that we anticipate being a certain way at some point in the future. We can also include our perceptions of others’ expectations of ourselves which may be the result of concrete information or our beliefs. Expectations are to do with the future, yet they are based on past experiences, and can therefore be seen as a link between past and future. They can focus on the future as being positive, that is, to aspire for a better situation for ourselves or meaningful others.

It is also common to have ‘negative expectations’ (for example ‘I expect that this tutor will be late/moody/unfair’) or interestingly, a negative expectation might also be expressed as a state of no expectation (for example, ‘I’m not expecting anything from the course’). Expectations can be based on ‘myths’, interpretation of external information and on similar past experiences. The attached positive or negative value of an expectation is particularly important as it has an effect on creating incentives or constraints for future possibilities.

From the multitude of interactions between the student and the institution, staff, other students, and family, it is clear that expectations (and whether or not they are met) are one of the key determinants in how students assess their level of success and quality of experience. These may be expectations of what higher education study will look like, how well the student will do, how they will grow and develop over the course of study, how they will relate to staff and so on — even as far as their level of satisfaction in completing the National Student Survey (or equivalent) as they prepare to complete undergraduate study. Given the centrality of expectations to the student experience, it is important to understand them and what informs them.

Student expectations are founded on a raft of factors shaped by their previous learning experience and their own social worlds. They are based on prior personal experiences in other learning environments, acquired knowledge from external sources and they are constructed by social standards. These prior experiences are referred to by Biggs (2003) as ‘presage factors’ and they influence the way that the learning process is experienced. Students have multiple goals and expectations with various foci; some might also be shaped by adopting others’ (parents, friends, teachers) expectations. Thus, for the purpose of our discussion, it may be more useful to consider the idea of ‘communities of expectations’. These might be established by, for example, gender, ethnicity, culture, or
class. An example would be the student’s common expectation of a tutor’s impartiality, which may be based on the notion of democratic standards and prior experience in an earlier educational environment such as secondary school. We can see therefore that student expectations are not inert or completely individualised: they are constructed and evolving.

Prior experiences of success and failure are also a rich breeding ground for expectations. Ways of working which brought praise before can drive students to build an expectation that the same way of working will attain future success. In higher education art and design courses, where students are often required to change their mode of operating and reconstruct their way of thinking, we often encounter the bewildered expression of those who no longer receive the accolades they were used to receiving before entering higher education. It is also common that work produced within a particular aesthetic context is no longer acceptable in the culture of higher education. In the vignette above, the expertise of the father as a teacher and the collective experiences of his family of educational success, formed the basis of the father’s and the student’s expectation that he would be successful at university.

An additional source of expectations, which has become dominant in the current information age, is the powerful imagery created by the mass media. Images of the successful designer or the ‘star’ artist may promote a student’s expectation of becoming such an artist or designer, and seeing the art or design course as the golden path to attaining that position. Higher education institutions play a role in creating these images as they frequently promote projections of perfection in the world of education through, for example, the prospectus. The kind of marketing used to attract students may lead them to expect they will spend their time in the most up-to-date technologically equipped learning spaces with help available as and when they need it. Both tutors and students are held hostage to a partial vision of reality, which promises, as all advertising does, the vision of an experience (and implied future career success) that is there for the student if only they buy into, or win their way into, the particular institution of their choice. This was evidenced in a review of prospectuses undertaken by the Design Skills Consultation. They commented:

‘After reviewing a total of 67 UK course websites, the design world came across as glamorous, fast moving, cutting edge and closely linked to industry and fun. If making a course selection based on the websites alone, a prospective student is likely to come away expecting good employment prospects in a highly attractive industry. There is no doubt that the impression given by the course websites is that of a highly attractive world with lots of opportunity for varying levels of success.’

(Design Council and Creative & Cultural Skills, 2006)

While not implying that courses are low quality, the report notes that such claims raise concerns about how the marketing of courses can become increasingly ‘compromised’ in the struggle, at an institutional level, to attract students and meet targets. Such claims may set the stage for students’ expectations even before they enrol on a course.
There appears to be a paucity of research in the area of student expectations in relation to art and design education and as a result we have little evidence of what students actually expect while they are learning.

Austerlitz (2007) interviewed second year architecture students and identified that they had expectations in the following areas:

- producing an original artefact of high quality (as seen in magazines)
- learning skills and being guided on the way to becoming a successful designer
- fulfilling themselves as creative and autonomous individuals
- being valued, supported, and respected by the tutor
- belonging to the student group and keeping up with its standards
- becoming a successful member of the architects' community.

A central theme to emerge within students' expectations was around the tutors' role and behaviour. This is particularly important in one-to-one and small group tutorials where, owing to the significant role of tutors in this learning environment, students develop high expectations regarding the tutor's level of expertise and also the quality of their interactions and the kind of guidance they will offer. Webster (2001) refers to these kinds of expectations and drawing from his research on the expectations of architecture students notes that they had constructed an image of an 'ideal tutor':

‘… when students were asked about the ‘ideal’ role of the design tutor in one-to-one tutorials they referred to: giving assistance with managing and planning work, being enthusiastic, understanding the problem from the students’ perspective, accepting the student’s ideas and helping to develop them and offering design guidance which the student understood.’

(Webster, 2001, p. 109)

In art and design courses students rely on their tutors for guidance and for evaluation of the quality of their work. It is assumed, therefore, that what students perceive others (and particularly their tutors) expect of them, has a direct impact on students’ performance and on the expectations that students then place on themselves. Such experiences enable students to reconstruct their expectations of themselves, which in turn either motivate or demotivate them.

As expectation is always in relation to a future state of being, students (whenever it is possible) will be aiming to bring about desirable situations and to avoid damaging or undesirable situations. Yet hopes and expectations are not often accurately fulfilled. At times we surprise ourselves by achieving more than we had expected, but more often than not we do not feel we have fulfilled all our expectations. This suggests that at some point in the future, someone will be held responsible for the fulfilment or lack of fulfilment of the expectation.
Vroom (1964) asserts that there are three conditions which need to be in place for expectations to be met:

- **Valence** — value of obtaining the goal — what's in it for me?
- **Instrumentality** — connection of reward and success — is there a clear path for me?
- **Expectancy** — perceived probability of success — what is my capability?

Vroom argues that all three must be present for motivation to occur. That is, if an individual does not believe he or she can be successful at a task or the individual does not see a connection between his or her activity and success or the individual does not value the results of success, then the probability is lowered that the individual will engage in the required activity. From this perspective, expectations are seen as an important facet of students' learning as they influence the level of a student's motivation, underlie and maintain their social interactions and affect their interpretation of events. Research into architecture students' experiences shows that they are constantly appraising the extent to which their expectations have been met, as well as monitoring their situation according to what should be and what it actually is.

Our experience shows that in many cases students come with hopes for a breakthrough into the art and design world and expectations of being led gradually by a supportive, yet inspiring tutor towards a triumph. This idealised image of success and the tutor's role in achieving it creates the potential for a significant gap between expectation and reality. The vignette demonstrates such a gap — between the expectations of the student and his father, and what actually happened.

When a gap is revealed it is a human tendency to look for causes and responsibilities. Rotter's ‘locus of control’ cited in Carlson *et al.* (2004) refers to whether one believes that the consequences of one's actions are determined or controlled by internal, person variables or by external, environmental variables, which in turn can give rise to a range of emotions or states of being in the ‘holder’ of the expectation, dependent on how we interpret what ‘the gap’ signifies to us. Following Ben-Ze’ev’s perspective (2000) we assert that the emotion which arises from recognising a gap will be determined by two parameters — the level of achievement and fulfilment of expectation, and the responsibility (controllability) for that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Level of fulfilment of expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject's responsibility</td>
<td>Fulfilled expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' responsibility</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Level of fulfilment of expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject's responsibility</td>
<td>Fulfilled expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' responsibility</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is critical that we recognise the important role that student expectations play within their learning experience and that we work to identify the key gaps and transitions and to acknowledge the subsequent emotions which have the potential to modify a student's approach to learning — from the level of self-motivation and self-confidence to the positive, or negative, quality of their interactions with tutors. The vignette demonstrates how anger or disappointment grows from a gap between the expected and actual behaviour of a tutor. Moreover, when students interpret a situation to be unjust, or feel that they have been treated in a wrongful way, there is a danger that they may also begin to feel insulted or humiliated. In both cases, they are likely to see the ‘locus of control’ as being outside of themselves and modify their learning approach and the quality of interaction with whoever they deem to be responsible.

Students have to deal with more than just their own prior expectations. They also face gaps between the expectations of many others such as educational institutions, tutors, relatives or even potential employers. Each one of these parties has different and at times contradictory expectations. Once a gap is revealed it may lead to either an internal conflict which the student must struggle to resolve, or to a conflict between the student and one of the other parties.

**What are tutors’ expectations and what shapes them?**

Having examined the nature of student expectations along with the varied determinants that can contribute to the formation of expectations in students, we will now focus on tutors' expectations and try to identify potential loci of gaps between tutors' and students' expectations.

Tutors’ expectations of students are often founded on the folk mythologies of the ‘ideal student’; a construction formed by the amalgamation of tutors’ hopes and expectations and their desire for success in terms of the students’ own development and performance. We want our students to succeed and we want to be proud of them. These desires lead inevitably to the search for perfection in our own projected forms of the ideal and the formation of the ‘other’; those who demonstrate other characteristics, abilities or tendencies. In describing the ideal we look for the impossible, and we begin at a point where we look for those who match most closely our desires and, probably, ourselves. These models are culturally loaded in favour of a constructed notion of the masculinist, unencumbered, affluent individual (Leathwood and O’Connell, 2003).

The ‘ideal student’ would demonstrate that they are ‘fit’ in a Darwinian way to take up the subject the minute they enter higher education. They would be highly motivated and as passionate about their subject as their tutors. They would be totally dedicated to study, wanting and able to spend every waking hour engaged in their disciplinary practice. This ideal has no family commitments or financial imperatives. Students who work part-time in a supermarket or who have family commitments cannot match this ideal; thus revealing that these expectations already begin to discriminate against the
very students we seek to attract. The ideal student would have rounded skills, excelling at every aspect of the modern art and design curriculum, able to write, argue, debate, articulate, present, negotiate, draw, create, invent, and innovate, all within the context of the current politico-social global environment and capable of adapting and changing as the fast-changing modern world throws technologies and problems their way. Now we observe a ‘super student’; as likely as a manifestation of the comic heroes and heroines, but somewhere, underneath the realities of our own experience as students and teachers, our hopes and expectations breed the impossible. We create this hybrid student ideal, moulded in our own form, but lacking the weaknesses we ourselves exhibited as students.

This ideal is mirrored in the never-ending lament of industry that we do not produce graduates who are ready and capable of entering into another social world, that of a specific place of work or professional role, fully formed and fully functioning, a ‘super hero’ ready to take on the problems of the world in the coming century, and solve them.

In neither of these constructs of the ‘super student’ or the ‘super hero’ is the notion of having to learn about the local and particular knowledge and ways of working of the social context they are moving into. Meaning is constructed through the context in which actions are carried out; the context of the action explicates the meaning. In this social constructivist approach to understanding human endeavour the student could be said to be, at both these points of transition, entering into a community of practice (Wenger, 1998) where they will have to learn to move from the periphery to the centre (Lave and Wenger, 1991) before they are able to contribute and change the practice itself, whether this is in education as a fully participating and collaborating student, or in the world of work.

In our construction of ‘the other’ we move from the impossibility of perfection to the problematisation of lack or difference. This leads to discourses of student ‘deficit’ where the gap between the ideal and the other is emphasised. No human can fulfil the desires or hopes of the projected ideal and we fall back on a construction of ‘the student’ who is needy, deficient or culturally inadequate. These discourses serve to present the student as the problem rather than, as we argue in this paper, focusing on the need to recognise and mediate the gaps in expectation and experience. We need to recognise that many students currently experience complex cultural transitions when they enter higher education creative arts programmes. Traditionally we talk about inducting students into an art and design higher education environment. The term induction suggests that students need to adapt themselves to ‘our ways of being and doing’. For some students, for those with the right cultural capital, this is not a problem, but for others the failure to adapt becomes ‘their problem’.

We want to re-conceptualise induction as a series of participatory encounters throughout the whole journey of education and working life. We want to replace this inductive, linear model of experience and expectation with the notion of transitions; an exchange between tutor and student, rather than a moulding of the student to fit a one-dimensional concept of the student.
More than this, transitions happening at more than one point, which allow insights into ways of working and being in other cultural situations would enable such conceptions to be valued. For example, genuine interactions between school, further/higher education and industry should emphasise the fluidity and mutuality of engagement. In contemporary interactions we work at emphasising the linearity of experience and the difference between our sectors, maintaining barriers and the rituals of rites of passage that these transition points emphasise.

The difficulties of articulating the essence of our practice-based learning to others is common to any discipline at a level beyond the common experience we share through our schooling and our peripheral interactions with these in our everyday lives. It is relatively easy to talk about and to observe technical skills and abilities, but harder to explain the nature of knowledge that is generated through the visual and the artefactual. Harder still for those outside to see the complex web of the historic, the current and the socio-political strands that make up the discipline and the context of the practices that constitute those activities. It is a challenge to find ways to demonstrate, to bridge or to navigate the gaps evidenced in the transitions between the higher education institution and the worlds beyond.

Knowledge and knowing in art and design is complex and not readily rendered through text. Many practices develop ways of knowing through experience of the tactile, visual and spatial and these ways of knowing are illusive to those outside our community.

We do not question that to understand the language and the knowledge of particle physics requires long engagement with the theories and ideas of the discipline and art and design is the same. Simply because ways of communicating ‘knowledge’ in art and design are more visual, linked to contextual debates in the discipline and less accessible to those who are not members of the community of practice (Wenger, 1998) does not mean that knowledge does not exist. Indeed, the knowledge is more diverse and more embedded in the practice, the doing, making and engaging in the social historical and technical world of the disciplines. Blackler (1995) refers to different ways of knowing and different types of knowledge, that might be inherent in organisations. He asserts that these different ways of knowing can be embedded, encultured, embodied, encoded, and embrained, they are not simply about knowledge that is explicit, written and overt. Knowledge is situated within the practices and cultures of human activity and art and design and education are no different. Such dispersed and contextualised knowledge has been explored in graphic design by Logan (2006) where the kinds of language and metaphors used in education mirror those found in the practice of graphics in the industry. Such linkage between the use of language in practice and in education is not surprising if we consider the large numbers of practitioner tutors engaged in education in this sector and it suggests that knowledge is generated and shared socially and not contained within easily transferable formats such as text books.

Ways of knowing are built up through experience and through the pedagogies of art and design education. The centrality of ambiguity in the educational experience leads to disjunctions in expectations as described in the vignette above.
A number of key precepts are central to art and design pedagogies within a western context. The first of these is the notion of the individual’s personal development. Each person is required to develop his or her personal response to the creation of ‘work’. In such circumstances the tutor acts as guide and facilitator, and in such a role it is an anathema to impose one’s own views of ‘the right solution’ to a design problem. There are many ‘right solutions’. However, there is an underlying opposite, and often unspoken, knowledge that some solutions are more ‘right’ than others, more successful and more innovative. Some ways of working are also considered to be inappropriate. These are challenging and difficult ways of knowing and are part of the culture of the course, the discipline and the current cultural context of the particular art or design practice. Hence there is an emphasis on students learning about and knowing the work of current practitioners and also the traditions and heritage of their practice. This is the knowledge of the context of making, the artefact and the commentary on such products that is the second key factor in the pedagogies of art and design. Knowledge is provisional, socially constructed and ever changing. In fashion, in multi-media design and in fine art it is essential to be familiar with the world of practice beyond academia.

Secondly, experiential knowledge of the practice is important. Students learn through doing and making. They learn to practise and what it means to be a practitioner. Tutors who hold the conception of teaching as helping students to become practitioners, spend more time with their students and intend them to experience what it means to be a practitioner (Drew and Williams, 2002; Drew and Trigwell, 2003). Such experiential knowledge is built up through learning about a range of processes and techniques, through experimentation, testing, and trial and error. The students are expected to research, to independently explore a wide range of contextual factors relevant to the discipline and to the project they are engaged in. However, what research means can be variable and students conceptions of research can limit them to reproducing strategies rather than holistic and expansive understandings of the role of research in the construction of individual, personal meanings in response to the brief (Shreeve, Bailey et al., 2003).

Engaging students is another fundamental concept of art and design pedagogies. In order to learn students have to ‘engage’ in the learning activities. This is active learning advocated by many theorists, student-centred, leading to deep approaches to learning as opposed to surface approaches (Prosser and Trigwell, 1999). However, not all students experience engagement in the way intended and they do not approach their studies in the same way (Drew, Bailey et al., 2002). For many students there is a conceptual gap between the way we teach, the way we intend our students to learn and the way they experience it.

Even though the material, the world of the made object is primary in our discipline we still require language to mediate the understandings that we construct around such artefacts. There has been a tendency in some situations to obscure rather than mediate understanding in such disciplines. Comments like, ‘if I have to explain what I mean by fashion, then you do not understand what fashion is,’ are not unknown in higher education. It is possible that we privilege ambiguity in art and design education. Ways of
experiencing knowledge are not primarily through words and either through laziness or a sense of exclusivity it is possible to disenfranchise many learners. It is easy to forget that we have a very specific language in our practices and ambiguity can easily be replaced by poor communication. Having to explore verbally is also a central tenet of art and design education. The ‘crit’ or critique is a social situation intended to engage students in the debate and evaluation of their work. Too often this can slide into an exposition of the tutor’s views, but in most cases there is an expectation that students will communicate their views and express opinions. One aspect of the crit is to enable students to learn an appropriate and discipline specific language of evaluation. They are learning to think and to act like practitioners, or educational practitioners. Vygotsky’s (1981) view of language as the primary mediating artefact of social meaning exemplifies the importance of dialogue in teaching and learning. Tutors engage students constantly in discussion as part of their teaching, developing the ability in their students to speak and to understand the language of their particular practice. Failure to articulate arguments, debates and difficult concepts that depend on broad contextual knowledge of the practice, obscures the workings of the discipline and turns the process of learning into a game that some students just don’t get (Reid, 2007). Those who are experienced practitioners can deal with the idea that there are many possible answers and many possible ways of working, within fuzzy boundaries. They are comfortable with the notion of ‘provisional stabilities’ (Saunders, Charlier et al., 2005) or with ambiguity.

The futility of the unending search for clarity

Our audit cultures have generated more and more writing about our courses and our educational practices. Both within and beyond the institution there is a pressure to make more explicit the nature of education and often a subtext that believes that because we lack the words to convincingly evoke these experiences then we lack rigour in our systems and practices. If we believe that there can only be a true understanding through the generation of the collaborative construction of meaning, then the ‘tyranny of transparency’ (Strathern, 2000) will continually fuel the gap between our expectations of the educational experience and the reality of our experience, whether at the point of transition into or out of higher education or the perceptions of ‘stakeholders’.

Visser and Visser (2004), reporting on a project involving a multidisciplinary team, argue that people face an increasingly complex and ambiguous world. There is therefore a need to take ambiguity seriously and ‘deliberately acknowledge and embrace it’ rather than try to remove it. They explore the intersection of ambiguity and learning and draw a number of implications. Rather than avoid ambiguity teachers need to create situations where students have opportunities to negotiate ambiguity. They argue that people consider actions against a backdrop of their own lived experience and that different discourses mean that words only have meaning in context. This creates a challenge when moving between discourse communities. They point out that a level of comfort with ambiguity is culturally specific and the importance of context in the design of each
learning situation. Most contexts are complex and working through this complexity helps students learn to understand different perspectives and so better cope with ambiguity. This approach also recognises the need for a degree of courage in looking at the world from different perspectives and coaching each other to understand our conflicting perspectives and being able to co-exist with these different perspectives.

Barnett (2000) offers the metacommunication of ‘supercomplexity’ as a way of understanding the world as it is and argues that what graduates need is:

‘[The] capacity to embrace multiple and conflicting frameworks and to offer their own positive interventions in that milieu.’

(Barnett, 2000, p. 167)

We need, however, to take care with how we use the term ambiguity and what we claim for it. Gaver, Beaver and Benford (2003) argue that:

‘… ambiguity is a property of the interpretative relationship between people and artefacts. This distinguishes ambiguity from related concepts such as fuzziness or inconsistency; these are attributes of things, whereas ambiguity is an attribute of our interpretation of them. Things themselves are not inherently ambiguous. They may give rise to multiple interpretations depending on their precision, consistency and accuracy on the one hand, and the identity, motivations and expectations of an interpreter on the other.’

(Gaver, Beaver and Benford, 2003, p. 235)

Rowland argues that there are two different kinds of ambiguity and makes the distinction between vagueness and uncertainty (Rowland, 2003). This allows us to differentiate between not taking the process far enough to identify the issues and possibilities (vagueness) and the recognition of multiplicity of routes and interpretations with porous boundaries (uncertainty). When we claim ambiguity, we must be sure this is not an excuse for under-developed thinking.

There is also a danger of inauthentic ambiguity where there is a discourse of acceptance of diverse outcomes but beneath is a hidden curriculum open only to the privileged few. If ability to cope with ambiguity is culturally specific, then different forms of ambiguity are also socially and culturally constructed, often within a hierarchy of acceptability by the dominant group.

These issues are also highly relevant to the context of teaching international students. As Lask (cited in Carroll and Ryan, 2005) points out ‘in order to provide a relevant educational experience for all students in an environment that is supportive and inclusive of all’, you will need to be prepared to review and interrogate your own culture and values, you will need to be actively pursuing intercultural engagement with your students and within the discipline and seeking opportunities to learn about the national and cultural perspectives of others. Recent work around the subject of internationalisation has raised issues entirely appropriate to the search for gaps in cultural understanding and expectation that are relevant to all students regardless of culture, class or creed.
The need to develop ‘meta cultural sensitivity’ amongst both students and tutors is seen as a way of helping to devise strategies for dealing with students’ sense of ‘otherness’ and to bridge gaps in expectations. Cultural sensitivity in this sense does not require the gathering of knowledge or facts about other cultural perspectives, but to develop sensitivity and understanding to a point where ‘partners must be cognizant of their partner’s cultural heritage and, must accord that heritage legitimacy in their dealings with one another’ (Smith and Bond, 1999). Rather than expect all our students to conform to our expectations we should be aware of their perspectives and expectations.

To be familiar with the world of practice in art and design higher education in the UK means understanding its western context and traditions. Students studying art and design in a host culture often find commonly used phrases such as ‘mark making’, challenging and difficult, and often find that they are used in teaching without context or explanation. Mark making as an abstract form of expression deeply embedded in western modernist artistic practice may mean nothing to a learner whose cultural context for meaning in art and design is almost always symbolic and representational. If the modernist paradigm is the prime pedagogical value then it is likely to create dissonance in such learners and they may come to question knowledge and may challenge the tutor’s authority.

In an important study of cross-cultural issues in teaching online the Australian Flexible Learning Framework produced a guide which pointed out that the pedagogic values embedded within the curricula in one culture may be culturally inappropriate to another, and may not fit students’ ‘world view’ (McLoughlin and Oliver, 1999). While this study was based on online learning some of the findings seem apt in the context of this chapter. The learner’s ‘world view’ is the percipience that results from the individual’s mental programmes which in turn are developed out of the ‘patterns of thinking, feeling and potential acting that every person carries within him or herself’ (Hofstede, 1991). If there is little cultural sensitivity in the tutor’s pedagogy, all students can be disadvantaged and feel disengaged with the education process. The diverse culture that the international student body represents also brings with it complex and contradictory understandings of globalisation as it affects their individual and communal lives and experiences over time (Luke and Tuathail, 1998). This multinational group may display many advantages of the privileged (e.g. the ability to pay the fees to study at Masters level overseas), but the growing availability of grants and support for international learners (who will often have a specific political purpose and an agenda closely aligned to the economy of their country) adds to the diversity of the student group at this level of learning. This provides a multifaceted mix of expectations which offers us the opportunity to enhance our curricula and enrich art and design pedagogies for sustainable art and design curricula.

Students who come from different traditions of practice may also have different definitions of the subjects studied in art and design. Fashion in Ghana for example, does not necessarily divide the subject into the component parts, fashion and textiles. Fine art students from Nigeria may not see the point of the conceptual or the ironic when they will be going back home to an arts audience primed to inhabit the representational and
narrative in visual arts practice. This will demand more than individual or collective tutor and student ‘sensitivity’ but quality assurance and bureaucratic systems which can cope with flexible definitions of subject areas and assessment methods that relate to and address cross and inter-cultural issues and content.

As teachers we also have to consider appropriate sites for exploration of ambiguity at different levels. Do we throw our new students in at the deep end or do we scaffold activities that build towards our ultimate aim?

**Ways forward**

Art and design learning tasks are often ill defined and open-ended and can be characterised as ‘wicked problems’ (Rittel and Webber, 1973). By its very nature art and design activity has neither one correct end result nor one way to get there and therefore can not be addressed by any linear pre-structured method (Cross, 1984). Engaging with these open-ended tasks forces students to deal with ambiguity and uncertainty and whilst experienced artists and designers expect this and even embrace ambiguity since they know that this incubation phase of ‘not knowing what to do’ is often the origin of innovative ideas, many first year art and design students are not familiar with such a process. On the contrary all their previous experience brought them to expect clear goals with structured ways to achieve them. Tutors are therefore often expected by students (or, as in the former vignette, by their parents) to clear the way for them by teaching techniques or thinking methods which will guarantee success in ‘solving the problems’ and therefore success on the course.

Bridging the gap between the expectations of students and those of tutors reveals a major challenge which we have to face. Not only are art and design tasks often ill-structured but also the process of teaching students to deal with these issues is uncertain and therefore can be described as a ‘wicked issue’ where the best approach is ‘progressively to disengage from unsatisfactory practice’ (Watson, 2000). Since art and design students learn mostly by doing, the tutor role is more that of a coach, facilitating students’ capacity to deal with the ambiguous process, to reflect on it and to grow from that reflection (Schön, 1987).

In an educational environment where this pedagogy of ambiguity is the norm, tutors and institutions need to learn to acknowledge the nature and importance of students and tutors’ expectations and to respond to them as part of the educational process.

Recognising students as individuals with a multitude of difference and a multitude of experiences to bring to higher education, rather than as the failed ‘super student’ hero who can never live up to our expectations has to be the way forward to enabling a meeting and understanding of worlds. We have to decrease the gap between unrealistic expectations generated through projections of unachievable goals or unintended exclusion from the world of education through art and design. We need to break down
the isolation and the development of separate cultures through a greater participatory experience where more meaningful insights can permeate through all levels of art and design, from primary education through to the worlds of professional practice.

Such an approach should not try to 'manage' student expectations nor should it be obsessed with fulfilling every expectation. Instead the approach should be to encourage students and tutors to acknowledge each others’ expectations and to develop methods to enable both students and tutors to transition through the gaps in a positive, supported way. This transition also needs to be facilitated through greater understanding about the educational process and purpose in relation to the world of professional practice. In a rapidly changing world our students need to be able to deal with ambiguity, to live and work through it and with it. Learning and experiment is at the heart of education and also creative practices. Graduates need to be able to adapt, innovate and see the creative potential in a world we can only imagine and industries need to recognise that we have a dual role in facilitating those abilities.
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‘The ultimate aim of the visual arts is the building! Their noblest function was once the decoration of buildings. Today they exist in isolation, from which they can be rescued only through the conscious, cooperative efforts of all craftsmen. Architects, painters and sculptors must recognise again the composite character of a building as an entity.’

Walter Gropius, The Bauhaus Manifesto, 1919

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to investigate the current use of space within art and design institutions and to pose the questions: How is practice-based learning, with its relationship to space, best offered to the art and design student of the future? What are the implications for accommodation and resource needs to support the continuing development of this practice?

This paper is divided into four discussion-based sections. It begins with an overview of the distinctiveness of practice-based learning and teaching with a focus on the skills agenda for the UK as a whole. The next section identifies current uses of space within the art and design school through case studies of current practice from the authors’ own institutions. These scenarios attempt to
identify individual institutional contexts and demonstrate some of the range and
diversity of practices across the sector. Next, the paper highlights and lists the
main drivers for change and how these may influence the art and design school
of the future. Finally, possibilities for the future are discussed. This issue was the
theme of the Council for Higher Education in Art and Design (CHEAD)
Conference: Spaces for Art / Spaces for Art Education (Bugg, 2006), and as many
institutions are currently undergoing a general reallocation of their use of space
this paper is timely and will generate further debate across the sector.
The distinctiveness of practice-based learning and teaching

The academic and intellectual distinctiveness of practice-based learning and teaching is well established and extensively documented. Indeed, the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Higher Education Art and Design (HE A&D) Benchmark Statements of 2002 in its introduction states:

‘The study of art and design as an academic and intellectual pursuit develops a range of cognitive abilities related to the aesthetic, the moral and the social contexts of human experience. The capacity to visualise the world from different perspectives is not only intrinsically worthwhile as a personal life-skill, but is also an essential part of the human conditions [sic]. The engagement in the study of art and design is, therefore, a commitment to improving the quality of one’s own and others’ cultural experiences.’

(Section 1.8: QAA HE A&D Benchmark Statements, 2002)

This highlights the intrinsic values of an art and design education and how these impact on the world beyond the art school. The statement continues:

‘The manifestation of these essential human capacities has always been through the production of artefacts, more often than not for cultural consumption, thus the study of art and design has always provided a vocational outlet for creative endeavour. In a world that is becoming culturally more sophisticated and requires greater material output, the cognitive abilities and practical skills of artists and designers are in increasing demand.’

(Ibid)

These benchmarking statements stress the purpose of practical skills that go beyond the boundaries of the creative industries alone.

Indeed the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Education and Skills are aware of the importance of practical skills to the wider UK economy. In 2004, they commissioned Lord Leitch to lead an independent review to consider the skills base that the UK should aim to achieve in 2020 to maximise growth, productivity and social justice and to consider the policy implications of achieving the level of change required.

The Leitch Report, published in 2006, Prosperity for all in the Global Economy: world class skills, examines the UK’s long-term skills needs and sets out ambitious goals for 2020 which, if achieved, would make the UK a world leader in skills. The report is set against a background of economic strength and stability in the UK, with 14 years of unbroken growth and one of the highest employment rates in the developed world. The UK has significantly improved the skills base with rising school and college standards and strong growth in graduate numbers.

‘In the 21st century, our natural resource is our people — and their potential is both untapped and vast. Skills are the key to unlocking that potential. The prize for our
country will be enormous — higher productivity, the creation of wealth and social justice.’
(Leitch, 2006)

However, the report makes clear that in a rapidly changing global economy, with emerging economies such as India and China growing dramatically, the UK cannot afford to stand still. Despite having made good progress over the last decade, aspects of the UK’s skills base remain weaker than those in other developed economies, for example, the report recommends that the UK commits to a compelling new vision — to become a world leader in skills by 2020.

Leitch believes that to attain these goals, the system must become more efficient, responding to market needs. Government, employers and individuals must all engage and invest more in skills development. The report identifies necessary institutional reforms and simplification.

Further, Leitch recommends radical change across the whole skills spectrum not only by increasing skills attainments at all levels, but particularly by increasing employer investment in higher level qualifications, especially in apprenticeships and in degree and postgraduate levels; significantly more training in the workplace (ibid).

In his opening address to the GLAD Conference 2007, Sir Michael Bichard, Rector of the University of the Arts London, warned that the UK must not allow a vocational focus to diminish the quality of its art and design education and that a creeping vocationalism in the creative industries could damage the discipline. He said:

‘Creative industries worldwide are increasingly important to national and international economies. There are signs that people are valuing vocational-based education more than they have done, and that is not before time. But my cautionary note is that we should not go from one end of the continuum to the other. The danger of that is that you turn out technicians, when the success of the creative industries, particularly in the UK, derives from educating people to think conceptually and to challenge accepted norms.’
(Attwood, 2007)

Indeed, Bichard’s words appear to be echoing George Cox, Chairman of the Design Council, in his 2005 pre-budget report on how best to enhance UK business productivity. Cox identifies that we now need to draw on our world-leading creative capabilities (Cox, 2005). The review addressed two specific issues: firstly it identified how best to strengthen the relationship between businesses — particularly Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) — and creative professionals drawn from a range of design, arts and related disciplines. This included the potential impact on business performance of, among other things, digital media, product and industrial design, the arts and culture, graphics, branding and advertising, publishing, packaging, as well as interior and retail design. Within this, the review had a particular focus on the role of creativity in modern manufacturing.

In order to further underline the importance of practice-based teaching in art and design
to the economically vital creative industries, the review looked at strengthening the links across university departments and with industry. This included new forms of courses, services and alliances involving, amongst others, art, design and creative courses, business schools and engineering and technology courses (Cox, 2005). In the creative industries there is an increasing emphasis on collaborative teamworking. This manifests spatially in project rooms and creative ‘third spaces’, for example, in design firms such as IDEO. This emphasis and these spaces are not the norm in art and design colleges, who are responding to develop the kinds of spaces needed to develop these soft- or meta-skills alongside the subject skills based on dedicated facilities.

In this vein, this paper proposes that practice-based learning is even more relevant to the demands of a changing world, increased globalisation, environmental pressures and more competitive markets. The experience of learning through practice-based approaches particular to art and design students relates to the mainstreaming of physical, tactile and visual creative tools. Implicit in practice-based learning are visualisation, problem-solving, prototyping, reflection, trial and error, both in two and three dimensions and time-based media all of which develop in the student the tactile, sensory, kinaesthetic awareness demanded by their future role in the professional world.

Current uses of physical space within the higher education art and design sector

On entering an art and design institution we are confronted with various sensual inputs. The building, its inhabitants and their work seem to fill not only our eyes, but our nose and ears too. Just like these senses, the functions of our art and design educational spaces only gradually reveal themselves and may change with any new student cohort. Thus discovering the purposes of flexible and awkward spaces for any university-wide audit can prove difficult and frustrating. The QAA benchmark statements note:

‘An appropriate range of well-equipped studios and workshops is necessary to provide a challenging and professional learning environment which usefully mirrors the context of professional practice. The dedicated studio-base rooms and individual workspaces that are typical of most providers of art and design higher education, are highly valued by students and contribute substantially to their independence as learners. Integrated learning resource centres complement the specialist facilities of the studios and workshops.’

(Section 5.1.2: QAA HE A&D Benchmark Statements, 2002)

The variety of use that these spaces provide are both highly prized and celebrated in the art and design institution, but they are also seen as essential. In order for this to work in any newly designed space, a great deal of discussion is required with architects or planners. An architectural embodiment of the curriculum is needed in the design of any new spaces for students in art and design.
In order to assess what is currently happening within our own institutions we have used four short case studies to show the possibilities of a new build and the processes now taking place (Case study 1: University of Worcester); the resulting spaces and process of engagement with planning (Case Study 2: University College Falmouth); the effects of a recent new build on the course structure and students (Case Study 3: Goldsmiths University of London); and the use of exchanged space (Case Study 4: Gray’s School of Art, Aberdeen).

**Context: University of Worcester**

Maureen Gamble

The University of Worcester is currently undergoing a period of rapid expansion and a new campus is being developed on a second site in the city centre, which will be available in 2012. The new art building will include specialist art facilities and the art team have worked closely with architects, BDP, to ensure that flexible learning spaces will be available for large or small group activities, complemented by workshop areas, communal social spaces, other bookable spaces, exhibition facilities and seminar rooms.

Art students at Worcester have, for many years, followed a modular programme and developed their practice in specialist, non-dedicated studio spaces that have been available for fine art, ceramics, textiles, photography and printmaking. In addition, computer suites and specialist studios have been provided for video, film, photography, design and digital media. Workshop sessions take place within taught sessions or students can book time to work with technicians. As student numbers have increased across the university, rooms are now all centrally timetabled, as demand for teaching space is high. However, studio spaces are often minimally used except near assessment time, which makes it difficult to justify their continued use by the art and design department.

With part-time employment and other commitments, learning patterns have changed in the past few years and students now need to be able to negotiate their learning outside of taught sessions. Curriculum initiatives, such as: studio projects; group work; work-based learning opportunities; live projects; residencies; and individual professional development plans for students, have gradually been introduced to encourage more flexible ways of working. In the past the flexible use of space has enabled students to drop in as need demanded. However, it will be essential to maintain what works well currently, so that we can correctly predict the needs of future students.

What is currently happening at Worcester has already happened within the Design Centre at University College Falmouth and the visual arts department at Goldsmiths, University of London. The importance of proximity, flow, community and the serendipity of encounter through space within a design school are concretely demonstrated in the following case study from University College Falmouth.
The Design Centre project

Context: University College Falmouth: The Design Centre project

John Miller

The Design Centre was opened in October 2003 — the facility was purpose-built as a creative community for five design undergraduate courses, a masters programme, a research centre, business bureau, and small business incubation centre.

The key objective was to enable people and processes to ‘flow’ within the new building. To maintain the atelier style of design education but to place different subject areas alongside each other in order to encourage greater collaboration between courses. The co-location of research and business with courses was also planned to encourage debate between staff in these areas, and to establish networks between students, staff and other stakeholders that could lead to future employment or business start-ups. Finally, a free flow through different types of space and between processes was to be encouraged. The studios are immediately adjacent to the workshops and IT labs, and digital equipment is located alongside traditional craft facilities.

These aims were realised in a large open plan studio with shared workshops and staff offices are round the outside. It is a light, active, impressive interior which conveys a sense of dynamism.

After four years, the Design Centre continues to be a vibrant, exciting building in which to work. Research is currently underway into its impact on courses, staff and stakeholders. In the interim, the following observations are lessons learned that may be of most interest to others in the sector, particularly those planning new buildings:

Firstly, the Design Centre manifests a hothouse, competitive environment and the teaching staff have had to adapt to this quickly, managing expectations and developing their teaching methods. Rather than beginning their studies within a controlled subject ‘department’, students are presented with an apparent creative playground where anything is possible. Necessities such as workshop inductions and skills acquisition can seem like a brake on creativity. It’s an environment in which students can immediately notice any apparent discrepancy between courses — more space, a more exciting project, more contact etc. Again, the onus falls on staff to explain the rationale behind such perceptions.

Second, the Design Centre was conceived as a working space with less attention paid to communal and social areas. These have grown from corners of studios with wi-fi points, sofas and water coolers put in place. Such areas have become important learning spaces. The flexibility of the building has allowed this change to occur easily and organically.

Finally, an undoubted success of the Design Centre is its ‘mixed economy’. The clustering of so many different activities has established the building as a hub of the creative community. The mixed use also helps the sustainability of the Design Centre.
Centre as external users make most use of it outside regular teaching hours and bring in another income stream.

The success of this build comes from its collaborative and discussion-based initiation allowing for the organic growth of spaces and uses, but also its closeness to professional space.

The new build at Goldsmiths also grew out of discussion and collaboration and has heralded a newly-framed BA course, which has moved away from the separate disciplines of fine art and textiles to promote the art practice course. Thus the building could be said to have affected the delivery of the programmes it contains. It is interesting to survey what some of the students think about their use of this new building and the wider university spaces.

**Context: Goldsmiths, University of London**

Julia Lockheart

In 2005 Goldsmiths unveiled the seven-storey purpose-built Ben Pimlott Building housing studio, lab (workshop), office and lecture space for students in the visual arts department. The estimated £10.5m building, covering 2,700 sqm, was designed by Alsop and Partners and funded by the Higher Education Funding Council and by the college’s estates budget. Current students on both the BA (Hons) in textiles and BA (Hons) fine art courses have made the physical change of moving to new accommodation and the disciplinary change of course amalgamation: the launch of the new art practice degree in 2006 incorporating both textiles and fine art.

Through informal discussion with 3rd year students, formally on the textiles course, it seems that they view their space in a variety of ways: the whole university campus rather than the individual studio space is seen as integral to the learning environment; this involves the large playing fields (the back field), the library and the café, as well as the virtual environments that students inhabit. Structured workshops or labs remain an important focus of the learning environment. A great deal of the making takes place in these spaces. However, for those I spoke to, the individual studio space, now jointly owned by students across the two disciplines, is used more for assessment and display of work than as the main working space. It is also used for group crits and is essential for the end of year degree shows. Moreover, most students also consider working in the studio as an essential form of socialising and networking, which may lead to collaboration.

It is interesting to note how much space is used in ways that cannot be accounted for in terms of the audit. Networking and collaboration come to the fore in the students’ use of space and cannot be forced, timetabled or accounted for in the usual ways. The environment and proximity of workshops and other facilities are also extremely
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important to the kind of educational experience that is being delivered: space is not the consequence of what we do, but is essential in enabling what we do. There is a visual and spatial literacy which our students develop through a tacit understanding of the curriculum which could gradually ebb away if we do not develop strategies to combat purely financial constraints on space accepted by other higher education disciplines.

Within the course at Gray’s School of Art there is the use of the exchange of space which could prove harder to timetable in traditional ways.

**CASE STUDY 4**

**BA (Honours) Fine Art Programme**

Context: Gray’s School of Art, Aberdeen
Sculpture Level 2: Scottish Sculpture Workshop/AKI Academy of Art and Design Enschede, Netherlands Project
Allan Watson – Course Leader Sculpture

For the past 10 years the sculpture department at Gray’s School of Art, Aberdeen (Gray’s) have participated in an ‘informal’ exchange project which enables students from two European art schools to live and work alongside one another for a short period of time.

Whilst the Socrates Exchange Programme is successful in providing European exchange on a formal level, ultimately, it is only a minority of students who can commit to a lengthy period abroad. For mature students with family commitments such an exchange is not an option.

The Gray’s/AKI Enschede project works on the basis that the two groups live and work alongside one another for one week, whilst undertaking a bronze casting course at the Scottish Sculpture Workshop (SSW) in Lumsden, Aberdeenshire. The residential nature of the course ensures discussion and social interaction. Around 12 students attend the course — six from Gray’s and six from AKI. A second group of 12 attend during the following week. When AKI students are not at the SSW, they are invited to work in the sculpture studios at Gray’s. What has happened during this period has varied from year to year, but events have included drawing exhibitions and temporary installations created by the AKI students followed by joint crits. These discussions have been useful in highlighting the different teaching philosophies within the respective schools, and different work patterns or approaches by the students.

There is no specific funding that supports the project. The AKI students self-fund their travel and AKI fund their SSW accommodation and workshop fees. During their stay in Aberdeen they stay with a sculpture student. The SSW funding for Gray’s students comes out of their own studio fund, whilst they pay the cost of the bronze that they use.
There is normally a reciprocal invitation for Gray’s students to visit AKI. If the students decide to accept the invitation, they must self-fund their travel, but accommodation and food is provided by their AKI hosts.

In summary, this is a low-cost project (for Gray’s) that provides all sculpture students with an opportunity to meet and talk with sculpture students from another European school. It provides both Gray’s and AKI students access to other models of education outside their immediate experience. During the past 10 years, over 100 Dutch, German and other nationalities have visited Gray’s, Aberdeen, and the SSW.

Again there is an emphasis on the collaborative and networking nature of the spaces used. This exchange of space offers the opportunity for students to develop ideas beyond the insular nature of the institution and gives them a much broader experience of the possibilities of workspace. It also highlights the experience of live/work space.

In this first section we have not only demonstrated that our use of space is essential to the maintenance and development of the art and design community within the institution and beyond; we have also shown that practice-based learning is highly relevant to our own graduates’ success in negotiating our changing contemporary world, and also to graduates of other disciplines. The way the art and design courses and students use space is not necessarily auditable and accountable. Moreover, we should celebrate that art and design, with its search for learning and teaching strategies that suit its particular student base, are often leaders in teaching models across tertiary education, i.e. the Writing PAD project (Writing Purposefully in Art and Design, www.writing-pad.ac.uk) has done much to address models of writing to suit the practice-based curriculum; and problem-based learning models, now used across the higher education sector, first originated in the apprenticeship system of the traditional art and design schools. Hence, it is evident that beyond art and design other disciplines have also adopted practice-based modes of learning i.e. medicine and business studies.

Drivers for change and development within practice-based learning

We have identified the key drivers for change, which we believe will shape future implications for accommodation and resource to support practice-based learning and teaching. We have tried to keep these sections as short as possible so that they can act as a checklist for discussion for those institutions currently approaching building development or new build.

• **Human resources:** The retention, development and recruitment of staff with appropriate expertise and knowledge is increasingly essential to sustain and enhance current provision. This human resource is fundamental to maintaining and enhancing
the use of practice-based learning either via traditional methods or through rapidly changing digital technologies.

- **Technology**: This has always had a huge impact on curriculum, use of resources, and allocation of areas of funding to support and enhance both existing and new course development. However, now there is rapid development of technologies, both in course content (digital manufacturing processes such as rapid prototyping), as well as equally fast development of learning technologies, such as VLEs and Wireless. Moreover, funding for the cost of maintenance, providing technical support for both students and staff and the dilemma of trying to secure funds to purchase, maintain or replace out of date equipment, which is of a specific form rather than new technology, may add to the technology issue.

- **Studio/workshop**: This form of provision is still seen as a fundamental need within the art and design school of the future. Encouraging peer group learning, discussion and the development of social interaction and communication skills will be even more essential because of the needs of the creative and cultural industries and the identification by those within the engine of UK economic growth. With the widespread provision of wireless networks, students are increasingly using personal laptops to research, explore, develop ideas and present solutions within the studio environment. An activity which would previously have taken place within computer labs.

- **Expansion of numbers**: Provision for students entering higher education will impact on what and how we are able to deliver; larger student numbers will increase pressure on space. As a result we will need to validate the challenge of demographic shift versus course expansion or student choice and flexibility.

- **Space costing and charging**: This creates a shift in the prioritisation of need for all courses, in particular the balance and usage of non-flexible space versus flexible space will continue to feature highly in planning. Courses with smaller numbers with specialist needs will be encouraged to maximise usage in order to compete with less space intensive activities.

- **Funding sources at institutional level**: Devising appropriate models which encourage and reward managers and course leaders to be creative, strategic and responsive to shifting demands.

- **Funding sources following student numbers**: With the significant expansion of students in certain disciplines, budget holders will increasingly need to respond to internal and external drivers. Academic leadership is necessary to maintain and create a diverse and sustainable portfolio.

- **Working together with employers and other external agencies**: Offering students an experience, for example, placements, live projects, residencies and work-based learning, which reflect the external professional world.

- **Understanding the changing student needs and expectations**: Enhancing the student learning experience and providing relevant quality learning opportunities.

- **Production**: Relevant to both artists and designers, appropriate learning resources are
needed to promote an understanding and response to the rapidly changing global modes and patterns of making.

- **Interdisciplinary**: The ability to be able to work within and across discrete and interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary sectors. Art and design students should be particularly well placed to contribute to the global workplace which demands increasingly flexible graduates. One of the performance indicators may be evidence of the value of this learning within the professional context.

### The implications for accommodation and resources to enhance practice-based learning

If managers and course leaders are faced with increasing student numbers and a reduced resource base, a much more proactive approach to resource allocation will need to be adopted. Some models already exist which include 24/7 access, extended opening, bookable use of space, year round timetabling, staggered timetabling, blended learning, distance learning, and curriculum change to accommodate a more flexible use of all resources.

There is the need to review the roles and responsibilities of staff at all levels who contribute in a technical, demonstration, tutorial and teaching capacity alongside schemes involving students who undertake mentoring as part of peer group learning whilst continuing to develop their own skills as part of their own personal development plan. The expansion of practice-based postgraduate studies provides a valuable shared learning resource as well as extending the pool of people available. At the same time this enhances the student learning experience at postgraduate level.

> ‘The principal aim of undergraduate education in art and design is to facilitate acquisition of appropriate knowledge and understanding, development of the necessary personal attributes, and mastery of the essential skills which will equip and prepare students for continuing personal development and professional practice.’

(4.1 QAA HE A&D Benchmark Statement, 2002)

This study confirms the views held by both Wenger (1998) and Billett (2001) that a skills based approach to learning to practice is simply not enough on its own. There is also evidence here that a skills-based approach corresponds with an information transmission/teacher-focused approach to teaching. Those teachers who integrate skills into ‘real world’ projects and studio or practice-based approaches, help learners develop competence in those skills so that they can construct an experience of meaning (Drew, 2004).
The changing pattern of space usage needs to mirror real space within the professions

The ability of institutions to offer private study space will vary markedly across the sector. There is the need to recognise that each institution will want to maintain its individuality in terms of its own particular style/culture which will be reflected within its curriculum and what it makes available to students. What is clear is that no matter what individual institutional resources are, there is a need to move toward more flexible provision to create new dynamics of learning.

We need to look at the totality of resources available within an institution and not just the art school in isolation. Research from *The Case Base* (Hamilton, 2007) demonstrates that the space needs to support:

- quiet internet access for individual research and reflection
- small group working and seminars
- refreshments and informal knowledge exchange in a social atmosphere
- group and individual access to database for all stakeholder groups.

Curriculum structures may wish to reflect upon the value of more interesting methods of working which offer opportunities for team working, multi-pathway courses utilising common/core units and resources, matrix-based systems of working, work-based learning. Curriculum development will need to reflect more closely contemporary professional practice, which increasingly involves cross-disciplinary working, multidisciplinary and dispersed team working using video conferencing, conference calls and interactive media communication.

‘These are considered to be fundamental to the study and practice of the student’s chosen discipline(s). Many are also potentially transferable to other contexts. Typically, these will be evidenced in a body of work which demonstrates the graduate’s ability to:

- generate ideas, concepts, proposals, solutions or arguments independently and/or collaboratively in response to set briefs and/or as self-initiated activity;
- employ both convergent and divergent thinking in the processes of observation, investigation, speculative enquiry, visualisation and/or making;
- select, test, use and exploit materials, processes and environments;
- develop ideas through to material outcomes, for example images, artefacts, products, systems and processes, or texts;
- manage and exploit the interaction between intention, process, outcome, context, and the methods of dissemination;
- apply resourcefulness and entrepreneurial skills to support their own practice, and/or the practice of others.’

(4.3 QAA HE A&D Benchmark Statements, 2002)
The importance of recognising the value of learning which occurs in non-conventional or traditional arenas would acknowledge the significant educational experience gained from learning in social spaces. These informal spaces may allow a more creative discourse to take place. It is still a valid discourse and one through which the work place is mirrored.

The convergence of new technologies opens up a new range of possibilities in virtual design projects, e.g. visualising and animating a fashion runway show, mobile learning and teaching using mobile phones and PDAs, on-line crits, technology supported international team working, networks between higher education institutions to transfer data and share expensive digital equipment.

The use of mobile communication will enable the sector to reach a widening student base empowering those with disabilities, those in remote areas, those with other personal responsibilities and those whose identified and agreed needs require them to work from home. Moreover, as the case study from Goldsmiths shows, there is a need to recognise that students need arenas where research can be conducted within the diversity of the subject discipline. There is the need to acknowledge the worth and relevance of traditional facilities, i.e. learning resource centre, library, labs and computer suites alongside sector recognised specialist areas such as white space, black space, clean and dirty spaces; alongside social spaces and recreational spaces. The most important change may be the usage and occupancy of how students access those facilities and the need to mirror ‘real’ space within the professions.

New build – future models for art institutions

It is possible to look to other models of good practice external to educational spaces for ideas about how educational art and design spaces may develop in the future.

When the Tate Modern was unveiled it was described as the new cathedral of contemporary art. Over the years it is a space which has changed and grown to meet the needs of its visitors. It now includes a wide range of flexible spaces, e.g. resource, seminar, educational, social, retail, interactive, exhibition, workshop, cultural centres, and knowledge exchange and has developed new functions within a wider viewing community.

However, it may also serve today’s society to return to more traditional educational spaces where reflection and learning can take place in individual cells. The art school of the future may grow towards offering live/work spaces in which students produce their work with assessment and discussion taking place in larger flexible discussion or showing spaces. As with the Gray’s case study this could happen for short periods of time within the course of the learning but would be collaborative and serve to broaden the perspective of the students involved.

Study work patterns have changed markedly over recent years as described earlier in the case study from the University of Worcester. Students are not as wholly dependant on a
singular space as perhaps they were; interdisciplinarity and new technologies mean students require access to a range of workshops and facilities, which range further than previously accepted discipline boundaries. In some cases designers, digital imagists and fine artists require only a research desk and the work can be carried out in computer suites or workshops.

With many students in regular paid employment, the conceptual development of their work can take place off campus and the realisation is constructed within these technical facilities.

This implies a move toward a new dynamic of space use which includes emphasis on multidisciplinary technical facilities, cross boundary research spaces and the energising of public and social spaces as fertile learning spaces, as in the case study from University College Falmouth. Ambient spaces, such as corridors, canteens, and entrance lobbies have digital interfaces for the transmission of staff research, visitors programmes, etc. so as to fill every square metre of the estate learning potential. Flexible spaces that can be booked for trialling ideas and realising projects with time limited value. This reflects real working practices in the professions.

We are confident in the relevance of practice-based learning in the art and design sector and beyond. External pressures and changing student expectations require that we continually update and innovate our current best practices. In business, commerce and politics, creativity is the by-word for development. Creativity is at the core of art and design education, but sometimes so much so that we become complacent and reluctant to read the signals our students send out.

The 2007 Draft Benchmark Statements for Art and Design give recognition to the way that the art and design sector has responded to the creative potential of many of the newer media and technologies that have emerged since 2002. This has not only broken down barriers between different subject disciplines but also replaced some traditional subject specific skills with more generic ones.

Only minor revisions have been made to the 2002 edition which include the development of new approaches to learning and the learning environment, both in response to the increased levels of participation in higher education and to developments in teaching, learning and assessment in higher education. Studio-based activities are still seen as a significant feature of art and design education alongside other vehicles for learning and teaching which include team-teaching, demonstrations, seminars, lectures, peer-group learning, live projects, competitions, work-related learning and student exchanges.

This paper intends to confirm the increasing importance of practice-based learning and anticipate the challenges facing learning and teaching environments and resources required to ensure continued enhancement and respond to external drivers. We began with a quote from the Bauhaus Manifesto which, almost a century ago, spoke about bringing together all artists, architects and craftsmen in a collaborative spirit to create a building of the future. Our review and case studies show that we are currently in a far more complex age. If we are to truly achieve collaboration, we have many other issues...
to consider. Our case studies show that where spaces have worked best, debate has begun during the design stage of a new build. In this way current and future needs can be met. We also show that there is a requirement for the practice of artists and designers to be observed and students more directly questioned about their wishes for the types of space they need to occupy. In this way we can continue to attract and support the needs of our fast changing student body. Thus ensuring that we can offer the kind of multi-layered, ethically sound and ecological education to suit the diverse learning styles that it seems our students and society will require.
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Abstract

A major consequence of a new global context is the general drive towards the internationalisation of higher education. Jones, McCullagh and Watson (2006) argue that traditional concepts of higher education have altered, and that:

‘Globalisation has spurred technological, economic, social and cultural change as well as the greater mobility of capital, technology, information and labour. This phenomenon has created a growing demand for society’s capacity to acquire, process, disseminate and apply knowledge.’ (UNESCO, (c) online) In meeting this ‘growing demand’ the movement and educational ‘migration’ of students is an area for concern, we have a duty to understand and develop forward thinking inclusive policy attendant to these concerns. Those migrant students are forming a constitution of societies in their global movement and intra-cultural relationships.

(Jones, McCullagh and Watson, 2006)

Increasingly higher education reflects a globalised educational structure where different cultures and customs language education style are brought in to contact. This has profound implications for education since movements of people bring to the surface difference and the particular.

(Morris, 2005, p. 135)
Ideally the process of embedding international, intercultural and global perspectives within all aspects of an institution’s programmes, structures and environment should provide a richer educational experience for students by challenging cultural stereotypes, enhancing the understanding of the cultured self, promoting subject-subject relationships and creating a positively destabilising, and therefore, potentially transformative experience. However, the reality can be somewhat different: patronising, full of cultural misunderstandings, reinforcing the sense of cultural centrality and superiority.

To fully realise the potential benefits of an internationalised curriculum a shift in mindset is needed within higher education in the UK: away from the old structures of self and other which implies a hierarchy where the ‘other’ is marginal or peripheral to the European perspective. The needed shift is already underway in the wider community. Benyon and Dunkerley (2000) suggest that at the outset of the 21st century, there has been a deposing of the traditionally held version of western superiority. Through the subverting of Eurocentric perspectives, and the development of greater media technologies, the reach of global communications has radically altered the ways in which people in disparate places now ‘know’ each other (Benyon and Dunkerley, 2000, p. 10).

This chapter promotes a shift in UK higher education towards what has been called a ‘Third Space’: a generative, incorporative, dynamic, experimental space of mutuality and exchange. A space where new ideas and identities emerge through negotiation and co-creation: a space underpinned by values of mutuality, recognition of multiplicities, a belief in the transformative power of international and intercultural2 dialogue and a commitment to active listening. Case studies and narratives illustrate how we are moving towards Third Space thinking and how Third Space thinking could change current approaches.

1. A suitable working definition of internationalisation was provided by Jane Knight and Hans de Wit (1997) in their article The process of integrating an international, intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service of the institution.

   Much useful information and analysis is provided by Professor Robin Middlehurst and Steve Woodfield in their report of the Research Project 05-06: Responding to the internationalisation agenda: implications for institutional strategy, for the Higher Education Academy 2007.

2 We use this term as a means of identifying the recognition of cross-cultural dialogue. The terms ‘post modernity’ and ‘globalisation’ suggest that homogenous ways of viewing cultural identities is inaccurate. The use of ‘intercultural’ gives space for differences within and across cultures thus avoiding stereotypical accounts of different cultures.
The ideal and the reality

Many international programmes in higher education state as their aim an intention to provide fuller and richer educational experiences for students beyond the basic expectations of art school skills training. The intention is for students to gain a greater understanding of cultural contexts, of cultural dominance, of cultural history and global forces, and the double movement of overcoming parochialism while at the same time realising the specificity and partiality of their own cultural context. Academic staff too will be challenged to develop their curriculum, their pedagogy and assessment practices as they themselves respond to an international context and the increasing diversity of the student body at home.

International experiences, or experiences of the international, can challenge an individual's sense of their own national identity, expose preconceptions of their identity and make them more aware of how that identity is constructed. These are potentially transformative experiences. For art and design students, it provides a dynamic opportunity to reflect on cultural identity as constructed through cultural objects, artefacts and events. These students, who will be involved in shaping the culture of future decades, can learn first hand how culture is created, experienced and absorbed in a manner that is both specific and contingent. They can learn how they, as creators of cultural objects, also experience and absorb culture, and are involved in the constant evolution of their own culture and cultural identities. Stuart Hall suggests that ‘our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us, as ‘one people’ with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning beneath the shifting diversions and vicissitudes of our actual history’ (Hall, 1990, p. 223).

But if these are the potential benefits of internationalisation for art and design students, we must recognise that the actual experience of international exchanges and study abroad can be very different. (Think of the international student’s experience of enrolment and induction, for example.) Whilst it may be theoretically sexy to be on the periphery, to claim a bit of the margin, to be part of the porous frame or boundary, young adults are actually often engaged in a search for a stable identity and a sense of belonging. Breaking away from their parents for the first time, they may not relish further challenges to their identity. Sometimes this may manifest itself as a lack of curiosity in other cultures. Shyness, reserve, fear of difference may lead to lack of interest in international experience or lack of hospitality to international students. These international students in turn may get lonely, or regard the host institution as patronising or exclusive and work against positive learning experiences. As Sapochnik, cited in Wu (2002) notes:

‘Learning is a transformational process requiring an environment where not-knowing, uncertainty and tentative exploration can be experienced and accepted as integral components of the learning experience. Structural instability and the individual’s fear of change – as experienced by their staff or students – elicit insecurity, and inhibit the
transformational quality of this space, without which there can be no safety, no creativity, no risk taking or pleasure for the learning to take place ...’
(Sapochnik, 1997, pp. 226–227)

Matters can be exacerbated by cultural misunderstandings. Students and staff alike may have assumptions about incoming students particularly from non-western cultures — about their financial situation, for example; or about how they will integrate into the new cultural environment; or preconceived notions of what they will be like or what to expect from them. The scope for cultural misunderstanding on both sides is great: misreading body language, gestures or common etiquette are obvious examples. Students from different countries may also be used to very different course structures, teaching styles and staff expectations. They may be regarded as artistically naïve if their practice differs from contemporary western norms. The ‘educational west’ may create the ‘educational other’, particularly if the institution regards international students as a financial necessity. Staff may regard such students as ‘lacking’ because they are not grounded in the cultural, visual norms of the local context, and may therefore perceive them as difficult to teach and an extra burden on resources and time.

Nor are such cultural misunderstandings easily avoided even when we are aware that they are likely to occur. Killick and Poveda (1998) in exploring cross-cultural capability in the context of the ‘year abroad’ provide a good example of how, in the discipline of English, there has long been awareness of the need to rise above the ‘ethnocentric and culturally exclusive’. Nonetheless, the cultural landscape is depicted as a place of ‘struggle’ between meanings, and they argue that cross-cultural capability cannot be developed through a surface understanding of ‘culture bites’ (Killick and Poveda, 1998).

Further difficulties must also be noted. Staff may unconsciously assume that simple contact between students of different backgrounds promotes diversity in the learning and teaching environment and lead to meaningful cross-cultural encounter. In reality a culturally diverse group of students could just as easily lead to a reinforcement of prejudice rather than enhanced cultural understanding. Wider political events — the presence of terrorism, civil unrest, trade sanctions, the rise of fundamentalist religions and conflict between them — may produce further unexpected tensions.

Staff may also feel inadequate to the task of teaching international students because they have limited or no knowledge of the student’s background. They may be dismissive of work that draws upon different cultural experiences. They may carry notions of the superiority of their own culture or they may fear being perceived as racist.

The literature also suggests that before we even start to consider the nature of the challenge that the ‘inclusive curriculum’ represents to UK higher education, we need to consider how we perceive and engage with alternative approaches to the inclusive curriculum. There seems to be little doubt that the notion of ‘infusion’ is associated with consideration of cultural pluralism in the selection of course content (de Vita, 2003). However, cultural pluralism may go beyond content to ‘infuse’ notions of the legitimate experiences, perspectives, and discourses that may be included in the ‘inclusive curriculum’. In this sense, ‘infusion’ has been likened to the ‘holistic approach’ where
students (and staff) are encouraged to think critically about their own cultural values and biases which in turn, engenders ‘inclusive strategies’ and flexibility allowing for negotiation of assessment tasks between students and lecturers and the ‘linking’ of assessments (Caruana and Hanstock, 2003, 2005; Warren, 2005; Caruana and Spurling, 2006, p. 65).

So how are we to move forward from our current position to a context in which the potential benefits of internationalisation can be realised? Before considering our suggestion of moving to a Third Space, it is worth noting important work already carried out in this area. Leask describes her institution’s approach to internationalising the curriculum and sets out a core philosophy in relation to the inculcating of an international perspective.

‘The University of South Australia’s vision in relation to internationalisation of the curriculum is focused on learning processes and on the development of skills and attitudes within students as much as on curriculum content and the development of knowledge in students. This is evident in the Report on the Internationalisation of the Curriculum (Luong et al., 1996) which describes an internationalised curriculum as one which values ‘empathy and intellectual curiosity through which … learners participate in a mutually beneficial, internationally and multicultural aware learning process, engaging with and constructing global ‘state of the art’ knowledge, developing understanding and useful skills, and preparing themselves to continue learning throughout … fulfilling lives’ (p. 1). The focus is clear and is entirely consistent with the university’s policies relating to inclusivity and anti-racism; the challenge is still, however, to put the policy into practice - to develop curricula which … are culturally inclusive and which develop multi-cultural awareness and cross-cultural communication skills while achieving the specific skills and knowledge objectives appropriate to the discipline area.’

(Leask, 2001)

Leask’s research at the University of South Australia suggests that staff working with international students must also be culturally aware, have the ability to make use of international information and examples and have the skills to manage a group in which a broad range of communication and learning styles are present. Leask also references the work of Farkas-Teekens, where she identifies key knowledge, skills and attitudes for teachers in higher education delivering an internationalised curriculum to an international audience. She highlights the need for ongoing training and development as ‘most lecturers in higher education have little knowledge of theories of education. They teach their subject from experience, based on how they were taught themselves’ (p. 21).

Farkas-Teekens (1997) suggests that this means lecturers need:

- knowledge of different teaching and learning styles and understanding that ‘procedures and standards for assessing student performance are to a large extent culturally and nationally defined’
- skills in ‘involving students from different national traditions in the learning process by using examples and cases from different cultural settings’
• the ability to assess student performance with due respect for different academic cultures
• a ‘flexible attitude towards various styles of student behaviour’.

The authors of this chapter are in general agreement with the suggestions noted above. At issue is how we can bring about these required changes. It is an important first step to identify the sorts of changes that need to be made. But what is left unexplored is how to do it. We believe that nothing short of a paradigm shift is needed in the mindset that dominates higher education before these changes can be realised.

The Third Space

What is needed is a shift away from the old conceptual paradigms of self and other, subject and object, towards a Third Space: a generative, incorporative, dynamic, experimental space of mutuality and exchange.

The difficulty with international encounters, the factor which makes such encounters problematic, resides ultimately in deeply entrenched cognitive tendencies. We tend to categorise things in the external world into two major classes, ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’. Subjects are other human beings (and perhaps spirits), while objects include everything in the inanimate world and other animals. We also tend to have different attitudes towards subjects and objects. Subjects, other people, we tend to view as ends in themselves. On the other hand, we tend to view objects as means that we can employ to our own ends — or ignore. The virtue and sorrow of human cognition, however, is the capacity for metaphor. Metaphors allow us to see familiar things in new ways and thereby increase understanding. But this ability to take one kind of thing for another is a double-edged sword. There is a tendency for us to view other human subjects as mere objects and therefore not valued as ends in themselves. It is this capacity that underpins the reprehensible behaviour we associate with cultural superiority. The point in this context is that the objectification of human beings occurs most often when we encounter people who are physically and culturally different from ourselves.

This process of objectification happens at the level of the individual, but also at the level of the group. It is common, particularly in times of conflict, for human beings from different cultural groups to view each other as no longer fully subjects. In these circumstances the ‘other’ often becomes the object of the subject’s hopes and fears. But whatever the circumstances, when a subject is objectified the object is ‘subsumed’ into the subject’s interest and identity. The other’s own subjectivity is ignored. If, however, the subject recognises the ‘other’ as a genuine subject who has equally powerful, contingent and dynamic structures of personal and cultural identity, then a relationship that is respectful of cultural difference can have room to develop, often to the benefit of both.³

This positive reaction to difference creates a space where the making and experiencing

³ Luce Irigaray develops structures of subject-subject relations. See, for example I Love To You: Sketch for a Felicity within History (Irigaray, 1996)
of culture becomes a form of mediation. It is the Third Space: the space neither of one individual or culture nor of the other individual or culture, but the dynamic space of their encounter. It is a conceptual area that exists ‘between’ conventional categories of race, gender and national identity: a state of fluid hybridity yet grounded in personal and cultural identity.

What we suggest is that such a space must be reached in order for necessary changes to become possible. Only then will the full potential of an internationalised curriculum begin to emerge. Achieving this dynamic in international encounters in practice will fulfil the stated aim of many international programmes: it will provide a fuller and richer educational experience for the students, way beyond the basic expectations of art school skills-training. Many of these ideals would pertain to any academic discipline. In art and design, however, where the discipline focuses on cultural activity and the making of artefacts which are themselves means of communication and the mediation of identity, the need to create the space of intersubjective relationships is urgent.

### Moving towards the Third Space

We are not proposing a blueprint, a checklist or a ‘how to do it’ guide to internationalism in art and design education. Rather, we are proposing profound attitudinal shifts on the part of institutions and in our pedagogy: a shift that can occur in a process of adaptation towards the Third Space. Adapting to the Third Space is not a process requiring fundamental change in any individual. Nor does it imply a relinquishing of culture, assimilation or absorption into a host culture. Nor is it a call for the mere toleration of difference often implied by a multiculturalist position. Rather, it calls for the creation of generative, incorporative, dynamic, experimental spaces of mutuality and exchange: the spaces between.

Michael J Muller (2003) has written that ‘... the third space is an in-between region, a fertile environment in which participants can combine diverse knowledges into new insights. Important attributes of third space include challenging assumption, learning reciprocally, creating new ideas which emerge through negotiation and co-creation of identity, working languages, understandings and relationships, and poly-vocal dialogues across and through different participatory practices.’ The Third Space is the generative space of dialogue and mediation. It is reliant on being multiple: a continuum, fluid and aspirational; a space that enables experiment. The Third Space focuses attention on the creations of versatile thinking in the acts of interaction, mediation and dialogue. The Third Space is a fertile environment in which participants can combine diverse knowledge into new insights and creations.

Important attributes of the Third Space include the interrogation of assumptions; reciprocal learning; the creation of new ideas which emerge through negotiation and co-creation of identity, working languages, understandings and relationships; and poly-vocal dialogues across and through different participatory practices.
The Third Space may even be described as an ethical space, where active practices of listening are the norm. Homi Bhabha (1994) writes of ‘The third space of enunciation, which makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process. … Such an intervention quite properly challenges our sense of the historical identity of culture as homogenising, unifying force, authenticated by originary past, kept alive in the national tradition of the people.’

This is not necessarily an easy space, either to create or to inhabit. Without fixity, it might well be described as a constant work in progress. It could be seen also as a space of constructed friction — the friction that a student must bump up against in order to understand something. In this, it is similar to the political theory of agonism as developed by Chantal Mouffe (2000). She proposes that some forms of political conflict can be positive; that tension or antagonism is an inevitable pre-cursor to change and growth and so should be channelled positively rather than eliminated. In brief, she argues that the task of democracy is to transform antagonism into agonism — a common, shared, symbolic space where conflict can flourish in a place of belonging. She proposes that some forms of political conflict can be positive; that tension or conflict may be an inevitable pre-cursor to change and growth and so aims to channel conflict positively.

**Challenges**

How might we move towards a Third Space? It is difficult to give definitive answers – they will be determined by a whole host of factors specific to the institution, its staff and students and its context. But there are questions which can be posed and which, when answered, may provide a starting point.

- How can we change our pedagogy to:
  - avoid culturally determined forms of teaching
  - avoid learning outcomes which are dominated by particular cultural assumptions
  - provide assessment methods which accept that cultural references informing a student’s work may not be those which staff understand and find alternative approaches
  - understand that there are a range of culturally influenced forms of articulating visual literacy
  - use the cultural diversity of the student body more actively to enhance intercultural engagement and challenge cultural stereotypes?

- How can we rethink our approach to language in order to:
  - move away from traditional dissertation and essay in favour of other ways to demonstrate thought, construction and ability to articulate
  - find new forms for discourse
  - relax the traditional critique of written work to emphasise content and construction
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of the argument with grammar and spelling as subservient to that communication
– remove, translate or otherwise make explicit those implicit linguistic codes which undermine understanding
– ensure briefs, tuition and assessment are understood?

• How can we change our curriculum to:
  – engage with themes of cultural identity, cultural dominance and global forces
  – avoid mono-cultural approaches to cultural history and context
  – develop programmes and courses which are explicitly cross-cultural
  – actively capitalise on the varied cultural perspectives and knowledge which international students bring to enhance debate and challenge assumptions?

• How can the institution internationalise its staff:
  – through access to and engagement with a planned cycle of purposeful exchanges, residencies and sabbaticals
  – through collaborative projects with other international institutions
  – through leave to study internationalisation in other institutions.
  – through supporting research which explores global currents in our disciplines
  – through developing collaborative international educational programmes?

• How can virtual technologies with online critiquing of work and international discussion forums be used to develop Third Space activity?

Values

This theoretical framework — the Third Space — is underpinned by values that address the dissonance outlined earlier in the chapter between the ideals of internationalisation and the current issues that are encountered when engaging with the international. These values will also help address the challenges as outlined above.

• Mutuality
  The Third Space is underpinned by the value of mutuality. Mutuality of exchange feeds into the space and mutual benefits need to be negotiated along with the commitment to co-creation. The underlying layers of institutional values, be they financial or the result of external requirements, also have to be negotiated in relation to this.

• Commitment to the Third Space
  In this mutuality there has to be commitment, particularly staff and institutional commitment, to the creation of the Third Space. This may be shaped and nurtured through factors such as curriculum, briefings, the structure of tutorials and other studio teaching, the nature of assessment criteria, and so forth. In these ways, it is possible to articulate and map out the space between two subjects. The richness of
each student is then discovered in the way of doing and mediating their subjectivity, rather than treating others as objects.

- Recognition of multiplicity
  The Third Space, as indicated, is inevitably a space of multiplicity. Without recognition of multiplicity there can be no mutuality, co-creation, or intersubject mediation.

- Transformation
  The transformational capacity of this Third Space is through transnational and transcultural opportunities and encounters acting as a catalyst for change and growth — a willingness to change perceptions.

- Active listening
  The praxis of the Third Space is underpinned by active and engaged listening. Mutuality and co-creation of new understandings is dependent upon it. With active listening comes the understanding of the full subjecthood and perceptions of the other.

Case studies

The following short summary case studies illustrate the move towards the Third Space.

**Josephine**

**Author: Yvonne Watson**

Within European/British art and design education practice, when communicating from within this Eurocentric space, what place is there for the ‘non-European other’s ontology? Are we involved in a 21st Century neo-colonial educational process, premised only on modernist theories, and therefore in danger of creating a dichotomous educational relationship with the ‘non-European other’? Are we progressing continued aesthetic hierarchies often implicit within art and design education? What ‘space’ is there for overlapping perspectives? This case study is offered as a qualitative observation of an international student’s experience, and aims to highlight the current lack of ‘third space’ dialogue.

‘Josephine’ is a teacher in Ghana. Her Master’s Fashion and Textiles degree at Nottingham Trent University was funded by the Ghanaian government which has a progressive policy for educational staff development. This case study highlights a number of critical cross-cultural issues particularly when working with an international student, and points to a need for a Third Space discourse in UK higher education art and design pedagogic practice.
Background to the development process

*SANKOFA, is an Akan word meaning ‘learning from the past’.*

Josephine’s research and design development process was concentrated on Ghanaian Adinkra symbols. We discussed the socio-cultural nature of the symbols and how these are applied to fabrics and garments, such as those worn at funerals and weddings. The need to produce fabrics with a defined meaning is an important part of the cultural code of Ghana, as each cloth has an attached proverb and meaning. It was important to establish a contextual understanding of the significance of funeral wear as a ‘designed product’ and also to ascertain what part the Adinkra symbols play in the funeral ceremony and funeral wear. Discussions and questions were ranged around the symbols and their specific social significance, for general consumption as well as Ghanaian funereal culture.

‘It is not forbidden to return and fetch it when you forget’

We encountered an ethical dilemma as to how the symbols should be utilised, should they be preserved or could they be manipulated to produce a new contemporary interpretation. There was a concern from specialist tutors as to what might be considered merely ‘copying’ or translating these symbols and an insistence on ‘mark making’ as a means of interpreting and developing a design approach. This was something that she was not familiar with and needed formal guidance on. This ‘lack of skill’ meant that she was viewed by specialist tutors as being deficient, with less ability than a level one undergraduate. As our tutorial discussions evolved there was an acute awareness of this being a new design language/process for her, and within the tutorials we attempted to find a common ground of design understanding. Together we worked to counterbalance this, with inventive workshop based ‘tutorials’ to actively develop an uncomplicated approach to a design development journey.
Design development process around the Adinkra symbols

The micro issues encountered above lead to the mapping of the macro main issues.

Cultural design processes

• Educational difference in relation to approaching a design process/development journey, and the problem solving required. The traditional design process when viewed from a European perspective was openly challenged when confronted with the student’s own indigenous design approach.

• The presence of differing cultural and aesthetic imperatives, and the implications when mapping into established, Eurocentric, Bauhaus models of design development ‘rules’ and codes. The presence of a negotiable Third Space would allow for broader acceptance of differing cultural and aesthetic perspectives.

• Observation of ‘non-traditional’ design contexts, which initially are perceived as being alien to our understanding and at odds in a European education teaching environment. Cultural perspectives are questioned and tested, i.e. the establishing of ‘funeral wear’ as a designed product seems incongruous from a European design perspective. However, in Ghana it would be acknowledged as a viable concept for a design market.

• The ‘language’ of European art and design is heavily coded with implicit constructs which are used to frame art and design discourse. We draw on this model without recognising that there are other positions which would create a dynamic intellectual poly-vocal space of mutual exchange.

With an international student, perceptions of design and cognitive skills can often be seen negatively, in that it does not appear to directly relate to the European skill set. Difference is often perceived as weakness, i.e. lack of mark-making skills, or perceived familiarity with our ways of ‘doing things’. How do we in UK higher education institutions measure aesthetic finesse, and what are the implicit and explicit expectations and codes attached to benchmarking this aesthetic when applied to international students? In his research Burnapp (2006) suggests that as educators we should ‘re-map’ a negative pedagogic approach, and perspective of international students, to one of ‘people needing to adapt both their approaches to learning and their view of themselves as learners’. In re-mapping this view the focus is then on change rather than deficit. The Third Space dynamic would enable students to draw on their own cultural maps, and to use that to establish a framework upon which to confidently negotiate a position within an adaptive and transformative space.
CASE STUDY

2 Appropriation in the art of Richard Prince
Author: Stephanie James

The following case study is a distillation from a discussion that took place between postgraduate students and staff following a seminar on the appropriation of the Marlborough Country advert in the art of Richard Prince. It represents a spontaneous event in which the subjects were equal, without hierarchy and patronisation — towards Third Space thinking. Each brought their own set of rules and experiences to the discussion and gained new knowledge and a deeper understanding of the act of Appropriation. Appropriation is a key subject regarding Third Space thinking as it provides a platform to discuss the international debate in art and design on concepts surrounding originality, influences and styles. Assumptive views of one group about another are aired in the Third Space. It requires active listening and active responses from students and staff.

Student 1 is a black American male student from Philadelphia with Puerto Rican ancestors.

Student 2 is a white British male student from Devises in Wiltshire with English ancestors.

Student 3 is a white Portuguese female student born in Angola with Portuguese ancestors.

Lecturer is a white British female lecturer born in Australia with white English and Irish ancestors and a Thai adopted child.

Student 1
With regard to the advert, there is the idea, the application of it and the selling of it. The artist, recognising the aesthetic value of the advert, takes it, re-presents it and then sells it for masses amounts of money. That is colonisation, the exploitation of resources in which colonial power goes into another country takes a resource that is undeveloped as it has little cultural validity in that place and sells it. This becomes a method for exploitation. The problem is; the value of the colonial power becomes more powerful than the cultural value it originally had. It’s about power.

Lecturer
Israelis, talking about Palestine, assert that originally there was nothing there, it wasn’t a culture, it’s an orphan and the only country that recognised Palestine was Pakistan. It had no shape or form and the Israelis are claiming that they have given it one, so what has been lost by the Palestinian people?

Student 1
I was reading a conversation between Salman Rushdie and Edward Said about
how the Palestinian culture has become nomadic because of the continued sense of displacement and that they are continually in movement through space. The Palestinian culture highlights effectively the nature of many secular problems with identity, recognised when forced into travelling. Rushdie and Said discuss what happens when you travel; as you are displaced from your cultural identity you begin comparing what is you and what is your culture. This doesn’t naturally occur while you are still in place. The Palestinians are forced to deal with being moved outside of Palestine and what ‘identity’ means. Those left within Palestine are forced to deal with the aggressor.

It’s similar to Europe cutting up Africa claiming there was nothing there.

_Student 3_

Why can’t an empty space remain empty?

_Lecturer_

What is interesting is our Euro-centric perspective in relation to your black American Philadelphian perspective (accepting this also as a problematic set of identities). What unsettles the seminar discussion is that we do not know how to deal with not being able to define your cultural identity and that we don’t know how to talk about it.

_Student 1_

That’s where actual communication could happen and when we are stuck inside our platitudes we’re not going anywhere, it’s our comfort zone. It’s the same with artwork; you have to hope that someone challenges your platitudes.

_Lecturer_

Appropriation is a subject-to-object relation, there is a hierarchy implied. There is something that someone has, they don’t value it and therefore another takes it and exploits it.

_Student 1_

The goal for making artwork is about communication; finding and generating meaning. It’s generally a ‘giving thing’. Appropriation is when your work is taken and used in a way that you don’t like mostly for financial gain, cutting in to your own stability.

_Student 2_

The act is the same for appropriation and for colonisation, for example ‘to take’.

_Student 1_

Both are necessary, there is the argument that everything we do is appropriation and through that we create our sense of understanding.

_Lecturer_

The artist, Yinka Shonibare, makes Victorian costumes with frills and bustles
from African cloth bought in Brixton market, imported from Africa but printed in Belgium. He made a film with masked dancers in the costumes deploying symmetry, repetitive movement and irony. These aspects are pertinent to order and power, appropriation and colonisation.

Student 1
It highlights the importance of language and how we discuss these things. In a documentary on Israeli-Palestine issues, political speeches were given by prisoners. A commentator said that the situation is akin to apartheid. This shifted the way that I thought about it, just having the connection drawn in my mind.

Student 3
‘Apartheid’ is about Africa, particularly South Africa, whereas ‘separatism’ is about the United States.

Student 1
Rushdie commenting on Richard Wright, the black American author, said in the United States there is a war about language between black and white America as they can’t agree on reality. The language is the battlefield in which they are striving to express. Bridging these languages is very awkward, its past uncomfortable. Clashes of race, ethnicity, age or sex are responded to very poorly.

Lecturer
Because we don’t have the mechanism to do it?

Student 1
The primary role of art is to give people the tools to deal with experiences they are uncomfortable with and they don’t have words or images to express. They can read or see something and say, ‘Oh that’s the idea.’

In art and design, internationalisation is a growing debate in education. Teaching at its best, operates in a Third Space domain. Encouraging ideas and subsequent ideas is dependent on the open inclusion of the students’ views in the teaching space.

This discussion took place several months into the programme. The Third Space environment was not achieved easily. Relationships were often fraught and emotional in the process of gaining deeper understanding.
East meets West  
Author: Alison Harley

This case study describes the development of a proposed MA Fashion programme which offers the opportunity for students through practice and supporting study, to become conversant with contemporary cultural, social and economic issues for fashion designers in both an eastern (Singapore) and western context (Paris).

This proposal presents one idea for developing a platform or ‘Third Space’. Implicit in this idea is that students will actively embrace the destabilising effect that challenges cultural norms continuously for one year over two continents and cultures. Also core to this educational experience is that there will be creative responses to these challenges through individual design practice and shared critique, both providing primary methods of understanding complex cultural experiences.

The philosophy of the proposed programme is to enable the postgraduate student to develop an individual position as a fashion designer with the versatility to adapt to an ever-changing global market. The programme aims to offer the opportunity for students through practice and supporting study, to become conversant with contemporary cultural, social and economic issues for fashion designers in both an eastern and western context. Paris provides an eminent history and long established context as the fashion capital of Europe. Singapore provides a fluid and emergent context with the aspiration to become a fashion capital in South East Asia.

In equating the experience of developing the programme proposal in parallel with the student experience in a Third Space programme, project or simple discourse, initial discussions on the shared philosophy of the programme highlighted very specific positions and expectations for the collaboration of two institutions and two cities, demonstrating a cultural hierarchy. Initially the stereotyping of both centres was confirmed with Paris as the creative ‘thinker’ and Singapore as the production ‘technician’. After much debate it was agreed that the programme components would be named and weighted equally and that it would be in the contextualisation of the content — that Third Space; that students would understand differing perspectives and priorities of each centre. Each part of the programme would focus on the trans-cultural context of each city and its location to fashion design.

The challenge for staff facilitating this type of student experience is complex and asks most staff to work outside their normal working practices. Traditionally in art and design education, ‘subject’ territories have been established and there has been a level of reluctance to express such things as learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Therefore it is of major consideration as to the kind of staff development opportunities that can be created for staff wishing to pursue this new ‘specialist’ education. The redefinition of the traditional staff profile in art...
and design higher education is also under scrutiny in an evolving global educational context.

In all successful collaborations the essence of the development is about people who can identify with each other and can communicate their personal and professional values, as well as the educational values of their institution. Spoken language is essential and face-to-face discussion has brought about the most fruitful development. It is the tangible as well as the intangible that encourages dialogue and genuine debate to take place — the Third Space.

CASE STUDY

The Prato project: towards a Third Space
Author: Eileen Reid

This case study assumes that a profitable Third Space encounter requires more than a willingness on the part of two people from different cultures to engage in intercultural dialogue. In order for there to be a dynamic, transforming, destabilising, exciting and profitable exchange of views, perspectives, attitudes and approaches to art and design, it is necessary that ‘both’ participants be confident and capable representatives of their local or national culture. This is so because the exploration of a third space depends on the two participants bringing with them a ‘first’ and ‘second’ space to the encounter.

However, a difficulty facing students from lower socio-economic backgrounds is that a lack of confidence in, and often alienation from, the dominant local culture of the home institution precludes their participation in profitable third space exchanges. As ‘Prato’ students are not conversant in the dominant, white middle class culture that pervades UK art schools, the Prato experience — an intensive, international programme of exposure to Western art, international students, and an alternative more diverse local culture in a socially and politically radical area of Tuscany — helps to ground them in the basic elements of their own space.

Background to the Prato project

Glaswegian students from poor working-class backgrounds do not lack talent or ambition: they lack no objective feature required for success. Nonetheless they often lack confidence and feel out of place and inferior to the dominant culture of the art and design community. This perceived ‘deficit’ affects how these students see themselves, and how they are seen by others — including peers and staff. As Pierre Bourdieu (1993) points out, the process of acquisition or inculcation of social and cultural capital, its relevant associations and codes, and the appearance of being cultured, usually takes a lifetime. The Prato project is designed to quicken this process.
Glasgow School of Art was invited to bring a group of students from under-represented groups characterised by very low participation rates in higher education to Monash University’s Prato Centre in Tuscany to join their course Concept and creativity: the development of Italian art and design. The project is possibly one of the first international widening access programmes of its kind in higher education.

For two weeks Glasgow School of Art students study, alongside Monash University students, the development of Italian Renaissance art, architecture and design. The art history course is led by the highly accomplished art historian Bronwyn Stocks of Monash University.

The teaching programme was developed specifically for on-site teaching at galleries, museums, architectural sites and urban spaces in places like Florence, Siena, Arezzo, Lucca and Pisa. The lectures and discussions aimed at providing an awareness and appreciation of Italian art and design and its social and cultural contexts. Particular emphasis is placed on the medieval and renaissance periods, with reference to contemporary art practice. Students encounter for the first time and at first-hand some of the most important art, design, archaeological and architectural sites in the world.

Overall 30 students have now participated in the programme over four years. Informally, feedback from our students has exceeded Glasgow School of Art expectations, both educationally and culturally. The following quotations from some of those participants illustrate the impact:

‘Overall, I believe the Prato trip developed me as a person ... and I came back a more confident person. Seeing another side of the world motivated me to learn more about other countries and cultures.

I thought I was prepared for what was going to happen on the trip. I don’t think I knew exactly how much it would have contributed to the person I am today. It changed many things about me such as my confidence, independence and my hunger for learning. Since the trip I have been to Prague, Berlin twice, Barcelona and Riga. This is all because I now have the confidence to travel.

Coming from a high school like mine, I was fairly uneducated as far as art and history were concerned. This gift from the Glasgow School of Art was very thoughtful. I think it is great that people like me were given this chance, as I often can feel inadequate in my class. It made me more confidence in giving my opinion to some of my peers.’

The implication of Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital — or its non-acquisition — is that redressing the so-called ‘deficit’ is the work of generations. If we want to improve participation rates of students from less advantaged backgrounds in years rather than decades, we need to find imaginative short-cuts. The Prato experience, a brief but ‘intense’ two-week interlude in four years of undergraduate study, has demonstrated that it is possible to build confidence in
working class students and help them recognise themselves as genuine participants in their local and national culture, thus preparing them for the Third Space.

**Conclusion**

There can be no illusions about the challenges that confront efforts to internationalise the curriculum in higher education. Leask (2002) rightly notes that staff will be required to make some uncomfortable changes. They will need to change their focus to include a greater emphasis on teaching and learning processes as well as content, if they are to provide a relevant educational experience for all students in an environment that is supportive and inclusive of all students. Staff will need to be simultaneously more reflective and more outward looking, for they must be reflective as they review and interrogate their teaching practice but outward-looking and internationally and cross-culturally aware if they are to develop international perspectives in their students. But the main point of this chapter is that the required changes that need to take place before the potential benefits of the new global context can be realised within higher education ‘themselves’ depend on the prior creation of what we have been calling a ‘Third Space’. This will be no easy task. A move into the Third Space demands a significant shift in the way we think and in the way we do things as individuals. This will not come easily or naturally, but only with conscious and continuous effort. Our institutions will also have to change. They will need to provide organisational and educational structures in which an experimental space of mutuality and exchange can flourish; in which intercultural debate and dialogue can be fostered and new ideas and identities can be negotiated and co-created. This will demand a flexibility and willingness to adapt that many institutions find challenging. But this is not a challenge we can afford to shirk, nor can we afford to fail. An important step on the way to meeting this challenge is to make sure that we understand it aright. It is hoped that this chapter has thrown a revealing light on the nature and extent of the challenge.
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Chapter 9

The GLAD’07 Conference: some reflections

Linda Drew  
University of the Arts London  
Chair of Planning Committee

Sally Wade  
University of Central Lancashire  
Planning Committee Member
Often the most important learning we experience is in reflection, made even more powerful by sharing that experience with others. As we write this chapter we feel we have learnt a lot about the conference process, about working with each other and particularly how our experiences may help others, either in contemplating using the conference model or in considering social aspects of informal learning.

The gaps in-between

Habitués of academic conferences often cite the principal benefit to be the gaps in-between the parallel paper sessions or keynote speakers. We had designed the conference to have only one keynote as a catalyst for discussion and we wondered if participants would agree with our plan to maximise the gaps in-between by having absolutely no ‘content’. We knew that our theme and art and design sector focus would attract many participants who already knew each other well through working relationships. However many participants made new and fruitful collaborations during the work on their chapters, many from different UK, regional and other international perspectives. Not only did participants warm to this approach but they have gone on to extol the virtues of the model in many ways, by developing further collaborations with each other, by giving presentations at other conferences and being invited to speak at events and conferences. Some of the groups presented ongoing work at the 4th Centre for Learning and Teaching in Art and Design Conference in New York in April 2008 and the conference steering group are reprising this theme for the GLAD’08 Conference at Nottingham Trent University.

Did the conference model work?

As the model described in Chapter 1 is modelled on that of the Cambridge Conference 2003 we have no doubts that the model can be used in other settings, adapted to theme and participants. One of our biggest challenges was to convince the GLAD committee first and then the invited participants that a whole week was a really good idea. GLAD conferences have never had more than a two-day programme, and they are usually hosted in the university town or campus of one of the GLAD group members, past examples include Bristol and Manchester. We knew that Cambridge would be an attractive venue if we could find a college which shared the art and design sector’s preoccupation with good design values coupled with good food and wine. We found a real winner in New Hall Cambridge; the conference steering group were introduced to the venue by Jill Rogers Associates (our conference support organisation) in early 2006. The modern and well equipped conference facilities were coupled with an extensive and unrivalled collection of women’s art, most of which we agreed had been well collected if rather randomly curated. This was the deal maker, we knew people would want to spend a week outside of their familiar surrounds if they had this to look forward to. On leaving the venue on that cold winter day, we tripped across Kettle’s Yard gallery and a
handful of really interesting independent fashion retailers. The decision was finally sealed on those discoveries, which provided diversion and entertainment for our participants during the conference. One shop in particular must be hoping we would come back again for another conference as many of the participants emptied their shelves and racks of shoes, clothes and jewellery. This might not sound like a serious reflection, but these amenities proved to be culturally and socially significant to the success of the whole conference week.

As the Cambridge Conference 2003, we concluded that this model could be used by other practitioners (not just in an educational context) with another theme. For the model to prove a success we have also observed that a number of key variables need to be maintained. They are as follows:

1. **Planning Committee** For the GLAD’07 Conference there were four members of the planning committee including the chair. The committee contributed to the planning and facilitation of the conference, each member leading on different aspects and during the conference, facilitating sessions either in pairs or individually. They came from four different university sector organisations, two modern universities, one specialist institution and one specialist university. All four, with David Vaughan the then Chair of GLAD, were key to providing nominations for participants. They all contributed to the identification of the overall theme, the themes of the conference and the subsequent review of the draft chapters. Together, they represented a range of experience, both of the sector and of the conference theme which was complementary to the collaborative nature of the planning exercise. Each of them brought a high level of professionalism to the conference, both in planning and execution but also in following up on actions to achieve the production of this book. The small size of the group allowed the entire group to participate and to share workload. Commitment to attend meetings of the group was vital, so a lot of advance planning of meeting schedules was required. An even smaller group could be risky if one person fails to attend, and a larger group may not actually progress tasks efficiently and also becomes more difficult to coordinate and manage.

2. **Plan of the week** As discussed earlier, it had been our intention to maximise process and discussion and to minimise content-laidened presentations. With the exception of process and introductory sessions plus the opportunity for a scene-setting keynote, the remainder of the week was presentation-free. This ensured that the intention to maximise discussion leading to debate and writing was delivered. The GLAD’07 Conference week was structured around specific deadlines in order to meet the objectives of the week i.e. completed draft chapters by the Friday.

3. **Ethos and guidelines for working** A conference which is presentation-free must have some ground rules to avoid transgression becoming the norm and a descent into complete anarchy. We talked about the process and overarching ethos of the conference right at the beginning, and we talked specifically about how things would be managed. There were a number of non-negotiable rules, for example the objective of the week
was to work towards collectively writing a book, individuals could move between groups, debate and non-consensus was to be positively encouraged, and participation in cross group critiquing was essential. All other aspects of the week were negotiable including where groups met (in break-out rooms or outside *sur l’herbe*), size of group, themes to be debated (within the context of the overall conference theme), how and who did the writing, note-taking and reporting.

4. **Invitation only** This is a key factor; it allows the planning team to identify people who are experts in their field as well as those who represent particular points of view, specialist perspectives and insights. The fact that most participants were fully paid for and registered months before the event meant that commitment to the event was high and contributed to the strong ‘buy-in’ to the conference concept. With these precursors good participation was also ensured.

5. **Participants** Having a mix of UK and international participants enabled discussions to be broad and, for the most part, with an international dimension. Of the 50 participants, at least 10% were from overseas and came from a range of types of universities (Israel, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, USA). The UK participants came from varied work contexts, some in mixed economy specialist institutions, some in modern (post-92), and fewer in old universities, some specialists came from higher education organisations (for example the Higher Education Academy) which support activities related to the student experience. Many different career stages and types were represented, researchers, academics, academic developers and senior staff (e.g. PVCs and deans). This mix was important as was the ability of the invited participants to act as team players with a proven ability to take part in high level debate, write and also finish projects.

6. **Professional conference support** One word: invaluable. The conference support team focused on all contact with participants which contributed to a strong sense of professionalism and identity of the event. They provided full administrative support which ensured the smooth running of the conference.
Some reflections: how the week went

In Chapter 1 Drew described the outline and the intended plan of the week — so what actually happened?

The week was extremely successful and exceeded our expectations and those of participants. We held a feedback session at the end of the week and a synthesis of participant views revealed the following contributing factors to the success of the event. Some examples of these are:

**The big picture** The theme we chose for the conference could not have been broader, this enabled participants, through discussion and debate to identify the key challenges. It also encouraged ownership of the process and created an enthusiasm and passion. The possibility of influencing the sector and help shape the future of the discipline was important and commented upon throughout the week. This is reflected in the feedback, especially regarding the impact the conference and book ought to have on the sector. At the close of the conference, one participant recommends GLAD…

‘Continue creating opportunities for the ideas generated to be disseminated and engaged with by a broader group, within and beyond the sector.’

**The creative space** Many participants remarked on the value of having a significant period away from the ‘day job’, which provided the opportunity to think creatively, generate new ideas and ‘bottom out’ key challenges facing their discipline.

‘Time to reflect at length on important issues I am concerned about, but don’t usually have time to work on.’

‘It has been an excellent week and I have had a rare opportunity to work with colleagues (both old friends and new acquaintances) to discuss, negotiate meanings, affirm, contradict and in the end find a shared place around issues that genuinely interest and engage us all.’

The venue itself received favourable comments for creating a high quality physical space, which encouraged reflection and collaboration. Described by one participant, as ‘inside – outside’ the variety of spaces to meet, work and discuss ideas was valued.

**The working process** The format for the conference received incredibly positive feedback, the few comments to the contrary referred to minor changes to the process in the future. The ‘free and open ethos’, as well as the non-hierarchical, collegial nature of the event created an inclusive environment where all participants felt able to contribute to the process and this was recognised. This participant appreciated:

‘Having my viewpoints respected and incorporated into work in progress.’
The process was described variously as powerful, invigorating, rewarding, energising and motivating.

‘It has been fantastic, motivating and creative, a great learning experience. I am still not sure I am in the right subject group, but felt I have made a contribution. I just hope all that has been generated actually contributes to a real change.’

Collaboration and teamwork The most frequently remarked upon feature was the opportunity for collaborative activity and teamwork. This came out as the most rewarding aspect for participants. For some it was the opportunity to work with a variety of experienced professionals across the sector, from which they felt they learnt a lot. One participant commented on the ‘insight into how professionals work productively under pressure’ … well, we did want those chapters drafting. For others it was confirmatory and helped to re-affirm ideas and views.

‘I have more confidence in my own observations and understanding of higher education in art and design.’

There were other references to the ‘group energy’ and ‘rewarding, productive energising collaboration’, which contributed to the sense of real and meaningful work. Some drew comparisons on how this differed from the surface approach they were often required to take and the level of multi-tasking that made up much of their daily routine.

The process of generating material for the book chapter was commented upon. One participant referred to ‘the wonderful process of collaborative writing’, one the ‘collective process of co-authoring’. Others appreciated the benefit of process and tangible outcomes.

‘Confirms the methodology through teamwork, this has worked effectively, generating focused discussion and effective outcomes.’

In many cases, the feedback reflected the extent to which participants felt they had developed, recognising their own personal learning as a result. Many thought it had been a unique opportunity and felt empowered. Additionally comments referred to a clearer understanding of issues and challenges, a greater knowledge of the sector.

‘A fantastic leadership development — 360 degree for the sector and I feel places me ‘in it’ or even ahead of it — WOW.’

The ‘rule of two feet’ was one of the non-negotiable rules, that is the ability for participants to move groups. We believed this would remove the tension sometimes established in conference groups where a topic, politeness or indeed the group dynamic, do not serve the participant well. In the end, only one participant actually changed groups, to the satisfaction of all concerned, and was fully able to participate in the discussions of both the groups.

For issues related to participants’ conference support needs, we were aware of the need to support one participant with a hearing impairment. On reflection, although prepared
for the concept of support for any need (e.g. participants bringing children and partners), the support we provided was in negotiation with both her institution and the planning committee. The outcome was more than satisfactory with scribing services provided by the participant and support on site by the conference team. Many of the sessions were expertly scribed, including those of the chapter group’s discussions which were an invaluable record for all.

Contesting and transgression was also something we encouraged, but strictly speaking we wanted to encourage this in the context of debate and not in the process or of the aspects of the structure of open space technology. Challenges were put in the early stages to the planning committee to move away from group discussions to more plenary-wide debate. The planning committee were committed to the principle of smaller group discussions to enable all voices to be heard around themes of their choice and for no one voice, opinion or paradigm to dominate the process of debate. Although the points raised were well argued we spent a little time rehearsing the principles of the process of the conference that all had ‘bought into’ and very soon those issues seemed a distant memory, in fact some remarked how it had been important for the challenges to be raised and debated so openly yet dealt with promptly and without bad feeling.

Issues raised in the brainstorming session were influenced by both the content of the trigger papers in the resource pack and by the themes raised in the keynote address by Sir Michael Bichard. As we had chosen the student experience as our main theme it is not surprising then that many of the chapter groups chose to pursue themes which directly influenced students and their perceptions as they go through the higher education journey. Many of the groups chose to discuss issues arising from the keynote discussion of management and leadership issues in relation to the student experience and some also debated the very nature of the subject disciplines, the practice focus and emphasis on creativity. It is interesting to note that the chapters divide themselves into those which concern the student experience directly and others indirectly. The appetite for bringing this debate to the attention of policy makers including national government and funding bodies has not abated and we believe this process has strengthened the voice of opinion formers in the sector by giving a structure to the views which are often not expressed for want of a medium or channel at once neutral and effective.

Dealing with the press, or at the very least getting their attention, was another of our ambitions. A press release was prepared with tantalising headlines and dangled in front of the specialist and quality press. It asked:

*Is art and design education fit for purpose?*

- Are the UK’s highly successful creative industries being starved of suitably skilled recruits?
- Is art and design education the preserve of the white middle classes?
- Why has the subject area of art and design performed less well in some areas than other subjects?
Among other promises our release asserted that we would solve all of these issues and more as we were:

*Experts to draw up blueprint to meet future art and design challenges.*

This element of our planning was most successful as we garnered column inches in two influential weekly publications, across one page in the *Times Higher Education Supplement* (*THES*, 04.05.07, p. 4) which also featured interviews with participants, the planning committee and Sir Michael Bichard, and one page in *Design Week* (*Design Week*, 26.04.05, 22, p. 7). Both articles also featured in online versions of these publications.

**Learning points**

It has been interesting to reflect on this process, and we believe we would use this approach again in another context or with different themes if the opportunity arose. Our learning points include:

- **Plenary sessions** – making sure they are not all the same in process and format reduced the risk of them being perceived as set pieces. We removed the ritual of plenary reporting back sessions to avoid overload and running over time, instead reporting became a peer-to-peer and group-to-group imperative, and much more was gained through the smaller, focused critiquing sessions and through informal social exchange.

- **Making a book and making sense** – while we were driving our ambition towards the production of a book, we also wanted the event to make sense as a week of exciting engagement. We therefore checked out with each other regularly that the immediate experience was to explore the issues and themes in sufficient depth. The planning committee met each morning (and more) to iron out these and other practical issues.

- **Purpose of the event** – although the planning committee had the original idea, this needed to be communicated well to all participants, from the outset. The letter of invitation was clear as to the purpose of the event and why individual participants were invited; this encouraged a positive response from those invited even if they were unable to attend.

- **Process is paramount** – once we had signed up to the process, it was important for us to ensure it was adopted by all conference participants. We believe the quality of the debate, the openness of the event and the scholarly rigour of each of the chapters in this book bear this out.

- **The uninvited** – sensitivities were expected and dealt with tactfully as we explained to some others why they were not invited on this occasion.
• **Good lunches and dinners doth a good conference make** – the lunches and break time refreshments were excellent, accompanied as they were by brilliant sunshine and access to good outside terraces. The dinners were also good, and paying that little extra for a conference dinner in the Fellows Room with an excellent jazz band finished off the week in style.

• **Of bedrooms, bars and off-licences** – venue issues are always important, so the opportunity to check out the quality and standard of bathrooms, bedrooms, checking bar opening times and the proximity of off-licences and supermarkets can help oil the wheels of off-schedule conference activity. The college porters enabled a smooth and efficient liaison with our organising team, providing directions, parking advice and laptop ethernet cables for those keen to maintain e-contact.

• **Professionals** – using a professional conference organising team was a key element to the success of the conference, their experience and their professionalism were extremely refreshing.

• **The right people** – we said on day one that ‘whoever comes is the right people’, but of course we are aware that it was absolutely vital to invite those right people to attend and participate, so many thanks to all of you who attended.

**The next steps**

As we put the finishing touches to this book of the GLAD’07 Conference we are planning the GLAD’08 Conference. Although we are not using the same approach, we are using the themes and chapters of the book to open out the debate to a wider audience of practitioners and academics in the art and design sector. We hope many of those ‘right people’ will participate, this time as experienced facilitators and leaders of the debate about the student experience in art and design higher education.
GLAD times

an interview with David Vaughan

In the summer of 2007 David Vaughan stepped down from the chair of the Group for Learning in Art and Design (GLAD), a post he had occupied since its inception. GLAD had its roots in activities promoted by the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) which had done a great deal to develop teaching, learning and assessment in what was, in the late 1980s, known as the public sector of higher education.

The first national event run by what later became GLAD took place at Liverpool Polytechnic in 1990. The planning of the event was initially led by Cal Swann and Mantz Yorke from Liverpool Polytechnic in conjunction with David Vaughan, but Cal’s departure to Australia meant that the leadership of the final planning devolved to Mantz and David. Simon Lewis attended this event, and it quickly became apparent that he and David had been students together some 20 years previously, but had lost touch until that point.

David, Simon and Mantz have been members of GLAD since it was founded, and it seemed appropriate, on David’s retirement, for Simon and Mantz to ask David to reflect on GLAD and its achievements during the past two decades.

Mantz Yorke (MY): Why did (what became) GLAD need to be initiated at the end of the 1980s?

David Vaughan (DV): I was at that time Associate Registrar at CNAA, on secondment from Brighton Polytechnic, and set up a CNAA/CHEAD Steering Group for Teaching and Learning. Cal Swann had given an address at a CHEAD meeting in which he set out the need to reconsider the then ‘sitting with Nellie’ (one-to-one) approach to teaching in art and design. This was against a background of increasing student numbers and no increase — or even reductions — in staff numbers. This was only the start of, and may even have been the catalyst for, serious consideration of the characteristics of art and design education in higher education, the purposes that art and design would serve and how they would be taught in future.

The Steering Group was formed of fearless and enthusiastic individuals from across higher education in the UK who were determined to get an often sceptical (and at times rather hostile) sector to consider the questions.
**MY:** How prescient was the first conference?

**DV:** The first Teaching and Learning in Art and Design Conference took place in Liverpool in the Autumn of 1990. It was launched at the Liverpool Tate and was preceded by a series of ‘roadshow’ seminars around the mainland UK. There was a common message that change had to be considered, not least because of the worsening student staff ratios brought about by the then Thatcher government’s decision to increase student numbers without equivalent funding. The prospect of change under these conditions was not well received by many in the sector, who were happy with the way things were done and didn’t see a need for forced change. Indeed, members of the Steering Group were regularly accused of being ‘Thatcher’s messengers’ when all we were intent on doing was getting the sector to face reality — well, that’s how it seemed to us at the time.

**MY:** At the first conference, John Stoddart (then Principal of Sheffield City Polytechnic) said that art and design had a good story to tell regarding pedagogic innovation, but that it had not been shouted out loudly enough. Was that true, and is it true today?

**DV:** Because teachers and managers of art and design had, in general, largely been happy with their lot, they had not really considered what might be particular or even special to higher (and further) education in the widening range of subjects covered.

Unlike many other subjects, art and design has never been taught on the basis of a ‘this is how it’s done’ philosophy but has emphasised individual discovery through question, risk and personal exploration. Projects have always encouraged students to explore their own personal approach — there being no one answer, unlike the situation in many knowledge-based subjects. However, this had never really been thought of as something particular to art and design subjects, and so at that time it was little recognised beyond the subjects themselves. There were many other, taken for granted, approaches that were not recognised within the subjects as innovations in pedagogy. Many of these have now been adopted by other subjects (often because they have been faced with even more difficult change imperatives) but, as with higher education more generally, there has been no great enthusiasm to record and tell the story of pedagogic development, despite a range of initiatives.

**Simon Lewis (SL):** GLAD events always attracted a high level of participation: why is this?

**DV:** Since the demise of the CNAA in the early 1990s GLAD has been independent of any funding organisation, surviving on the voluntary and energetic input of the members of the group and, equally importantly, the enthusiastic attendance at GLAD events and conferences by a wide range of teachers in higher and further education. No GLAD event has failed to attract
maximum numbers or to pay its way. GLAD is seen to be owned by the sector and, as such, can often identify and raise topics that might to others be taboo.

**SL:** Has the pedagogic challenge to art and design changed over the past couple of decades? If so, in what ways?

**DV:** The simple answer to the first question is yes. As well as the range of subjects increasing year on year (well beyond what would have traditionally been considered art and design), so have the technologies involved. Applying the basic philosophy of developing the individual through personal exploration and risk taking in a wider range of subjects and career options becomes ever more challenging. We need to pay much more attention to explaining and proving this approach to our students and to the outside world.

**SL:** In what way has the establishment of the Higher Education Academy (and its precursor organisations) contributed to the development of learning in art and design, and in what way has this affected GLAD?

**DV:** GLAD has benefited from the support of the Higher Education Academy and its predecessor the LTSN, through an indirect relationship with the Art, Design and Media Subject Centre. However, this has also been a two-way process with GLAD helping to alert the subject community to topics and vice-versa.

The ADM Subject Centre has probably made a greater contribution at shop floor level than the Academy because of its direct relationship with institutions and practitioners and its more specific subject focus.

**MY:** What are your views of the apparent thinness of pedagogic research output that specifically addresses the particular nature of the teaching and learning environment that art and design education at higher education level in the UK embraces?

**DV:** Well, is this just an art and design problem? Evidence of pedagogic research is known to be thin throughout higher education in the UK. Apart from teacher educators and those who have made a career out of pedagogy (often presenting other peoples’ approaches rather than developing their own!), there has been a dearth of published pedagogic research. Sadly this has not been improved because of the lack of any real incentive from the various Research Assessment Exercises (RAE) that the sector has endured to date. Unfortunately a lot of what is published is often based on ‘how to do it’ or is so esoteric as to be meaningless on the shop floor. The weakness lies in a disjunction between practice and theory, with adverse consequences for generalisability and transfer.

GLAD conferences have had some very good, down to earth presentations of real pedagogic practice. Perhaps we need to find better ways to record such inputs and to encourage more of this. GLAD, with the Academy, could perhaps find ways to promulgate and share this with the wider higher education
community. I think that the Academy could act as a repository of ‘grey literature’ which consists of examples of interesting practice but which lack — for perfectly good reasons — some of the features that would see them being formally published in a journal. There could then be a bank of such material that would be useful as a base for (possibly) some more rigorous study. Otherwise this kind of material is ephemeral, yet it may ‘speak to’ someone at some indeterminate time in the future.

**SL:** In England, HEFCE has promoted a number of initiatives that have aimed at improving learning and teaching, such as the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF) and the associated Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning (FDTL), and the funding of a number of Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLs). What has been their impact on education in art and design?

**DV:** From my own experience TQEF has been very beneficial in the development of learning and teaching initiatives in smaller and specialist institutions, but I’m not sure how well it has worked in larger institutions. Although I was a member of the HEFCE Quality Assessment, Learning and Teaching Committee, chaired FDTL 5 (which did not include art and design) and was a member of the assessment panel for CETLs, I have never been convinced that sufficient thought was given to how the sector as a whole would benefit from the outcome of major funded projects like FDTL and certainly not CETLs. For example the FDTL 5 panel argued strongly to HEFCE that the outcomes of all of the funded projects should be shared directly with the sector and not simply through the Subject Centres, as I believe has been the case.

**SL:** During the life of GLAD, several bodies concerned with teaching and learning issues, and initiatives in higher education, have come and gone, so why has GLAD survived and prospered? Are there things that the sector can learn from this model?

**DV:** Probably the most significant thing is ownership by the sector rather than any funding, quality, or governmental organisation. Colleagues seem to appreciate GLAD because it doesn’t tell them what to do but asks what should be done. They discuss, they share and they take ideas back to their own institutions.

**SL:** What evidence is there that GLAD has made a difference?

**DV:** Probably our main achievement has been to identify topics that colleagues need and want to discuss. GLAD events have always been very well received and fully booked. Colleagues are always anxious to know when the next conference is going to be. If we do no more than we currently do, then we need to keep ahead of the game in that respect and continue to throw down the gauntlet to colleagues in the sector.
GLAD has certainly created opportunities and an appetite to consider, discuss and share learning and teaching approaches in art and design.

**MY:** What challenges face art and design in the next decade, and what can GLAD do to help meet them?

**DV:** GLAD has recently held a week-long Cambridge residential think-tank conference from which a whole range of challenges have been identified. These are being published in a book and then subjected to a more traditional GLAD conference later in the year.

Alongside this a major challenge for art and design education will be to maintain the well-proven philosophy of encouraging students to discover and develop their individual abilities so as to be able to make full use of creative opportunities that arise in their lives. With a fast developing world economy and ever faster new technology developments, maintaining that philosophy will become more and more of a challenge. Since other developing nations seem to see the benefit of the way we do things isn’t it time we had greater confidence ourselves and learned how to explain our approach better? With few exceptions we do not do well in student surveys and we have to get better at sharing pedagogy and explaining our intentions.

GLAD has always appreciated the input of practitioners in art and design teaching. Most of them have been part-time teachers whose main qualification has been their real world practice experience. Changes in employment law make it much more difficult to maintain this crucial input and making sure that those we do manage to employ understand the institutional quality and standards context of their teaching will always be a challenge.

**MY:** What about the impact of the National Student Survey?

**DV:** Across the whole higher education sector the National Student Survey has identified concerns from students about assessment and feedback. This has been no less the case with art and design but, perhaps more worryingly, with added emphasis on the student understanding of the learning and teaching approaches and the contact with, and role of, their tutors in the learning process. There clearly remains much to be considered and explained here — or could it also be that we in art and design are successful in rightly challenging our students and in return they rightly challenge us?

Summer 2007
John Last  
Chair of GLAD, 2008

Reflecting on this conversation as the new Chair of GLAD, I am struck by the consistency with which GLAD has been able to engage practising academics in debates that are directly at the heart of their work, namely teaching and learning and how to help improve student learning. In concluding this section, I would like to confirm that GLAD will be continuing in that tradition and to note how much I am looking forward to taking it forward in the future.

However, I would be remiss if I did not also mention some other colleagues who have played such a significant part in the development of GLAD. Key people from the early days (in alphabetical order) were:

William Callaway who with Simon Lewis jointly drafted the ‘On not sitting with Nellie’ paper for discussion and final agreement of the original GLAD group

Alan Davies then at Worcester College of Higher Education

Barry Jackson then at Middlesex Polytechnic

Tony Marshall Bournemouth and Poole College of Art and Design

Jan Thorne of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA)

Sylvia Wicks who administered GLAD having joined CNAA in place of David Vaughan

Mary Wilson then at Bradford College.

These colleagues, with Mantz, Simon and David, created GLAD as it is today, and the new group with responsibility for GLAD looks forward to building upon their tradition. Along with myself and David, this group is:

David Clews ADM Subject Centre
Linda Drew University of the Arts London
Simon Lewis Nottingham Trent University
Chris Owen University of Derby
Eileen Reid Glasgow School of Art
Sally Wade University of Huddersfield
Mantz Yorke Education Consultant

Each of this group would wish to express their personal thanks to David Vaughan for his leadership and commitment over the period he has acted as Chair and to wish him well for the future.
Participants attending GLAD’07

Note: Job titles and institutions correct at the time of the event

Dr Noam Austerlitz
Research Fellow
University of the Arts London
London, UK

Professor Naren Barfield
Head of Research and Postgraduate Studies
The Glasgow School of Art
Glasgow, UK

Dr Bernadette Blair
Director of Academic Development and Quality Assurance
Kingston University
London, UK

Dr Margo Blythman
LCC Director of Teaching and Learning
University of the Arts London
London, UK

Ms Glenda Brindle
Head of Department
University of Central Lancashire
Preston, UK

Dr Roni Brown
Deputy Head of College
University College for the Creative Arts
Farnham, UK

Professor David Buss
Deputy Rector
University College for the Creative Arts
Maidstone, UK

Mr David Clews
Art Design Media Subject Centre Manager
University of Brighton
Brighton, UK

Dr Glynis Cousin
Senior Advisor
Higher Education Academy
York, UK

Professor Alan Cummings
Pro-Rector
Royal College of Art
London, UK

Professor Linda Drew
Professor of Art and Design: Higher Education Pedagogy
Head of College (Acting)
University of the Arts London
London, UK

Mr Tim Dunbar
Director of Studies
Manchester Metropolitan University
Sale, UK

Professor Gareth Fisher
Professor of Sculpture
University of Dundee
Dundee, UK

Ms Pauline Franckel
Dean of Foundation Degree and FE Portfolio
University of the Arts London
London, UK

Mrs Maureen Gamble
Head of Art, Design and Creative Digital Media
University of Worcester
Worcester, UK

Professor Brian Griffiths
Associate Dean
University of Chester
Chester, UK

Ms Annie Grove-White
Senior Lecturer, BA Graphic Communication
University of Wales Institute Cardiff, UK

Professor Alison Harley
Dean
Lasalle College of the Arts, Singapore

Dr Catherine Harper
Head of the School of Architecture and Design
University of Brighton
Brighton, UK

Professor David Hayward
Deputy Head of College
University College for the Creative Arts
Canterbury, UK

Mr Richard Heatly
Principal
Hereford College of Arts
Hereford, UK

Mr David Henderson
Teaching Fellow
The Robert Gordon University
Aberdeen, UK

Mrs Emma Hunt
Dean of School of Art and Design
University of Huddersfield
Huddersfield, UK

Ms Stephanie James
MA Course Leader
The Arts Institute at Bournemouth
Poole, UK
Ms Barbara Anne Jones
Assistant Principal
Cleveland College of Art and Design
Middlesbrough, UK

Ms Carol Ann Jones
Academic Team Leader
Nottingham Trent University
Nottingham, UK

Professor Jill Journeaux
Dean
Coventry University
Coventry, UK

Mr John Last
Deputy Principal
The Arts Institute at Bournemouth
Poole, UK

Professor Simon Lewis
Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Head of College
Nottingham Trent University
Nottingham, UK

Ms Julia Lockheart
Lecturer in Student Learning Support
Goldsmiths, University of London
London, UK

Mr Christopher McIntyre
Dean
University of Hertfordshire
Hatfield, UK

Mr John Miller
Director of Design
University College Falmouth
Penryn, UK

Professor Sally Morgan
Pro-Vice Chancellor
Massey University
Wellington, New Zealand

Professor Judith Mottram
Associate Dean
Nottingham Trent University
Nottingham, UK

Ms Susan Orr
Deputy Dean
York St. John University
Faculty of Arts
York, UK

Dr Fiona Powley
Director
University of Cumbria
Carlisle, UK

Professor Seona Reid
Director
The Glasgow School of Art
Glasgow, UK

Ms Eileen Reid
Head of Widening Participation
The Glasgow School of Art
Glasgow, UK

Ms Hilary Robinson
Dean, College of Fine Arts
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, USA

Ms Alison Shrieve
Director
University of the Arts London
London, UK

Ms Barbara E Thomas
Academic leader
University of Bolton
Bolton, UK

Professor Suzi Vaughan
Portfolio Director
Queensland University of Technology
Queensland, Australia

Professor David Vaughan
Principal
University of Cumbria
Carlisle, UK

Mrs Sally Wade
Academic Development
University of Central Lancashire
Preston, UK

Professor Allan Walker
Deputy Director and Director of Academic Development
The Glasgow School of Art
Glasgow, UK

Ms Jo Walter
Head of Quality, Art and Design
University of Wales Swansea
Swansea, UK

Dr Shân Wareing
Dean of Learning and Teaching Development
University of the Arts London
London, UK

Ms Yvonne Watson
Senior Lecturer MA Programme Leader Applied Design
Nottingham Trent University
Nottingham, UK

Mr John Woodman
Scholarship Enhancement Manager
University of Cumbria
Carlisle, UK
Biographies of editors

**Linda Drew**
Linda Drew, PhD is the Dean of Academic Development for Camberwell College of Arts, Chelsea College of Art and Design and Wimbledon College of Art at the University of the Arts London. Professor Drew was previously Head of College at Chelsea College of Art and Design (acting 2006-2007). Before joining the University of the Arts as Dean of Academic Development in 2003, Linda was Co-Director of the Art, Design and Communication subject centre based at the University of Brighton. She is editor of the peer-reviewed journal *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education* published by Intellect books and is Vice-chair of both the Design Research Society and the Group for Learning in Art and Design. Linda is an alumnus of Saint Martin’s School of Art and a Fellow of the Design Research Society (FDRS).

**John Last**
John Last is Deputy Principal at the Arts Institute at Bournemouth, with responsibility for operational management at the Institute, including the development of learning and teaching. He has extensive experience in the sector including work for the Council for National Academic Awards and a period as head of a large undergraduate and postgraduate department of teacher education.

John was elected chair of GLAD in 2007; his other work includes external examinerships and curriculum development consultancy, as well as work as an auditor for the QAA for the past eight years. He is a member of the HEFCE NSS/TQI Steering Group, the ADM Subject Centre Management Board and the CHEAD Executive. He chairs the GuildHE Quality Management Group, the NALN Management Group and the DVC Executive Committee of the Universities of the South West (HERDA). He has acted as reviewer for the *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education* journal, the HEA NTFS scheme and ADM Subject Centre research projects.

His other activities include chair of an arts educational trust, deputy chair of a school governing board and membership of the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC) and Ronnie Scott’s.

**Simon Lewis**
Simon Lewis studied sculpture at Bath Academic of Art, in the mid-sixties and did his MFA at Reading in the early seventies. He has lived and worked in London, Hull and most recently in the Midlands. He has taught in many different art schools in the UK and Far East but principally at Chelsea School of Art, Hull, the University of East London and Nottingham Trent University.
He came to Nottingham as a Professor of Painting and Head of Department of Visual and Performing Arts in 1996. In 1998 he became Dean of the School of Art and Design and in 2005 was appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Head of College of Art and Design and Built Environment at Nottingham Trent University.

Throughout his career in education, he has continued to practise as a sculptor and, more recently, as a painter. His development as an artist has shadowed his development as an educator.

He exhibits widely and internationally since winning the International Prize at the Paris Biennale in 1966 and, more recently, an international prize at the Millennium Exhibition of the Museum of Modern Art in Beijing.

He has also contributed to the development of art and design education in the UK higher education sector through active membership of a number of committees and trusts. He was a founder member of the National Association of Fine Art Education in 1982. Between 1988 and 1992, he was a subject advisor for art and design to the CNAA. He was a trustee of the Art and Design Admissions Registry until 1996 and then a member of the UCAS Art and Design Advisory Board until 2000. He is a founder member and treasurer of GLAD and is also currently the Treasurer of the HEAD Trust. He is also a current member of the ADC LTSN reference group.

**Sally Wade**

Sally Wade is Head of the Department of Design at the University of Huddersfield, where she leads a team of academic, technical and administrative support staff. As Chair of the School Learning and Teaching committee, Sally has a wider remit for the enhancement of learning and teaching and student retention. This draws on previous experience, working in an academic development unit at a large post ‘92 university, with an institution-wide remit coordinating the retention strategy and associated staff development and enhancement activity across the university.

Prior to this, Sally has extensive experience of the development and delivery of art and design education, particularly higher education in further education. With a discipline background in textiles and fashion, she has a long-standing involvement with the Association of Fashion and Textile Courses and is currently Deputy Chair. Sally is also a member of GLAD Executive (Group for Learning in Art and Design) and is Secretary … for her sins.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADM-HEA</td>
<td>Higher Education Academy Subject Centres in Art, Design Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHRC</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETL</td>
<td>Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAA</td>
<td>Council for National Academic Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Department of Culture, Media and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIUS</td>
<td>Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTI</td>
<td>Department of Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfEE</td>
<td>Department for Education and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIA</td>
<td>European League of Institutes of the Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAD</td>
<td>Group for Learning in Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE</td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESDA</td>
<td>Higher Education Staff Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTSN</td>
<td>Learning and Teaching Support Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDAD</td>
<td>National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS</td>
<td>National Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESTA</td>
<td>National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACCE</td>
<td>National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCA</td>
<td>Qualifications and Curriculum Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAE</td>
<td>Research Assessment Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQEF</td>
<td>Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development Panel on Creative Industries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>