

Future Proof New Learning in the Creative and Cultural Industries

David Clews

Art : Design : Media
Subject Centre

Future Proof brought together the Sector Skills Councils most related to creative and cultural industries with creative arts, design and media higher education departments to focus on the problems and opportunities within the creative and cultural sectors relating to educational and work-based developments.

The event took place on Friday, 13 June, 2008 at the Royal Institute of British Architects at 66 Portland Place, London, W1B 1AD

Contents

- 1.0 Employer Engagement**
 - The Background
 - Key Issues
 - Introduction by Hugh Tollyfield, HEFCE Special Adviser - Employer Engagement

- 2.0 Summary of the discussion**
 - Introductory Remarks
 - Key Issues

- 3.0 Discussion of the key issues and ideas**
 - Diversity and differentiation
 - Cultural Change
 - Relationship Management
 - The Front Door
 - Potential and Strengths
 - Evaluation and Sustainability
 - Diversity and Widening Participation

- 4.0 Recommendations**

- 5.0 Appendix**
 - 5.1** Bibliography
 - 5.2** Contributors to Future Proof

1.0 Employer Engagement

The Background

This paper reports on the Future Proof event held at the Royal Institute of British Architects on 13 June 2008. The event brought the Sector Skills Councils (SSCs)¹ most related to creative and cultural industries into closer contact with creative arts, design and media higher education² departments. Participants included a range of other stakeholders: Centres of Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLs); Life-Long Learning Networks (LLNs); key sector agencies, including the Council for Higher Education in Art and Design (CHEAD) and subject associations; the Higher Education Funding Councils, and the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS).

Participants in Future Proof are involved in strategic and operational planning and implementation in their agencies and organisations. They are positioned to understand their context and the wider issues that will drive or act as barriers to effective initiatives. Discussions were intended to explore the issues and formulate strategies and actions that can be developed and shaped to have positive effects in educational and work-based contexts. Whilst it is envisioned that existing students will benefit from these discussions and actions, the primary aim was to formulate ways in which organisations and institutions can rise to the challenge of delivering relevant, appropriate and authentic learning to those already working in our creative and cultural industries, and in particular to do this within existing, highly-valued qualifications frameworks. This will be done by:

- Encouraging the links between the SSCs: Creative and Cultural Skills, Skillfast-UK, Skillset, and higher education institutions that will focus on the problems and opportunities within the creative and cultural sectors. In particular we aimed to explore how these links will shape core activities in educational contexts.
- Identifying and building an understanding of priorities so that the Higher Education Funding Councils (and other funding agencies, for example the Research Funding Councils) can consider pump-priming those activities that would make a real difference to the whole sector and that would not happen otherwise.
- Understanding how the SSCs can help to generate a market for new provision by higher education institutions (HEIs) and further education institutions (FEIs) for workforce development, co-funded by creative and cultural businesses and organisations.

Key issues

The Sector Skills Councils are initiating programmes to support industry-facing learning at all levels, from new creative and media diplomas to HE strategies. *What can be done by SSCs, other sector agencies and individual HEIs to maximise the impact of these initiatives and strategies?*

It is widely acknowledged that creative and cultural industries have poor provision for Continuing Professional Development (CPD). *What can be done to ensure the*

¹ The Sector Skills Councils most closely related to Creative and Cultural Industries are: Creative and Cultural Skills (advertising, crafts, cultural heritage, design, music performing, literary and visual arts); Skillfast-UK (fashion and textiles); Skillset (creative media).

² Creative Arts and Design and Mass Communication in the UCAS/HESA classifications cover almost all the DCMS 13 lines of industry with the exception of architecture.

workforce has access to, and is supported and motivated to participate in appropriate CPD? What roles can be played by industry (individuals and organisations), agencies and HEIs?

Government departments³ and sector agencies, most notably the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), have identified workforce development as one of the key challenges for the UK over the next decade. The vision is that HE (and FE) will offer new learning experiences to people already in work as part of the way skills and capabilities are developed and acquired. *In what ways will the creative and cultural industry SSCs and HE departments for creative arts, design and media collaborate to meet these challenges?*

Future Proof invited participants to identify issues, opportunities and barriers to developing more intensive employer engagement with higher education institutions and then to propose specific actions for delivery. This paper reports on the introduction by Hugh Tollyfield, HEFCE Special Advisor for Employer Engagement, setting the scene for proposals that might benefit from the Higher Education Funding Council's Employer Engagement Fund. The paper then moves to report on the key issues raised by the break-out groups and in the third section, these are synthesised into a discussion. In the final section this discussion is presented as a series of recommendations aimed at a range of stakeholders.

In common with many such discussions there was, at Future Proof, considerable debate on the meaning and definitions for the terms used by HEFCE and others. Where these emerge as problematic and further clarification or consensus is needed to move the debate forward, they are identified in the recommendations in section 4.0. However, in order to avoid endlessly problematising the debate, some terms are used uncritically but can be taken in this paper to encompass the discussions that they have come to embody. Key among these is 'employer engagement'. We accept explicitly that 'employer' in this context is not someone limited to employing others or that employees are necessarily the only or majority clients in the employer engagement initiative and that for the initiative to apply to the creative industry sector, key participants will be the large number of owner-managers, self-employed and freelance creative industry practitioners across all types of sector activity.

Introduction

by Hugh Tollyfield, HEFCE Special Adviser - Employer Engagement

We will ask HEFCE to develop proposals to support expansion of accrediting employers' own training to higher levels. HEFCE will test regional and sectoral approaches to employer co-funding... we believe there is a case for more funding to be employer demand led. Higher Education at Work, 2008.

We have seen the Cox review (Cox, 2006), the outcome of the innovation review, Higher Education at Work (DIUS, 2008), and the Creative Economies Strategy Paper (DCMS, 2008). So, a lot has been said about the contribution of people in the workforce and about people in the creative sectors in terms of how they contribute to the development of the UK economy. HEFCE is keen to ensure that employer engagement is tested within the creative and cultural sectors as in other industry sectors. This is raising challenges for the organisations that represent employers and for institutions involved in teaching and learning. This is why it is important to discuss how we can make progress so we can see it as part of our overall programme.

There are challenges: in particular working with small businesses, sole practitioners and freelancers; and the fact that organisations in some parts of the sector are reliant on public arts funding. Future Proof is an opportunity to find ways of testing new approaches to tackling these challenges.

As ever, the funding we are making available comes with conditions. We have to acknowledge there is an agenda about achieving substantial cultural change both in the supply and demand sides; change in terms of development of skills in the workforce; in development of knowledge and learning; and the way they are applied. And, it is about looking for new ways for those in the business of contracting with and commissioning practitioners to get involved in supporting both the entry to the sector of people from education and their continuing development in the workforce.

The debate is about institutions thinking through issues and creating new opportunities that are more accessible, particularly to those already in work. For many institutions another element of this will be connecting up with other initiatives in relation to research and knowledge transfer so we can keep the sector at the leading edge in terms of development in the world.

The government has provided HEFCE with at least £105 million over 3 years which we are developing as our Employer Engagement Fund. It is a fund in which we can bear higher levels of risk than normal in terms of developing markets and consumers for new types of education and training provision, supporting employers who are seeking to contribute towards growth in business success in their sectors. We have tried to keep criteria for funding as flexible as possible. HEFCE's main concerns are in supporting the transformation in the higher education providers; we want the fund to assist in creating a legacy of a more employer/market facing capacity in the higher education sector. To what extent it will impact on every institution will vary. Some are defining their whole mission around engagement with employers. Others see it as a substantial element and for some this will be intervention in particular market niches, disciplines or occupational areas. But it is important that we have the capacity to engage with business and organisations in a way that operates at a larger scale than ever before and, in the longer term, is focused on how we create a workforce with the necessary knowledge and skills base to take forward growth.

Broadly speaking the employer engagement initiative is about delivering transformation. The fund should be focused on the creation of new forms of higher education provision focused on the development of the workforce; it is not intended as money to address general issues of employability within undergraduate or postgraduate provision.

'Co-funding' is an important characteristic of the HEFCE Employer Engagement fund. Lord Leitch, in his 2006 report (Leitch, 2006) said employers should contribute towards costs of developing skills in the workforce. Our grant letter from the government, which provides the funding for HEFCE's Employer Engagement Fund, requires us to develop the co-funding model: this is a huge challenge. Higher education institutions may choose to ignore the challenge or can commit to look at ways to meet it. At Future Proof, we want to look at ways co-funded provision might be developed in your disciplines. It is a challenge when talking about people who are practitioners or maybe operating on their own or in a variety of ways with commission work. It is important that somehow we demonstrate co-funding is part of the way they develop their skills and knowledge. This is an opportunity to take some calculated risks and find, ways we can make it work; whether this will be in the way the policy-maker originally thought is less of an issue. What we do need to do is to try to make it work in a way that is best for your sector.

Higher Education at Work (DIUS, 2008) has a lot to say about the way the sector should work with the Sector Skills Councils and professional bodies. I am pleased the Sector Skills Councils are represented at Future Proof. It recognises the value the Sector Skills Councils can bring as representatives for employer and business demand in specific sectors. The Sector Skills Councils have done a fantastic job in exploring the areas of demand, the skills we need now, and in the future. They have added to the body of knowledge in new and effective ways, we know more than we ever did about the 'shape' of the industry, its employment trends and working practices. It is important that Sector Skills Councils work closely across the higher education sector with consortia and individual higher education institutions. The Sector Skills Councils are in position to raise demand for workforce development, in partnership with higher education through co-purchasing of specific education and training provision. However, to make this market work, expressing demand is not sufficient, many of us can see what we would like to do to change provision, the challenge is how to make the change attractive and acceptable and generate the levels of take-up by employers which will make it worth doing for a higher education institution. The concept of co-purchasing has something to do with bringing forward the customers, paying customers, to back up the demand they have expressed. That is a challenge, we don't know how it will work, but we have to find out.

Finally, with the money come targets expressed in terms of new entrants into co-funded provision. I am feeling extremely pleased with the way the higher education sector has responded so far. From 2008-09 HEFCE contracted nearly 8,000 new places against a target of 5,000 co-funded entrants. So, even if not all our eggs hatch we are in a good position. The targets then ramp up dramatically to 10,000 and to 20,000 next year and the year after, so the expectations for growth are substantial. These targets mean that when looking at deploying funds we will look at the outcomes which will be delivered as well as the mechanisms to be put in place.

The opportunity today is to ask what are the big things we are trying to do? What does cultural change mean? And, what does higher education, working more closely with the sector mean when the focus is on the workforce? We have seen valuable interventions from the Design Council around the Design Skills Blueprint (Design Council, 2008). The thinking around the Design Skills Alliance fits in with existing structures and aims to make it easier for higher education institutions to identify how to work with design practitioners and the design industry. What else do we need to do to create the big framework? What is transferable and importantly, sustainable? Then are there specific things that take advantage of opportunities offered by this particular funding? They might be small scale but may be ramped up into larger structures for workforce development. Today we ask: can we bring those ideas forward?

2.0 Summary of the Discussion

Introductory remarks

The Higher Education Funding Council for England has established an 'Employer Engagement Fund' of at least £105m to support greater engagement between Higher Education Institutions and the world of work. The aims are broad and the intention is that the funding will "test ideas, support risk" and promote substantial cultural change in HEIs and organisations, businesses and public enterprise. The fund is intended to:

- Effect change in the supply and demand of education and training by HE to the UK workforce
- Promote and support the development and application of new knowledge
- Increase the number of 'new entrants' from the workforce to HE
- Promote and stimulate workforce development
- Promote access and diversity in the workforce.

There are a number of key challenges: the subject of employer engagement is bigger than the funds available. The size and diversity of the UK labour market and diversity of potential industry activities make strategies difficult to define. There are also challenges relating to differences between commercial, public sector and not-for-profit sector enterprise, problematising the debate.

However, there are a number of issues on which the Funding Council is clear:

- Projects and initiatives receiving funding will focus on "new forms of HE provision for workforce development" but these will be more focused on people already in work than on enhancing graduate employability. However, a number of the projects we have already approved will deliver spin-off employability benefits.
- The fund is underpinned by a principle of 'co-funding' where "employers will contribute to the costs of workforce development".
- The fund is underpinned by the further principle of 'co-purchasing', "in order to make this (co-purchasing) work, expressing demand is not sufficient... the challenge is to generate take-up by paying customers... to back up the demand that has been expressed".
- There are targets, for example, for new entrants for co-funded provision. For 2008-9 HEFCE has already contracted 3000 more places than its target of 5000 co-funded entrants. However over the next two annual cycles the target rises from 5000 to 10000 new entrants in 2009-10 and to twenty thousand in 2010- 11.

HEFCE recognises that the cultural and creative industries are a key sector in the UK economy. It is widely acknowledged that the potential for growth is high and there is a need for workforce development, including training and continuing professional development. How this might be designed and delivered and, importantly how HE might be a partner in that delivery is a key challenge.

The key agenda for Future Proof is to:

- Explore what 'cultural change' means in this context.
- What does it mean for HE "to look at employer engagement"?
- What specific action can be taken?
- What intervention can be proposed?
- How will these build on existing structures?
- What are the intended effects?

The UK is a world leader in creative education. The free-flowing creativity encouraged in many British art, design and technical schools and colleges is widely recognised as having contributed to our success in the creative sector. Our best schools and colleges strongly emphasise imagination alongside the development of technical skills. They offer opportunities for students to work on 'live projects' and be taught by practitioners. Creative Britain, 2008.

Key issues

Diversity and differentiation

- Variations in scale in creative and cultural enterprises are a major factor in considering the design of Employer Engagement initiatives.
- The range of practices represented across creative and cultural industry is a factor in considering the design of Employer Engagement initiatives. These two points are opportunities rather than barriers.
- Regional and local opportunities should be exploited.
- Despite these variations there are core practices and a need across the entire sector for continuing professional development especially in innovation, management and leadership.

Cultural Change

- The cultural industries, particularly those dependent on public subsidy need to be included in the Employer Engagement initiative.
- Sector Skills Councils and higher education institutions need to join together to convince creative and cultural industry that higher education is a credible and effective provider of workforce development.
- Senior academic managers at vice-chancellor/director level need to commit to the initiative and new end-to-end procurement processes developed.
- The focus should be on design rather than content and should shift from raising the academic quality quotient to developing business facing learning experiences.

Relationship management

- There is a pressing need to develop effective outreach programmes based on evidence and experience of delivering effective collaborative projects.
- Conventional faculties and schools built around conventional knowledge bases need to be reconsidered in favour of new units for collaborative design and delivery of

workforce development.

- The audit culture of current quality and management systems needs to be reconsidered in favour of enhancement based on evidence of positive effect.

The 'front door'

- As part of the outreach programme and development of appropriate procurement processes the institution needs to create a 'front door' to improve access for potential clients of workforce development.
- The 'front door' cannot be seen as part of the current centralised recruitment systems.
- Effective two-way communication is essential.

Potential and strengths

- The unique selling proposition for workforce development for creative and cultural industry will emerge from the proven effective pedagogies for the subjects.
- These pedagogies, include project-based learning, learning-by-doing and learning in social learning spaces which are ideally suited to flexible, learner-centered experiences.
- There is potential to harness existing programmes and structures including Knowledge Transfer Partnerships for the delivery of effective workforce development for the cultural and creative industry.
- The extensive practice of employing teacher-practitioners⁴ can be harnessed to deliver Continuing Professional Development and workforce development to people from industry already engaged with higher education.
- Existing powerful networks should be harnessed for the development of Employer Engagement initiatives. These operate at national levels (e.g: developed by Sector Skills Councils) or at regional levels (e.g: the Greater Manchester Strategic Alliance).
- Good experience and innovative practice already exists, for example, the Centre for Excellence in Media Practice has developed on-line distance learning programmes, and these should be tested for transferability and scaling up to cross sub-sectors.

Evaluation and sustainability

- Although it is accepted that additional student numbers or new entrants to higher education are useful as targets for the Employer Engagement initiative, there also need to be outcomes criteria as well as process criteria for evaluation.
- Metrics for evaluation should be developed in respect of each programme (or group of programmes) and be aligned to the aims of the collaborators.
- Minimising marginal and recurrent costs will be a major factor in minimising risk to the higher education institution.
- Project proposals for co-funding should show how they build on existing strengths, evidence for those strengths and show the change mechanisms that will shape the cultures within the institutions and for participating employers/businesses.
- Proposals for co-funding should show what is scaleable and transferable and how mechanisms for understanding this should be built into evaluations.
- Evaluation should be reflective and self-directed rather than a compliance process.

⁴ *Teacher-Practitioners are any individuals contributing to the student learning experience who also work within the creative and cultural industry. They may be part-time studio teachers, work-based learning supervisors, visiting and specialist speakers, external examiners, members of industry liaison panels, etc. Stepping-Out, 2008*

Widening Participation

- Employer Engagement and co-funded projects based on working with creative and cultural industry collaborators should be encouraged.
- There needs to be greater diversity in all areas of collaboration, in the workforce, in the community of creative and cultural industry leaders and in the teaching teams.

3.0 Discussion of the key issues and ideas

Diversity and Differentiation

Much has been said about the character of the creative industries and since the term was articulated by the Department of Culture Media and Sport in the original 1998 report (DCMS, 1998), where the creative industries were described as “those activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skill, talent and which have their potential for wealth creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property”. Although more recent studies have served to extend the question and the definition, noting that many types of activity not normally recognised as being ‘creative’ would meet this definition, the original work proved invaluable in framing the policy debate. On the one hand these studies offer broad definitions that seek to offer a clear differentiation between creative and cultural industry activity. On the other hand there are more analytical models that seek to make more practical and useful differentiation between the range of industry activities and outputs. For example, the Work Foundation’s definition is based in the way creative producers commercialise ‘expressive value’.

What is distinct about the creative industries is that their revenues are largely generated by commercialising ‘expressive value’ and that necessarily a greater part of their commercial turnover is attributable even more so than other parts of the knowledge economy to acts of genuine ‘creative origination.’
Core communal business model. *Staying Ahead, 2007.*

In *Creating Growth* (NESTA, 2006), the National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts proposed a model based on what and how creative outputs are delivered to audiences and consumers. This typology suggests fundamental differences in practice, knowledge and business models for producers of creative content, original events and services. Not only does this make a distinction between say the designer producer of an original piece of furniture, jewelry or a garment, and those offering design services such as architects and industrial designers, it also suggests that the difference between the business of producing and making film (a creative original) has less in common with screening a film (a creative event) than with, say, producing a computer game.

Economic benefits of the sub-sector (museums and galleries) are estimated to be of the order of £1.5 billion per annum, taking account of turnover and plausible estimates of visitor expenditure wider economic impacts would be still greater. Museums and Galleries in Britain, LSE, 2006.

The debate has become elaborated further as greater clarity has been given to the relationships and interfaces between those parts of creative cultural enterprise that are clearly commercial and were the focus in the early years of developing policy and those that have emerged as being significant but not commonly categorised as commercial. These sectors and activities, often in the not-for-profit or community interest sectors and often dependent on public investment, were neglected in estimates and forecasts for economic development until recently, despite writers like Schumpeter making links between wealth and well-being and the existence of networks of creative

and cultural people. Now the Department of Trade and Industry identifies the activities and contributions to the economy of not-for-profit and community interest sectors. It is not only that sectors and activities that are non-commercial or dependent on public investment are making significant contributions to economic, cultural and social wealth but that there is a significant fluidity between commercial and non-commercial enterprises in terms of delivery and movement of the workforce. There is work being undertaken on articulating the value of the cultural sectors in the economy and London Higher is currently undertaking work examining the contribution 'creative graduates' make to the economy.

Despite changes forming policy and guiding intervention based on accurate assessment, this remains difficult. In his report on the economic impacts of museums and galleries, Tony Travers notes: "there is no, single, consistent data source for British museums and galleries, still less for the wider arts and cultural sector" citing the "fragmented and disparate nature of such institutions and the relative novelty of considering cultural activity as an economic sector in its own right" as factors (Travers, 2006). Economic forecasts are based on Standard Industry Classification and Activities (SOC/SIC) that remain modeled on traditional divisions of labour in industry (agriculture, mining and mineral extraction, financial services, etc.) and do not reflect the diversity of activity across the creative industry sector. Economic measurement is based on Gross Value Added (GVA) based on VAT and many creative enterprises will fall below the threshold for measurement, particularly in sub-sectors that comprise large numbers of micro-businesses, self-employed workers and freelancers.

Although most industry sectors, when examined more closely, are likely to reveal themselves as more differentiated than might first be assumed, this is sharply drawn in the creative and cultural industries. The range of scale of enterprise in the sub-sectors is huge, from a corporation as vast as the BBC to sole-practitioners in crafts related business. Even within a single sector the range is large; for example in the design sector, businesses may be large but only a few will be larger than fifty people. Again many will be sole-practitioners or working in micro-businesses and Creative and Cultural Skills estimate there may be over 62,000 creative and cultural businesses and organisations in the UK (CCS, 2007). In the non-commercial sector, for example, the visual arts is likely to be more consistently small-scale, typically comprising individual practitioners. These very high levels of differentiation are made more complex by the distribution of activity throughout the UK. Whilst London undoubtedly remains the "creative hub" (Purnell, 2005), other major cities have major concentrations of creative and cultural activity. In some cases there is regional policy to grow and sustain historic, creative enterprise, for example, Manchester's textile industry and Birmingham's Jewelry Quarter. As early as 1990 Glasgow used its status as European Capital of Culture to catalyse regeneration. Regeneration in the North East cities in Tyne Tees has been focused on landmark cultural intervention. In yet other cities and regions, deliberate efforts have been made to attract and sustain particular creative and cultural enterprises, for example new media business in Dundee and creative industries that relate to leisure and tourism in the South West of England.

In England the workforce is around 480,000 people, predominantly in art and design and 95% of businesses employ less than ten people. Even so they have money in their pocket if they can find the right thing. Future Proof.

Highly differentiated in scale, varied in activity and with uneven patterns of distribution across the UK, employer engagement between higher education and creative and cultural industry, whether intended to deliver enhancements to existing students on existing programmes, effective workforce development or new innovation through

research and development partnerships, presents unique challenges. However, there are two great strengths in place. The Sector Skills Councils, particularly Creative and Cultural Skills, Skillfast-UK and Skillset have done significant work with their footprints to articulate the challenge and employer needs. Regional Development Agencies and regional sector agencies, for example, the Creative Industry Development Service in the North-West, have also worked with creative and cultural industries to raise demand and point employers towards higher education as a credible partner. Finally, as HEIs act as independent operations, free from conforming to national frameworks they are, like creative enterprises, able to adapt to the needs of local and regional partners to deliver the most effective collaborations.

Despite the levels of differentiation there are common needs across the sub-sectors. These may be shaped around particular technical skills but across all the sub-sectors there is a pressing need to develop frameworks for continuing professional development particularly in areas of management, innovation development and leadership.

In fact each creative industry has a core communal business model. Other parts of the economy certainly engage in creative acts of origination. Moreover every part of the economy commercialises their outputs and offerings by pricing them in markets. But these activities are defined by having a practical function. Staying Ahead, 2006.

Cultural Change

Cultural change needs to happen across the piece. Agencies have done much to raise expectations in the creative industries of the need to develop both higher levels of core skills that relate to specific activities and for higher-level skills. Sector Skills Councils have identified the need for better subject-related skills in the workforce. The National Council for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA) have suggested the major limiting factors for growth in creative enterprises are a need for better management, entrepreneurship and leadership skills leading to innovation in the way creative businesses will extend and enhance their direct contact, with existing and new consumers and audiences and in raising the intention of owner-managers for growth. Meanwhile, the government continues to promote small and medium sized businesses as the engine of the economy and to invest in programmes that will grow the entrepreneurial capacity of the workforce.

Culture in the UK not only helps to define and shape and deepen our lives as individuals, it also makes a significant contribution to our nation's prosperity. If this significant part of our economy is to continue to prosper and grow as it should, we must recognise the role of our cultural leaders in delivering that success. Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP, Chancellor of the Exchequer, June 2006

In the non-business sector, cultural change has been a major factor in regeneration. Local authorities and regional development authorities and the Arts Council's Cultural Leadership programme aim to raise leadership levels and diversity in the UK's new cultural leaders with the aim of growing creative businesses and the cultural conditions in which cultural enterprise will thrive.

Many universities and colleges, particularly their performing arts, design and media departments situate themselves at the cultural heart of their cities and regions. Many have been instrumental in regional regeneration. In coastal and rural contexts this has been especially important, for example, the new University Campus Suffolk, through developing new programmes and building strong links with local business, has raised

local recruitment to its courses and encouraged retention of graduates in the area. It is cited by the DIUS as one of the HEIs offering significant benefits to its local and regional economy. In many towns, cities and regions education has grown to be one of the largest turnover businesses and one of the biggest employers. Jointly, the Universities of Brighton and Sussex are the third biggest employer in the city and their staff and students contribute massively to the cultural and economic wealth of the region.

However, despite evidence that at the macro-level cultural change is happening, it is more difficult to see within the institutions' development of educational programmes. Course development remains focused on undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. This is unsurprising as the key funding stream is for this development. Academic structures for curriculum development and academic quality are engineered to assure courses at this level hinge on academic coherence rather than on a 'product' that is attractive to employers and those already in work. The challenge here is to bring about the conditions that will promote cultural change in higher education. The thinking and approaches to building new courses is very robust. Whatever might be said about the uses, misuses and intentions of current quality assurance processes, they have often played out as complex, time-consuming and possibly unhelpful audit and compliance mechanisms. These processes not only consume resources but shape the thinking top to bottom, encourage risk-averse approaches and deliver documents that are opaque and irrelevant and fail to articulate the value of education to large sections of the population.

We need not only new partnerships in collaboration between creative and cultural industry practitioners and employers, with the agencies that will broker and support these collaborations, we also need ways in which innovative thinking in developing programmes at the delivery level which will impact on the strategic development of the institution. This means that academic developers, not necessarily at the heart of developing the university and college business plan, need new lines of communication to the senior management. It means that risks have to be accepted and managed and new models of collaborative development implemented. It also means that existing quality assurance mechanisms need to be set aside in favour of those more appropriate to the new partners, including developing credible education brands, business credible education products and metrics for quality that depend on change in the real world rather than in adding to academic knowledge.

Cultural change needs also to occur outside higher education. Creative and cultural industry does not yet see the higher education sector as a business partner in supporting its training and development needs. Their calls have largely been expressed in terms of failures of undergraduate provision to meet the needs of the workplace with little acknowledgement that at the heart of most high-level activities, learning-in-work and continuing professional development is accepted as fundamental to developing high-level skills. Despite buoyant graduate recruitment, employers have often complained that graduates are poorly qualified to work in their businesses. From the perception of higher education, demands for change are not backed up by support for change and there has been little confidence that more industry-facing courses delivered by the higher education sector will be economically viable.

Relationship Management

Set within this is the need for cultural change within higher education institutions and in their relationships with the world beyond their doors. For most institutions the delivery of undergraduate programmes with the state as a major funder, is likely to remain core business, but with the Higher Education at Work (DIUS, 2008) and the HEFCE

Employer Engagement initiative, the government has clearly signalled its intention that universities and colleges should expect to change and broaden as education providers. In this new relationship, structures need to evolve if real change is to be delivered.

We have undergraduate and postgraduate schools. We need to consider another type of school that can offer this support for employer engagement, there is a need for a separate school that draws on the same knowledge and experience. Future Proof.

Most higher education institutions are still formed of subject-based schools or faculties with a range of supporting departments including the directorate, vice-chancellor's office, HR, finance etc., The financial model for the faculties is often pseudo-competitive with faculty managers bidding for core funding based on student recruitment and initiative funding, for example from the Higher Education Innovation Fund. Fragmentation or 'silo' behaviour is driven by the Research Assessment Exercise and other devolved funding mechanisms. The internal market precipitated by these structures does not lend itself to cross-faculty interdisciplinary working. But at the heart of the concept of the faculty will be essentially conventional and robust ideas about subject knowledge, the curriculum and disciplinary identity. These are often reinforced by the very mechanisms that seek to encourage reflection and enhancement. Professional bodies, validation and benchmarks tend to re-enforce technical rational models of knowledge, lend authority to convention and resist innovation, by favouring stable knowledge that is easy to transmit and to articulate, define and assess as a learning outcome.

Despite this, across the UK, higher education institutions have seen the benefits of developing new activity through free-standing innovation or incubation units. Although these are often closely connected with enhancing the students' experience, these units also broker partnership, manage research and Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and offer ways in which ideas being generated in academic environments, either as research and innovation projects or as part of student projects, can be situated in new non-academic (including commercial) environments. It is quite likely that it is the change in emphasis from large-scale coherent academic programme planning to outward facing and project-based activities that drive their success.

The new relationship management in higher education will be across all three axes. Ideas need to flow from bottom-up and have an impact on strategic planning in the institution. Equally academic and curriculum developers in art, design and media who often have the best developed networks with creative and cultural industry practitioners need realistic expectations of senior management and time to develop projects and programmes shaped to new consumers. In another axis agencies like Sector Skills Councils need to work as brokers in the chain, not only bringing the collaborators together but working along the chain of development from policy and funding development to design, delivery and the evaluation of effects for new consumers.

Whatever these 'units' might be and it is clear that they need 'porosity' and sit with their subject communities, they will need to evolve different ways of modelling the educational offering centered not on academic coherence to deliver long full-time courses but on business partnerships. It is not likely to matter whether the partnership is with commercial or non-commercial sub-sectors of creative and cultural industry, the consumers, or more likely collaborators, will be looking for adaptable programmes that can be delivered around their core business.

The 'front door'

We have open days and exhibitions, tonight the whole of Manchester will turn out and have a party for the private viewing, but we know we are missing opportunities to reach a different audience. Future Proof.

One of the key practical problems in building greater levels of employer engagement is our lack of a clearly marked 'front door'. The public face of most HEIs is oriented towards their biggest audience: new undergraduate entrants. The job of reaching these potential students is divided between different agencies including the individual institutions marketing the 'experience' the admissions services, careers services and issue-based agencies addressing things like widening participation or access. Whilst agencies have collected evidence that show more young people might take practical steps towards higher education if outreach and access are improved, it is entirely likely that the key audience in the Employer Engagement initiative, new entrants to higher education, are not going to be attracted in greater numbers by simply smoothing out the current processes.

Some of the problems are straightforward. For example, if I were an owner manager of a creative enterprise considering my staff development needs, who would I call at my nearest university? If I don't know the answer, would the person answering the main switchboard know? Does the university's web site carry this information? Do I call the head of the media school, the innovation unit or business services? In all likelihood, and research bears this out, most of these engagements are developed through personal networks. People in the creative industries are very good at building and exploiting these. Students and creative industry practitioners have identified network building as a key entrepreneurial skill they need to develop (ADM-HEA, 2006). However, as successful as these networks might be, they are unlikely to enable or encourage higher education institutions to build sustainable structures for employer engagement.

The first point of contact is really an indication of a wider need for an outreach programme. The government, through reports as early as the Lambert Review (HMT, 2003), then more recently the Leitch Review (Leitch, 2006) leading to the DIUS Higher Education At Work (DIUS, 2008) paper, has signalled in clear terms to employers and the higher education sector the need to join together to deliver higher level skills to the workforce. Furthermore, the government, through initiatives like the HEFCE Employer Engagement Fund, has acted to support the efforts of partners in developing projects that will deliver strategic change.

Part of the challenge for this sector will be to develop effective initiatives and strategies that deliver the 'new entrants' expected by the funders. We may be assisted in this by working with a graduate-rich workforce. Despite often hearing complaints about the weaknesses of education in providing the right learning, it is difficult to deny that the spectacular growth in the UK creative industries must be at least in part as a result of the educational experience of its workforce. As early as 1999 the Destinations and Reflections (Blackwell and Harvey, 1999) research showed that not only did most art and design graduates eventually work in related industries but were a factor in the emerging high growth of creative industries. However, new relationship management means developing credible and effective outreach programmes and this cannot be left until after the delivery of pilots, it must be part of the brand development, backed up by practical solutions to form better lines of communication between consumers and providers.

Potential and Strengths

The art and design school tradition in the UK is an exemplar of the right approach. ... the emphasis is on allowing space for imagination and creativity to flourish, alongside the development of technical skills. In particular, (courses) offer the opportunity to forge links with industry, offering 'live projects' for students and ensuring that students are taught by practitioners in their field. Staying Ahead, 2007.

The expectation for the employer engagement relationship is often expressed as a value chain with a provider delivering a service to a consumer. This may well be the relationship between the private training providers and consumers and, where training is in technical and instrumental skills based in knowledge transmission, be entirely appropriate. At Future Proof little value was seen in conceiving the Employer Engagement initiative as competing directly with private training providers and the debate suggested a far more complex and potentially fruitful set of relationships. In addition to delivering higher-level skills to industry-based participants, the signal advantage of working within higher education will be to harness other forms of knowledge creation and innovation. Participants in Future Proof identified how capacity to innovate in curriculum development should be harnessed to develop a Unique Selling Proposition (USP) for co-purchased educational experiences for adult learners in creative and cultural industries. These experiences should deliver a range of benefits centered on the experience delivering the learning outcomes rather than transmitting curriculum content.

In general terms the USP is the learning experience, typical to creative and performing arts, design and media students. It has a tradition stretching back to the medieval workshops and ateliers, it has synthesised academic models such as the Ecole des Beaux Arts in France, the Royal Academy in England and the Bauhaus in Germany. It has evolved through the trade and craft models of the Arts and Crafts movement and been integrated into the higher education system to deliver popular, credible and valuable degrees and postgraduate programmes with buoyant recruitment and enviable employability achievements. But the greatest potential is the core pedagogies of the subjects. These may be under-articulated but it is clear that co-learning, with practitioners of your craft, remains at the heart of fostering technical skill and creative thinking. The independent project, reflexive thinking and social learning that characterises the learning experience is adopted widely by other disciplines. The pedagogy lies at the heart of developing theory and practice for creativity learning across different subjects. The HEFCE funded InQbate Centre of Excellence in Teaching and Learning in Creativity adopts typical art, design and media pedagogic models to encourage creativity for engineering students. Massachusetts Institute of Technology recently held an international seminar, attended by art, design and media educators from the UK and educators from business management and engineering in the USA, to explore Project Centred Learning. Art, design and media pedagogies are adopted widely in the developing area of entrepreneurship education. Sara Sarasvathy's (Sarasvathy, 2001) effectuation theory is essentially an adaptation of Schon's (Schon, 1987) ideas of the reflexive practitioner, Allan Gibbs' advocacy of learning-by-doing (Gibb, 2005) mirrors project-based learning and David Kirby (Kirby, 2005) and David Rae's (Rae, 2003) recognition of the importance of social learning over transmission models is the basis of group and co-learning in the studio.

New learning experiences should harness existing project frameworks with proven track

records especially Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTPs). These have high credibility but have until very recently been focused on technology, engineering and management initiatives. Participants welcomed the recent announcements by the Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills that the Technology Strategy Board (TSB) will extend the projects to cover media projects but believe that KTPs should be available to any area of enterprise within the creative and cultural sectors, including those focused on social and environmental outputs or based in community interest and the public sectors. The funding of associates, the delivery of research outputs and evidence for growth in participating enterprises are seen as highly attractive and participants believe that industry partners will respond positively to approaches by collaborations aimed at delivering multi-valent benefits.

KTPs are one of several initiatives that can be harnessed to encourage greater employer engagement. The Higher Education Innovation Fund also intended to enhance the capacity of HEIs to develop and co-develop intellectual property (IP) but like KTPs has tended to focus on technological innovation, on IP rather than copyright. There is a groundswell of interest in developing value in copyright and this may prove beneficial to working across creative industries.

Innovation in the curriculum is a strength of the subjects. The practice is the core of learning in arts, design and media practice, as well as the performing arts. The workshop, studio or learning-by-doing model has always been at the core of the educational experience. There is a vast and comprehensive literature on this but what is most relevant in this discussion is the recognition that practitioners delivering the learning experience remain at the core of the pedagogy. Research shows that as much as 80% of the curriculum of some programmes is delivered by teacher-practitioners who also work in creative and cultural industries.

Across the 80 (art, design and media) departments responding to the survey an average 50% of the curriculum is delivered by specialists who work in the creative industries. Creating Entrepreneurship, 2007

Although there is evidence that it remains common practice to employ teacher-practitioners and departments cite this as one of the ways that the currency of curriculum content is maintained, the link between knowledge brought to the students' learning experience and curriculum development appears to have become attenuated. Certainly students noted that teacher-practitioners "behave like academics" and managers appear to 'protect' teacher-practitioners from administrative work, often synonymous with quality assurance and curriculum enhancement.

We are missing out on high-end commercial experience so we need to look at ways to engage teacher-practitioners. At the moment teacher-practitioners are brought in for course delivery not course design, we want to see that addressed. Future Proof.

The Design Skills Alliances' Design Skills Strategy is to develop a Visiting Design Professionals programme. This will not only strengthen existing custom and practice but will promote the engagement of senior and leading design professionals with higher education. The 'Looking-Out' research project recently commissioned by the Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS, 2008) and to be undertaken by the ADM-HEA will be focusing on "effective engagements between creative and cultural industries and higher education programmes for art, design and media". It will look at projects and initiatives that have 'flown under the radar' of the policy makers but can be shown to have significant impact on shaping the student experience. This will include a close examination of the roles of teacher-practitioners including the barriers and

opportunities for them to shape the curriculum. In a parallel but separate series of pilot projects, ADM-HEA, HEFCE and others will be exploring how new knowledge based in industry practice will be applied to curriculum development. This will include examining how continuing professional development for practice is delivered to teacher-practitioners through the activity of teaching. Although most of the work done so far has been focused on enhancing existing provision there is new work capitalising on our capacity to deliver meaningful learning and focused on workforce development through employer engagement. The Greater Manchester Strategic Alliance is developing credit bearing short courses recognised across higher education institutions in the region. The Centre of Excellence in Media Practice (CEMP) has developed credit bearing, on-line distance learning courses that will build into professional masters and doctorates for media practitioners. Finally, CEMP and ADM-HEA are working with Skillset and HEFCE to harness the network of seventeen Media Academies that have their focus on working closely with media industry throughout the UK.

Evaluation and Sustainability

It is always one of the dangers when designing assessment that we focus on what is easy to measure rather than what learners can demonstrate they have learned. Future Proof.

The employer engagement initiative aims to deliver up to 30,000 new entrants to higher education, specifically these students will not be conventional students funded through HEFCE core funding for undergraduate programmes. There were requests for clarification as to what this means in terms of full-time equivalence and more specifically there were calls for definitions for co-funding and 'co-purchasing'. HEFCE can point to information on its website on this and has signalled that it is prepared to be flexible in these early projects. The Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills has clearly stated that it wants to see experimental approaches and delegates expect some reassurance as a commensurate level of risk is acknowledged to be the consequence of experimentation. The important point in this discussion is that there might be a difference between targets to deliver X number of new entrants but not use this as the measure of effectiveness. The example of KTPs was offered, here the partnership develops new knowledge and practice and this is evidenced through research outputs (the knowledge) and growth in the participating enterprise (the practice). There was a strong indication from participants in Future Proof that each initiative should propose metrics for evaluation that measured effects rather than processes.

The discussion around additional student numbers also relates to the volumes of recruitment that might be achieved within a programme and this discussion related to the scale and diversity of creative and cultural industry. There are anxieties that the relative small scale of business, the lack of monolithic or homogenous consumers like the National Health Service or the police force might militate against initiatives for this sector. Other participants felt that although differences in practice for various sub-sectors will be a factor, the core business was sufficiently similar across groups of activities to make scalability feasible. There was also a reassurance from a representative from the Department of Culture Media and Sport who pointed out that the economic value and growth rates of creative and cultural industries make it a key target for workforce development and the department would put pressure on the DIUS if it emerged that chasing the 'bulk supplier' was exercised as the easy option.

The approach for the next three years is deliberately experimental in order to encourage the innovative capacity in higher education providers. It is an

approach that draws on insights showing that innovation in services often happens through the interactions between customers and providers. As such we are encouraging HEFCE to test and invest in a range of approaches. Higher Education at Work, 2008.

Further clarity is sought regarding Equivalent Learning Qualifications (ELQs). Delegates asked whether the new entrants are disqualified from co-funding unless they are enrolled on programmes to deliver higher-level qualifications than they currently hold and HEFCE have confirmed that ELQ is not applied to co-funding. However, in terms of sustainable development and if a co-funding model persists, this is likely to remain an issue in the development of new workforce development programmes.

The Higher Education at Work (DIUS, 2008) paper recognises that there are significant risks for higher education institutions in the development of Employer Engagement programmes and the funding is intended to address marginal cost issues. But there is a danger that demand will not be sustained beyond the three-year period and that as co-funding winds-down and co-purchasing emerges as the model for capitalising the programme potential, purchasers will diminish. This relates back to cultural change: the need to persuade creative and cultural businesses and organisations to make sustained investment in workforce development for higher education institutions to develop skills and attitudes to developing programmes that are business facing.

Evaluation of initiatives relates to issues of sustaining cultural change and relationship and management and the integration of employer engagement into institutional strategic planning and development. Evaluation processes can support changes in attitudes by employers towards higher education as a provider of workforce development and without appropriate evaluation for enhancement these sustained changes are unlikely. Issues around sustainability will be inflected in the business planning, development of USP for learning experiences and design and delivery collaboration. Without end-to-end design with tangible benefits to all collaborators, Employer Engagement could end like many initiatives, at the end of the supported period. Employer Engagement should build on existing strengths and be articulated in relation to evidence for these. Employer Engagement programmes need to have embodied within them evaluation and reflection that is aligned with their aims and that will support sustained cultural change, scalability and transferability.

Diversity and Widening Participation

Diversity is critical to the continuing success of the creative industries. The more diversity, openness and contestability are encouraged, the more likely it is that creativity will be fostered and productivity increased. The industries need to address diversity issues urgently... The Work Foundation, 2007.

Although little was said about widening participation, increasing diversity in the creative and cultural industries is a priority. Entrants to art, design and media higher education programmes by black and ethnic minorities is lower than in many other subjects and research undertaken by the Sector Skills Councils and others show their representation in the creative industry workforce is poor. This has been taken up by the National Arts Learning Network (NALN), a Life Long Learning Network and by the Sector Skills Councils but with mixed success. Some institutions have widened participation by focusing their outreach programmes and reviewing curriculum relevance. There is evidence though that even where participation by young black and Asian people is raised, new problems emerge, for example, in finding appropriate partners for work placement initiatives.

Although the focus of our employer engagement strategy is on learning and teaching, our approach will link to knowledge transfer and widening participation. A primary consideration is to meet the needs of learners as independent decision makers in their learning.
HEFCE Employer Engagement Strategy, 2006

The Sector Skills Councils have acknowledged that black and other ethnic minority groups are poorly represented in production roles throughout creative and cultural enterprises and this is hindering the development of new audiences and consumers for creative products and other outputs. Higher Education at Work, the Work Foundation and the Cultural Leadership Programme all seek to raise the levels of diversity in the sector. There are opportunities to harness Employer Engagement programmes to do this. New research show that the focus on a deficit model for addressing widening participation is failing to effect change and that in the HE context it is curriculum change that is most likely to make programmes more attractive to black and ethnic minority groups. There might be good reason to suppose that as the same deficit models are applied to recruitment to creative and cultural industries, a similar, more structural adjustment will be required to enhance diversity in the work place. Whilst other routes into production roles are being developed, including the new 14-19 Creative and Media Diploma and National Apprenticeships, it likely that a degree programme will remain a significant route of entry to creative roles in the industries. Delivering higher diversity as a joint initiative by industry and education is a favoured route and, whilst an aim to widen participation may not be a feature of all programmes, it should be accepted that some may focus on black and ethnic minority groups within the wider workforce wanting to develop production roles in the creative and cultural sector.

Diversity enriches our society and communities. But it is also a creative and business imperative. The creative industries suffer when they cannot draw on our creative people, whatever their ethnicity, gender or location. Yet the industries don't always reflect that diversity in their own employment practices. *Creative Britain, 2008.*

4.0 Recommendations

It is likely that development of Employer Engagement will be a collaborative enterprise between the partners and will include a role for brokers. Existing and new networks and communities of practice will 'own' the programmes.

Programmes developed for new learning experiences for workforce development will be developed collaboratively. The Sector Skills Councils can act as brokers in collaborations but there will be other regional agencies with sound connections to potential partners in creative and cultural industries.

The programmes for employer engagement are aimed at (re)introducing the workforce to learning that delivers higher level skills aimed at enhancing personal development and growth of creative and cultural enterprise. Programmes will be innovative and based on curriculum design rather than curriculum content.

Delivery of learning will be end-to-end with learning outcomes for all the collaborators. The programmes should be credit rated but not necessarily lead directly to qualifications. New models of learning and assessment will be designed and will address forms of flexible delivery, including distance learning, and group and team learning.

Existing models for developing new knowledge through learning will be extended to workforce development. In particular, Future Proof welcomes the formation of the Knowledge Transfer Network for creative industries and the announcement of the Arts and Humanities Research Council's (AHRC) Creative Economy Programme. However, there is a need to avoid constraining new KTPs to working with new technology solutions.

Higher and further education institutions need to integrate employer engaged workforce development into strategic planning. While the design and development maybe at the level of course development, senior management at vice-chancellor/director level needs to be behind the development. Sector agencies including HEFCE need to encourage buy-in by senior management.

There is a need for greater clarity on future funding. Employer Engagement will be sustainable if senior management is confident of up-front investment. HE sector agencies and the DIUS need to either commit to long-term co-funding streams or identify strategies for sustainable co-purchase. Creative and Cultural industry development agencies, especially Sector Skills Agencies, need to turn the demand being expressed by employers into collaborative action leading to real programmes.

The 'units of delivery' within the institution need to be identified. It is unlikely that the existing faculty or school can 'hold' these programmes. Innovation units, enterprise offices and other free-standing units may be the appropriate department to design and manage new business-facing programmes. However, the opportunity may be to conceive of a new type of school that links new knowledge development back to the wider student experience.

Outreach and marketing of the Unique Selling Proposition of Employer Engagement in workforce development is urgently needed. The USP will be based on existing and demonstrable expertise and potential that is, at the moment, poorly articulated to creative and cultural industry.

Metrics and evaluation for Employer Engagement initiatives need to be aligned to the aims of the programme and will deliver new entrants to higher education. Evaluation should be criteria (evidence) based rather than process (target) based. Evaluation should be reflective and aimed at enhancement, sustainability and transfer.

To effect real change in widening participation and increase diversity in education and in industry there need to be structural and cultural changes in both contexts, as the deficit model approach (including 'aspiration raising') have proved ineffective.

5.0 Appendix

5.1 Bibliography

ADM-HEA, (2007), *Creating Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurship Education for the Creative Industries*, University of Brighton, Brighton.

Blackwell, A. and Harvey, L., (1999), *Destinations and Reflections: Careers of art, craft and design graduates*. Birmingham, Centre for Research into Quality.

Cox, Sir G. (2005), *Cox Review of Creativity in Business: Building on the UK's Strengths*, HMT, London.

Creative and Cultural Skills, (2007), *The Creative Blueprint, The Sector Skills Agreement for the Creative and Industries: UK Document*, CCS, London.

Department of Culture Media and Sport, (1998, 2001), *Creative Industries Mapping Document*, DCMS, London.

Department of Culture Media and Sport, (2008), *Creative Britain: New Talents for a New Economy*, DCMS, London.

Department of Universities, Innovation and Skills, (2008a), *The New University Challenge*, DIUS, London.

Department of Universities, Innovation and Skills, (2008b), *Higher Education at Work: High Skills: High Value*, DIUS, London.

Design Skills Alliance, (2008), *The Design Skills Blueprint*, Design Council, London.

Gibb, A. (2005), *Towards the Entrepreneurial University: Entrepreneurship Education as the Lever for Change*, NCGE Policy Paper 3, NCGE, Birmingham.

Kirby, D. (2005), *A Case for Entrepreneurship in Higher Education*, University of Surrey, available at: www.heacademy.ac.uk/946.htm

HM Treasury, (2003), *The Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration*, HMT, London

Leitch, S. (2006), *Prosperity for all in the global economy - world class skills* (the Leitch Review), HMT, London.

National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts, (2006), *Creating Growth: How the UK Can Develop World Class Creative Businesses*, NESTA, London.

Purnell, J., (2005), 'Making Britain the world's creative hub', keynote speech to the IPPR event, 6 March 2005, available online (accessed 28.03.06) at: http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/press_notices/archive_2005/purnell_creative_inds_speech.htm

Rae, D. (2003), 'Opportunity Centred Learning: An Innovation in Enterprise Education?', *Education and Training*, Vol. 45, no. 8-9.

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001), 'What makes Entrepreneurs Entrepreneurial' <http://www.effectuation.org/ftp/What%20makes%20entrs%20entl%20note.pdf>

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001), 'Causation and Effectuation: Towards a Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency', *The Academy of Management Review*, Apr 2001, Vol.26, No.2, ABI/INFORM Global pg. 243

<http://fp.tm.tue.nl/ecis/EcisA12004/sarasvathy.pdf>

Schumpeter, J. A. (1996), *The Theory of Economic Development*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1934, Stockholm.

Travers, T. (2006), *Museums and Galleries in Britain, Economic, Social and Creative Impacts*, National Museum Directors' Conference and Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, London

The Work Foundation, (2007), *Staying Ahead: The Economic Performance of the UK's Creative Industries*, London

Web sites

ADM-HEA, Higher Education Academy Art Design Media Subject Centre
<http://www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk>

Arts Council, Cultural Leadership Programme
<http://www.culturalleadership.org.uk/fullpage/default.asp>

Creative and Cultural Skills, Sector Skills Council
<http://www.ccskills.org.uk>

Design Council, Design Skills Alliance
<http://www.designcouncil.org.uk>

Higher Education Funding Council for England, Strategic Development Fund for Employer Engagement
<http://www.hefce.ac.uk>

Life Long Learning Networks
<http://www.lifelonglearningnetworks.org.uk>

PALATINE, Higher Education Academy Subject Centre for Dance, Drama and Music
<http://www.palatine.ac.uk>

Skillfast-UK, Sector Skills Council
<http://www.skillfast-uk.org>

Skillset, Sector Skills Council
<http://www.skillset.org>

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Cambridge MIT Institute: Project Centered Learning Symposium: <http://web.mit.edu/cmi/ue/workshop2008>

5.2 Contributors to Future Proof

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Anne Applebaum	Artsmark Officer	Arts Council England
Keith Bartlett	Deputy Principal	Norwich School of Art & Design
Carolyn Bew	Academic Developer	ADM-HEA Subject Centre
Dr Jos Boys	CETLD Senior Research Fellow	Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Through Design (CETLD) University of Brighton
Julia Calver	Sector Officer, Culture, Media, Sport and the Arts	West Yorkshire Life-long Learning Network, Leed Metropolitan University
Dr Ben Calvert	Associate Dean of Faculty	School of Art, Design and Media, University of Gloucestershire
David Clews	Subject Centre Manager	ADM-HEA Subject
Patricia Cooper	Associate Dean Undergraduate Programme	School of Art and Design University of Wolverhampton
Rosy Crehan	Act. Dean and Campus Director	School of Arts and Education, Middlesex University
Jean Dyson	Study Support Tutor	Centre for Learner Development, University of Wolverhampton
Gavin Freeborn	Cultural Partnerships Officer	Leeds Metropolitan University
Dr Julia Gaimster	Academic Development & Quality Manager	School of Fashion Promotion & Management London College of Fashion,
Prof. David Hayward	Head of Art	Canterbury Christ Church University
Laura Hirst	FE and Student Liaison Manager	Centre for Professional Learning from the Workplace (PLW), University of Westminster
Louise Howson	Co-ordinator Creative Industries	Curriculum Group Progress 2 Succeed, Southampton Solent University
Ursula Hudson	Director	Fashion Business Resource Studio London College of Fashion,
Lucy Jenks	Lifelong Learning Co-ordinator	South East London Lifelong Learning Network (SELLLN), University of London, Goldsmiths
Dr Bob Jerrard	Emeritus Professor	Birmingham City University
Dr Mike Kent	Research Officer	ADM-HEA Subject Centre
Stephen Mallinder	Project Manager	ADM-HEA Subject Centre
Lesley Morris	Campaign Leader, Design Skills	The Design Council

Kate O'Connor	Executive Director of Policy & Development (Dep. CEO)	Skillset
Jamie Petrie	Head of Qualifications and Standards	Skillfast-UK
Professor Rod Pilling	Dean, Faculty of Media, Arts and Society	Southampton Solent University
Victoria Pirie	Executive Director Partnerships and Strategy	Creative & Cultural Skills
Martin Price	Sector Leader for Cultural & Creative Industries	Coventry and Warwickshire Lifelong Learning Network, Coventry TechnoCentre
Ann Priest	Dean of School of Art & Design	Nottingham Trent University
Liam Scanlan	Director of the School of Media	The Arts Institute at Bournemouth
Tim Scott	Education and Skills Manager	Department for Culture Media and Sport
Alison Shreeve	Director	Creative Learning in Practice (CLIP-CETL) London College of Fashion,
Brenda Sparkes	Chair	Association of Fashion and Textile Courses
Mark Stone	Director	HELP CETL, University of Plymouth
Prof. Anita Taylor	Vice Principal	Wimbledon College of Art, University of the Arts, London
Jared Taylor	Senior Lecturer for Animation	Ravensbourne College of Design & Communication
Hugh Tollyfield	Special Adviser - Employer Engagement	HEFCE
Bland Tomkinson	Representing Heads of	Educational Development Group (HEDG) University of Manchester
Cath Walsh	Director	Greater Manchester Strategic Alliance (GMSA)
Jo Walter	Head of Quality	Swansea Metropolitan University
Jon Wardle	Deputy Director	CEMP CETL, Bournemouth Media School, Bournemouth University
Prof. M. Wayman	Pro-Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculty	Faculty of Art & Design, Manchester Metropolitan University

Art Design Media Subject Centre
The Higher Education Academy

University of Brighton
68 Grand Parade
Brighton BN2 9JY
Telephone +44 (0)1273 643119
Fax +44 (0)1273 643429
adm@heacademy.ac.uk
www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk

