University of Huddersfield Repository

Hunt, Emma

A Critical Analysis of Key Policy Documents to inform the Strategic Choices available to the Higher Education Art and Design Sector for the next five year

Original Citation

Hunt, Emma (2010) A Critical Analysis of Key Policy Documents to inform the Strategic Choices available to the Higher Education Art and Design Sector for the next five year. Working Paper. University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, UK. (Unpublished)

This version is available at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/11979/

http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/

A Critical Analysis of Key Policy Documents to inform the Strategic Choices available to the Higher Education Art and Design Sector for the next five years

Emma Hunt

DBA 8

8/1/2010

INTRODUCTION

The Academy is changing: either through rehearsed debates on globalisation, marketisation, new public managerialism, and social mobility or through more recent challenges beset by fiscal, political, economic and social issues. In this context the role of the 21st Century University is under scrutiny, every aspect is being questioned, and whilst this is challenging it can also bring about a new freshness in thinking and ideas that might enable a different, but positive approach to Higher Education. Equally other aspects of social and economic life are being tested due to the current economic climate.

The aim of this paper is to investigate what these changes mean to the Art and Design Higher Education sector, in terms of curriculum developments and its relationship to the employability agenda and the creative economy. The paper draws upon recent public documents on the Arts, Skills, Higher Education, and Creative Industries in the context of the economy. The challenge is to provide a set of recommendations on the strategic choices available to the HE Art and Design Sector for the next five years, and that these may also become the bedrock for the future of the 21st century art school in the UK. Writing this paper coincided with major changes in public finances, a recession and a change of government and as a consequence keeping abreast of these fast moving changes was challenging in its own right. Whilst other messages were being delivered on the economy and education there has been relatively little new announcements regarding the Creative Industries, (since the general election) the most recent being the CBI's blueprint for the Creative Industries and some short comments in the Prime Minister's speech on the economy:

"We are determined that (the economy) should change. That doesn't mean picking winners but it does mean supporting growing industries, aerospace, pharmaceuticals, high value manufacturing, hi tech engineering, low carbon technology. ..And all the knowledge based businesses including the creative industries" (PM 28/5/10…no 10 news website REF)

The last ten years has seen the rise and importance of a phenomena known as the Creative Industries as a perceived new super economic power when the manufacturing and service industries went into decline (FLORIDA :2005). The former Labour Government established the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and set about defining the Creative Industries and ensured its focused support to the economy:

> The Creative industries are those industries that are based on individual creativity, skill and talent. They are also those that have the potential to create wealth, and jobs through developing intellectual property. (DCMS website 2005 document)

DCMS shares the responsibility for the creative industries with the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) which has as its mission to:

> Build a dynamic and competitive UK economy by creating the conditions for business success, promoting innovation, enterprise and science and giving everyone the skills and opportunities to succeed. To achieve this we will foster world class universities and promote an open global economy. (BIS 14/2/2010 website)

Often quoted statistics demonstrate that the Creative Industries are a success story for Britain:

> The creative industries together combine a Gross Added Value (GVA) of 6.4% to the UK economy in 2006 and grew by an average of 4% per annum between 1997 and 2006, which compares to an average of 3% for the whole economy over this period. In 2007, total revenue across the creative industries amounted to some £67.5bn. (TSB CREATIVE INDUSTRIES TECHONOLOGY STRATEGY 2009-10)

The Creative Industries became embedded in many University structures (some faculties being renamed for example as the Faculty of Creative and Cultural industries and also became a priority area for drawing down external funding in response to diversifying income streams in Higher Education. With the growing focus on diversified income streams through enterprising and entrepreneurial activities there is a natural engagement with the Creative Industries and the knowledge economy in an attempt to support the rhetoric about increasingly global concerns for Universities to be part of the solution for economic recovery. Art and Design Higher Education in the UK holds a unique position in global creative education and has arguably helped the UK capitalise on the rise of the creative industries as a major economic force. (CROSSICK 1/6/10). One reason for this success is the diverse landscape in which the Higher Education Art and Design system operates, from niche specialist colleges, to multi – faculty universities, (either ex polytechnics or more established research universities) and a large proportion of Art and Design Higher Education in Further Education colleges.

Changes to Higher Education are being formulated by the new Coalition government in response to reducing public spending, and the new Minister for Higher Education ,David Willets, having clear views on Higher Education which includes maintaining its world class provision, and the value of the student experience, quality and graduate outcomes. Vince Cable the new BIS minister is equally clear on his priorities where Higher Education policy concerns his department (POLICY REVIEW TV – HE FUTURES CONFERENCE 23/6/10)). However, whilst the inputs might be challenging in terms of public finance the new government maintains a position on the importance of the outputs, e.g. skills, employability, the innovative economy, the transformative experience and accessibility.

The public spending cuts also involve the arts and design and in particular the Arts Council and Design Council both of which has had a traditional longstanding symbiotic relationship with Higher Education Art and Design involving projects that support the value of a creative education, audience development, and skills development amongst other things. The Arts council has had a very public and rigorous review and consultation over the last year, but the announcement of the Design Council review was more discreet and barely noticeable.

" The background to the review is the Government commitment to reduce the number and cost of quangos as well as to consider the implementation of the March 2010 Dyson report which recommended a review of the funding, objectives and impact of the Design Council" (BIS 16/7/10)

It would be easy to feel a certain amount of threat to Art and Design Higher Education in this context, where the main themes emerging seem to support Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) subjects over those in the Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts subjects. This paper therefore aims to look at a selection of the relevant current literature/policy documents to analyse and find a way forward for a contemporary Art and Design Higher Education sector which helps to crystallise why this subject is deemed important for study and analysis.

Literature Review

This literature review aims to discuss the range of topics contributing to the debate on Higher Education Art and Design and its relationship to the creative economy. I have included some elements, on key issues and texts on the 21st century University because this helps to inform the debate on the future of Higher Education and the current policy debates in government. Within the mix of literature there are interesting texts on entrepreneurship and enterprise contributing to the modern university and its role in society and the economy, and

therefore also being an important factor of the innate skills found within Higher Education Art and Design disciplines. The review is limited in its scope to recent and current policy documents as it would be impossible to draw upon the range of literature regarding creative learning, tacit knowledge and cultural studies all of which are very important to a creative education and has some resonance with the debate on the value of a creative education, but this paper is focusing mainly on the literature that helps to identify the future strategic direction for Art and Design Higher Education. Three main sections form the literature review which concerns current thinking on the role of Higher Education, the Creative Industries and Skills and Employability which are considered relevant to providing the context to the strategic developments. The final part of the literature considers some of the policy analysis framework concepts that have informed my critique of the documents.

The policy analysis is best framed within current context of public spending cuts and reviews, however much of the literature scoping the notion and purpose of a different 21st century university was written in more favourable times. Although issues of mass higher education and globalisation were driving the perceived need for change rather than one of funding crises, it was still clear that most governments could not afford the rate of growth demanded of the sector and the rise of the entrepreneurial university became a global concept to support the idea of the university in the 21st century. Beecher states "an increasing emphasis in government policy and rhetoric on the vocational functions of Higher Education in terms of both of its role in supplying qualified students for the professionals, industry and commerce and in terms of its research function. This has meant a de-emphasising of other roles, those concerned with the general development of an individuals minds and capabilities, contributing culturally to the community of enhancing knowledge and understanding for their own sakes rather than utilitarian ends" (Beecher: 2001 :5) This is a convincing argument as to why University disciplines were changing and largely supports the art and design sector in its recent developments for supplying a chain of graduates to work in

the creative industries. (Ball:2010) but it fails to articulate how beneficial a vocational education might be to the economy.

There have been great imperatives for universities to change, as Barnett acknowledges "we can say that the university as such is finding a new habitus, a new location in society, a new ordering of its perceived value, and a new register of meaning and understanding across its now enlarged audience" (Barnett 2000:13). Barnett notes that the situation is super complex often going beyond all the traditional forms of reference that universities have been working towards and that these multiple frames of reference are often conflicting (Barnett quoted in Rowlands:2006:5). These have been played out in the Art and Design sector as it increased the numbers studying art and design through widening participation schemes, whilst also responding to the enterprise and employability agenda. These changes have included industry related research, consultancy, technology transfer, lifelong learning and continuing professional practice, international students, franchising, and commercialisation of resources (Davies 2001) and encapsulate a focus on being entrepreneurial so as to avoid reliance on public funding. This is an important point within Art and Design Higher Education sector, as the tendency to think of the subject discipline as being inherently entrepreneurial though the development of ideas generation and creativity has, it could be argued, at times stifled any new thinking within staff teams or the curriculum. Conversely on a positive note the way in which Art and Design Higher Education is taught has been very much engaged with industry and business from the outset.(Clews:2009) By their very nature, Art and Design students deal with speculative and divergent ideas, the negotiation of uncertainties and ambiguities. The knowledge – base is contingent, moving across boundaries to make new connections. (Jackson: 2006: 110) and enabling entrepreneurial thinking.

Much of the literature in the past ten years has been around managing a successful university and its perceived purpose, including being entrepreneurial in its outlook. (Shattock: 2003). Key questions such as 'what is higher education? what is a university? how is the concept of Higher Education and the nature of higher education institutions changing? and what might they become in 2025 (Warner and Palfreyman: 2001; p 4) is typical of many authors concerns. The conclusions drawn from the literature on the purpose of the 21st century suggests that there are elements that need further consideration such as cross disciplinary working, and entrepreneurial and creative thinking as being fundamental to the sector delivering on the government agenda on economic revival and future employment.

The engagement of business and industry either to be entrepreneurial or to ensure 'work ready' graduates is a consistent theme. More recently there has been literature that challenges how repeatedly the Creative Industries are forced into models of entrepreneurship and knowledge transfer , for example ,those devised for science and technology (Crossick:2006) that are not appropriate for the type of future learning for the creative industries sector. A belief in the innate creative potential of the individual appears to be at the heart of the creative education studied in the UK. (Jackson: 2006: 117) and endorsed in part by the Lambert report (2003) encouraging businesses and universities to work closely together and supplemented by the Cox report (2005) and more recently the Leitch report on skills (2006).   A critical look at the literature on the skills agenda demonstrates mixed camps as to its purpose in a university and the importance linked to the future knowledge based society. It's important to consider some of this literature in light of its contribution to the analysis of the strategic choices available to the Art and Design sector.

The skills agenda can add up to a complex range of mechanical sounding metaphors: 'Learning is 'delivered' when teaching is 'rolled out' in accordance with 'benchmarks' and have an impact on students who are 'tracked' to ensure

'driving up standards'.   Research outputs are required to fill state 'gaps'. (Rowlands: 2006:7) and as such denies the concept of learning as an unpredictable process similar to the creative process in art and design. Rowlands continues to debate the differences of discipline in implementing government policy on skills and of the difficulty of sharing a Higher Education understanding to present to the public when there are such great differences between subjects. (Rowlands 2006:9) I concur with much of what Rowlands writes about the difficulties and the opportunities and it starts to identify where the gaps in curriculum knowledge for the 21st century lie.   The idea of categorising knowledge into disciplines is being challenged, and is potentially outmoded for this century. This challenge can lead to exciting opportunities. The way in which universities organise knowledge is changing. (Rowlands 2006:14)

In a recent document produced for the government when in opposition James Dyson (2010)) talks about exploiting knowledge through collaboration and not competition between universities , businesses and not for profit organisations (Dyson: 2010 :5),again developing the argument for interdisciplinary skills and collaboration between disciplines, sometimes known as 'boundary spanners' (NESTA 2009) is a useful indicator of current thinking.   Again supported by Rowlands who advocates for a interdisciplinary transfer of theoretical concepts and frameworks although he recognises that it is not always easily agreed upon by the different disciplines involved, and yet is often seen to have great advantage for new discoveries. There are problems with the loss of identity and professional role (Rowlands :2006;25) which further exasperate the tensions between the purpose of a University to provide intellectual theoretical and critical knowledge are contested by the economic, practical, and services felt on the other hand… sometimes known as the skills agenda.   (Rowlands 2006:45) Identifying this as a problem of the perceived separation of knowledge and skill is a critical point in the literature, as Dyson also argues that there should no longer be a distinction between a 'hands and a brain' person (DYSON 2010) which in fact has been part of the tradition of art and design education, or all vocational

education, or learning by doing. Whilst attempting to secure a future for art and design by not lobbying for the past these tensions need to be addressed and overcome.

The challenge for the art and design sector has been to capture the focus in the past ten years on the creative industries, and to work with other disciplines such as technology business, computing and engineering who also quickly moved into the space that was for a long time seen to be the preserve of the arts. The Creative Industries gave the art and design sector a status that it had not previously enjoyed in the merged and new university sector whose purpose tended not to favour the vocational creative arts. Often criticised for being different and non conformist, all of a sudden they had centre stage as being a potential solution to the growing creative economy. Staff and students regularly focused on 'originality and adventure on the importance of 'seeing things differently', pushing boundaries, making connections and working in ways which were 'wild', crazy, or unorthodox. Its about lateral thinking , distance form the origin, pushing all ideas good and bad with a belief in producing something of interest and desire'. (Jackson. 2006:111) these approaches are often out of kilter with systems designed to measure and count and attribute success through monetary gain or designated key performance indicators in the new accountability era of higher education. (Birnbaum:2000)

The literature is vast on Higher Education management, Higher Education futures and the Creative Industries generally, but the gap in the literature seems to be how they can all relate and understand one another to the advantage of the economy. The 'wild, crazy and unorthodox' teaching methodologies do not translate easily into typical working patterns, methods of accountability and quantitative data to support the industry. Yet at the same time, blueprints, policy documents and statements of intent all cry out for Higher Education to radically change its way of working to improve the economy, to be innovative, and at the same time utilise the recession to find new ways of working, business models to

support the new industry and new jobs that emerge from the creative industries. The next section attempts to focus on some of the features of creativity that will help direct the focus of a creative curriculum and its potential for development within the employability and creative economy.

Many books and articles have attempted to analyse creativity, whether it can be learnt or if it is inherent in everyone. This paragraph encapsulates much of the literature on the subject.

Features of creativity:
- Being imaginative, generating new ideas, thinking out of the boxes we normally inhabit, looking beyond the obvious, seeing the world in different ways so that it can be explored and understood better

- Being original – this embodies
  - the quality of newness, for example inventing and producing new things or adapting things that someone else has invented; doing things no one has done before, and things doing things that have been done before differently
  - the idea of significance – there are different levels and notions of significance but utility and value are integral to the idea.
  - exploring , experimenting and taking risks

- skills in critical thinking and critical synthesis – the ability to process and analyse data/situations/ideas/contexts and to see the world differently as a result

- communication – often through story telling that helps people see the world you have created or helps you see the worlds of others
(Jackson ed. 2006:119)

These features of creativity are important to note when reviewing the chosen policy documents as they are all referred to in one way or another as being the attributes needed for successful business, for being innovative and creative. The four documents I have chosen to analyse presented a problem as they do not fit readily into a literature review as such, as they form the main part of the research and analysis, so I have looked at the policy analysis literature to find a suitable research method for policy analysis but also to put it into context of what and why do an analysis of policy. The Oxford English Dictionary states that policy is:

'a course of action adopted and pursued by government, party or ruler, statesmen etc any course of action adopted as advantageous or expedient'

And so the simple explanation is that policy analysis will review the decisions made in the course of the actions taken and invariably will change over time. (Hill: 1997)

Originally the work of Fairclough on analysing discourse was thought to be an appropriate methodology but on reflection this would not provide the sort of framework I was looking for (Fairclough 2009) as a concentration on language and linguistics would potentially deter from the content of the documents. Fairclough asserts that 'language is a irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language' (Fairclough 2009:2) whilst it is difficult to argue against this statement it did not provide the context I was looking for.

Spickler introduced a more coherent approach to concepts, methods and skills required for policy analysis in practice which seemed far more appropriate and was able to distinguish between analysis of policy and analysis for policy. (Spickler: 2006) The purpose of this paper to find new directions for Art and

Design Higher Education than a strict analysis of policy (at a local level or nationally) and Spickler's approach seemed readily more assessable and enabling in helping to make decisions for the future. The book is largely focused around public administration and also borrows from social policy and therefore makes a good connection between the two focused areas. The assertion that many of the skills of a researcher can also be applied to policy analysis was evident in the gathering of the evidence and the judgements that could be made at the end. (Spickler:2006:13) The policy documents reviewed have ideas taken from a wide range of sources, ' agencies, coalitions of interests, networks ' which supports the policy formulation (Spickler:2006) so I focused mainly on the structure of policy analysis that Spickler developed into six points to lead into results for further decision making,

1. Assessment of the environment (decisions have to be made in the light of existing situations)
2. The identification of aims and objectives (aims and values have to be identified and established as criteria by which decisions can be subsequently be evaluated)
3. Consideration of the alternative methods which are available.(different ways of achieving the aims and objectives identified. This is a question of what is possible)
4. Selection of methods. (the possible consequences of all the possible methods are judged against the aims and objectives in order to decide their likely effectiveness. The selection of particular methods of working is then guided by consideration of efficiency and practical constraints.
5. Implementation. (the policy is put into practice)
6. Evaluation. (The consequences of policy are monitored, and fed back into a re- assessment of the environment – at which point the assessment begins again. (Spickler :2006:33)

A similar Eightfold path has been developed by Bardach (Bardach: 2009) but I adapted Spickler for my own needs as an aid to appraisal but found it fell short of a meaningful structure, and did not allow multiple policies to be contrasted or to show where areas of conflict may emerge, instead this came naturally from my own reading and note making, thus making it in turn a form of literature review. This method is attempting to show concern for the content and how it influences the Art and Design Higher Education community.

' some invariably show concern for the content too but they are mainly interested in uncovering the various influences on policy formulation. Studies of the policy process are often concerned with single issues of this kind or with specific policy areas, but they may also focus on the policy process within an organisation or on the influences on policy within a particular community of society' (Hill: 1997)

If we assume that policy derives from government and the need to influence and in the majority of cases takes an interventionist approach to stimulate and promote change, the ensuing cuts in the public sector means that changes will have to take place. In the NESTA discussion paper (Blunt:2010)' it points out that the crisis facing the public services is not just a financial one but even before the recession services were struggling to respond to changing needs and expectations that were leading to increasingly high demand(and higher costs) . Traditional models of service delivery – the state delivering to essentially passive citizens – were already unsustainable' (p4) an important point in my thinking after the analysis was in using innovation to transform public services, and in this case Higher Education art and design -as suggested by NESTA – although the barriers to innovation are significant as discussed later. There is considerable agreement in the literature that the creative industries policy and Higher Education policy can be matched to find solutions to the future economic needs of Higher Education Art and Design, but there is little in the way of actual recommendations which the research seeks to address.

The four policy documents are:

1. Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy (DCMS 2008)
2. New Industry New Jobs – one year on (HM Government 2010)
3. Unlocking the potential of the cultural and creative industries (EC Green paper 2010)
4. Creative Industries 2009 – 2012 (Technology Strategy Board)

These were chosen particularly for their currency, and the focus on the creative industries/creative economy and employability issues in giving a strategic steer to those working in the creative field, and their relationship to the literature review. Policy documents relating to Higher Education were ignored due to the timing of the new government announcing its priorities for the year's ahead, but also because it enabled recommendations to be made without any bias towards Higher Education funding.

Adapting a schematic from the TSB (TSB 2009 :20) helps to put into context the range of documents/government departments, sub groups and Higher Education Art and Design discipline groups that these documents currently sit within.

Government departments – pre election	Sector specific government agencies	Research and innovation support	Business support	skills	HE A&D groups	Mission groups CEP projects?
DCMS	Film council	TSB	RDAs	Skillset	ADM-HEA	UUK
BIS	Design Council	AHRC	Business Link	CCSS	CHEAD	Guild HE
UKTI	Fashion	ERSC			GLAD	

	Council					
HEFCE	Arts Council	NESTA			UKAIDIA	
	Crafts Council				Links groups	
EU	Museums, Archives and Libraries					

Tabulated below is the policy environment (TSB :2009:28) to provide a contextual overview of the last ten years.

1997 – Creative Industries task force created to increase awareness of economic importance of creative industries

2001 – 5 – Digital Television project – joint industry and government for digital switchover

2005 – Creative economy programme established

2007 – Staying Ahead report (Will Hutton – The Work Foundation)

2008 – Creative Britain : New Talents for the New Economy published: cross government strategy for creative industries

2009 – Digital Britain

2009 –Creative industries 2009 - 2012 (Technology strategy board –)

2010 – New Industry New Jobs: One year on (HM Government)

2010 – EC Green Paper Unlocking the Potential of cultural and creative industries

2010 – Coalition government formed

Appendix one shows the detailed processing and interpretation of the data, this section of the paper is a brief overview of the main themes in each of the four documents. The detailed design of the policy analysis was aimed at seeking to answer the research question and pull out key features and empirical issues in all four documents.

Creative Industries Technology Strategy Board

This strategy written from 2009 until 2012 reinforces the need for the UK to remain a global leader in the creative industries. It demonstrates leadership through the success of the economic growth of the sector in comparison to other sectors, in particular the decline of manufacturing. Of all the documents it shows the clearest understanding of a sector that is difficult to measure and capture in normal economic terms, because it tends to be made up of small and medium sized businesses that are quickly flexible and adaptable. It naturally concentrates on the technology sector of the creative industries and challenges the traditional content production, through to distribution as not being sustainable as new business models are sought to add value to the creative content end. Skills and training are mentioned as important for businesses and education to work together as a way of multi and cross disciplinary innovation and enterprise.

EC Green Paper Unlocking Potential of Cultural and Creative Industries

This paper suggests that the EC is late to the party! It recognised the importance of the creative and cultural industries to the economy and as a consultation document is asking for ways to ensure competitiveness in the global market. It seeks to address issues around ensuring society is creative, that business and education work together and to find new jobs and skills that will focus on developing policy for the globalisation era. It draws on many other creative industries reports and highlights the UK as being particularly successful in its education and business relationships. The highlighted challenge is to find new business models that support the creative content/originators. There is an emphasis on social as well as economic benefits alongside city and urban regeneration. It concludes that a way forward is to strengthen the link between education, training and Creative and Cultural Industries.

New Industry, New Jobs – one year on

This document attempts to set out an agenda for equipping Britain to succeed in a rapidly changing global economy. It debates the arguments for a free market

and government intervention in fiscally constrained times. It aims to pull together business, education, and research and innovation policy so ensure economic competitiveness. It aims to have a diversified economy and build on new areas of work such as digital, creative, environmental, and low carbon etc. A focus on higher level skills, a world leading university system, the need for more engagement with STEM subjects, innovation, infrastructure ,and access to international and new markets. This was published two months before the new coalition government was elected.

Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy

This document also refers back to the Staying Ahead report (Work Foundation 2007) and draws upon many of its assertions on the economic performance of the UKs creative industries. It states the facts about economic growth and the need to maintain a strong global position and to move the creative industries from the margins into the mainstream. This is the oldest document (2008) reviewed but many of the aims are for a ten year period. Its vision is that Britain will be driven by creativity and innovation, and attempts to focus on key strategic areas that will unlock creative talent through skills, education, business growth and support for new models of attaching monetary value to creativity. Some of the interventions have been achieved, such as commissioning research by the Higher Education Academy: Art, Design and Media subject centre to investigate the links between industry and Higher Education and establishing a creative careers website. However recently the new government has reviewed some of the quangos that would have supported these developments (such as the regional development agencies) and these no longer exist, which puts this documents vision into jeopardy.

Analysis

The four documents all have several aims in common and it's these that will form the basis of my recommendations to the sector, and a potential to implement

them in my own School of Art, Design and Architecture. Six key themes have emerged in the right hand column (see appendix 1) and the recurrent frequency that these are mentioned give weight to their perceived importance and provide a way forward from the literature review to answering the research question. . Each will be discussed in turn.

1. **The Global Economy.**   This is seen as a threat, a panic, to keep up with the rest of the world, particularly in relation to the Creative and Cultural Industries as one of the fastest growing economic areas. The great opportunity to maximise the world consumer market for various creative content, service and distribution.   Drawing on the Higher Education literature it shares common themes, where technology driven curriculum, mass consumption all create opportunities and threats on the world stage. Each of the four documents state the success of the UK creative industries so far but each is tinged with the threat that we need to become more mainstream in our support of the creative industries and not allow it to languish in the margins. All differ in their approach to how this should happen. The most overt document TSB, suggests that only technology is the saviour and warns of implications for failure to keep abreast the fast moving technology. All mention new consumers and new markets with the EC document being the most concerned about piracy, and needing to find ways of attributing value to the creative originators of content that cannot be copied. This is also seen as an opportunity of opening up new markets and new types of consumers such as those who engage in their own user generated content and social networking. Mobility of artists is only mentioned in the EC document as a key issue for the success of bringing an international, or at least a European dimension to the easy mobility of creative individuals that will inspire and innovate cross cultural creative practices.

2. **The Digital and Technological Economy**. A main concern with all documents is the speed of technological advancement and the need to keep up to pace with change. Most creative industries are small enterprises and are quick to move with change but do not always have the capacity to update on new technology or software. More positively they are flexible in approach because of the fragmentation of the industry from content, to service to distribution. The supply chain is fragmented and has its own sub sectors making it difficult to capture in economic terms. Opportunities lie with the cross over technologies between sub sectors and disciplines and industries. For example using manufacturing processes for the film industries, or 3D visualisation skills from the video industry into complex systems understanding.

3. **Collaboration, partnerships and linkages**. All of the documents call for collaborations and partnerships as a way of ensuring competitiveness. These collaborations take many forms, either between businesses and education, small and larger companies, SMEs and cultural institutions such as museums and galleries or between arts and science. There seems to be a general and uncontested sense that collaboration and partnerships will bring new innovations, new markets and growth. All the collaborations are justified in relationship to the economic advantage that can be had either through allowing the market to dictate or by reducing the amount of public interventions necessary.

4. **New business models.** This is the 'Holy Grail' of all the documents. The real problem is finding ways to attribute value and monetary gain to a fast moving and elusive industry. All the reports state the need to find appropriate new business models that will be acceptable to new consumers, to user generators, and to the creative's that does not devalue original content creation. New Business models are important to government as they provide real opportunities for further economic

expansion. In all documents they state this desire but none of them have the solution, it seems that business and academia are targeted to find the solution. Intellectual Property Rights forms the cornerstone of all the debates.

5. **Education, skills and training**. The most important aspect as far as this paper is concerned, but also greatly integrated with the other areas. There is a mismatch between the acknowledgement of the role the UKs art and design schools have played in creating the new talent and jobs in the creative sector with the governments desire to support greater engagement with STEM subjects. All documents focus on the excellence and the need to continue to have 'beacons' demonstrating world class training. The creative industries are one of the most highly qualified groups with many holding M level qualifications but the emphasis seems to be on lower level skills training for 14-19 year olds. This strategy could be questionable if the current system is able to advance to such a high level. Innovation, finding new talent, not letting the creative streams dry up, and its influence in the knowledge economy is key themes. Cross discipline working and the need to blur the boundaries are also encouraged. Links with employers and business is also vital for economic success but with little reference to the long traditional pedagogy of working with industry as part of the Higher Education art and design system.

6. **The Social dimension**. Finally all documents make some reference to the wider social gains beyond the economic of the role the creative industries can play. They are often matched with other social areas of concern such as the environment and health issues. The role of the large institutions that have enjoyed public funding such as the BBC, Galleries, Museums are put to the question in terms of the audience development as opposed to the new more easily accessible digital areas. User generated content,

and involvement in the creative process has been seen as a good indicator of the future of the creative industries.

Looking across all the documents the themes running through are all very similar, varying in focus only slightly depending on the intended audiences and authors. However there is a lot that crosses back to the trends in Higher Education at the moment, these include finding new funding streams, globalisation, mass engagement, technology driven curriculum and new ways of learning and the value and importance of life long learning and social engagement. Pulling the policy analysis together with the trends in Higher Education enables some recommendations for the sector to be drawn up.

Recommendations for Strategic Actions.

Reviewing the creative industries documents, within the context of the changes to Higher Education, the perceived value of a creative education, a focus on surviving after the credit crunch, employability, and opportunity arising out of crisis enables following recommendations to be made in light of this analysis. Four recommendations come to light that would be suitable for a 21st century art school to develop into curriculum actions to support the employability agenda and the creative economy.

1. Engaging employers in as many different ways as possible right across the spectrum of disciplines. This statement might be obvious and many Universities would claim good industry connections however the analysis demonstrates that this is more complex that is often assumed. There is an extremely good engagement with employers, companies, businesses offering live projects, work based learning and simulated work based learning in most art and design schools. There is a good history of employing visiting practitioners to be part of the academic staff and to engage high profile speakers. But this still seems to fall under the radar of

the policy makers who all claim that greater engagement is needed. One problem is that most of the policy documents reviewed refers to employers as being a united a large body who make recommendations for education, but as has also been pointed out, most creative industries are micro or small businesses many flourishing as freelancers, so this engagement is not noticed nor has the voice of government.

The recommendation at University level is to ensure that the most senior staff recognises the type of engagement already in place, and its value to the creative industries sector. A major barrier is the real need for employer engagement with non creative firms who can benefit from the imagination, innovation and ideas driven students and graduates who can potentially make a competitive difference to the business through design. Multidiscipline universities probably have a much better chance to realise this recommendation through internal connections that single mono discipline based art schools. This would also include engaging professionals in developing the curriculum. This has happened in part through some sub degree work, but the real strength would be in using a cross discipline mix of businesses to work and support the curriculum. In particular this could draw on the mix of digital technology, business skills and creativity to drive forward the curriculum developments from the outset.

2. Work cross discipline, at undergraduate, postgraduate and for research and knowledge transfer.. Within a multi faculty university this should be relatively straight forward. All the documents are calling out for cross discipline working in the hope that some serendipity will allow for great innovations and enterprises. In reality the cross discipline working at undergraduate level is more challenging as skills and techniques that allow for creative freedom have to be developed. There is more potential

at post graduate and research levels for this to be effective. Pilot schemes are in place in some institutions that enable greater cross referencing to other disciplines and some art and design schools are leading on these curriculum developments. The notion of 'boundary spanners' (Nesta) to transfer theoretical concepts and frameworks of distinct subjects could result in new discoveries and new subject areas. This zeitgeist recommendation needs to overcome barriers relating to time honoured canons of knowledge and the academic tribes that sit within subject disciplines and as pointed out in the literature review the need to create cross discipline journals and assessment methodologies to support this way of working. The post 92 University sector in enabling more vocational and practice based subjects to thrive, may have a better chance of realising this recommendation.

3. Maintain creativity at all costs. All the documents refer to the unique position of the ideas driven exploitation of the art and design schools in this country. This needs to be maintained and developed but according to contemporary needs. One major problem is the tendency to look back to the 'good old days' of art education rather than focus on the curriculum opportunities of the future. However the analysis is absolutely clear that creative talent, however it is arrived at, is the key strength of the creative economy and should be retained. An issue here lies in the Government's ability to understand the Higher Education contribution to the creative economy and in particular how best to support Higher Education art and design. As James Dyson referred to the 'silent D' in the STEM subjects this would be a major barrier to overcome in any new funding regime.

4. Coalitions and partnerships to ensure the greatest impact on creativity. This is probably the most problematic of the recommendations and is partly borne out by the need for public funding to be allocated into different

silos for accountability. But there is common agreement amongst the policy documents that sharing and developing partnerships within the public sector (for example Higher Education and art galleries and museums working together , or shared HEI and public libraries) are to mutual benefit. However many tensions underlie such ideas from working because of failures to come up with new rationales for their existence with a tendency to hang on to past structures and limited innovation in public thinking (as indicated in the literature review) whereas the private sector is used to being more entrepreneurial when facing problems. For this recommendation to be successful it would take a major shift in thinking and in distributing public funding. However at a micro level this recommendation for making smaller partnerships between art schools and other partners, such as the Arts Council, could secure the talent, creativity and innovation that is needed to succeed into the future.

Conclusion.

From undertaking the literature review and the policy analysis on the creative industries it is clear that there is general agreement that as a sector it will continue to develop and should form part of Government thinking. There is also clearly a place for the traditional art school to develop into an area of study that is multi disciplined but still values the inherent skills of creativity to engage with the new creative economy. This was a desk top survey and to understand how the recommendations and conclusions would work in practice more research is needed. The research would need to focus on subject disciplines beyond art and design, and also the different types of Higher Education providers. It would also need to try and find a methodology of conducting valid research with employers; particularly that elusive group of freelancers and micro businesses to ascertain how they fit into the creative economy and the sorts of skills they believe are needed.

There are opportunities for me as Dean of a School of Art, Design and Architecture to put some of these ideas into practice, and this could also provide a pilot case study for the recommendations. Some are already being implemented for example our cross disciplinary masters programme, and we have a great opportunity for aligning our research developments more closely with the local museum and art gallery. An ethnographical approach to looking at how these developments mature could be put into the context of the above recommendations.

However, I cannot help but think that maybe the fact that the creative industries are elusive, that creativity does not work best when it subjected to normal behaviours it might not actually be possible to do the research, or it may stifle some of the creativity that is hidden in the art and design curriculum by teachers and practitioners who work around some of the existing bureaucratic constraints. Maybe the research focus is to ensure a continuing world class creative higher education that contributes to the creative economy would be best served by following some fairly typical undergraduate projects on 'ideas generation' to see where the ideas run and what serendipity arises.

Words 7,880

REFERENCES

Bakhshi H. Arts and Humanities Resaerch in the Innovation system. The UK Example. Journal of Cultural Science. Vol 2 no 1. 2009

Ball L, Pollard E, Stanley N (2010) Creative Graduates: Creative Futures. IES Bardach E. A Practical Guilde for Policy Analysis. The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving. 3rd ed. CQPress. 2009

Barnett R (2005) Reshaping the University. New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching. OUP and SRHE
Beecher, T.A.T, Paul, R. (2001) Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and Culture of Disciplines. The Society for research into Higher Education and Open University Press

Birnbaum, R. (2000) Management Fads in Higher Education. Where They Come From, What they do, why they fail. Jossey Bass

BIS (2009) Higher Ambitions – the future of universities in a knowledge economy Blunt L, Harris M, Westlake S. Schumpter comes to Whitehall. Cuts and Innovation in public services. NESTA July 2010

CBI Creating Growth; A Blueprint for the creative industries. 2010-09-24

Clews David. (2009/10) Looking Out. Art, Design and Media HEA.

Cox George.   Cox Review of Creativity in Business : Builiding on the UK strengths. 2005

Crossick G (2006) Knowledge Transfer Without Widgets: The Challenge of the Creative Economy. RSA Lecture 31/5/2006

Davies J (2001) The Emergence of Entrepreneurial Cultures in European Universities Higher Education Management OECD

DCMS Making the case for Public Investment. Developing Entrepreneurship for the creative industries. DCMS 2006

DCMS/BIS (2009) Creative Britain New Talents for the New Economy

Fairclough N.   Analysing Discourse.   Textual Analysis for Social Research. Routledge.2009 edition.

Florida R (2005) The Flight of the Creative Class Harper Collins.
Florida R. The Rise of the Creative Class. Basic Books. 2004

Goddard J.   Reinventing the Civic University. A Provocation. NESTA September 2009.

Higher Education Policy. The quarterly journal of the international association of universities. Volume 20. no.4. Dec 2007.

HM Government ((2010) New Industry, New Jobs – one year on

Hutton Will (2007) <u>Staying Ahead</u> The Work Foundation. DCMS

Jackson S, Oliver M, Shaw M, Wisdom J (eds) <u>Developing Creativity in Higher Education..</u> Routledge 2006.

James Dyson. <u>Ingenious Britain. Making the UK the leading high tech exporter in Europe.</u> March 2010 James Dyson.

Lambert (2003) <u>Review of Business and University Collaboration </u>HM Treasury
Leitch (2006) <u>Review of Skills</u> . HM Government

NESTA (2009) <u>Demanding Growth – Why the UK needs a recovery plan based on growth and innovation</u>

Rowland S <u>The Enquiring University. Compliance and Contestation in Higher Education.</u> OUP 2006.

Shattock M (2003   ) <u>Managing Successful Universities. </u>SHRE and OUP

Smith A, and Webster F. (eds) <u>The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Soceity.</u> SRHE and OU Press. 1997.

Spickler P. <u>Policy Analysis for Practice. Applying Social Policy. </u>The Policy Press University of Bristol. 2008.

TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY BOARD (2009) <u>Creative Industries Technology Strategy</u> 2009 – 2012

Wallace and Wray. <u>Critical Reading and Writing for Postgraduates</u>. Sage study skills.2006

Warner D, and Palyfreyman D The State of UK Higher Education. Managing Change and Diversity. SHRE and OUP 2001.