

**Knowledge Exchange, HEIs and  
the Arts and Culture Sector: A  
systematic review of literature in  
the field**

**Dr Sarah Sigal**

# **Knowledge Exchange, HEIs and the Arts and Culture Sector: A systematic review of literature in the field**

**Dr Sarah Sigal**

A publication by The National Centre for Academic and Cultural Exchange

©NCACE 2021

Copyright of each work printed herewith belong to the respective author and is reproduced here with their permission

# Contents

Abbreviations

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and context

1.2. Research objectives, conceptual framework and definitions

2. Methodology

2.1. Introduction

2.2. Systematic literature review method

2.3. How literature was reviewed and synthesised

2.4. Alignment with NCACE primary data collection

3. Theme 1: Nature of collaborations

3.1. Introduction

3.2. Evidence synthesis

3.3. Summary of main findings

3.3.1. Features of successes and challenges

3.3.2. Model of the collaboration

3.3.2.1 The hub model

3.3.3. Scope of the collaboration

4. Theme 2: Nature of documentation

4.1. Introduction

4.2. Evidence synthesis

4.3. Summary of main findings

4.3.1 Analytical sources

4.3.2 Descriptive sources

4.3.3 Analytical and descriptive sources

5. Theme 3: Conceptualising the process

5.1. Introduction

5.2. Evidence synthesis

5.3. Summary of main findings

5.3.1. Overview of the field

- 5.3.2. Providing a framework
- 5.3.3. Theorising the challenges
- 6. Theme 4: Defining and describing Knowledge Exchange
  - 6.1. Introduction
  - 6.2. Evidence synthesis
  - 6.3. Summary of main findings
    - 6.3.1. Different definitions, how hard it can be to find them
    - 6.3.2. Difficulty in understanding characteristics (drivers, origins, themes)
    - 6.3.3. Opaqueness of who was involved and who did what
- 7. Theme 5: Impact
  - 7.1. Introduction
  - 7.2. Evidence synthesis
  - 7.3. Summary of main findings
    - 7.3.1 Researchers and artists
    - 7.3.2 HEIs and arts organisations
    - 7.3.3 Communities and students
- 8. Conclusion: Summary, findings and recommendations
  - 8.1. Summary of the research findings of each theme
    - 8.1.1. Theme 1: Nature of collaborations
    - 8.1.2. Theme 2: Nature of documentation
    - 8.1.3. Theme 3: Conceptualising the process
    - 8.1.4. Theme 4: Defining and describing Knowledge Exchange
    - 8.1.4. Theme 5: Impact
  - 8.2. Limitations within existing evidence
  - 8.3. Findings from comparison to NCAACE primary data collection
  - 8.4. Recommendations
  - 8.5. Literature review table
    - Theme 1: Nature of collaborations
    - Theme 2: Nature of documentation
    - Theme 3: Conceptualising the process
    - Theme 4: Defining and describing Knowledge Exchange

Theme 5: Impact

Bibliography

Appendix 1

## Abbreviations

The Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE)  
National Centre for Academic and Cultural Exchange (NCACE)  
Knowledge Exchange (KE)  
Knowledge Transfer (KT)  
Higher Education Institution (HEI)  
Arts Council England (ACE)  
Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)  
The Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities (TORCH)  
Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF)  
Research Excellence Framework (REF)  
Early Career Researchers (ECRs)  
Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)  
Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)  
Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund (ISCF)  
Science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM)  
Humanities, arts and social sciences (HASS)

# Executive Summary

This literature review was commissioned by the newly established National Centre for Academic and Cultural Exchange (NCACE). NCACE is led by The Culture Capital Exchange with regional partners around the country and funded by Research England. The new centre has been established to facilitate and better support capacity for Knowledge Exchange (KE) between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and the arts and cultural sector across the UK, with a particular focus on evidencing and showcasing the social, cultural, environmental and economic impacts, as well as realising and communicating the potential of KE with the arts and culture sector.

The core purpose of this brief literature review is to provide an overview of the nature of the literature itself relating to the field of Knowledge Exchange between universities and arts organisations and practitioners in order to contribute to NCACE's emerging Evidencing and Impact activities.

It provides an overview and analysis of a sampling of 67 different academic and non-academic research materials including: 19 journal articles, 3 book chapters, 15 reports, 13 blog entries, 12 websites, 2 lectures and 3 handbooks. The materials cover different models of KE involving academic researchers, arts and culture sector organisations and practitioners who work in fields such as film, theatre, literature, fine art, photography, dance and music.

The literature reviewed was selected in order to answer questions pertaining to NCACE's key mission to evidence and showcase the nature, drivers, motivations and impacts of KE collaborations between Higher Education and the arts and culture sector. It has been designed to enhance a further understanding of how and why relations between Higher Education and the arts and culture sectors have been established, how they functioned, what made them productive and/or challenging and how they sit within the landscape of these kinds of collaborations. Materials reviewed range from the analytical to the descriptive, as well as the broad to the specific, giving an overview of the field or documentation of particular case studies.

The research materials were evaluated and selected based on the range they covered in terms of the following criteria:

- Source (academic or non-academic)
- Type
- Perspective
- Area of arts practice
- Field of research
- Geography (mostly UK-based but also some international examples)
- Model of collaboration

The materials were then divided into 5 themes which represent a series of trends and tendencies across the field. This division, as well as the ways in which sources overlapped into different themes, can be seen in section 8.5 (Literature Review Table).

In brief, the general trend shows the majority of analytical sources came from researchers within HEIs and policy experts, whereas the more up-to-date, specific accounts focusing on case studies of KEs tended to come from HEI websites and blogs, being more specific but also much shorter and more descriptive. There was however a noticeable lack of sources written from the perspective of artists or cultural organisations, as well as materials that showcased specific case studies of KEs analytically. In many sources, there were reminders too that this is an emerging field; one where the use of numerous terms are common when referring to Knowledge Exchange. Unsurprisingly these included: collaboration, project, partnership, initiative and others, as well as ways of framing the projects across different sources.

It was also not always easy to identify what the drivers of these collaborations were (e.g. funding, policy, relationships, the projects themselves). Similarly, the names of individuals and organisations involved were sometimes absent or unclear. The findings of this research process were cross-referenced, categorised and compared in order to build a picture of this emerging field of arts and culture -related Knowledge Exchange that is still defining itself.

A number of sources focused on the characteristics of successes and challenges of KEs. The successful elements of collaborations included:

- Ongoing, consistent and clear communication
- Consistent managing of participants' expectations regarding process and output
- Thorough understanding of cultural differences between arts practice and academic research

The challenging elements of collaborations included:

- Unclear and/or inconsistent communication
- Mismatch of expectations regarding culture, process and expected output
- Limited time and resources to complete the project

It is also important to note that all the sources in the review could be broken down into analytical, descriptive or (less frequently) a mix of the two. Characteristics of analytical literature include the following:

- Most analytical sources consisted of articles, reports, lectures and some book chapters, produced by academic and policy sectors
- Often provide overviews
- Usually some references to case studies with limited detail
- Academic and policy researchers more likely to produce analysis of case studies than practitioners
- Tendency to focus on critical frameworks obscured the case studies

Characteristics of descriptive literature include the following:

- Most descriptive sources consisted of websites, handbooks and blogs, produced by researchers, HEIs, arts organisations, (less frequently) artists
- Ranged from documentation of ongoing or recent KEs to promotion of particular institutions or programmes
- The more specific the documentation of a case study, the more descriptive it was
- Sometimes too brief to be analytical

Characteristics of literature demonstrating a mix of tendencies include the following:

- Most mixed sources consisted of book chapters, handbooks, lectures
- Included descriptions of case studies but with some analysis, often in order to understand lessons learned

There were also some general trends across the field that are worth noting:

- Most sources were written by academic or policy researchers
- A number of case studies combined community-oriented KEs with students' learning process, allowing students to understand approaches to community engagement
- Community engagement initiatives embedded in KEs allowed the public able to have exposure to the development and production of new cultural outputs
- Academic background of the author(s) often influenced documentation and analysis of the KE

Finally, a number of discernible gaps can be identified in existing literature on this field. Firstly, it was evident that the artists' perspective and documentation of art practice was often missing. Secondly, it was often difficult to determine the defining and driving factors of KEs (such as objectives, policy, funding, relationships). Thirdly, analytical source materials often focused on giving an overview of the field, resulting in the absence of an analysis of the KE process. Fourthly, the sources that addressed case studies were sometimes unclear regarding details like names and roles of project partners and whether the researcher(s) writing the source had taken part or not. Lastly, it was not common for most sources to be explicit about the impact of KEs.

This literature review serves primarily as a critical survey of materials themselves relating to arts and culture related knowledge exchange, providing an up-to-date overview of research and models emerging from the field. Although there are a number of shorter literature reviews relating to KE and various fields, this piece of work addresses a gap relating specifically to those initiatives that engage broadly with the arts and culture industries.

As such, it is intended that this review will be of use to HEIs, researchers, policy writers, arts and culture organisations and arts practitioners and any others interested in the growing field of arts and culture Knowledge Exchange.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Background and context

### **Background to NCACE**

This literature review was commissioned by NCACE, the new Research England funded National Centre for Academic and Cultural Exchange which was publicly launched in February 2021 and will run until 2024. NCACE is led by The Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE) with partners including: Bath Spa University, Birmingham City University, Manchester Metropolitan University and Northumbria University.

TCCE has been working in the domain of knowledge exchange and the arts and culture sector since it was first established as LCACE in 2005 with support from the then HEFCE HEIF 2 fund. It was the first major university-led network to focus specifically on developing connectivity with the arts and cultural sector. LCACE was led by Kings College London along with Birkbeck, City, Courtauld, Goldsmiths, Queen Mary and Royal Holloway. These were later joined by the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and others. In 2011, LCACE became an independent organisation, rebranding as The Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE). In that year it also formed a key part of the team, led by Queen Mary, to successfully bid for Creativeworks London - one of four AHRC (Arts and Humanities Research Council) Knowledge Exchange Hubs for the Creative Economy - which ran between 2012 and 2016. Leading Creativeworks London's Knowledge Exchange Programme, TCCE devised and delivered a number of initiatives that enabled over one hundred creative research collaborations to be funded.

In 2015, TCCE developed a wider national pilot project known as The Exchange and funded by Arts Council England (ACE) and the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). The Exchange supported a further thirty creative research collaborations between Early Career Researchers (ECRs), artists and creative Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) across the country. In 2017, TCCE then went on to co-develop and co-curate another programme funded by Arts Council England, entitled Boosting Resilience. The partners were City, University of London and Manchester Metropolitan University and the programme supported a two year development programme for almost 30 senior leaders in the arts and culture sector around the country and resources for the sector more widely.

NCACE was established in Autumn 2020. The key purpose and mission of the new centre is to facilitate and support the capacity for Knowledge Exchange between Higher Education and the arts and culture sectors across the country with a particular focus on evidencing the social, cultural, environmental as well as the economic impacts of such activities. As part of NCACE's Evidencing and Impact activities, an investigation into and review of the literature on this emerging field is one of the tasks associated with the first year of the centre and has been the driver of this literature review.

## **Purpose of the Review**

The purpose of the literature review was to gather and synthesise data, papers and relevant information from both academic and non-academic sources concerning collaborations, partnerships and knowledge exchange initiatives between higher education and the arts and cultural sectors. These sources varied considerably in scope and nature and also ranged in terms of the case studies they covered (if any existed) and levels of formality; from large-scale institution to institution type agreements through to small-scale projects that were quite short in duration and/or associated with particular funding streams (e.g. those associated with specific research or knowledge exchange initiatives).

This review is intended to contribute to the knowledge base line for the project. It aligns with the wider objectives of the Evidencing and Impact Development work being undertaken by NCACE in order to gain more and better evidence and analysis about the extent, nature, driver and broader social, cultural, environmental and economic impacts of KE and the arts and cultural sectors.

The purpose of the review was not only to provide a systematic overview of evidence about the nature and extent of KE between higher education institutions and the arts and cultural sector, but also to shed light on key gaps in evidence and understanding to further inform the development of the Evidence Hub. It is important to note that this review is qualitative rather than quantitative, providing a descriptive and analytical overview of the field and the range of existing literature within it. The aim is for this literature review to provide a basis for future quantitative studies including a statistical analysis of existing arts and culture-oriented KEs.

## **Some Knowledge Exchange Definitions**

Although Knowledge Exchange is in some respects an emerging field, it is still not a term that is well recognised beyond the academy as the evidence in this review attests. This is the case not only within the arts and culture sectors but more widely within other public and private spheres where relations with universities are common.

In recognition of the fact that this report is likely to have a readership beyond as well as within the academy, we draw attention to some current definitions, all broadly similar but with slightly different emphases. Research England, for example, talks about Knowledge Exchange as follows:

‘Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), such as universities, teach students and undertake research that creates new and useful knowledge. But they also work with many different types of partners to ensure that this knowledge can be used for the benefit of the economy and society - this is known as knowledge exchange (KE).

“These partners range from individual members of the public who may attend events organised by a university, to a multinational company partnering with a university to develop new medicines. The activities might include public events, allowing

businesses to access specialist equipment or facilities, undertaking consultancy or licensing their intellectual property so others may use it. Universities often also play important roles in their local area” (Research England, 2021).

The Knowledge Exchange Concordat is a new mechanism designed to complement the work of Research England’s Knowledge Exchange Framework ‘by which universities can consider their performance in the wide range of aspects of knowledge exchanges and make a commitment to improvement in those areas that are consistent with their priorities and expertise’ (n.d.). It was established in 2020 and proposes in essence a series of high-level principles to cover the range of necessary underpinning activities for effective knowledge exchange. The KE Concordat defines Knowledge Exchange as follows:

“...a collaborative, creative endeavour that translates knowledge and research into impact in society and the economy. KE includes a set of activities, processes and skills that enable close collaboration between universities and partner organisations to deliver commercial, environmental, cultural and place-based benefits, opportunities for students and increased prosperity (Knowledge Exchange Concordat, n.d.).”

The concordat does not see itself however as necessarily providing a ‘prescribed recipe for effective KE in all institutions and for all universities’ (Knowledge Exchange Concordat, n.d.).

Yet another, slightly different take can be found on the VITAE website which describes KE primarily in relationship to academic research as follows:

“Knowledge Exchange, or Knowledge Transfer, is a key output of academic research. It conveys how knowledge and ideas move between the knowledge source and the potential users of that knowledge. It may occur through the training of postgraduate researchers who subsequently apply that knowledge in the public or private sector, or through direct engagement between the academics and public/private sector via collaborative or contract research, or through the exploitation of intellectual property through the creation of start-up companies, or in many other ways. The key common element is that information and expertise is exchanged with businesses, society and/or the economy (Vitae, 2021).”

NCACE’s perspective on current definitions is that there is still a tendency to use the term ‘exchange’ where the more STEM dominated notion of ‘transfer’ is in fact implied. It recognises that knowledge exchange as a field can be enriched by a more ubiquitous recognition of the values of two-way or multi-way exchange, or what NCACE refer to as ‘knowledge flows’, between sectors. It also recognises the centrality of ‘public engagement’ as a mode of Knowledge Exchange.

## 1.2. Research objectives, conceptual framework and definitions

The research objectives were conceived and the methodology was carried out in order to answer the primary research questions supporting the Evidencing and Impact Development work, which, in turn, drove the selection, evaluation and analysis of the materials:

- How/why was the KE established?
- How did it function?
- What was successful and/or challenging about the process?
- How did the KE sit within the overall landscape?
- What does the source say about Knowledge Exchange as a field?

The questions were developed in order to showcase the nature, drivers, motivations and impacts of KE collaborations between Higher Education and the arts and culture sector. The sources were selected in order to provide the literature review with a broad selection of documentation regarding arts-and-HEI-oriented KEs covering a variety of models of collaboration; geographical areas; (both within and outside the UK); project perspectives, objectives and impacts; area of arts practice and area of research. The selection criteria were also oriented around finding a variety of types of sources (websites, analytical papers, reports, lectures, blogs and handbooks), which generally offered various perspectives from the authors, whether individual or institutional. Some sources did not detail the specifics of particular case studies but rather gave a critical overview of the field of KE.

The conceptual framework of the literature review was driven by the research questions generated by the NACE Evidence and Impact Development team; the aim was to develop an overview of how and why KEs operated, how they were being documented, what lessons could be learned and what the gaps in the field were. The review was designed to understand the variety of KEs in the field, the practicalities of the ways in which they operated and the evaluations of those practical approaches.

As the results from the searches were evaluated, the criteria for analysis were refined and used to break down each source that was discovered, and later evaluate in comparison to other sources in the study. The following questions emerged from this process:

- Is the research analytical or descriptive?
- Does it include specific case studies and deal with practicalities of collaboration?
- Does it refer to KE specifically or use another term to define the collaboration?
- What is explicit about the project and what is implied?
- What are the drivers? (funding, policy, relationships, the project itself)
- What is the nature of the KE?
  - o Shape
  - o Scope
  - o Type
  - o Model
  - o Geographical region

- o Features of any successes
- o Features of any difficulties
- What is the perspective from which the document was written? What is the background of the person or organisation writing it?
- What was the impact of the KE?

These questions were helpful in categorising the research, as well as drawing a more complete picture of what exists in the field in terms of documentation and where there are gaps.

Accordingly, the questions have been used to shape the conceptual framework for this literature review and grouped into themes that recurred throughout the research. While of course these themes overlap within the research, some sources are particularly good examples of each theme. These themes have been arranged as follows:

- Theme 1: Nature of collaborations
  - o Features of successes
  - o Difficulties
  - o Shape
  - o Scope
  - o Model
  - o Type
- Theme 2: Nature of documentation
- Theme 3: Conceptualising the process
- Theme 4: Defining and describing knowledge exchange
- Theme 5: Impact on
  - o Researchers and artists
  - o Organisations and institutions
  - o Communities and students

Theme 1 details a variety of examples of the literature which document and explore case studies of KEs, either analytically or descriptively, dealing with the mechanics of these collaborations. This section examines elements such as the nature of the collaborations, features of successes and difficulties, shape, scope, model and type. Theme 2 details a sample of the literature that answers the question of what types of materials tended to be analytical, which tended to be descriptive and which were a mix of the two, how and why. Theme 3 explores a section of the literature that focuses on conceptualising KEs through different frameworks, analysing various processes and reviewing sources upon which they have drawn in their own research. Theme 4 explores a series of research materials that fall into a pattern of featuring either transparent or opaque characteristics, as well as those which operate like KEs but define themselves in other ways. Theme 5 deals with literature within the review that addresses the impacts of these projects, whether on researchers, artists, organisations and institutions, students or communities. It will explore both the perceived positive and negative impacts.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Introduction

Section 2 provides an overview of the methodology used to put together this literature review, giving an understanding of the objectives, structure, systematic method, assembly, analysis and synthesis of findings.

The objective of the research phase of the literature review was to compile a database of a mix of sources (including: articles, blogs, articles, websites, reports, lectures and brochures) from various artistic disciplines with respect to case studies and perspectives. The research and selection of materials were guided by the questions detailed in section 1.2. The process was collaborative in the sense that it was conducted in consultation with NCACE's Evidencing and Impact Development Team who participated at different stages throughout the process to help focus and guide the search. In addition to the database of reports and articles already compiled by the NCACE team, the search was undertaken using Google, Google Scholar, JSTOR, EBSCOhost, White Rose Research Online, Oxford University Press, Taylor & Francis Online, ScienceDirect, VLe Books and Project MUSE.<sup>1</sup> Each search was carried out focusing on particular search terms compiled by the NCACE team. It is important to note that this review does not comprise the entirety of the field of arts/culture KE, but rather a considered selection of materials.

The sources gathered via these searches were then organised into a spreadsheet and analysed by categories answering primary research questions, and then later secondary research questions, designed to focus the materials. The sources were cross-referenced and compared in order to analyse their significance within the study and further narrow the last phase of the research process.

### 2.2. Systematic literature review method

The initial step of the research process used to gather materials was to: review the pre-existing NCACE database, build on that as a resource base and use these materials as a base of understanding of the field. This database provided a context for research which has already been carried out with respect to KE and arts and culture, as well as names of researchers, artists and institutions prominent in the field that might have produced further work.

Once this base of materials had been established, the first phase of the search was undertaken through the three separate search engines. The first phase was devoted to searching for different permutations of the search term 'arts + culture + universities + knowledge exchange'. This process created a second layer to the existing research database, widening the breadth of materials and understanding of the field, its complexities, parameters and gaps.

---

<sup>1</sup> Access to these databases was kindly granted by Bath Spa University.

The second phase of this search was more extensive and specific, engaging with a comprehensive list of key words designed to exhaust the existing resources relating to KE and the arts and culture sector. Compiling the list of search terms was a collaborative process whereby the NCACE team contributed numerous terms to focus the research process and find sources that would build a comprehensive literature review. (This list can be found in Appendix 1.) This process took a number of days, as some terms proved fruitful while others did not produce relevant results.

A process of cross-referencing was used during these searches in order to explore the research thoroughly and continue to refine the search in order to best answer the guiding research questions. For example, when a reference to a specific project was found, it was often fruitful to conduct a search under the name of that project to see if there were any further materials relating to it that could provide useful, more specific material. Often, academic papers would present an overview of the field, mentioning specific projects in brief; sometimes searches relating to these projects turned up nothing, sometimes they turned up other brief descriptions, but other times, they turned up more detailed documentation such as videos, blogs and podcasts.

In this vein, it was useful to compile a document with names of cultural institutions and organisations mentioned in reports and articles, so that their websites could be used as a resource in order to search for further documentation of the KEs in which they participated. Another document was created in order to record potentially pertinent references sourced from bibliographies from particularly relevant articles; these references were searched at a later stage in order to build on the existing research and focus the database further, as well as fill in existing gaps.

As the research process took place in the United States, the Google and Google Scholar searches prioritised US KEs. Although the literature review covers projects conducted internationally, its focus is predominantly on UK-based projects. In order to find more UK-based collaborations, '+UK' was often added to the searches. Pertinent projects were also discovered in the US, Canada, Spain and Australia. If the literature were to be expanded, a search focusing on finding more international projects could prove informative.

Searching '+ knowledge exchange' was often helpful in narrowing the searches and finding more relevant material. KEs were sometimes referred to as 'knowledge transfers' in older materials, which was also a helpful search term. They were also referred to under a number of other terms such as: project, relationship, collaboration, partnership or programme. What proved challenging for the research process was that while the term 'knowledge exchange' was not mentioned, at times, using terms such as 'project' or 'collaboration' rendered the search too broad to be useful or relevant. Less common terms were: network, initiative, residency, platform. These kinds of terms were also often too broad to be useful, providing even less relevant search results.

When the key words 'value' and 'impact' were included in searches, 'culture' became negated with respect to the context of this study; instead, it was converted into the broad definition of culture. (For example, the culture of university departments.)

Terms like ‘public engagement’ or ‘community engagement’ opened a new dimension of projects to investigate which involved universities and the arts sector. Sometimes, these projects focused on research and the exchange of knowledge, and sometimes were solely a mechanism for public engagement.

Search terms like ‘STEM’ and ‘technology’ brought up too many irrelevant results, often showing projects that had nothing to do with HEIs. In general, it was difficult to find materials that pertained to the arts, universities and STEM subjects or technology.

As a general method, it was useful to exhaust each search term in all three search engines (Google, Google Scholar and Bath Spa Library, which was a portal to other search engines) before moving on to the next.

### 2.3. How literature was reviewed and synthesised

In order to keep track of, analyse and compare the sources, a shareable Google Sheet was created, recording potentially useful materials in a spreadsheet. In the first phase, the following characteristics were noted:

- Title/author
- Nature of item
- Author disciplinary background
- University involved
- Project details
- Partners
- Summary of findings
- URL
- Search terms used
- Discipline of artistic practice
- Any other notes

This process was instrumental in documenting and assessing potential source materials in the first stage, as well as creating a matrix for comparing and categorising them in relation to each other. At times, not every category was able to be filled out, which sometimes indicated that the source was not relevant to the review, and was sometimes instrumental in understanding the limitations of and trends within the field. For instance, with certain sources, particularly blogs and web pages relating to recent or ongoing KEs, there were no conclusions or findings as such, but rather only a description of the project; this turned out to be a trend in the field.

In the next phase of the analysis and research, this spreadsheet was organised into categories of type:

- Article
- Report
- Book chapter
- Commissioned essay

- Blog
- Website
- Lecture/presentation
- Handbook/brochure

This enabled the team to evaluate the sources, understanding which types of research tended to be most relevant to the literature review and where there might be gaps, omissions or irrelevant inclusions. Their feedback on the spreadsheet was then incorporated into the next stage, further focusing the research process.

In the final phase of researching, organising and reviewing these materials, further categories were added to the spreadsheet in order to be able to analyse the findings and understand different dimensions of the materials:

- Whose perspective is the source privileging?
- Is the source descriptive or analytical?
- Does the source address practice issues?
- Does the source deal with key themes as identified by NCACE?
- How is KE being defined?
- What is prioritised in the KE?
- What are the drivers of the KE? (e.g. funding, policy, collaborators)
- What (if any) are the suggestions/themes/trends found from the case studies?

In order to fill out these categories, a full re-read of the sources was conducted, gaining a more in-depth understanding of each source. In the process, any that seemed superfluous or irrelevant were deleted from the spreadsheet and trends regarding the field were noted.

Within this final phase of the research process, it was useful to return to the initial research questions and review the spreadsheet, gaining an understanding of which materials answered the questions (whether a few, most or all) and where there were gaps in the database. Cross-referencing the materials also allowed for an understanding of general trends in the field regarding methods of analysis and documentation of KEs, as well as who (researcher, artist, HEI, arts organisation) was responsible for producing what type of material (blog, website, handbook, article, report). It was particularly fruitful to do an analysis of which materials were descriptive, which were analytical and which were a combination of the two.

## 2.4. Alignment with NCACE primary data collection

The findings from the literature review research were compared to the findings from NCACE's first primary data collection, a survey co-designed with Arts Professional which ran in March 2021. Entitled Collaborating with Higher Education, the survey set out to capture information and attitudes on how arts and cultural sector organisations and practitioners are, or have been, working with Higher Education. This comparison was instrumental in gaining a better understanding of how the documentation of KEs measured up to the primary data gathered, where one has

mapped directly on the other and where there were discrepancies. This will be further explored in the conclusion in section 8.3.

## 3. Theme 1: Nature of collaborations

### 3.1. Introduction

This section will address the first theme of this literature review, which breaks down a sampling of research materials that represented another trend in the field, namely that of the studies that focused on the nature of the KEs, how they operated, what was successful and challenging, plus the shape, scope, type and model of the collaboration. This section of source materials provided a typology of KEs models for the literature review, though some sources provided more detailed case studies than others and some were descriptive while others were analytical. Each of these sources presents a different kind of case study, ranging from small-scale, one-off collaborations between an HEI and a single arts organisation or practitioner to large-scale, transnational projects taking place across multiple countries, involving numerous organisations. Not all case studies drew analytical conclusions about the lessons learned from the KEs, but many featured analyses of the successes and challenges, which often repeated from case study to case study. This section also presents different models and manifestations of KEs such as festivals, residencies, networks, installations, community-driven projects and multi-departmental initiatives. The range of collaborative models allowed this study to understand the possibilities for KEs regarding scope, model and type.

### 3.2. Evidence synthesis

These sources were selected according to whether they answered the central research questions (identified in section 1.3) and then later appraised as to the nature of the KEs depicted in the case studies. The following questions were applied to the sources in order to understand what could be learned from the case studies represented in them for the literature review:

- What type of KE is being modelled?
- What is the scope of the KE?
- How was the KE carried out?
- What was successful?
- What was challenging?

Additionally, the questions applied to the case studies detailed in section 4.2 (regarding project partners, arts discipline and drivers) were also applied to the case studies in this section in order to gain an understanding of how they functioned in relation to others in the field. The sources included in this section consist of articles, blogs, reports, websites, a book chapter, a presentation and a handbook; they were selected for this section of the literature review because they represent literature that presented a range of case different studies, exemplifying some possible models of KEs. These sources were analysed within the matrix used to understand the literature as a whole (explained in sections 2.4 and 2.5) and evaluated as to how they compared to other sources within the study. This analysis was then, once again, examined through

the lens of the research questions in order to better understand the strength of this evidence for NCACE's emerging Evidencing and Impact activities.

### 3.3. Summary of main findings

This section is broken down into three categories of sources in order to understand the different kinds of models of KEs found in the field: those that used case studies to draw conclusions about successes and difficulties within KEs, those that presented various examples of case studies with respect to shape and type and finally, those that presented KEs that varied in terms of scope. In the first category, studies that drew conclusions from case studies about KEs about lessons to be learned regarding successes and challenges, the common trend was that successful KEs involved a great deal of clear and continuous communication between parties, as well as a careful management of expectations in terms of process and output and a consideration for ways to reconcile the culture of research and HEIs with the culture of arts practice and arts organisations. Challenges arose in most KEs when the communication was unclear or inconsistent, expectations of practitioners and researchers were not managed and/or the product was valued over the process in a way that compromised the KE. The second category includes a university/theatre/community arrangement, a pairing of a theatre-maker and a researcher, a large-scale programme, a festival, HEI-museum partnerships and a network of researchers and practitioners housed by a university as examples of what is possible regarding different models of KEs. The sub-category within this category details the four KE hubs produced as part of an AHRC initiative, involving universities, arts organisations, individual practitioners, communities and small businesses. The third category is similar to the second, but instead focuses on different models of KEs; the case studies presented here include a small-scale project (in the form of a university course and a commission), a medium-scale initiative (in the form of a cross-department project in a university) and a large-scale KE (transnational projects involving multiple organisations). These categories illustrate that KEs are flexible and can take many forms and sizes, depending on the individuals and institutions involved, goals of the KE and funding supporting it.

#### 3.3.1. Features of successes and challenges

This subsection contains a selection of case studies that provide the literature review with examples of and explanations for the successes and challenges of different kinds of KEs, including a book chapter, a blog and a report.

The first example provides an example of a source that represents a case study that was successful because it anticipated the complexities of the collaboration beforehand and planned accordingly. The report is unusual because it gives a detailed overview of the KE process but is also analytical in its approach. 'Devising Bespoke Art and Design Interventions for a Dialysis Community', a chapter by Rachel Louis and Luise Vormittag from the book *Cultural policy, innovation and the creative economy: creative collaborations in arts and humanities research* (2016), details a particularly successful KE between the NHS and Central St Martins, that produced a visual arts project for renal dialysis patients at the Royal London Hospital by freelance artists

and researchers; the project was a success because those involved recognised the potential challenges and complexities of involving artists, researchers and healthcare professionals, so did extensive research in collaboration with NHS workers on the ward before conceiving the project and adapting the work as they went along, continuing to communicate as a group.

The next source is a blog by researcher Peter Mitchell, which, although less lengthy and rigorous than the previous source, is similar in its approach in terms of chronicling the process of the KE, as well as its challenges and successes (both of which are useful in terms of understanding the practical mechanics of KE). 'Ragged Children, Mended Lives: Unearthing Histories of Poverty and Philanthropy for a 21st-Century Audience' (2016) on the collaboration between Queen Mary University of London and the Ragged School Museum for their 'Ragged Children, Mended Lives' project, where Queen Mary researcher and Creativeworks London Researcher-in-Residence Mitchell took up a residency in the museum to transcribe the registers from a Victorian school and turn them into public-facing documents for the museum, culminating in an exhibition on children and poverty in the Victorian East End; while the collaboration itself was successful (due in part to the small-scale nature of the KE and the support that was in place), Mitchell attests that the process of summarising and simplifying lengthy and complex research materials into readily understandable artefacts for a public-facing exhibition was challenging.

An illustration of a more challenging case study is an article by University of Bristol researcher Kirsty Sedgman, who gives an insight into the potential culture clash between HEIs and arts organisations. 'Challenges of cultural industry knowledge exchange in live performance audience research' (2019) which details what kinds of knowledge are produced in an academic study within the context of KE, using an audience study at the National Theatre Wales as an example. Sedgman found it challenging to combine research culture and the attitudes within the creative sector within a project, as the outputs and approaches tend to be different; she noted that KEs involving theatres and HEIs can be difficult because academics often feel pressure to write positive reports of the work they have done so as to maintain a good relationship with the theatres with whom they have collaborated, which makes honest evaluations difficult to produce. Whereas Mitchell found the difficulty in converting research into a public-facing project, Sedgman found it in navigating between the academic sector and the theatre industry.

Whereas the previous two studies concentrated on specific KEs, the TCCE report 'The Exchange: Revealing Collaborative Values' (Leighton and Mitchell, 2018) covers 26 short-term, small-scale projects and gives a comprehensive overview of the challenges of and barriers to collaborations within the context of a KE, such as differing scales, languages, timescales and priorities; an overall lack of understanding of the mechanics of meaningful collaboration; a limited amount of investment opportunities to develop skills. It also lists more subtle barriers such as a lack of knowledge on the benefits of KE; negotiating disciplinary, departmental and institutional silos within which collaborators sometimes work; navigating the goals of those participating in KEs (which may be shared or different) and understanding languages and cultures used by different sectors, which impact the process, output and

methods of evaluating KEs. Such a broad sweep of trends within different kinds of arts/culture KEs is helpful in understanding the potential successes and challenges across the field.

There are numerous examples of literature that engage with the theme of successes and challenges within KE to be found throughout this literature review. Here are a few specific examples. Explored further in section 7.3.1 are the blog entry ‘Compassion for Voices: a tale of courage and hope’ (King’s College London, 2014), which gives a shared perspective of a researcher and an artist and the presentation ‘Our Fathers: Reflecting on a creative collaboration between a researcher and a theater company’ (King and Mullin, n.d.), which privileges the artists’ perspective within the KE. The article ‘Having an impact? Academics, the music industries and the problem of knowledge’ (Williamson, Cloonan and Frith, 2011) can be found in greater detail in section 7.3.2. Finally, the article ‘Merging arts and bioethics: An interdisciplinary experiment in cultural and scientific mediation (Couture, Bélisle-Pipon, Cloutier and Barnabé, 2017), which looks specifically at science and the arts, can be found in section 6.3.3.

### 3.3.2. Model of the collaboration

This subsection covers case studies that illustrate different types of KEs in terms of possibilities for collaborations between individuals and institutions, including sources such as two blog entries, two articles, a book chapter, a report and three web pages.

Although brief, University of Sheffield researcher Kirsty Liddiard’s blog entry ‘Exchanging Knowledge through Creative Practice: What do disability arts and culture mean to you?’ (2018) provides an example of a model of a focused, small-scale KE from the perspective of a researcher sympathetic to the needs and goals of the artist with whom she is working. The blog documents the early phase of Liddiard’s experience as researcher on a Wellcome Trust fellowship working with the theatre company Touretteshero (involving two theatre-makers), a small-scale project examining the role the arts can play in disability studies, widening access for disabled people in the arts and the academy, as well as broadening the conversation about the experiences of disabled people.

Another example of a small-scale KE oriented around theatre practice is the article ‘Becoming civic centred – A case study of the University of Greenwich’s Bathway Theatre based in Woolwich’ (Ellis, Hockham, Rolle and Zigomo, 2021), which takes into account the dimension of community engagement in their KE model, rather than just the researcher/artist dynamic, as with previous literature covered so far under this theme. The article uses an interdisciplinary lens to consider a University of Greenwich’s Bathway Theatre community engagement programme. This case study is an example of how a project can focus and operate on a small scale, but the level of complexity in navigating the fields of power that exist between cultural organisations, practitioners, funders, community gatekeepers and local councils can be significant. The article takes this model of the arts organisation/university/community KE and argues that there is a need for universities to consider KE as a reflexive process whereby the knowledge of partners coming from non-university settings is positioned

equitably with those from the academy, especially within diverse neighbourhoods, in order to find new ways of decolonising approaches to KE and research.

The following three examples are web pages which present unusual models of KEs which, although not analytical, provide disparate possibilities for collaboration amongst numerous partners and stakeholders: a festival, a network and a large-scale project. 'UTOPIA 2016: A Year of Imagination and Possibility' (Somerset House, 2016) is a web page presenting a year-long festival of the same name at Somerset House, which celebrated the 500th anniversary of the publication of Thomas More's *Utopia*, in collaboration with Kings College and the Courtauld Institute and Gallery. The festival spanned the art, literature, fashion, design, architecture, theatre and film, featuring a programme of events, exhibitions, new commissions and activities exploring challenges facing contemporary culture and society, such as sustainability. 'Liveable Futures' (n.d.) is a network of artists, scholars and activists seeking to share resources and foster creative solutions to survival under planetary conditions of unpredictability and crisis, supported by Ohio State University. 'Cape Farewell' (n.d.) is an example of a large-scale, transnational project based in the UK, established in 2001 by the artist David Buckland in order to bring creatives, scientists and researchers together to produce work responding to climate change.

Further examples of literature that present different models of arts/culture KEs can be found throughout this entire section and the entire review, but here are some particular sources. Covered in section 7.3.2, the article 'Museum-university collaboration to renew mediation in art and historical heritage. The case of the Museo de Navarra' (Arriaga and Aguirre, 2019) provides a model of researchers collaborating with museum curators. In section 4.3.2, the report 'Collection Enhancement Report No. 23 for the V&A, Theatre and Performance Department (August 2013) Knowledge Exchange: DMU and the V&A' (2013) Peter Sillitoe gives an account of his role as a researcher working within the V&A theatre archives. A third source on museum-related KEs, the chapter 'At Home with Collaboration: Building and Sustaining a Successful University-Museum Partnership' (Owens, John and Blunt, 2016) documents and analyses the model developed between the Geffrye Museum and Queen Mary University and the possibilities for collaboration within that model (further covered in section 4.3.3). Although not covered in this review, the blog 'Writing the Climate' (Culture Forum North, 2019) and the website for a project called 'S.H.E.D.' (Jones, 2020) both provided unique models of arts/culture KE; the former involved a partnership between Newcastle University and New Writing North to commission a poet to create a series of climate-change-related projects for the Durham Book Festival; the latter is a former garden shed converted into a small arts venue and site for conversation and arts practice -- a particularly unusual example of a KE as a specific space.

### 3.3.2.1 The hub model

As mentioned in the Introduction, between 2012 and 2016, the AHRC funded the Knowledge Exchange Hubs for the Creative Economy, which resulted in a series of KE hubs across the UK: The Creative Exchange (Lancaster University, University of Newcastle, Royal College of Art), Design in Action (University of Dundee, University

of Edinburgh, Glasgow School of Art, Robert Gordon University, University of Abertay, St Andrews University), Creativeworks London (led by Queen Mary University of London and TCCE with Birkbeck College, Central School of Speech and Drama, City University, Courtauld Institute, Goldsmiths College, Kingston University, Guildhall School of Music and Drama, King's College London, Roehampton University, Royal Holloway, School of Oriental and African Studies, Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance, University of the Arts, BTW along with many non HE partners including: BBC, IBM, British Library, Tate, British Museum amongst others; Research and Enterprise in the Arts and Creative Technologies (REACT) (University of the West of England Bristol, University of Bristol, University of Exeter, University of Bath, University of Cardiff, Watershed Arts Trust). These hubs all produced a number of KEs engaging with the arts and culture sector and the creative economies with each hub producing several reports for the AHRC.

The Creative Exchange's CX Hub (2015) was designed to stimulate the creative economy in the North of England partnerships of HEIs, industry and the public and third sectors through creative innovation in the area of digital media and technology in social and cultural contexts. The report details a series of case studies of projects produced by the hub, as well as comprehensive appendices detailing the projects, participants and partners organisations. CX Hub focused on working with small and micro creative and digital business, which had not previously engaged with HEIs, created an online cultural archive, produced a conference and supported a series of PhD projects. CX Hub faced challenges similar to other KEs covered in this review, such as that of consistency and fluidity of communication and managing numerous individual and institutional participants with different backgrounds and approaches to collaboration, as well as technological issues specific to their projects. Like numerous KEs in this review, CX Hub notes that consistent communication, thorough organisation, a flexible approach to working methods and cultures and clarity of purpose were crucial to facilitating the operation of the KEs.

Design in Action (2016) was conceived to explore the principles and practices of design, prove their economic value and expand ways of incorporating HASS approaches to new business development involving entrepreneurs, researchers and designers. The hub developed a model of KE particular to the area of design involving 'scoping' (identifying future challenges for business opportunities), 'interpretation' (framing these challenges as starting points for innovation), 'ideation' (events focused on developing new business concepts) and 'formation' (development of the business model involving user testing and product launches). The report draws the conclusion that the application of design as a strategy for business growth was successful, arguing that the focus on the consumer within the conceptual framework encouraged participants to reevaluate entrepreneurial strategy; current KEs that engage with the economy are limited in concept and policy and can benefit from HASS research and HEIs need to do more to engage with micro-businesses; the IP model used in research is limited and can benefit from the more collaborative 'shelter model' developed by the hub.

REACT (2016) produced a network of creative practitioners, academics, businesses and other creative organisations in order to collaborate and contribute to the creative economy, funding projects from publishing to interactive documentaries. The report focuses on the social, economic, cultural and environmental impacts of these projects, as well as how the work changes from region to region within the South West. REACT was especially focused on the outputs resulting from interdisciplinary networking and collaboration between arts and culture practitioners and researchers working in what they termed ‘Sandboxes’ (further explored in a report produced at REACT’s halfway point in section 4.3.3). The report frames these hubs as ‘third spaces’ which are neither academic nor commercial (a concept explored by two articles in section 5.3.2), allowing a meeting between researchers and practitioners. The authors argue that the facilitation of creative hubs is both disruptive to the ways in which the creative economy is often conceived, and also productive in terms of multidisciplinary growth that can make socio-economic contributions to the communities in which they operate; HASS-oriented approaches to innovation are useful in facilitating products and processes centred around people. Echoing Geoffrey Crossick’s argument regarding the issues of applying STEM models to KE (mentioned in the Executive Summary and further explored in sections 4.3.1 and 5.3.3), REACT advocates for creative and arts-orienting thinking and collaboration regarding the development of technology within the creative industries. Like Design in Action, these authors also propose a more flexible approach to conceptualizing IP in order to have fluid collaboration and communication between participants in the development process.

Creativeworks London supported over one hundred KEs between researchers and the arts and culture sectors. These took place across three main schemes namely: Creative Vouchers, Creative Entrepreneur-in-Residence Scheme and Researcher in-Residence Scheme. A follow-on fund called BOOST supported a further tranche of activity. As one of the Knowledge Exchange Project leads, Evelyn Wilson, TCCE proposed and led a blog platform entitled Widening the Register, the purpose of which was to allow participants to write accounts of their work and experiences within the projects; especially arts practitioners and organisations whose voices, as this review demonstrates, are often under-represented in the field. The blog contains over fifty entries including many that document the KEs supported through CWL, detailing the ways in which the projects operated, as well as the successes and challenges of each one, providing a significant bank of first-hand accounts of arts/culture KEs. (One of the KEs incubated in this hub is further explored in section 4.3.3.) For example, in one entry, immersive theatre company Punchdrunk gives an account of the impact of having Royal Holloway researcher Emma Miles as Researcher-in-Residence writing about their education project on the company’s outreach programme; Miles then gives her own account of the project and her experience within it as a PhD student.

### 3.3.3. Scope of the collaboration

This third subsection presents two articles, three web pages, a handbook and a blog relating to KEs of varying sizes and scope. Although much of the literature from all four sub-sections intersect and overlap with one another in different ways, it is worth noting the following sources with respect to their attention to the size and scope of different arts/culture KE models.

The article 'Integrated science and art education for creative climate change communication' (Jacobson, Seavey and Mueller, 2016) describes an interdisciplinary field trip module on climate change to Shoals Marine Laboratory for University of Florida graduate students from fine arts and natural resource science departments to think creatively about climate change and science communication. This field trip afforded the students an opportunity for ecological and artistic exploration of the island and informal conversations about climate change and what images might better convey information about it to the public through peer-to-peer learning. The article notes that while this interdisciplinary approach to teaching and integrating the arts benefitted the students, it was difficult to implement as there were cultural and systematic differences between the science and art departments that impeded collaboration and created tension.

(NB: This case study presents an interesting and unusually student-centred KE but the way the article is written makes it difficult to tell which partners were involved and how; the authors were from the University of Florida Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation and School of Art and Art History, as well as the Shoals Marine Laboratory, the School of Marine Science and Ocean Engineering (University of New Hampshire) and the College of Agriculture and Life Science (Cornell University) but it was difficult to tell if the students involved were only from the University of Florida or from all three universities. freelance artists were mentioned in the article but it is unclear who they were and if there was an external arts organisation involved or if they worked for one of the universities.)

The web page 'Arts, Science + Culture Initiative' (University of Chicago, n.d.) presents an interdepartmental, interdisciplinary KE at the University of Chicago, bringing together arts and science in a series of projects involving researchers, students, arts practitioners and members of the public across art history, astronomy and astrophysics, biology, chemistry, cinema and media studies, computer and information science, creative writing, literature, mathematics, medicine, music, molecular engineering, physics, theatre and visual arts, exploring new modes of artistic production and scientific inquiry, bridging the gap between art and science. The initiative involves guest speakers, scholars and artists; seminars; collaboration grants; workshops and labs for making new work. In this way, the University of Chicago serves as a hub for outside speakers and practitioners. The web page provides an overview of the KE, brief descriptions of individual projects and a series of interviews with participants.

The handbook 'This is No Longer That Place' (Crimmin and Oakley, 2020) documents the largest-scale KE in this section, a transnational project of the same name exploring how training and education in art and culture could reflect on and respond to conflict through audience participation and co-production. The 4Cs consortium consisted of eight institutional partners from Denmark, France, Germany, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the UK. In addition to the handbook, KE outputs includes an artist-in-residence programme, a creative workshop, a public discussion, exhibition and film screening. Participating organisations included the Royal College of Art, Creative Europe, Tate Britain, The Show Room, 4Cs and Culture + Conflict. Collaborations between such large, international institutions afforded the project a wealth of

experience and knowledge and a broad audience base, as well as a variety of approaches to carrying out the KE. However, the authors noted that such a large, international partnership took up a good deal of time and resources and the audiences who came to the workshops were, according to the handbook, limited and homogeneous, suggesting perhaps that the project did not have the reach they would have liked.

Further examples of sources that engage with the notion of scope and size of different models of arts/culture KEs can be found throughout in the review, as well outside of it. Kenn Taylor's blog 'A Totem for Hull' (2020) details the commissioning of a public sculpture by disabled artist Jason Wilshire-Mills inspired by participatory work in the community by Artlink and the University of Hull. The article 'University in the Art Museum: A Model for Museum-Faculty Collaboration' (Villeneuve, Martin-Hamon and Mitchell, 2006) is another source depicting another model of HEI/museum collaboration, this time within the University of Kansas, where curators and researchers engaged with the on-campus art museum for faculty training and interdisciplinary work with students. In 6.3.3, the article 'Teaching Race, Place, and History Through Culture and Performance' (Mazzocca, Finn, Goetz and Gibson, 2015) presents a case study where numerous stakeholders engaged in a focused KE that resulted in numerous outputs, including art exhibits, interactive lectures and a community performance. While these are all smaller-scale KEs, further detailed in section 6.3.2, the website for 'Arts at CERN' (n.d.) is an example of a large-scale KE engaging numerous stakeholders from several countries, in different geographical locations.

## 4. Theme 2: Nature of documentation

### 4.1. Introduction

This section will address the second theme of this literature review, which breaks down a sampling of research materials that were largely analytical, those that were largely descriptive and others that fell somewhere in between. Although this turned out to be a significant characteristic of the sources overall and every source referenced in this review could fall into one of these categories, this section will examine particular sources in order to better understand this trend in the field and how it has impacted the literature review. The analytical dimension of the sources proved to be one of the most significant elements in this research process, as it determined what could be understood of arts/culture KEs from the existing literature, as well as the limitations of the field.

### 4.2. Evidence synthesis

These sources were selected according to whether they answered the central research questions (identified in section 1.3) and then later appraised as to whether they were analytical, descriptive or a combination of the two. The following criteria were adopted in order to appraise the sources with respect to how analytical they were:

- Does it engage with theory and/or demonstrate use of a critical framework?
- Is it analytic with respect to a case study/studies and/or the field of KE?
- Does it conduct a comparative study or give a systematic overview of KEs?
- Does it draw conclusions about the KEs discussed?

Another element of the appraisal was length of the source; while not all long sources were analytical or all brief ones descriptive, length was a contributing factor, as shorter sources (particularly blogs and websites) did not provide the scope for rigorous analysis. The following criteria were adopted in order to appraise the sources with respect to how descriptive they were:

- Does it document, describe or present a case study?
- Does it document, describe or present some aspect of or trend within the field of KE?
- Does it promote some manifestation of a KE (project, programme, conference, festival or residency) for an HEI or arts organisation?

The sources included in this section consist of articles, reports, presentations, blogs, websites, book chapters and a handbook; they were selected for this section of the literature review because they exemplify analytical and descriptive sources, as well as how they align with one another and how they differ. They also serve to illustrate the nature of the field, as well as the gaps within it. These sources were analysed within the overall matrix (explained in sections 2.4 and 2.5) and compared to each other in order to understand the spectrum of analytical to descriptive literature. This analysis

was then, once again, examined through the lens of the research questions in order to better understand the strength of this evidence for the project.

### 4.3. Summary of main findings

The literature in this section generally followed a pattern: articles, reports, book chapters and lectures tended to be analytical, stemming largely from the academic and policy sectors. They were generally written by researchers and policy-makers and gave overviews of the field of arts/culture KEs, sometimes also providing a literature review of sources pertaining to the field. Sometimes specific case studies were included, but more often than not, they were referenced briefly and with limited detail. Websites, handbooks and blogs tended to be more descriptive, stemming largely from a variety of sources, such as researchers, HEIs, arts organisations and, less frequently, artists. They ranged from sources serving to document an ongoing or recent project to those being used by institutions to promote a particular project, initiative or department.

#### 4.3.1 Analytical sources

This subsection will give examples of analytical sources and how this category of research breaks down with respect to the literature review. These sources tended to be articles, reports, chapters and lectures, which mostly presented overviews of the field of KEs, sometimes referencing specific case studies and often delving into other literature pertaining to the field. This analytical literature was largely written by academic researchers and policy-makers, some of whom were involved in KEs themselves, some of whom were not. Although these sources give the reader an analytic insight into art/culture KEs in a general sense and draw a number of conclusions about their efficacy, sometimes the studies lack the specificity regarding case studies often found in the descriptive sources.

The first category of examples represents one of the most common examples of literature relating to arts/culture KEs, which is sources that give an analytical overview of the field—in this case, two academic articles and a report.

The first article, ‘Rethinking “knowledge exchange”: new approaches to collaborative work in the arts and humanities’ by Simon Moreton (2016), is both unusual and significant because it is one of the few sources written from the perspective of someone who is both an academic and an artist and draws on his experience as an artist in his research; this complexity is demonstrated in the way in which the article bridges the concerns of both the researcher and the artist, as well engages with the political implications of KE. Moreton asserts that in order to fully understand both the possibilities and challenges of KEs between researchers and artists, those participating in the field must embrace a nuanced view that recognises the importance of communication, fluidity, networking and contingency (as opposed to the transactional view dominant in KE discourses). Moreton does not engage with specific case studies but draws nuanced and considered conclusions about the field. It is worth noting that Moreton’s research was the result of his engagement as an AHRC-

funded researcher employed to evaluate the 2012-2016 Knowledge Exchange hubs, and so he was in a unique position of both an insider and outsider (a practitioner, University of the West of England academic and evaluator).

The second example of this type of literature, the article, 'The Role of Universities in the Regional Creative Economies of the UK: Hidden Protagonists and the Challenge of Knowledge Transfer', by Roberta Comunian, Calvin Taylor and David N Smith (2013) is less overtly political than Moreton's article but applies a framework in order to understand the arts/culture KE in a critical fashion. Like the previous article, it does not engage with specific case studies but uses a specific critical framework of the Triple Helix in order to understand the relationship between knowledge, industry and government as well as to identify challenges in understanding the system. The authors conclude that the outcomes of most KEs are heavily mediated and influenced by institutional realities (of funding, organizational structure, institutional culture and tradition) and disciplinary cultures - such as the shared ideas across the academic-practice nexus about such matters as artistic credibility, professional repute, disciplinary values and norms. The diversity of outputs in the knowledge creation/practice dynamic makes KEs complex.

The report 'The Hidden Story: Understanding Knowledge Exchange Partnerships with the Creative Economy' (2017) gives the reader tools for understanding and evaluating the impact of KEs on learning, creativity, place-making, wealth creation. The aim of the report is to highlight what is missing from other studies of and reports on KEs and make recommendations for stakeholders for evaluation and future KE planning, such as the importance of learning from previous case studies and deepening collaboration and communication between partners. It is unique in this field for finding methods for evaluating the outcomes of KEs, rather than simply understanding the functioning of the KE itself.

The second category of examples deals with the kind of analytical sources that serve to give an instrumental, foundational understanding of the field by drawing conclusions from an overview of arts/culture KEs, which are useful in terms of putting other case studies in context. Geoffrey Crossick's seminal two lectures (which were later published) 'Knowledge Transfer without Widgets' (2006) and the subsequent 'So who now believes in the transfer of widgets?' (2009) are slightly older than much of the literature in this review, but are significant in that they analyse the shift in the field around this time from knowledge transfer (KT) to KE (both papers are mentioned a number of times throughout this review). In the earlier lecture, Crossick cautions against forcing arts/culture collaborations into the model used in the fields of science, technology and business, saying that this is a growth sector that has great potential if the models are reworked to facilitate creativity rather than marginalise it, treating the process as an exchange rather than an economic transaction. In 2009, he built on this argument by considering what is distinctive about knowledge development and transfer in relation to the creative economy in comparison with other areas of research and industry, asserting that STEM KEs and arts/culture KEs have much they can learn from each other's practices and methodologies. His argument was that the lack of traditionally commercial outputs from many arts and humanities disciplines makes engaging in KE activities challenging, especially when using STEM-style

models which tend to focus on output. Crossick was also arguably instrumental in encouraging a shift in the KE field from knowledge transfer (simply from one party to another) as the dominant language to knowledge *exchange* (focusing on a collaborative exchange of knowledge between participants).

The third category of examples of analytical literature uses specific case studies in order to draw conclusions, which provide both an analytic overview of KEs but also detail with respect to how collaborations function. For example, the article ‘Engaging People in Making History: Impact, Public Engagement and the World Beyond the Campus’ by Laura King and Gary Rivett (2015) uses the case studies of a theatre company and a storytelling organisation to argue that KEs with HEIs and arts organisations working in the community should not embrace a top-down model but rather a highly collaborative one, allowing the knowledge to flow freely between all participants, rather than treating the community as a passive recipient. The report ‘Shared interest: developing collaboration, partnerships and research relationships between higher education, museums, galleries and visual arts organisations in the North West’ by Jane Dawson and Abigail Gilmore (2009) gives an overview of the field by drawing conclusions from case studies focused on a particular region in the UK (the North West) and a particular area of the arts (visual arts, museums and galleries). They explain that successful collaborations must design the approach to the collaboration together, and that partnerships between large institutions especially need careful, detailed planning and grounding in specific operational activities.

Other examples of analytical literature in the field are covered in the next section (section 5), but there are others not included elsewhere in this review that are worth noting here. The article ‘Science Communication Through Art: Objectives, Challenges, and Outcomes’ (Lesen, Rogan and Blum, 2016) is an overview of literature around and projects engaged in arts-based science communication for raising awareness and shaping public policy; while not all the case studies entailed are KEs, the majority are. The report ‘The Cultural Knowledge Ecology: A discussion paper on partnerships between HEIs and cultural organisations’ (Fisher, 2012) gives a critical overview of KEs between HEIs and arts/cult organisations, largely in the north of England, including a summary of findings, identification of models and suggestions for stakeholders in terms of moving forward. A second report, ‘New Model Visual Arts Organisations & Social Engagement’ (Froggett, Little, Roy and Whitaker, 2011) is an ethnographic study investigating how the socially engaged practices of four arts organisations might facilitate change for individuals and communities; echoing Crossick’s papers on moving away from the output-focused STEM model, the authors examine the ways in which these practices might be researched by developing a methodology sensitive to arts practice to account for their impact and influence. A third report, ‘Museums for Health and Wellbeing: A preliminary report from the National Alliance for Museums, Health and Wellbeing’ (Lackoi, Patsou, and Chatterjee, et al., 2016) describes the wealth of activity around health, wellbeing and social care that museums and galleries offer across the UK, providing the context in which the National Alliance for Museums, Health and Wellbeing was established.

### 4.3.2 Descriptive sources

This subsection will give examples of descriptive literature and how this category of research breaks down with respect to this literature review. These sources tended to be websites, handbooks/brochures or blogs, briefly summarising finished or ongoing projects in order to document the work, often created from the perspective of the body housing the KE (arts organisation, HEI or network). Although these sources give the reader a good sense of the nature of the collaborations described (often more so than many analytical sources), they do not generally provide insight into the successes and challenges of the projects, or do not mention the outcomes at all. This tendency seems largely due to the unfinished nature of the KEs in question, and at other times, the nature of the purpose of the source itself (often to provide a brief overview of the project or advertise the institution). It may also be that many longer, more detailed and critical evaluations of KEs are not publically available, but rather in the archives of the institutions that produced them and/or the funding bodies that required them.

The first category is represented by a brief academic report documenting a project from the perspective of the researcher, serving the function of recording the outcome of a KE. ‘Knowledge Exchange: DMU and the V&A’ was written by Peter Sillitoe (2013) about his experience working in the V&A performance archives as researcher-in-residence for the Shakespearean London Theatres project at De Montfort University, identifying which neglected artefacts should be showcased in an exhibition on early modern drama. This source is valuable for its detail in documenting the researcher’s experience within a KE between a university and a museum archive, even if it is brief.

The second category of descriptive sources exemplifies the trend of websites that document KEs for the purposes of promoting a particular project, department or organisation, which was a particularly common trend in this field. Three examples of similar websites are ‘Coventry Made Me’ (n.d.), ‘Temporary Contemporary’ (University of Huddersfield, 2021) and ‘Northumbria University Cultural Partnerships’ (2021), all of which briefly summarise different kinds of arts/culture KEs for University of Warwick, Coventry University, University of Huddersfield and Northumbria University, respectively. ‘Coventry Made Me’ focused on one case study, a film made by two artists, informed by research on the ways in which Coventry has impacted the creative identity of its artists and creatives; although the project is finished, there were no analytical conclusions drawn about the work. ‘Temporary Contemporary’ is a KE that provides a platform for exhibitions, performances and research, bringing together artists, researchers, students and people within the community of Huddersfield; the website itself is a platform for the programme, a way of documenting and promoting the KE (now in its second year), demonstrating the ways in which the KE utilises the spaces at Queensgate Market, where it operates. ‘Northumbria University Cultural Partnerships’ represents a KE model whereby the university operates as a hub, fanning out across numerous arts organisations in the region; the site representing this hub presents the different cultural organisations (representing creative writing, film, theatre, museums and visual art) and the ways they are collaborating with the university within these KEs.

Lastly, one website worth noting that is a similar example of a descriptive source but different in its format is the online brochure ‘Humanities Knowledge Exchange Fellowships’ (2020), produced by The Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities (TORCH). TORCH is an example of a hub incubated within a single university (similar to the University of Chicago ‘Arts, Science + Culture Initiative’ hub - section 3.3.3) and can be seen as a smaller model of the KE hubs covered in section 3.3.2.1. This online brochure for TORCH differs insofar that it gives the reader a better, somewhat more detailed idea of the typology of KEs currently emerging from universities. While the description of each KE (usefully divided into ‘Performance’, ‘Culture and Heritage’, ‘Health and Wellbeing’ and ‘Policy’) is brief and does not draw any conclusions about the efficacy of the project, it is effective in giving details such as project partners, locations and outcomes in terms of the work.

The third category depicts another example of a descriptive source common in the field, which is a blog documenting a project, either from the researcher’s perspective, the artist’s perspective or both. In this case, the blog ‘Queer Rural Connections’ (Allmann and Allsop, 2021) is a rare example of extensive documentation of a case study of a KE from the perspective of the artist, rather than the researcher. Writer and performer Timothy Allsop writes about working on the project with Oxford researcher Kira Allmann, researching and making work about the lives of queer people in rural areas, with the goal of producing a film and a piece of theatre. Other platforms such as ‘Widening the Register’ and ‘Beyond the Campus’ showcase similar blogs, but are generally more abbreviated.

Although there are many noted throughout this review, the following are some further examples of descriptive literature. In section 6.3.1, ‘Writers’ Kingston’ (Kingston University, n.d.) is the website for Kingston University’s literary cultural institute, producing talks, publications, courses and exhibitions, a unique approach to a specifically writing-focused KE. The blog ‘Illustrating Futures’ (University of Liverpool, 2018) presents a KE devised between the University of Liverpool, the Tate Liverpool Exchange and Comics Youth to investigate how comics and zines can improve literacy and mental health in young people. Another website, ‘Radical Mischief: A Conference Inviting Experiment in Theatre, Thought and Politics’ (University of Birmingham, 2018) gives a brief overview of a conference created by the University of Birmingham and the Royal Shakespeare Company in order to explore strategies for combating prejudices and presuppositions in academia and the theatre industry.

### 4.3.3 Analytical and descriptive sources

This subsection will give two examples of sources that are both analytical and descriptive in their content, written for different purposes and formats, but both documenting case studies resulting from KE hubs.

The first category depicts a case study which exemplifies the kind of source which is a combination of descriptive and analytical in that it provides a detailed description and some analysis of a single case study and a conclusion regarding the lessons learned from the process. The chapter ‘At Home with Collaboration: Building and Sustaining a

Successful University-Museum Partnership' by Alastair Owens, Eleanor John, Alison Blunt, from the book *Cultural policy, innovation and the creative economy: creative collaborations in arts and humanities research* (Shiach and Virani, 2016), documents a Creativeworks London (previously mentioned in section 3.3.2.1) collaboration between Queen Mary University of London and the Geffrye Museum, the nature of their partnership, its challenges and benefits. The collaboration was successful in that it created opportunities for both the university and the museum staff to learn skills from one another; museum employees learned how to supervise PhD students and Queen Mary researchers learned how to curate exhibitions and run outreach programmes. Additionally, both parties learned new approaches to collaboration through the KE. The challenging aspect of the project seemed to come later on; further funding proved to be challenging to secure, and the increased workload for both organisations as a result of the success of the project was difficult to manage with limited staff. The fact that the chapter focused on a single case study gave the authors the opportunity to devote more time to analysing the collaboration than sources that attempted to cite numerous case studies, and the fact that the KE had finished allowed for them to draw conclusions about the project. However, the chapter still tended to embrace a more descriptive than analytic approach in terms of presenting findings from the case study.

This second category contains a case study which exemplifies the kind of source which is partially analytical and partially descriptive in that it provides a somewhat analytic breakdown of a series of case studies, but, unlike the previous example, does not draw any concrete conclusions (as it documented a series of projects in process). 'Collaborations 2012-2013' (Dovey, Moreton and Gwalchmai, 2014) is a report published by REACT (previously mentioned in section 3.3.2.1). It gives a detailed description of a series of case studies of REACT projects at the halfway point in the initiative in 2014, referring to the curated KE laboratories into which researchers and artists were sorted as 'Sandboxes'. For example, *Jekyll 2.0* was an immersive media adaptation of *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*; *JtR125* is a documentary video game giving players the chance to investigate the Jack the Ripper killings. This report breaks down the ways in which the Sandboxes were organised and operated as a way of developing projects from the ground up and engaging audiences in the making of the work, rather than allowing funding to dictate the process. There is some analysis of this KE framework in the report, but as the project was only halfway through, there are no conclusions drawn.

Two further examples of this hybrid analytical-descriptive literature can be found elsewhere in this review. In the next section (5.3.3), the article 'Beyond the campus: higher education, cultural policy and the creative economy' (Gilmore and Comunian, 2016) is a hybrid in that it gives a description of some literature across the field but is somewhat analytical in nature. In section 6.3.3, the chapter 'A model for university-town partnership in the arts: TestBeds', from the book *Developing a Sense of Place: The Role of the Arts in Regenerating Communities* (Ashley and Weedon, 2020) detailed the mechanics of a KE between a town and an HEI and offered some analysis of the process. 'Pioneering Places, Kent' (Cultural Placemaking, n.d.) is the website that hosts the blog and provides a landing page for a placemaking KE of the same name, focusing

on connecting Canterbury Christ Church University with arts organisations across East Kent, as well as individual local artists and regional communities.

## 5. Theme 3: Conceptualising the process

### 5.1. Introduction

This section will address the third theme of this literature review, which presents a selection of sources that represent another tendency in the field, namely that of academic articles and reports (and lectures?)/papers that focus on conceptualising KEs through different frameworks, analysing various processes and reviewing sources upon which they have drawn in their own research. Although some of these papers have been mentioned in previous sections, they also form a separate category of research that do not necessarily engage with case studies in detail, but take an analytical overview of the field of arts/culture KE. These studies generally demonstrated the following tendencies: provided an overview of the field, proposed a theoretical framework for understanding arts/culture KE and/or critiqued the challenges of these kinds of collaborations. Although some sources demonstrated two or three of these tendencies, they have been separated into categories for clarity.

### 5.2. Evidence synthesis

These sources were selected according to whether they answered the central research questions (identified in section 1.3) and then later evaluated as to how they engaged with the field. These sources are analytical and approach understanding KE by applying critical frameworks and theories, comparing case studies and cross-referencing (sometimes even cataloguing) other sources relating to the field. The following questions were applied to these sources in order to better understand how they made sense of the field:

- What argument is the author(s) making?
- What are they saying about the way arts/culture KEs operate?
- Do they make any statements/suggestions regarding the challenges inherent in the process?
- Does the source include a review of literature relating to this area of study?
- Does the source propose a framework for understanding how KEs do/can operate?
- Does the author(s) focus on a particular area of practice or are they looking at arts/culture more generally?

The sources included in this section consist of articles, reports and presentations. They were selected for this section of the literature review because they exemplify literature that provided an overview that conceptualised the process of KE, sometimes also making attempts to understand how these collaborations intersected with or impacted the greater ecology of the communities in which they operated (academic, local and industrial). These sources were analysed within the matrix used to understand the literature as a whole (explained in sections 2.4 and 2.5) and evaluated as to how they compared to other sources within the study. This analysis was then, once again, examined through the lens of the research questions in order to better understand the strength of this evidence. Those that include their own

literature reviews were used to cross-reference with the growing body of sources in this review in order to consider and incorporate potentially useful sources.

### 5.3. Summary of main findings

This section is characterised by sources that are analytical, each taking a critical overview of the field of arts/culture KE, whether to provide an introduction to the field, draw conclusions about different approaches to KE, create frameworks for understanding them and/or suggest approaches to engaging with the challenges posed by these kinds of collaborations. There is a significant amount of overlap between subcategories but it is useful to divide this type of source into central tendencies, in order to understand the ways in which analytical writing about arts/culture KEs not focused on specific case studies can operate. The first subsection contains an article and a report that give an overview of the field of arts/culture KE, some pertaining more to specific areas of practice and research than others. The second subsection of literature contains two articles, a book chapter and a report which engage a specific analytical framework in order to understand the functioning of arts/culture KE. The third subsection contains a report, two articles and two lectures which focus on theorising the challenges of KE and what we can learn from those challenges.

#### 5.3.1. Overview of the field

This subsection will give examples of an article and a report that provide an overview of the field of arts/culture KE, one of which also gives the reader a review of other literature pertinent to this area.

The first example, ‘Hidden Connections Knowledge exchange between the arts and humanities and the private, public and third sectors’ (Hughes, Kitson, Probert et al., 2011), an AHRC-funded report produced by the Centre for Business Research at Cambridge, not only gives a survey of this field but also draws a conclusion that many sources in this review have drawn about arts/culture KE. The report provided an overview of the intersection between arts, humanities, technology, business and the academy in KEs, examining how the advantages of each field can be maximised and how different fields do or do not intersect with each other. It emphasises that it is important to distinguish between the needs of different fields, manage the expectations of participants and recognise the complexities within the arts sector in particular. While connections between the academy and the public sector can be strengthened to the advantage of both sectors, the authors caution that when conceiving of a KE, it is important to make a distinction between arts/humanities researchers in the academy and arts practitioners, understanding their particular perspectives, experiences and needs.

The second example is similar to the first in that it is an article that gives a survey of this field and draws conclusions from a range of sources, however its focus is on the area of environmental science and ways in which KEs can engender positive change. “‘Raising the temperature”: the arts on a warming planet’ (Galafassi, Kagan, Milkoreit, et al., 2018) reviewed a range of literature and synthesized these sources in order to

draw out the role of the arts in fostering climate transformations as perceived by researchers and practitioners. Their study shows an increased engagement in climate-related art projects and initiatives in recent years, particularly with respect to visual and performing arts. Artists are moving beyond raising awareness and are entering the terrain of interdisciplinarity and knowledge co-creation with HEIs and other research bodies. Like some other literature across this review, the authors conclude that climate-arts can contribute positively in terms of presenting the findings of climate studies to the public and encouraging an appetite for the transformations necessary to address climate change.

### 5.3.2. Providing a framework

This second subsection will give examples of sources that propose a critical framework for understanding and analysing different kinds of arts/culture KE, namely two articles, a book chapter and a report. It is worth noting that all the articles were written with the participation of researcher Roberta Comunian as a co-author, who is a leading researcher in this field.

Previously discussed in section 4.3.1, 'The Role of Universities in the Regional Creative Economies of the UK: Hidden Protagonists and the Challenge of Knowledge Transfer' (Comunian, Taylor and Smith, 2013) interrogates the relationship between universities and the regional creative economy using the Triple Helix model of innovation (the intersection of knowledge, industry and government) as a critical framework. The paper identifies the nature of challenges inherent in arts/culture KE and engages with this framework in order to develop a clearer understanding of the systematic and institutional realities that underpin the often complex dynamics of knowledge creation-practice relationships found in arts and humanities disciplines, especially with respect to geographic location. They argue that while HEIs have long-standing and hidden associations with local creative activities (so-called 'hidden protagonists'), there are significant institutional and practical challenges in the possibility of developing a sustainable role as partners in the regional and urban creative economies (such as the production of knowledge, such as growth, reorientation, assimilation, exploitation and value systems) which the Triple Helix framework can be used to analyse.

Similarly to the Triple Helix framework, the authors of the following book chapter engage with the concept of the third space (what is produced when the creative industries and HEIs collaborate) in order to frame the nature of arts/culture KEs as a place where knowledge production is stimulated. 'From knowledge sharing to co-creation: paths and spaces for engagement between higher education and the creative and cultural industries' (Gilmore and Comunian, 2014) charts the changing dynamics of and drivers for the different relationships between universities, the creative/cultural industries and the communities they serve. It explores the motivations and rationales emerging from policy making and from the sectors themselves which shape and influence these modes of engagement. The findings emerged during the discussions and events that took place in the UK and internationally from 2012 to 2014 as part of the research network Beyond the

Campus: Connecting Knowledge and Creative Practice Communities across Higher Education and the Creative Economy. In a critical dimension to this study, the chapter argues that creative practitioners often struggle in the unbalanced power dynamics with HEIs and that more KEs need to engage with local communities in order to be truly sustainable. Like the previous articles, the authors engage with a review of pertinent literature in the field to support their argument.

Building on these previous studies, 'Higher Education and the Creative Economy: Creative Graduates, Knowledge Transfer and Regional Impact Debates' (Comunian, Gilmore and Jacobi, 2015) is an article that highlights the growing importance of interdisciplinary research at the intersection between HEIs, the creative industries and regional creative economies, framing the research within the concept of KEs as third spaces (similarly to the previous article). The authors argue that in this third space, a better understanding of the importance of local community management and engagement is needed in order to improve viability and sustainability of KEs regarding their impact on the communities in which they operate. The informality often inherent in arts/culture KEs can obscure the contributions of participants, especially members of the public; investing in more transparent practices and relationships can prevent tension and conflict.

A further report previously discussed in this review (in the Executive Summary and in section 4.3.1) that falls into this category is the AHRC-funded report 'The Hidden Story: Understanding Knowledge Exchange Partnerships with the Creative Economy' (2017) that provides a toolset that can be used to evaluate impact of KEs on learning, creativity, place-making, wealth creation, as well as highlight what is missing from studies of and reports on KEs.

### 5.3.3. Theorising the challenges

This third subsection will give examples of sources that analyse and draw conclusions about the various challenges individuals and institutions face when executing arts/culture KEs. Although some of the sources in the previous two subsections also highlighted the complications of arts/culture KEs, the following articles, report and lectures focus particularly on theorising these issues.

Similarly to the aforementioned articles by Gilmore and Comunian, 'Beyond the campus: higher education, cultural policy and the creative economy' (Gilmore and Comunian, 2015) examines case studies in UK and internationally and reviews existing literature on the subject of arts/culture KEs within the framework of cultural policy studies, this time looking to the issue of impact and evaluation. The authors interrogate the question of 'creative human capital and knowledge development', noting that the development of these kinds of collaborations can be crucial to local economies and societies but difficult to facilitate and evaluate because of the variable and sometimes informal nature of the field. The article serves as a useful introduction to the field in its overview and also its references to other relevant sources.

Looking at a study from another country, 'Collaborating across sectors. The relationships between the humanities, arts and social sciences (HASS) and science,

technology, engineering and medicine (STEM)' (Metcalf, Riedlinger, Pisarski and Gardner, n.d.) is a report on and evaluation of interdisciplinary collaborations between HASS and STEM, the benefits and costs, models, incentives for participants and impediments in Australia. This report systematically breaks down and analyses a number of case studies of interdisciplinary KEs in order to identify challenges in these kinds of collaborations and draw conclusions about best practices. The authors call for a change in approach to research behaviour, educate participants for better collaboration, train students in these new approaches and coordinate and advocate for cross-sectoral collaborative practice.

Although they have been covered in more detail earlier in this review, it is worth noting two pairs of significant sources that fall into this category of theorising the challenges of KE, three of which have previously been mentioned as having had an impact on the field of arts/culture KE. In 2006, Geoffrey Crossick helped shift the way in which researchers and other HE professionals involved in the field considered the production and dissemination of knowledge with his lecture 'Knowledge Transfer without Widgets', by arguing that the arts had great potential for KE if the collaborations were reworked to facilitate creativity. His 2009 lecture 'So who now believes in the transfer of widgets?' built on this argument by proposing that the STEM model for KE needs to change in order to accommodate the ways in which knowledge is produced and transferred in the arts. (Both can be found in the Executive Summary and in section 4.3.1.) Simon Moreton's 2015 paper 'Rethinking "knowledge exchange"' (also in 4.3.1) encourages readers to avoid taking a transactional view of arts/culture KE. In section 7.3.1, this review will address Moreton's 2018 paper which theorised the issues around KE and the neoliberal economy.

## 6. Theme 4: Defining and describing Knowledge Exchange

### 6.1. Introduction

This section will address the fourth theme of this literature review, which breaks down a sampling of research materials that represented another trend in the field, namely that of studies that presented issues of identification and classification. What these sources have in common is that the comparison of one to another allows for an understanding of the challenges of the study of KEs; they vary in terms of self-definition as well as relative opaqueness or transparency of certain characteristics of case studies. Although the collaborations in this review can be considered KEs, not all of them used that term to define themselves, using terms such as ‘project’, ‘collaboration’, ‘platform’ or others instead; this was instructive for the literature review in terms of understanding how KEs presented themselves, versus how they were regarded when treated as case studies by researchers. If a study did categorise itself outside the term KE, it was often difficult to find it in a search and then understand how to categorise it. Others were vague with respect to aspects of the projects depicted, such as their origins and drivers, the themes of the KEs, who and/or what organisations were involved and how they collaborated. This, in turn, made it difficult to fully analyse the case studies presented and how they functioned.

### 6.2. Evidence synthesis

These sources were selected according to whether they answered the central research questions (identified in section 1.3) and then later appraised as to what terms they used to define themselves, as well as their relative clarity or ambiguity regarding particular characteristics within the case studies they presented. In terms of variety regarding self-definition of the KEs, the following questions were applied to the sources:

- How does the source refer to KE?
- Is there another term being used?
- What type of source is it?
- Is this source analytical or descriptive?

It was useful to apply the following questions in order to get a sense of the case studies and how they functioned:

- What were the project details?
- Who were the participating individuals and institutions?
- What was the discipline of the art practice?
- What were the drivers? (funding, policy, collaboration)
- Did it deal with any of the key NCACE themes? (health and wellbeing/placemaking/tech for social good/climate and environment) Or others?
- What was the background of the author of the source?

The sources included in this section consist of articles, blogs, websites and a book chapter; they were selected for this section of the literature review because they exemplify literature that demonstrated some of the limitations of documentation of KEs, namely that they are sometimes difficult to classify and also that case studies, when recorded at all, are not always recorded in detail with respect to significant characteristics that often determine the nature, successes and challenges of the KE. Like the previous categorisation of literature (section 3, analytical and descriptive), this analysis of sources illustrates the nature of documenting and analysing KEs, as well as the limitations of the field. These sources were analysed within the matrix used to understand the literature as a whole (explained in sections 2.4 and 2.5) and evaluated as to how they compared to other sources within the study. This analysis was then, once again, examined through the lens of the research questions in order to better understand the strength of this evidence.

### 6.3. Summary of main findings

This section is broken down into sources that defined themselves outside the term 'knowledge exchange', those that were unclear regarding driving factors of case studies such as policy or funding and those that were unclear regarding who was involved in the case studies and what role(s) they played in the collaboration. (It is important to remember that there are numerous studies within this review which fall into these categories, and that these sources are representative of these tendencies but not exhaustive.) In terms of definition, more formal academic sources such as articles, reports and lectures tended to refer specifically to the term 'knowledge exchange', while briefer, more informal sources (or, less frequently, those written from the perspective of the artist or arts organisation) such as blogs and websites tended to use terms such as 'project', 'collaboration', 'platform' and others. In terms of the issue of clarity of detail versus ambiguity, sometimes it was a case of a source being too brief to go into extensive detail (such as blogs and websites), and at other times, it was a case of the source being more invested in a conceptual framework or overview of the field of KEs than the detail of specific case studies (articles and reports).

#### 6.3.1. Different definitions, how hard it can be to find them

This subsection will give examples of two websites, two blogs, two reports and a handbook that define their projects outside the term 'knowledge exchange'. It is worth reiterating that numerous sources in the field and in this review defined themselves outside this particular term and this is merely two examples of this tendency. In brief, it seemed as if the term KE was mostly used in academic contexts, in reports and papers, while terms such as 'project', 'collaboration', 'platform', 'partnership', or 'programme' were used more frequently in more informal contexts and public-facing platforms such as blogs, websites and brochures. Within sources produced in the arts and culture sector, the trend seemed to be either to refer to KEs more generally using those aforementioned terms ('project' being the most commonly used), or to refer to the specific platform it took such as 'conference', 'residency', 'event' or 'workshop'. It could, in future, be worthwhile to devote a longer study to the significance of the use of

terminology in arts/HEI collaborations, specifically how and why projects self-define in different ways.

‘Writers’ Kingston’ (n.d.) is the website for Kingston University’s literary cultural institute for students, writers and publishers, running courses, workshops, talks and exhibitions, as well as producing publications. It defines itself variously as a programme, collaboration, partnership and cultural institute, but does not mention the term KE. This raises the question of what a KE is and can be, if the term be appropriate in this context or if it is more constructive to engage these terms to describe the range of outputs being created by ‘Writers’ Kingston’.

‘Case studies: Beyond the Campus Body Stories: Queensland University of Technology & Widening Participation’ (n.d.) is a blog describing the case study on the Creative Campus website (documenting case studies from a 2012-2014 AHRC-funded network of KEs), including a link to a brief PowerPoint presentation and recorded interview with participants. Queensland University of Technology connected senior citizens with high school students to make a performance using the body and storytelling; this culminated first in a series of workshops and then in a series of performances. Neither the participants in the project nor the platform presenting the case study refer to it as a KE, but rather use terms such as partnership, project, collaboration and programme.

Other examples of sources that demonstrate varying definitions of KE can be found throughout this review. Although there are numerous examples, here is a selection of different descriptions of different kinds of KEs. In section 3.3.3 can be found the blog ‘A Totem for Hull’ (Taylor, 2020), where the KE (a commission for a sculpture) is referred to as a project and also a partnership, and the handbook for ‘This is No Longer That Place’ (Crimmin and Oakley, 2019), where the activities of the KE are described variously as a workshop, a series of events and a debate. Covered in section 4.3.1 are one report ‘Shared interest: developing collaboration, partnerships and research relationships between higher education, museums, galleries and visual arts organisations in the North West (Dawson and Gilmore, 2009) which uses the terms collaboration, partnership and relationship to describe its activities, and a second one ‘Museums for Health and Wellbeing: A preliminary report from the National Alliance for Museums, Health and Wellbeing’ (Lackoi, Patsou, and Chatterjee et al., 2016) which uses programme and project. A further source, the blog for ‘BU at The Freud Museum: “Powerplay: Psychoanalysis and Political Culture”’ (Yates, 2017), refers to itself as a conference, while another, the article ‘Art, science and organisational interactions: Exploring the value of artist residencies on campus’ (Lee, Fillis and Lehman, 2018) uses the words arts-based initiative, residency and collaboration.

It is probable that the term KE is not widespread because the field is still emerging within the context of the arts and culture industries, and while this sector is accustomed to engaging in collaborative practices, the term KE is still unfamiliar. In some cases, materials designed to be public-facing (such as blogs, websites and brochures) tend to describe what can be understood as KEs as terms more familiar to the general public, such as project, collaboration or partnership, whereas more academic sources (articles and reports) use the term KE. However, it can be seen in the literature that even some of the academic sources use those terms in addition or or

even instead of KE. Certainly KEs with multiple outputs (such as ‘Writers’ Kingston’) tend to use various terms to describe those activities, perhaps also for clarity, as KE might not be an umbrella term they find most useful.

### 6.3.2. Difficulty in understanding characteristics (drivers, origins, themes)

This subsection will give a number of examples of sources (in the form blogs and websites) that did not specify elements such as the drivers and origins of the KEs detailed in the case studies, explaining certain elements of the collaborations but not others. Like most other sources that fall into this category, both were brief and descriptive, documenting and promoting these projects for the organisations providing the platform for the projects, rather than comprehensive and/or analytical, unlike the sources in the next section.

The first source, a blog called ‘Walk refugees’ Balkan Routes at Tate Exchange’ (University of Liverpool, 2018) provides accessible documentation in that it is succinctly presented and includes a link to a video (which is on another page to which the blog is linked), as well as a link to the corresponding page on the Tate website, but it ultimately provides relatively little information about the KE. The blog was written for the University of Liverpool website and included a brief video with interviews with researchers involved in the project from Liverpool and Aston University, discussing the ways in which they documented refugees fleeing Middle East through the Balkans with photos, and then engaged in a quilting project and exhibition through the Tate Exchange programme at Tate Liverpool. While this is an unusual and interesting example of a KE case study and includes creative dissemination through the form of video, the documentation is too brief to provide detail and brings up questions such as: were there any artists involved? Were the researchers also practitioners? Was the focus of the project the photography, the quilting or both? Was the photography with which the researchers engaged treated as an art practice, a method of documentation of both?

The second source, a website called ‘Arts at CERN’ (n.d.) produced by the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), is a more expansive, complex KE than the previous one, and while it provides more information, it does not necessarily provide more clarity. The website presents a series of projects such as commissions, exhibitions, events and residencies, but it is difficult to discern which organisations are playing what roles in these projects. For example, ‘Connect South Africa’ invites Swiss and African artists to spend three weeks at CERN in Geneva, followed by five weeks in astronomy observatories across South Africa; while there is a mention of the University of Cape Town, it is not made explicit what role they play in the project.

There are numerous further examples of sources throughout this review that fit this profile of literature that does not necessarily provide enough information and/or enough clarity for the project and its drivers to be fully understood. Many examples from section 3.3.2 (model of the collaboration) fall into this category, such as the two websites ‘Liveable Futures’ (n.d.) and ‘S.H.E.D.’ (Jones, 2020), and the blog ‘Writing

the Climate’ (Culture Forum North, 2019). And also several examples from section 4.3.2 (descriptive sources), such as the websites ‘Coventry Made Me’ (n.d.), ‘Pioneering Places, Kent’ (Cultural Placemaking, n.d.), ‘Temporary Contemporary’ (2018) and ‘Northumbria University Cultural Partnerships’ (2021). There is a good deal of overlap between these three categories, as public-facing sources such as blogs and websites are often designed to give a succinct overview of the project (rather than an in-depth analysis), to promote the institution, programme or project, rather than provide an extensive evaluation.

### 6.3.3. Opaqueness of who was involved and who did what

This subsection will give examples of sources (two articles and a book chapter) that lacked clarity in terms of the individuals and organisations involved in the case studies presented, as well as whether the researcher(s) documenting the project were themselves involved in taking part in it. It was not always clear as to why these details were omitted, whether for lack of time to describe the case studies fully, for political reasons—i.e., not wanting to criticise certain parties directly, or because they were more invested in drawing conclusions about the case studies in question.

For instance, the article ‘Merging arts and bioethics: An interdisciplinary experiment in cultural and scientific mediation’ (Couture, Bélisle-Pipon, Cloutier and Barnabé, 2017) is an interesting example because although it provides extensive documentation of the KE model and outputs in the form of names of participants, photos and diagrams, it is unclear about the participating institutions. The article described the Canadian Art + Bioéthique project, which paired artists, art historians and bioethicists to create an exhibition, events and workshops in order to help the public understand bioethics through art history. The case study presented was complex, extensive and drew interesting conclusions about the efficacy of approaches to KEs, but the article failed to explain who the participating universities and arts organisations were, for reasons that were unclear.

Similarly to the previous example, the second article was detailed about some aspects of the case study but unclear on others. ‘Teaching Race, Place, and History Through Culture and Performance’ (Mazzocca, Finn, Goetz and Gibson, 2015) focused in detail on experiential learning activities within a KE at Christopher Newport University in the US including performances, visual art exhibits, interactive lectures, and a culminating embodied experience of singing and dancing; the collaboration was between a local school, arts practitioners and researchers as an investigation into the history of slavery and the ways in which the arts can contribute to the field of geo-literacy. However, while the article provides a relatively detailed report about the process of the case study, it is inexplicably unclear about the roles of the participants within the collaboration.

Similarly, the third example, a book chapter, is detailed in its documentation of the model and process entailed in the case study KE but not the names of the participating individuals, their disciplines (as researchers or artists) or the organisations from which they came. ‘A model for university–town partnership in the arts: TestBeds’, by Emma-Rose Payne and Alexis Weedon, from the book *Developing a Sense of Place: The*

*Role of the Arts in Regenerating Communities* (Ashley and Weedon, 2020) details a KE between the University of Bedfordshire and local artists in nearby Luton, developing relationships between the artists and the university in order to develop the artists' skill sets as well as those of the university students, and strengthen town-gown relations. This is an interesting and detailed case study, both analytical and descriptive, providing lessons from a successful KE (such as sophisticated communication and extensive funding, as well as offering opportunities to all participants such as producing new work and research), as well as providing an example of a project more driven by the artists than most. However, it was vague in terms of who the participating individuals and arts organisations were, or even what disciplines they were engaging with.

Unlike other categories of sources, the literature that displays this tendency of obscuring (intentionally or unintentionally) participating individuals, institutions and the nature of their participation in case studies of arts/culture KEs can be found in every section in this literature review: nature of collaboration ('Integrated science and art education for creative climate change communication' - section 3.3.3), nature of documentation ('Illustrating Futures' - section 4.3.2), conceptualising the process ("Raising the Temperature": The arts in a warming planet' - section 5.3.1), defining KE ('Body Stories: Queensland University of Technology & Widening Participation' - section 6.3.1) and impact ('Learning about Neighborhood Identity, Streets as Places, and Community Engagement in a Chicago Studio Course' - section 7.3.3). It can also be found across a variety of formats and platforms (articles, websites and blogs), and manifest in different styles of documentation (descriptive and analytical). It is not always (if ever) clear why so much of the literature obscures details of who participated and how, although it is likely there are a number of possible reasons: the source was too brief to go into detail, the source is intended to provide an overview of the case study, there are political reasons for not naming stakeholders specifically, there were too many participating individuals and bodies to mention and others.

## 7. Theme 5: Impact

### 7.1. Introduction

This section will address the fourth and final theme of this literature review, which considers a sampling of research materials that represents the trend of presenting a reflection on the impact the KEs had on stakeholders such as researchers, artists, HEIs, arts organisations, students and communities. The kinds of impacts these KEs have had on participating bodies and individuals with respect to research outputs, art practice and processes ranges from the intended to the unintended, as well as the positive, negative and a mix of the two. Although numerous studies within this review discuss the outcome of KEs, not all discuss impact on participants, and while a number of studies discuss process, not all evaluate outcome or impact. It was more common to find sources that evaluated the impact of arts/culture KEs if they specifically addressed projects that were designed to be public-facing and/or community- or student-oriented; smaller and/or more insular KEs did not necessarily assess impact. Even in the first instance, the studies covered were not always explicit about the impact on participants and conclusions had to be drawn from information regarding artistic and research outputs.

### 7.2. Evidence synthesis

These sources were selected according to whether they answered the central research questions (identified in section 1.3) and then later appraised as to the impact of the KEs depicted in the case studies. The following questions were applied to the sources in order to understand what could be learned from the case studies represented in them for the literature review with respect to the question of impact. What was the impact of these KEs on various stakeholders in collaborative projects, such as:

- Researchers
- Arts practitioners
- HEIs
- Arts organisations<sup>2</sup>
- Students
- Communities

Additionally, the questions applied to the case studies detailed in sections 3.2 and 6.2 regarding participating project partners, discipline of arts practice, drivers, model of KE (including type and size) and relative successes and challenges were applied again to the case studies in this section in order to get a complete understanding of how they functioned in relation to each other and others in the field. The sources included in this section consist of articles, blogs, reports, websites and a lecture; they were selected for this section of the literature review because they represent sources that presented a range of case different studies that demonstrated different kinds of

---

<sup>2</sup> There is a distinction made here between arts practitioners and arts organisations, as not all collaborations involve entire organisations, sometimes just individual artists.

impacts a KE can have on different stakeholders and participants. These sources were analysed within the matrix used to understand the literature as a whole (explained in sections 2.4 and 2.5) and evaluated as to how they compared to other sources within the study. As with other sources in this review, this analysis was then examined through the lens of the research questions in order to better understand the strength of this evidence for the project.

## 7.3. Summary of main findings

This section is broken down into sources that focus on the impact of KEs on different participants and stakeholders. For researchers and artists, many KEs changed the way they thought about the process of making work and conducting research by giving them a window into alternative cultures. Many KEs gave HEIs and arts organisations an insight into the ways in which the arts can impact non-arts fields of research and vice-versa. Public-facing KEs often provided opportunities for students to learn about ways in which they could collaborate with communities in arts projects, as well as for communities to engage with institutions that could contribute positively to and invest in their areas. However, in this section, as well as throughout this review, a number of sources have discussed the ways in which KEs have had a negative impact on participants and stakeholders, illustrating the clash of cultures between arts practice and academia, as well as where the failings lie in the system.

### 7.3.1 Researchers and artists

This subsection is broken down into sources that concentrate on the impact of KEs on arts practitioners and researchers, including three blogs, a lecture and two articles.

The first example had a positive impact on both the artist and the researcher in terms of building their experience in interdisciplinary collaboration and engaging the public. ‘Compassion for Voices: a tale of courage and hope’ (King’s College London, 2014) is a blog documenting a collaboration between a clinical psychologist and an animator who created an animated video that was intended to engage the public on combating stereotypes regarding mental health and approaching the issue of those who hear voices with compassion, as a therapeutic, educational and de-stigmatising tool. In addition to the freelance animator, the KE involved Kings College University of London, the Compassionate Mind Foundation, Balanced Minds and the Medical Research Council. The video was successful in terms of visibility for the condition, and has been used for training and inspiring other arts projects, as well as having a wide reach.

The second example goes one step further than the first, having had a productive impact on both the individual participants as well as the arts organisation in question. ‘Our Fathers: Reflecting on a creative collaboration between a researcher and a theatre company’ (n.d.) is a lecture by Dr Laura King and Brian Mullin, found as a link on a blog on the Creative Campus website (also mentioned in section 6.3.1) describing the project in brief. Reflecting on a creative collaboration between a researcher from the University of Leeds and Babakas Theatre Company, taking into account the

materials from the Creative Campus website (the description and an interview with participants) the lecture gave the audience a new perspective on what the intervention of a historian in a theatre-making process can look like in the development of a new play. The KE caused the theatre-maker and the researcher to view their disciplines from new angles; the theatre company made the historian look differently at how stories of fatherhood can be used, told and represented; the researcher caused the company to consider history more analytically, taking the scope of 20th century into account and considering feminist theory as a lens through which to understand it.

Unlike the other sources in this section, Simon Moreton's article 'Contributing to the creative economy imaginary' (2018) does not present a case study of a single KE, but rather is a critical analysis of how neoliberal models of funding have impacted the relationship between the arts and culture industry and the academy as a whole. It is significant to include in this section as Moreton makes the argument that creativity is often used as a tool for bolstering the neoliberal economy and HEIs are complicit in this because knowledge and the production of it is too often treated as a commodity, rather than as a means of exploration or having inherent value. The impact of this approach to KE is that both artists and researchers are under undue pressure to produce results as a response to funding and policy-driven KEs. (This article can be seen as working in dialogue with Moreton's 2016, covered in section 3.3.1.)

Further examples of literature that engage with the impact on researchers and artists can be found throughout the literature review, in previous sections, such as the blogs 'Exchanging Knowledge through Creative Practice: What do disability arts and culture mean to you?' (Liddiard, 2018) in section 3.3.2 and 'Queer Rural Connections' (Allmann and Allsop, 2021) in section 4.3.2, and the article 'Art, science and organisational interactions: Exploring the value of artist residencies on campus' (Lee, Fillis and Lehman, 2018) in section 6.3.1. Not included in this review is the article 'Illuminating the practice of Knowledge Exchange as a "pathway to impact" within an Arts and Humanities Research Council "Creative Economy Knowledge Exchange" project' (Munro, 2016), which investigates the workings of the University of Glasgow's 'Supporting Creative Business' KE and concludes that a number of elements can place pressure on KEs; too much emphasis on a product, too little time, not enough emphasis on informal KE arrangements and the pressure of having to write reports.

### 7.3.2 HEIs and arts organisations

This subsection is broken down into sources that focus on the impact of KEs on HEIs and arts organisations, including four articles and two reports.

In the first article, the KE was successful as a collaboration because it was productive, focused and the communication between collaborators was effective. 'Museum-university collaboration to renew mediation in art and historical heritage. The case of the Museo de Navarra' (2020) by Amaia Arriaga and Imanol Aguirre analysed the case study of Arriaga and Aguirre coming to the Museo de Navarra from the Department of Education at the Universidad Pública de Navarra to help them find new ways of

mediating between the public and the art collections. The impact on the museum was that the researchers created a space for social engagement by disrupting the chronological curation of the collections, instead approaching the curation in ways that facilitated analytical thinking on the part of the public. The researchers commented that significant changes were able to be made because the museum invited and welcomed this change. Arriaga and Aguirre brought in research regarding other museum practices in order to develop a new approach to curation suited to the museum, but also learned about ways of applying education theory to museum curation in the process.

The second article 'Having an impact? Academics, the music industries and the problem of knowledge' (2011) is one of the more analytical sources regarding the impact of KEs, specifically focusing on the cultural negotiation between HEIs and the music industry. In examining three case studies, John Williamson, Martin Cloonan and Simon Frith observed that the intention of knowledge exchange can become resistant to conversation and collaboration when artists and researchers attempt to combine academic and creative working cultures and attitudes; while the researchers needed a certain amount of transparency regarding the production of music in order to satisfy their research, the musicians and recording artists were concerned with privacy and the protection of the intellectual property rights of their work. Another trend the authors noted was one seen in other studies throughout this review, that of the conflict of the researchers' focus on product over the artists' focus on process. In the end, the impact was a certain amount of friction and misunderstanding between the two parties.

The third article, 'Culture and climate change scenarios: the role and potential of the arts and humanities in responding to the "1.5 degrees target"' (Tyszczyk and Smith, 2018), analyses and assesses the role and potential of the arts and humanities in relation to the climate target embedded within the Paris Agreement, looking to the possibilities inherent in future collaborations. Specifically, it considers the purpose of scenarios in inviting thinking about transformed futures and includes a preliminary assessment of the Culture and Climate Change: Scenarios project, which paired artists in the fields of visual art, sound art, photography, film and theatre with climate researchers in order to produce works of art that could help the public understand the impact of climate change. This project involved numerous independent artists, as well as the University of Sheffield, the Open University convening research projects, workshops, exhibitions, events and publications. The projects were successful in that they allowed the artists to become more climate-literate in their work and enabled the researchers to present their research to the public in a more creative, approachable fashion. This paper argues that integrating more culturally-oriented contributions into the creation and deliberation of climate change scenarios would enrich processes of future-thinking beyond climate model outputs, allowing space for participants and the public to think more flexibly and creatively about the future of climate change.

Other examples of literature that engage with the impact on HEIs and arts organisations can be seen in sources that provide an overview of the field, such as, for example, the report 'The Cultural Knowledge Ecology: A discussion paper on partnerships between HEIs and cultural organisations' (Fisher, 2012), covered in

section 4.3.1. They can also be seen in sources that engage with specific case studies, such as the article ‘Challenges of cultural industry knowledge exchange in live performance audience research’ (Sedgman 2019) in section 3.3.1, and the report ‘Shared interest: developing collaboration, partnerships and research relationships between higher education, museums, galleries and visual arts organisations in the North West’ (Dawson and Gilmore, 2009) in section 4.3.1.

### 7.3.3 Communities and students

This subsection is broken down into sources that concentrate on the impact of KEs on communities and students. Although not all sources focused on case studies which combined these two participant groups, these three articles and two blogs represent a trend in which arts/culture KEs that were engaged with communities, were also focused on the learning experience of students from participating HEIs.

Ivis García’s article ‘Learning about Neighborhood Identity, Streets as Places, and Community Engagement in a Chicago Studio Course’ (2018) analyses a KE that took place during a summer school for architecture and design students in Chicago, bringing together concepts of community engagement and placemaking with education and the creation of public art projects. The students collaborated with architects, urban planners, government officials and activists in order to create and foster partnerships to develop emerging forms of socially responsible practices with respect to implementing public art projects in Chicago’s Humboldt Park to embrace the Latinx history and character of the area while challenging gentrification. The students’ designs helped the local community build on their project of reclaiming the neighbourhood and advance issues of social justice, while the students learned how their approach to design and public art could embrace a political and activist practice.

This last source presents a case study which focuses on the impact a KE collaboration can have on students from a participating HEI. Additionally, the KE served as a pilot project for what became the London School of Mosaic, a small university, designed to train mosaic artists and contribute to public art in specific communities, and therefore produced an even more lasting legacy than other case studies in this section. The blog ‘Beyond the Campus Community Development and HE: Southbank Mosaics and a new model for training socially engaged artists’ (Jacobi, n.d.) on the Creative Campus website (another case study found on the Creative Campus website, which turned out to be rich source of brief but informative descriptions of case studies) presents a case study on an international KE carried out by Kings College, University of Connecticut and Southbank Mosaics where mosaic artists and students created a mosaic at a dock on the Thames in London. The project was not only about producing this piece of public art but also about the learning the students undertook in working with local youth and nearby communities and how the mosaic was a vehicle for this. The impact on the students was that they gained an understanding of arts-led placemaking, collaborating with communities on public art projects and the practice of mosaic making. The impact on the local community was that they benefited from the project in terms of co-producing and contributing to the aesthetic development of the local area.

Further examples of sources that engage with the impact on communities and students in this literature review include the articles 'University in the Art Museum: A Model for Museum-Faculty Collaboration (Villeneuve, Martin-Hamon and Mitchell, 2006) in section 3.3.3 and 'Becoming civic centred – A case study of the University of Greenwich's Bathway Theatre based in Woolwich' (Ellis, Hockham, Rolle and Zigomo, 2021) in section 3.3.2, both engaging with particular case studies. Not previously mentioned in this review is the blog 'Playwriting Can Give Vulnerable Young People Confidence and a Sense of Control' (Lewis, 2020), which documents a KE where the University of Winchester engaged a playwright to mentor vulnerable students in a project that provided the students with confidence and a sense of agency through the process of writing their own plays and performing them; what is unique about this source is that Zoe Lewis, the researcher paired with the playwright, was a playwright herself in addition to being a PhD student at Winchester, which seemed like more of a carefully aligned pairing than many other KEs across the field.

## 8. Conclusion: Summary, findings and recommendations

This conclusion will summarise the findings of the literature review and reveal insights about sources in the field, as well as their limitations and gaps. It will also report on the findings from comparison of this review to the NCACE primary data collection survey. Lastly, it will make a series of recommendations to address the gaps and practical actions to respond to the successes and challenges discussed in the literature.

### 8.1. Summary of the research findings of each theme

#### 8.1.1. Theme 1: Nature of collaborations

The purpose of this first theme was to select and organise a number of sources into categories under the umbrella of the nature of the KEs found in the case studies, in order to get an understanding of the kinds, shapes and models of collaborations that have been executed in the past. This theme is designed to understand what is possible in the field, as well as the potential successes and challenges.

The first theme in this literature review focused on different kinds of models of KEs found in case studies in the field. This was broken down into studies that drew conclusions about successes and difficulties within arts/culture KEs, those that presented examples of different shapes and types of case studies and those that illustrated examples of KEs that varied in terms of the scope of the collaboration.

Examples of successful KEs involved an ongoing, consistent and clear communication between participants, as well as the managing of expectations in terms of process and output, with an understanding that cultures within arts practice and academic research (as well as within arts organisations and HEIs) differ. For instance, the report 'Devising Bespoke Art and Design Interventions for a Dialysis Community' (Louis and Vormittag, 2016) covered a case study of a successful KE between the NHS and Central St Martins, that produced a visual arts project for renal dialysis patients; the participants were able to anticipate the complexities of the collaboration beforehand, plan accordingly and adapt to the circumstances as they proceeded.

Examples of challenges that arose in KEs were unclear and/or inconsistent communication between parties and a mismatch of expectations between participants and/or institutions regarding the culture, process and expected output/product of the KE. For example, the article 'Challenges of cultural industry knowledge exchange in live performance audience research' (Sedgman, 2019) gave an insight into the potential culture clash between HEIs and arts organisations, where the researcher found it challenging to combine HEI research culture and the attitudes towards collaboration within the theatre industry to execute the KE.

This section included a number of case studies from different kinds of descriptive and analytical sources where KEs manifested as community projects, festivals, networks, university courses, small-scale pairings, medium-scale project and large-scale,

transnational initiatives. Size and scope of the model used by the KE, as well as the nature of the collaboration depended greatly on the individuals and institutions involved, goals of the project and funding supporting it. For example, the web page for ‘Arts, Science + Culture Initiative’ (n.d.) presents an interdepartmental, interdisciplinary KE at the University of Chicago, bringing together arts and science in a series of projects involving researchers, students, arts practitioners and members of the public across numerous subjects. Also covered in section 7.3.2, the article ‘Museum-university collaboration to renew mediation in art and historical heritage’ (Arriaga and Aguirre, 2019) presented a model of researchers collaborating with museum curators in order to rethink the audience experience within the museum from a research perspective.

It is also worth recalling the four KE hubs noted in section 3.3.2.1 that engaged numerous HEIs and arts organisations that merit their own category: Creativeworks London, CX Hub, Design in Action and REACT.

## 8.1.2. Theme 2: Nature of documentation

The purpose of this second theme was to organise and select a number of sources according to the ways in which they documented KE case studies, thus better understanding the tendencies in KE documentation and how that might impact the field.

Most articles, reports, lectures and some book chapters covered in this review tended to be critical and analytic in their approach to the understanding of arts/culture KEs, and they were largely produced by academic and policy researchers. These sources often provided overviews of this field, sometimes including brief references to case studies with limited detail. For example, Simon Moreton’s article, ‘Rethinking “knowledge exchange”: new approaches to collaborative work in the arts and humanities’ (2016) is one of the few sources written from the perspective of someone who is both an academic and an artist and draws on his own experience in both areas. The article is also unusual because it explicitly engages with the political implications of KE, analysing both the possibilities and the challenges of KEs for researchers and artists. Websites, handbooks and blogs tended to be more descriptive, stemming from various sources, such as researchers, HEIs, arts organisations and, less frequently, artists themselves. They tended to range from sources serving to document an ongoing or recent KE to those being utilised by institutions to promote a particular initiative. For example, the online brochure ‘Humanities Knowledge Exchange Fellowships’ (2020) for The Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities (TORCH), a hub incubated within a single university, gives the reader a somewhat more detailed idea of the typology of KEs currently emerging from departments at Oxford, as well as project partners, locations and project outcomes.

Some book chapters, handbooks/brochures and lectures proved to be a mix of the analytical and descriptive, engaging with descriptions of case studies but taking a more analytical perspective than the previous category, often in order to understand the lessons gleaned from these KEs. For instance, ‘Collaborations 2012-2013’ (Dovey,

Moreton and Gwalchmai, 2014) is a report published by KE hub REACT gives a detailed description of a series of case studies of REACT projects at the halfway point in the initiative, referring to the curated KE laboratories into which researchers and artists were sorted as ‘Sandboxes’. The report gave some analysis of the KE framework, but no conclusions were drawn.

At times, it seemed as if the more specific the documentation of a case study’s operational and practical issues, the more descriptive it was and the more lacking in analytical perspective; often the drive to document a project (whether finished or ongoing) resulted in this approach, whether because the sources were too brief to be analytical or because the authors were not leaving the documentation for the purposes of analytical study. There was a tendency for academic and policy researchers to be more invested in critical analysis of case studies than practitioners, unless the practitioners were also researchers or students at academic institutions. Sometimes the imposition of an over-reliance on critical frameworks by academic or policy researchers on the study of KEs obscured the case studies themselves and the mechanics of how they operated.

### 8.1.3. Theme 3: Conceptualising the process

The purpose of this third theme was to investigate the analytic literature in the field that conceptualised the collaborative process inherent in arts/culture KE and understand the ways in which these sources framed and categorised various practices and tendencies. While the other themes were more focused on KE case studies, this section of the literature review covered sources that often took a broad overview of the field in order to break down the practice of arts/culture KE as a whole and note its theoretical, economic, artistic and social implications.

The sources covered in this review that focused on conceptualising the process of arts/culture KE were analytical articles, reports and lectures, sometimes commissioned by research bodies in order to evaluate KEs. They critiqued various approaches to KE, engaged with critical frameworks and reviewed sources upon which they drew in their own research. (There are papers in other sections throughout this review that fall into this category, which have been noted.) These studies generally demonstrated at least one of the following tendencies: provided an overview of the field, proposed a theoretical framework for understanding arts/culture KE and/or critiqued the challenges of these kinds of collaborations.

Some studies were more focused on particular areas of this field of KE than others (for instance, the intersection between arts and environmental research). For instance, the article “‘Raising the temperature’: the arts on a warming planet’ (Galafassi, Kagan, Milkoreit, et al., 2018) reviewed a range of literature and synthesized these sources in order to draw out the role of the arts in fostering climate transformations as perceived by researchers and practitioners. Others gave a general overview of the nature of the field, like the report ‘Hidden Connections Knowledge exchange between the arts and humanities and the private, public and third sectors’ (Hughes, Kitson, Probert et al., 2011). Some engaged with frameworks such as the ‘Triple Helix’ model, such as the

article ‘The Role of Universities in the Regional Creative Economies of the UK: Hidden Protagonists and the Challenge of Knowledge Transfer’ (Comunian, Taylor and Smith, 2013), interrogating the relationship between universities and the regional creative economy using the Triple Helix model of innovation (the intersection of knowledge, industry and government) as a critical framework. The concept of the ‘third space’ was also presented, such as in the book chapter ‘From knowledge sharing to co-creation: paths and spaces for engagement between higher education and the creative and cultural industries’ (Gilmore and Comunian, 2014), which charts the changing dynamics of and drivers for the different relationships between universities, the creative/cultural industries and the communities they serve. These frameworks crop up again in other reports on specific KE projects throughout the review.

#### 8.1.4. Theme 4: Defining and describing Knowledge Exchange

The purpose of this fourth theme was to select and organise the sources in the review according to how they defined and described KEs, what terms they used and how they described and evaluated them.

This theme detected within the literature in this field was that of the challenging nature of determining defining and driving factors of case studies. Due to the framing and presentation of case studies, it was sometimes difficult to discern what kinds of funding schemes and policy inspired these projects, or if the drivers were the projects themselves, and/or the desire of the collaborators to work together. For example, in a blog called ‘Walk refugees’ Balkan Routes at Tate Exchange’ (University of Liverpool, 2018) the documentation of the KE is too brief to provide detail and brings up a number of questions regarding who was involved and what was the central art practice of the project.

In a number of cases, it was also difficult to understand which individuals and/or organisations were involved in the KEs and what roles they played. At times, this lack of clarity resulted from sources being too concise to be detailed (like blogs and websites) while at other times, as in the previous category, the source’s author(s) was more focused on presenting a conceptual framework or overview of the field of KEs than the details of specific case studies (such as articles and reports). For example, in the book chapter ‘A model for university–town partnership in the arts: TestBeds’ (Payne and Weedon, 2020) detailing a KE between the University of Bedfordshire and local artists in nearby Luton was unclear about who the participating individuals and arts organisations were.

Sources pertaining to arts/culture KEs were not readily apparent if they did not define themselves as such, which many did not, instead choosing terms such as project, collaboration, platform or partnership; these sources were often more likely to be briefer, more informal, less academic and more oriented around specific case studies. For instance, on the blog ‘A Totem for Hull’ (Taylor, 2020), which detailed a commission for a sculpture, referred to the KE as a project and a partnership; the handbook for ‘This is No Longer That Place’ (Crimmin and Oakley, 2019), the activities of the KE are described variously as a workshop, a series of events and a

debate; the article 'Art, science and organisational interactions: Exploring the value of artist residencies on campus' (Lee, Fillis and Lehman, 2018) uses the words arts-based initiative, residency and collaboration to describe the KE in question.

The terms 'culture industries' and 'creative industries' were sometimes used interchangeably, which could make the searches difficult, as, for example, gaming which was not relevant to the search. However, many studies, reports, articles, brochures, etc combined these two fields.

#### 8.1.4. Theme 5: Impact

The purpose of this fifth theme was to develop an understanding of the impacts the case studies had on various participants and stakeholders in the projects, such as researchers, artists, arts organisations, HEIs, students and communities.

This theme focused on the impact of KEs on different participants and stakeholders: artists and researchers, arts organisations and HEIs and communities and students. There was a good deal of overlap in this category of sources with other categories within the literature review; for example, this section drew conclusions about the successes and difficulties for different KEs, as well as presented different models of working between artists and researchers. For instance, the article 'Having an impact? Academics, the music industries and the problem of knowledge' (Williamson, Cloonan and Frith, 2011), focusing on the cultural negotiation between HEIs and the music industry, the article concluded that KE can become resistant to conversation and collaboration when artists and researchers attempt to combine academic and creative working cultures and attitudes without enough robust discussion.

However, it was not common for most sources found in this field to be explicit about the impact of KEs on those who participated in them, either directly or indirectly. Different sources focused on different aspects of the study of KEs, and were often general about impact (as in academic sources lacking in detailed case studies) or speculative, perhaps not having a thorough or longitudinal evaluation of the impact of the KE on those who had participated in it.

In case studies focusing on the exchange between arts practitioners and researchers, KEs impacted the way they considered the process. In those focusing on institutions, KEs provided HEIs and arts organisations with an insight into the ways in which the arts can impact non-arts fields of research and vice-versa.

The lecture 'Our Fathers: Reflecting on a creative collaboration between a researcher and a theatre company' (King and Mullin, n.d.) reflected on the KE between a University of Leeds researcher and Babakas Theatre Company, giving the audience a perspective on what the intervention of a historian in a theatre-making process could look like. Both parties were encouraged to look at their disciplines from new points of view as a result of their collaboration and sharing of practices as a researcher and an artist.

There were several case studies which combined public engagement or community-oriented KEs with the learning process for students, which seemed to allow the students to understand the ways in which they could engage the community, while the public was able to have exposure to new modes of thinking about and producing culture. For example, the article ‘Learning about Neighborhood Identity, Streets as Places, and Community Engagement in a Chicago Studio Course’ (García, 2018) analyses a KE that brought together students to understand concepts of community engagement and placemaking with the creation of public art by collaborating with architects, urban planners, government officials and activists to foster partnerships in the community.

## 8.2. Limitations within existing evidence

The most glaring gap in the literature was that the perspective from artists and documentation of art practice was largely missing. Most sources have been written by academic or policy researchers, with the occasional exception of creative practitioners or researchers. There is an occasional source written by a practitioner, though the documentation of the case study in question tends to be brief and/or relating to an unfinished project (or one still in progress), and generally descriptive rather than analytical. The blogs ‘Widening the Register’ and ‘Creative Campus’ which emerged from the Creativeworks and Beyond the Campus hubs both proved useful sources of reports from practitioners, but appeared to be the exception rather than the rule in this field. Most of the more in-depth, analytical materials tended to be articles by academics and reports from the cultural policy sector. The analytical materials often focused on giving an overview of the field, rather than an in-depth look at examples of models of KEs, so there was also an absence of analytical views on case studies and the mechanics of KEs. Analytical reports and articles were often broad, non-specific and/or generalised and presented an overview of the field of KEs, drawing conclusions for the reader. In terms of sources that addressed particular case studies, even if they did address the practicalities of KEs, sometimes they were unclear as to details such as names and roles of project partners. It was also sometimes unclear whether the researcher(s) writing about a KE had actually taken part in or not. However, the academic background of the author often heavily influenced the documentation and analysis of the KE, making objectivity difficult.

Web pages and blogs created by institutions (mostly universities but sometimes cultural organisations) would document specific case studies, but only giving a broad overview, often of projects in progress. These were descriptive and often came across as promotion for the institution. Sometimes it was difficult to distinguish between a blog and a website. There were a number of cases of mentions of KEs (completed and in progress) on university websites but when a search was conducted for their names in the hopes of finding documentation (videos, photos, other websites, blogs, articles), nothing further would come up. Alternatively, websites sometimes contained dead links to external sources.

It is also worth noting that there is a significant lack of engagement with metrics in the field of the study and documentation of arts/culture KE.

The ideal source for this project would be literature that would give perspectives from both the researcher(s) and the practitioner(s), with a detailed, clear and analytic account of the case study.

### 8.3. Findings from comparison to NCACE primary data collection

The findings from the literature review research were compared to the findings from the NCACE survey conducted with Arts Professional in March 2021, which sought insight on collaborations with HEIs specifically from the perspective of those working within the arts and cultural sector rather than academia. Not only does the combination of this review and the survey results begin to attend to the gap in knowledge from non-academic collaborators, it also allowed for a better understanding of trends within the field of KE and arts and culture - both documented and undocumented.

There were a number of survey results that mapped onto and/or echoed the research findings from this literature review. Firstly, there were a variety of activities that took place within an arts/culture KE and formed the bulk of the collaborative process. For instance, the participants mentioned projects as varied as cultural education programmes, open source software creation, lecture series and artist in residence placements and co-developed physical infrastructure. Secondly, the successes and challenges of KEs reflected many of those documented in the literature in this review (which, in itself, was repeated again and again). For example, respondents mentioned that successful partnerships involved strong and clear communication, project management focused on mutual benefit and goals and robust R&D processes that allowed all parties to engage in valuable research. As for the challenges, respondents noted unrealistic expectations for delivery, culture clash between sectors and poor project management. Lastly, the fact that respondents commented that HEI partners were most likely to take on the role of evaluating the KEs reflects the fact that much of the documented, publicly available research (formal, detailed and analytical, rather than more informal blog posts and web sites) has been produced in the form of academic papers and policy reports.

There was also new information, as a good deal of the respondents were arts practitioners who were able to share their perspective on the process of being involved in KEs. Information from the survey was useful in terms of filling in the gaps relating to the perspective of arts organisations and practitioners. For instance, a number of respondents noted that there was often unpaid work inherent in the KE process (such as, for example, administration), building audiences for the activities was often challenging and increased funding for the arts organisation meant both fewer financial risk and also sometimes further funding for future projects. The survey results provided further detail regarding the variety of roles arts organisations can play in KE collaborations, such as, for example, co-designing the project, leading workshops for HEI staff, co-writing research bids and work placement for students. The survey also provided a new insight with respect to the student perspective; for

instance, some students appreciated the exposure to arts practice in their studies but sometimes felt as if they were treated as financial targets by the university.

As the survey provided more detail with respect to KEs than most of the literature reviewed in this document, it was interesting to note the patterns in terms of the themes and topics with which arts/culture KEs engaged, the most popular being Place/Placemaking and Health and Wellbeing, followed by Technology for Social Good and Environment and Climate Crisis. Other topics were varied (which reflects the findings from the literature), including such themes as home, community art, censorship and the process of decolonisation.

Overall, of the respondents who had taken part in KEs, most seemed to indicate a positive experience with those collaborations, feeling they were largely effective and mutually beneficial to both artists and researchers.

## 8.4. Recommendations

A number of recommendations are being suggested below in response to the gaps evident in the field, as well as the findings within the research on arts/culture KEs. These are in four key areas including: Future Research; Building stronger Arts and Cultural Knowledge Exchange Cultures; Persistent Challenges and Communicating Arts and Cultural Knowledge Exchange.

### Future Research

With regards to research, there are four broad actions which can be taken to address the gaps in the field.

1. **Find out more about the international picture:** Whilst the focus of the review was mostly limited to UK based knowledge exchanges the process of compiling the database for this literature review, revealed pertinent projects across the United States, Canada, Spain and Australia. Research focusing on finding more international projects could prove informative for the study, discovering similarities and differences across countries with respect to different collaborative models between researchers and the arts and culture sectors.
2. **Better understanding the language:** in the course of this research process, numerous terms were discovered as alternatives for the term KE, it could be instructive to delve deeper into a study of these terms, how and why they are used, if there are patterns to be discovered in their usage and if it influences the field as a whole and how it is best understood by different actors across academia and the arts and culture sectors.
3. **Building a better picture of the quantitative evidence:** It could prove useful to build on this study which focused on a qualitative analysis of the literature, by undertaking a more systematic quantitative study of the current state of arts and cultural knowledge exchange across the UK. Some pictures of this activity will be able to be detected through the REF and KEF exercises but it is likely

that, for various reasons, these together will not reveal the full extent of this field.

4. **Dedicated Journals:** Either leading or in partnership with others, NCACE could play a role in supporting a dedicated space or journal devoted to highlighting arts and cultural knowledge exchange.

### **Building stronger Arts and Cultural Knowledge Exchange Cultures**

This review has highlighted a number of broad opportunities to better support stronger cultures of Arts and Cultural Knowledge Exchange. These are as follows:

1. **New Commissions:** It could be fruitful for universities to coordinate efforts internally, and/or to work in partnership with other academic institutions, funders and others to commission research from specific institutions and/or individual artists and researchers in, for example, particular thematic areas with a view to building better not only more standardised bodies of evidence around the impacts of cultural knowledge exchange but to open up the potential for this field to develop and thrive into the future.
2. **Commissioning ideas.** These could include the following for example commissioning PhDs to work with different cultural partners to embed KE practice and to enable the arts and culture sector to have access to emerging talent pools. Mechanisms to support matchmaking opportunities between researchers with artists in particular fields would also seem useful and pertinent to consider developing.
3. **Empowering collaborators:** In terms of encouraging collaborations in the field of arts/culture KE in a way that might produce future projects and research, there are possibilities for engaging individual artists and researchers so that they are empowered to develop their own partnerships. Activities could include:
  - Hosting networking (live or digital) events for artists and researchers looking to work together; researchers wanting to engage with the arts, artists wanting to engage with research
  - Creating a platform for researchers and artists to find each other: a database listing biographies, skill sets and interests
4. **Open Access Networks:** One approach may be the development of open-access networks that are co-facilitated between researchers and artists, to create an alternative for participants to instigate ideas for projects independent of institutions, that can later be proposed to HEIs and arts organisations. In this way, these collaborators could have the opportunity to develop ideas together that could serve both their interests and demonstrate shared ownership and investment of the projects.

## **Finding solutions to Persistent Challenges**

There are a number of observations to be made regarding barriers to collaboration between HEIs and external organisations and participants. Whilst these challenges may not be new, the fact that they persist suggests that not as much is being done to tackle these barriers as perhaps could be. In terms of external organisations collaborating with HEI departments and staff, the following elements persist in prove challenging:

- Bureaucracy and administration that can be time-consuming, complex and confusing
- Unfit systems for internal-external HEI collaborations and partnerships
- The amount of time HEI staff may or may not have available to engage with the project, on top of their university workload (teaching, pastoral, administrative)

Practical solutions to dealing with such sticky, persistent challenges could include the following:

1. **Developing standards:** A system for standardisation of the field, possibly according to scale, could be adopted that includes areas such as
  - Terminology
  - Procedure
  - Contracts and agreements, including IP
  - Evaluation

2. **Utilisation of Best Practice Guides:** Development of a set of publicly available best practice guides or toolkits including: case studies insights from participants from previous KEs as well as a checklist for different stages of the KE: before the beginning, beginning, midway point and conclusion with evaluation and communication strategies embedded through the project.

3. **Consider the role of neutral parties:** Budgeting for project management support provided by a neutral party may help facilitate the collaboration and manage the participant, especially with larger-scale projects.

4. **Staff development and support.** It is recognised that the implementation of the above requires support for staff across both research and professional support areas within universities. Not all universities are likely to have dedicated staff to support such activities so peer to peer networks and development sessions may also prove helpful in such instances.

## **Communicating Arts and Culture Knowledge Exchange**

This review has indicated that arts and cultural KEs are generally not well communicated and the fact that this is the case could arguably be holding back the potential of this rich field to gain greater recognition and value, within and outside of the academy. Recommendations Include:

1. **Better university communications co-ordination.** Whilst universities do promote their arts and culture KE activities online, it can sometimes be difficult to obtain a full picture of the nature of the collaboration, why it is happening and who is involved, internally and externally. KE project descriptions could prove more useful if they more fully explained the nature of the collaboration and provided details of the various partners involved. Artists' names, for example, should be included in the project description.
2. **Impact.** Better attention could also be paid to articulating the impact of the collaboration, as this review has found that most impacts are under-narrated.
3. **More case studies.** Whilst various research councils and other funding bodies support collaborations and different types and scales of arts and cultural knowledge exchange, their websites are not always particularly helpful in describing the work that has been supported. There could be a communications role for research council websites in providing a richer resource base for the field through blogs, videos, case studies and so on.

## **Final Reflections**

Although this review has focussed on a relatively narrow selection of material, there is significant evidence pointing to the fact that KE between HEIs and the arts and cultural sector is a vibrant, emergent field that holds much promise in terms of the wider impacts with which NCACE is concerned over the next few years. For this potential to be met, practical means of enacting and supporting the recommendations (such as those cited above, along with several others) will need to be considered by the range of actors that go to make up this rich and compelling ecosystem.

With thanks

In the writing of this review I would like to pay special thanks to the team at NCACE for all their inputs and suggestions and for consistently working with me to bring this piece of work to fruition. For editorial input and support, I would like to thank Evelyn Wilson, Federica Rossi, Emily Hopkins and Suzie Leighton. I would like to thank Noshin Sultan for providing administrative support at NCACE. I would also like to thank Professor Bambo Soyinka and Dr Kayle Rose at Bath Spa University as well as all the staff at Bath Spa University Library for their support and assistance along the way.

Dr. Sarah Sigal  
August 2021



## 8.5. Literature review table

Theme 1: Nature of collaborations	Theme 2: Nature of documentation	Theme 3: Conceptualising the process	Theme 4: Defining and describing Knowledge Exchange	Theme 5: Impact
‘Arts at CERN’ (n.d.)	‘A model for university–town partnership in the arts: TestBeds’ (2020) ‘Rethinking “knowledge exchange”: new approaches to collaborative work in the arts and humanities’ (2016)	‘Beyond the campus: higher education, cultural policy and the creative economy’ (2015)	‘A model for university–town partnership in the arts: TestBeds’ (2020)	‘Art, science and organisational interactions: Exploring the value of artist residencies on campus’ (2018)
‘Arts, Science + Culture Initiative’ (n.d.)	‘At Home with Collaboration: Building and Sustaining a Successful University–Museum Partnership’ (2016)	‘Collaborating across sectors. The relationships between the humanities, arts and social sciences (HASS) and science, technology, engineering and medicine (STEM)’ (n.d.)	‘A Totem for Hull’ (2020)	‘Becoming civic centred – A case study of the University of Greenwich’s Bathway Theatre based in Woolwich’ (2021)
‘At Home with Collaboration: Building and Sustaining a	‘Beyond the campus: higher education, cultural policy	‘Contributing to the creative economy	‘Art, science and organisational interactions:	‘Beyond the Campus Community Development

Successful University-Museum Partnership' (2016)	and the creative economy' (2016)	imaginary' (2018)	Exploring the value of artist residencies on campus' (2018)	and HE: Southbank Mosaics and a new model for training socially engaged artists' (n.d.)
'A Totem for Hull' (2020)	'Collaborations 2012-2013' (2014)	'From knowledge sharing to co-creation: paths and spaces for engagement between higher education and the creative and cultural industries' (2014)	'Arts at CERN' (n.d.)	'Challenges of cultural industry knowledge exchange in live performance audience research' (2019)
'Becoming civic centred – A case study of the University of Greenwich's Bathway Theatre based in Woolwich' (2021)	'Coventry Made Me' (n.d.)	'Hidden Connections Knowledge exchange between the arts and humanities and the private, public and third sectors' (2011)	'Body Stories: Queensland University of Technology & Widening Participation' (n.d.)	'Compassion for Voices: a tale of courage and hope' (2014)
'Cape Farewell' (n.d.)	'Engaging People in Making History: Impact, Public Engagement and the World Beyond the Campus' (2015)	'Higher Education and the Creative Economy: Creative Graduates, Knowledge Transfer and Regional Impact Debates' (2015)	'BU at The Freud Museum: "Powerplay: Psychoanalysis and Political Culture"' (2017)	'Contributing to the creative economy imaginary' (2018)
'Challenges of cultural	'Humanities Knowledge	'Knowledge Transfer	'Case studies: Beyond the	'Culture and climate change

industry knowledge exchange in live performance audience research' (2019)	Exchange Fellowships' (2020)	without Widgets' (2006)	Campus Body Stories: Queensland University of Technology & Widening Participation' (n.d.)	scenarios: the role and potential of the arts and humanities in responding to the "1.5 degrees target"' (2018)
'Collection Enhancement Report No. 23 for the V&A, Theatre and Performance Department (August 2013) Knowledge Exchange: DMU and the V&A' (2013)	'Illustrating Futures' (2018)	"Raising the temperature": the arts on a warming planet' (2018)	'Coventry Made Me' (n.d.)	'Exchanging Knowledge through Creative Practice: What do disability arts and culture mean to you?' (2018)
'Compassion for Voices: a tale of courage and hope' (2014)	'Knowledge Exchange: DMU and the V&A' (2013)	'Rethinking "knowledge exchange"' (2015)	'Illustrating Futures' (2018)	'Having an impact? Academics, the music industries and the problem of knowledge' (2011)
'Creative Exchange's CX Hub' (2015)	'Knowledge Transfer without Widgets' (2006)	'So who now believes in the transfer of widgets?' (2009)	'Integrated science and art education for creative climate change communication' (2016)	'Illuminating the practice of Knowledge Exchange as a "pathway to impact" within an Arts and Humanities Research Council "Creative Economy Knowledge Exchange" project' (2016)

‘Design in Action’ (2016)	‘Museums for Health and Wellbeing: A preliminary report from the National Alliance for Museums, Health and Wellbeing’ (2016)	‘The Hidden Story: Understanding Knowledge Exchange Partnerships with the Creative Economy’ (2017)	‘Learning about Neighborhood Identity, Streets as Places, and Community Engagement in a Chicago Studio Course’ (2018)	‘Learning about Neighborhood Identity, Streets as Places, and Community Engagement in a Chicago Studio Course’ (2018)
‘Devising Bespoke Art and Design Interventions for a Dialysis Community’ (2016)	‘New Model Visual Arts Organisations & Social Engagement’ (2011)	‘The Role of Universities in the Regional Creative Economies of the UK: Hidden Protagonists and the Challenge of Knowledge Transfer’ (2013)	‘Merging arts and bioethics: An interdisciplinary experiment in cultural and scientific mediation’ (2017)	‘Museum-university collaboration to renew mediation in art and historical heritage. The case of the Museo de Navarra’ (2020)
‘Exchanging Knowledge through Creative Practice: What do disability arts and culture mean to you?’ (2018)	‘Northumbria University Cultural Partnerships’ (2021)		‘Museums for Health and Wellbeing: A preliminary report from the National Alliance for Museums, Health and Wellbeing’ (2016)	‘Our Fathers: Reflecting on a creative collaboration between a researcher and a theatre company’ (n.d.)
‘Having an impact? Academics, the music industries and the problem of knowledge’ (2011)	‘Pioneering Places, Kent’ (n.d.)		‘Northumbria University Cultural Partnerships’ (2021)	‘Playwriting Can Give Vulnerable Young People Confidence and a Sense of Control’ (2020)

‘Integrated science and art education for creative climate change communication’ (2016)	‘Queer Rural Connections’ (Allsop and Allmann 2021)		‘Pioneering Places, Kent’ (n.d.)	‘Queer Rural Connections’ (2021)
‘Liveable Futures’ (n.d.)	‘Radical Mischief: A Conference Inviting Experiment in Theatre, Thought and Politics’ (2018)		“‘Raising the Temperature’”: The arts in a warming planet’ (2018)	‘Shared interest: developing collaboration, partnerships and research relationships between higher education, museums, galleries and visual arts organisations in the North West’ (2009)
‘Merging arts and bioethics: An interdisciplinary experiment in cultural and scientific mediation’ (2017)	‘Science Communication Through Art: Objectives, Challenges, and Outcomes’ (2016)		‘Refugee Journeys’ (2018)	‘The Cultural Knowledge Ecology: A discussion paper on partnerships between HEIs and cultural organisations’ (2012)
‘Museum-university collaboration to renew mediation in art and historical heritage. The case of the Museo de Navarra’ (2019)	‘Shared interest: developing collaboration, partnerships and research relationships between higher education, museums, galleries and visual arts organisations		‘Shared interest: developing collaboration, partnerships and research relationships between higher education, museums, galleries and visual arts organisations	‘University in the Art Museum: A Model for Museum-Faculty Collaboration’ (2006)

	in the North West' (2009)		in the North West (2009)	
'Our Fathers: Reflecting on a creative collaboration between a researcher and a theater company' (n.d.)	'So who now believes in the transfer of widgets?' (2009)		'S.H.E.D.' (2019)	
'Ragged Children, Mended Lives: Unearthing Histories of Poverty and Philanthropy for a 21st-Century Audience' (2016)	'Temporary Contemporary' (2021)		'Teaching Race, Place, and History Through Culture and Performance' (2015)	
'REACT' (2016)	'The Cultural Knowledge Ecology: A discussion paper on partnerships between HEIs and cultural organisations' (2012)		'Temporary Contemporary' (2018)	
'S.H.E.D.' (2019)	'The Hidden Story: Understanding Knowledge Exchange Partnerships with the Creative Economy' (2017)		'This is No Longer That Place' (2019)	
'Teaching Race, Place,	'The Role of Universities in		'Writers' Kingston' (n.d.)	

and History Through Culture and Performance’ (2015)	the Regional Creative Economies of the UK: Hidden Protagonists and the Challenge of Knowledge Transfer’ (2013)			
‘The Exchange: Revealing Collaborative Values’ (2018)	‘Writers’ Kingston’ (n.d.)		‘Writing the Climate’ (2019)	
‘This is No Longer That Place’ (2019)				
‘University in the Art Museum: A Model for Museum-Faculty Collaboration’ (2006)				
‘UTOPIA 2016: A Year of Imagination and Possibility’ (2016)				
‘Widening the Register’ (n.d.)				
‘Writing the Climate’ (2019)				

# Bibliography

## Articles

Arriaga, A. and Aguirre, I. (2020). Museum-university collaboration to renew mediation in art and historical heritage. The case of the Museo de Navarra. *Arte, Individuo y Sociedad*, 32(4), pp.989-1008.

Comunian, R., Gilmore, A. and Jacobi, S. (2015). Higher Education and the Creative Economy: Creative Graduates, Knowledge Transfer and Regional Impact Debates. *Geography Compass*, 9(7), pp.371–383.

Comunian, R., Taylor, C. and Smith, D. (2013). The Role of Universities in the Regional Creative Economies of the UK: Hidden Protagonists and the Challenge of Knowledge Transfer. *European Planning Studies*, 22(12), pp.2456-2476.

Couture, V., Bélisle-Pipon, J., Cloutier, M. and Barnabé, C. (2017). Merging arts and bioethics: An interdisciplinary experiment in cultural and scientific mediation. *Bioethics*, 31(8), pp.616-630.

Ellis, T., Hockham, D., Rolle, E. and Zigomo, P. (2020). Becoming civic centred – A case study of the University of Greenwich’s Bathway Theatre based in Woolwich. *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, 40(3), pp.316-327.

Galafassi, D., Kagan, S., Milkoreit, M., et al. (2018). ‘Raising the temperature’: the arts on a warming planet. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 31, pp.71–79.

García, I. (2017). Learning about Neighborhood Identity, Streets as Places, and Community Engagement in a Chicago Studio Course. *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy*, 27(2), pp.142-157.

Gilmore, A. and Comunian, R. (2015). Beyond the campus: higher education, cultural policy and the creative economy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 22(1), pp.1-9.

Jacobson, S.K., Seavey, J.R. and Mueller, R.C. (2016). Integrated science and art education for creative climate change communication. *Ecology and Society*, [online] 21(3). Available at: <https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol21/iss3/art30/>. [Accessed 19 May 2021].

King, L. and Rivett, G. (2015). Engaging People in Making History: Impact, Public Engagement and the World Beyond the Campus. *History Workshop Journal*, 80(1), pp.218-233.

Lesen, A.E., Rogan, A. and Blum, M.J. (2016). Science Communication Through Art: Objectives, Challenges, and Outcomes. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 31(9), pp.657–660.

Lee, B., Fillis, I. and Lehman, K. (2018). Art, science and organisational interactions: Exploring the value of artist residencies on campus. *Journal of Business Research*, 85, pp.444-451.

Mazzocca, A.E., Finn, J.C., Goetz, E. and Gibson, L. (2015). Teaching Race, Place, and History Through Culture and Performance. *The Geography Teacher*, 12(4), pp.144-151.

Moreton, S. (2018). Contributing to the creative economy imaginary: universities and the creative sector. *Cultural Trends*, 27(5), pp.327-338.

Moreton, S. (2015). Rethinking 'knowledge exchange': new approaches to collaborative work in the arts and humanities. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 22(1), pp.100-115.

Sedgman, K. (2019). Challenges of cultural industry knowledge exchange in live performance audience research. *Cultural Trends*, 28(2-3), pp.103-117.

Tyszczyk, R. and Smith, J. (2018). Culture and climate change scenarios: the role and potential of the arts and humanities in responding to the '1.5 degrees target.' *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. [online] 31, pp.56-64. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343517301057> [Accessed 31 May 2021.]

Villeneuve, P., Martin-Hamon, A. and Mitchell, K. (2006). University in the Art Museum: A Model for Museum-Faculty Collaboration. *Art Education*, 59(1), pp.12-17.

Williamson, J., Cloonan, M. and Frith, S. (2011). Having an impact? Academics, the music industries and the problem of knowledge. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(5), pp.459-474.

## Reports

Dawson, J. and Gilmore, A. (2009). Shared interest: developing collaboration, partnerships and research relationships between higher education, museums, galleries and visual arts organisations in the North West: A Joint Consultancy Research Project commissioned by: Renaissance North West, Arts Council England North West and the North West Universities Association. [online] *Beyond the Campus: Higher Education & the Creative Economy*. Available at: [http://www.creative-campus.org.uk/uploads/1/0/9/7/10973203/shared\\_interest\\_report\\_2009.pdf](http://www.creative-campus.org.uk/uploads/1/0/9/7/10973203/shared_interest_report_2009.pdf) [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Dovey, J., Moreton, S. and Gwalchmai, B. eds., (2014). *Collaborations 2012-2013*. [online] REACT. Bristol: REACT. Available at: <http://www.react->

hub.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/REACT%20Collaborations\_0.pdf [Accessed 25 May 2021].

Dovey, J., Moreton, S. and Hargreaves, I. (2016). REACT Report 2012-2016. [online]. REACT. Bristol: REACT. Available at: [http://www.react-hub.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/REACT%20Report%20low%20res\\_2.pdf](http://www.react-hub.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/REACT%20Report%20low%20res_2.pdf) [Accessed 22 July 2021].

Fisher, S. (2012). The Cultural Knowledge Ecology: A discussion paper on partnerships between HEIs and cultural organisations. [online] Culture Forum North. Arts Council England. Available at: <http://www.cultureforumnorth.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/The-Cultural-Knowledge-Ecology.pdf>. [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Follett, G. and Marra, M. (2016). Design in Action: A new economy of knowledge exchange. [online]. Design in Action. Available at: <http://www.designinaction.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/DiA-Final-Report.pdf> [Accessed on 4 July 2021].

Froggett, L., Little, R., Roy, A. and Whitaker, L. (2011). New Model Visual Arts Organisations & Social Engagement. [online]. University of Central Lancashire. Available at: <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/3055/1/WzW-NMI%20Report%202%20with%20nav%20bar.pdf> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Hughes, A., Kitson, M., Probert, J., Bullock, A. and Milner, I. (2011). Hidden Connections Knowledge exchange between the arts and humanities and the private, public and third sectors. [online]. Available at: [https://www.cbr.cam.ac.uk/fileadmin/user\\_upload/centre-for-business-research/downloads/special-reports/specialreport-hiddenconnections.pdf](https://www.cbr.cam.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/centre-for-business-research/downloads/special-reports/specialreport-hiddenconnections.pdf) [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Lackoi, K., Patsou, M., and Chatterjee, H.J. et al. (2016). Museums for Health and Wellbeing. A Preliminary Report, National Alliance for Museums, Health and Wellbeing. [online]. The National Alliance for Museums, Health & Wellbeing. Available at: <https://museumsandwellbeingalliance.files.wordpress.com/2015/07/museums-for-health-and-wellbeing.pdf> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Leighton, S. and Mitchell, P. eds., (2018). The Exchange: Revealing Collaborative Values. [online] The Culture Capital Exchange. The Culture Capital Exchange Ltd. Available at: <https://www.theculturecapitalexchange.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Revealing-Collaborative-Values.pdf> [Accessed 22 Jul. 2021].

Metcalfe, J., Riedlinger, M., Pisarski, A. and Gardner, J. (2006). Collaborating across sectors. The relationships between the humanities, arts and social sciences (HASS)

and science, technology, engineering and medicine (STEM). [online] Analysis & Policy Observatory. Council for Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. Available at: <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2006-10/apo-nid15633.pdf> [Accessed 22 Jul. 2021].

Sillitoe, P. (2013). Collection Enhancement Report No. 23 for the V&A, Theatre and Performance Department (August 2013). [online] ShaLT: Shakespearean London Theatres. Leicester: De Montfort University. Available at: <http://shalt.dmu.ac.uk/media/uploads/documents/reports/cer-23.pdf> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

The Hidden Story: Understanding Knowledge Exchange Partnerships with the Creative Economy. (2017). [online]. University Alliance. Available at: [https://www.unialliance.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/THE-HIDDEN-STORY-REPORT\\_final\\_web.pdf](https://www.unialliance.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/THE-HIDDEN-STORY-REPORT_final_web.pdf) [Accessed 19 May 2021].

### Book chapters

Gilmore, A & Comunian, R. (2014). From knowledge sharing to co-creation: paths and spaces for engagement between higher education and the creative and cultural industries. In: R. Kooyman, G. Hagoort and A. Schramme, eds., *Beyond Frames: Dynamics between the Creative industries, Knowledge Institutions, and the Urban Environment*. Antwerp: University Press Antwerp, pp. 141-147.

Louis, R. and Vormittag, L. (2017). Devising Bespoke Art and Design Interventions for a Dialysis Community. In: M. Shiach and T. Virani, eds., *Cultural policy, innovation and the creative economy: creative collaborations in arts and humanities research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp.115-132.

Owens, A., John, E. and Blunt, A. (2017). At Home with Collaboration: Building and Sustaining a Successful University-Museum Partnership. In: M. Shiach and T. Virani, eds., *Cultural policy, innovation and the creative economy: creative collaborations in arts and humanities research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp.147-162.

Payne, E.-R. and Weedon, A. (2020). A model for university-town partnership in the arts: TestBeds. In: T. Ashley and A. Weedon, eds., *Developing a Sense of Place: The Role of the Arts in Regenerating Communities*. London: UCL Press, pp.74-83.

### Commissioned essay

Ferran, B. (2010). LCACE commissioned paper: Towards ecologies of learning; enhancing relationships between arts and academia [online] The Culture Capital Exchange. Available at: <https://www.theculturecapitalexchange.co.uk/2010/06/09/lcace-commissioned-paper-towards-ecologies-of-learning-enhancing-relationships-between-arts-and-academia/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

## Blogs

Allman, K. and Allsop, T. (2021). *Queer Rural Connections*. TORCH: The Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities. Available at: <https://torch.ox.ac.uk/queer-rural-connections#/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Creative Campus (n.d.). *Body Stories: Queensland University of Technology & Widening Participation. Case studies: Beyond the Campus*. Available at: <http://www.creative-campus.org.uk/body-stories.html> [Accessed 22 Jul. 2021].

Culture Forum North (n.d.). *Writing the Climate*. Available at: <https://www.cultureforumnorth.co.uk/case-studies/writing-the-climate/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Jacobi, S. ed., (n.d.). *Community Development and HE: Southbank Mosaics and a new model for training socially engaged artists. Case studies: Beyond the Campus*. Available at: <http://www.creative-campus.org.uk/southbank-mosaics.html> [Accessed 22 Jul. 2021].

Jones, N. (2018). *Illustrating Futures 2018 at Tate Liverpool*. Available at: <https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/humanities-and-social-sciences/research/blog/2018-posts/illustrating-futures-2018/> [Accessed on 22.7.21].

King's College London (2014). *Compassion for Voices: a tale of courage and hope. King's Cultural Community*. Available at: <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/cultural/projects/archive/2014/ecr-compassion-for-voices> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Lewis, Z. (2020). *Playwriting can give vulnerable young people confidence and a sense of control*. Available at: <https://www.winchester.ac.uk/news-and-events/press-centre/media-articles/playwriting-can-give-vulnerable-young-people-confidence-and-a-sense-of-control.php> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Liddiard, K. (2018). *Exchanging Knowledge through Creative Practice: What do disability arts and culture mean to you? Human: Putting the Social in Science*. Available at: <https://sheffsocscience.medium.com/exchanging-knowledge-through-creative-practice-what-do-disability-arts-and-culture-mean-to-you-d3402cab3edb> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Mitchell, P. (2016). *Ragged Children, Mended Lives: Unearthing Histories of Poverty and Philanthropy for a 21st-Century Audience. Engagement Blog 2016*. Available at: <https://www.qmul.ac.uk/publicengagement/blog/2016/items/ragged-children-mended-lives-unearthing-histories-of-poverty-and-philanthropy-for-a-21st-century-audience.html> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Taylor, K. (n.d.). *A Totem for Hull*. Available at: <https://www.artlinkhull.co.uk/a-totem-for-hull> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

University of Liverpool. (2018). Walk refugees' Balkan Routes at Tate Exchange. Available at: <https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/research/news/articles/walk-refugees-balkan-routes-at-tate-exchange> [Accessed 14 Jul. 2021].

Yates, C. (2017). BU at The Freud Museum: 'Powerplay: Psychoanalysis and Political Culture'. BU Research Blog. [online] Available at: <https://blogs.bournemouth.ac.uk/research/2017/01/08/bu-at-the-freud-museum-powerplay-psychoanalysis-and-political-culture/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

## Websites

Arts at CERN. (n.d.). *Arts at CERN*. [online] Available at: <https://arts.cern/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Arts and Humanities Research Council (2021). *KE Hubs for the Creative Economy*. [online] Available at: <https://ahrc.ukri.org/innovation/knowledgeexchange/hubsforthecreativeeconomy/>. [Accessed 4 July 2021].

Cape Farewell. (n.d.). *Cape Farewell: The cultural response to climate change*. [online] Available at: <https://capefarewell.com> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Coventry Made Me (n.d.). *Coventry Made Me*. [online] Available at: <https://coventrymademe.com/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Creativeworks London (n.d.). *Widening the Register*. [online] Available at: <https://www.cwblog.org.uk/> [Accessed on 4 July 2021].

Cultural Placemaking (n.d.). *Pioneering Places East Kent: Canterbury Dover Folkestone Ramsgate*. [online] Available at: <https://culturalplacemaking.com/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Jones, R. (2020). *The Artistry of Conversation: S.H.E.D.* [online] Available at: <https://theartistryofconversation.com/s-h-e-d/s-h-e-d/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Kingston University (n.d.). *Writers' Kingston: Kingston University's literary cultural institute* [online] Available at: <https://www.writerskingston.com/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Knowledge Exchange Concordat (2020). *What is knowledge exchange (KE)?* [online] Available at: <https://support.keconcordat.ac.uk/about-the-ke-concordat/what-is-knowledge-exchange-ke> [Accessed 22 Jul. 2021].

Liveable Futures (n.d.). *Liveable Futures*. [online] Available at: <https://livablefuturesnow.org/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Northumbria University (2021). *Cultural Partnerships*. [online] Available at: <https://www.northumbria.ac.uk/about-us/our-partners/cultural-partnerships/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Research England (2021). *About the Knowledge Exchange Framework*. [online] Available at: <https://kef.ac.uk/about> [Accessed on 11 August 2021]

Somerset House (2016). *UTOPIA 2016: A Year of Imagination and Possibility*. [online] Available at: <https://www.somerset-house.org.uk/press/utopia-2016-year-imagination-and-possibility> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

The Creative Exchange (n.d.). *The Creative Exchange*. [online] Available at: <http://thecreativeexchange.org/#/> [Accessed 4 July 2021].

University of Birmingham (n.d.). *Radical Mischief: Inviting Experiment in Theatre, Thought and Politics*. [online] Available at: <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/schools/edacs/departments/shakespeare/top/events/2018/radicalmischief/index.aspx> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

University of Chicago (n.d.). *Arts, Science + Culture Initiative*. [online] Available at: <https://arts.uchicago.edu/arts-science-culture-initiative> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

University of Huddersfield (2021). *Temporary Contemporary*. [online] Available at: <https://research.hud.ac.uk/art-design/temporarycontemporary/> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Vitae (2021). *Knowledge exchange*. [online] Available at: <https://www.vitae.ac.uk/doing-research/leadership-development-for-principal-investigators-pis/intellectual-leadership/demonstrating-research-impact/knowledge-exchange> [Accessed 11 August 2021].

### Lectures and presentations

Crossick, G. (2006). Knowledge Transfer without Widgets: the challenge of the creative economy. [online] Available at: [https://theplayethic.typepad.com/files/crossick\\_knowledge-transfer-without-widgets.pdf](https://theplayethic.typepad.com/files/crossick_knowledge-transfer-without-widgets.pdf) [Accessed 19 May 2021].

Crossick, G. (2009). So who now believes in the transfer of widgets? [online]. The Culture Capital Exchange. Available at: <https://www.theculturecapitalexchange.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Who-Now-Believes-in-the-Transfer-of-Widgets.pdf> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

King, L. and Mullin, B. (n.d.). Our Fathers: Reflecting on a creative collaboration between a researcher and a theatre company. [online] The Creative Campus. Available at: [http://www.creative-campus.org.uk/uploads/1/0/9/7/10973203/king\\_mullin.pdf](http://www.creative-campus.org.uk/uploads/1/0/9/7/10973203/king_mullin.pdf) [Accessed 19 May 2021].

### Handbooks and brochures

Crimmin, M. and Oakley, P. (2020). *This is No Longer That Place*. [online] Available at: [https://backup-rca-staging.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/This\\_is\\_No\\_Longer\\_That\\_Place\\_2020.pdf](https://backup-rca-staging.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/This_is_No_Longer_That_Place_2020.pdf) [Accessed 19 May 2021].

TORCH: The Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities (n.d.). *Humanities Knowledge Exchange Fellowships*. [online]. Available at: <https://torch.ox.ac.uk/files/humanities-knowledge-exchange-fellowships-brochure> [Accessed 19 May 2021].

# Appendix 1

Keywords for literature / evidence search:

Arts OR Culture + knowledge exchange  
Arts OR Culture + knowledge transfer  
Arts OR Culture + university + collaboration  
Arts OR Culture + university + partnership  
Arts OR Culture + university + project  
Arts OR Culture + university + value  
Arts OR Culture + university + impact  
Arts OR Culture + university + social impact  
Arts or Culture + university + cultural impact  
Arts or Culture + university + environmental impact  
Arts OR Culture + university + public engagement  
Arts OR Culture + university + community engagement

Arts OR Culture + university + geography  
Arts OR Culture + university + cultural + geography  
Arts OR Culture + university + regional policy  
Arts OR Culture + university + management  
Arts OR Culture + university + cultural policy/arts management  
Arts OR Culture + university + science  
Arts OR Culture + university + sociology

Arts Or Culture + university + place-making  
Arts Or Culture + university + regeneration  
Arts Or Culture +university + Health and/or Wellbeing  
Arts or Culture + university + climate change  
Arts Or Culture + University + Global Environmental Change  
Arts or Culture + Universities + Technology  
Arts or Culture + University + Digital Innovation  
Art or Culture + Universities + Technology for good

Arts Council England + University + consultancy  
Arts Council England + University + partnership  
Arts Council England + University + commission  
Arts Council England + University + collaboration

Festival + arts + university  
Exhibition + arts + university  
Gallery +arts + university  
Museum + arts + university  
Theatre + university + partnership  
Dance +university +partnership  
Performance + university + partnership  
Literature +university + partnership

**Music + university + partnerships**

**Media Centres + university + partnerships**



[ncace.ac.uk](http://ncace.ac.uk)