Creativeworks London (CWL) has undertaken a fascinating range of work over the past four years. Our aim has been to open up new opportunities for collaborative research between creative and cultural SMEs and researchers from the arts and humanities.

We have done this because we believe that collaborative and co-created research can lead to new ideas that make a difference. Our work has supported a diverse range of companies in the creative economy as well as many creative entrepreneurs, allowing them to benefit from working with researchers and research organisations. We have evidence of the many business benefits these collaborations have enabled. We have also created new possibilities for researchers, and particularly early-career researchers, to work with partners in the creative economy so that their research can directly benefit communities beyond the academy. We know this has made a major impact on their research, and built their commitment to working collaboratively in the future.

Our approach has been innovative because we have integrated the research we have undertaken – on the cultural geographies of innovation in London; on the changing nature of London’s audiences; and on London’s digital economy – with our funding schemes. Through ideas pools, research labs and funded projects, the CWL research team has been able to work with SMEs to advance understanding of many of the key challenges and opportunities for the creative economy in London. Research findings have been disseminated through working papers, the CWL blog, films, conferences and scholarly publications.

It has been a pleasure to lead such a creative and dynamic team of colleagues and partners over the past four years. This report provides a rich account of our work and I hope that you find it interesting, enjoyable and useful.

Professor Morag Shiach
Director, Creativeworks London
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Hubs of Excellence

The Arts and Humanities Research Council’s commitment to knowledge exchange is shown by its £18m investment in four hubs for the creative economy.

This report is an evaluation of Creativeworks London, a Knowledge Exchange Hub for the Creative Economy consisting of 43 London-based universities, research organisations and creative and cultural industry partners. Funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), CWL sought to bring together researchers, creative entrepreneurs and businesses to explore and enhance London’s creative economy.

The AHRC provides opportunities for all researchers to develop their work in collaboration with public, private and third-sector partners to increase the flow, value and impact of world-class arts and humanities research from academia to the UK’s wider creative economy and beyond.

Knowledge exchange stands at the very heart of the AHRC strategy, designed to ensure that arts and humanities academic interests are diversified and enhanced through partnership opportunities; to encourage co-creation and co-production of research agendas; to have a significant and transformative effect on the creative and cultural life and health and wellbeing of the UK; and to enlarge the contribution to the arts, public engagement and policy formation.

“The AHRC provides opportunities for all researchers to develop their work in collaboration with public, private and third-sector partners”

Given that much of the work it supports feeds into the creative economy, the AHRC is committed to concentrating most of its knowledge exchange funding on centres of excellence – Knowledge Exchange Hubs – to facilitate interaction between arts and humanities research and the creative economy.

Top: Professor Georgina Follett, Director, Design in Action, at the AHRC Creative Economy Showcase at King’s Place Conference Centre, London, March 2014

Bottom: A World in a Cube, New Media Networks and Hacklock (CV, round 1) and a performance by IJAD dance company and Goldsmiths (Creative Voucher, round 4), both at the AHRC Creative Economy Showcase
economy, and to create significant benefit. The AHRC committed £16m (80% of the full economic costs) during the period 2012-16 to support four Knowledge Exchange Hubs for the Creative Economy.

The four Hubs
Creativeworks London was one of four Knowledge Exchange Hubs for the Creative Economy funded by the AHRC. Knowledge Exchange Hubs, working as consortia, connect research of excellence in the arts and humanities with a range of creative and cultural organisations across the UK, to accelerate growth and innovation, generate and use knowledge exchange opportunities, foster entrepreneurial talent and contribute to the development of the UK’s creative economy.

The four hubs, each of which received £4m of funding from the AHRC, were:

- **Creativeworks London**
  Led by Queen Mary University of London, Creativeworks London (CWL) was a partnership of 21 London-based higher education institutions and independent research organisations and 22 creative and cultural industry organisations, including its knowledge exchange delivery partner, The Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE). It brought researchers, creative entrepreneurs and businesses together to explore the issues that impact on London’s creative economy.

- **The Creative Exchange**
  The Creative Exchange (CX) funded 21 PhD studentships and focused on bringing expertise in designing experiences, digital prototyping and communication innovation. The Creative Exchange was led by Lancaster University in partnership with the University of Newcastle and the Royal College of Art.

- **Design in Action (DiA)**
  Design in Action supported small and medium enterprises that use design as a strategy for innovation, both within and outside the creative economy. This Hub was led by the University of Dundee in partnership with Edinburgh College of Art at the University of Edinburgh, The Glasgow School of Art, Gray’s School of Art at the Robert Gordon University, University of Abertay and St Andrews University.

- **REACT**
  Research and Enterprises in the Arts and Creative Technologies (REACT) funded 53 collaborative projects, exploring a range of themes and ideas, from books and prints to design objects and documentaries. REACT was led by the University of the West of England Bristol in partnership with the University of Bristol, University of Exeter, University of Bath, University of Cardiff and the Watershed Arts Trust.

“CWL brings together researchers, entrepreneurs and businesses to explore the issues that impact London’s creative economy”

**PhD studentships and focused on bringing expertise in designing experiences, digital prototyping and communication innovation. The Creative Exchange was led by Lancaster University in partnership with the University of Newcastle and the Royal College of Art.**

**Design in Action**
Design in Action (DiA) supported small and medium enterprises that use design as a strategy for innovation, both within and outside the creative economy. This Hub was led by the University of Dundee in partnership with Edinburgh College of Art at the University of Edinburgh, The Glasgow School of Art, Gray’s School of Art at the Robert Gordon University, University of Abertay and St Andrews University.

**REACT**
Research and Enterprises in the Arts and Creative Technologies (REACT) funded 53 collaborative projects, exploring a range of themes and ideas, from books and prints to design objects and documentaries. REACT was led by the University of the West of England Bristol in partnership with the University of Bristol, University of Exeter, University of Bath, University of Cardiff and the Watershed Arts Trust.
Mission Statement

At its inception in 2011, Creativeworks London asserted that ‘AHRC-funded researchers who understand London and its distinctive characteristics [could] make a major difference to the UK’s creative economy’.

This was the vision for CWL as a Knowledge Exchange Hub. London is a global city and has almost one-third of the UK’s creative workforce, contributing more than £21bn each year to the capital’s economy. CWL sought to provide a strategic overview of London’s creative economy, in partnership with many existing national and local hubs and networks.

London was key to the Hub’s approach and methodology because of the scale of activity, enterprise and partnerships already in place in the city. CWL had a ‘unique opportunity to observe, research and support London’s changing relationship with the creative economy’.

London was seen to be different from other centres, and an answer was sought to the question, ‘How does London’s creative economy impact on the UK’s regions and on the international stage?’ CWL was founded on an existing network of partners led by Queen Mary University of London and the London Centre for Arts and Cultural Exchange (LCACE) – now The Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE). Hub development workshops, research cluster and Knowledge Exchange team meetings identified a broad range of target partners, including: London’s creative and cultural workers, micro-enterprises and SMEs; policy makers in London and, more broadly, the UK and internationally; and London’s cultural organisations. CWL was seen as a hub with a ‘single portal’ approach that, through knowledge exchange brokerage services, would support and further develop the network of partners and their approach, understanding and methodology of knowledge exchange research.

CWL provisionally sought a two-fold sustainable legacy: that by 2016 London’s creative businesses would turn to research collaborations with the broader arts and humanities community to meet their commercial needs, and be willing to pay for such services; and, that the researchers themselves would be both ready for and excited about this potential for engagement.
In the original bid to the AHRC, Creativeworks London asserted a single key aim: to ensure that AHRC-funded researchers make a significant difference to London’s creative economy, and are recognised for so doing.

The objectives within this were eight-fold:

1. **To undertake collaborative research** on the complexities of London’s cultural and creative economies, including business models, policy and skills development, to allow for a full understanding of the processes that underpin and sustain London’s creative economy.

2. **To use this knowledge to the benefit of creative and cultural enterprises** in ways that respond directly to business needs, including entrepreneurial development and new routes to market in the creative economy.

3. **To demonstrate the importance of business interaction** with arts and humanities research to private industries and the cultural sector, ensuring that arts and humanities researchers become partners of choice for leading creative businesses seeking innovative solutions.

4. **To create an interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral network** that connects leading businesses, SMEs, micro-enterprises and cultural organisations large and small.

5. **To develop innovative practice within the arts and humanities research community** and act as a strategic intermediary to provide support and advice to AHRC-funded researchers.

6. **To increase the number of arts and humanities researchers** actively engaged in knowledge exchange within the creative economy, building capacity in knowledge exchange in exciting and innovative ways.

7. **To leverage additional funding** from other sources to ensure a sustainable legacy.

8. **To work closely with the AHRC and Research Councils UK, and the other successful Hubs,** to integrate knowledge exchange activity within existing and developing programmes.
Programme Structure

The Creativeworks London programme was originally presented and conceived as five inter-related work packages: three research clusters, the Hub management and the knowledge exchange activities.

Research clusters
Work packages 1-3 of the business plan were the three research clusters: 1) Place Work Knowledge; 2) London’s Digital Economy and 3) Capturing London’s Audiences. The foci of the research clusters were to build teams of researchers from partner higher education institutions (HEIs) to complete a research agenda and further the research interests of the central Hub. In addition, the clusters would work together to further knowledge exchange relating to London’s creative economy. The clusters were comprised of research leads and dedicated postdoctoral research assistants – one per cluster – with each cluster supported by an expert network of associated researchers from partner HEIs and independent research organisations (IROs).

The Hub – management, structure and partnership
The Hub (work package 4) operated from the lead research organisation, Queen Mary University of London. The Hub’s day-to-day activity was to be regularly reported to and approved by a management board comprised of the Hub director, other key staff members and representatives from SME and HEI/IRO partners. The Hub’s core activity and objectives were to be reported and approved by a governing council comprising four members of the management board, representatives of partner organisations and relevant bodies including the AHRC and UKTI. The Hub was required to reporting biennially to the AHRC and respond to feedback, as well as engage with the other three Hubs.

The core Hub team led engagement with the partnership – a network of more than 40 HEIs, IROs and creative and cultural industry partners. Some research partners received funding to undertake research and others pledged in-kind support including academic/research time. Engagement activities included biennial events known as Partners’ Forums which gave partner organisations the opportunity to keep up to date with hub activity and strengthen their involvement.

The Knowledge Exchange Programme – funding schemes and delivery team
The CWL funding schemes – vouchers and people exchanges – that form the core of the knowledge exchange activity were the responsibility of the Knowledge Exchange team located at Somerset House, spearheaded by the TCCE team, CWL’s main delivery partner. The Knowledge Exchange team were responsible for all aspects of the activities, management and delivery of the funded Knowledge Exchange Programme.
Evaluating was written into the original business case for CreativeWorks London and has been a key part of the programme in the final year of delivery. Prior to the employment of a dedicated evaluation team, efforts to evaluate the processes, methodology and outputs of the programme had been undertaken in stages, including a commitment by the three original post-doctoral research assistants to conduct in-depth multi-phase interviews with Creative Voucher awardees related to their research strands. Prof Andy Pratt instigated an evaluation sub-team which took initial steps to compile information necessary for a full-scale evaluation of the Hub. The main task of this evaluation was to gather and collate information relating to all aspects of the CWL programme in order to assess the conduct of the Hub in relation to the original business case and bid, and explore whether the Hub achieved its stated aims and objectives. Material was gathered relating to the Hub itself, including: its management and governance structure (work package 1); the infrastructure and activity of the three research strands (initially research clusters and work packages 2, 3 and 4); and the Knowledge Exchange Programme (work package 5). The evaluation of CWL has used all material gathered and produced by the programme over the past four years, and has engaged with awardees and stakeholders (as per the evaluation methodology outlined on page 20 of this report). Evaluating knowledge exchange and research practices of the kind employed by CWL is challenging. Procedures for recording and measuring the impact of the knowledge exchange activity have been rationalised. Impacts seen include academic, business, cultural, and social or environmental. A significant difficulty of measuring and recording impact is that it is rarely felt immediately – particularly not in academia. Likewise, encouraging innovation is a key stated aim of the project, but defining and quantifying innovation is a new concept to knowledge exchange conducted between the creative economy and arts and humanities research. Recognised innovation types such as apps, prototypes, markets, methodologies and processes cover some, but far from all, of the ‘innovative’ outputs of this programme.

“A significant difficulty of recording impact is that it is rarely felt immediately”

This report has been designed to communicate the key findings relating to CWL’s outcomes, impacts and processes. It is drawn from a broad survey of all awardees, in-depth interviews with awardees from all four funding schemes, research strand members, key partners and the core management teams, along with a desk-based review of all available material relating to the conduct and administration of the Hub and Knowledge Exchange Programme. This report takes a systematic approach to the Hub, the Knowledge Exchange Programme and the research strands. It finishes with a summary of key points relating to significant findings and presents recommendations for future iterations of Knowledge Exchange Hubs.
The Big Questions

1. The Hub
   - How has the Hub contributed to knowledge exchange and research within London’s academic and creative economy?
   - Was a balance achieved between knowledge exchange and research within the Hub itself?
   - Have the Hub’s infrastructure and activities enabled it to meet the aims and objectives of the programme?

2. Knowledge exchange and delivery mechanisms
   - Why have ideas pools, and how have they worked?
   - How do the funding schemes – Creative Vouchers, Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence, Researchers in Residence and BOOST – work?
   - Why have a BOOST round? What did this achieve that the other schemes could not?
   - What were the funding mechanisms for each funding scheme and how did these work for a) academics, b) creative industry partners. What lessons were learnt from the early rounds, and were these acted on?

3. The partnership
   - Were the right number of partners included in the original bid, and were they the correct ones?
   - How did the partnership work in practice – i.e. clarity of roles and objectives, frequency of meetings and mechanisms for collaborations?

4. Supporting business growth
   - What have creative businesses been able to do better / differently as a result of participation in the programme?
   - Has participation in the programme helped the creative business to achieve its objectives?
   - Has participation in the programme led to unintended outcomes for the creative business?
   - To what extent have businesses ‘grown’ as a result of participation in CWL?

5. Supporting innovation
   - Has the programme contributed to ‘innovation’? If so, how? How do we know?
   - Has the programme helped with any of the following: a) visioning, b) exploring, c) experimenting, d) ideation.

6. Impact of assets emerging from the programme
   - What has been the tangible assets or ‘tools’ emerging from the programme and funding schemes (e.g. websites, prototypes, reports etc)?
   - Who has used these ‘tools’? How do we know that they are being used?
   - In what ways have external stakeholders benefitted from using these tools?

7. Research impacts
   - How has participation in the programme impacted on research practice?
   - What research outputs have been generated and what is their ‘value’?
   - To what extent can these ‘new’ research outputs be attributed to the programme?

8. Policy
   - What has been learned about participation in the programme? What do we know about knowledge exchange as a result?
   - How has any learning been disseminated?
   - Do we have any evidence that policy-making has been influenced as a result?
   - How will policy be influenced following the conclusion of this programme?

9. Strategic questions
   - Was the funding level the relevant amount and allocated appropriately – e.g. balanced between schemes and between partners?
   - How was the funding administered across schemes?
   - Has the funding led to improved social or environmental outcomes?

10. Equality
    - To what extent is CWL achieving / contributing to equality through the funds?
    - What is it about CWL that has been able to support ‘minority’ academics/researchers?
    - What have been the critical success factors: a) women, b) BAME, c) other?
Methodology

CWL has collated a large amount of evaluation data by engaging with awardees and stakeholders since the start of the programme.

**DESK-BASED REVIEW**
- 109 application forms
- 109 final reports
- Roundtable notes
- Review of Research outputs
- Film evidence

**CASE STUDIES**
- Interviews with 11 awardees: CV / FeIR / RiR
- Interviews with participants in five BOOST projects (filmed)
- Quantifiable evidence of impact (where possible)

**STAKEHOLDER REVIEW**
- Interviews with research leads and PDRAs to add to evidence of academic impacts
- Interviews with CWL core team
- Interviews with a selection of CWL partners
- Review of CWL and research strand activity
- Review of partner contributions/engagement

**EVALUATION OUTPUTS**
- CWL report
- Final evaluation/legacy report
- CWL legacy film showcasing BOOST projects
- Contribution to final report to AHRC
- ‘Articulating Impact’ chapter in Palgrave volume, edited by T Vironi and M Shiach

---

THE HUB
The Hub

The Hub was split across a number of partner organisations around London. At the close of the project the core team stands at 14. Based at Queen Mary University of London (QMUL) were Prof Morag Shiach, the Hub Director; Jana Riedel, Hub Manager; and Dr Helen Matheson-Pollock, Evaluation and Dissemination Officer.

The research strands

Also at QMUL are the three postdoctoral research assistants: Dr Tarek Virani, of the Place Work Knowledge strand; Dr Mariza Dima, of the Capturing London’s Audiences strand; and Dr Alda Terracciano, of the London’s Digital Economy strand. In addition, Prof Gemma Wiggins, Research Lead for Digital Economy, is based at QMUL. Prof Andy Pratt, Research Lead for Place Work Knowledge is based at City University of London. Research Lead for Capturing London’s Audiences is shared by Prof Barry Ife and Prof John Sloboda of Guildhall School of Music & Drama.

The Knowledge Exchange team

The Knowledge Exchange team is based at Somerset House, the headquarters of the key delivery partner, The Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE). Sue Leighton and Evelyn Wilson are jointly heads of the Knowledge Exchange Programme. They are supported by Rachel Lasebikan as Knowledge Exchange Coordinator and Noshin Sultan as Knowledge Exchange Programme Communications and Administration Officer.

"The Hub is split across a number of organisations around London. At the close of the project, the core team stands at 14"
A core part of the Hub’s activity was sharing and disseminating learning and engaging the public through a range of activities. This began with the launch of Creativeworks London in 2012. CWL joined the three other AHRC Knowledge Exchange Hubs at a showcase in 2014 where it presented a range of significant projects from across the funding schemes. The final event on the agenda was the Creativeworks London Festival, held at King’s College London on 29 April 2016. The festival was designed to showcase the variety of work done by the Hub, both the core team of researchers and the Knowledge Exchange team, as well as the collaborative projects themselves. CWL has taken steps to build a network between its partner organisations, SMEs and awardees, and the wider London public and creative economy in a bid to increase awareness of the programme and its activities. Two key elements of the Hub’s dissemination strategy were: 1) the Widening the Register blog, launched in 2014, which features articles and posts by members of the Hub core team as well as invited pieces by researchers and awardees; 2) the monthly newsletter sent out by the Knowledge Exchange team featuring items, articles, event listings etc relating to the Hub, awardees and partners. The newsletter’s readership figures highlight the strength and size of the CWL network and its wide public engagement. As of January 2016, the total recipients of the newsletter were 4,072 per month. The average open rate between February 2015 and January 2016 was 25.1%, meaning that, on average, about 1,000 people opened the newsletter. The click-through rate across the same period was on average 19.4%, which equates to approximately 790 people per month engaging with news items, events and articles circulated by the Hub. A benchmark email open rate is 24.4%, which is broadly equal to CWL’s rate. Significantly, however, the industry’s average click-through rate – that is, actual engagement with information contained within a newsletter – is 3.42%. This means that CWL’s rate is almost six times higher than the benchmark figure. CWL has a database of a network totalling 1,966 SMEs and researchers who have actively engaged with the Hub.

“Click-through rate of CWL’s newsletter was on average 19.4% – almost six times higher than the benchmark figure”
Creating a Network

Creativeworks London engaged 21 higher education institutions or independent research organisations and a further 22 creative economy partner organisations (private firms) in delivery of the Hub, the Knowledge Exchange Programme and research strands. A total of 92 academics from partner organisations collaborated on projects across all funding schemes, with over 40 further research assistants contributing to the programme. Together, this represented a combined investment in Knowledge Exchange projects of £1.6m from the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the European Regional Development Fund and over 26,000 hours of collaborative research.

All five component parts of CWL involved partner engagement:

- Creativeworks London Hub, led by Queen Mary University of London
- Creativeworks London Knowledge Exchange, led by The Culture Capital Exchange
- Three research strands:
  1. Capturing London’s Audiences, led by Guildhall School of Music and Drama
  2. London: Place Work Knowledge, led by City University London
  3. London’s Digital Economy, led by Queen Mary University of London.

Partnership activity also took the form of workshops and events for academics and businesses, which offered wider opportunities for knowledge exchange and network building. These were successful, and well attended by hundreds of individuals and businesses. Formats to promote knowledge exchange specifically to digital creative companies, such as ‘culture hacks’ and software ‘hackathons’, were experimented with. Meanwhile, CWL’s Widening the Register blog and website offered a repository of articles, reports and updates from CWL’s team, partners, awardees, and wider community.
Knowledge exchange programmes supporting SMEs and academic researchers play a critical role in the creation and dissemination of innovative ideas.

Knowledge exchange, cultural innovation and collaboration are the key concepts underlying the entire Creativeworks London programme. Within CWL, innovation was conceived not simply as the development of new ideas, but also their implementation and prototyping. Because innovative ideas can be brought to fruition only if a company can access the necessary set of skills and knowledge, CWL supported collaboration, exchange and co-creation between SMEs, universities and research centres.

To enable this, CWL facilitated knowledge exchange, intended as a dynamic, two-way flow of people and ideas between the research environment and wider economy. This approach moved away from the traditional knowledge transfer paradigm, viewed as a more passive, one-way flow from one sector to another. Knowledge exchange programmes, therefore, are part of a new agile economy, in which universities play a central role in the dissemination and co-creation of disruptive innovation, especially if matched with the expertise brought by business. As a result, universities have the potential to produce knowledge that addresses gaps in existing understanding and also respond to market needs.

When arts and humanities researchers work with SMEs, co-creation methods and approaches generate (among other things):

- fast and sustainable economic practices
- accelerated timing to market
- networks that build a sustainable ecosystem, allowing businesses to withstand market fluctuations
- new and sustainable approaches to intellectual property
- consumer involvement as part of the co-creation.

Dr Caspar Melville from the School of Oriental and African Studies, whose study on Malian music came under round 6 of the Creative Vouchers scheme, says: “Before this we never set out to innovate so much as to take a snapshot of an industry (publishing) and a key aspect of the creative economy (copyright) in action and consider the practical and ethical implications.”

“I've discovered a slight talent for public engagement and communication of complex research to general audiences that I was not previously aware of, and I intend to carry on with it as a major part of my career”

Dr Peter Mitchell, Queen Mary University of London – The Culture Capital Exchange (Researcher in Residence, round 3)

“The relationships that the grants enabled me to build with the creative sector have not only broadened my research skills, but have also given me crucial experience of impact and knowledge exchange early in my career”

Dr Harriet Hawkins, Royal Holloway, University of London (Creative Entrepreneur in Residence, round 2)
London Creative and Digital Fusion, in which CreativeWorks London became a partner in 2012, offered interactive, tailored and in-depth support to the capital’s creative and digital companies. It awarded innovation vouchers – called Fusion Collaborative Awards (FCAs) – to 34 SMEs looking to collaborate with academic partners on projects leading to new jobs and business growth. Each FCA was worth up to a maximum of £10,000 to the higher education institution (HEI).

FCAs were financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in collaboration with CreativeWorks London, with each contributing £247,000 to the scheme. The Fusion project had three phases: ‘Inspire’, ‘Fuse’ and ‘Create’, with CreativeWorks London contributing to the latter two. In the Fuse phase, Queen Mary University of London (QMUL) held workshops and networking events to bring together businesses and HEIs or independent research organisations (IROs), both to offer support and to identify possible collaborations and areas for development.

In the Create phase, QMUL, in partnership with the Fusion lead organisation, Lancaster University, managed selection via a tender process of a framework of HEIs and IROs. The following HEIs and IROs worked on Fusion projects:

- Goldsmiths, University of London
- King’s College London
- Kingston University
- QMUL
- Royal Central School for Speech & Drama
- Centre for Creative Collaboration
- Tate.

FCAs enabled SMEs to:
- access the wealth of knowledge and expertise from the London knowledge base of selected academic partners and IROs
- develop innovative thinking and solutions to resolving business problems
- access expertise to resolve a technical or non-technical issue
- improve product development
- get a product or service to market quicker
- develop long-term collaborative relationships with another business and/or academic partner.

FCAs differed from the other CreativeWorks London funding schemes in a number of ways:

1. It was more explicitly business-led: the SME applied for the voucher and selected the academic/research partner from the quotations received in response
2. The model was broadly one of knowledge transfer and consultancy, rather than knowledge exchange: successful SMEs used the voucher to purchase specialist advice from the academic partner
3. The target outputs of the funding were focused more narrowly on business outcomes – new jobs, products, processes and growth in gross valued added (GVA)
4. It engaged a mix of academics from arts and humanities and other disciplines – notably Goldsmiths’ computing department, either singly or in conjunction with other A&H researchers.
Designed to foster cross-sectorial interaction, knowledge exchange and co-creation, Creativeworks London’s programme featured a series of event-based activities, with funding provided under four schemes. These entailed collaboration between one or more academic researchers from a higher education institution or independent research organisation and one or more entrepreneurs, in order to inspire dialogues around London, the UK and the global creative economy.

The Creative Voucher scheme (CV) enabled small and medium-sized businesses to partner with an arts and humanities researcher from one of CWL’s partner institutions. The scheme awarded £15,000 (£5,000 to the SME, £10,000 to the research partner) to 51 projects through seven themed rounds of funding.

The Creative Entrepreneur in Residence scheme (CEIR) supported cultural, creative and creative-digital sector entrepreneurs in a short-term residency with one of CWL’s research partners. The programme made awards to 31 entrepreneurs across three rounds.

The Researchers in Residence scheme (RIR) enabled creative and cultural companies to access specialist knowledge or expertise provided by a current or recently completed PhD student or early-career researcher. RIR supported 22 projects across four rounds.

The BOOST scheme provided further support to five of the projects from the above schemes. BOOST was established to enable businesses and researchers to develop and/or commercialise their ideas through an additional research project that benefits both the SME(s) involved and the arts and humanities research base in London. BOOST projects had budgets up to £25,000 (£10,000 to the SME, £15,000 to the research partner).

CWL showcased the activities and the knowledge it created through a dense dissemination programme and a festival held on 29 April 2016.
Core Events and Methodology

The Cultural Capital Exchange (TCCE) was the key delivery partner for CreativeWorks London’s Knowledge Exchange Programme, building on almost a decade of experience in the industry. The original CreativeWorks Knowledge Exchange Director, Sally Taylor, supported by Evelyn Wilson and Suzie Leighton, after Sally’s departure in 2014, Evelyn and Suzie took over as joint heads of the programme.

The Knowledge Exchange team were also responsible for much of the partner engagement and liaison with partner organisations – many of whom were also members of the TCCE network. This role was primarily the responsibility of the Knowledge Exchange Coordinator, Jude Eastwood, later replaced by Rachel Lasheikan. All work done by the team has been supported by the Administrator, Noshin Sultan, who was also responsible for the blog and monthly newsletter.

The delivery of the Knowledge Exchange Programme included devising, organising and leading the information and networking events for the four funding schemes: Creative Vouchers (CV), Researchers in Residence (RIR), Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence (CEIR) and BOOST. Each scheme involved a widely attended launch (information event) followed by an application workshop (CV only) and a variety of match-making and brokerage activities that were developed by, and have become the trademark of, TCCE. After collaborative applications were submitted, they were reviewed by a panel before awards were made. All awardees were required to attend two roundtables during their projects – one during the initial phase and another at or near completion. Awardees were required to submit final project reports to CWL and were requested to provide additional information where necessary for reporting to the AHRC on the Hub’s knowledge exchange activities, and to provide data for this report.

Additional events were held that addressed key issues associated with the programme and the realities of collaborative research and engagement. Evelyn Wilson led three annual research and engagement events furthering Women in the Digital and Creative Economy – including Women in Residence (WIR), Women in Residence (WIR), and Women in Residence (WIR). Two further events were held to highlight the issues faced and possible solutions, associated with the programme and dedicated to delivering research expertise, networking and research activities that were developed.

"Some 66% of respondents highlighted access to CWL’s network and networking events as a core value"

The success of the programme was primarily the responsibility of the Knowledge Exchange Coordinator, Jude Eastwood, later replaced by Rachel Lasheikan. All work done by the team has been supported by the Administrator, Noshin Sultan, who was also responsible for the blog and monthly newsletter.

The delivery of the Knowledge Exchange Programme included devising, organising and leading the information and networking events for the four funding schemes: Creative Vouchers (CV), Researchers in Residence (RIR), Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence (CEIR) and BOOST. Each scheme involved a widely attended launch (information event) followed by an application workshop (CV only) and a variety of match-making and brokerage activities that were developed by, and have become the trademark of, TCCE. After collaborative applications were submitted, they were reviewed by a panel before awards were made. All awardees were required to attend two roundtables during their projects – one during the initial phase and another at or near completion. Awardees were required to submit final project reports to CWL and were requested to provide additional information where necessary for reporting to the AHRC on the Hub’s knowledge exchange activities, and to provide data for this report.
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Creative Vouchers

Creative Vouchers (CVs) were awarded over seven rounds, each attached to and supported by one of the three research strands, with the exception of round 4 which was an open call for non-themed applications, and was broadly inspired by the idea of open data. Round 1 (mobility and mobile cultures) and round 5 (localism and the creative industries: the right place at the right time) and round 7 (joining the dots: network building for the creative economy) were linked to the Place Work strand. In total, 51 vouchers were awarded featuring at least two people – one academic from a Creativeworks London partner higher education institution (HEI) and a member of a London-based SME. Project participants could apply for up to £15,000, with a maximum of £10,000 going to the academic and £5,000 to the SME. The disproportionate funding has been criticised by some SMEs, who suggested that they require the finance far more than an HEI. In the survey, the funding was described as ‘the most labour-intensive £5,000 ever received’ and not enough to substantively affect a business.

The process of the CVs evolved as the rounds progressed. The original round had two information events and a workshops but, following a lukewarm response, the decision was taken to restructure. With round 2 (co-creation), the application process hinged on an ideas pool – an innovative ‘matchmaking’ event where potential partners could identify key themes and ideas present in their work, which were then picked up on by the CWL team and partnerships were brokered. All awardees surveyed have indicated that they found the ideas pools a high point of the process because of the collaborations forged, both with their project partners and others with whom they might consider working in future.

Another key success of the ideas pools was the engagement with postdoctoral research assistants (PDRAs), who explored the theme of the round in relation to the work of the research strand. The PDRAs’ involvement in the relevant roundtables was also praised as encouraging engaged discussion that linked the projects to the wider direction of the Hub.

The projects pitched for CVs, as opposed to residencies, aimed for more significant, ‘weightier’ outputs – eg, book chapters and journal articles for the researchers, or business practice or methodology for the SME – and this is reflected in the numbers recorded for the earlier rounds, where projects produced on average just a single output.

The CV scheme totalled 191 outputs, an average of 3.75 per project, with the most common being internal-facing research or project reports. There were 10 journal articles, 11 new processes, four apps, eight prototypes, but no recorded ‘new marketable products’. The impacts of the CV scheme can be seen in four spheres (broadly categorised): academic, business, creative and social/environmental. All of the successful projects (more than 95%) produced academic impact through their published outputs and events; a number engaged students, from undergraduate to doctoral level, and researchers’ teaching practices were influenced by collaboration with an SME, such as the Creating Routes project (round 4). In another example of an educational impact, Making Friends (round 7) engaged with schoolchildren. Such small investments make business impacts harder to quantify. However, where collaborative research and researchers’ expertise has resolved business problems, this will clearly affect future business practice – for example, in BeatWoven (round 4) and June Giovanni’s Pan-African Cinema Archive (round 5). Projects that claimed new design approaches, along with other creative outputs such as showcase films, feed directly into London’s creative economy as their approaches are explored and subsequently adopted. Social and environmental impacts can also be seen in a range of examples, including Vital Arts (round 3) which sought to transform the Royal London Hospital’s renal unit through art and design intervention, and Money No Object (round 6), which used interactive technology to explore financial transactions and redefine value at the Victoria and Albert Museum.
Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence

The Creative Entrepreneur in Residence (CEIR) scheme funded 31 projects featuring entrepreneurs from the creative economy partnering with or being hosted by a Creativeworks London partner higher education institution or independent research organisation for a period of about three months. Entrepreneurs were allocated up to £5,000 to cover expenses and time during their projects. Overall, the scheme produced 145 outputs – an average of 4.7 per project. The numbers are skewed, however, by the types of output. One project, for example, produced 11 new works of poetry and 11 filmed interviews, with another producing a collection of 10 short stories. There are noticeably fewer academic publications, although there were four research reports and one co-written journal article. More significant to the CEIR scheme are the outputs that fall under traditional or accepted definitions of ‘innovation’ rooted in science and technology, including four apps, four prototypes, three marketable products, four new service formats, six new methodologies, six new design approaches, two new technologies and three new processes. In total, the 31 CEIR projects produced 39 ‘technical’ outputs and, significantly, four new collaborative projects that will extend beyond CWL.

Creative entrepreneurs applied to the scheme for a broad variety of reasons, but with an overarching requirement for an interest in advancing their business through exposure to and engagement with academic research. Some collaborations – such as Alice Circelliini with Professor Judith Clark from the London College of Fashion (CEIR 1) – were long-standing prior to CWL, but in many cases the scheme gave a small amount of funding to test a theory or prototype or pilot a new project on which the entrepreneur could subsequently build. Two applicants were PhDs who used the scheme to reconnect with academia in a new way and engage in practical knowledge exchange that crucially enhanced their work. One of these women has since returned to academia, becoming a lecturer at the institution of her residency.

The scheme was not without challenges – one project that was primarily about methods of producing new artworks was unable to really get off the ground due to intellectual property issues and debates between the artist and the institution. However, the response from those surveyed regarding the benefits of knowledge exchange in practice was overwhelmingly positive. A high point for many was the roundtables, which provided a unique and invaluable opportunity for engagement with other entrepreneurs interested in similar processes, business practices and methodologies. Some levelled the criticism that the conversation was dominated particularly by intellectual property issues which could perhaps have been dealt with elsewhere; numerous awardes suggested that more frequent roundtable discussions would have helped the progress of their projects by encouraging them to stay on track and enabling them to further exchange knowledge with their fellow entrepreneurs.

One participant interview was with Ross Miller, who had a residency at King’s College London (CEIR 3). Ross commented on the value of the scheme beyond funding in that he could market himself as a ‘creative entrepreneur’ and the worth of external validation through funding as well as having the opportunity to undertaking a new methodology with academic expertise. According to Ross, engaging in the scheme greatly encouraged him to ‘learn how to exchange knowledge in a more productive way. [The scheme] made me a better listener, a better exchanger of knowledge and a better businessman.’

“The scheme made me a better listener, a better exchanger of knowledge and a better businessman”

Ross Miller, Decoded Collective

Left: Paper Architecture: Flat sheet (folded form) by Alice Circelliini, Cassette College and Vanessa Dohler, Cabinet of Curiosity Studio and The Vika (CEIR, round 2).

Above: Three Futures: An exploration through photography and sculpture, Nadege Meriau and Queen Mary University of London (CEIR, round 2).
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“The scheme made me a better listener, a better exchanger of knowledge and a better businessman”

Ross Miller, Decoded Collective

Left: Paper Architecture: Flat sheet (folded form) by Alice Circelliini, Cassette College and Vanessa Dohler, Cabinet of Curiosity Studio and The Vika (CEIR, round 2).

Above: Three Futures: An exploration through photography and sculpture, Nadege Meriau and Queen Mary University of London (CEIR, round 2).

Left: The Flying Skirt (networked/motion sensitive version) by Ross Miller, Decoded College London (CEIR 3). Ross commented on the value of the scheme beyond funding in that he could market himself as a ‘creative entrepreneur’ and the worth of external validation through funding as well as having the opportunity to undertaking a new methodology with academic expertise. According to Ross, engaging in the scheme greatly encouraged him to ‘learn how to exchange knowledge in a more productive way. [The scheme] made me a better listener, a better exchanger of knowledge and a better businessman.’
Researchers in Residence

The Researchers in Residence (RIR) scheme partnered an individual – in this case a doctoral or early career researcher from a Creativeworks London partner higher education institution – with a relevant SME or independent research organisation in the creative or cultural sector.

Mary University of London (RIR 3), held two simultaneous residencies, one at the Ragged School and one at the Cultural Capital Exchange (TCCE) itself. His work with the Ragged School Museum contributed to a successful bid for follow-on funding and an award-winning exhibition. There was also a significant academic impact for Dr Mitchell, who was awarded a major fellowship shortly after his residencies.

Dr Daniel Strutt, Goldsmiths, University of London, was able to expand on a chapter of his thesis in practice with Punchdrunk and the collaboration continued into a major Arts Council bid. Dr Strutt has built his work with CWL into a portfolio used as evidence of public engagement and career development.

Emma Miles, Royal Holloway, University of London (RIR 4), a former teacher, used her own experience in schools and with theatre company, Punchdrunk, combined with her doctoral research in the socio-cultural positioning and impact of theatre for early years, to evaluate Punchdrunk’s effectiveness through observation in a school. Emma produced two versions of a research report – a full-length one for publication by Punchdrunk and a significantly reduced one to be circulated to a wider audience and aid Punchdrunk in securing funding and exposure. Emma also wrote a thesis chapter based on her residency; therefore her involvement had a direct academic impact on her work.

Perhaps more directly than the Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence scheme, the RIR scheme was beneficial to both partners: the researcher and the institution. Particular examples include London Symphony Orchestra, whose engagement with Dr Sam Duffy, Queen Mary University of London (RIR 4) produced an in-depth evaluation of their internal processes which has already been instrumental in internal reforms and evaluation processes. The Ben Yuri Archive’s work with Dr Lily Ford contributed to a major exhibition held at Somerset House in summer 2015, and significantly increased exposure of an under-used but important resource. Dr Benjamin Poore’s residency at the Freud Archive’s work with Dr Lily Ford contributed to a major exhibition held at Somerset House in summer 2015, and significantly increased exposure of an under-used but important resource. Dr Benjamin Poore’s residency at the Freud Archive resulted in a panel discussion held as part of TCCE’s Inside Out Festival in autumn 2015.

The scheme directly shows creative industry partners the value of seeking arts and humanities researchers to engage in specific and detailed pieces of collaborative research.

Abuse: Peopling the Ragged School: Uncovering the past, enriching the present, using archival collections to engage new museum audiences, Dr Peter Mitchell, Queen Mary University of London and Ragged School Museum
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The BOOST scheme was a late-stage initiative of the Creativeworks London Knowledge Exchange Programme – the only scheme not outlined in the initial bid or business case. It replaced a planned final Creative Vouchers (CV) round. The idea came about through recognition that the seed funding provided by the CV scheme and residencies would not be able to promote business or enterprise, or even research practice, to the desired extent because of the relatively small amounts of money involved and the short duration of projects. It was decided that the aims of the programme could be better met by providing

Opposite, clockwise from top left: BeatWoven and Queen Mary University of London (BOOST, round 1); Heart n Soul and Goldsmiths, University of London (BOOST, round 1); English Touring Opera and Guildhall School of Music & Drama (BOOST, round 1); Fantasy High Street and King’s College London (BOOST, round 2); June Givanni Pan African Cinema Archive and Birkbeck, University of London (BOOST, round 1). BOOST awards consisted of a further £10,000 of funding to the SME for time, expenses and services required, with £15,000 to the academic. The BOOST application process differed from those of the other rounds – most significantly because the format of previous rounds had encouraged the formation of new collaborations, which was unnecessary for BOOST awards. The application process included a ‘pitch day’, which provided applicants with support and expertise that would aid their continuing activity and future funding bids, whether or not they were successful with BOOST.

“BOOST was a test case that highlighted the fundamental value of seed funding and further funding to collaborative knowledge exchange projects that bring together the creative and cultural industries with arts and humanities researchers. Four of the five projects funded by the BOOST scheme were collaborations formed through CWL’s methodology and activities, and all five have used their initial funding and follow-on funding to produce outputs and innovations that will ensure their businesses and associated research practices continue beyond the life of CWL as a Knowledge Exchange Hub.”

They were given access to case studies from other relevant organisations (commercial and non-commercial) that have secured additional funding for their businesses, access to industry and creative experts who shared experiences and gave feedback on ideas and propositions; business development advice to aid in the preparation of applications for continuation funding; and the opportunity to pitch for support from investors and funders, in addition to further funding from CWL itself through BOOST. The process of the application, including the pitch day and workshops, was deemed useful even by those not funded because of the ‘upskilling’ approach, which was designed to be of relevance to all attendees. Alterations were made to the format between rounds 1 and 2 (held in March and June 2015) because it was deemed too intense. Instead of one full day, the second round was split into two half-day workshops, allowing more time for applicants to prepare their pitches – further evidence of learning in progress for the CWL programme.

Over 60% of CWL awardees from across the funding schemes put in expressions of interest, attended workshops and submitted applications. Those awarded vouchers in round 7 of the CVs, round 3 of the Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence and round 4 of the Researchers in Residence schemes were not eligible to apply. This was because the final project report had to have been submitted to CWL prior to applications being made, and these projects had either not yet completed or not yet begun. BOOST awards were made to five projects that might or might not succeed. Over 60% of CWL awardees from across the funding schemes put in expressions of interest, attended workshops and submitted applications. Those awarded vouchers in round 7 of the CVs, round 3 of the Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence and round 4 of the Researchers in Residence schemes were not eligible to apply. This was because the final project report had to have been submitted to CWL prior to applications being made, and these projects had either not yet completed or not yet begun. BOOST awards consisted of a further £10,000 of funding to the SME for time, expenses and services required, with £15,000 to the academic. The BOOST application process differed from those of the other rounds – most significantly because the format of previous rounds had encouraged the formation of new collaborations, which was unnecessary for BOOST awards. The application process included a ‘pitch day’, which provided applicants with support and expertise that would aid their continuing activity and future funding bids, whether or not they were successful with BOOST.
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Perfect Pitch

Nadia-Anne Ricketts won crucial follow-on funding to develop her app that translates music into woven patterns – and to explore the copyright issues.

BOOST – round 1

The follow-on funding allowed Nadia-Anne to develop her coding/software design to create an app to allow people to interact, personalise, upload their own music, see the patterns playing and create their own patterns to be woven. In turn, the app will be one of the first components to Nadia-Anne’s future project of creating London’s first BeatWoven digital mini-mill.

Collaboration

The project participants built on their previous legal research with more complex intellectual property questions, producing a legal research document that could help future businesses facing similar issues. This included the inspection of the envisaged business model and how it might be put into effect without seeking authorisation of music rightholders. Nadia-Anne needed to understand how her business plan might be affected by the source of the music played by the users of the app. What might be the potential liability of BeatWoven for facilitating such use? Where could the business model and app design be put into effect without seeking the authorisation of the rightholders (mainly involving copyright law)? And what defined BeatWoven’s freedom to describe the nature of its products and the circumstances under which it might be possible to do so?

Innovation

According to Nadia-Anne, ‘The opportunities this [project] will bring not only to BeatWoven but to the wider creative economy are endless.’ Since working with Creativeworks London, BeatWoven has grown as a brand and moved to the next level, with new clients, more business, and therefore more turnover, with the potential for new staff. BeatWoven is creating an exciting talking point in the industry, gaining press through its developing profile. It is Nadia-Anne’s hope that this project is the first piece of the puzzle towards her mini-mill, which will resolve ‘huge manufacturing issues caused by an aged and threatened UK weaving industry, and introduce digital weaving alongside 3D printing’.

The value of CWL

Nadia-Anne was introduced to Noam Shemtov via CWL’s activities. Of the initial collaboration, Nadia-Anne claimed that, without CWL, BeatWoven may have never found the answers to the obstacles it faced and could not exist today. Nadia-Anne’s business would not have developed as it has without the legal expertise offered by Dr Shemtov; prior to learning of CWL she felt that she could only get the expertise she needed by seeking out a lawyer who charged by the hour. The realisation that she could get funding to work with a researcher who would benefit from helping her unravel her legal tangle was game-changing.

Since the initial collaboration, BeatWoven has received commissions from the Southbank Centre and London Philharmonic Orchestra, has worked with Harrods on an exclusive collection for London Design Week 2014 and was showcased as a Future Heritage project at Decorex International 2014 and at Future Artefacts 2015.

Essential info

Collaborators: Nadia-Anne Ricketts, BeatWoven and Dr Noam Shemtov, Queen Mary University of London

Initial award: Creative Voucher – round 4

The project team sought to research the marketing and communication to the public of facets of BeatWoven’s business model. It examined free commercial speech in describing a fundamental characteristic of goods or services, and the potential impact of this on BeatWoven.


“Silence is the fabric upon which notes are woven”

Lawrence Duncan

Dr Shemtov researched many legal cases and wrote a detailed paper (since published) using BeatWoven’s copyright issues as a case study. He also provided legal expertise, allowing Nadia-Anne to continue with contracts in the safe knowledge that her practice was not infringing copyright.
High Street Heroes

Fantasy High Street has explored innovative methods for tracking the impact of cultural events on local businesses.

Lydia Fraser-Ward’s residency explored new methods to assess the economic, social and cultural impact of Fantasy High Street’s (FHS) work to provide evidence of its importance in supporting high street regeneration. The Creative Entrepreneur in Residence (CEIR) award enabled a collaboration on FHS’s inaugural event in July 2013 within shop spaces on Lower Marsh, Waterloo. The project delivered a series of evaluation and monitoring activities to assess: the impact of the event on the local economy (direct sales to participating businesses); cultural stimulation (numbers of participants from the local community); and social engagement (feedback on the importance of the high street to community members).

BOOST – round 1
The only CEIR project to secure a BOOST award, FHS and King’s College worked on a business-focused collaborative research project. They carried out a feasibility study for the application of a new business idea – an RFID wristband / entry pass that can be used within the context of a free arts festival, tracking the movement of festival-goers within an unticketed event site, and monitoring how these visitors engage with the local high street and businesses therein.

Collaboration
Much of the collaboration has been practice-based – ie. trialled through actual creative projects (installations and performances) rather than observation, theory, interviews or case study examination. The installations and performances only come to life through public interaction, so the audience is as crucial to the work as the mechanics, materials and staff of the performances themselves. Therefore the project constantly trialled new ideas to create bespoke audience experiences, while at the same time learning about the audience and what they think. According to Lydia, ‘It is a very tricky line to walk, and our partnership with King’s has assured that we constantly consider the ethics of data collection and analysis.’

Innovation
This system works with anonymous data, looking at trends for festival-goers, and thereby enabling organisers to collect more accurate information on the popularity and effectiveness of different events where tickets cannot be issued and headcounts can only provide estimated figures. By tying the system in with local businesses (offering discounts and incentives in local shops), it tracks how much money is spent within those businesses without gathering personal details about the individual festival-goers.

According to Lydia, ‘The relationship with CWL has introduced FHS to new potential partners, awoken creative ideas through discussion with other artists and academics and has provided a platform for us to talk about our work at conferences which has led to new potential partnerships.’

Collaborators: Lydia Fraser-Ward, Fantasy High Street; and Dr Roberta Comunian, King’s College London
Initial award: Creative Entrepreneur in Residence – round 1

Essential info

The innovation of these early ideas has led to an active thread of interactive evaluation methods, exploring clever new ways of engaging audiences and high street visitors.

The value of CWL
The BOOST award enabled FHS to work with a digital tech company to trial new methods for interaction. This has fed into the development of software, which has influenced many of the new ideas Lydia has for digital interaction installations. This collaboration began just as the company was starting up; it is now a registered community interest company with an annual turnover of £45,000 in its second year of trading. As part of the BOOST project, FHS took on a second employee for the summer and employed numerous freelancers.

“Imagine … a high street full of your wildest dreams”
Fantasy High Street
A Gift to the Givers

Heart n Soul and Goldsmiths teamed up to develop an online charity platform that takes an irreverent approach to donating.

Goldsmiths College and Heart n Soul developed, tested and launched an accessible app that drew creative inspiration from music by the band The Fish Police. Goldsmiths worked alongside a range of users with learning disabilities, supported by an interactive facilitator and large touch-screen technology. A prototype app was designed, tested and uploaded a month before release of The Fish Police’s album, Cheeseburger Man. This project paved the way for a successful approach to the Digital R&D Fund for a further £125,000 investment in developing innovative cultural products that are attuned to learning disability needs.

BOOST – round 1

The BOOST project is a direct development of a four-year, four-project relationship between Heart n Soul and Goldsmiths’ Embedded AudioVisual Interaction Group. The project’s output is a new donation platform website which enables users to learn more about Heart n Soul, give money and receive a digital gift in addition to the prospect of an ongoing relationship with the organisation.

Collaboration

Although the collaboration between Dr Mick Grierson and Mark Williams predates Creativeworks London, the BOOST project offered early-career researchers experience in collaborating with external partners, pitch for funding and develop project ideas – a hugely important skill.

“Our aim is to surprise, disarm and charm people”

Mark Williams, Heart n Soul

The funds also financially supported PhD students, who were able to apply their research and skills in developing prototype design ideas with the external organisation. Undergraduate and masters students worked on the project as paid developers – an opportunity of great value to those struggling to bridge the gap between academic study and the working environment.

Innovation

The project has been a collaboration involving Heart n Soul digital associate Hannah Mason, design associate Adele Jefts and digital associate Justin Spooner. Working together, with regular meetings with Mick, Heart n Soul has worked through a number of ideas, concepts and prototypes to try to discover and refine an ‘innovative and rule-breaking idea’. According to Mark, ‘We wanted to develop a giving platform where you give and get something as a thank you (in this case a piece of digital art created by a Heart n Soul artist or participant), and you do not know the nature of the gift that you will be receiving.

The idea was to create an experience for the user, which is like an online version of the experience of attending a Heart n Soul event – for example, the Beautiful Octopus Club at the Royal Festival Hall. ‘Our aim is to surprise, disarm and charm people into our world rather than making them feel guilty, pity, ashamed or sad for the people with learning disabilities whose talents, capabilities and life affirming aesthetics we try to shine a light on and share more widely.

So the challenge was initially to agree that this methodology was one that was worth further exploring as there are no other examples of a giving website that has this fun, playful and irreverent approach.’

The value of CWL

Although the existing relationship between the collaborators negated some of the impact of CWL’s brokerage, funding is essential to the development of new technology. That said, the Goldsmiths team is of the opinion that ‘in general, institutions and funding organisations need to understand more explicitly that the research outcomes produced by the academic sector are more explicitly that the research outcomes produced by the academic sector are necessary and vital. Nothing is without fault, but this form of money remains essential with respect to developing technology prototypes in a way that meets the needs of non-academic organisations.’

Essential info

Collaborators: Mark Williams, Heart n Soul, and Dr Mick Grierson, Goldsmiths College, University of London

Initial award: Creative Voucher – round 2 (Co-creation)

Above: Heart n Soul provides creative spaces for disabled and non-disabled artists and participants to come together.

‘Funding of this type is essential ...’

The BOOST programme allowed a team of entrepreneurial researchers and practitioners to develop something that could bring genuine value to the sector.’

According to Mark, ‘the programme is necessary and vital. Nothing is without fault, but this form of money remains essential with respect to developing technology prototypes in a way that meets the needs of non-academic organisations.’

‘Of course, the BOOST programme cannot guarantee success, particularly because it awards quite small sums of money. However, in a large number of cases we have been involved in, CWL funding has led to further funds becoming available from other bodies or commercial enterprises. It is too early to tell if this will be the case for this project, but as it is basically a reusable funding platform for creative agencies, it may well reap rewards in the future.’
Access All Arias

English Touring Opera and Guildhall School of Music & Drama used collaborative research techniques to widen opera’s appeal.

English Touring Opera (ETO) and Guildhall School of Music & Drama's Creative Voucher (CV) project sought insight into audience responses to broadcast operas. Research showed that cinema audiences were largely positive about the extra footage in these broadcasts. 'Audiences enjoyed having access to things they could not normally see in the theatre, and insight into the “real people” connected with the performance.'

The value of CWL

ETO has been very positively impressed by the amount of expertise available through CWL and is keen to continue to partner with research institutions to further improve its business practice and decision-making. We now have a clearer picture of audience response to our supporting materials, and are able to create a new strategy for both their creation and delivery. Those new materials will drive ETO’s business forward by allowing us to appeal to new audiences, and better retain existing ones in the face of competition.'

ETO’s qualitative research analysis skills and contributed to a more data-orientated mindset within the company. Following on from Guildhall’s initial presentation to ETO, the marketing department has started to make changes to its schedules and activities to revise the way content is produced, presented and delivered to its audiences.

BOOST – round 2

While ETO also produces video interviews, podcasts, pre-show talks and other supporting materials to enhance audience experience of productions, these are not as seamlessly integrated into the overall experience as the cinema broadcasts, and initial conversations with audience members indicated that many do not access these materials. The BOOST project sought to make these materials appeal more broadly, rather than just for highly engaged opera enthusiasts, and make sure they reach the widest possible audience.

The Brokership

According to ETO, the most significant benefit of the BOOST programme was that it enabled successful collaborations between SMEs and universities/research centres to continue. All too often, these types of partnership end when follow-on funding is unavailable. As a result, partners focused on developing the project amid competing calls on time and energy. The BOOST project has allowed us to sharpen our understanding rather than open up radically new areas of perception or experience. ETO has been able to build on the research findings from the CV award. The learning resulting from both projects is being brought to bear on ETO business practice, with the support of the research team underpinning any changes or proposed changes. The BOOST programme has enabled a process whereby research-led changes to business practice can become more embedded in the long-term activities of the company.
Unlocking an Archive

With Birkbeck, June Givanni’s film archive developed a sustainable model for opening up independent cultural collections to the public.

The Connections project was developed to provide a further step in the development of the June Givanni Pan African Cinema Archive (JGPACA). The project was initially a small, focused exploration of the archive, seeking to identify its potential value with academic stakeholders. Along with Chelsea College of Arts, University of the Arts London (UAL) and the joint professo...
The knowledge generated thanks to Creativeworks London also worked as input for academics. The collaborative partnerships enabled the development of new research questions and methodologies and generated knowledge of benefit both to the creative economy and the arts and humanities research base. For researchers, working on funded projects could also mean the beginning of new partnerships.

The publications generated by CWL include papers and reports along three different research strands. Each strand developed and implemented two themes that governed different rounds of the Creative Voucher scheme.

**PWK**

*Place Work Knowledge (PWK)* analysed the processes that drive and sustain London's creative economy, examining how innovation, knowledge production and knowledge exchange work in practice. The projects listed under this strand developed the sub-strands of localism (round 3) and networks (round 7). Projects attached to the PWK strand included Making Friends – Emilie Giles, Codasign, and Tessa Whitehouse, Queen Mary University of London, studied how creative technologies can be used to actively reinforce and explore social relations. In particular they conducted workshops with year 7 students and disseminated materials and expertise for education and research.

**CLA**

*Capturing London’s Audiences (CLA)* had the aim of better understanding how audiences and cultural consumers behave, how their experience can be enhanced and developed, and how artistic and economic value can be added to the creative process. The researchers specifically investigated the concepts of co-creation (round 2) and value (round 6). Projects associated with the CLA strand include the Cheeseburger Man project – Mick Grierson, University of London, and Mark Williams, Heart N Soul, prototyped an app pioneering new ways of making and experiencing art promoted through a collaboration between disabled and non-disabled people.

**LDE**

*London’s Digital Economy* explored how ‘digital cultures’ can facilitate the use of understanding from arts and humanities research in the digital industries of the creative economy. Moreover, the strand focused on understanding the digital cultures which pervade the interpretation of digital in society, leading to distinct perceptions on the potential of digital societies. The researchers framed their research around the mobility and mobile culture (round 1) and on archiving (round 5). Projects included London Memories – Michela Magas, Stromatolite LTD and Frank Millward, Kingston University London created a mobile digital platform for disseminating community-generated narratives about the city of London.
"There has been excellent engagement between the strands, particularly the PDRAs who have actively sought opportunities for collaborative research"
Engines of Creativity

The Place Work Knowledge strand produced a wealth of research on the processes that drive the creative economy.

The Place Work Knowledge (PWK) strand centres on the processes that drive and sustain London’s creative economy, examining how innovation, knowledge production and knowledge exchange work in practice. The strand’s core questions are:

• What knowledge is critical for these activities?
• How is it obtained and circulated?
• Is this knowledge generic or proprietary?
• Is it formal or informal?
• Is it gained or exchanged or both?

These are based on the idea that even when a ‘product’ exists, its journey into the public domain requires a huge amount of ‘knowledge’. Furthermore, the development and refinement of a ‘product’, or the very idea of a product, requires access to knowledge.

Through the development of case studies, the researchers sought to interrogate the idea that knowledge can be gained through past education, through research, or by interaction (and/or past experience). Assuming that any cultural product begins its life in, and is sustained by, an unacknowledged ecosystem, PWK researchers attempted to map, make visible, and plot gaps in this system. The primary case studies were:

Case study 1 – A fashion incubator based in a university
Case study 2 – A fashion co-working and studio space and fashion lab
Case study 3 – A co-working space for tech start-ups tied to a large advertising agency
Case study 4 – A BA programme at an art school that acts as a hub
Case study 5 – An enterprise hub being created as part of a regeneration project.

The completed case studies provide a holistic array of creative economic activity.

The Place Work Knowledge strand produced a wealth of research on the processes that drive the creative economy. The strand uses qualitative research methods including ethnographic methods, interviews, film and participant observation in order to construct the case studies. The approach taken reflects the diversity of London’s creative economy, including the pivotal role of educational institutions, public and curatorial institutions such as museums and libraries and extra-institutional clusters of creative activity. The research conducted provides a rigorous understanding of the dynamism of London’s creative economy – how is it nurtured, what challenges does it face? The strand looked at individuals working and the relation of individuals to organisations such as firms or project-based networks, as well as the role played by policy and public initiatives. This research provides an evidence base for London’s policy development and delivery for the creative economy and its skills base, as well as insights into the creative economy’s governance that will inform companies, individuals, civil society and the state policy-making community.

PWK is the most prolific of the strands in terms of publications. By 2016 more than 20 published research outputs had been authored by members of the research cluster, including working papers, journal articles, book chapters and edited volumes. Andy Pratt and Tarek Virani have co-authored a number of working papers that tie the focused research of the strand to the core activity of the Hub and have engaged robustly with the nature of knowledge exchange within the context of the Hub. The research conducted by the PWK strand on innovation clusters has generated significant business insights for clusters in London, for creative entrepreneurs and policy makers. Pratt and Virani have engaged with the GLA regarding their work, and research labs on IP in the Creative Economy led to the development of Policy White Paper: Andy Pratt, Cities: The Cultural Dimension, commissioned by the UK Government Office for Sciences Foresight Committee on the Future of Cities.

“By 2016 more than 20 published research outputs had been authored by members of the research cluster”
Capturing London’s Audiences (CLA) takes as its premise that the majority of economic value in the creative economy is added by the end user – the audience. Yet how this value is added is not fully understood. Whether through attendance at exhibitions and performances, or the purchase of objects or downloads, audiences ascribe many kinds of value to their experience, including monetary value. The CLA researchers sought to better understand how audiences and cultural consumers behave, how their experience can be enhanced and developed, and how artistic and economic value can be added to the creative process.

By working with artists, promoters, technologists, designers and academists, members of the strand aimed to answer the key questions: what is an audience; how do people respond to and interact with an aesthetic experience; what is the relationship between technology and live experience; what motivates people to engage with cultural products; and what value do they ascribe to their engagement?

The strand’s core research consisted of projects undertaken in the following areas: cinema and film, museums, performing arts and visual culture. Projects included:

**London’s museum audience experience** – In collaboration with a consortium of London’s museums including the British Museum, the project analysed the different experiences of London’s museum audiences, and identified factors that affected their participation in the museums’ activities and their engagement after museums were made free entry.

**Experiencing an art gallery** – In collaboration with the Tate, researchers sought to deepen understanding of how audiences are affected by the different experiences offered to them through online portals and during their physical visit. The project followed a ludic engagement methodology for exploring audience experience, focusing on a rich variety of qualitative responses.

Understanding opera audiences – In association with Guildhall School of Music & Drama and English Touring Opera, this project used independently held audience data and surveys and the combined knowledge and research interests of the research leads and PDRA to explore audience engagement with opera. Contact with Punchdrunk – a CWL SME – meant the strand was able to use its innovative audience engagement methodology.

The CLA strand has been solidly tied to CWL’s knowledge exchange capabilities and practices – indeed the expertise and interests within the team have been key. Prof Barry Ife is also on the board of The Culture Capital Exchange. The direct relationships built between the strand and the institutions that are key to the research directly impacts the creative economy by generating new and greater audiences to some of London’s key attractions.

The strand research has followed a creative, design-led methodology using creative exercises as well as questionnaires to gather data from the public and other participants. The strand has produced a variety of publications, including journal articles, and engaged in a large range of conferences and workshops, developing an international profile. Impact has been felt from directed events such as an industry-facing workshop, ‘Audiences, Live! Understanding and augmenting audience dynamics at live events’, which demonstrated how technology can provide real-time information about people’s reactions to a live event, and the new kinds of audience engagement this enables. This approach is applicable to a huge range of activity within London’s creative economy.

---

**Capturing London’s Audiences**

- **Prof Barry Ife**
- **Prof John Markus**
- Joint Research Leads

**Prof Mariza Dima**

(Formerly Dr Sinéad O’Neill)

Postdoctoral Research Assistant

**PARTICIPANTS**

---

**Amplifying Youth Voice** - Valuing youth radio campaign creation, Reprezent and Goldsmiths, University of London, (Creative Voucher, round 6)

**Crowd Pleasers**

Through a wide range of projects, the Capturing London’s Audience strand explored how audience engagement adds value to the creative economy.
Towards the 
Digital Society

The final strand explored how different approaches to the changing digital landscape can meet the needs of creative companies.

The London’s Digital Economy (DE) research strand explored how ‘digital cultures’ can facilitate the use of knowledge gained from arts and humanities research in the digital industries of the creative economy. Researchers sought to understand the digital cultures which pervade the interpretation of digital in society, leading to distinct perceptions about the potential of digital societies. Research questions included:

- How do we enhance interactions between technologists and the humanities to challenge the limits of media technologies and vice versa?
- How can they create appropriate metadata around them and how are they thinking about recombining such assets?
- What is the digital landscape to meet the creative needs of creative companies help them to thrive and transform the way people think about themselves, their communities, their environment, their past and their future.
- How do small cultural companies best understand their digital assets?

As an overarching aim, researchers explored the opportunities of the digital landscape to meet the creative needs of creators, publishers, distributors and users. Initial research explored two key themes:

1. Creative gardens – Exploring the potential for innovation through dialogues, exchange of ideas, interdisciplinarity and collaboration in networked communities. The model supports processes of knowledge exchange aimed at cultivation of growth in socio-cultural capabilities that replenish natural capital, rather than at destructive economic growth.
2. Creative cultures – Based on observation of business models in which innovation is modelled on service performance, this is an ongoing process of exchanging one service for another, resulting in co-creation of value. This model is linked to service science and service economy in which the application of competences is for the benefit of another entity.

The final strand explored how different approaches to the changing digital landscape can meet the needs of creative companies.

The final stage of research under the DE strand explores these collaborations in relation to five key themes:

1. Digital transnationalism – The heightened interconnectivity between people around the world facilitated by the introduction of digital communication and online sharing platforms and the socio-political implications of global cooperation.
2. Democratisation and the digital space – Power relations and ways in which power operates not only through top-down institutions but also in a dynamic network of power relations reproduced through the capabilities of everyday life.
3. Digital heritage commons – Responding to the need for respect and mutual co-operation between culturally diverse populations in metropolitan areas and exploring how, why and on what grounds digital heritage commons can transform the way people think about themselves, their communities, their environment, their past and their future.
4. Active digital public(s) – How CWL projects have contributed to distribution and communal ownership of information resources and creative engagement with them, and how technology can stimulate methodological developments which acknowledge polymorphous differences and democratic changes in a city like London. This has stimulated an active engagement with a number of issues, including urban planning, history and artistic co-creation.
5. Digital tools of innovation – How have projects that explored the potential for digital innovation overturned old systems of production and consumption, attribution of value and distribution of resources?
limited attention paid to the realities of data-gathering for the purposes of evaluation and summative reporting – something that needs to be built into the programme from the outset rather than at a later date. Generating responses to the survey was time-consuming and frustrating for those gathering the data and those filling in the survey but the process was necessary both for this report and the final report to the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC).

The need for complete data for evaluation should have been recognised earlier and mechanisms put in place to gather it. What were termed final evaluation reports, required from all awardees, continued the ‘light touch’ approach of the application process, and so asked.

“There was a very positive response to requests for interviews”

Lessons from the Hub

This report has addressed the structure, function, key successes and challenges of Creativeworks London as a Knowledge Exchange Hub. This final section highlights key points and observations relevant to future iterations of CWL or a similarly structured Hub.

The Hub

The first and fundamental point to be made is to recognise the challenges of evaluating a Knowledge Exchange Hub. In gathering material for this report and the other evaluation outputs, there was a very positive response to requests for interviews – all those spoken to were keen to share their experiences and the outcomes of their projects. Clearly there is a great deal of pride in the work done and funded by CWL. In the design of the programme, however, there was
for limited information. As these reports were completed at the end of the projects, they could not account for future impacts, subsequent developments, outputs and outcomes. The timescale of the programme also significantly affects efforts to measure impact and must be taken into account. How to measure a variety of impacts in a meaningful way across sectors is a challenge for which an answer has still to be found.

In the life-span of a project such as CWL, personnel changes cannot be avoided. Early in the project Principle Investigator, Prof Evelyn Welch, and Hub Manager, Ruth Hogarth, moved onto new roles. Throughout the course of the programme Hub Deputy Director and London’s Digital Economy Research Lead, Prof Mark Plumbley, Director and London’s Digital Economy Knowledge Exchange, Sally Jodie Eastwood, and two Postdoctoral Researchers went on to new positions. All losses had an impact on hub productivity; however, in the face of these challenges, CWL has grown and developed through the opportunities that these departures offered.

Knowledge Exchange Programme

A lot of gratitude has been expressed towards CWL. In many cases, the funding came at the perfect moment – without it, collaborations would not have happened and potentially SMEs not been able to continue as they were. BeatWoven is a great example of this because of the limit that copyright posed to the business. On the flipside, however, limited funding – particularly to SMEs – reduces people’s willingness to engage with repeated efforts to gather data and directly corresponds to the likely outputs and impacts of a small project, particularly in terms of business impacts.

A reality of AHRC funding is that the academic institution received more than the SME – who arguably needed it more – and this seems in some cases to have affected the ease of collaboration. The innovation of the BOOST scheme was a real success in terms of the chosen projects’ impact and outputs – academic, economic, creative and social. The success of this follow-on funding suggests that the BOOST award should have been an integral part of the Knowledge Exchange Programme from the outset, with more funds directed to BOOST and fewer to vouchers. BOOST rounds would need to be integrated into the programme alongside the other schemes to avoid awardees being unable or ineligible to apply due to timing.

Partner engagement

From the outset, the Hub had too many partners, making it difficult for them all to engage or be engaged (i.e. for the promised in-kind support to be used and collected). Equally, there is a lot of personnel movement over a period of four or five years in academia – in some cases, a partnership was forged in 2011 that ended in 2015. BeatWoven is a great example of this because of the limit that copyright placed on the business.

Looking forward, iterations of programmes such as CWL or organisations like TCCE may need to evolve to meet the continuing importance of personal relationships was key. However, there might be no one in post who was aware of, or engaged in, the project. knowledge exchange. These same partners discussed the value or usefulness of independently subscribing to the Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE) while engaged with CWL, which may suggest an attitude change regarding knowledge exchange in London-based higher education institutions.

“From the outset, the Hub had too many partners, making it difficult for them all to engage”

Therefore what was originally promised in terms of academics’ time and institutional in kind support has been difficult to access. Another aspect of the partnership to consider is that for the partners there has not been a large-scale conversion with regards to knowledge exchange practice. This was not the expectation – the partner organisations who came on board were those who were already engaged in knowledge exchange to some extent and had practised, but perhaps not fundamentally learnt about, and more sophisticated needs of a culture more experienced in knowledge exchange.

The research strands

As with the partnership, the challenge presented by the formation of the research strands and the clusters was that, in some cases, there were too many academic researchers with limited time available for engagement with the research, other strands or cluster members. Again, the migration of academics from partner institutions also posed a problem.

Another point to consider is dissemination of work done by the research strands more widely within the partnership and network of awardees. This would promote more collaboration within the Hub itself and increase awareness of the Hub’s own knowledge exchange in practice.
Four Different Methodologies

The research strands stressed the importance of exploring audiences, the digital economy and clusters of workplaces in London. CWL also maintained a focus on developing the role of arts and humanities researchers in collaboration with a range of creative economy partners. Rather than having a particular sectoral focus (such as digital), it used successive rounds of innovation vouchers (including the Fusion Collaborative Award and BOOST schemes) and creative entrepreneur and researcher residencies to foster the role of knowledge exchange between arts and humanities researchers and cultural and creative organisations of all kinds.

CWL particularly focused on disruptive innovation, exploring fields not already requested by the market. With the exception of the more business-led Fusion strand, the majority of its projects supported an early innovation stage, not very often supported in similar schemes.

The Hubs – an overview

The Creative Exchange (CXC), led by Lancaster University, focused on the potential of ‘digital public space’ – a conceptual realm where anyone can access, explore and create with digital content, including newly accessible collections of media, public information and personal data trails. Projects were grouped into six clusters: public service innovation and democracy; performance, liveliness and participation; making the digital physical; rethinking working life; stories, archives and living heritage; building social communities – dynamic structures for growth.

The Hubs in London leveraged European Regional Development Fund match-funding through the Fusion project, whereas Design in Action (DiA) was supported by Creative Scotland. The Hubs were geographically spread, and CWL had a particularly close relationship with its city.

Women in the Digital Economy

Though research from the AHRC shows there is a higher proportion of female students undertaking higher degrees (research) in arts and humanities related subject areas, women occupy a smaller proportion of the creative workforce. Data from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) suggests that in 2013 women occupied 34.8% jobs in the creative economy and 37.1% of jobs in the creative industries.

“The RIR scheme had 62% female doctoral or early-career researchers”

This is smaller than the 46.9% female employment in the UK as a whole. Research from charity Nesta also found that women occupy a smaller proportion of the creative workforce compared to national standards. This creative industries gender gap is also reflected in London. Research by the Greater London Authority (GLA) suggests women accounted for only 26.7% of the capital’s creative economy between 2011 and 2014. Creativeworks London has actively sought to facilitate female engagement in its funding schemes to attract a more balanced split between genders.

Female participation was highest in the more research-focused funding schemes and lower in those that were more business-oriented. The Researcher in Residence scheme had one of the highest female participation rates, with 46% female doctoral or early-career researchers, while Fusion Collaborative Awards only had 24% female engagement. This is reflective of the wider context in which women are better represented in arts and humanities research.
Summary: Female Engagement

Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence

In total, 52% of the entrepreneurs who were funded by the Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence (CEIR) scheme were female. This figure is significant as it is higher than the national percentage of jobs filled by women (46.9%).

The percentage of academics who partnered with the entrepreneurs who were women was 61%; a figure closely aligned with those for the RIR scheme and an increase on academic employment UK figures, which suggest that only 44.5% of academic staff are female.

The overall percentage of female participants in the CEIR scheme was 56% – the lowest percentage of female engagement across the CWL funding schemes, excluding Fusion. However, it still indicates that the majority of participants in the scheme were female, further attesting CWL’s success with female engagement.

Considering the individual funding schemes:

Creative Vouchers

In total, 63% of the projects funded by the CWL Creative Vouchers (CV) scheme had female SME partners; 60% of projects had female academic partners, therefore 62% of the funded projects had at least one female partner. Of note is round 4, which was the open round where all eight funded SME partners were women.

Researchers in Residence

Figures relating to female participation in the Researchers in Residence (RIR) scheme are higher than average. Overall, 67% of the doctoral or early-career researchers who took part in the RIR scheme were female.

Of the RIR SMEs/host institutions, 45% identified themselves as female-led.

“52% of the entrepreneurs funded by the CEIR scheme were female”

“62% of the funded CV projects had at least one female partner”

Percentage of self-defined female/male-led SMEs
London’s Creative Economy

The impact of Creativeworks London on the capital’s creative economy needs to be considered both in spatial and sectoral terms. London is one of the world’s top three cities by scale and value of its creative industries, along with New York and Los Angeles. Those industries, and the knowledge and research base that feed them, catalyse London’s diverse and distinctive cultural and creative economy. This is manifest in both ‘mainstream’ commercial venues and community-based cultural events, the clustering of certain sub-sectors around particular physical locations, the interaction of industry, retail and night-time economies that typifies creative districts like Soho, and the regeneration through culture and creative industries of whole swathes of the city – evidenced not only in ‘grand projects’ like the Olympic Park but in more localised, ‘bottom-up’ developments such as Deptford Creek.

Not all projects had a sectoral focus. Analysis of the sectoral bias in take-up of the different opportunities within the programme varied between strands, but overall reflected a bias toward disciplines more obviously connected to arts and humanities research priorities, such as performing arts and publishing, and away from sub-sectors with more direct technology and media inputs, such as film and TV, software design and advertising.

Transferable methods

Creativeworks contained, in its research strands, voucher schemes and residencies, projects that addressed the transversality of methodologies between sectors – such as the collaboration between bodyspace and Guildhall School of Music & Drama, which looked at whether innovation among makers followed similar methods to those deployed in live performance some three decades earlier.

The range of themes explored in the different calls were too diverse to allow the formation of a view on any correlations between approaches of the kind that would point to a definitive model to measure the impact of knowledge exchange in the development of London’s creative economy, either in particular sectors or as a whole. The following pages propose recommendations on further steps to address these issues.

Recommendations and Legacy

Research and innovation are at the heart of the success of London’s creative industries. As has been observed on the previous page, this produces benefits in the wider creative economy. The Creativeworks London programme reinforced this not only through business-led product development, exemplified by the success of the Fusion innovation voucher scheme, but in the over 100 collaborative research programmes were followed through to a conclusion. Other than in the Fusion strand, which successfully demonstrated the immediate economic impact of an interaction with the knowledge base for SMEs with a product that was closer to market, the CWL programme was looking to establish and validate other kinds of outcome, particularly the value of knowledge exchange between researchers and early-stage creative SMEs. This is in contrast to schemes such as Nesta’s Creative Credits, more oriented toward ‘business support’ or supply chain development.

In that context, it was to be expected that the evaluation of the CWL programme should have produced a wealth of qualitative evidence of the success of the approach, but as yet less data on financial outcomes. With a few notable exceptions, it would be unrealistic, moreover, to expect that a seed investment of £15,000 shared between the SME and a research collaborator would result in anything more than a prototype, in commercial terms. The BOOST awards, offering higher levels of funding to more developed propositions, hold out the promise to use ‘lean start-up’ methods to translate those initial investigations into marketable products and services.

Research outcomes

The immediate and medium-term legacies of Creativeworks, therefore, call for two complementary but differently focused approaches. The first and immediate legacy is focused on research outcomes. This first iteration of CWL has demonstrated demand among researchers and institutions to engage in this kind of knowledge exchange, and this demand has been translated into significant volumes of papers, seminars and other research. There is insufficient data at this stage to establish any correlation between the performance of individual arts

“Over 100 collaborative research programmes were followed through to a conclusion”
and humanities departments to the overall levels of commercial and collaborative research in the creative sector across the institutions of which they form part. Although there are indications that some institutions showed greater awareness of the value of interdisciplinary teams, involving some combination of arts and humanities, computing and social science researchers in engagement with creative SMEs, this needs to be further explored to understand:

- whether there is a clear and shared sense that knowledge exchange methods practised by arts and humanities researchers can influence the development of practice in other fields
- whether arts and humanities researchers have themselves learned from and adapted their research design and practice to reflect successful methods deployed both in other academic disciplines and in businesses
- whether there is any correlation between interdisciplinary approaches and more successful research and business outcomes.

With the project term still ongoing at the time of writing, there are not yet enough points of data to offer a clear correlation between approaches and suggest whether there is, for example, an arts and humanities equivalent to TRLs (technology readiness levels), commonly deployed to assess the relative stage of development of science and technology projects at inception and close; nor even whether the more iterative processes of innovation and market testing within creative and design disciplines would benefit from such a scale, however useful it may be to funders in assessing the relative levels of return, impact and value for money. If there is any appetite to do this, the demonstrable strength of the Creativeworks network offers the potential to continue and build upon the engagement of the institutions, early-stage researchers and principle investigators with London’s creative SME community.

**Long-term value**

The second legacy calls for longer term evaluation of the performance of creative SMEs that have already benefited from the programme, alongside new entrants, to test the hypothesis of longer term value creation within the knowledge exchange methodology. This further work should be structured to allow for direct measurement and comparison of a number of variables, including the relative stage of development of the initial proposal, the size and maturity of the SME, the experience of the lead entrepreneur, gender, sub-sector and others. It would look to establish whether:

- there was clear evidence that the absorptive capacity of the SME in respect of innovation in its products and services was increased by engagement with a process of collaborative knowledge exchange, and
- whether this results in improved commercial returns in the short, medium and long term.

“CWL has demonstrated demand among researchers and institutions to engage in this kind of knowledge exchange”
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Project titles and participants

Creative Vouchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>Artist round</th>
<th>Site partner</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Academic partner</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music, mobility and the Mediterranean melting-pot: a new model of mobility through social intelligence</td>
<td>CV 1</td>
<td>Motiroti Professor Clive Excursions</td>
<td>cv1 Tim Jones</td>
<td>cv1 Michela Magas Stromatolite Frank Millward Kingston University London Memories</td>
<td>cv1 Professor Peter Holtham Kingston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural mobility through Augmented Reality technology</td>
<td>CV 2</td>
<td>Heart n Soul Dr Mick Grierson Kingston University London Memories</td>
<td>cv2 Mark Williams</td>
<td>cv2 Frank Millward Kingston University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoding The Platform-7 Network: Understanding how creative projects can transform their micro-locality through art and design interventions?</td>
<td>CV 3</td>
<td>Arcola Theatre Dr Amanda Brown City University London</td>
<td>cv3 Dr Ben Selby</td>
<td>cv3 Dr Sara Jones City University London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse Cut pilot project: Linking place and creativity</td>
<td>CV 4</td>
<td>InBox - A transmedia storytelling project, exploring the stories hidden in our phone memories and hard drives</td>
<td>cv4 Mark Williams</td>
<td>cv4 Dr Simon Bayly University of Roehampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building audiences for live opera through understanding the appeal of ‘Opera Live’ at the cinema</td>
<td>CV 5</td>
<td>The Appeal of ‘Opera Live’ at the cinema</td>
<td>cv5 Mohamed Cally Calls</td>
<td>cv5 Rebecca Ryan Furtherfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project titles and participants

Creative Vouchers continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>round</th>
<th>partner</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>academic partner</th>
<th>institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making the invisible visible: Enabling audiences to ‘see’</td>
<td>round 1</td>
<td>Andrew John</td>
<td>Alfresco Museum of Modern Art</td>
<td>Queen Mary University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restock, Rethink, Reflect – Live art, feminism and the archive</td>
<td>round 1</td>
<td>James McDonald</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song Catchers: Archiving and promoting oral culture in careers</td>
<td>round 1</td>
<td>Salley Holmes</td>
<td>V&amp;A Museum</td>
<td>University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the Invisible Visible: Enabling audiences to ‘see’</td>
<td>round 2</td>
<td>Helen Hesmondhalgh</td>
<td>Sample Arts</td>
<td>Royal Holloway, University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project titles and participants

Creative Entrepreneurs in Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>round</th>
<th>partner</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>academic partner</th>
<th>institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curating Fashion in Virtual Reality</td>
<td>round 1</td>
<td>Everton Wright</td>
<td>Evewright Studio</td>
<td>Royal Holloway, University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Portable Antiquities</td>
<td>round 1</td>
<td>Gavin Bailey</td>
<td>TraceMedia Projects</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy High Street: Evaluation methodologies to measure social, cultural and economic impact on specific localities</td>
<td>round 1</td>
<td>Paula Graham</td>
<td>FossBox CIC</td>
<td>Queen Mary University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Architecture: Flat sheet to folded form</td>
<td>round 2</td>
<td>Caroline Collinge</td>
<td>Paper Architecture</td>
<td>Victoria and Albert Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Futures: An exploration through photography and collaboration between artists and technologists</td>
<td>round 2</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetic London</td>
<td>round 2</td>
<td>Sarah Cole</td>
<td>TIME/IMAGE Online</td>
<td>Goldsmiths University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agile improvisation in the performing arts and creative digital age</td>
<td>round 2</td>
<td>David Manners</td>
<td>Artsbeds</td>
<td>University of Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PlanEt - Can data from plant help us to increase our city resilience?</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Sarah Cole</td>
<td>TIME/IMAGE Online</td>
<td>Goldsmiths University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Ross Miller</td>
<td>Decoded Collective</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons - Reading performative mappings</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons - Reading performative mappings</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Dan Barnard</td>
<td>fanSHEN</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Buttons</td>
<td>round 3</td>
<td>Paddy Hartley</td>
<td>Dr Ian Thompson</td>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project titles and participants

Researchers in Residence

**PROJECT NAME** | Start date | End date | Company | Academic partner | Institution
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---

**Evaluating an evidence base for the impact of responsive narrative adventures within formal learning**
- Ref: 1 David Cahill Roots Coney
- Ref: 2 Corey Baker Katharine Fry
- Ref: 3 David Mitchell Patricia Ryan
- Ref: 4 Benjamin Poore

**Rata-loha, A Maori tale**
- Ref: 1 Corey Baker
- Ref: 2 Kathie Caddy
- Ref: 3 nutrightarrow

**Hannibal’s Test**
- Ref: 1 Corey Baker
- Ref: 2 Kathie Caddy

**Mediations**
- Ref: 1 Annabel Elton
- Ref: 2 Andy Ryan
- Ref: 3 Laura Kenwright

**Building an evidence base for the impact of responsive Kapa Haka, A Maori Tale**
- Ref: 1 Rachel Briscoe
- Ref: 2 Rebecca Enderby

**Cheese Visitors Studio Part 1**
- Ref: 1 Ruth Catlow
- Ref: 2 Furtherfield

**Searchlight**
- Ref: 1 Stanley Middleton
- Ref: 2 Moving Stage

**Cityread London 2014**
- Ref: 1 Annabel Elton
- Ref: 2 Andy Ryan

**Value in Dance**
- Ref: 1 Corey Baker
- Ref: 2 Daniel Strutt

**outdoor cultural activities**
- Ref: 1 Ruth Catlow
- Ref: 2 Furtherfield

**Culture Place: Marketing and audience development tools for outdoor cultural activities**
- Ref: 1 Annabel Elton
- Ref: 2 Andy Ryan

**Ratan Mooney Foundation Archive**
- Ref: 1 Caroline Coates
- Ref: 2 Helen Storey

**Out of the Shoebox**
- Ref: 1 Ruth Catlow
- Ref: 2 Helen Storey

**Kapa Haka, A Maori Tale**
- Ref: 1 Rachel Briscoe
- Ref: 2 Rebecca Enderby

**RIR 1 Rachel Briscoe FanSHEN Rebecca Enderby King’s College London**

**RIR 1 Ruth Catlow Furtherfield Alexandra Reynolds Kingston University**

**RIR 2 Annabel Elton Royal Society of Arts Place**

**RIR 2 Andy Ryan Stellar Libraries CIC Maite Usoz de la Peña**

**RIR 3 Corey Baker Daniel Strutt Goldsmiths University of London**

**RIR 3 Caroline Coates Helen Storey Helen Storey Foundation Archive**

**RIR 3 Stanley Middleton Movingstage**

**RIR 3 Laura Kenwright Spread the Word Luke Kelly Birkbeck, University of London**

**RIR 3 Sorrel Hershberg The Sorrell Foundation**

**RIR 4 Rachel Dickson Ben Uri Gallery and Museum Lmited**

**RIR 4 Anna Herrmann Clean Break Emily Hunka Queen Mary University of London**

**RIR 4 Mark Waugh DACS Tania Phipps-Rufus Goldsmiths University of London**

**RIR 4 Astrid Korporaal The Institute of Contemporary Arts**

**RIR 4 Bryony Davies Freud Museum**

**RIR 4 Sarah Davies Punchdrunk Emma Miles Royal Holloway, University of London**

**INNOVATION EVALUATION LONDON CREATIVEWORKS**

**INNOVATION EVALUATION LONDON CREATIVEWORKS**

---

**Provisional output count**

**Final reports and survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>CV 1</th>
<th>CV 2</th>
<th>CV 3</th>
<th>CV 4</th>
<th>CV 5</th>
<th>CV 6</th>
<th>CV 7</th>
<th>CEIR 1</th>
<th>CEIR 2</th>
<th>CEIR 3</th>
<th>RIR 1</th>
<th>RIR 2</th>
<th>RIR 3</th>
<th>RIR 4</th>
<th>BOOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications - academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic book</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International conference papers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research reports/case studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications - cultural etc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated social media presence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New projects extending beyond CWL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CVs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIR 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIR 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIR 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIR 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIR 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIR 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIR 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provisional data produced January 2016
## Outputs – Academic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications – academic</th>
<th>Creative Vouchers</th>
<th>Researcher in Residence</th>
<th>BOOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International lecture/conference paper</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research report (internal)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Executive director report</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Publications – cultural etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Final reports and survey continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic book series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic time series</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Provisional output count

- Final reports and survey continued

### Creativeworks London Publications

A selection of publications produced by Creativeworks London:

Creativeworks London

Publications continued


Editorial Team

Dr Helen Matheson-Pollock, Evaluation and Dissemination Officer, Creativeworks London, Queen Mary University of London
Iain Bennett, Associate Director, BOP Consulting
Eleanor Aulby, Researcher, BOP Consulting
Marta Morretto, Researcher, BOP Consulting
Jana Riedel, Hub Manager, Creativeworks London, Queen Mary University of London
Emma Roberts, Head of Evaluation, Impact and Dissemination, Creativeworks London, Queen Mary University of London
Professor Morag Shiach, Vice-Principal (Humanities and Social Science), Director, Creativeworks London, Queen Mary University of London
Emma Roberts, Head of Evaluation, Impact and Dissemination, Creativeworks London, Queen Mary University of London
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Rosella Traverso, Researcher, BOP Consulting
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Creativeworks London, one of four Knowledge Exchange Hubs funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) between 2012 and 2016, brought new collaborative research opportunities to London’s creative businesses. It teamed arts and humanities researchers with creative minds to deliver on its mission to further showcase the capital as a centre for creative excellence.