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Foreword
The Group for Learning in Art and Design (GLAD) was established in 1990, as a non-affiliated group of academics representing art, design and media from across higher education institutions plus colleagues from the specialist further education sector.

GLAD’s remit is to engender discussion about best practice in developing the student experience in art, design and media; in particular, to promote and stimulate debate and consideration of developments in the teaching and learning of the subjects. The principal means of supporting this remit has been through a series of conferences, supported by publications.

The GLAD09 conference will be a unique opportunity to connect with teachers, practitioners and researchers in art, design and media from across the UK through sharing excellence in teaching and learning. GLAD09 will focus on the work of the Creative Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLs) in art, design and media to enhance creative pedagogy and support excellence across our sector.

Looked at in terms of subject spread, creative and performing arts, design and media have the greatest number of CETLs. Most of these have pre-existing close links with their cognate Art, Design, Media Higher Education Academy Subject Centre (ADM-HEA) and PALATINE, the Subject Centre for Dance, Drama and Music. Many were built upon existing projects and innovative practices. There are four CETLs related solely to art, design and media practice subjects and four related to dance, drama and music. Two are combined across the range of creative and performing arts, design and media subjects; four are based on creative and performing arts, design and media pedagogies and how these are applied to students in other subjects; and three examine generic issues, for example, work-based learning with a focus on art and design students.

Most CETLs have proposed some form of conference or other event towards the end of their period of operation (March 2010) as part of the mission to disseminate beyond their institution to meet the HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) requirement that CETLs will:

... support and develop practice that encourages deeper understanding across the sector of ways of addressing students’ learning effectively ... [influence] practice and raise the profile of teaching excellence within and beyond their institutions; and demonstrate collaboration and sharing of good practice and so enhance the standard of teaching and effective learning throughout the sector. (2004)

Early in 2009 a group of eight CETLs involved in developing learning and teaching in art, design and media participated in a meeting hosted by the Centre of Excellence for Learning and Teaching Through Design (CELTd) and facilitated by ADM-HEA. The participating CETLs acknowledged that eight separate conferences that addressed intersecting issues would be counter-productive and not in the interests of the audiences likely to gain most from their work. All those at the meeting were keen that they should share their work across art, design and media higher education.

Two key decisions arose out of this meeting. The first was that the Creative Learning in Practice Centre (CLIP) would be publishing some of its research work in a special issue of the *Journal of Art, Design and Communication* (the journal was founded by Prof. Linda Drew when she was Co-director of the ADM-HEA Subject Centre). This issue is freely available from the Intellect website: www.intellectbooks.co.uk/journals/view-Journal,id=139/.

The second decision was that the CETLs at the meeting would consider a joint conference. It was suggested that the GLAD might be interested in hosting a discussion-based conference as part of its series of annual conferences. In addition to eight CETLs at the meeting the group decided to invite contributions from other CETLs that were undertaking work that would be of particular interest to an
audience of art and design teachers. GLAD is delighted that in total 16 CETLs have contributed papers.

In 2007 ADM-HEA collaborated with CETLD in the design and delivery of the European League of the Institutes of Arts (ELIA) Teachers’ Academy to deliver a conference that was based on pre-published papers (www.elia-artschools.org/publications/archive_2). The CETL Group agreed that this would be a good format for a joint event and would afford delegates who were not from CETL-hosting higher education institutions (HEIs) the best opportunity to discuss work.

This conference also builds on a series of conference-with-publication events offered by GLAD. In 2007 GLAD hosted the ‘Student Experience in Art and Design Higher Education: Drivers for Change’ residential conference at Cambridge. This conference invited delegates to identify key issues in arts and design higher education and work in groups to produce chapters for a book of the same title, published in 2007 (ISBN 0 9547111 7 3). The 2008 GLAD conference at Nottingham Trent University invited colleagues to discuss issues arising out of the Student Experience in Art and Design book, and led to a series of reports on the GLAD website, which can be found by following the ‘links’ section to GLAD on the ADM-HEA website: www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk/links/group-for-learning-and-teaching-glad.

We hope that the ‘Dialogues in Art & Design’ conference will allow colleagues from across the creative and performing arts, design and media subjects to share the projects undertaken by CETLs and extend and apply this knowledge beyond the CETLs. The conference is organised to allow for maximum discussion. There is a series of panels based on themes drawn from the papers and the conference will end with a panel debate on issues raised at the discussion sessions.

There is huge diversity in the papers presented for the conference: those that argue for intensifying pedagogic research in our disciplines, and those based on pedagogic research; those that discuss how student learning and staff development is enhanced through focusing on creativity, innovative approaches to learning activities, implementing project-based learning for non-arts students, and e-learning; and those that question whether new communications technologies enhance learning. There are papers under each of the three major themes that discuss collaborations with industry, with museums and with international partner HEIs. Choosing which discussion session to attend will be a challenge but we hope that the plenaries, panel discussion and informal networking will help with knowledge transfer. Additionally, all delegates will receive a copy of the book and have access to a brief summary of the conference, which we plan to post on the ADM-HEA website.

We are particularly pleased that Sean Mackney, Deputy Director of the Higher Education Academy, will be at the conference and presenting to us, and that Dr Liz Beaty will be giving the keynote address. Dr Beaty’s paper will discuss the CETL activities and future action. As many of you know, before taking up her current position at the University of Cumbria, Dr Beaty was Director for Learning and Teaching at HEFCE and the driving force behind the design and inception of the CETLs.

I hope you will enjoy the conference and find it, and this publication, a stimulus to further thought about best practice in developing the student experience in art, design and media.
The GLAD09 conference will be a unique opportunity to connect with teachers, practitioners and researchers in art, design and media from across the UK through sharing excellence in teaching and learning. GLAD09 will focus on the work of the Creative Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLs) in art, design and media to enhance creative pedagogy and support excellence across our sector.
Excellence in Learning and Teaching in Art, Design and Media

Introduction
When the Dearing report was published in 1997, coherent and strategic efforts to shape new initiatives in teaching and learning across UK higher education (HE) had been underway for at least a decade. The Higher Education Funding Councils’ (HEFC) Computers in Teaching Initiative (CTI) – established in 1989 – offered a UK-wide service to academic staff in higher education institutions through a network of 24 subject-based centres.

CTIs [aim to] maintain and enhance the quality of learning and increase the effectiveness of teaching through the application of appropriate learning technologies. (Martin, 1996)

The Dearing report formally acknowledged the central role that cultivating and sustaining excellence in teaching and learning would play in UK higher education:

Higher education will make a distinctive contribution to the development of a learning society through teaching, scholarship and research ... That future will require higher education in the UK to be at the leading edge of world practice in effective learning and teaching. (Dearing, 1997)

In the same year the HEFC undertook a major review of the CTI and its partner initiative, the Teaching and Learning Technology Support Network (TLTSN). Brian Fender, then Chief Executive of Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), commented in his foreword to the review:

Communications and information technology (C&IT) and computer-aided learning have proved to be successful and innovative features of learning and teaching [and] have complemented other developmental work undertaken in subject-based activity ... The development of subject centres and subject networks will provide an important means of facilitating change and improvement in learning and teaching practice. (HEFCE, 1998b)

This report recognised that the subject dimension of CTIs was an important factor in shaping new practice and ‘the source of its strength and success’ (1998b), not only enhancing the role of technology in applied learning in the disciplines but also new occupational and discipline related skills and informing innovative pedagogy. A second and equally important factor for the effectiveness of CTIs was their location – in higher education institution (HEI) departments where disciplinary knowledge was sustained and developed alongside delivery to students. Despite locating the CTIs within HEIs, the review found that dissemination across the UK had significant impact on teaching practice across the sector.

There is substantial support across the sector for taking forward a reconceptualised programme on a subject basis. Virtually all respondents believe that academic staff identify most readily with their subject and that, to be successful, implementation and integration of ICT have to be tackled from a subject perspective. (HEFCE, 1998b)

The report found positive outcomes for the initiatives and identified variations across the four UK nations, in particular that the initiatives had prompted greater strategic change in Scotland than in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Furthermore, that across the UK the weakest effects were at institutional management levels. The review went on to commend outcomes at the interface of teaching and learning practice and in particular recommended establishing a subject-based new Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) to succeed the CTI and TLTSN. The new LTSN would promote high quality learning and teaching in all subject disciplines including, but
not exclusively focused on, the use of computers and information and communication technology.

...[the] new, broad-based and reconceptualised Subject Centres to support the sharing of innovation and good practice ... would be the one-stop shop and information gateway. The Subject Centres must provide comprehensive coverage of subjects and disciplines offered in UK higher education. (HEFCE, 1998b)

In 1999 HEFCE invited bids from HEIs to host LTSN centres. The 24 subject centres were to have a common remit based on networking; identification, promotion and sharing of good practices; and knowledge brokerage. HEFCs acknowledged that the precise balance of each centre's activities should reflect variations in practices across different subjects and suggested a key role would be 'reviewing, advising and encouraging discipline-based research and development on learning and teaching to meet the needs of the disciplines [of the] subject centre' (HEFCE, 1999).

There was an expectation that the LTSN Subject Centres would develop distinctiveness through shaping their work to the needs of their communities of practice, for example, specific issues of employability and disciplinary skills, but would also address the learning needs of the entire HE student population, such as: students with learning difficulties or disabilities; widening participation and the development of multi- and cross-disciplinary teaching and learning practice; and the development of life-long learning. To meet these wider aims Subject Centres would work collaboratively with Subject Centres of cognate disciplines.

The LTSN was launched in January 2000. The Art, Design, Media Subject Centre (originally known as the Art, Design and Communication Subject Centre) was awarded to the Faculty of Arts at the University of Brighton, which had formerly hosted the CTI for Art and Design. The most closely cognate related Subject Centre, PALATINE, covers dance, drama and music, and was awarded to the University of Lancaster.

There was a wide range of large- and small-scale initiatives to enhance teaching and learning but until 2004 there were four principal strands:

- The Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN)
- The Institute of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILTHE)
- The Higher Education Staff Development Agency (HESDA)
- The National Coordination Team (NCT)

The LTSN (one generic and 24 Subject Centres) helped teachers enhance their learning practice; it was funded by all four HEFCs and operated nationally through funding small projects, holding events and workshops, supporting networks, special interest groups and offering a ‘post-office’ and sign-posting services.

The ILTHE was launched in 1999 'to accredit programmes of training for higher education teachers; to commission research and development in learning and teaching practices; and to stimulate innovation' (Dearing, 1997). Operating as a quasi-professional body, the ILTHE promoted standards and training and maintained a register of 'fellows'. The ILTHE cast itself as a professional body and was a membership organisation. It did not confer any direct benefits on its members but it was supposed that it would impact on recruitment criteria and career development. In contrast to Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) like the Architects Registration Board (ARB) or General Medical Council (GMC) the ILTHE had no regulatory or disciplinary role and did not, other than tangentially, represent students, other consumer or stakeholder interest. However, membership of the ILTHE was intended to offer a guarantee of excellence as opposed to ARB, for example, which guarantees only competence but which does uphold standards through disciplinary procedures. In 2003, when the Future of Higher Education Report was published, the ILTHE had over 14,500 individual members and 164 accredited programmes of staff development at 112 HE institutions.

Established in 1989, HESDA had been the national training organisation for higher education since 1997. It promoted strategic staff development and training, provided specialist advice,
resources and professional services for the development of people working in higher education; it also collaborated with partners in strategic human resource development initiatives. In 2003 it had 155 institutional members representing over 95 per cent of the higher education workforce.

Finally, the NCT worked on behalf of the HEFCE and the Department for Higher and Further Education, Training and Employment (DHFETE) to manage and co-ordinate two initiatives focused on encouraging innovation and new developments within learning and teaching. The Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning (FDTL) was launched in 1995 and ‘aimed to stimulate developments in learning and teaching and secure the widest possible involvement of institutions in the take-up and implementation of good practice’ (HEFCE, 1995). It was particularly focused on developing excellence in learning and teaching through the subjects. The second scheme, the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund, launched in 1998 (HEFCE, 1998a) included an ‘institutional strand’ of funding aimed at encouraging and rewarding high quality learning and teaching, disseminating and embedding good practice, supporting research and innovation in learning and teaching, and supporting HEIs in building the capacity to enhance learning and teaching.

Art, design and media subjects were not eligible to bid for phases one, two or five of the FDTL. Phase three was launched in 1996 and began operations in 1998 and phase four projects were launched in 2001 and ran from 2002 to 2005 (HEFCE, 2001, 2005c). There were several projects based in art, design and media subjects in both phases. These included the GWAMP project based on group and peer assessment aimed at media practice students (GWAMP, 2000-04); and the Keynote project (Keynote, 2000-04), aimed at enhancing graduate employability and life-long learning skills of graduates in textiles, fashion and printing. The Employability and the Media Studies Curriculum project (EMSC) had similar aims for media studies graduates (EMSC, 2000-04). Globalising Art, Architecture and Design History (GLAADH, 2000-04) launched staff development initiatives to help teachers develop curricula for art, architecture and design history more appropriate to current multicultural society.

In phase four, Art and Design: Enabling Part-Time Tutors (ADEPTT, 2001-05) produced support materials for facilitators and part-time staff. These materials were designed to be adaptable to the needs of new and experienced staff and able to accommodate local variations in delivery and student expectations. Writing PAD: Writing Purposefully in Art and Design (Writing Pad, 2001) encourages the use of writing as a valid tool for reflective practitioners in studio-based art and design. Life, Work, Art: Integrating Entrepreneurship into Art and Design Programmes in the North East focused on graduate retention in the region and student-artists as entrepreneurs and freelancers (Life, Work, Art, 2001).

These projects involved around 25 HEIs, colleges and organisations. Many of these initiatives continue in one form or another despite the cessation of FDTL funding. For example, the GWAMP project developed CASPAR: a customisable, online solution for self and peer assessment that remains freely available and widely used. Meanwhile Writing Pad continues with a growing number of partners and, in 2007, launched the Journal of Writing in Creative Practice, which explores ‘the notion of writing as a parallel to visual discourse in art and design practice’ (Intellect, 2009).

The NCT also managed the Teaching and Learning Technology Programme (TLTP). The TLTP included the CTI and Information Technology Training Initiative, the Effective Teaching Assessment Programme and the JISC Technology Applications Programme.

The ‘Future of Higher Education’ (DfES, 2003) report reiterated the general commitment to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning:

*We are committed to understanding better where and how good teaching and learning take place and to take steps to ensure that standards are high and continually improved, and that best practice is effectively shared ... those who teach well are entitled to have their success rewarded properly.* (p.46)

The report recognised challenges to raising the profile of excellence in teaching and learning for academics and for HEIs.
Firstly, status in HE had, for some considerable time, been based on individual and institutional reputations for research. This was inherited from the ‘old’ university sector, reflected a dominant value in universities’ prestige and was inflected in career development. When the polytechnics achieved degree awarding powers and the title of ‘university’ in 1992 they cleaved to a similar set of values. The esteem, promotion and career opportunities of academics were often linked to ‘proper research’; this appears to have excluded scholarship (see Neary, p.142) and pedagogic research. The latter was defined for research assessment purposes in the 2008 exercise, but despite this, pedagogic research represented a very low volume of submissions across all sectors of research activity.

Secondly, the report recognised that excellence in teaching and learning was being actively pursued, but lack of promotion opportunities, recognition and reward (based on academic, scholarly work of teachers, founded on their own teaching practice and knowledge exchange) was hindering wider acceptance and further development. The report set out to consult on the establishment of two entities: a ‘teaching quality academy’ to develop and promote best practice in teaching; and centres for excellence in teaching to reward good teaching at departmental level and promote best practice. The review consultation also proposed expanding the National Teaching Fellowships Scheme to offer substantial rewards to twice as many outstanding teachers.

On 16 May 2003 HEFCE announced a consultation on the formation of the Higher Education Academy (HEA), a single organisation assuming the roles and functions of the LTSN (which was to remain virtually intact) and the roles and functions of the ILTHE, HESDA and the NCT. Leslie Wagner, Vice-Chancellor of Leeds Metropolitan University, invited by HEFCE to lead the development of this initiative, commented:

It [the HEA] will play a major part in enhancing the role of learning and teaching in universities and colleges as they seek to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student body. (HEFCE, 2003)

The HEA was launched in October 2004 and its first Chief Executive, Professor Paul Ramsden, then Pro-vice-chancellor at the University of Sydney, Australia and a visiting professor at the Institute of Education, University of London, took up his post in August 2005. The current website for the HEA gives its strategic aims:

- Identify, develop and disseminate evidence-informed approaches
- Broker and encourage the sharing of effective practice
- Support universities and colleges in bringing about strategic change
- Inform, influence and interpret policy
- Raise the status of teaching

On 29 January 2004 HEFCE made £315 million available for five years, inviting English (and Northern Irish) universities and colleges to bid to host Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLs) to reward and invest in excellent teaching practice. It was expected that CETLs would have a distinct focus and, importantly, would build on existing track records of excellence, having demonstrated a commitment to knowledge exchange through existing networks including the LTSN, and be able to demonstrate planned sustainable links with the HEA. Thus HEFCE made an explicit commitment for CETLs to work with the newly founded HEA.

On 27 January 2005, after a two-stage bidding process, HEFCE announced the creation of 74 CETLs. Dr Liz Beaty, HEFCE Director for Learning and Teaching, emphasised that the CETLs would build directly on previous HEFCE initiatives aimed at promoting excellence in teaching and learning.

The CETLs represent a richness and diversity of excellence that spans a wide range of subjects and learning and teaching activity. They include many examples of innovative and imaginative practice. Some will reach deeply into their local and regional communities ... others are advancing new forms of learning that will resonate widely across the HE sector. (HEFCE, 2005a)
CETLs proposed to boost career development and promotion opportunities for excellent teachers; strengthen practice-based scholarship and research into learning and teaching, fund secondments and other exchanges of staff, regionally, nationally and internationally; and support active dissemination and implementation of new knowledge.
The funding was intended to recognise and reward excellent teachers and enable institutions to invest in staff, buildings and equipment to support and enhance learning in new and challenging ways. The CETLs were well distributed geographically and covered all the main subject areas, plus a wide variety of student learning. CETLs were to be hosted by 54 institutions: from large universities to higher education colleges and small specialist colleges. Sixteen institutions were to host more than one CETL, 19 were collaborative, working across several HEIs, with further education colleges and other professional, industrial, commercial and cultural organisations. CETLs proposed to boost career development and promotion opportunities for excellent teachers; strengthen practice-based scholarship and research into learning and teaching, fund secondments and other exchanges of staff, regionally, nationally and internationally; and support active dissemination and implementation of new knowledge.

Broadly speaking, CETLs fell into three types. First, those that dealt with generic enhancement issues and graduate attributes, like employability, entrepreneurship, widening participation, etc., for example, the Centre for Inter-Professional e-Learning (CIPeL) at Coventry University and SOLSTICE (Supported Online Learning for Students using Technology for Information and Communication in their Education) at Edge Hill University. Second, those that were interdisciplinary and borrowed or dealt with knowledge exchange, applying and synthesising pedagogies and practices from a range of disciplines, for example, the Reinvention Centre at the University of Warwick (see Neary, p.142) and InQbate (see Hamilton and Brewster, p.212). And third, those that had specific subject focus, for example, the Creative Learning in Practice (CLIP) CETL at University of the Arts London; and, at Loughborough University, the Engineering Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (engCETL).

HEFCE received 259 proposals at stage one. Proposals were expected to show how claims for excellence were supported and informed by knowledge of pedagogic practice and thinking relevant to the focus of their CETL. One hundred and six of these were invited to proceed to stage two; of these 19 (18 per cent) were focused on creative and performing arts, design and media subjects. At stage two, proposals included evidence of pedagogic reflection, engagement with relevant literature, and debate in confirming the excellence of their practice and how the CETL would take this further. Bids were expected to identify ways of overcoming obstacles, and of persuading others of the benefits and impact of the CETL including the development of ideas both within and beyond the institution.

HEFCE’s analysis of the outcomes (HEFCE, 2005b) of CETLs showed a broad spread across 17 pedagogic issues (see Figure 1), with over half focusing on general pedagogic and curriculum issues. An analysis by subject types showed a high number of CETLs focused on creative arts and design and mass communications and documentation. Of the 74 CETLs, 17 (23 per cent) were related to creative and performing arts, design and media subjects, the Higher Education Statistic Agency (HESA) categories that most closely align with the footprint of the ADM-HEA and PALATINE, the HEA subject centre for dance, drama and music. In 2004/05, together these represented 8.5 per cent (195, 155 students) (HESA online data) of the total HE student population. Compared with other groups, for example, business and administrative studies with 13 per cent (299,310 students) and medicine and dentistry (including subjects allied to medicine) with 15.6 per cent (356,100 students) and 24 CETLs, this appeared to be a positive outcome (see Figure 2). It is difficult to draw any conclusions based on this, for instance, it is not possible to tell how many students and staff as a proportion of the total in participating universities or colleges are implicated in CETL initiatives; that is, it is not possible to identify, even now, the number of beneficiaries or the extent or effect of benefits that have accrued to participants in CETLs. However, we might speculate, with some caution, that since the award of CETL funding was based on a track record of excellence there were some factors driving the higher than expected number of creative and performing arts, design and media CETLs. There has been a far lower investment in research in these groups of subjects than in science, technology, medicine, engineering and so on. This is, in part, a result of the historical location of art and design (and performing arts) in...
**Figure 1** Pedagogic spread of funded CETLs

**Figure 2** Subject spread of funded CETLs
the non-research intensive polytechnics and independent college sector prior to 1992, but is also due to a far lower allocation of Research Councils UK’s funding being directed towards the arts. One can speculate that the ‘gap’ was filled by scholarly activity based on learning and teaching and departments were able to articulate this clearly in their bids for hosting a CETL. References to building pedagogic research as an aim of CETLs may have been an advantage for art and design departments (see Shreeve, p.124) if they were already focused on building a body of scholarship and research in this area. The creative and cultural sectors were identified in the Department for Culture Media and Sport’s articulation of the creative industries as a distinct sector of the economy (DCMS, 1998, 2001). Their rapid growth from the mid to late 1990s (coinciding with rapid growth in HE and the perceived growing importance of excellence in learning and teaching, as articulated in the Dearing report (Dearing, 1997) may also have been a factor in creative and performing arts, design and media departments in the securing of CETL funding. Strong historical links with the creative industries, substantial contributions by creative and cultural sector practitioners (see Note 1) and the increasing expectation that HEIs become more outward facing in terms of engagement with industry and other external communities and stakeholders may have enabled art and design CETLs to clearly articulate relevance and transferability of their learning to post-graduation experiences. It is interesting to note that all of the art, design and media related CETLs explicitly relate to engagements with industry or learning through deliberate practice (Ericsson et al., 1993). Finally, like all subjects, art, design and media had experienced substantial growth in student numbers throughout the 90s. This presented particular challenges to subjects that are not traditionally located in the classroom, or are not lecture-based where the limiting factor for student numbers is related to the size and number of rooms rather than the engagement students have with each other (their practice as a learning activity). It may be that significant work undertaken to manage growing student numbers was revealing itself in the proposals for CETLs.

In April 2005 ADM-HEA launched the Art, Design, Media-CETL (ADM-CETL) network at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). Of the 17 CETLs relating to creative and performing arts, design and media subjects some fell outside the art, design media footprint. For example, several were related wholly to performing arts but six CETLs agreed to participate and met to discuss ways in which they might work together to share and disseminate their resources beyond their own departments and institutions. ADM-HEA undertook an early analysis of the contributing projects; this analysis is available on the ADM-HEA website but some of the highlights are given below (ADM-HEA, 2005).

The six earliest collaborators were:

• ARTSWORK Learning Labs: Bath Spa University College
• The Centre for Excellence in Media Practice (CEMP): Bournemouth Media School
• The Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning for Transport and Product Design: Coventry University
• The Creative Learning in Practice Centre (CLIP): University of the Arts London
• The Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Through Design (CETLD): University of Brighton
• InQbate, The Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in Creativity: Universities of Sussex and Brighton

In 2004-05 HESA showed 104,555 students on ‘Creative arts and design’ courses (excluding dance, drama and music). In their first year of operation the six ADM-CETLs anticipated engaging around 6,500 students, around 6.2 per cent of the current art, design, media student populations. As local impacts and dissemination took effect this figure was expected to rise.

The ADM-CETLs are concentrated towards the south of England. However, when seen in the wider context of all CETLs relating to creative and performing arts, design and media and those CETLs that relate to generic HE sector issues (e.g. widening participation, e-learning, etc.), the spread is more even, including an ‘Area of Excellence in Northern Ireland (see Figure 3).
Figure 3
Distribution of ADM, performing arts and CETLS engaged with related pedagogies
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- Centres for Excellence in art, design and media subjects
- Centres for Excellence in dance, drama and music
- CETLs with generic focus (e.g., W.P, employability) engaging with art, design and/or media students/cross-discipline: focusing on ADM pedagogy for other subjects
There was a range of shared and intersecting issues across CETLs (see Figure 4) directly related to art, design and media subjects or through working with knowledge exchange – either pedagogy or content – with these subjects. These issues include learning (and teaching) activities and approaches that are common, dominant or central to learning in art, design and media: learning-through-making; learning-through-doing; learner/teacher co-learning; group and peer learning and/or assessment, learning, etc.; and teaching activities and approaches that are adapted to the ADM context (particularly project-based learning and experiential learning). There was also clear commitment across ADM-CETLs to enhance the capacity for pedagogic and evidence-based research in art, design and media (see Shreeve, p.124; Osmond, p.130), and to integrate research and research-like activities into the undergraduate learning experience (see Neary, p.142).

There was a clear and common interest in the application of new technologies to enhance the learning experience. This is seen in the commitment to the design and use of digital studios (see Bull, p.198; Osmond, p.130); the use of digital communication to facilitate learning (see Reynolds and Speight, p.226); the use of digital resources to facilitate learning (see Berger, p.232; Tatlock et al., p.252); enhanced and re-purposed e-learning (see Boyes et al., p.260); and using new practice-related technologies to enhance learning (e.g. ARTSWORK, CEMP and CEPAD).

All the ADM-CETLs proposed developing or enhancing new learning spaces including studios, workshops, media labs and the interface between collections and archives and other sites of learning, for example, museums or the workplace (see ARTSWORK and CETLD). There was an interest in flexible spaces harnessing adaptive technologies and architecture and using new digital technologies (see InQbate) to maximise networking and the use of distributed learning space. Several papers at this conference discuss these including the use of the ‘Creativity Zones’ at the departments of engineering at the Universities of Brighton and Sussex (see Martin et al., p.204; Rogers and Kilgallon, p.182). There was a commitment in harnessing new immersive digital environments and rapid prototyping, both as learning spaces and ways of introducing learners to new industry-based technology (see CEPAD).

The ADM-CETLs aimed to identify, enhance and introduce students to their communities of practice (CoP) to promote employability and enterprise. Several looked at the roles of teacher-professional practitioners (see Clews, p.70; Jeffries, p.44) and engage more directly with creative and cultural sectors in curriculum development. There was a common interest in learning in the workplace, work-simulated learning (see Dyer, p.86; Hornsby, p.220) and new learning organisations. Engagement with the creative and cultural sectors was a key theme and, as is evident from papers from CETLs not in the original network, this has been central to most of the CETLs relating to art, design and media practices. Industry participation in teaching and learning practices, engagement with experts and facilitators (e.g. Regional Development Agencies (RDAs), NESTA – National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts), collaboration and/or engagement with professional institutions are all at the centre of the ADM-CETLs (see Head, p.30; Dyer, p.86; Sovic and Blythman, p.108).

Finally, all the CETLs have worked on enhancement and recognition of the status of teaching and learning. They have contributed to institutional Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and staff development programmes, implemented mechanisms for rewarding staff active in their CETLs (either through project grants or salary enhancements) and have sought to raise awareness of the need to develop and sustain reflective practice and scholarship to drive forward learning and teaching excellence.

The important factor is the way these interests and activities intersect with each other and with other issues in the policy landscape offering collateral benefits. The main issues are:

- New pedagogic research and the learning/teaching nexus
- Engaging with industry and industry teacher-practitioners
- New learning spaces
- New learning technologies and the enhancement of learning and teaching excellence
Figure 4
The range of intersecting issues across ADM-CETLs
Figure 5
ADM-CETLs networks of engagements and issues
Where there are good links with subject centres and where other strong networks exist along with a strategic approach to engagement, CETLs have begun to enrich teaching in their discipline or their area of focus across the sector.

All of these play out in a more complex network of ideas whose effectiveness will depend on knowledge sharing between those that have developed the initiatives within a CETL and those departments, universities and colleges who have not (see Figure 5).

The range of collaborators with the original six ADM-CETLs was impressive including, at CETLD, collaborations between the University of Brighton, the Royal College of Art, the Royal Institute of British Architects and the Victoria and Albert Museum. ARTSWORK formed close collaborations with Paintworks (www.paintworksbristol.co.uk), local creative businesses and the South West Regional Development Agency (SWRDA). The CEMP formed networks with local colleges, with the BBC Partnership Scheme and with Skillset, the Sector Skills Council (SSC) for the Creative Media (www.skillset.org). CEPAD has substantial collaborations for projects and placements with a range of businesses including Land Rover, Jaguar, Mazda, Reebok and National Express. CLIP-CETL, based at the London College of Fashion and Chelsea College of Art and Design, has formed a network across all six University of the Arts Colleges and InQbate has worked with the South East England Regional Development Agency (SEEDA).

The relationship between ADM-HEA and the ADM-CETLs has led to several collaborative projects that are extracurricular to the CETLs’ original plans and have developed resources for audiences beyond CETLs. These include the Creating Entrepreneurship Project (ADM-HEA, 2007), the 2007 European League of Institutes of the Arts Teachers’ Academy (Boddington and Clews, 2007) and the 2009 ‘Collecting Experiences’ event held at the V&A with CETLD. ADM-HEA, in collaboration with CEMP, acted as consultant to Skillset’s successful bid to the HEFCE Employer Engagement Fund (HEFCE, 2008); the bid includes funding for ADM-HEA to develop transferable educational resources arising from the Media Academies’ (HEFCE, 2009) employer engagement initiatives. ADM-HEA supports CEMP’s Media Education Summit, launched in 2008 (www.cemp.ac.uk/summit). Several CETLs including ARTSWORK, CEMP, CETLD and the Bridges-CETL are contributing to a series of ADM-HEA employer engagement projects (ADM, 2009a). ADM-HEA’s experience with CETLs and their partners led to a successful bid to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport to undertake research into creative industry engagement with art, design and media departments as one of the commitments in Creative Britain (DCMS, 2008, commitment 4: 25; ADM-HEA, 2009b).

The evaluation of CETLs undertaken by the Centre for the Study of Education and Training (Saunders et al., 2008) shows that the CETLs have had a positive impact. The report reveals positive feedback on the development of the CETLs as ‘nodes of teaching and learning focused activities’. It points to growing evidence of positive effects beyond CETLs and in some cases impacts on institutional strategic planning. The report suggests that CETL funding has had positive impact locally through raising the visibility of the CETL and that all CETLs have ‘enriched and extended the expertise of teachers through reward and have been innovative in approaches to developing practice and course content’ (Saunders et al., 2008). However, the report is unable to say that these benefits extend beyond the host institution other than through creating what it calls a ‘cadre of “extended” professionals through which increased priority is given to teaching and learning’ (2008).

The report highlights the uneasy relationship that pedagogic research enjoys within three dimensions of university practice and identifies these dimensions as:

**Active research within a discipline or cluster of disciplines (traditional research-based practice), how that research-based knowledge is reproduced through teaching and learning programmes (teaching and learning practices embedded in courses and the pedagogic knowledge produced through research or experientially), which may or may not have a disciplinary boundary. (Saunders et al., 2008)**

It is interesting to note that despite acknowledging that CETLs have increased the volume, quality and, quite possibly the impact and status of pedagogic research within the hosting institution, tensions have also been sharpened. In the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), where for the first time a rubric for pedagogic
research is included, the chair’s report for ‘Unit of Assessment 64, Art and Design’ noted, ‘Outputs in design research are higher compared to 2001 but pedagogic research remained a minor feature of submissions’ (Clews, 2009).

The CETL programme does have its critics: not whether the CETLs have worked to produce positive developments within hosting institutions; rather, the critique points to the aim of the programme to ‘deepen its impact across a wider teaching and learning community’ (Saunders et al., 2008). Vice-chancellors, pro-vice-chancellors and other ‘key informants’ argue that there is no necessary connection between good and effective practice within a CETL and the chances that it might be inflected within the institution or across the HE sector more generally, pointing to the need for wider engagement and an explicit engagement strategy. Their concern is that many CETLs may have had little or no effect on institutional practice outside the immediate CETL beneficiaries.

However, the report also states that where there are good links with Subject Centres and where other strong networks exist along with a strategic approach to engagement, CETLs have begun to enrich teaching in their discipline or their area of focus across the sector. The ‘Dialogues in Art & Design’ conference is not the first, nor one hopes, the last in a series of knowledge exchanges between the CETLs and the rest of the sector. The conference is an opportunity for delegates to participate in interrogating and exchanging knowledge, resources and ideas. We hope that the debates at the conference and those that follow will go some way towards enriching ‘effects on institutional practice outside the immediate CETL beneficiaries’.

Note 1
The ADEPTT (2001-05) project announced that in many faculties visiting lecturers deliver over 25 per cent of teaching. However, more recent research undertaken by ADM-HEA (to be published in 2010) shows that 85 per cent of departments (responding to a questionnaire) employ creative industry practitioners as teachers and external examiners. Ninety-eight per cent of these work as teachers and 51 per cent as external examiners. In many departments the ‘full-time equivalent’ number of teachers can be as much as 100 per cent higher in arts and crafts subjects and 50 per cent higher in design and media practice subjects. ‘Creating Entrepreneurship’ (ADM-HEA, 2007) showed that up to 80 per cent and an average of 50 per cent of the curriculum in surveyed art, design and media courses was delivered by these teacher-practitioners.
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