

**CREATIVE INDUSTRIES HIGHER EDUCATION FORUM MEETING  
THURSDAY 25 SEPTEMBER 2003**

**Chair:** Rt Hon Estelle Morris MP, Minister for the Arts

**Attending:** John Newbiggin (Channel 4), Chris Murray (CABE), Bronac Ferran (ACE), Adrian Hill (HEFCE), Sir Michael Bichard (The London Institute), Dame Janet Ritterman (The Royal College of Music), Prof Rod Bugg (Wimbledon School of Art and CHEAD), Prof Geoffrey Crossick (AHRB), Dr Geoffrey Copland (University of Westminster), Leslie Finch (DTI), Roger Laughton (Bournemouth University), Prof Alasdair Smith (University of Sussex), Marilyn Wedgwood (Manchester Metropolitan University), Prof Roger Wilson (Chelsea College of Art & Design), Prof David Eastwood (University of East Anglia), Adrian Brazier (DTI), Sally Edgington (DCMS), Ian Jenkins (DCMS), Clive Marks (DCMS), Amy Donnison (DCMS).

### **1. Welcome and Introduction**

In welcoming attendees to the meeting, Estelle Morris noted that:

- The creative industries interface with HE was a really important area but was concerned that the Forum's purpose needed to be more focussed.
- Meetings had perhaps been too infrequent and the role and purpose of the Forum had not been reviewed for some time. Important questions were : Why the Forum existed and what did it aim to achieve?
- The three key areas of interest: skills, research & knowledge transfer and entrepreneurship were the most important for the group but to have any impact work to progress these issues needed to be more clearly defined and happen faster.

### **2. Open Discussion**

A number of themes emerged from general discussion:

- i) The origins of the Forum were in the CI mapping exercise and the need to derive value from CIs for the economy. Original membership had included other key Departments, e.g. DfES and Office of Science & Technology and this partnership between departments remained important. The sub groups idea, long in gestation, was intended to give some momentum to the key areas of the Forum's interest.
- ii) While the extent and strength of links with industry within individual institutions represented was good there was also a need for greater industry representation on the group.
- iii) A lot of work was being done across the regions on the impact of the CIs on local economies. The Forum should not be too remote from initiatives and projects actually happening on the ground.

- iv) While there were good examples of individual institutions supporting young entrepreneurs these were not widely disseminated and there was a lack of research and best practice.
- v) A need to look at how the research agenda can link to and support CIs. Geoffrey Crossick reported on the work to link Research Councils and RDAs. Geoffrey Crossick said that focussed groups were needed to identify the needs for interaction and how things can be taken forward. The AHRB are keen to resource this work. Sub groups could be formed at a local/regional level and get other agencies involved. Research is needed through the sub groups. There was a need for strong research institutions providing core research; the issue of IPR was also important.
- vi) The group could have considerable influence in a number of policy areas and research studies in progress or in planning; there was a need to get new initiatives 'CI-proofed'. While individual institutions were likely to respond to consultations there was greater weight to be added from a collective, co-ordinated view, particularly with a DCMS role as Ministerial/Departmental champion. The infrastructure that supported CIs was immature in comparison to, for example, science & technology, with OST and the Research Councils.
- vii) CIs needed to gain 'intellectual respectability' with Treasury.
- viii) Traditional models of innovation, 'big science and big business' have prevailed – creative and cultural industries to not fit these models; there was a need for new models of government interaction. The DTI Innovation Review, as it is emerging, is light on the service sector generally.
- ix) Should be aware of the diversity of disciplines in the creative and cultural sector

## Conclusion /Summary

The role of the group should be to:

- Help DCMS define the uniqueness of the sector and why traditional government structures don't serve it well.
- Act as a powerhouse, with DCMS, to promote the needs of the sector, influencing policy and research - a watchdog and champion for the CIs.
- Achieve a better understanding of the relationship between CIs and HE and spread best practice.
- Commission research, particularly to develop a common language and extend the evidence base.

## Action for the next meeting:

1. With the Forum having identified the need for a strong, co-ordinated approach to some current and impending research and policy initiatives there was a need to quickly identify the critical areas for the group to consider. Rod Bugg, working with Janet Ritterman, offered CHEAD as a route to identify and set out what these areas might be for the Group to consider at a further meeting within 4 weeks. **ACTION: Rod Bugg.**

2. DCMS should recast the terms of reference for the Forum in light of the discussions and present these at the next meeting. **Action: DCMS.**
3. With AHRB keen to press ahead with the work identified for the Research & Knowledge Transfer sub group Geoff Crossick will aim to have a more specific and detailed specification ready for the next meeting. **Action: Geoffrey Crossick.**

Sally Edgington  
Creative Industries Division