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On the 28 September 2016, over 350 people gathered on Level 5 of the new Blavatnik Building at Tate Modern to celebrate the launch of Tate Exchange. Twenty invited speakers, from local organisations, Tate Exchange Associates, members of staff from Tate and Plus Tate partners, were asked to share the most significant exchange from their professional or personal lives. There were speeches, performances and silently presented exchanges.

This then set the tone for this ‘open experiment’ in which an invitation is extended to diverse people and constituencies, an invitation that is open to interpretation and thus elicits a myriad of varied and often surprising and extraordinary responses. As Director of Tate, Sir Nicholas Serota suggested in his speech, ‘It’s slightly dangerous but exciting!’ He went on to share the aim of Tate Exchange as ‘A space in which people can discover themselves and explore and find out about the world.’ Lead artist, Tim Etchells, revealed the method of achieving that aim, ‘Filling a space, not with stuff but with conversations, ideas and arguments.’

The exploratory nature of Tate Exchange was emphasised at the launch by Anna Cutler, Director of Learning at Tate and Sir Nicholas Serota, the latter concluding, ‘The relationship between teachers and learners has switched: we’re the students, we will learn and I hope, other museums will learn from our experience...This is what a civic institution needs to do in Britain, in Europe, in the world.’

This commitment to learning was supported in 2016/17 by the Tate Exchange Research and Evaluation Programme which was funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation. As part of this programme, I was appointed in September 2016 as the Tate Exchange Evaluator with a role to coordinate the evaluation, facilitate reflection, gather evidence and act as a critical friend to the programme. I started the year with an outline plan but was also responsive to need and changing circumstances. I introduced storytelling as a method of data collection, for example, when it became apparent we had limited evidence of participant outcomes.

As befitting a new and experimental programme, there was a focus on formative evaluation throughout the year to inform ongoing improvement. I facilitated sessions with Tate staff and Tate Exchange Associates to reflect on what we were learning about Tate Exchange. I documented and shared this collective learning during the year and it is summarised in this report. We also reflected individually, in project teams and wider groups on the achievement of the programme’s objectives, reviewing the evidence we had gathered, with reference to the programme’s evaluation framework.

For this report, I have drawn on varied and rich sources of quantitative and qualitative evidence gathered by diverse stakeholders through varied methods. I have analysed the evidence, looking for common and contrasting findings about what worked, what was challenging, what was learned and what difference was made. In the analysis, I have striven for objectivity but inevitably, this report represents my interpretation.
of the evidence. I have selected supporting evidence that best illuminates a theme or finding whilst also attempting to include data from as wide a range of events as possible. For every quote, story or example I include, there are as many that I have left out. To add depth and give an insight into the often remarkable experiences and outcomes of Tate Exchange, I have included a small number of Vignettes in the report.

A ROUTE-MAP OF THE REPORT

The first four sections of the report outline the background to Tate Exchange, details of the programme and evaluation study, and a summary of the outputs. The remainder of the report is structured around the four programme objectives and includes a summary of recommendations.

Tate Exchange aspires to be a common space for public debate and in this regard, it exceeded expectation. The public's appetite to engage in extended conversations about a wide range of societal issues was apparent from the outset and the length of time people spent in the space (an hour was common) was surprising and gratifying. At Tate Modern, Tate Exchange welcomed 83,305 visitors to the space and at Tate Liverpool, the figure was 32,035 (exceeding targets of 45,000 and 20,000 respectively). The online visitor total of 141,447 was almost three times the target of 55,000.

The unifying programmatic theme was ‘exchange’ and the space bore witness to exchanges between people of different generations, backgrounds, abilities, cultures, genders, sexualities and ethnicities; exchanging everything from personal memories, artistic practices and ideas, to recipes, secrets and smiles. We found that people were inclined to hesitate on the threshold, uncertain of the ‘rules of engagement’, seeking permission and guidance and so the notion of ‘hosting’ the space was borne; the welcome, paramount. Having an empty, flexible space dedicated to public engagement was described as a ‘massive gift’ and ‘extraordinarily generous’ but the visibility and promotion of Tate Exchange within Tate Modern and online was an issue. By contrast, the integration of Tate Exchange into the first floor gallery at Tate Liverpool created a highly visible programme but brought restrictions on messy activities. The affordances and challenges of the Tate Exchange space are explored in sections 6 and 7.

Sections 8, 9 and 10 describe the exchange with artists, Associates and the public. The partnership with Associates was clearly framed by the programme's values of generosity, trust, openness and risk, and a set of guiding principles but it became apparent that the invitation to artists was sometimes less clear. The ingredients of this invitation and the choice of artists is being refined for year 2 of Tate Exchange. The Associate organisations (53 at Tate Modern, 13 at Tate Liverpool) brought cross-sectoral expertise and diverse practices and audiences to Tate. Associates identified reciprocal benefits, highlighting in particular the visibility, voice and validation afforded by Tate Exchange and the partnership with Tate. The power dynamics inherent in partnerships was an issue for some Associates as was the actual and hidden cost of staging events.

Tate Exchange aims to attract a broader public with diverse voices, and a dedicated Twitter account was used to great effect as an inclusive, discursive forum to share in-house, partner and visitor content and comment. Budgetary constraints limited the extent of audience surveys but observation and data collected by researchers at six events, suggested that Tate Exchange was reaching a younger and marginally more ethnically diverse audience than Tate Modern. There is still work to do however, particularly to reach and engage more socially and ethnically diverse audiences. Sections 11 and 12 provide further details of audiences in the space and online.

Sections 13 and 14 outline learning for participants, artists and Associates. Whilst gathering evidence of participant outcomes proved challenging for many, evidence is emerging that Tate Exchange is making a difference for some participants. Common areas include:

- Opening minds about issues and constituencies
- Validation, voice and visibility for the experiences of participants
- Improved wellbeing
- New perspectives on art, Tate and galleries in general
- Understanding new ways of making, working and thinking.

We also began to identify the conditions that foster change for participants and we found the most frequently cited features were: people feeling their ideas, views and contributions are valued; conversations, seeing things differently, and active participation and making. Associates identified how Tate Exchange had changed and improved practice at individual and organisational levels and facilitated new partnerships and networks. It will be interesting to explore these growing ecologies in future years.

Section 15 of the report explores learning and outcomes for Tate. Tate Exchange has been embraced enthusiastically by the public, has the ability to be agile and responsive, diverse in content and audience, surfacing areas of practice, concern and interest that are of relevance to Tate as a whole. The evaluation revealed a growing awareness, understanding and appreciation of Tate Exchange across Tate but also a residual confusion amongst some staff. In year 1, Tate Exchange was largely the responsibility of the Learning Department but there is scope for greater inter-departmental collaboration in the future which will hopefully share the ethos, approaches and learning from Tate Exchange more widely across the institution.
This report cannot do justice to the panoply of innovative, exhilarating, moving and downright fun events that took place during the year but I hope it gives you an insight into what we have learnt so far about Tate Exchange. We need to go further into our exploration of how the programme can make a difference to those involved and this will be the focus for the evaluation in year 2. Finally, I would like to thank Tate and in particular, the Tate Exchange team and staff within the Learning Department for their unfailing and enthusiastic support for my work. Together with the Associates and members of the public that I met along the way, they have made my role a joy.

Hannah Wilmot,
Tate Exchange Evaluator

2.1 WHAT IS TATE EXCHANGE?

Tate describes Tate Exchange as an open experiment that seeks to explore the role of art in society. It is a new public space for collaborative projects and a platform for testing ideas and encouraging new perspectives on life through art, opening up the museum to new audiences and new ways of working. Tate Exchange invites international artists, contributors from different fields, the public, and over 65 Associate organisations, who work within and beyond the arts, to collaborate with Tate on creating participatory programmes, workshops, activities and debates.

AIM

Tate Exchange aims to consider what the role of art might be in relation to broader societal systems and structures; specifically, to better understand how art makes a difference to people’s lives and through that to society more widely.

OBJECTIVES

To create a common space (actual and virtual) for local, national and international public debate in which diverse voices and views generate new ideas and perspectives that contribute to cultural and societal issues of our time.

To engender a deeper relationship with art for a broader public through new partnerships and approaches to engagement with art, ideas and through new social opportunities.

To provide open and accessible cultural educational opportunities for all publics, with a particular focus on young people.

To give participants an opportunity to contribute ideas by providing a platform and new networks reaching the broader cultural sector and generating practices, products and processes that can make a difference to culture and to society more broadly.

Tate Exchange was launched in September 2016 on Level 5 of Tate Modern’s newly opened extension, the Blavatnik Building. The programme extended to Tate Liverpool in November 2016 and included throughout, digital elements to support and complement the physical activities.

2.2 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Anna Cutler’s arrival at Tate Modern in 2006 as Head of Interpretation and Education, coincided with Tate’s decision to build an extension to the museum that would include new spaces for learning. Anna was charged with developing a vision for those spaces and learning in general at Tate Modern and she embarked on a process of desk research, audience consultation and site visits to innovative learning spaces, to inform her proposals. The research findings were consolidated the following year in a seminal report bespoke to Tate Exchange.
paper, The Imperative for Change which located the vision and proposed programme within an international context of shifting practice in cultural learning, summarised as:

- From the passive → participative (from content delivery to content generation)
- From standardised delivery → personalisation
- From transmission → co-construction
- From knowledge acquisition → knowledge application
- From single author → plural voices
- From private knowledge → public access

The Tate Exchange that launched in 2016 was the result of 10 years of research and development including negotiations with the architects, working with consultants Jonathan Robinson and Shelagh Wright to develop a framework for the programme that was structured around three phases with an annual theme, and securing and then losing a major commercial sponsor. This latter incident could have dashed the plans but Tate’s then Director, Sir Nicholas Serota and the Tate Modern Board were fully behind the initiative and plans were revised accordingly. In some respects, the process of producing a ‘stripped back’ version of Tate Exchange helped the team identify the key elements that were non-negotiable. It is important to note, however, that the new plans were based on a significantly reduced budget and minimal staffing.) Nonetheless, at Tate Modern, Tate Exchange was championed by the Director, Frances Morris and the initiative sits at the centre of her strategy for the museum as part of a concerted focus on people, places and programmes that draw together curatorial, community programming and Learning. Throughout the development of Tate Exchange, Anna Cutler worked closely with the Head of Learning: Programme and Resources, Fiona Kingsman, who was appointed as Head of Tate Exchange in 2014.

The development of Tate Exchange built on existing research-led practice in Tate Learning that embeds reflection and evaluation into projects and programmes. This commitment to research was consolidated by the appointment of Dr Emily Pringle as Head of Learning Practice and Research, and exemplified in Transforming Tate Learning in 2012. This two-year action research programme, to interrogate existing practices and place learning at the heart of Tate, was documented and shared in a publication that made visible the ‘ups and downs, successes and failures’ of institutional change.3

As outlined above, the design of Tate Exchange was informed by international developments in cultural education and learning practices in museums and galleries. Across the decade of its development, the climate for arts and culture in the UK shifted, with financial austerity leading to severe cutbacks in public sector expenditure and concerns growing around the future of arts education in the wake of initiatives such as the EBacc.4

Tate was not alone in wanting to rethink its relationship with the public and a number of national initiatives in the cultural sector are worthy of note.

---

3. www.tate.org.uk/download/ file/6592424
4. See, for example, The 2015 Warwick Commission on the Future of Cultural Value www2.warwick.ac.uk/ research/ the Future of Cultural Value file/fid/30243
5. http://uemuseum.org.uk/about/
7. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (2017) Arts Organisations: Objectives, 2008 which concluded that the funding invested in recent years in public engagement
8. 6 was founded in 2011 and provides a leadership framework for museums to develop a holistic approach to wellbeing and sustainability. A five year action research programme with 22 museums commenced in 2015 and early in 2017, a peer network, the Happy Museum Affiliates Scheme was announced.

In 2016, the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation launched an Inquiry into the Civic Role of Arts Organisations. The Inquiry proposes five civic roles for arts organisations as:

- colleges (places of learning)
- town halls (places of debate)
- parks (public space open to everyone)
- temples (places which give meaning and provide solace)
- home (a place of safety and belonging)

In the recent report on Phase One of the Inquiry7, the authors explain the particular role they believe arts organisations can play:

‘We believe that arts organisations have a power that other organisations with missions to achieve social change do not. Arts organisations have a particular capacity to draw out the best in us, to engender hope, to prompt empathy, to encourage kindness, to create safe, neutral places for the discussion of tricky issues and to inspire us to mobilise to create positive change.’

This sentiment is evident in the Tate Modern strategy written by Frances Morris and was endorsed by the new Director of Tate, Maria Balshaw, in a recent interview for the Guardian8. Publicly funded arts institutions should come into their own in tumultuous times, says Balshaw. “It’s not about taking positions left or right politically, but about holding a space where things that are at issue in our world can be explored, because that’s what artists do.” The first year of Tate Exchange has been a time of political, economic and social uncertainty in the United Kingdom and Tate Exchange has sought to be that ‘space’.
YEAR 1 (SEP 2016–MAY 2017)

3.1 STRUCTURE AND PROGRAMME

Each year, Tate Exchange (TEx) addresses a relevant social/political theme and a lead artist helps inspire and frame the programme. In 2016/17, the theme was ‘Exchange’ and lead artist, Tim Etchells created a set of four projects to open Tate Exchange in September 2016. The Give & Take included:

- **TEN PURPOSES**
  A set of instructions distributed on cards for the public to pick up and activate in Tate, private and not-so-private performances which responded to the collection.

- **FURTHER PROVOCATIONS**
  An ongoing performance by Andrew Stevenson, in which a series of texts (see opposite) were endlessly painted, painted out and then repainted on the longest wall in Tate Exchange.

- **THE GIVE & TAKE TALKS**
  Invited guest speakers made presentations and dialogues focused on some approach to, or experience of, ‘exchange’ including economic systems, intercultural exchange, exchange between humans and animals, exchange between family members, friendship, exchange with landscape.

- **THREE TABLES**
  A long interactive performance in which three performers exchanged stories and had other interactions with the public on topics ranging from work and money, love, friendship and ephemeral things.

In 2016/17, Tate Exchange at Tate Modern comprised three phases:

- **PHASE 1**: Framing the annual provocation – September to December 2016
  Tate Learning teams worked with a range of artists, theorists, facilitators and the public to explore the idea of exchange.

- **PHASE 2**: Expanding the annual provocation – January to April 2017
  The programme continued through collaborations with external organisations (Tate Exchange Associates) who sit beyond the arts but who also work closely with the public in areas such as health and education.

- **PHASE 3**: Reflecting further on the Tate Exchange aim – May to June 2017
  The year culminated with You are Welcome, a programme devised by artist, Sarah Carne, that invited the public to respond to the question, “How can art make a difference to society?”

At Tate Liverpool, internally curated events and Associate events were integrated across the year with the majority of events programmed for a week and open to the public every day. The programme at Tate Modern was originally planned and advertised as being open every day, from 12.00 – 18.00 with evening opening on Friday and Saturday. But with a rapidly changing programme of events that varied in duration from a day to a week, this allowed little time for installation and clear down or indeed, time off for staff. It was found to be impossible to open the space to the public for seven days a week but in general, it was open for at least five.

Phase 1 was programmed by Learning teams with Public Programmes taking responsibility for the largest number of events and other teams such as Young People’s Programmes and Early Years and Families working on one or two events. The list of artists invited to collaborate included a small number of high profile artists with work in the collection, some that had worked with Learning teams on previous projects and other artists known for their socially engaged practice.

3.2. STAFFING

Tate Exchange was developed and managed by a small staff team with additional freelance support. For Year 1, the staff team comprised:

- Head of Tate Exchange – appointed in June 2014
- Tate Exchange Production Co-ordinator – appointed in July 2016
- Tate Exchange Digital Producer (4 days per week) – appointed in August 2016
- Part-time Production Assistant – appointed in February 2017
- Learning Research Administrator (3 days per week) – appointed September 2016
- 3× part-time Visitor Experience (VE) Assistants seconded to Tate Exchange and acting at Tate Exchange ‘Hosts’.

Freelance team:

- Arts Media People – appointed in March 2014 to manage and support all aspects of the Associates’ programme, including ‘get-in’ and ‘get-out’ of Associates during Phase 2
- Tate Exchange Evaluator – appointed in September 2016
- Tate Exchange Coordinator, Tate Liverpool (2 days per week) – appointed August 2016.

All other work related to Tate Exchange was undertaken by existing staff including programming Phase 1 at Tate Modern, marketing, technical and AV support, and managing freelancers.

The workload related to Tate Exchange was very high with the Head of Tate Exchange, Tate Exchange Production Coordinator and Arts Media People often working 12 hour days, six days a week once the programme was up and running. During Phase 1, Tate Learning staff had a significant role in managing and supporting individual events.
including liaising with technicians and dealing with issues that arose. For Phase 2, however, these responsibilities fell to the core Tate Exchange team and it became apparent that additional support was required; a part-time Production Assistant was, therefore, employed. At Tate Liverpool, Text was led by the Head of Learning with the support of a part-time Coordinator and in Year 2, the Programme Manager for Public and Community Learning is managing the relationship with Associates.

For Year 2, the management and support of Associates will be brought in-house at Tate Modern. The work of Arts Media People was applauded by Tate and the Associates but the need for freelancers to refer important decisions to the Head of Tate Exchange or the Director of Learning was frustrating for all parties. The Tate Exchange Production Co-ordinator will take on this area of work in a new post of Tate Exchange Programme Manager. A new post of Production Manager will also be created (a role previously undertaken by Arts Media People) with support from one full-time and one part-time Production Assistant. Other staffing will remain the same for Year 2 with the possibility of the Digital Producer becoming a full-time post.

3.3 TATE EXCHANGE ASSOCIATES

In March 2015, 18 months before the launch of Tate Exchange, Tate hosted a meeting for a wide range of organisations, some had pre-existing relationships with Learning teams, others were potential new partners for Tate. The concept of Tate Exchange Associates was explained and those present were asked who else needed to be invited. Tate hoped to secure partnerships with 40 organisations in Year 1 but more organisations than anticipated made a commitment to the programme and were invited. Tate Liverpool, TExL was led by the Head of Learning with the support of a part-time Coordinator and in Year 2, the Programme Manager for Public and Community Learning is managing the relationship with Associates.

Likewise, at Tate Liverpool, the 13 founding Associates covered a broad range of interests. Following this initial meeting, five further Associate days brought representatives from the organisations together to share ideas, find common areas of interest and develop collaborations; hear presentations from Tate Modern’s curatorial team and Director; discuss evaluation, digital and marketing strategies; and share learning about the affordances and challenges of Tate Exchange from Phase 1. Outside these group sessions, each Associate had a series of one-to-one meetings with the Head of Tate Exchange and/or Arts Media People including: finalising the partnership; developing proposals and ensuring top line copy was ready for the web launch of Phase 2 in November 2016; and production meetings four weeks and one week prior to the event. For some Associates, this level of contact was sufficient. For others, with more complex programmes or needs, or with less experience of managing large-scale public engagement projects, a lengthy process of ‘to and fro’ was required to finalise details and production logistics. At Tate Liverpool, Associates received similar support in the development and realisation of their programmes.

The Tate Exchange Evaluator was appointed in September 2016, shortly before the launch of the programme. The brief set out the rationale for the evaluation and the evaluator’s role in both formative and summative evaluation.

“Evaluation is intended to be an aid to professional development and learning as well as a means to improve practice during and after the project and, most importantly, evidence the impact of the programme on Tate, the Associates and all those taking part in Tate Exchange programmes and activities. As such, the evaluation is intended to inform ongoing development of Tate Exchange and not just account for the project’s outcomes at its conclusion.”

The Evaluator worked closely with the Head of Learning Practice and Research and the Learning Research Curator (the latter leading on the Practice as Research strand of the Tate Exchange Research and Evaluation Programme (TEREP)). The evaluator’s role included:

- Developing a generic Tate Exchange evaluation framework with edited versions for Tate Learning teams and Associates with prompt questions to encourage customisation of the framework for each event. A brief Guidance on Evaluation accompanied the framework to provide support for those less confident in designing and carrying out evaluation. Finally, an Event Report was designed to capture evaluation and other feedback on the event.

- Introducing the evaluation framework to Learning teams and to individual curators in Public Programmes during October 2016. Discussing each event, including progress and challenges. Introducing the evaluation framework to Associates at a meeting in October 2016. A small number of individual meetings were held with Associates (at their request) to discuss evaluation methodology. The aim was to support those delivering events at Tate Exchange to undertake their own evaluations. The framework was also used at Tate Liverpool.

- In consultation, identifying three ‘case study’ events in Phase 1 and three in Phase 2. Meeting the relevant Learning teams and Associates to explore the background to the event; completing the evaluation framework together; preparing interview schedules and an observation guide based on the evaluation framework; attending the event and gathering data as appropriate (through interviews, conversations, observation and documentation); and providing a summary of evidence gathered to the relevant Learning teams and Associates.

- Designing and facilitating opportunities for reflection and formative evaluation: two Evaluation Forums with Learning teams to reflect on learning at the end of Phase 1 (January 2017) and the end of Phase 2 (May 2017); a reflection session for Associates in May 2017; two mid-point reflection sessions for the Tate Exchange team and Arts Media People in February and March 2017.

10 The founding Associates are listed online: www.tate.org.

4 THE EVALUATION

4.1 SCOPE AND APPROACH

The Tate Exchange Evaluator was appointed in September 2016, shortly before the launch of the programme. The brief set out the rationale for the evaluation and the evaluator’s role in both formative and summative evaluation.

“Evaluation is intended to be an aid to professional development and learning as well as a means to improve practice during and after the project and, most importantly, evidence the impact of the programme on Tate, the Associates and all those taking part in Tate Exchange programmes and activities. As such, the evaluation is intended to inform ongoing development of Tate Exchange and not just account for the project’s outcomes at its conclusion.”

The Evaluator worked closely with the Head of Learning Practice and Research and the Learning Research Curator (the latter leading on the Practice as Research strand of the Tate Exchange Research and Evaluation Programme (TEREP)). The evaluator’s role included:

- Developing a generic Tate Exchange evaluation framework with edited versions for Tate Learning teams and Associates with prompt questions to encourage customisation of the framework for each event. A brief Guidance on Evaluation accompanied the framework to provide support for those less confident in designing and carrying out evaluation. Finally, an Event Report was designed to capture evaluation and other feedback on the event.

- Introducing the evaluation framework to Learning teams and to individual curators in Public Programmes during October 2016. Discussing each event, including progress and challenges. Introducing the evaluation framework to Associates at a meeting in October 2016. A small number of individual meetings were held with Associates (at their request) to discuss evaluation methodology. The aim was to support those delivering events at Tate Exchange to undertake their own evaluations. The framework was also used at Tate Liverpool.

- In consultation, identifying three ‘case study’ events in Phase 1 and three in Phase 2. Meeting the relevant Learning teams and Associates to explore the background to the event; completing the evaluation framework together; preparing interview schedules and an observation guide based on the evaluation framework; attending the event and gathering data as appropriate (through interviews, conversations, observation and documentation); and providing a summary of evidence gathered to the relevant Learning teams and Associates.

- Designing and facilitating opportunities for reflection and formative evaluation: two Evaluation Forums with Learning teams to reflect on learning at the end of Phase 1 (January 2017) and the end of Phase 2 (May 2017); a reflection session for Associates in May 2017; two mid-point reflection sessions for the Tate Exchange team and Arts Media People in February and March 2017.
• In January 2017, analysing data gathered during Phase 1 and writing a Learning from Phase 1 report to ‘share the collective learning thus far.’
• Attending and reporting to the TEREP Steering group which met four times during the year. Attending and reporting to other internal Tate Exchange management meetings throughout the year.
• Providing support to Learning teams and Associates as required and attending a range of Tate Exchange events at Tate Modern.

The evaluator’s role was linked to Tate Exchange at Tate Modern in London and as a result, the majority of learning and evidence presented in this report derives from Tate Modern (although many of the findings from the evaluation are common to both institutions). Tate Exchange was extended to Tate Liverpool in November 2016 and the evaluation framework and methods were shared with colleagues responsible for the programme in Liverpool. Evidence and examples from Liverpool are clearly indicated in the report – the programme is known by the acronym TExL in Liverpool.

4.2 DATA COLLECTION

The evaluation used a mixed method approach and was responsive to the programme and the evolving needs that arose. There was a large formative element to the evaluation and the evaluator shared learning throughout the year to inform and support those involved in Tate Exchange delivery. The Associates, for example, benefitted greatly from hearing about the affordances and challenges of the space that were identified during Phase 1.

This report is based on an analysis of a wide range of data gathered by the evaluator, Learning teams, Associates, consultants and researchers. Qualitative and quantitative data was gathered from participants, artists, those involved in managing and delivering the programme and senior leaders at Tate Modern. Evidence was gathered through observation (including participant observation), interviews and conversations, surveys, written feedback and online comment, participative evaluation at events and facilitated reflection sessions. The main sources of data included:

- Six case studies undertaken by the evaluator with additional notes on events and meetings throughout the year.
- Reflection sessions with Learning teams, Associates and the Tate Exchange team.
- Event reports on 19 Phase 1 events (from a total of 21) and 23 Phase 2 events (from a total of 39).
- Digital analytic reports and Tate Exchange Online R&D report from Tate Exchange Digital Producer.
- Daily Reports written and circulated by the VE staff seconded to Tate Exchange.
- An analysis of 77 Daily Reports undertaken by consultant, Nicki Setterfield.
- Monitoring and statistical data gathered by the Tate Exchange Team.
- Tate Exchange Qualitative & Quantitative Research by Sphere Insights based on 593 surveys completed by randomly recruited audiences at six events and 40 follow-up telephone interviews.
- Two sets of interviews undertaken by Nicki Setterfield with a small sample of Associates to chart their experiences with Tate Exchange.
- Interviews undertaken with senior leaders at Tate Modern as part of research undertaken for Tate Exchange by Clore Fellow, Maurice Carlin.
- A case study on Complaints Department Operated by Guerrilla Girls undertaken by PhD student, Hollie MacKenzie.
- An evaluation report on TExL written by the Tate Exchange Coordinator, Jessica Fairclough and drawing on evaluation undertaken by and with Associates in Liverpool.

4.3 LIMITATIONS

Triangulation of evidence from varied stakeholders at a single event, across different events, and through the use of varied methods of data collection carried out by multiple ‘evaluators’, improves the validity of the findings. However, the evaluation of Tate Exchange was itself an experiment and challenges were encountered. Learning about the evaluation design, process and limitations is explored in detail in a separate report compiled by the Head of Learning Practice and Research (Experiments in Practice: Learning from the Evaluation of Tate Exchange Year One will be available at: www.tate.org.uk/research/research-centres/learning-research).

In brief, this report is in part a meta-analysis of data and reports produced by a wide range of people and is therefore reliant on the skills, confidence and experience of those individuals in relation to evaluation. For example, the evaluative content of the daily reports increased as VE staff gained experience and confidence in their role and the Tate Exchange team identified key elements for reporting. Joining Tate Exchange shortly before its launch gave an urgency to designing an evaluation framework and this was therefore drafted by the evaluator with input from a limited number of Tate staff. Ideally, this would have been developed through a more consultative process with a wider range of stakeholders. Unlike Tate Liverpool, Tate Exchange at Tate Modern does not have an automatic visitor counter installed; VE staff therefore kept a tally of visitor numbers manually. There was no mechanism, however, to routinely gather demographic data from visitors. This was undertaken for six events and the majority of the findings echo observations from across the programme but a larger sample would be beneficial.
## THE NUMBERS

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors to the space</td>
<td>37,143</td>
<td>41,266</td>
<td>83,305</td>
<td>32,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Target: 45,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average audience</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday–Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average audience</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday/Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of events*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of event strands**</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days open to public</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/exhibition</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(half days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking part sessions</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(half days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists engaged</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New products/commissions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Associates Y1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(Target: 40)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Target: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Associates Y2</td>
<td>61–65***</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention rate for</td>
<td>89–96% (Target: 60%)</td>
<td>100% (Target: 80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Y1 + Y2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to TE website</td>
<td>49,432</td>
<td>85,580</td>
<td>141,447</td>
<td>1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Target: 55,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page views</td>
<td>95,495</td>
<td>140,375</td>
<td>246,511</td>
<td>2,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New visitors to website</td>
<td>53.8% (Target: 35%)</td>
<td>54.2% (Target: 35%)</td>
<td>60% (Target: 35%)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average dwell time</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online (top 10 events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An ‘event’ is defined as the total programme delivered by an artist or Associate
** A ‘strand’ is defined as elements within a programme such as a seminar, workshop or other activity
*** At the time of writing, discussions were still in progress with four Associates.

During the year, Tate Exchange exceeded visitor targets in the space (almost double at Tate Modern) and online (almost three times the target). In London, although some visitors entered Tate Exchange and used the space to rest awhile, without participating, the vast majority did engage and the visitor numbers are therefore a fairly accurate estimate of participant numbers. In Liverpool however, the location of Tate Exchange within the first-floor gallery made it more difficult to determine the level of participation in TEIx. The automated counting system recorded a total of 152,719 visitors to the gallery for the duration of the TEIx (47% of the total visitors to Tate Liverpool) but it is likely that a proportion were viewing the collection displays. The Tate Exchange Coordinator used Associate evaluation to estimate levels of engagement and concluded that approximately 32,045 people actively participated in TEIx, 60% higher than the target.

Average daily audience figures in the space surpassed expectations but did vary across the week and between events. The three events from Phases 1 and 2 with the highest number of visitors in the space and online are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL VISITORS</th>
<th>PHASE 1 – ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Re-Education</strong></td>
<td>4,017 (4 days)</td>
<td>5,379 (2.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Bedfellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints Department</strong></td>
<td>4,684 (6 days)</td>
<td>5,045 (2.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated by Guerrilla Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,634 (2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Give &amp; Take</strong></td>
<td>3,147 (4 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Tim Etchells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL VISITORS</th>
<th>PHASE 2 – ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairground</strong></td>
<td>4,271 (4 days)</td>
<td>13,633 (2.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*11 On average the busiest event of the year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is an Art School</strong></td>
<td>4,768 (6 days)</td>
<td>8,487 (2.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central St Martins</td>
<td>4,007 (7 days)</td>
<td>6,773 (3.46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. A collaboration between Canterbury Christ Church University, University of Kent People United, Valleys Kids and Whitstable Biennale
12. A collaboration between Counterpoints Arts, Loughborough University, The Open University and University Of Warwick.

*There were parallels between the most-visited events in the space and online with two of the top three being the same for both Phases. Central St Martins and participating students used social media effectively to promote This is an Art School which, as the launch event of Phase 2, also attracted high levels of media coverage. In combination, this resulted in large audiences and very high online traffic. By contrast, Fairground did not appear in the top ten most visited web pages for Phase 2 but achieved the highest visitor numbers for Tate Exchange at Tate Modern. Fairground was programmed for the Easter break and was an ideal event for families, thereby capitalising on drop-
in visitors. It is important to stress that audience numbers was only one measure of success and Tate Exchange’s objectives were often achieved through working with smaller and targeted groups. The numbers of Associates engaged and the levels of retention exceeded the targets in London and Liverpool, suggesting high levels of interest in, and satisfaction with, the programme. In addition, both organisations are receiving enquiries from other interested parties, again signalling the success and growing reputation of the programme.

OBJECTIVE 1
TO CREATE A COMMON SPACE (ACTUAL AND VIRTUAL) FOR LOCAL, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC DEBATE IN WHICH DIVERSE VOICES AND VIEWS GENERATE NEW IDEAS AND PERSPECTIVES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO CULTURAL AND SOCIETAL ISSUES OF OUR TIME
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THE TATE EXCHANGE SPACE

6.1 RESPONSES TO THE SPACE

‘My first impression was of a raw energy, an atmosphere alive and fizzing with creative potential, on second glance it was obvious this energy was being enhanced, fostered and focused to resolve a given problem. I witnessed first-hand the exchange of ideas and energy among the students, this exchange was terrifically inspiring and while I didn’t get to see the end result (Japanese tea ceremony) to witness the dynamism/interaction and exchange was a real thrill. This culture reflects current progressive thinking that we have come to associate with Scandinavian culture coupled with the drive of South Korean education… The paradox was, this was happening in the UK and thus reflected the best of the UK.’

(Visitor comment emailed to Tate Exchange)

Physically, Tate Exchange offers a creative, communal and flexible space that accommodates different modes of interaction including artist and self-led activities; open rehearsals; immersive, multi-media events; performance; discussion, debate and contemplation. Tate Exchange affords opportunities to discuss, create, listen, observe, learn, empathise, make friends, let off steam, relax, reflect or just hang out. (See Table 2 on page 22 for comments about the space).

6.2 PRACTICALLY – WHAT WORKED WELL

Formative evaluation identified the affordances and challenges of the Tate Exchange space and learning was shared across Tate Learning teams and with Associates to inform planning and delivery of events. Key learning about what works included:

- People hesitate on the threshold. It is essential to have ‘hosts’ to invite and welcome people into the space and explain what is happening, how they can get involved and how this event is part of a larger programme.

- ‘Branding’ that identifies those hosting or managing the event so that members of the public know who to ask for help. Several Associates wore t-shirts emblazoned with the name of the event and/or institution.

- Clear messaging to the public that clarifies the invitation, ‘This is a workshop, please join in.’

- Sound, music and live performance draw visitors into the space as does other activity that ‘spills out’ from the space including processional or performance work that culminates on Level 5.

- Soundscapes and projections create an ambience. The tranquil soundscape created by an artist in Phase 1, for example, encouraged visitors to ‘slow down, think and re-centre’.

- Zoning in the space to guide the public through the event and clarify the invitation in each area, for example, making, performing, observing, reflecting.

- ‘The importance of food and drink as a tool for public engagement.’ (Associate). The provision of free tea added greatly to the Tate Exchange welcome and was used strategically by some Associates to encourage people to spend time in reflection, feedback or ‘call to action’ zones.

- Using the Southwark Room as a quiet and intimate space for booked events, such as talks and movement workshops. It also provides safe, calm space for participants if required and was of particular value for people who were vulnerable or had additional needs.

- Having a range of activity and entry points to appeal to different audiences, age groups, duration of visit and types of learner.

- The space needs to ‘work’ with or without an audience, it can’t be reliant on audiences to activate the space. One Associate university, for example, described how, ‘every lesson had a contingency plan in case audience numbers were low or didn’t engage it’s really intimidating to walk into a space where people are needing your involvement.’

- Targeted social media campaign; utilising artist and partner contacts to reach people with specialist interests such as the politics of food.

- Building in time for rehearsals and familiarisation in the space when working with adults with learning disabilities (or other potentially vulnerable people) is essential to ensure their ownership of the event.

- Briefing TEx, Learning and VE staff about the event including clear guidance from the artist(s) about the invitation to the public and the ‘rules of engagement’. For one event in Phase 1, for example, some staff on the floor were uncertain about the ‘rules’ for making a mark – should they deter text? They felt disempowered by the lack of clear guidance.

- Promoting and embedding events across the building. For one event in Phase 1, for example, the artist created a 3-page program that provided information on TEx, the project and the artist, a small flyer for VE staff that was also distributed across the building, and his films were screened in the Terrace Bar and Viewing Level, attracting audiences and giving legitimacy to the space and activities.
• At Tate Liverpool, signage in the foyer on light walls and a daily chalkboard directed the public to the first floor where an additional chalkboard directed the public into the gallery.

It should also be stressed that the Tate Exchange team (Tate staff including floor ‘hosts’ and Arts Media People) were unanimously praised for the ‘Warm and enabling support on the floor’ (Associate). In the ‘Key Learning for TEx’ section of the event report, the team frequently appeared in the points listed under ‘What worked well’; for example, ‘Support from TEx team before and during the day – practicalities, preparation, communication. The floor manager was brilliant!’ The team’s unflagging determination to ‘make it work’ was appreciated by all contributors to Tate Exchange and especially by those with less experience of public engagement or those with challenging requirements. One Associate, for example, whose event presented logistical and access challenges for Tate, concluded, ‘Ask for improbable things and keep asking! Wishes come true where there is a good reason and goodwill on all sides.’

6.3 PRACTICALLY – WHAT WORKED LESS WELL

The Tate Exchange team continually reflected on learning, in effect, working through an action research cycle (plan, act, observe, reflect) to explore and refine the best use of the Tate Exchange space and share this learning with others. Tate Learning staff, the TEx team and Associates identified challenges in meetings, debriefs and event reports. Some were specific to individual events but others were cited more frequently and included:

• TECHNICAL AND LOGISTICAL DIFFICULTIES including daytime lighting levels that didn’t support film projections, a floor unsuitable for dance or ‘messy’ activities and unreliable wi-fi across Level 5. The limited set-up time was also reported as problematic. One Associate, for example, reported, ‘Logistics prevented us from realising our ambitions despite being encouraged to think big. The limited time to set up in the space and the opening hours of the loading bay meant we were unable to construct large items for the space.’ At Tate Liverpool, TExL occupies a section of the first floor gallery, flanked by two collection displays. Activity within the space is therefore subject to restrictions imposed by the proximity to artworks. Elements of the programme that included prohibited materials took place in the Clore Learning Studio (on the same floor) and could be linked by live streaming between the two spaces.

• ACCESS INFORMATION AND ISSUES. For example, the only toilet facilities with a hoist and bed is in the Turbine Hall at Tate Modern. Feedback from SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disability) schools involved in an Associate event indicated, ‘Access via lifts was only smooth with the support of a lift driver. Moving between spaces and returning to the fifth floor was time consuming and sometimes stressful if a young person needed to access the toilet facilities in the Turbine Hall.’ In the pursuit of its objective of inclusivity, Tate Exchange also highlighted access issues elsewhere in the museum. Following difficulties with ‘gallery rules’ for some SEND students visiting the Rauschenberg exhibition, for example, the Associate recommended, ‘Re-think the rules about the use of technology such as the i-pad viewer which may be the only way a student can directly look at an image’, also, ‘allow students to enter and leave an exhibition space several times to facilitate sensory processing.’

• LEVELS OF NOISE AND SOUND ‘BLEED’ between activities within the same event and between events. ‘It was nice to have a wider offer for different audiences, however we had to negotiate throughout the day so the [university] could have some quieter moments and the students [from the second university] could express themselves as they have planned as well. We prompted them to talk to each other and that brought a harmony to the shared space.’

(Daily report)

• PROGRAMMING THAT WAS MISALIGNED WITH THE AVAILABILITY OF AUDIENCES. During Phase 1, the event programme at half-term had a theoretical slant and was not an ideal family activity and programming for young
people on term-time weekdays struggled to attract the target audience. (Formative learning resulted in more targeted programming for Phase 2).

- **USING THE SOUTHWARK ROOM FOR DROP-IN EVENTS.** In general, the public assumed this was a private, closed space and did not enter. There were exceptions, however, where the Southwark Room was ‘The perfect space for the event...because [it] contributed overall to the feel of the event set up, being in a board room and self-contained.’ Importantly, this Phase 2 event had a reception desk in the main space which ‘helped to stimulate interest...and direct participants into the room.’

- Devising MECHANISMS TO MAINTAIN CONTACT with visitors who may be interested in future, similar activity.

### 6.4 VISIBILITY AND PROMOTION OF TATE EXCHANGE

The issue that was cited most frequently related to the visibility and promotion of Tate Exchange within Tate Modern and online; specifically marketing, signage in the building and wider staff awareness of Tate Exchange that resulted in inconsistency in audience numbers and uncertainty about the space and programme. It should be noted that these concerns were not universal with one Associate, for example, reporting, ‘Social media/twitter was great...Tate web presence essential and a boost in terms of reach.’ However, an event report from Tate Learning, was more typical in identifying the following challenge,

‘Lack of signage, marketing and comms – people actually knowing what was on level 5 and making the journey up to join activities.’

These issues caused some people to question the value placed on Tate Exchange by the institution as the following quote illustrates:

‘It was noticeable that nowhere across the entire Tate Modern site was there any signage to indicate the timetable of events for Tate Exchange or even the fact that [our event] was taking place. We felt that this indicated a low prioritisation of Tate Exchange in relation to the other gallery spaces at Tate. Whilst Tate Exchange engaged with the programme through social media, re-tweeting etc we noticed that the Tate account does not tweet about activity at Tate Exchange. This seems counter-intuitive. Tate Exchange has 1851 followers (as of 20/4/17), whilst Tate has 3.8 million. There is obviously a strategic decision not to tweet about Tate Exchange from the main account but this inevitably has a negative effect both on audience numbers and awareness of the programme, as well as bringing into question the validity of the content in relation to the rest of Tate.’

(Associate)

The main @Tate Twitter account has a limit of three tweets per day. Given the volume of events and exhibitions throughout the galleries that @Tate has to cover, combined with the sometimes last-minute nature of TEx programming, there was often little or no room to get an @Tate tweet for Tate Exchange. It was for this reason that @TateExchange was established. Similarly, way-finding and signage across Tate Modern has been recognised as a general issue, with one senior staff member, for example, commenting that, ‘At times it is easier to find your way to Tate Exchange than to the restaurant in the new building.’ A student participating in an Associate event was enthusiastic about the role of Tate Exchange but also questioned Tate’s commitment to the programme,

‘It’s making people wake up to what art should be – it’s not just about viewing it. People get on auto pilot about looking at art...To disrupt people, you need Tate Exchange to be on Level 2 rather than Level 5. I’ve seen ads for exhibitions but not the same for Tate Exchange and what it’s trying to do. It makes me wonder – is Tate doing this half-heartedly? (As it’s challenging Tate’s ethos – i.e. it’s not just for the middle class).’

Whilst one might challenge the portrayal of Tate’s ethos and reference the organisation’s audience development strategies, the central issue of visibility and perceived institutional value remain. (See section 11 for more on the diversity of participants).

Allied to the issues of visibility and promotion was the challenge voiced internally at Tate about how to describe Tate Exchange to others. In interviews undertaken by Maurice Carlin, senior staff reported, ‘I find it hard to describe to people, except in a really vague way.’ The volume and variety of activity in the programme was thought to exacerbate the difficulty of articulating what Tate Exchange is, both internally and externally and there were calls for, ‘A really simple way to talk about it – a really simple sentence to define it.’

The description of Tate Exchange will inevitably vary depending on the audience, the ‘open experiment’ and exploration of the role of art in society may be fore-grounded for funders or colleagues from the cultural sector, whilst for members of the public, the invitation to ‘take part’ is key. The fundamentals are constant but the order and emphasis may change. During the year, members of the Tate Exchange team became adept at describing Tate Exchange as they welcomed visitors to the space. This knowledge could usefully be shared across the institution.
During time spent evaluating Tate Exchange, I would often chat to people on Level 5, perhaps sitting on the sofas or moving through the space. I was often asked about Tate Exchange, ‘What is this? What’s it about?’ Inevitably, my response included information specific to the event that day and the opportunities for participation but I also found myself describing the programme in general, saying perhaps,

Tate Exchange is a programme of activity, based on Level 5, which invites members of the public to join in with whatever’s going on in the space: last year people made cardboard houses, explored virtual reality, watched performances and discussed what artworks might taste or smell like!

The programme involves a whole range of international artists and outside organisations working with us to explore themes and issues of our time, like identity or wellbeing, but it’s really about you, taking part, having fun, making and chatting with the artist or a perfect stranger (!), maybe discovering something new, that’s what it’s about.’

(Tate Exchange evaluator)

VIGNETTE 1: DESCRIBING TATE EXCHANGE TO THE PUBLIC

Tate Exchange facilitated exchanges between people of different generations, backgrounds, abilities, cultures, genders, sexualities and ethnicities. People exchanged personal memories, stories, recipes, traditions and rituals, ideas and passions, artistic practices, knowledge, skills and contact details.

Exchanges occurred in the physical space and online through social media; between art forms and across time periods; between disciplines including art, science, technology, geography, health and wellbeing; and between and amongst artists and the public.

For some of those working with vulnerable groups, Tate Exchange presented a challenge about safe and appropriate forms of exchange with the public. Quotes below illustrate some of the challenges and the solutions found.

‘The risk was the vulnerability of the artists and dancers [with learning disabilities] presenting their work and being asked questions by the public. We used the written and printed material to support these conversations and had at least two people from each organisation along with myself and [another member of the Tate Learning team] present to support the public interaction.’ (Tate Learning)

‘Approaches to exchange with the public were going to be more complex. Some schools felt that face-to-face contact was an essential element of the project. Others had clear rules relating to safeguarding that made this impossible so that alternative ways of facilitating exchange had to be sought. This included sharing examples of visual timetables, PECS (Picture Exchange Communication System), social stories and films of “a day in the life” and the use of new technology in SEND schools such as the Eye-Gaze.’ (Associate13)

Tate Exchange was very popular with families and the presence and engagement of large numbers of children and young people, and the intergenerational exchange and learning that resulted, was a surprise to some of those involved in Tate Exchange. Whilst welcome, this was an important consideration for those designing activities as one Associate discovered,

‘There is a fine line between artistic freedom and mild chaos when working with younger years...[this] might have been managed better by creating more regimented “zones”.

6.5 EXCHANGES IN THE SPACE

Tate Exchange facilitated exchanges between people of different generations, backgrounds, abilities, cultures, genders, sexualities and ethnicities. People exchanged personal memories, stories, recipes, traditions and rituals, ideas and passions, artistic practices, knowledge, skills and contact details.

Exchanges occurred in the physical space and online through social media; between art forms and across time periods; between disciplines including art, science, technology, geography, health and wellbeing; and between and amongst artists and the public.

For some of those working with vulnerable groups, Tate Exchange presented a challenge about safe and appropriate forms of exchange with the public. Quotes below illustrate some of the challenges and the solutions found.

‘The risk was the vulnerability of the artists and dancers [with learning disabilities] presenting their work and being asked questions by the public. We used the written and printed material to support these conversations and had at least two people from each organisation along with myself and [another member of the Tate Learning team] present to support the public interaction.’ (Tate Learning)

‘Approaches to exchange with the public were going to be more complex. Some schools felt that face-to-face contact was an essential element of the project. Others had clear rules relating to safeguarding that made this impossible so that alternative ways of facilitating exchange had to be sought. This included sharing examples of visual timetables, PECS (Picture Exchange Communication System), social stories and films of “a day in the life” and the use of new technology in SEND schools such as the Eye-Gaze.’ (Associate13)

Tate Exchange was very popular with families and the presence and engagement of large numbers of children and young people, and the intergenerational exchange and learning that resulted, was a surprise to some of those involved in Tate Exchange. Whilst welcome, this was an important consideration for those designing activities as one Associate discovered,

‘There is a fine line between artistic freedom and mild chaos when working with younger years...[this] might have been managed better by creating more regimented “zones”.

6.6 DIGITAL SPACE

The digital elements of Tate Exchange aimed to share the same open, inclusive and discursive approach. Through a website and Twitter, the Tate Exchange Digital Producer created and shared content drawn from and inspired by Tate Exchange programming.
It was agreed that @TateExchange would seek to identify more strongly as a forum for discussion, rather than a purely broadcast or marketing channel. This was a break from Tate’s approach to Twitter, which typically provides marketing messaging with a single ‘Tate’ voice. In order to achieve this, the Digital Producer developed a content strategy which sought to reflect the variety of activity in the space by balancing content produced in-house, such as short films and photo collections, with content produced by Associates and visitors. Visitor comments and observations were re-tweeted alongside highly-produced video content and artist contributions. This lent the account a DIY aesthetic and a sense of authenticity (rather than broadcast authority).

Given limited time, resources, and the newness of the project, opportunities to develop deeper online engagement and broader audiences remained relatively unexplored. A Tate Exchange Online R&D project14 was established to investigate and trial ways to foster a common digital space to support discussion around social and cultural issues, to build relationships with partners new to Tate, to make the work of Tate Exchange accessible to diverse publics and young people, and to give participants opportunities to contribute their own words and ideas.

A call to action, for example, resulted in the creation of creative non-visual art content that both addressed an artwork in the Tate collection from a new perspective while supporting a specific Associate event. (See Vignette 8 on page 75).

Key findings and recommendations from the Tate Exchange Online R&D are summarised below.

• **FACTOR IN LEAD-IN TIME AND INCORPORATE DIGITAL EARLY**
  Sufficient lead time allows for working better with Associates, mitigating risk, and also gives time to research potential online advocates who could support and encourage dialogue.

• **TEX CONTENT SHOULD BE CROSS-CHANNEL AND HAVE A UNIQUE TONE OF VOICE**
  A ‘Tate Exchange’ tone of voice, that adheres to Tate guidelines but that is unafraid to question and support debate, should be carried from website to Tate social channels as necessary. Making content available in a variety of different formats and platforms but linked with a TEx ‘voice’ increases accessibility. Not all potential audiences can be found on the Tate website; there is a need to find them where they are.

• **USING POPULAR EVENT HASHTAGS (#)**
  Drawing on existing hashtags (for example, #flashfiction) reaches audiences who might not be familiar with Tate. Referring to known anniversaries like International Women’s Day (with the time-based hashtag #IWD2017) taps into a wealth of ongoing online conversation. Use of more general hashtags like #culture, #migration, and #AnishKapoor can raise visibility and integrate TEx conversations into wider online dialogue.

• **THEMATIC CONTENT HUBS REACH DIVERSE AND ENGAGED AUDIENCES AND CAN PROMOTE LEARNING**
  Successful resource hubs on the Tate website can have very high dwell times and engagement: 3:10 on average for the Women in Art resource, and an impressive 5:40 for visitors from Twitter, suggests there is an appetite for thoughtful, in-depth content for visitors to Tate Exchange online.

• **TARGETED PROMOTION CAN BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH NEW AUDIENCES**
  Targeted promotion, paid and otherwise, through platforms like Thunderclap, Facebook and Twitter, help to build specific and hard-to-reach audiences.

• **SOCIAL ADVOCATES AND PEERS ENHANCE DIALOGUE**
  On social media, high-profile advocates create moments of high engagement, for example when Phil Jupitus and the BBC Arts tweeted and retweeted TEx events. While social advocates can be helpful for dedicated moments, even more important for long-term dialogue was the cross-fertilisation of followers between Associates’ social media accounts and that of Tate, opening up both partners to vast and often very different social audiences.

• **‘DEEP DIVE’ CASE STUDIES GIVE TIME TO REFLECT AND REDEFINE PRIORITIES**
  Deeper dives into analytics and reporting give granular insights into projects that supplement the Digital Producer’s regular top-line analytics reports.

6.7 **DEBATING CULTURAL AND SOCIETAL ISSUES**

Tate Exchange provided varied and innovative opportunities for participants to explore a wide range of socially relevant issues including sexuality, gender, identity and bullying; sex education and pornography; physical and mental health including dementia, homelessness; social inclusion and social class; migration, citizenship and refugees; diversity and difference, food and food poverty; schooling and arts education; the natural and built environment; and the impact of new technologies. Events early in Phase 1 (the Three Tables with Tim Etchells, for example and the Guerrilla Girls’ Complaints Department demonstrated the public’s enthusiasm for debating societal issues, but overall it was the Associates’ events that provided innovative and engaging activities for people of all ages to explore and debate a broad range of social and political issues.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 1

• The welcome is paramount! Ensure all artists and Associates appreciate the need to ‘host’ the floor and activities.

• Tate Exchange is open to all, audience numbers vary. Ensure that artists and Associates plan events with varied and accessible entry points and which look inviting whether activated by large crowds or just a few weary visitors looking for a rest.

• Consider access requirements, information and adaptations throughout the building to become more welcoming and inclusive to diverse audiences.

• Provide clearer information at the entrance of Tate Exchange and in the space about the nature of the activities taking place and how people can get involved.

• Increase the opportunities for work to ‘spill out’ from Tate Exchange into the rest of the building, creating physical and conceptual bridges between Tate Exchange and the collection, whilst also increasing promotion for the programme.

• Improve signposting within Tate about Tate Exchange to make it more visible to visitors and ensure there is widespread awareness and understanding amongst staff in the building to enable them to talk about the programme with confidence.

• Provide more resources to promote Tate Exchange in the digital sphere, continuing the use of the unique, multi-authored voice developed in Year 1. Consider the effective use of the Taylor Digital Suite at Tate Britain as a digital hub for Tate Exchange.

• Continue to champion the experimental nature of Tate Exchange in the physical space and online and ensure that the ‘permission to fail’ is understood throughout Tate.

OBJECTIVE 2
TO ENGENDER A DEEPER RELATIONSHIP WITH ART FOR A BROADER PUBLIC THROUGH NEW PARTNERSHIPS AND APPROACHES TO ENGAGEMENT WITH ART, IDEAS AND THROUGH NEW SOCIAL OPPORTUNITIES
WHAT ARE THE AFFORDANCES AND CHALLENGES OF THE NEW PARTNERSHIPS? WHAT IS THE ‘GIVE & TAKE’ WITH ARTISTS AND ASSOCIATES?

8.1 THE INVITATION TO ARTISTS

Conceptually, Tate Exchange explores the role of art in society. The programme’s objectives (with their focus on engagement with art and ideas, partnerships and co-creation, plurality of voices and views, accessibility and inclusivity, debate and new ideas) build upon Tate Learning’s vision\(^\text{15}\) and combined with the affordances of the space, call for a new approach to programming and programme content.

As indicated in section 2.2 above, the Director of Learning had a clear vision for Tate Exchange which was shared with the Learning teams. The focus and demands of each team varies as does the expertise of the staff. Public Programmes, for example, has more demanding targets for income generation than other teams and offers a programme of talks, workshops and tours. However, the team also run Access and Community programmes to help overcome barriers to engagement with the arts, with the former providing access opportunities for visitors with disabilities including British Sign Language (BSL) and Lip Speaking tours for Deaf and hard of hearing people, and the latter, a longstanding programme of work with community groups who face real or perceived barriers to visiting Tate. Differing areas of expertise across teams may have influenced the ways in which the Tate Exchange vision was interpreted and realised.

Through a combination of lack of time and personnel, and assumptions made about common understandings of approach and language, the invitations made to artists for Phase 1 of Tate Exchange were not necessarily consistent or clear and crucially, were not always understood or heeded by the artists. It is important to note, however, that planning for Tate Exchange began before the space was finished, let alone open, and no-one had a clear idea about how or if the public would engage with the programme. This undoubtedly created challenges for Learning staff, artists and Associates when negotiating projects, as one artist commented, ‘As information came through on TEx... TEx kept morphing and the invitation morphed too.’

An event report of one project in Phase 1 illustrates the issues that arose when the invitation to the artist and perhaps the selection criteria for artists were unclear. In a debrief meeting with the Learning curators, the artist reported being very happy with the project. ‘She thought it was a success and it exceeded her expectations.’ However, she went on to offer a critique of the process and Tate Exchange that was less positive, having found the planning ‘more difficult than any previous project.’ (She did note, however, ‘Surprised by how much support and good vibes there were once she arrived in London for the project.’) The artist’s concerns were three-fold:

- ‘An absolute lack of funding relative to Tate’s expectations [which was] stressful and problematic [with a] constant push to do more, despite the limited resources.’
- The artist felt the TEx space meant ‘What was wanted from me was anything except art...and...asking artists to draw lines between art and non-art is a losing battle.’ The artist was especially disappointed that Tate would not support/finance the making of a sculptural object.
- The artist felt that TEx was over-designed and over-curated and that projects should be more artist-driven. She felt ‘hamstrung the whole time’.

In a meeting with the evaluator (prior to the event), the Learning curator working on this project raised a concern that Tate Exchange was hosting the artist’s ideas but that these ideas were not necessarily in keeping with the programme’s values or objectives. This view contrasts with that expressed by the artist in her third concern above. In the event report, the Learning curator concluded, ‘The ownership of the project is not clear. We should be clearer about the parameters and bring agency back to the curator to agree decision-making in the space.’ The mismatch of aims and expectations resulted in the Learning curator also suggesting that artists may feel exploited if Tate ‘Celebrates successes whilst not providing proper infrastructure and support to the artists or the project...This must feed into Tate’s reputational risk; thus emphasising the need for a clear invitation that highlights the values and opportunities of Tate Exchange but also its limitations.

Allied to the clarity of invitation is the choice of artists to work with and several Learning curators questioned whether particular artists were a good ‘match’ for Tate Exchange. One Learning curator, for example, reflected,

‘It’s important that we research an artist’s practice and reputation in full before committing to working with them. Social media usage was a particularly contentious issue within this project, and should have been anticipated.’

Perhaps the main issue that was raised by Learning curators, however, was the degree to which artists were prepared to enter a dialogue with learning staff about their proposals and plans. Positive experiences were characterised by a collaborative approach where the artist held the vision for the project but recognised the expertise of the curator (particularly in relation to public engagement and learning) and welcomed their input. As the Director of Learning stated, ‘This is not about an artist coming in to talk about their work; it’s about engaging with their processes in dialogue with the public.’ In some cases, this required Learning curators to say ‘No’ and some staff found this easier than others depending on:

- the seniority, experience and confidence of the Learning curator
- the level of trust in the relationship with the artist
- the public profile of the artist
- the prior experience of the artist and their understanding of the Learning curator’s role (and specifically, how this may differ from that of an exhibition curator).
It was also apparent from discussions with Learning staff, Associates and artists, and from observation of Tate Exchange events, that understanding about public engagement varied widely. There are, of course, many manifestations of public engagement but what was at issue was the degree of agency afforded to participants. Returning to Anna Cutler’s document The Imperative of Change (see section 2.2), to what extent was the event participative, listening and responding to multiple voices and enabling people to apply their knowledge, co-construct learning, collaborate with artists and do things for themselves?

At best, the answer was ‘yes’ across the board (and this was true of a great many Tate Exchange events) but some events fell short, failing to capitalise on the unique affordances of Tate Exchange to inhabit a middle ground between learning and looking; between workshops and exhibitions. Many conversations at and about Tate Exchange included discussion of ‘socially engaged practice’ that touched on the extent to which Tate Exchange should be working with artists who use socially engaged practice. In research conducted by Clore Fellow, Maurice Carlin, for example, a senior leader at Tate commented,

‘It feels weird that we work with Tania Bruguera who does this kind of work16 but we don’t work with her at TEx... Why? ...I think they work with artists who have come from within their culture (Learning-focused Artist-Educators).’

This comment reveals the breadth of practice that is referred to as ‘socially engaged’ and the importance and value of clarifying terminology and expectations in any discussion with or about artists in Tate Exchange. It also suggests the value of continuing the discussions internally and with Associates and participants, regarding the particular affordances of Tate Exchange for artists’ practice and how this relates to the wider artistic and pedagogic milieu of Tate.

The exchange between Tate Learning and artists included reflection and evaluation. The extent to which this was embedded in planning and delivery or predominantly summative (through debrief sessions) varied between teams. Whilst practice could be improved and the artists’ role clarified, the opportunity for open and honest reflection was appreciated by artists and informative for Learning teams as the following quote illustrates,

‘Constantly dealing with similar issues with institutions, issues of cultural exclusion and invisibility. But never previously been able to have this kind of conversation with an institution (despite having worked with New Museum, MoMA etc), so thankful to have this opportunity. Important that these kinds of meeting are part of the project.’ (Debrief meeting with Phase 1 artists)

One team had a particularly difficult relationship with the artists they worked with, both sides agreeing at a debrief meeting that although the event had been a great success, there had been a breakdown of trust in the relationship. The team is used to working in a collaborative and exploratory way and were keen to enter into a dialogue about the development of the project. The artists, however, questioned the legitimacy of the apparent freedom, ‘The idea of a research residency...open and unknown. but if you need a public outcome, you have to have knowns!’ They asserted that ‘limitations and boundaries are helpful...you’re so much more free when someone gives you clear expectations.’ It was not that the learning team disagreed with these sentiments but rather that they hoped to ‘work alongside the artists in thinking through their ideas’ and thus uncover the ‘knowns’ together. In response to this stressful experience, the team produced a document setting out the Curatorial Principles of the Artist Invite to be used for future collaborations.

8.2 ENGAGING WITH THE TATE COLLECTION

‘Learning with art, and specifically with Tate’s collection’ is central to the vision of Tate Learning and finding ways of building bridges for participants between the work on Level 5 and the collection was, therefore, part of the invitation to artists and Associates.

From the outset, Tim Etchells encouraged audiences to move between spaces in the building with his Ten Purposes, ‘a set of instructions that will animate your experience of the galleries and other people in new and different ways.’

Events that successfully engaged the public with the collection fell into four main categories. The categories with examples are listed below.

1 CONTEXTUALISING TATE EXCHANGE WITHIN THE MUSEUM AND ITS PURPOSE

‘The gallery visits were a very significant part of our TEx day giving the children a frame for their creative work on level 5 and an understanding of Tate’s function and purpose.’ (Associate)

2 PLAYFUL WAYS OF ENGAGING WITH THE COLLECTION, DIGITALLY AND IN REAL TIME

For example, a Phase 1 event encouraged people to pose with artworks and participant feedback indicated ‘The activity made me feel like an artist, an exhibitor. It is the most comfortable I have ever felt in the Tate Modern’ and
"I did the Conceal project with tubes and baskets. Amazing experience. I felt more engaged and personally connected with the artwork, and look at them from a different angle and perspective."

3 DEMYSTIFYING INTERPRETATION AND FINDING NEW ROUTES IN

For example, an Associate event that explored how artworks might taste or smell.

4 PROVIDING INSPIRATION AND ENHANCEMENT FOR TATE EXCHANGE ACTIVITY

For example, 'Most schools responded to the generous offer of exhibition tickets [for Rauschenberg] and this added to the experience of being at Tate. One school commented that being able to see the original works gave more value to the subsequent activities they did.' (Associate)

A small minority of artists and Associates who engaged with the collection experienced difficulties. One Associate event, for example, aimed to explore the place of photography at Tate Modern and successfully drew inspiration from The Radical Eye exhibition for activities on Level 5 and also placed students in galleries to engage members of the public. This latter element was problematic as the project coordinator reported,

'Making a successful link between the Tate collection (especially photography) and TEx was problematic. The students in the galleries were all challenged by security staff despite having received assurances that it was OK for them to be there.'

As Tate was entering into a contractual agreement with Associates, and perhaps because learning from other Tate initiatives such as Circuit had demonstrated the need to be explicit about shared aims in partnerships, the invitation to Associates was articulated more clearly. Associates were asked to embody the Tate Exchange values of OPENNESS, GENEROSITY, RISK and TRUST, and a set of principles guided planning.

8.3 THE AFFORDANCES OF TATE EXCHANGE FOR ASSOCIATES

As Tate was entering into a contractual agreement with Associates, and perhaps because learning from other Tate initiatives such as Circuit had demonstrated the need to be explicit about shared aims in partnerships, the invitation to Associates was articulated more clearly. Associates were asked to embody the Tate Exchange values of OPENNESS, GENEROSITY, RISK and TRUST, and a set of principles guided planning.

For a programme or activity to be considered as part of Tate Exchange, it needs to:

- Inspire diverse audiences locally, nationally and internationally with new ways of engaging with Tate's collection.
- Invite and enable the audience to become collaborators in helping shape the programme, activities and outcomes.
- Make a connection to the annual Tate Exchange theme.
Tate Exchange provided a public platform that offered Associates:

- Visibility for their work and the constituencies they work with (see Vignette 2)
- Voice for an organisation, an issue, an individual or a constituency
- Validation through association with the Tate brand.

Take Exchange offered Associates opportunities to surface and change perceptions about issues and practices through:

- Engaging new, larger and more diverse audiences
- Increasing the understanding of the public and in the cultural sector.

Tate Exchange promoted collaboration and co-creation, including:

- Opportunities to network and work with like-minded, creative, ‘inspirational’ people, both within and between organisations.
- Collaboration and new partnerships within and between Associates, Tate, artists and the public.

Tate Exchange afforded opportunities to develop practice through:

- Experimentation, risk and an invitation to make new and ambitious work
- Working across art form practices and sectors
- Connecting with and taking inspiration from Tate and the collection
- A greater focus on research, evaluation and reflection
- Professional development and team building.

8.4 WHAT DO THE ASSOCIATES OFFER TATE EXCHANGE AND TATE?

The Associates and the events they produced for Tate Exchange provided clear benefits for the programme and for Tate. In a reflection session, the TEx team highlighted the following.

NEW AUDIENCES brought in by the Associates: either directly through Associates’ mailing lists and social media or indirectly as the artists, practices and issues were of interest to audiences who are not regular visitors. In many cases, this new audience was one that Tate ordinarily struggles to reach or attract, or includes priority groups, such as young people with mental health issues in Liverpool.

BRAVERY AND RISK-TAKING. Associates were modelling new and diverse ways of engaging audiences and using Tate Exchange as a laboratory to test ideas and practices.

RESPONSIVE PROGRAMMING INCLUDING RAISING IMPORTANT SOCIETAL AND POLITICAL ISSUES. In general, Associates are nimble and can respond to current issues and debates more easily than Tate which is encumbered with long lead-in times for programming. (See section 6.7 above on societal issues).

AUTHENTIC PROGRAMMING AND VOICE involving artists and others with expert and lived experiences of, for example, the youth justice system or Tourettes. As described in 6.6 above, Tate Exchange in the digital sphere (@TateExchange) also strove for authenticity over broadcast authority.
ADDITIONAL AND DIFFERENT MARKETING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS. Tate has neither the resources or, in some cases, the contacts, to generate the range and quantity of promotion and media coverage secured by Associates such as the double-page spread in *The Big Issue* about one event focussing on homelessness. It should be noted, however, that Associates’ communications activity caused challenges for the already over-stretched Communications team at Tate who needed to ensure the Tate Exchange ‘brand’ was accurately represented. This tension was highlighted by one Associate who reported, ‘We worked very hard to secure press and marketing coverage for our weekend but at times the relationship with Tate was a little complex. There were occasions we felt there was nervousness from Tate about our conversations with the press in general.’ Promotion and engagement through Associates’ social media channels was also beneficial although again, at times required a degree of Tate oversight. One Associate event, for example, featured Swedish rapper, Yung Lean and led to concerns about overcrowding at TEx. With Twitter followers of over 200,000, it was agreed the Associate would promote the event without mentioning the rapper by name but when magazines, *Time Out* and *Dazed* picked up on the event, an embargo was placed on all further digital content in the run up to the opening.

**VIGNETTE 2:**

**VISIBILITY, VOICE AND IDENTITY – CULTURE SHIFTS WITH OPEN EYE GALLERY AT TATE LIVERPOOL**

Open Eye Gallery, SURF (The Liverpool Service User Reference Forum) and photographer Tadhg Devlin produced a series of events about *Culture Shifts*, a new socially engaged photographic programme. The aim was to raise awareness of dementia through art. The three day event consisted of large portraits of SURF group members (produced collaboratively with the group members), a newspaper resource for those living with dementia, talks, tours and musical performances.

During a storytelling session, the Tate Exchange Coordinator for Tate Liverpool, told the story of one participant and how Tate Exchange had made a difference to his life by giving him a voice and changing people’s perceptions about dementia.

Open Eye Gallery, SURF (The Liverpool Service User Reference Forum) and photographer Tadhg Devlin, Tate Exchange Liverpool 2016. Photo: Open Eye Gallery

Storytelling image by Learning team at TERP Steering group
8.5 CHALLENGES FOR ASSOCIATES

Associates also reported ‘considerable challenge and workload’ and ‘More grief than anticipated’.

Several Associates talked about the actual and hidden cost of the TEx event.

One gallery’s two-day event, for example, cost the organisation £7000. A second associate estimated a similar expenditure for their one-day event although the budget did not include the staff time to plan, deliver and evaluate the event. The hidden labour costs of volunteers, staff and artists were often extensive. A total of 68 people were involved in staging a health-related event, for example, and the coordinator reported that ‘A lot of facilitators/contributors were contributing in a voluntary capacity and/or in addition to their clinical or other arts/health practice.’ Although often unavoidable, it is important to ensure that support in kind is part of an exchange of reciprocal benefits. One Associate, a small charitable organisation, for example, concluded,

‘The weekend was expensive and we would need to think carefully about our budget for a future project. So we would need to be more careful about some of the elements we committed to next time. That said, the benefits far outweigh the negatives in this instance.’

This view was echoed by the Director of Counterpoints Arts, during her presentation at Experiments in Practice18 during Phase 3. She stressed the importance of revealing the true cost of activities, this idea was developed in workshops where conference participants proposed that an ‘exchange of assets’ might be a better way of describing the relationship between partners in initiatives such as Tate Exchange.

In some Associates’ events, the blurring of roles between coordinators, facilitators, artists and participants, added to the opacity of budgets and potentially compromised project aims. In evaluation feedback, for example, a health practitioner commented:

‘Perhaps there might be scope for funding the artists as we are trying to show the importance of art in mental health and the impact, yet we are not taking the artists seriously enough to give them a fee.’

The Tate Exchange ‘brand’ also supported the fundraising endeavours of some Associates, with one regional gallery, for example, securing £10,000 of additional funding for their project. However, ‘Due to economic circumstances, [young people’s parents and guardians who wanted to visit the event] were not able to afford the cost of travelling to Tate Modern.’ The gallery hopes to run another incarnation of the project later in the year when the organisation moves into its new building which will enable parents and guardians to participate. Feedback at the Associates day 18 during Phase 3. She stressed the importance of revealing the true cost of activities, this idea was developed in workshops where conference participants proposed that an ‘exchange of assets’ might be a better way of describing the relationship between partners in initiatives such as Tate Exchange.

In some Associates’ events, the blurring of roles between coordinators, facilitators, artists and participants, added to the opacity of budgets and potentially compromised project aims. In evaluation feedback, for example, a health practitioner commented:

‘Perhaps there might be scope for funding the artists as we are trying to show the importance of art in mental health and the impact, yet we are not taking the artists seriously enough to give them a fee.’

The Tate Exchange ‘brand’ also supported the fundraising endeavours of some Associates, with one regional gallery, for example, securing £10,000 of additional funding for their project. However, ‘Due to economic circumstances, [young people’s parents and guardians who wanted to visit the event] were not able to afford the cost of travelling to Tate Modern.’ The gallery hopes to run another incarnation of the project later in the year when the organisation moves into its new building which will enable parents and guardians to participate. Feedback at the Associates day 18 during Phase 3. She stressed the importance of revealing the true cost of activities, this idea was developed in workshops where conference participants proposed that an ‘exchange of assets’ might be a better way of describing the relationship between partners in initiatives such as Tate Exchange.

In some Associates’ events, the blurring of roles between coordinators, facilitators, artists and participants, added to the opacity of budgets and potentially compromised project aims. In evaluation feedback, for example, a health practitioner commented:

‘Perhaps there might be scope for funding the artists as we are trying to show the importance of art in mental health and the impact, yet we are not taking the artists seriously enough to give them a fee.’

The Tate Exchange ‘brand’ also supported the fundraising endeavours of some Associates, with one regional gallery, for example, securing £10,000 of additional funding for their project. However, ‘Due to economic circumstances, [young people’s parents and guardians who wanted to visit the event] were not able to afford the cost of travelling to Tate Modern.’ The gallery hopes to run another incarnation of the project later in the year when the organisation moves into its new building which will enable parents and guardians to participate. Feedback at the Associates day 18 during Phase 3. She stressed the importance of revealing the true cost of activities, this idea was developed in workshops where conference participants proposed that an ‘exchange of assets’ might be a better way of describing the relationship between partners in initiatives such as Tate Exchange.

In some Associates’ events, the blurring of roles between coordinators, facilitators, artists and participants, added to the opacity of budgets and potentially compromised project aims. In evaluation feedback, for example, a health practitioner commented:

‘Perhaps there might be scope for funding the artists as we are trying to show the importance of art in mental health and the impact, yet we are not taking the artists seriously enough to give them a fee.’
A final challenge concerned the use of terminology about the work in Tate Exchange which was seen by some Associates to devalue the work and play into the hierarchies of practice that the programme was attempting to bridge. One Associate, for example, reported,

‘The young people who made their own work, and programmed the work of other artists for [the event], raised questions about why they were directed to not use certain terms, such as ‘exhibition’ or ‘show.’ It gave them the sense that perhaps they weren’t ‘good enough’ for the ‘real’ Tate spaces...the contractual nature of the words perhaps undermined some of the openness at the heart of TEx for them.’

This view was endorsed by another Associate working with marginalised constituencies, with the conclusion, ‘...in the long term we feel that this displays a pre-occupation with issues of quality control that could potentially undermine relationships with collaborators in the future.’ Comments from senior leaders at Tate highlighted the differing views of quality with concern about the ‘jumble sale’ aesthetics contrasting with enthusiasm for Tate Exchange ‘breaking down the threshold between community art and collectable art.’ (See section 15.2 for further discussion.)

These issues raise a broader question about the language used to describe Tate Exchange; in this report, the generic term ‘event’ has been used but perhaps other terms such as ‘encounter’ might be a more apposite term.

9.1 KEY FEATURES OF THE INVITATION

Tate Exchange challenges museum conventions of how people view and interact with work, creating opportunities to disrupt and critically question perceived ‘norms’ and attempting to break down the divisions between making and consuming art. The programme is varied, with the invitation to the public being equally diverse. Evidence from the evaluation indicated the importance of making this invitation clear to the public (what is going on and how can they join in?), giving them permission and confidence to enter and take agency in the space. Key features of the ‘new social opportunities’ and ‘new approaches to engagement with art and ideas’ afforded through Tate Exchange included:

- A free, drop-in offer that welcomes all audiences and includes varied entry points and activities to suit differing learning styles, interests, ages and available time.
- Providing opportunities for participants’ agency, autonomous learning and reflection.
- An informal, welcoming, non-prescriptive, social space.
- Providing a platform for extended conversations including an open invitation to enter into conversations with strangers and debate current social issues.
- Giving prominence to the production and understanding of art rather than showing art.
- Creating opportunities for facilitators, artists and participants to interact, converse, share and make together thus questioning ideas of artistic hierarchies, identity and ownership.
- Encouraging participants to ‘play’ with the exhibits and collection; finding their own meaning that is afforded equal value with that of the institution.
- Inviting participation in and between the physical and digital realms.

A number of the universities brought large cohorts of students onto the floor and in some cases, this created confusion around the invitation to the general public. If visitors observed 40 or more students sitting in a circle of chairs listening to a tutor or engrossed in an activity, there was a tendency to assume the space was closed and being used for a private workshop. Other universities grasped the unique opportunities afforded by Tate Exchange and used their event to introduce and support students to share their practice with the public.
9.2 WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE SPACE?

In an analysis of 77 daily reports, almost a third noted dwell times of more than an hour, more than half referred to the multi-national audience and ten reports highlighted the welcome and inclusivity of the space or activities. Research from Sphere Insights confirmed the high dwell time with interviewees spending an average of 54 minutes in the space which compares well with the mean time spent at Tate Modern of 118 minutes. Mentions in the daily reports of the space being quiet and contemplative outnumbered those when the space was described as busy or ‘buzzy’ by 4:3. The analysis revealed that approximately 80% of the event descriptions referred to participants’ active rather than passive engagement, with making and talking the primary modes of engagement. A summary of the analysis is presented in table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODES OF ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>NO. OF MENTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Building a cave; making folded boats; crocheting; workshop on up-cycling; creating posters &amp; community maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Most people spent 20–23 minutes talking to strangers behind a screen; intimate discussions; asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Watched mind-mapping, like a performance; watching film; enjoyed freedom to observe with no pressure to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Listening to stories; listening to the concert; live music and DJ set; listening to sounds of words and possible intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing/rehearsing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Playing music and dancing; warm up session; through theatre with workshops in print and film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing &amp; reflecting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relaxing on sofas, drinking tea; space to reflect; just to enjoy the space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adding own ideas around a questions; sensory workshop; connecting through Skype; funfair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The floor operates as social space but also requires moments of focussed attention. It became apparent that there was sometimes a need to help audiences and participants understand their role and how this might change over time in the space. Putting chairs out, for example, signified that visitors were being invited to form an audience; or posting clear written instructions in the space on participatory activities, gave people agency to engage without fear of misunderstanding the invitation.

9.3 A DEEPER RELATIONSHIP WITH ART

The evaluation framework for Tate Exchange set out suggested indicators of success to help Learning staff and Associates think about what they might be looking for or asking about in their evaluation. The second objective includes the ambition, ‘To engender a deeper relationship with art’ and indicators of success included ‘Participants report desire for further participation and or/intention for return visits to TEx’ and ‘Members of general public engage for extended periods with art and ideas.’ High dwell times have already been discussed in 9.2 above and the Sphere Insight research also indicated relatively high intentions to return with 75–80% or interviewees giving a score of 7 or above (out of 10) for the likelihood of them returning to Tate Exchange. The evaluation report from Tate Liverpool includes evidence of success against both of these indicators. (See Vignette 3).

Through the evaluation, it has been possible to identify factors that support the development of a deeper relationship with art and also to add greater specificity to what this looks like in Tate Exchange such as the examples cited in 8.2 above about engaging with the collection. As the Director for Learning commented, ‘Being invited into a conversation about it at all’ is the first step and to hold this conversation whilst engaged in creative activity has helped people find personal and often emotional connections to the work. The presence of artists on the floor, making with people and answering questions, also served to enrich people’s understanding, enhance their identity as artists and thus deepen their relationship with art. Vignette 4 draws on observations and conversations from Emergent Landscapes to illustrate these processes.
Visitors to TExL who have been engaged by Associates have reported a desire for further participation both within and outside of TExL. When TExL activity has lasted for more than a few days, we have noted visitors returning to take part in different aspects of the programme. This was evident in projects such as Culture Shifts and LOOK/17 with Open Eye Gallery, The Harmonic Oscillator with Alder Hey Children’s Hospital and The Alchemy Between Us by Laurence Payot/The Royal Standard. During all of these events, the programme had a mixture of drop in events with talks and workshops taking place on certain days. Visits that weren’t initially motivated by TExL encouraged visitors to return to the gallery for future TExL events.

In evaluation on The Memory Store from Liverpool John Moores University – ‘A man spent some time in the space reading the contributions on the timeline, he sat and watched others adding in their ideas. He left the space but returned a little while later and with great purpose wrote a contribution and added it to the wall. It is a lovely idea that he was wandering in the gallery when inspiration hit and he came back to add his idea – to share what was in his mind’. They also observed that ‘Another lady came and went several times saying that she wanted to see what had been added – to see the timeline grow’ and that visitors brought other visitors to see the project and those visiting other galleries in the building had heard others speaking about TExL and came to take part.

Projects such as this, where visitors are asked to make physical contributions proved to be successful with visitors returning to TExL. The act of creating something, either individually or collaboratively, allows visitors to have a physical exchange and encourage them to be confident in returning and taking part in future activities.

VIGNETTE 4: EMERGENT LANDSCAPES WITH ROB ST JOHN – A DEEPER RELATIONSHIP WITH ART

A family from Hackney sit painting tiles for over 20 minutes. The five-year old is making patterns and the seven year-old is concentrating hard on her animal picture. ‘Coming to Tate is a favourite thing to do at the weekend’, the parents tell me. ‘It’s great to be contributing’ the father says and describes their recent attendance at a local tree-planting ceremony. The parents say they will definitely visit the cairn in Dorset, ‘We’ll drive down next summer...I grew up in the countryside so any excuse to escape is good for me.’

As they paint, Jake Bee (who supported Rob St John in the development of the Emergent Landscapes installation at Tate Exchange) joins the family and chats easily with the parents about the project, gently probing their interests. They ask about the cave painting that partly inspired the use of lichen paint. Jake talks about the rock art of Western Australia that is up to 40,000 years old, where lichen has colonised the paintings, re-forming the work, yet staying with the original markings.

He shows them French cave painting in a reference book and it so happens that a close family member lives in that area of France. ‘That’s great. We’ll visit the caves when we’re next there...it’ll be good to refer to this activity when we see the cave painting in France, the children will make the connection.’ Later that day, two sisters come along to hear Rob St John talk about the project; they also paint a tile each and place them on the cairn. One sister is a lecturer on visual culture, the other a message therapist who tells me, ‘You can use lichen, known as Old Man’s Beard (it grows on Silver Birch at this time of year) ...it has health properties.’ The sisters talk about the resonance of Emergent Landscapes, ‘It makes you think about the layers of life out there. It’s easy to think it’s all packaged in shiny boxes but it’s not, it’s messy human life.’

‘It’s easy to think of natural and urban as separate but actually, it’s not like that. I’m from Scotland and love to be out in nature and you’re aware of the strata...visible in the hills...but this makes me think how there are strata in the city too, natural and human.’

Emergent Landscapes Rob St John, Tate Exchange 2016
Emergent Landscapes (cairn installed in Hooke Park), Rob St John 2016
9.4 CRITICAL FEEDBACK

Visitors to Tate Exchange felt inspired to offer feedback; more Comments Cards were completed for Tate Exchange than for the whole of the rest of Tate Modern (and yet it accounted for only 3% of visitor numbers). This feedback was overwhelmingly positive as was that garnered online and through conversations on the floor. The very small amount of negative feedback tended to focus on the lack of diversity in the voices, opinions and audiences at Tate Exchange. Events such as Who are We?, with its focus on identity, belonging, migration and citizenship, inevitably evoked strong reactions and amongst the praise, solidarity and emotion, there were dissenting voices.

Contrasting feedback is illustrated below.

The idea of the ‘echo chamber’ extended to criticisms of the demographics of the audiences, artists and Associates and this is discussed further in sections 11.

Other criticism was levelled at Tate Exchange as a programme at Tate. Again this represented a very small minority of feedback and was always countered by contrasting views as illustrated in Vignette 5 opposite.

Today was full of surprises – it was quiet and then suddenly would be full of people… and all sorts of people – families, teenagers, adults, people who loved the work and people who totally HATED it!

The school groups had an absolute blast this morning – one child told me it was his best visit to Tate EVER (and they come often).

I spoke with one very angry lady who just ‘doesn’t get it’ (a Tate member). She thinks what we are doing at TEx but specifically this event is a total waste of time and money – she said ‘If I don’t get this then no one will.’ A member of staff from the Associate and I mentioned that the earlier school group had been totally transfixed by the display and we suggested she come back tomorrow or on Sunday to see the space activated by children but she thinks it is definitely wasted on children who would never understand this work. Many of the families we met on the floor today, however, will come back on Sunday for the workshops.

In contrast to the views of the Tate member, comments from other visitors included:

- Engaging for adults and nice to see artists working with children without being condescending! Some complex themes told in an accessible way! Great!
- My first visit to this space VERY enjoyable and informative. Also a great space to just sit and relax.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 2

- Ensure the invitation to artists is clear and emphasises collaboration with curators, the agency of participants and the affordances and limitations of Tate Exchange.

- Consider the selection criteria for artists to ensure that all parties benefit from their engagement in Tate Exchange.

- Ensure that all proposals have clear aims and objectives in line with Tate Exchange and that the artists’ and Associates’ roles in relation to embedded evaluation are clear.

- Consider how best to support Learning staff to undertake evaluation of Tate Exchange events.

- Link the Tate Exchange programme more closely to the collection as a way of contextualising the work on Level 5 with the wider museum, demystifying art, finding personal connections and finding inspiration.

- Encourage more collaborations between Associates to share practice and develop more innovative approaches to engaging with art and ideas.

- Explore further the new ‘ecologies’ of organisations and artists developing through Tate Exchange (see, for example, Vignette 10 on page 84).

- Consider ways of sustaining links with participants at Tate Exchange to build on their experiences and thus deepen the relationship with art.

- Ensure relationships between Tate and Associates are based on a mutual exchange of assets that acknowledges and capitalises on the skills and expertise of those involved.

- Ensure terminology that is used or disallowed for Tate Exchange does not undermine the programme’s aim or values.
WHO IS TAKING PART IN TATE EXCHANGE?

TO WHAT EXTENT IS TATE EXCHANGE ATTRACTING A BROADER PUBLIC? ARE HIGHER NUMBERS OF YOUNG PEOPLE ENGAGING?

11.1 ONLINE PARTICIPANTS

At the time of writing, @TateExchange has 2,158 followers on Twitter, all obtained organically, without paid promotion. The most popular interests among the group include those that might be expected, such as performance arts, painting and design, but also issue-based interests such as the UK, politics and current events. English is unsurprisingly the most used language among followers and 75% of followers are female.

Analytics reveal that 14% of visitors to the Tate Exchange homepage (not including individual event pages) are 18 – 24 years, 34% are 25 – 34, 25% are 35 – 44, and the rest are older. The age profile of Tate Exchange Twitter is slightly younger with 15% of followers under 25 and 52% 25 – 34.

Almost 50% of TEx Twitter followers reside in London; over 75% of visitors to the website are based in the UK with the bulk of other visitors from the USA and Europe. Analytics cannot reveal how many followers identify as LGBTQ or are from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds, but observation of followers and activity suggests these groups are present amongst @TateExchange followers.

Levels of engagement (likes, shares and reposts) tripled from Phase 1 to Phase 2, reflecting the high levels of Associate-driven content; there were days in Phase 2 when over 100 Twitter notifications were posted. This increase in online traffic reflected multiple and diverse voices with a strong sense of the Associates taking over the TEx digital space. Visits to the Tate Exchange homepage fell by 40% in Phase 2, suggesting that visitors linked directly to an Associate's event page on the Tate website. This is confirmed by an analysis of traffic type that reveals a tripling of direct visits from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

11.2 PARTICIPANTS AT TATE EXCHANGE IN LONDON

Sphere Insights was commissioned to undertake audience surveys at six events across Phases 1 and 2. A total of 593 interviews were undertaken with people randomly recruited as they left Tate Exchange. Findings about the audience profile and comparisons with Tate Modern’s regular audience included:

- The slight female bias (57%) was identical to that for Tate Modern.
- Higher numbers of local audiences with 38% from inner London including 11% from Southwark and Lambeth (compared with 18% and 5% respectively for Tate Modern).
- In line with Tate Modern visitors, Tate Exchange participants were more likely to have obtained a graduate or postgraduate degree (accounting for 66% of interviewees).
- The majority of interviewees (71%) were regular museum and gallery visitors, visiting at least 3 or 4 times a year.
- A significant proportion (24%) had specialist knowledge of visual art, higher than for Tate Modern (16%).
- The audience included a balance of new, regular and lapsed visitors to Tate Modern in line with the rest of the building. 21% were new visitors to Tate Modern which fell short of the target of 35% and was also lower than the Tate Modern figure of 40% new visitors.

In relation to motivation, only 22% of interviewees were visiting Tate Modern because of Tate Exchange and this was found to be 4% at Tate Liverpool. However, this rose to 44% and 29% at events in London that received wide-spread coverage across media platforms. For those coming specifically to Tate Exchange, word of mouth was the main source of information (42%) followed by social media (36%). Interviewees were encouraged to visit Tate Exchange to have fun (22%); stimulate their creativity (19%) and thinking (15%); and improve their understanding of art (15%).

Interviewees were asked how likely they were to recommend Tate Exchange to friends, colleagues or relatives to give a Net Promoter Score (NPS) which can range from −100 to +100. For all but one event, the NPS was positive, ranging from +5 to +38 which is good but indicates scope for improvement. Interestingly, the two highest scores were for events with very different programme content and target audiences perhaps indicating that these communicated a clear invitation and by attracting the appropriate audience, provided a rewarding experience.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 3

- Improve external communication and work more closely with Associates to reach and engage more socially and ethnically diverse audiences.

- Word of mouth and social media are the main sources of information for participants; consider how best to expand these modes of communication.

- The range and quantity of media coverage (including social media) translated into higher numbers of people coming to Tate specifically to participate in Tate Exchange. For this reason, TExL needs to work more closely with Tate Digital and have greater input to content for @TateExchange Twitter account.

- Ensure the programme is reaching and engaging diverse young people, not just university students.

- Consider ways to improve the proportion of new visitors to the physical space.

OBJECTIVE 4
TO GIVE PARTICIPANTS AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE IDEAS BY PROVIDING A PLATFORM AND NEW NETWORKS REACHING THE BROADER CULTURAL SECTOR AND GENERATING PRACTICES, PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES THAT CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO CULTURE AND TO SOCIETY MORE BROADLY
LEARNING AND OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPANTS

13.1 THE CHALLENGES OF GATHERING EVIDENCE OF OUTCOMES

General feedback on the space and activity was gathered through comments cards (and other tools such as post-it notes) and conversations reported by TEx and VE staff. These were mostly affirmations of the successful qualities of Tate Exchange and whilst heartening, did not provide insight into personal outcomes. Gathering evidence of participant learning and outcomes was identified as a challenge by some Learning teams and Associates. This challenge comprised two components: uncertainty about how best to gather evidence of change and uncertainty about whether change was happening at all. A visitor dropping in to an event for 20 minutes will hopefully have a positive experience, perhaps feel good about Tate as a consequence but is it realistic to expect further and more profound outcomes? Although there was wide variation across events in the collection and reporting of participant outcome data, there was strong evidence that Tate Exchange is bringing about change for participants. This assertion requires the caveat that change is happening for some participants at certain events but change is happening. Overall, the most detailed and reliable evaluation of participant outcomes was collected and reported by Associates (although it is important to note that a third of Associates did not submit an event report). A number of factors could be responsible:

- The Associates had more time to embed evaluation into their plans (the evaluation framework was developed in September 2016 which was late for Phase 1 planning).
- The nature of some Associate events and the practices employed, perhaps meant themselves more easily to employing creative evaluation techniques.
- Some (but by no means all) Associates were able to bring large teams of staff, volunteers and students to the floor which enabled them to assign people to oversee evaluation activities. A minority were also able to call on evaluation expertise within their organisations.
- In general, Associate events focussed more directly on societal issues and the evidence suggests that these were the events most likely to affect change in participants.
- In general, the artists engaged in Phase 1 had more varied and sometimes limited understanding of evaluation, not necessarily appreciating the need to embed evaluation in their event planning and delivery. This created challenges for Learning staff. For evaluation, it is important to have a clear idea about how you hope participants will benefit from their experiences and again, artists in Phase 1 did not always bring this clarity to their proposals.
- Many of the Associate events involved participants who were ‘attached’ to the organisation and were often engaged in a longer-term relationship with the Associate. This included school and university students, and adults and young people working with cultural or third sector organisations. Outcomes for these ‘Associate participants’ were often more evident and Associates’ ongoing relationship meant they could gather feedback after the TEx event.

13.2 CONDITIONS THAT FOSTER CHANGE

‘Tate has brought people in from the margins to have important conversations and that’s a role Tate can play. I don’t want to go to a conference about this [porn literacy]... but this is a fertile space... I could imagine using this space and doing something I couldn’t do elsewhere... The atmosphere helps you let go of the paradigms you’ve been working with and think afresh.’ (Workshop participant)

Tate Exchange has ambitious objectives to affect change: to make a difference to people’s lives, to culture and society more broadly. However, as discussed in the previous section, the evaluation of participants’ experiences and outcomes was inconsistent. An analysis of Phase 1 event reports revealed that only limited evidence of participant outcomes had been gathered or presented and yet, learning teams were managing and observing events on the floor, talking to participants and often related significant encounters they witnessed or took part in. In response, the evaluator introduced storytelling as a tool for gathering this evidence for the evaluation.

In a Learning staff Evaluation Forum in January 2017 and in a TEREP Steering group meeting in February 2017, colleagues were asked to ‘tell me a story about a time when Tate Exchange made a difference to someone’s life.’ These stories (which could be written or drawn) were then analysed by the ‘author’ to ascertain the key elements of the story. This technique was also utilised with Associates at Tate Liverpool and across both sites, a total of 34 stories were collected and whilst individually these might be considered anecdotal, collectively they provide evidence of the conditions that support change.

The most common features in stories about making a difference to people’s lives were people feeling their ideas, views and contributions were valued, conversations, seeing things differently and active participation/making. Close behind were engaging with and debating ideas and societal issues, engaging with art and artists and being surprised. These findings were echoed in observations on the floor which also highlighted the importance of the extended nature of these interactions. (Further details are provided in Table 4).

Whilst findings were broadly similar in London and Liverpool, it is notable that ‘engaging with art’ was a more frequent feature in stories from Tate Liverpool than Tate Modern, perhaps reflecting the position of TEx within a gallery rather than in a separate space.
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories About...</th>
<th>Overall % of Stories with This Element (N=34)</th>
<th>% for London (N=23)</th>
<th>% for Liverpool (N=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People feeling their ideas, views and contributions are valued</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing things differently</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation/making</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with and debating societal issues</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with art</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being surprised</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with artists</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having fun and feeling welcome</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being pushed beyond their usual boundaries and being taken on a journey</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13.3 The Surprise Encounter

The stories revealed the potential of the ‘surprise encounter’ to affect change. The encounter could be with artists, strangers, an idea or issue, alternative views or creative work that resonated with the individual. Very often, however, the surprise was ‘stumbling across’ Tate Exchange itself, an encounter aided by the location of Tate Exchange on Level 5, half-way up and half-way down the Blavatnik Building, the visibility afforded by the glass walls of the space, and the public appetite for drop-in, hands-on activity. These chance encounters often resulted in people abandoning their original plans and remaining in the space as the following two examples illustrate. (See also Vignette 7 on page 73).

‘I met a group of four architects who originally arrived in the space looking for the loos but spent 45 minutes in deep conversation surrounding the photo collages – rearranging them according to shapes depicted, personal taste, dimensions and media. We all had a great chat about our ability to appreciate art and being part of it!’

(Daily report)

‘An elderly couple from Yorkshire wandered into Tate Exchange because they were looking for the toilets. They were visiting their daughter who worked in the area and had come to Tate mainly to escape the poor weather. The husband recognised some of the landscapes from the film and began asking questions. They ended up staying for almost an hour, painting, participating and speaking with the artist about their work.’

(A story from Tate Learning)

The surprise also extended to the ethos and affordances of Tate Exchange as the following story from Tate Learning illustrates.

### Guerilla Girls – Complaints Department

‘While working on the floor during the Guerrilla Girls, a woman approached me, shocked that I was drinking in an “art space”. I told her it’s fine and the public is welcome to as well. She was surprised that an organisation like Tate was so open, trusting. She mentioned she was working on a Young Peoples Programme project and the surprise she felt in having Tate be interested in her work and also having a place for her ideas/herself to be represented at Tate.’

(Storytelling image by Learning team at Phase 1 Learning team forum, 2017)
However, in some cases these encounters require courage, especially if the aim is to engage people who are less familiar with museums and galleries. The importance of ‘hosting’ the events and providing navigation is illustrated in the following feedback from a participant,

‘I don’t know how much they are advertising them and how they are telling people about it. Trying to catch people and give an explanation about what is going on and why, would be useful, would be good. For most people is a new idea to go in and get involved. You have to be brave and confident, it can be intimidating if you don’t know what is going on, having some help for people to get involved would be useful.’

13.4 LEARNING AND OUTCOMES

Learning and outcomes inevitably varied across events but a number of categories emerged where triangulated evidence (from participants, Associates, learning staff, artists and the evaluator, through observation and written, verbal and online feedback) indicated common outcomes for participants engaging in Tate Exchange in London, Liverpool and online. These categories are presented in Table 5, together with a small selection of supporting quotes and online feedback. The outcomes in the table relate to all participants. For attached ‘Associate participants’, additional areas of learning were reported and these are discussed in section 13.6.
TABLE 5 – LEARNING AND OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPANTS

OPENING MINDS – NEW UNDERSTANDING AND PERCEPTIONS ABOUT ISSUES OR CONSTITUENCIES

‘Didn’t necessarily change minds but opened minds’
(Associate)

‘Great concept, will try to get a copy of the MO report19.’
(Participant, Associate event)

“You need to know the reality of sex – porn shows glorified side not reality. I wasn’t aware of this before. Boys need this too.’
(Y11 Student at Phase 1 workshop)

'Food as a topic is endlessly fascinating, well done for making us think in depth about it.’
(Participant, Phase 1)

VALIDATION, VOICE AND VISIBILITY FOR THE EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS RESULTING IN A SENSE OF BELONGING AND OWNERSHIP AND IN NEW PERCEPTION OF SELF

TABLE 5 – LEARNING AND OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPANTS

**IMPROVED WELLBEING**
(See also Vignette 6)

‘It bought me tranquility, both the light and the music.’
(Comment Card)

‘Really kind and generous feeling, lots of sharing ideas and supporting each other.’
(Comment Card)

‘I really enjoyed my experience. It’s helped me to express my thoughts and inner emotions that I don’t usually express in everyday life.’
(Participant, Associate event)

‘Time...time is really important...always rushing but...taking time out...that’s what we need.’
(Participant, Associate event)

‘Just telling my story has been a really good beginning [towards recovery]’

‘It’s given me an identity.’

‘Art literally saved my life.’

(Artists with lived experience of mental health issues)

‘[I’m] not really vocal but to let it out, it helps me in a way.’
(Participant, Phase 1)

**NEW PERSPECTIVES ON TATE/GALLERIES**
(See also Vignette 7)

‘A participant from Romania compared her previous experience of Tate as ‘a cold place’ with her experience here which had been ‘warm and life had been brought into Tate through working directly with its visitors...It was a big surprise for me.’
(Event Report, Phase 1)

‘We like to think we have rules about how to act in a contemporary art space but this breaks those rules...I want to roll around on the floor too!’
(Participant, Associate event)

‘This totally surprised me – I thought maybe a tour of areas you don’t normally see and a talk. I didn’t expect this – to be making and having a little book to take away...Before Radical Eye, I wouldn’t think of Tate for photography but after this [indicating Tate Exposed], I will do.’
(Participant, Associate event)

‘The ‘behind the scenes day’ – that was the best part – it was really interesting and meeting the people...they were completely different to how you imagine...they were so friendly...chefs, security and...what was that guy? the Gaffer.’
(Participating student, Associate event)
### UNDERSTANDING NEW WAYS OF MAKING, WORKING AND THINKING (INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT)

- Learning about photography: ‘How loose people are, like, people cutting and ripping, whereas, I’m quite restricted. Maybe I need to loosen up.’
  - (Participating student, Associate event)

- In a survey of 18 people at one Associate event, 16 (89%) said they now felt encouraged to be more creative with their camera phones.

### EMOTIONAL RESONANCE AND REFLECTION

- ‘Very moving and intimate, made me reflect on my identity and myself in life in general.’
  - (Participant, Associate event)

- ‘I like that it will be out with the public in a park, I love that. You can come back and say, I painted one of those tiles. Leaving your mark... being part of this cool thing that’s going to endure for a while.’
  - (Participant, Phase 1)

- ‘Xanadu by day was really cool! Loved the aesthetic of the space, and talking about dreams was super interesting.’
  - (Participant, Phase 1)

- ‘Very moved by the You Are Here pop up LGBT+ display. It’s great to see other arts orgs representing us.’
  - (Participant, TExL)

- ‘As a medical doctor, my knowledge about dementia is … scientific, I would say. Visiting the exhibition space gave me a new perspective, more emotional.’
  - (Participant, TExL)
NEW INSIGHT INTO ART, HOW ART IS DEFINED AND DESCRIBED AND HOW ARTISTS WORK

"In my opinion, we usually engage with art and more generally with galleries and museums in a rather “traditional way”. We bear in mind a set of detailed rules, a specific code of conduct about how to approach artworks...we sometimes miss important aspects of artworks because we tend to look at it in only one way, catching nothing more than what our eyes can see instead of thinking out of the box, as artists have often done to create them. For this reason, I think [this] was an extremely relevant project. By enhancing the consciousness of our five senses' perceptions instead of solely focussing on sight, we learned a new approach, a new way of thinking about art which unleashes new possibilities to appreciate artworks."
(Participating student, Associate event)

"It gives you an understanding about why something was created as it was. It's good to think about the production of art – how difficult or painstaking it is."
(Participant, Phase 1)

"One of the singularities of art is to deal with the unknown, with causality. It is possible to misunderstand, commit mistakes. Also to begin something with a certain target. Without the common sense of pragmatism. Artists do not have a problem with that. And to share and experience this with other areas and practices of the society is very generous. This project, in this sense, is very generous."
(Participant, Phase 1)

"It helped me in reading and better understanding what I might see in a gallery and the work done by curators."
(Participant, Associate event)

"It's unusual how the photos (being used for the zine) focus in on things and makes you notice stuff you wouldn't otherwise (indicating the photo of a small wheel)."
(Participant, Associate event)
The atmosphere in Tate Exchange is peaceful but with a real sense of focus and purpose. W is painting a red poppy on a small piece of card. Once the painting is complete, she will add it to the growing installation of ‘Art for your Pocket’ and, later in the day, a stranger will hopefully exchange a photo of a smile for this unique artwork. W is making small, fluid strokes with the brush, intent on her task and as she works, we strike up a conversation.

W is middle-aged and on long-term sick-leave from work, ‘Stress – one week turned into a month and now six months...but I have to go back now or my pay will be halved and I couldn’t live on that...I’m dreading going back.’

A friend had told her about this event, Art in Mind, ‘She thought I’d like it’. She is supposed to be meeting the friend and was initially nervous as the friend was late. But, ‘Now I’m here, it’s fantastic! I would have come on my own. Everyone here is so friendly. I came in and was invited to get a cup of tea and the lady there [pointing to the tea station] had done one of these little paintings...so...here I am!’

W writes and performs poetry, ‘Performing frees my soul and the writing gets it out of my head...like 3.00am, I couldn’t sleep but I could write a good rant!’ Whilst on sick-leave, W has joined a free art class at a local community centre, ‘[The tutor] says I’m a graphic artist.’ She looks around the Tate Exchange space, takes in the myriad of people at workshop tables, some selecting fabric and sewing quilt squares, others making boxes that reveal their interior and exterior selves, almost everyone is engaged in quiet conversations except for the group who, with eyes closed, are undertaking a body scan in a Mindfulness taster.

‘We need this, I need this, to express myself, to feel better about myself...We need art classes in work places – that’s what we need. We need therapy too but we need art classes.’

* The activity was coordinated by SLaM AdArt groups for artists who have suffered issues of addiction in their lives and enabled service user artists who were unable to attend the event due to where they were in their recovery, to take part by providing artwork and later, receiving the photograph of a smile in return.

An Italian young man is travelling through Europe. He spent a few weeks in Scotland trying to get to know ‘the real Scotland’. He has three days in London before going to Eastern Europe. He hadn’t heard of Tate but was wandering along the river to ‘find the main sites.’ Climbing the stairs to the viewing gallery, he was intrigued by the cardboard houses and decided to take a look. When we talk, he has just taken part in a tea ceremony, led by artist Rain Wu, in one of the students’ cardboard tea houses.

‘I really enjoyed the experience, the tea ceremony and this [indicating the Tea Houses and the Tate Exchange space in general] is about bringing people together. As a traveller, if you’re foreign and have a back-pack, you’re pushed into being a tourist, put into a role of buying souvenirs; spending money, put over there [indicating, put to one side] – but this is about bringing people together and sharing...in Italy, we have a lot of art but we’re quite traditional – art is about contemplation (which can be very special) but this feels more modern – to be participative.’

The traveller talks about the varied construction techniques, the sense of freedom and ‘the big pile of abandoned cardboard’ which give the space a ‘feeling of a studio’. He decides to remain in Tate Exchange and view London from Level 5 rather than Level 10 as he feels ‘welcome here’.
13.5 TAKING ACTION

One of the indicators of success for objective 4 was that participants take (or intend to take) action as a result of their engagement with Tate Exchange. This is an area where there is very limited evidence of impact although it is important to note that action may be a long-term response and not, therefore, evident within the time-frame of this evaluation. One example of success was the formation of a new research-led, artist collective, Thick/er Black Lines, which emerged as a result of Skype conversations with Black Women Artists for Black Lives Matter20 in the UK and USA, that took place amidst the Phase 1 project Psychic Friends Network with Simone Leigh. In response to the interest generated, the group was offered space to meet and support from Tate Exchange and Learning staff to network and develop ideas that critically question the history of artistic production by Black British women and its present condition. The resulting work, We Apologise For The Delay To Your Journey – a map identifying and connecting Black British women/femme artists and cultural workers – together with associated talks and workshops, were programmed into Tate Exchange in August 2017, at a time when the space would otherwise have been closed.

Very few events included a ‘call to action’ and as Tate Exchange had no way of keeping in touch with public participants, action may also have gone unnoticed. Several Associates reported increases in social media followers and a small number also noted an increase in enquiries from artists and other people interested in finding out more about the organisation following a visit to their event at TEx. Sphere Insights reported increases in social media followers and a small number also noted that interviewees had shared information with friends and colleagues and posted about the organisation following a visit to their event at TEx. Tate Exchange had no way of keeping in touch with public participants, action may also have gone unnoticed.

Very few events included a ‘call to action’ and as Tate Exchange had no way of keeping in touch with public participants, action may also have gone unnoticed. Several Associates reported increases in social media followers and a small number also noted an increase in enquiries from artists and other people interested in finding out more about the organisation following a visit to their event at TEx. The resulting work, We Apologise For The Delay To Your Journey – a map identifying and connecting Black British women/femme artists and cultural workers – together with associated talks and workshops, were programmed into Tate Exchange in August 2017, at a time when the space would otherwise have been closed.

As part of Who are We?, The New Union Flag Project by artist Gil Mualem-Doron contained a specific call to action to support the proposal of a new flag for the UK that is representative of the various ethnic and national groups that currently live in the UK. Gil tweeted his success.

One of the online R&D projects also explored a call to action and is illustrated in Vignette B.

---

VIGNETTE B: TATE EXCHANGE ONLINE R&D – BUILDING CONTENT DRIVEN PARTICIPATION

On February 12, 2017, the main Tate Twitter account (@Tate) shared a call to action prepared by the Tate Exchange Digital Producer and Digital Project Consultant. The challenge shared a work from the Tate collection – Jonathan Leaman’s A Jan Steen Kitchen, 1995–6 – chosen specifically for its narrative potential. Arvon’s Word Exchange programme at Tate Exchange ran from 15–17 February and served as a short residency for a group of young writers from outside London.

Arvon’s Twitter account (@arvonfoundation) had 17.2k followers, and in conjunction with Tate’s @Tate 3.79m, the team believed a call could have significant reach and response. This was also an experiment in participating with an existing and frequently used hashtag (#flashfiction) to see if audiences interested in creative writing could be drawn to engage with Tate content.

OUTCOMES

The main call to action was shared on @Tate on Feb 12 (60 retweets, 104 likes, 23 responses) and every response was creative, considered, and clearly inspired by the artwork: This was retweeted by @TateExchange twice (5 retweets and 8 likes on Feb 12, 1 retweet and 4 likes on March 2, no direct responses either time) and by @Arvon (2 retweets and 2 likes, no direct responses).

Several responses were shared and retweeted on @TateExchange in March. While Arvon retweeted the original call to action, it did not disseminate it further. However, retweets included several Arvon mentors and a number of London-based arts and humanities groups. Considering the relatively niche call to action around flash fiction and literary engagement, the response was considered to be successful given the quality of contributions.

LEARNING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

• When working with Associates, liaise as early and as directly as possible. A two-week lead-in time was sufficient for Tate but was not enough time for Arvon to provide timely feedback. Likewise, the Digital Producer would have liked to sign off or at least make suggestions on copy for the tweet (above), which could have been stronger.

• Twitter responses are limited to 140 characters. This intentionally served as a challenge in this case but future opportunities could be seeded across platforms such as Instagram, which is similarly visually led but offers space for longer and possibly more in-depth responses. The trade-off with this approach would be that responses could not be shared or acknowledged directly, nor re-shared in the future.
The Tri-Borough Virtual School service supports the education, attainment and achievement of Looked After Children and Care Leavers of three London Boroughs (who may be living across Greater London and beyond). Look Both Ways involved Looked After Children aged 5 to 17, and their carers; other members in the wider social and professional networks around them; and two artists. The exchanges were between and among these people, and between them and both the collection and the staff of Tate Modern.

Over four days, the group built ‘Rovers’ with which to collect video, photographic and sound data from around Tate Modern; re-worked printed images into 3D, edited film, recorded and manipulated sound. They roamed the galleries, spoke with staff and visitors, encountered artworks and worked individually and collectively to create artworks and an exhibition space for the fifth day.

It was important that the Looked After Children took part with their immediate and sometimes wider foster-families. It was striking that the families and young people committed so much time and effort to the week: they travelled often from the outskirts of London, juggled family and other commitments and only missed sessions when it was unavoidable. One foster carer, for example, negotiated time off school for her children, whose term-dates clashed with the project. The family groups and the young people were ‘provoked’ to respond to proposals such as ‘children in care have nothing to teach adults,’ ‘modern art is only for people who’ve been to university,’ ‘there’s nothing in Tate Modern about people like us’. A genuine discussion was sought about who did and did not agree with any of these proposals. As one of the artists reflected,

‘[I] think that the above process offered participants a greater understanding of the creative process and a set of tools to engage with contemporary art in their own terms and make sense of the experience by themselves.’

(Artist, Albert Potrony)

Those unfamiliar with Tate Modern (the great majority) had their first experience of it, and a much richer one than a single visit a family or school might have offered. The perception that Tate Modern is a place for ‘insiders’ was one the project changed.

‘This project allowed the groups to enter the gallery initially as makers, then as explorers, and collectors of content – and then, only with this context, as audience. The project shape really subverted the normal relationship, and brought the participants to a level where it felt to me that they could stand eye to eye with the artists who inhabit the gallery and say, “Yes, I matter, I belong here”.’

(Artist, Gawain Hewitt)

Two months after Look Both Ways, the group of young people and their families returned to Tate Exchange with the project coordinator. They participated in You Are Welcome (the space was closed that day but Tate Exchange staff opened it specifically for this group). The Tate Exchange Production Coordinator observed, ‘It was powerful for them to return and feel total ownership of the space again. The space and privacy also really allowed them to get stuck into the tasks, with lots of deep conversation happening at the tables while they worked.’

‘The carers are hugely appreciative of Tate Exchange and want to keep coming back. They all noted incredible growth in the children over their week at TEx and were very thankful of the opportunity to reflect on it today over the ‘stories’ especially. [One young person’s] carer was particularly moved by her stories and said she hadn’t heard her talk like that before.’

(Tate Exchange Production Coordinator)
13.6 ADDITIONAL LEARNING AND OUTCOMES FOR ‘ASSOCIATE PARTICIPANTS’

It is important to stress that in some cases, Tate Exchange was a ‘pop-up’ within a longer-term project with ‘Associate participants’ and reported outcomes are therefore, in part, attributable to this extended project. Tate Exchange was mostly the impetus for these longer-term projects, however, and sometimes also provided the lever required to secure funding for the project.

The ways in which Tate Exchange changed people’s perceptions of Tate and galleries and museums in general has been illustrated in the outcome table above. Evidence suggests that these shifts and revelations were particularly insightful for young people engaged as ‘Associate participants’, as the following two quotes illustrate (see also Vignette 9 on previous page).

‘Changed my view about galleries and museums differently as I thought it was for old people...art isn’t just about pictures and stuff. It’s also about ideas.’
(Young person outside mainstream education)

‘The experience helped to completely remove certain preconceptions about museum visitors as “predominantly passive” in the museum experience, I identify that every individual has the potential to generate interesting conversations using their personal experiences regardless (if) their previous exposure with art or cultural products. Enhancing the idea of a museum as a place for a meaningful experiences and not as a “three-dimensional art history lesson”’
(University student)

Other outcomes reported specifically for ‘Associate participants’ are listed below with supporting evidence. (All quotes are from participants unless otherwise indicated).

DEVELOPING PRACTICE

The experimental nature of Tate Exchange, the affordances of the space and interaction with the public supported the development of participants’ practice. Associates and artists noted increased creativity and confidence to take risks:

‘We had feedback from the audience which really let us get a different feel to the music we composed. It was a special place and inspired us to be more creative.’
(University student)

‘It is interesting to see that actually if you abandon your usual discipline then it opens up so much creative potential. As just meeting new people reveals enough commonalities between a diverse group in which we can create a new language to our art.’
(University student)

‘It’s good to go outside solitary practice, to get opinions from people who are not designers, to hear other perspectives.’
(University student)

‘We had a limited number of photos: around 20. Personally, I had more like 200! So you had to edit and be selective and think, for example, what’s behind the image.’
(School student)

‘It is clear that initially the students found public participation a struggle, however, as the week progressed their understanding of how, when, with whom and the why of public engagement changed, as well as their views on socially engaged practice (as relates to their own practice).’
(University Tutor)

INCREASED CONFIDENCE AND OTHER SOCIAL SKILLS

One Associate’s project was the culmination of a year-long programme for young people aged 18–24 years old from a deprived community. The programme aimed to develop the artistic and social skills of a core group of eight young people facing a range of challenges. The young people completed feedback forms before and after the TEx event, documenting their experiences and tracking their personal progress. ‘Using a scale of 0–5 (0 being least and 5 the most) they assessed the extent to which they felt able to express themselves, comfortable experimenting and trying new things and more confident about doing new things. The participants’ scores at the start of the project had a median score of 2. After TEx, the participants’ scores ranged from 3 to 5 and the median score was 4. A particularly high scoring metric after the project was: ‘I am amazed by what I’ve achieved’, with all participants scoring a 4 or 5’

‘Before, I found it difficult in social situations. I am trying to improve my confidence. I hope to achieve different things in my life as [a result] of this experience.’
(Young person facing social exclusion)

Confidence was both personal and artistic,

‘The impact for the ViM over-60’s group was immense. To have members cornering us to express interest in future performative ideas for the groups is evidence I feel of a confidence that the artistic direction of the group need not always be directed from “above”.’
(Creative practitioner)
IMPROVED MOTIVATION, AMBITION AND CLARITY
FOR FUTURE CAREERS AND CREATIVE WORK

The experience of being part of a project in a major art institution combined with the development and inspiration provided through artist-led projects, resulted in raising motivation and ambition.

‘Two students from [the participating college] who were not going to apply for university places were motivated to do so through work with [the artist].’
(Event report)

‘Working at Tate makes me want to be more enterprising. It’s really exciting to be part of something engaging new ideas of how to, and who to, engage with art.’
(School student)

‘This has made me decide I want to be a business man when I’m older. I’m going to go into business.’
(Young person outside mainstream education)

IMPROVED LEADERSHIP, COMMUNICATION AND OTHER EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS

Eight young people working with the John Hansard Gallery on the Department for Doing Nothing achieved an Arts Award (from Discover to Bronze). Other outcomes included:

‘Postgraduate and undergraduate students involved in the delivery of workshops developed employability skills and confidence communicating their ideas in a high profile public forum.’
(University Tutor)

‘I learnt how to practically develop a fundraising strategy, approach and attract sponsors, draw agreements and develop an understanding of fundraising methods and challenges. It was a new and extremely useful experience... Overall, I believe the project enabled me to gain skills regarding the development of an event, from the beginning to end, and about effective collaboration and team working. Additionally, having the opportunity to collaborate with such an important museum as Tate it was very exciting and I hope it will help my CV. I feel I had the chance to deliver a professional project, beyond the university’s walls.’
(University student)

WHAT HAS CHANGED FOR ASSOCIATES AND ARTISTS AS A RESULT OF TATE EXCHANGE?

ARE THE NEW NETWORKS AND PARTNERSHIPS WITH ASSOCIATES AND ARTISTS AFFECTING CHANGE?

14.1 LEARNING AND OUTCOMES FOR ASSOCIATES

During the Associates’ day in May 2017 and in event reports, Associates identified personal and organisational change resulting from Tate Exchange. Common areas of change with brief examples are listed below:

• NEW LINKS, PARTNERSHIPS AND UNDERSTANDING ABOUT PARTNERSHIP WORKING
  ‘New understanding of hidden labour required to make this happen.’
  (The university) have invested a significant amount in this project, with a key focus on a possible impact narrative for REF2021. Without TEx, we could not have accessed the range of partners making this project a possibility.’
  (See also Vignette 10 on page 84).

• INCREASED OPENNESS TO INTERNAL COLLABORATION
  ‘The programme underscored synergies between departments at [the university] and possibilities for future collaborative activities.’

• CHANGING AND IMPROVING PRACTICE; PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
  ‘Lived experience – better understanding of what we are capable of and how to manage large numbers, expectations and increase engagement.’
  ‘New and exciting ways in which socially engaged artistic practice may be used to interrogate political issues.’

• GREATER APPRECIATION OF THE NEED FOR AND COMPLEXITIES OF EVALUATION
  ‘Evaluation, not just documentation.’
  ‘Starting with a research question/what are we testing? – not just an activity.’

• IMPROVED AWARENESS AND PROFILE OF CREATIVE LEARNING WITHIN INSTITUTIONS
  ‘Greater understanding of the layers of institutional obstacles and opened up questions around motivation for such spaces in museums and galleries.’

  ‘The status of the TEx association has supported internal advocacy for Learning and Participation and Research activity, which in turn initiated the re-directing of internal marketing resource resulting in the highest social media presence these departments have had to date.’
14.2 LEGACY FOR ASSOCIATES

Together with the more immediate outcomes outlined above, Associates reported on the legacy of their Tate Exchange events which included dissemination through publications and conferences, new relationships and new strands of activity or strategic developments. In some cases, Tate Exchange has been instrumental in wide-scale institutional change as the following quote from one University illustrates,

“The Digital Maker Collective approach and its involvement in public/social engagement events at Tate Exchange has helped underpin some major new initiatives at CCW which address curriculum/pedagogic development and student engagement, spaces, open collaboration and social/public interaction.”

Other examples of legacy included:

• The London CLC shared findings from their project at the CLC primary conference in June 2017. They also plan to share findings with their European Erasmus partners in Sweden, the Netherlands and Denmark, and with partner organisation Dreamyard Project in the Bronx NYC.

• Kettle’s Yard is producing a publication, Conditions for Creative Communities drawing on their event.

• Through ANDInclusive, the Vale School has made connections with other SEND bands and is exploring progression routes for their students.

• Several of the installations at Who Are We? have since travelled to sites across London, York and Bournemouth. And three of them – Alketa Xhafa Mripa’s Refugees Welcome, Gil Mualem-Doron’s New Union Flag and Richard De Domenichi’s Shed your Fears – will travel in a cluster, via Counterpoints Arts, to Who Are We? partners at Loughborough in November 2017.

• One of Royal Holloway’s workshops, Interdisciplinary Futurism will be presented as a case study at two conferences: the School History Project International Summer Conference and the Society for Italian Studies in Hull.

• The Digital Maker Collective (UAL) has been approached to deliver similar workshops for Somerset House, Tate Kids and by UAL Academic Support, to provide CPD on Documenting Visual Thinking in VR.

• Industry collaborations established for and through the Digital Art Making School are developing into more formal collaborations with UAL and leading to live projects and internships.

• Many of the objects and stories shared during State of the Nation have become part of the Museum of Homelessness’ collection and archive, and a future learning resource is in development.

• Based on feedback from participants at Open Eye Gallery’s Culture Shifts (TExL), SURF and photographer Tadhg Devlin are working on the next steps of their collaboration. The photographer is submitting an ACE application to support further research and development to work in collaboration with individuals living with Dementia across the region and specifically those from BAME backgrounds.
Established in 1977, Valleys Kids is a Community Development Organisation based in the South Wales Valleys. At its heart, it is about changing lives for the better, working with some of the most marginalised communities in Europe. Valleys Kids develops innovative projects in play, youth and family work in which the arts have a central role.

The Artistic Director (AD) of Artworks (working with young people in and through the arts) at Valleys Kids, was interviewed before the launch of Tate Exchange and again in February 2017 by consultant, Nicki Setterfield, one area of discussion focussed on the affiliations and networks established through Tate Exchange.

During the development of Tate Exchange, Associates had an opportunity to meet each other and form alliances of interest. The AD emphasised the importance of, ‘Not having ready designed groups to network within; it is part of the pleasure and really important that we forge these relationships ourselves. Often, when groups are placed together, it is for outside gain, this isn’t.’ Valleys Kids is in discussion with two Associates (London Connected Learning Centre and Room 13 Hareclive in Bristol) about potential future projects but in April 2017, was a partner in the collaborative and highly successful TEx event, Fairground.

During the Associates days, four organisations based in East Kent formed a group: Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU), University of Kent (UKC), People United and Whitstable Biennale. Although Valleys Kids does not share the geographical base, the common industrial heritage of the coal industry created a bridge and the organisation joined the collaboration. The fact that both universities were represented by departments of Politics and International Relations was, perhaps significant for this alliance. The group’s network drew in other partners including Gulbenkian (the University of Kent’s Arts Centre), Astor College for the Arts in Dover, the Live Art Development Agency, the Sidney Cooper Gallery (ICCU) and five lead artists.

In the earlier interview, the AD stated, ‘I feel it is vital that those relationships happen within communities and not just at Tate.’ The distance between Wales and Kent could have prevented the realisation of this aim but the network formed through Tate Exchange enabled funding for two Valleys Kids visits to Canterbury to be split between CCCU, UKC and Gulbenkian. During the first visit, a group of women from the Valleys’ community met partners at the two universities, choreographer, Gary Clarke, whose piece Coal, was touring to Gulbenkian and young people from Art 31 at Gulbenkian. This latter encounter served to highlight differences between young people from these two mining areas, with young people from The Valleys defined by their connection to mining in a way that is not the case in Kent. The women became informal teachers, recounting the tragedy of Aberfan and the AD reported how shocked the women were that ‘educated young people’ in Kent didn’t know about this incident. On the way home in the car, one woman reflected, ‘Do you know what that has taught me? We talk about grandchildren and life in general all the time but we should make time to talk about the more important stuff as well.’

For the AD, the fact that the contractual agreement is with Tate rather than the other partners was important, ‘It gives everyone the freedom to get on and work collaboratively rather than worry how we are funding the project and who is doing what to raise it...I can’t tell you what that does to your relationship with the project, especially if you are the person responsible for that [funding] side.’ Returning to the AD’s aim for relationships to be built across communities, in the run-up to Fairground, she stated, ‘Feels like we are journeying out towards each other before we all reach London together. East and West, equal value’.

![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

*Peace & Judy co-created by Anne Culverhouse-Evans and Hollie Mackenzie at Fairground, Tate Exchange 2017. Photo: Jason Pay*
14.3 LEARNING AND OUTCOMES FOR ARTISTS

At some events, artists met for the first time which in the case of three digital artists at one event, resulted in a decision to collaborate in the future. Other events brought artists together in new collaborations which led to new practices. The artists and performers from Corali and Intoart, for example, were able to develop new ways of working through their collaboration with the visual artists incorporating live and performative practice and the dancers incorporating research methods, producing written and drawn responses to the chosen artist in the galleries.

For the events curated by BP Art Exchange, the artists were rooted in socially engaged practice but the student artists (from University of the Arts London) they were mentoring were working in this way for the first time. Moving their practice from solitary to participatory was often challenging but ultimately beneficial, as one student described, ‘There were a couple of times where I was really proven wrong, the model magic was more useful than drawing which was more inhibiting as a tool for exchange. The authorship – you can stand behind it – but everything else is the process and compromise.’

Who Are We? engaged 22 artists and was a collaboration between four Associates: Counterpoints Arts, The Open University, Loughborough University and the University of Warwick, with additional contributions from Goldsmiths University of London, the Stuart Hall Foundation, Universal Design Studio and Graphic Thought Facility. At the time of writing, Counterpoint was still in the process of gathering detailed feedback from the artists about how the experience had influenced their practice. The nature of the collaboration across cultural and academic institutions, however, was one beneficial factor highlighted in the event report,

‘The process and methodology as a whole enabled the artists to enter into longitudinal conversations with academic partners (and interestingly in disciplines outside the fine arts, such as Politics, Sociology, Digital Cultures and Literature), with Counterpoints Arts mentoring artists throughout. many of the artists have commented on the value of these exchanges.’

For artists with socially engaged practice or for those sharing existing or new iterations of previous work, the experience at Tate Exchange often served to reinforce and validate ideas about public participation. One Associate described the impact on an artist who highlights issues of homelessness in his work, ‘It has validated and underscored [the artist’s] views about the potential of art to change society and has inspired him to take on even more ambitious projects in the future. “I never expected to make such an impact with my artwork or ever show at a place like Tate Exchange.”

Similarly, a theorist working in Phase 1 believed the events offered some ‘ratification’ of her belief that these ‘keywords’ resonate with audiences and that they are ‘fraught and subject to debate’. The events also led her to consider ‘which formats allow people to linger and think through an issue, which formats allow for engagement, and situations in which particular terms might be effectively used.’

In debrief meetings with Learning teams, many other artists described the way their experiences raised questions about the event, about practice and about Tate Exchange. Referring to Three Tables, for example, Tim Etchells asked, ‘What would the difference be if the tables were in the galleries?’ He also debated the ‘offer’ to the public that engaged some members of the public for extended periods of time in often, unexpected and intense conversations with strangers, but was ‘not for everyone.’ At the weekend, for example, what is the offer for families?
LEARNING AND OUTCOMES FOR TATE

WHAT IS TATE LEARNING FROM THIS ‘OPEN EXPERIMENT’?
IS CHANGE EVIDENT ACROSS TATE?

12.1 CHANGING PRACTICE

Reflections from Learning staff indicate that Tate Exchange has raised the profile and status of Learning and Research within Tate. It has extended notions of what a learning programme can be (in relation to space, time, content and method) and encouraged a greater acceptance of risk and failure as you cannot have pre-conceived ideas of the outcomes. However, there is a challenge of having to ‘let go of certainty’ with the associated ‘anxiety of not knowing’ for staff. Staff reported that experimentation and permission to fail are endorsed by senior staff in Learning but are not always embraced by other departments.

In a number of recent presentations, the Director of Learning has talked about Learning staff and Tate being ‘responsible to a constituency’ rather than ‘responsible for a constituency such as school children’ – the latter removes agency from the learners whilst the former suggests listening and dialogue. This new discourse needs to inform future plans. Formative learning from Phase 1 within and between teams has resulted in a new approach to programming for Year 2 of Tate Exchange that emphasises cross-team and cross-departmental working to curate a smaller number of longer projects. As the programme is open to all ages, cross-team collaboration maximises relevant expertise but requires sufficient lead-in time and clear articulation of project aims, and agreement on how best each team can contribute.

As outlined in section 8.1 above, the selection of, and invitation to artists and Associates are central to realising the programme’s aim and securing Learning curators’ agency. Through the Associates’ programme in particular, Tate Exchange increased understanding about diversifying audiences. Tate Exchange introduced new issues and agendas for Tate that have sometimes called on the expertise and negotiating powers of the Director’s Office, Corporate Communications, Legal, Security, Learning and TEx staff. Whilst demanding, this has revealed a willingness for people to accommodate change and has resulted in institutional learning such as new protocols on showing explicit materials derived from the legal implications of showing pornography during one Phase 1 event.

15.2 CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR TATE

In research with senior leaders at Tate about Tate Exchange, ‘difference’ was a recurrent theme: ‘a different way to present what Tate offers’ bringing ‘different people to Tate’ meaning ‘we feel like a different institution in TEx.’ Tate Exchange represents an institutional shift from ‘broadcast’ or ‘deficit’ model (‘We tell you how to look at, think about and experience art’) to a learner-centred model in which you start with the experiences and interests of diverse participants and ask, ‘Tell us why art, and what art, matters to you.’ This means actively seeking out and welcoming ‘other’ voices and listening to what these voices say. In many ways, this describes the ‘audience first’ model to which Tate subscribes but it is still a relatively new paradigm for some and as a result, Tate Exchange is seen by some as a pioneer and by others, a challenge.

It is important to note that whilst Tate Exchange represents new terrain for Tate, it is not necessarily new for the sector. The Imperative for Change (see section 2.2) outlined the shifting landscape in cultural learning in 2006 and participants in The Sphere Insights research suggested that art museums and larger galleries ‘are behind the curve’;

‘It is new for Tate but not ground-breaking. I go to a lot of art exhibitions at smaller galleries’

‘I think actually this is the direction of travel for a lot of galleries of how they are considering how they engage in the future.

During Year 1, there was limited but successful collaboration between Tate Exchange and Curatorial staff. One Learning curator from Public Programmes, for example, reported, ‘We received very positive feedback and support from our colleagues in Curatorial for this project...and this has helped their thinking for the upcoming Soul of a Nation.’

There are opportunities for Tate Exchange to work more closely with Curatorial and other departments such as Library and Archive. Tate Exchange has the ability to be agile and responsive, attracting more diverse audiences and acting as a testing ground for ideas, surfacing areas of practice, concern and interest for the institution as a whole.

‘The problem with the current permanent Tate Modern collection is that it is not nimble enough to be truly reflective of our current concerns. They need to show works like this that are immediate responses to our rollercoaster world. There is no better illustration of this than Finding Fanon’s commentary comparing the racist imagery of Enoch Powell and Donald Trump.’

Concerns were raised by senior staff about the physical and programmatic position of Tate Exchange within Tate Modern, with calls for ‘The TEx approach to be more present and integrated across the institution...not just something that Anna [Cutler] does, it needs to be something that Tate does.’ Over the course of the year, several developments supported such integration including the Director of Learning joining the Content Meeting at Tate Modern (which makes programmatic decisions across the museum) and closer ties cultivated with Curatorial. Ways of integrating the Tate Exchange programme and ethos within the institution could usefully be explored further and the following comment from the Director of Tate Modern, makes a commitment to do so,
‘Tate Exchange has significantly informed our thinking and planning at Tate Modern and is central to the vision for the museum going forward. Across the organisation, we have learnt a great deal in this first year and there is considerable goodwill and commitment to fully embed Tate Exchange, learn from the challenges and build on its successes.’

Despite the reservations voiced around visibility, Tate Exchange brought the learning process into a public arena; it revealed what has often been hidden behind closed doors in the Clore Studio and other ‘learning spaces.’ The public response to Tate Exchange was overwhelmingly positive and the enthusiasm for conversations and making and learning with art, surpassed all expectations. It is important that staff across Tate appreciate the characteristics of high quality in learning. Whilst practices, aesthetics or notions of ‘quality’ may vary, there is no hierarchy, just difference. The following quote from a senior leader at Tate highlights the budgetary constraints of Tate Exchange,

‘We are an organisation that prides itself on visual culture. There is an aspect of ‘bannerishness’ about (TEx)...looking like a jumble sale. The kit at TEx isn’t quite good enough...tinfoil, string, vinyl banners, paper and sticky stuff...a nursery school aesthetic.’

The comment also suggests a need to communicate further the value of making visible the processes of creative making and learning which are complex, unpredictable, sometimes fun, sometimes upsetting and frequently messy. At Experiments in Practice, Melanie Keen, Director of Iniva spoke of the danger that discussions around diversity can ‘result in a single story that flattens experience’ in which the discussion is less about diversity and more about ‘the conditions and anxieties it creates.’ She suggested rather an ambition to be, ‘At home with strangeness’ and this feels like an appropriate aim for Tate.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 4

- Recognise that for many people, Tate Exchange is a transient, fun experience that may lift their mood, make them feel good about Tate but will not necessarily make a difference to their life. The evaluation has identified the factors that are most likely to foster change for participants, however, and these should inform future programming.
- Explore further how Tate Exchange makes a difference to people’s lives, including tracking these changes over time and working in partnership with Associates to do so.
- Encourage Tate Learning staff, artists and Associates to learn from each other through shared programming, conversation, observation of practice, reflection and evaluation.
- Extend cross-departmental communication and collaboration at Tate, embedding understanding of Tate Exchange and extending the practices of co-creation, listening and responsive programming.
- Consider how people’s contributions can be translated into action and ‘making a difference.’
CONCLUDING REMARKS

In June 2017, towards the end of the first year of Tate Exchange, a new report was published as part of Kings College London’s Cultural Enquiry. At the heart of the report is a call for a radical but pragmatic new approach to understanding and enabling cultural opportunity. The authors state,

“Our research shows that cultural creativity requires a number of enabling conditions which, in combination, constitute the substantive freedom to co-create versions of culture. What is required for cultural creativity varies considerably across circumstances. But it very often involves the substantive freedom to play (and try things), to spend time with other people (to affiliate), and to make sustained use of our imagination, senses and capacities for thought. Taken together, substantive freedoms such as these enable people to pursue and realise cultural creativity, thereby co-creating a version of culture. This condition of substantive, social freedom is what we call cultural capability.”

It is striking that these freedoms are those that have been highlighted through the evaluation of Tate Exchange and which have been found to foster change for participants. In reflection and evaluation sessions during Phase 3, Learning staff and Associates were asked to rate the achievement of Tate Exchange, thus far. The ratings varied between the objectives and between individuals and organisations but averages ranged between 5.5 and 7.3 out of 10. In further discussion, it was apparent that there was much to celebrate but also more to be done, and the recommendations throughout this report summarise suggested action.

In the Guardian interview cited at the start of this report, Director of Tate, Maria Balshaw was asked, “So what does she want people to feel after a visit to a Tate gallery?”

“I would like them to feel that they’ve seen the most adventurous art, been part of a conversation about what that art is and to feel comfortable, which seems like an easy word, but it really isn’t. We absolutely need to be speaking to the whole of our society.”

Evidence from this evaluation indicates that Tate Exchange has taken great strides towards achieving this vision. Audiences are more diverse though not yet sufficiently representative of all sections of society. Conversation has flourished and Tate Exchange has been especially successful in creating an environment in which people feel comfortable, which as Maria Balshaw points out, is no mean feat.
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