Paul Hamlyn Foundation has supported engagement and participation work over many years. We believe that people of all ages can realise their potential through meaningful involvement with the arts and learning.

When Tate approached us to underpin their Transforming Tate Learning (TTL) programme, we soon realised that they were considering quite a radical transformation of their practice, by placing learning at the heart of the organisation. They wanted to re-think their engagement and education work, trialling new approaches. The TTL project has supported the research and development of an innovative evaluative framework within which to assess new learning activity, enabled staff professional development and brought about a series of experimental projects designed to challenge current perceptions and practices associated with gallery learning. The final element of TTL is the dissemination of this activity, of which this publication piloted as part of TTL.

TTL has enabled more strategic thinking, planning and implementation within the organisation and with peers outside of it. It has put in place more effective processes to develop and evaluate new programmes, learning work better. It has provided the context for Circuit: A National Youth Network for the Visual Arts. This scheme, funded through a gift to mark the Foundation's recent 25th anniversary, involves the four Tate galleries and firstsite, MOSTYN, Nottingham Contemporary, Whitworth Art Gallery, and Wyvern Arts Centre with Kettle's Yard. Circuit is the largest ever youth-led programme in gallery education in the UK, and gives Tate an opportunity to share findings with partners and to learn from them – and to implement on a national scale some of the work piloted as part of TTL.

Paul Hamlyn Foundation is proud to have supported Tate at a time of transition through Transforming Tate Learning.

The principles have been to integrate evaluation and reflection into everyday practice (action research) and to be open to critique, seeking out feedback and interrogation. This confident approach has led to programmes and projects of quality and impact. It has introduced the idea of change and encouraged risk-taking.

We undertook research that showed us that there was an imperative for change. What we were doing and the spaces we were using didn't fulfil the changing needs of our public. We were doing things differently or we will simply continue to 'get what we get'. The world is changing and we need to change with it.

The main body of this document takes you through the detail of our approach which begins with our values and ends with examples of what we are finding that has prompted changes in what we do. However, there were some initial decisions, which begin with our values and ends with examples of what we are finding that has prompted changes in what we do. However, there were some initial decisions, which begin with our values and ends with examples of what we are finding that has prompted changes in what we do.

Paul Hamlyn Foundation is proud to have supported Tate at a time of transition through Transforming Tate Learning.

The aim of this resource is to share the approach we have undertaken in the last two years to Transform Tate Learning. Its ups and downs, successes and failures, so that we can make visible what happens when you take on change in a large institution, what the values and rewards are when you do so, and what outcomes emerge for those taking part. It's not a walk in the park and challenges are part of the package. But I have always believed that 'if you do what you do, you get what you get' and if we want to improve what we do, to be of real relevance and value, create new ideas, agency with our public and continue to learn ourselves, then we need to do things differently or we will simply continue to 'get what we get'. The world is changing and we need to change with it.

The team to include research on an ongoing basis, is widely recognised to be the primary role of Tate.

• Trustees wanted to better understand the impact of our work and wanted us to be more integrated into the organisation, bringing learning more to the heart of what Tate does. A positive value was therefore given to learning institutionally.
• We had to question our assumptions and values about what we do. We had to start with uncertainty, honesty and both external and self-critique.
• A strategy was written and endorsed by senior staff at Tate who supported the idea of change and encouraged risk-taking.
• We undertook research that showed us that there was an imperative for change. What we were doing and the spaces we were using didn't fulfil the changing needs of our public.
• We genuinely wanted to dig deeper into what is actually going on for participants when they engage with our work – what are they (and the institution) actually learning and what does this mean? We know that we needed to create new processes for finding this out. What we were doing wasn't giving us the answers.
• Maximising impact meant change across the entire team, not focusing on a single project or area within our work. Therefore the whole of Learning needed to be involved and the approach developed from their practice, not imposed as another 'to do'.
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This resource follows on from these initial provocations. It takes you through our process in order that you might critique it, use bits of it, improve on it, challenge or change it. It represents one way of approaching change; we recognise that there are others and that this looks different in different contexts. We are still in the process, still learning, still figuring out what makes for meaningful engagement today and how conditions can best be created to do this as best we can to make a difference.

Learning, as we understand it, concerns itself with profound processes of change: personal, social, imaginative and cognitive. Change is continuous; it never stands still. This means that we can’t either and that there is no such thing as an ‘end point’. Therefore consider this resource as a visual, textual, map of our movements and the route we are taking to tomorrow.

Discussions during one of the monthly cross-site Learning meetings

This is a response to the question ‘What do we want to get out of this?’ which was posed at the first of the Positively Disgruntled meetings.
In London (Tate Britain and Tate Modern) and at Tate Liverpool and Tate St Ives we have teams that work across:

- Adult Programmes (which includes Public Programmes, Access and Community)
- Young Peoples Programmes (which works with young people aged 15–25)
- Schools and Teachers
- Early Years and Families
- Interpretation
- Digital platforms

All members of the team across all four Tate sites were involved in the Transforming Tate Learning programme, as well as a number of colleagues within Tate from beyond Learning. We worked closely with two external experts: Steve Seidel (Learning Research Fellow) and Eileen Carnell (Learning Critical Friend).

Transforming Tate Learning (TTL) provided a rare and valuable opportunity to embark on an institutional and practice change programme that aimed to transform Tate’s learning offer through three strands:

- Thedesignandimplementationofanewapproachtoprogramme
- Initialimplementationofthoseprocessesandsubsequent
- Thedesignofprocessesfortransformingtheeducational
- Completingthehiringprocessesforthenewpositions
- Theentirerestructureofthestaffingofthedepartment,

Please note that this is a partial list and does not adequately acknowledge that programming never ceased; in other words, school groups, adults, families have kept coming to the museum 364 days a year, expecting – and receiving – support for their learning experiences in the two museums. The numbers of people involved in these programmes traditionally have been large, but here conceptualised as absolutely interconnected and mutually dependent.

The TTL programme has had a profound and positive impact on Tate’s learning practice and on the place that learning occupies within Tate itself. It has also shaped the experience of those participating in our programmes, enabling greater participation and deeper learning (see for example the findings from the Open Studio pilot project and the A is for Britain pilot). The process has taken longer than anticipated (we recognise will never be ‘finished’) and we have needed to return again to some aspects to ensure that we have fully understood and learnt from them before moving on. Without question, however, this time and degree of attention and flexibility has been vital to the success of the programme.

Uppermost was the desire to shape and implement the programme in order to develop authentic best practice in the long term, to bring about improved experiences for our participants. In doing this, we needed to take account of the fact that the four Tate sites were at different stages organisationally, and had rich and varied histories of working. Each had different priorities and needs as well as challenges and the TTL programme was structured to accommodate these and to bring all four sites into closer synergy. Judgements were made on the basis of trialling new ways of working, and strengthening the teams and programme to ensure that the implemented changes were sustainable. This meant that TTL did not always follow the predicted trajectory. For instance the process has taken longer than anticipated (we recognise will never be ‘finished’) and we have needed to return again to some aspects to ensure that we have fully understood and learnt from them before moving on. Without question, however, this time and degree of attention and flexibility has been vital to the success of the programme.

The TTL programme has had a profound and positive impact on Tate’s learning practice and on the place that learning occupies within Tate itself. It has also shaped the experience of those participating in our programmes, enabling greater participation and deeper learning (see for example the findings from the Open Studio pilot project and the A is for Britain pilot). The process has been complex, but the conversations that have taken place, the opportunity to develop new practice through pilot projects, and the structures and processes we have put in place, have together changed our thinking and the work we do.
Five actions we think worked well

• Initiating cross-site research meetings that initially set out our plans and then involved presentations by each team in turn over nine months on the role of research within their work – this generated knowledge and an ever-deepening respect for each other’s work.

• Giving team members time out of the office to visit sites of exemplary practice, and positive impact on programme and visitors’ expectations of the sessions themselves.

• Having consistent and ongoing meetings with senior managers, and again.

• Conversations need to happen repeatedly – some issues need to be returned to and re-examined time and again.

• Terms like ‘evaluation’ and ‘values’ are complicated by each team in turn over nine months on the process, share their values and be able to articulate them, with the support of trusted external colleagues.

• Meeting with the ‘Positively Disgruntled’ Group to interrogate issues of quality in relation to our practice – having meetings that are open and honest really shifts thinking, although we recognise that we needed to be clearer about our collective intentions, impacts on people’s ability to step back and reflect.

• The pressure to keep programming, however good and sustainable; evaluation becomes a vital part of learning, rather than the tedious task to be completed at the end of a project.

Five things we wish we’d known before we started

• This process will not be finished in two years – this will only be the beginning.

• Terms like ‘evaluation’ and ‘values’ are complicated – there needs to be exploration and discussion with all those involved in the process, to enable people to feel comfortable with how such terms are understood within this process.

• Conversations need to happen repeatedly – some issues need to be returned to and re-examined time and again.

• This is a process that absolutely and necessarily has to be supported and directed by senior managers, but must also be owned and shaped by every team member – balancing this can be challenging at times.

• This process will not be finished in two years – this will only be the beginning.

• Conversations need to happen repeatedly – some issues need to be returned to and re-examined time and again.

Identifying effective learning practices was not difficult. Good practice is linked with dialogue, collaboration, sharing and so on – the most frequently quoted set of related values. However, identifying how values might be manifest in learning activities was more challenging. Thoughts around this included that visitors would need to be supported and directed by senior managers, but must also be owned and shaped by every team member – balancing this can be challenging at times.

The values-based evaluation framework

A key element of the TTL programme involved reframing evaluation. We wanted to move away from old models that were generally seen to be unsatisfactory, and we were keen to avoid replicating mechanisms that were too cumbersome and prescriptive (and hence inappropriate to the practice itself), or to implement approaches that failed to provide insights that were useful, either in terms of accounting for the activity or informing better practice going forward.

In discussion with Steve and Eileen, we formulated an approach to evaluation that involved the teams moving through five interconnected stages. These stages have themselves been reconfigured through the experience of implementing them, but can be summarised in the five points shown on the next page.

Having developed the framework, we then put in place a series of structured meetings with Eileen Carnell, the Learning Critical Friend, and each of the Learning teams across all the Tate sites and the Learning Senior Management Team to support staff to move through and engage with the different stages. Each of these meetings was documented and between meetings staff were invited to reflect on what was discussed and prepare for the follow-up sessions.

Once again the model was one of a combination of action and reflection, with change being supported through facilitated dialogue. The adoption of the values-based framework and the approach we took to implement it were carefully considered. Fundamentally we believe in the importance of knowing and articulating clearly why we undertake particular programming in order to account for its effectiveness.

Specifically we identify that taking a values-based process-led approach to evaluation enables us to:

• be accountable to our values

• embed rigour and reflexivity in our programme

• identify if it is working

• ask the right questions at the right time

• help us keep track of what is happening, when and why

• use appropriate data collection methods for each activity

• share what we are trying to do with others

This evaluation approach enables teams to take ownership of the process, ensuring that it is active and sustainable; evaluation becomes a vital part of learning, rather than the tedious task to be completed at the end of a project.

These values were identified during a team brainstorming session in January 2013. They formed the basis for a longer discussion and reminded us where we had got to...
VALUES-BASED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

1 IDENTIFYING WHAT OUR CORE VALUES ARE AND WHAT WE CONSIDER ARE THE NECESSARY CONDITIONS FOR LEARNING

2 ARTICULATING IN DETAIL HOW THESE VALUES ARE MANIFESTED IN PRACTICE – WHAT THE ACTIVITY ENTAILS AND WHAT WE EXPECT TO SEE

3 IDENTIFYING THE PROCESSES AND MECHANISMS THAT NEED TO BE IN PLACE TO ENABLE US TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS HAPPENING AND TO ACCOUNT FOR THE EXPERIENCE OF THOSE PARTICIPATING

4 DRAWING TOGETHER AND ANALYSING OUR FINDINGS IN ORDER TO DEVELOP BROADER UNDERSTANDINGS AND TO BUILD THEORY

5 ENSURING THAT WHAT WE FIND THROUGH THIS PROCESS FEEDS BACK INTO PRACTICE AND IS DISSEMINATED APPROPRIATELY.

The aim of putting into place evaluation principles that derive from the values manifested in the work of all the teams rather than being implemented from top-down fits well with the overall philosophy of Tate’s learning programmes within a democratic society. This is an excellent way of making the process visible and provides a useful and important record.

Eileen Carnell
Learning Critical Friend

The process of implementing the Values-Based Evaluation framework was represented diagrammatically by some of those involved – this is Eileen Carnell’s Learning Critical Friend’s version.
Identifying what our core values are and what we consider to be the necessary conditions for learning:

This first stage of the process involved many conversations—between Eileen Carroll and each of the teams, within the teams themselves, across the teams at the Learning cross-site research meetings and with Eileen again. These conversations are ongoing and have been challenging at times, but it is something we return to time and again, not least to check whether our values have changed. It is something we return to time and again, not to compromise or easy ways out just won’t do. This is a feeling I’m certain that is shared across the teams, within the teams themselves, across the Learning teams in London. And as a member of the department, for me it became professional trust and will inform how we report on our activities to trustees and others.

The task on paper appeared quite simple but during this project I found that I took on many different roles—research assistant, interpreter, colleague, confidant—so particular one a disguise for a hidden agenda of another, or consistent throughout the project and across any one team or person. Having studied social anthropology, the notion of exploring thoughts, feelings, values and beliefs, expressing and identifying them, recording and reflecting upon them, made sense: an ethnography of Tate Learning. And as a member of the department, for me it became professional research and development, as well as a personal interest.

The first stage of the process was a conversation with Eileen Carroll when each team identified what they thought were the core values that underpinned their work. Joseph took notes throughout that meeting which he then wrote up. After Eileen had met all the teams, she met with Emily Pringle to review the process and then wrote up. After Eileen had met all the teams, she met with Emily Pringle to review the process and then wrote up. This is part of the process of reviewing what you are doing in your area of work and is intended to support your own reflective practice. It is also to put in place evaluation principles that derive from your own values as manifest in your programme, rather than being implemented from top-down. The outcomes of this process will be discussed at the research cross-site meetings and will inform how we report on our activities to trustees and others.

It would be extremely helpful if you and the rest of your team members could read through the following notes and think about the issues raised prior to our meeting.

Focusing on core values

During our first meeting the following issues emerged around what guides your programme:

- Informal learning
- Involvement through individual choice
- Peer-Led
- Creative learning, respect for culture, relevance, sharing experience (which can build confidence/self esteem)
- Social, democratic, mutual development of ideas through conversation

To give a flavour of what this process looked like in practice—the following pages tell the story of the Young People’s Programme team in London. The first stage of the project was a conversation with Eileen Carroll when each team identified what they thought were the core values that underpinned their work. Joseph took notes throughout that meeting which he then wrote up. After Eileen had met all the teams, she met with Emily Pringle to review the process and following that, Eileen sent a version of the email below to each team. This is the email to the young people’s team.

Dear Mark,

I am so pleased that we will be meeting with your team again on Thursday 22nd March at 3.30 pm at Tate Britain. A reminder from Emily states that ‘this second meeting in the next phase in the process of developing what we are calling an evaluation framework for Learning.

It would be extremely helpful if you and the rest of your team members could read through the following notes and think about the issues raised prior to our meeting.

Focusing on core values

During our first meeting the following issues emerged around what guides your programme:

- Informal learning
- Involvement through individual choice
- Peer-Led
- Creative learning, respect for culture, relevance, sharing experience (which can build confidence/self esteem)
- Social, democratic, mutual development of ideas through conversation

In this email Eileen is reiterating:

- What the process is
- Where they are in the process
- What they said last time in relation to their values
- The opportunity to amend this/re-present/refine their ideas.

And she also:

- Moving them on and going deeper
- Setting up the expectation for the next meeting.

She is modelling the reflective practice that we are asking of them and the actions they need to undertake to move forwards.
Involvement while maintaining autonomy (a learning process that requires constant consideration)
Functioning as experts
Access, encouragement and ownership of programmes and facilities
Artistic collaboration, innovation, experimentation (willingness to change practice) and diversity

Key values are embedded in the learning process

Would you say this is an accurate summary of key issues around your core values? Would you like to add to or amend this list in any way? Please bring any additions or amendments to the meeting on Thursday 22nd March.

Next, ask ‘why’ about each of the issue, for example, Why creative learning, respect for culture, relevance, sharing experience?

Why mutual development of ideas through conversation? and so on.

In answering the ‘why’ question to each of the issues can you distill your answers into a fundamental principle/core value that underpins your practice?

Core values manifest in practice

To what extent is this principle/core value visible in your practice?

Methods already in place – a review

What methods do you already have that capture your practices as manifesting your core values/principle? Would you identify these methods before you come to the meeting. (NB These methods may not necessarily be the ones that are required by funders)

Identifying one strand of practice that you wish to work on next.

With your team decide on the one strand of your area of work that you want to examine.

At the meeting on Thursday 22nd March we will discuss ways you wish to proceed in this examination in more detail.

Looking forward to discussing these issues with you.

With best wishes, Eileen.

Following this second meeting with the Young People’s Programme Team, the discussion notes taken by Joseph were amended and the values identified in the notes above agreed.
At the same time as the ongoing conversations were taking place, we were putting in place four pilot projects – one at each Tate London site, one at Tate Liverpool and one at Tate St Ives. Each project took a different form and developed from consultation with the learning teams, with the Tate Learning Research Fellow and the Critical Friend, with other experts and practitioners and with our visitors. Common to all was the ambition to test out new ways of working and to put our principles into practice. The projects also sought to explore key questions and issues that were identified by Learning teams in conjunction with partners and learners as being of major significance in terms of developing more sustainable, higher quality programme going forward. Equally important was the need to ensure that the project that took place in each site was relevant and meaningful.

Open Studio took place at Tate Modern.

Open Studio took the form of a series of artist-designed installations linked to particular displays or works in the collection. The project was directly informed by the research trip that Susan Sheddan (Convenor, Early Years and Families) took to Reggio Emilia in Italy, where she came into contact with the philosophy and methodology of this leading educational programme. Taking key Reggio concepts – most notably the concept of the child as an active creative and collaborative being – Susan worked with artists and colleagues within Tate to put in place a series of dynamic and participatory environments where families were invited to engage directly with artists’ practice and respond and experiment according to their wishes.

We used observations, documentation and a research group testing ideas on the programme to examine the conditions required to support speculative, experimental, open-ended engagement. By working with artists on this programme and the evaluation we were able to situate these questions and development in actual art practice. This approach to developing installations, documentation and evaluation were all based on the idea of dialogue as a collaborative model which involves different perspectives, listening and responsiveness.

Observations and documentation carried out by the research group, assistants working on Open Studio and participating families indicated that Open Studio facilitated engagement characterised by curiosity, improvisation, testing and reflecting. The very conditions we hoped to put in place, since these manifest the values inherent in Reggio practice.

Below is a selection from the Open Studio workshops that took place from April 2012 to March 2013.

May 2012
Next Door, Louisa Martin
Next Door is created as an imaginary space in which the usual laws of physics do not apply. Louisa uses an alter-persona called ‘The Physicist’ to add to the playfulness and surreal nature of the workshop, in an attempt to encourage participants to make connections in Open Studio in much the same way Louisa might in her studio.

Materials: miscellaneous objects including fake hair and tap shoes, impossible shadows created from black vinyl, areas masked off with gaffer tape, light sources, overhead projectors.

June/July 2012
Scrib, Dan Scott
Often viewed as a dirty mark, or a failed gesture, the scribble is actually a crucial aspect of artistic practice. Art historian and educationalist Viktor Lowenfeld believed the scribble to be the first stage in the artistic development of children, and it’s a methodology that contemporary artists have continued to use well into adulthood. This Open Studio encourages families to explore the scribble as a form of performance. Scrib translates scribbling into sound, and explores both materials and effect; through the initial scribble and the encounter with the sound of the scribble seconds later.

Materials: boards with contact microphones attached, blank musical scores, biros, amplification on differing delay times, overhead projector.

Open Studio in action

Early Years and Families’ values
1. Accessing Art Practices
   Generating experience and understanding
2. Dialogue
   Listening, being responsive, co-authoring
3. Agency
   Participants taking agency of their own engagement, supporting difference in terms of people, cultures, contexts and interpretations
4. Recognition
   Making learning visible, bringing attention and significance to learning experiences
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Notes taken from Susan Sheddan’s (Convenor Early Years and Families) report on Open Studio that identify what the team’s research questions were and what they found out through the pilot project.

Do you have specific research questions underpinning this programme? What are they and why have you devised them?

In what ways can contemporary and multi-disciplinary art practices support more diverse forms of engagement?

What have we found?

Diverse participants of all ages are more able to take agency when engaging with contemporary and multi-disciplinary art practices, because these:

- Are open to diverse forms of engagement
- Utilise the tools and media of popular culture
- Include a global perspective, are multi-lingual and cross-cultural
- Offer experiential and more open-ended engagement as well as a contemporary perspective which is relevant to our current audiences.

What are the conditions required to support speculative, experimental, open-ended engagement?

What have we found?

Ideal conditions include creating a programmatic, physical and conceptual framework for a space that positions participants as the protagonists of their own engagement. Within this space it helps to intentionally interrupt preconceptions of roles, processes and experiences in order to provoke speculation, curiosity and improvisation. It is important to uphold the framework, intention and ethos of the programme in every detail of its delivery. This essential framework holds the conceptual space we invite participants into and implicitly communicates to them that they can trust that this is a space of improvisation. This enables them to take the risk of not knowing.

How can we offer audiences agency in their own engagement?

What have we found?

By creating programming that, through the frame and space that it opens for difference to occur, implicitly acknowledges what participants bring to their own engagement.
Below, you have Schools and Teachers London’s articulation of their Core Values and how they are manifested in practice:

Trust
A programme which is responsive to the thinking and ideas of artists, teachers, students and the team and trusts in the agency of the learner (artist, teacher and student) through recognising and validating the multiple emotional and intellectual reactions to encountering art.

Thoughtfulness
The team reflecting on and thinking about what we are doing and why, to ask questions of ourselves, the programme, the institution and our audience.

Generosity
A democracy of learning through exchange and collaboration with our audience, artists and the institution.

Desire
A focus on process rather than outcome.

Risk
A programme which trials new ways of working and encourages artists, teachers, students and the team to test out new ideas.

Pilot Project: Tate St Ives
The pilot project at St Ives is a good example of how we examined our core values with key externals in order to develop programming of the highest quality.

This is a response to the question ‘What do we want to get out of this?’ which was posed at the start of the two-day residency.

The St Ives pilot project took place towards the end of this first phase of TTL and was directly informed by the experience of the programme to date and the particular circumstances and needs of the gallery and its audiences.

In 2012 the teams at St Ives were restructured as a new integrated Programme Team, bringing together Learning and Exhibitions and Displays curators under the leadership and direction of the Artistic Director. The intention was for this model to allow for a more integrated approach to Exhibitions, Displays, Learning and Interpretation, across Tate St Ives.

It also allowed for different skills, expertise and experience to feed into and across the development and realisation of these programmes for Tate St Ives’s broad audiences. In response to the research-led practice initiative within TTL, a new Artist Residency programme will be launched in 2013, which will involve artists contributing to the culture, life and programmes of both the gallery and the wider community.

To establish effective working models and practices at this crucial stage in St Ives’s development, the team, in consultation with key stakeholders, framed their pilot project as a series of structured conversation-based workshops involving artists to begin to develop these ideas, test them out, and establish the first 12 months of programme. In this way, the pilot workshops and conversations directly informed their research as practice and future core programmes by trialling new ways of working in collaboration with artists.
The structure of the Pilot project

**December 2012**
A discursive session for the whole Programme Team, facilitated by Eileen Carnell, to look at core values for the new team and the proposed programmes.

**January 2013**
A two-day workshop, held off-site in residential accommodation. Facilitated by Emily Pringle, the session will involve the whole Programme Team plus a number of invited artists (between four and six). The focus for this session will be on reflection on the outcomes and values thrown up in the first session.

- **Thinking, with artists, about how we might apply these ideas to our new programmes at Tate St Ives.**

Importantly this involves thinking about how we work with artists at the heart of our programmes by actually bringing them in at this early moment, in a residential situation. Our intention is to embed collaborative, reflective practice to ensure that artists sit at the centre of programme planning across all Tate St Ives activity.

**February 2013**
The third session would be facilitated by Eileen Carnell in which we think through the outcomes, findings and experiences of the residential workshop and start to translate this into future programme ideas and strands at Tate St Ives.

From: Eileen Carnell
Sent: 20 December 2012 11:04
To: Emily Pringle; Martin Clark
Subject: Jottings about the residential

As you are having a conversation tomorrow morning about the residential experience I thought I would jot down a few notes that I recorded during the group discussion (see below). I hope these make sense. It strikes me that this could be a really wonderful and creative experience.

With all best wishes,
Eileen

In no particular order:

- **active with variety** - over the two day period have different activities - not just talking. These might include making art, drawing, sketching, painting, walking, workshops
- **clarity** - to become clear about what kind of conversation we want and what we hope we may achieve
- **loosely structured** - going with the flow and being spontaneous while being productive and achieving what people want
- **equality** - Tate staff and artists seen as a group rather than a ‘them’ and ‘us’ division. Artists not seen as the dominant force
- **putting artists in the picture** - starting with Tate staff talking about what we have already covered in terms of thinking about values/principles in an inclusive, creative way, i.e. not a lecture. This may mean getting artists to think about their values before they come so that they can join in and/or some notes sent to artists in advance
- **dialogue** - around artists’ practices and work with Tate. Not falling into the trap of thinking there is only one way of working and/or limiting what artists might be doing or what the role of the artist is
- **looking in and looking out** - time for personal reflection as well as forging social connections. This might be assisted through the use of reflective journals kept throughout the weekend and continued during the year as an aid to action research
- **benefiting all** - how is the residential going to be of value to everyone who attends regardless of their role?

- **thinking about artists as residents** - everyone contributing to thinking about how a residency might be effective. Perhaps using practice to explore this and making it active. Perhaps an artist and a member of Tate staff leading a workshop together for the group and then everyone reviewing the experience and highlighting the learning
- **thinking about artists as residents** - everyone contributing to thinking about how a residency might be effective. Perhaps using practice to explore this and making it active. Perhaps an artist and a member of Tate staff leading a workshop together for the group and then everyone reviewing the experience and highlighting the learning
- **a big focus on cultural shift**
- **reclaiming evaluation** - a further discussion about evaluation to overcome the knee-jerk reaction to consider how it links with action research and reflection rather than formal, quantitative approach.

In this email Eileen reiterates what the team has done and sets out the underlying values, the plan, and the democratic approach. She also gently introduces questions of value, evaluation and inclusivity as well as setting out the purpose of action.
Over the Easter weekend families created an imaginary city, that evolved day by day, inspired by the artist Peter Fraser’s City in the Mind series. These activities attracted 3,381 family participants and feedback was very positive. As part of the activity the Learning team also posed the question, ‘What happened in the city today?’ and asked people to record their thoughts on a tape recorder or tweet their response, one being: ‘City – amazing fun – a great way to inspire young creativity.’

The Tate Ives courtyard drop-in activity, Easter 2013

Hi Emily

I hope that you had a good journey back from Cornwall. Thank you for coming down and facilitating the workshop. It was so good to have that time to debate, reflect, walk and of course have a glass of wine together as a team!

You asked about what thoughts we’d had, so for me the key one was this change in the philosophy that informs our programme (exhibition and learning) and the understanding of what a gallery is: that it shouldn’t be a place for passive reception of art but a cultural hub of exchange of ideas and creativity. I know that this isn’t a new idea but I think that actually following this philosophy through into our displays, programmes and interpretation would create a huge change at Tate St Ives. From this can come the idea that programmes and interpretation should be encouraging our audiences to be part of the conversation and to be critical thinkers that confidently explore art in the way that they wish. I think that having the artists with us at Kestle Barton, and also having them more involved in the programme at all levels, will help us to develop in this way.

Best,
Rachael
Identifying the processes and mechanisms that need to be in place to enable us to understand what is happening and to account for the experience of those participating.

This stage of the values-led evaluation process has proved to be one of the most interesting and at the same time highly complex, for reasons we will try to make clear here. We have tried a number of approaches, some of which have been more successful than others. The examples below hopefully give a sense of how we have gone about this and why we are continuing to trial several different ideas.

Approach one – involved asking each team to identify one area of practice and gather data in order to account for participants' experiences. Teams discussed with Emily Pringle what this strand would be and how they would go about it and were then expected to report back to Emily with findings once this process had been completed.

Example 1 – Young People's Programme

From: Emily Pringle
Sent: 01 August 2012 14:36
To: Young Peoples Programmes
Cc: Joseph Kendra
Subject: EP attending YPP team meeting to discuss work with Eileen Carnell

Dear All

Apologies about confusion, but I would like to attend the YPP team meeting tomorrow from 11 - 12am at TB and would ask, if you can, to give thought to the following in relation to your meetings with Eileen:

1. What key insights have you gained about the practice of the Young People's Programme through these conversations?
2. In relation to identifying a strand of practice to evaluate, are there issues that you think remain to be addressed?

Best wishes
Emily

This proved to be a useful approach for Young People's Programmes to adopt, as they could readily identify a core strand of their activity – their work with Tate Collective – to focus on, alongside a workable methodology for capturing the data they needed.

Example 2 – Young People's Programme

From: Assistant Curator Young Peoples Programme
Sent: 02 November 2012 16:10
To: Young Peoples Programmes
Cc: Joseph Kendra
Subject: Evaluating TC

Hi Joseph,

As discussed in our last team meeting with Emily, we are looking at setting up an evaluation meeting with Tate Collective w/c 3rd December, likely Thursday 5 December 5 - 7pm, Learning Meeting Room or Duffield if available. This would be repeated annually to record Tate Collective's development. 10 members of Tate Collective, ranging from new starters to older members, would be invited and their conversation recorded in response to the following questions:

Please introduce yourself and your current occupation or studies (what are you up to outside of Tate Collective?)
1. How long have you been a member of Tate Collective?
2. Who are Tate Collective?
3. What is the role of Tate Collective?
4. Why are you part of Tate Collective?
5. Using an example, please describe your involvement in a recent event or project?
6. What have you learnt? Prompt if needed: About yourself, about Tate?
7. What do you think are the aims and core values of Tate Collective?
8. What does Tate Collective bring to the institution? Prompt: Without Tate Collective, what would be missing?
9. What is the best thing about being part of Tate Collective?
10. What would you change about Tate Collective?

Please let me know your thoughts on the above, if feasible and whether there would be budget to transcribe - days work at £100?

Many thanks
From: Emily Pringle  
Sent: 02 August 2012 14:02  
To: Adult Programmes  
Subject: Follow up on evaluation (post my attending AP team meeting)  

Dear All  
I just wanted to follow up on my conversation with you a while back when I attended your team meeting.  

In the discussion about evaluation and how we build on the conversation with Eileen Carnell, I think we reached agreement that you would each collate the event summary documents for the events you have been responsible for and that one person in the team would look at these with a view to identifying how effective they are at capturing the AP core values as manifest in practice. I know everyone has been, and is, extremely busy, but I would really like not to lose momentum on this. Therefore could I ask you to collate the event summary documents for all your events for the period April - July 2012 and forward them to the team member by the end of August.  

Do come back to me if you have any questions. Many thanks.  

Example 2 – Adult Programmes  
Adult Programmes also set out to focus on one strand of their practice in terms of how it is recorded in their evaluation ‘event summary’ documents.

Example 2 – Adult Programmes  
Adult Programmes also set out to focus on one strand of their practice in terms of how it is recorded in their evaluation ‘event summary’ documents. However, this exercise has not proved to be as valuable as anticipated, in part due to the complexity of the team, which includes a wide range of programmes ranging from regular touch tours for visually impaired visitors and long-term partnership programmes with community organisations to one-off symposia. We needed to rethink our approach and have broadened the remit to consider in the first stage all the methodologies Adult Programmes currently employ.

These images are taken from a presentation prepared by the Adult Programmes team. During this session they described and reflected on all the tools they use currently for evaluating their programmes and how they connect to their core values.
The pilot project at Tate Britain is one example of another approach we have trialled – working with internal Tate colleagues and external researchers to identify appropriate methods and tools and gather data on the experience and learning of our visitors. ‘A is for Britain’ is an in-gallery resource for visitors at Tate Britain.

‘A is for Britain’ was developed by Sarah Carne and Effie Coe, Learning Resources Coordinators, with artists and colleagues within Tate Learning. Sarah describes the rationale for the resource thus:

The history behind ‘A is for Britain’ started with the concept for ‘A is for Horses’, its sister resource at Tate Modern, which is based on the Cockney Alphabet, the Cockney Alphabet, also known as the Surrealist Alphabet, parodies the way the alphabet is taught to young children. Some examples are A is for Horses (Hay is for Horses), C for yourself and U for Mism. Our play on language was to link the “A is for” to A4 paper and use this as a starting point for activities that could be done in the gallery and relate to specific works, ideas around curating and elements of the building itself. It also allows for contributions from a number of artists and therefore a number of voices and, importantly, explores the possibilities of a sheet of A4 paper – it might be folded, ripped, drawn on, used to conceal etc. When looking to develop a sister resource at Tate Britain we realised that to repeat the Cockney Alphabet concept felt like we were imposing a concept where it didn’t fit so well so at that point we decided to open it up to wider interpretation. Artists have been allowed to determine what each letter stands for but the A4 paper element stands firm.

The pilot project investigated the quality of the learning and engagement enabled by artist-designed paper based resources that visitors can access for free in the gallery. This project was of particular relevance to us as we are keen to explore how we can ‘scale up’ our offer, without any reduction in the quality of support we provide for all our audiences.

We worked with colleagues in Visitor Experience to develop appropriate methodologies and gather data, based around observation of visitor behaviour in the gallery.

The pilot project investigated the quality of the learning and engagement enabled by artist-designed paper based resources that visitors can access for free in the gallery. This project was of particular relevance to us as we are keen to explore how we can ‘scale up’ our offer, without any reduction in the quality of support we provide for all our audiences.

We worked with colleagues in Visitor Experience to develop appropriate methodologies and gather data, based around observation of visitor behaviour in the gallery.

A is for Britain is a new free learning resource (an A to Z of activities devised by artists that relate to works in the displays, to artists’ processes and the building itself) that has been installed at the top of the Manton staircase at Tate Britain. This research project will investigate the experience for visitors using the resource and the quality of their learning.

Research objectives

• To get a sense of who is using the resource
• To identify visitors’ motivations for using the resource
• To understand how visitors are using the resource
• To gain insights into what visitors have gained (particularly in terms of new insights and knowledge) through using the resource
• To use the data to inform how and why we develop resources in the future.

Instructions

• To observe and record how visitors engage with the resource (or not)
• To observe and record any contextual information (if you overhear their conversation etc)
• To record your reflections and interpretation of what you observed.

Spend half your time at the top of the Manton Stairs observing whether people read the signs and use the resource or not.

– Spend half your time in the galleries themselves observing if and how people are using the resource in front of art works.
This approach gave us valuable insights into visitors' overall use and experience of the resource. We also worked with two independent researchers who undertook more in-depth qualitative data collection. We brought together and analysed the data from all our colleagues. Key findings from the A is for Britain pilot project research included:

The research approach and methodology included:

1. Conducting interviews with users of the resource using a tailored questionnaire
2. Conducting interviews with non-users of the resource using a tailored questionnaire
3. Observing visitor behaviour in the gallery
4. Maintaining a record of any questions/feedback comments on the resource at the Information desk

The sample:
For the interviews, researchers targeted a random cross-section of visitors who interacted with the resource in some way (ranging from visitors who casually glanced at the resource, to those who took an activity sheet and completed it in the gallery).

Drawing together and analysing our findings in order to develop broader understandings and to build theory

This stage of the process is ongoing and again requires conversation and collaborative thinking – not least to come to a shared sense of what 'theory' is. Eileen found a useful definition of theory which has helped our understanding of what we are trying to do:

How we did it

Some participants at first viewed evaluation in a summative way – the need to identify outcomes when a project is completed. Others saw evaluation as formative – taking place within a project, such as reflective or action research in order to learn and extend and change practice. It was agreed that the second approach has more opportunities for learning. Reclaiming evaluation is the challenge set by Steve. He urges us to reclaim the term to mean the type of activity that reflects what we do – a value-action – that is, making sense of the ways in which our values are manifested in our practices. This is about seeing evaluation as a process not an event. How effective practices are manifested in relation to the learning of visitors. We need to have a view of evaluation that fits with the values identified – empowerment, inclusion and learning – and so on. The values being identified and informing practice are becoming clearer over time as people are becoming more confident in discussing these. This is having a knock-on effect as the values in practice are not limited to how we work with visitors and develop in evaluation processes but inform all our professional experiences, such as communicating with each other and supporting each other.

Eileen Carnell
Learning Critical Friend

Eileen Carnell
Learning Critical Friend

Drawing together and analysing our findings in order to develop broader understandings and to build theory

This stage of the process is ongoing and again requires conversation and collaborative thinking – not least to come to a shared sense of what 'theory' is. Eileen found a useful definition of theory which has helped our understanding of what we are trying to do:

What is theory?

Traditionally theory is often set against something called 'practical'. Practice in this sense can be approached as the act of doing something. 'Theory', crudely, can be portrayed as abstract ideas about some thing or phenomenon... From theory can be derived general principles (or rules). These in turn can be applied to the problems of practice. 'Theory' is 'real' knowledge while practice is the application of that knowledge to solve problems... Implicit within this are notions of thoroughness or of system. In this sense a theory can be seen as an attempt to bind together in a systematic fashion the knowledge one has of some particular aspect of the world of experience... This binding together is seen as bringing with it:

- explanatory power;
- the ability to make predictions.

In other words, it helps us to make sense of phenomenon; and to say what is likely to happen if the same relationship applies.

Pilot Project: Tate Liverpool

The pilot project at Tate Liverpool is an example of how we worked with an external researcher to look deeply at our practice in order to gain knowledge that we then, in turn, have applied to practice.

Here is an extract from the pilot projects checklist based on the Programme Manager, Public and Community Learning who managed the project.

**What are the core values underpinning this project?**

- Working access and participation to the gallery and to collections for people who might otherwise be disenfranchised.

**How are those values manifested in practice – what would you expect to see?**

- Artist-led collaborative participatory activity in an NHS mental health facility. Programmes delivered using the Opening Doors methodology. Distinct projects commissioned and delivered as part of ‘Tate Space’, and collaborations focused on major exhibitions.

**What are you trying to find out?**

- The research was undertaken in order to examine the extent to which the values and beliefs that underpin practice within Tate Liverpool’s learning team were communicated to, understood, and upheld by artists employed on a freelance basis to undertake community-based projects on behalf of the gallery.

**Furthermore, are the personal practice values and beliefs of each freelance artist aligned with those espoused by the gallery and, if not, are the artists able to assume Tate values when working on the gallery’s behalf?**

- The study sought to test the belief that organisations representing Tate, negotiated any tensions caused by variations in their respective philosophies and practice.

**What data collection methods will you employ to provide insights into the questions and issues identified?**

- The study has looked in some detail at the Windsor House project in action and, more briefly, for comparative purpose, at a further Tate Space project taking place in another acute inpatient psychiatric unit run by Mersey Care. A series of informal interviews have taken place involving members of Tate Liverpool learning team, artists engaged in joint programmes, staff of Mersey Care’s Occupational Therapy service, and staff employed by Mersey Care to co-ordinate their cultural partnership programmes.

**What frameworks might you use to analyse your data?**

- The transcripts of the interviews have been analysed to identify themes and the views of each interviewee, with regard to these themes, have been noted. Language is specific to the context from which the interviewee is speaking, and reveals a particular value base or mindset.

**How do you envisage using your findings to inform your practice going forward?**

- The study sought to test the belief that organisations holding different values, consistent with those espoused by the gallery, and, if not, are the artists able to assume Tate values when working on the gallery’s behalf?

**How might you disseminate your findings more widely?**

- Findings from the research pilot will inform a new delivery model between Tate Liverpool and Mersey Care going forward. This new model will include three strands of delivery: CPD programmes for NHS activity workers, socially engaged international artist-led participatory practice in mental health care settings; and enhancing independent living for service users post discharge, through supported gallery visits.

**Comment**

- The study has looked in some detail at the Windsor House project in action and, more briefly, for comparative purpose, at a further Tate Space project taking place in another acute inpatient psychiatric unit run by Mersey Care. A series of informal interviews have taken place involving members of Tate Liverpool learning team, artists engaged in joint programmes, staff of Mersey Care’s Occupational Therapy service, and staff employed by Mersey Care to co-ordinate their cultural partnership programmes.

From: Alison Jones
Sent: 14 February 2013 15:20
To: Margaret.Brown2@merseycare.nhs.uk; Lindsey Fryer
Subject: Tate Space invoice

Hi Margaret,

If you are available over the next couple of weeks, Lindsey and I would like to meet to update you on recent discussions between Mandy Chivers, Berenice Gibson and Andrea mine, (Tate Liverpool’s Executive Scientist), regarding a review of Tate and Mersey Care’s relationship going forward. Also, we would like to share the findings from the research study, undertaken by Judith Mawer, as part of Tate Liverpool’s Learning Strategy. The research study sought to test the validity and relevance of our current practice within the Clinical Business Units and the innovative approach that we would like to take to managing our future outreach work.

If you could let me have your availability over the next couple of weeks I will arrange a suitable time for Lindsey and I to come and meet with you.

Best wishes and I look forward to hearing from you.
As I commenced the study, what had seemed like a task mired in subjectivity and conflicts of interest, evolved as I began to see how my knowledge and experience enabled me to formulate questions and let interviews develop organically to produce rich data and open up unforeseen avenues of inquiry. Without my background, I believe I should not have possessed the intelligence that enabled questioning to be responsive, and would instead have employed interview frameworks that strait-jacketed feedback. I found that having an understanding of the Mersey Care environment, its politics, and the debates that exist within different professional groups, services and settings acted as a catalyst, generating pathways that led to the philosophical ‘holy’ from which values, beliefs and practice proceed. Knowing the questions to ask was critical to this process, and that knowledge derived from understanding the dynamics of play within the organisation and being able to challenge with appropriate awareness and sensitivity.

Judith Mawer
Mersey Care Learning and Development Associate

Ensuring that what we find through this process feeds back into practice and is disseminated appropriately

In order to share and test ideas, and to disseminate the findings from the various strands of TTL, we established a discussion group. This group included colleagues from across the cultural learning sector who were keen to examine practice in detail and consider, in particular, issues of quality in relation to the work we do. Between November 2011 and July 2012 the ‘Positively Disgruntled’ group met three times.

Why are we ‘disgruntled’? Why are we meeting about it?
• Because we are constantly grappling with the same sort of questions independently and we never have the opportunity to consider them out loud with others
• To ask why things aren’t as good as they could be
• To be more honest without being surrounded by bureaucracy
• To maintain our values in the face of (forced) change
• So we can work out what and how things can be changed under our own agency.

Each meeting was documented and the discussions at earlier sessions informed subsequent meetings. Continuity with the other strands of the TTL programme was established through the attendance of the Tate Learning Senior Management team, as well as Steve Seidel (who attended the first two meetings) and Eileen Carnell (who attended all three sessions).
Here is another response to the question 'What do we want to get out of this?' which was posed at the first of the Positively Disgruntled meetings:

At the final meeting the group discussed and developed a set of 'Characteristics of Positive Disgruntlement'. We see these as being of value in terms of identifying and making explicit 'quality' in our work.

Having had these conversations we also came up with some reflections on the nature of quality and how we can recognise it in our work. We thought it might be useful to share these with you.

What is the practice of Positive Disgruntlement?

The need to be explicit about what shapes our judgements – what knowledge do we have and how do we use this?

Key characteristics:

1. Scepticism. The central place of questions – coming from a place of optimistic doubt – these include what, who, why, how and for whom and repeatedly coming back to these.
2. Tenacity. The practice itself – hanging around, close observation.
3. Open-mindedness. Having our preconceptions challenged, moving from the comfort zone, being stretched. But also the tension between intuitive responses and the value of structures and frameworks to help guide judgement and effective learning.
4. Presentness. Being 'in' the moment and reflecting 'after' the moment. Where is the learning, the knowledge gained?
5. Clarity. Making explicit what is tacit or assumed.

Quality?

How do we know when something is of quality? This is surely one of the most frequently asked questions in our work and, it seems, one of the most difficult to answer. In our Positively Disgruntled group three Stedel outlined four reasons why this might be the case and why quality is so hard to pin down.

- Quality is multi-dimensional
- Quality is a moving target
- Quality is subjective
- Quality is a sensitive issue
- Context matters

When we talked about these aspects this is what came up:

- Quality is multi-dimensional: There are so many different factors that generate quality that it’s hard to extricate one part from another and be able to pin it to the wall, name it and hold it there! Talking about one aspect of quality often requires another to be present.
- Quality is a moving target. Once you have done something considered of quality, you want to do it better, the bar has been raised and so quality is always changing, always improving and may not look the same twice.
- It is sensitive stuff. Talking about quality is to talk about people’s qualities and values. It can be difficult to talk about and invokes the next point.
- It is subjective. Quality looks differently to different people. If work is being assessed by someone with a different set of values then the work may appear to fail on another person’s terms.
- Every single context will be different and particular. The people involved will also be different: their capacities, skills, values, needs, hopes and feelings will be in constant flux and always unlike any other’s at any other time.

Therefore, there can be no universal baseline from which quality can be measured and no ‘top score’ of human endeavour, behaviour or experience that marks the output. Learning with art represents the non-quantifiable: the qualitative.

Given that quality is subjective and all the other issues above, are there any aspects of arts learning that can be used as a measure?

We struggled with this but discussed these features below as contenders:

- Clear purpose of the activity
- Enjoyment/pleasure/fun
- Good /interesting content that is relevant to the individual
- Emotions positively tapped into
- Deep engagement and focus on the content
- Opportunities for participation and contribution from those involved
- A range of dynamics
- The right materials that enable people to work at their best
- A good environment appropriate to what you are doing
- Leaving the room thinking differently from when you came in
- In control of the experience
- Being able to articulate and apply what you have learned.

However, all of these aspects align to a set of values in which they are considered ‘of value’ in the first place. None of them in and of themselves necessarily ‘guarantee’ quality. This is why we have taken a values-based approach to our e-value-action. We aim to make explicit our values so that we have some chance of measuring up against them from the outset: Putting ‘value’ back into evaluation.

How we did it?

Thus we have been able to give a more detailed account of what we have been doing and the ways in which we have sought to navigate these complex terrain.
Don’t do what we did (but still give it a try!)

Don’t work too fast

The process took longer than expected, but it was vital that we worked at this pace – scheduling the six London Learning teams’ presentations and including sessions from externals alone has taken over a year of monthly meetings. Even with our mindfulness of appropriate pace, we would suggest spending as much time as you can assessing what you do and establishing core values in order to build firm foundations for the subsequent stages of the evaluation process.

Perhaps unexpectedly we found that the pilot projects were the most challenging strand of the TTL process, partly due to timing pressures. They revealed some of the challenges of tasking programme teams with ongoing evaluation, particularly in terms of the time needed to gather data, analyse and share findings. In the case of the London pilots ideally we would have had more time to embed the principles of research-led practice to ensure that these were genuinely able to inform the pilots. We learnt from this and the projects at Liverpool and St Ives benefited from our earlier experiences.

Don’t over-schedule

It was important to keep to a structure and regular time and to ensure staff made the commitment to attend the monthly meetings. At the same time it was crucial that staff could input into the design and content of these sessions to ensure that they were relevant and flexible to the ongoing development of their work. Our staff are already busy – the object was to re-work the way we work, not simply introduce more work. Allowing space for everyone to approach an initiative like this means applying a structure without implementing an unnecessarily added set of tasks, meetings and reports. Changing the discussions you are already having.

Do what we did (and/or adapt to suit your particular circumstances)

Play to people’s strengths

There is a challenge in marrying scholarship to practice, not least in terms of time and resource. We have found that particular staff are more drawn to this than others and recognise that these individuals are likely to take the lead on implementing research-led practice.

Do what your individual programme needs

Most notably, the London pilot projects taught us that, although contained projects provided a useful opportunity to trial new ways of working, the activity must be appropriate to the moment of its realisation, authentic and part of ongoing practice. By recognising this we tried to avoid having a ‘project’ mentality wherein learning is not taken forward to inform future work. It was appropriate to consult learners in planning the two London projects, however for Liverpool and St Ives pilots, it was more important to involve partners (i.e. colleagues at Mersey Care and artists working with Tate St Ives) as their strategic input was vital at that point in the team and organisation’s development.

Do make critical friends

All the pilot projects and the enterprise more widely has benefited from supportive Critical Friends who played a variety of very useful roles, for example developing the projects, asking key questions, bridging disciplinary boundaries, gathering data and analysing findings. The ‘Positively Disgruntled’ group has not reached any definitive conclusions, but this discursive process is agreed by all to be essential.

This is Helen Davison’s (Assistant Curator, Early Years and Families team, Tate London) representation of the Values-based Evaluation process. Helen is a musician. When asked, she described this image in these words: ‘Objective Score – Each line of the stave represents a different objective. Objectives run in parallel and converge at intervals to be repeated or re-evaluated where necessary. Notation and dynamics can be added to show harmonies, clashes or individual points of reference, depth or intensity of research and/or evaluation.’

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED, WHAT WILL WE CONTINUE, WHAT ADVICE CAN WE GIVE?
We must dare, in the full sense of the word to speak of love without the fear of being called ridiculous, hawskish, or unscientific, if not antiscientific. We must dare in order to say scientifically, and not as here, blah-blah-blah, that we study, we learn, we teach, we know with our entire body. We do all of these things with feeling, with emotion, with wishes, with fear, with doubts, with passion, and also with critical reasoning. However, we never study, learn, teach, or know with the last only. We must dare so as never to dichotomize cognition and emotion.

Paulo Freire, Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letter to Those Who Dare Teach
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Alice King-Farlow, Director of Learning, National Theatre
Steve McPherson, CEO, A New Direction
Helen Holbrook, Professor of Drama and Theatre, Royal Holloway, University of London
Helen O'Donoghue, Head of Education and Community Programmes, Irish Museum of Modern Art
Jaqui O'Hanlon, Director of Education, Royal Shakespeare Company
David Parker, Director of Research and Evaluation, Creative and Cultural Skills
Paul Rewe, Director of Education, Royal Opera House

Mark Reid, Head of Education, BFI
Becky Swan, Head of Learning and Participation, Artes Mundi Foundation
Professor Pat Thomson, Professor of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, Nottingham University
Jasmin Wilson, Learning Director, Random Dance

Tate:

Nick Serota, Director
Alex Beard, Deputy Director
Patricia Lankester, Former Tate Trustee
Caroline Collier, Director, Tate National
Srája Bríks, Head of Programmes, Development
Clare Gill, Development Manager, Programmes
Jennifer Ryan, Publication Coordinator
All the members of the Learning teams at Tate London, Tate Liverpool and Tate St Ives, with particular thanks to Joseph Kendra.

Members of the Tate London Visitor Experience team who participated in the A is for Britain pilot project.
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Design by Tate Design Studio
It is certainly too soon to tell the outcome for Tate, but there are many indicators that the entire organisation is serious about these changes and this can be seen in who is talking to whom and how many people are working together on small and big projects... my sense, albeit from a great distance, is that there truly is significant change, although much of it is likely visible in small increments.

Steve Seidel
Learning Research Fellow

Over time I am struck by the ways the individual teams work together and then come together a whole group. It appears that learning and change has a cumulative effect. The learning of individuals, then teams, then the whole group appears to create a dynamic relationship; the team influences participants’ learning, and participants influence the organisation’s ability to learn.

Eileen Carnell
Learning Critical Friend