

1. Introduction

This short paper has been prepared by the UK NGO and not-for-profit Creativity, Culture and Education (CCE). It is intended to be a contribution to the consultation on the next phase of the EU's culture programme from 2014 onwards.

2. Background to CCE

Creativity, Culture and Education (CCE) is the UK's leading provider of creative and cultural programmes for young people. It has been managing the Creative Partnerships programme in England since 2002. This programme, which supports around 2500 secondary, primary and nursery schools each year, helps teachers place culture at the heart of the curriculum in order to unlock the creativity of children and young people. CCE's operating budget in 2009/10 was approximately €60 million.

CCE has commissioned a number of evaluations of the Creative Partnerships programme over the last few years which has also been subject to two inspections by the UK Government's national school inspection service, Ofsted. These evaluations and inspections have confirmed that the programme is successful, not only in unlocking creativity, but in raising attainment, improving behaviour and engaging parents in their children's education.

International interest in the programme has grown rapidly in recent years as the success of the programme has been recognised in the research. The EU's Year of Creativity and Innovation in 2009 had a major impact on the European profile of the programme. As Member States came to consider how they might stimulate greater creativity and innovation within their economies, they inevitably came to explore how creativity can be developed in children and young people through the formal education system. As Creative Partnerships is the biggest programme of this kind in Europe, it led many Member States to invite CCE to present at conferences, seminars and workshops. This in turn led to CCE being commissioned to develop proposals for the delivery of appropriate programmes within Member States. As a result CCE is now advising the City of Amsterdam on its creative and cultural education programmes and has agreed to support the roll out of a programme modelled on Creative Partnerships in Germany. It also has programmes in development in Lithuania and Latvia.

At the same time, the quality and significance of CCE's work has attracted considerable interest in the Far East. In Korea, in particular, Creative Partnerships has developed a high profile. Creative Partnerships featured in a documentary on the UK's creative industries broadcast on Korean TV in 2009 whose contents were subsequently published in the form of a book, one of the books on Korean president Lee Myung-bak's summer vacation reading list in 2010. The book includes an interview with Paul Collard, CCE's chief

executive. Two further documentaries on Creative Partnerships were broadcast at the end of 2010.

Within Europe, CCE has now been actively involved in developing proposals and sharing knowledge and best practice in Norway, Sweden, Latvia, Lithuania, Germany, Poland, Holland, Austria, Hungary, Spain, Slovenia, and Romania. Paul Collard has meanwhile represented the UK on the EU's OMC group on the Synergies between Culture and Education.

2. Transferring Knowledge

CCE's wide set of relationships with education and cultural practitioners and policy makers across Europe has given it a particular insight into the challenges that exist in developing a European approach to creativity and innovation. From this it has been possible to identify a set of challenges that should be addressed.

In our experience, every Member State now understands innovation and creativity to be the key drivers of the future EU economy. We cannot compete on labour costs, and hence will become increasingly uncompetitive in manufacturing. We do not possess the abundant natural resources that can be harvested, mined or collected more cheaply elsewhere. We remain the dominant world force in innovation and the creative application of knowledge and have unparalleled capacity in design, fashion, architecture, popular music and the other creative industries.

However, the capacity to succeed with an innovative, creative and knowledge based economy is not distributed equally across Europe. There are certain cities and regions that have both the experience and expertise to exploit the new opportunities. Other parts of Europe have significant disadvantages. Despite their best efforts, the modernizing economies of Eastern Europe lag far behind those of the North and West in their capacity to innovate and create new industries and markets. The Southern States face enormous economic challenges following the economic turbulence of recent years. To make Europe internationally competitive, the capacity and expertise that exists within a small selection of Member States must be shared more widely, to give a greater proportion of Member States and a much wider cross section of Europe's population the skills to succeed in the new economy.

There are however significant barriers to achieving this wide scale transfer of knowledge and expertise.

- Firstly, those with the capacity and knowledge are generally not sufficiently confident of their long term economic viability to be keen on transferring knowledge elsewhere in Europe. They are concerned that it might undermine their competitive position. In any case, they are unlikely to consider it a business imperative. In our conversations with South Eastern European countries, for instance, we have been give numerous examples where events have been organised for the purpose of transferring knowledge, but to which those with the

knowledge in the end fail to turn up. Many European instruments to support knowledge transfer in the cultural sector assume that there is a desire within each party to participate if direct expenses are met. This is not the case.

- Secondly, the current economic climate makes it increasingly unlikely that this transfer of knowledge will be self financing. Taking an example close to home, the UK has considerable experience of programmes designed to unlock creativity in young people in schools. This knowledge exists within the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) who have funded such programmes, and the organizations who have designed and delivered these programmes. However, the DCMS will lose 50% of its staff through redundancy in the next three months because of Government cutbacks. Those organizations funded to design and deliver such programmes face cutbacks, and in any case are restricted from using their funding to operate abroad. It is therefore unrealistic to assume that there will be anyone to participate in knowledge transfer activities unless they are properly and separately funded.
- Thirdly, people don't know what they don't know. The process of getting individuals without appropriate experience within education, culture or economic affairs ministries to the point at which they understand the ways in which culture can unlock creativity and innovation is the most time consuming element of the process. In the North East of England, for instance, in the 1990s, €100s of millions of EU structural funds were invested in cultural development projects because there existed a cadre of officials in key organizations who had both the understanding of the value of such investment and the time within their existing jobs to make the applications. This has resulted in the economic and social transformation of one of the UK's poorest regions and left it with a world class and cultural infrastructure. In our experience there is neither the understanding nor the capacity to deploy such arguments in many regions of the EU. As a result, at a time when EU regional and social development funding is available in significant volumes in many eastern European states, the cultural sector is not benefitting from this investment in the ways in which it could. This is because there are no EU instruments which will support the development of regional capacity to deploy the arguments..
- Fourthly, EU instruments focus on groups of Member States collaborating. Many Member States find this frustrating, as it reduces many knowledge transfer projects to generalities. There is an appetite for highly specific, bespoke, solutions to the problems of developing creativity and innovation. Our experience is that although the problems are generic, the solutions are invariably specific and that the inability of existing instruments to support the development of bespoke single state solutions is a major barrier.

- Fifthly, those Member States likely to benefit the most from knowledge transfer are those facing the most severe financial difficulties. Their ability to invest in devising their own solutions without the leverage of matched funding is limited.

3. New Instruments

CCE would recommend two instruments which could be regarded as extensions to existing instruments or new instruments to support knowledge transfer.

- **Networking**

There is a need to fill an implementation and knowledge sharing gap more effectively through properly resourced networking. These networks need to link closely to agreed EU workplans and be led by organisations who are properly resourced to support the network. The level of funding necessary to participate in networking, transferring knowledge and sharing expertise is limited to those states and partners that have existing funding from other sources which they can divert into carrying out such activities. Those with the greatest need miss out or waste money re-inventing the wheel rather than learning from others and being supported to adapt tried and tested methods. The current funding crisis which affects most countries in Europe is going to make it increasingly unlikely that those with the knowledge and experience will be able to finance their participation in knowledge transfer networks. To address this problem the level of funding available to sustain a knowledge transferring network should be substantially increased (to say €2 million over 5 years) and the matching requirement of partners reduced.

- **Single State advice**

We would recommend that a new single state instrument be created which allows new Member States to look externally for good practice and to seek consultancy support with the aim of exploring how culture and creative industries can support their specific economic and educational development priorities. This should require the state to make a contribution to the project as a gesture of real commitment to this work. It would allow them to seek a package of consultancy, study visits and strategy development support to be managed by a single external partner. The main purpose of the instrument would be to establish how culture can contribute to the achievement of the

Members States wider educational, social and economic aims. A maximum of budget per package of €75,000 would be appropriate.

4. Conclusions

CCE would recommend the following:

- That DG Education and Culture recognize that the effective deployment of ERDF and ESF budgets in support of cultural programmes will release far greater funds in support of its cultural objectives than would be achieved through the direct deployment on cultural programmes of the funds available to it
- That new instruments are devised which would support the transfer of knowledge and expertise to key officials to enable them to understand and deploy the arguments necessary to bid successfully for support for cultural projects from a range of EU sources.
- That new instruments be devised which enabled bespoke solutions to be devised for individual members states and regions.
- That new instruments be devised which enable independent suppliers to support the transfer of knowledge. This would result in the development of cultural programmes which could be funded through ERDF and ESF, but which need support before they have received confirmation of funding.

Creativity Culture and Education (CCE) Ltd 2010.