

# An Imagined Museum

Collaborative Models  
Impact and Possibilities

Sue Potts  
Institute of Cultural Capital

instituteofculturalcapital



# Contents

- 1. Background**
- 2. The Impact Study**
- 3. Evaluating Collaboration**
  - 3.1 Evaluating the Impacts of Collaboration**
  - 3.2 Research Framework**
  - 3.4 Methodology**
- 4. Findings**
  - 4.1 Survey Results**
    - 4.1.1 Sense of Collaboration**
    - 4.1.2 Collaborative Working**
    - 4.1.3 Collaborative Tasks**
    - 4.1.4 Decision Making**
    - 4.1.5 Problem Solving**
    - 4.1.6 Conflict**
    - 4.1.7 Learning**
    - 4.1.8 Collaborative Outputs**
    - 4.1.9 Communications**
    - 4.1.10 Creating Shared Outputs**
    - 4.1.11 Sharing Practice and Resources**
    - 4.1.12 Enabling Innovation**
    - 4.1.13 Digital Resource**
- 5. Semi Structured Interviews**
  - 5.1 Clarity of Project Vision**
  - 5.2 Decision Making**
  - 5.3 Impact on Working Practices**
  - 5.4 Curatorial Methodology**
    - 5.4.1. Attributes of the successful methodology**
- 6. Focus Group/Workshop**
- 7. Conclusion and Recommendations**
  - 7.1. Research Questions**
  - 7.2 Impact Summary**

## **1. Background**

An Imagined Museum was an ambitious and innovative project which brought together key works from three national collections in a unique touring exhibition. The concept or theme of the exhibition, *Works to Know by Heart*, examined the value of art through the dystopian lens of censorship and loss, as depicted in Ray Bradbury's novel *Fahrenheit 451*. Bradbury describes a world in which books are banned and society has rejected the benefits of knowledge and thinking for oneself. The plot involves great works from literature being kept alive by a secret society who memorise and embody key texts as acts of preservation.

Funded by Creative Europe and delivered by Tate Liverpool (Partnership lead) Museum fur Moderne Kunst and Centre Pompidou Metz, An Imagined Museum asked audiences to imagine a future without art works and to devise re-enactments of the key works on display. The partnership emptied the galleries in the final weekend of each exhibition, entrusting the space to audience members to deliver performances which embodied the missing works. Emptying the gallery space and giving ownership of the exhibition to non-arts professionals was bold risk taken by the partnership. However, the invitation was embraced enthusiastically by audiences in each museum and enabled a fascinating insight into how art works are understood and valued.

The project anticipated the following key outputs and outcomes:

- To devise and inform a new approach for sharing works from national collections
- A co-curated exhibition and transnational circulation of 100 art works
- A toured exhibition
- Digital resource
- Learning and public programmes
- Audience attendance of 200,000, online target 400,000
- Learning participants of 15,000

Although audience figures fell short of projections at 103, 458, on line audiences surpassed expectations at 485, 918. Moreover, the success of the project is evidenced in deeper engagement with the programme content through localised learning programmes in which 33, 481 people took part in activity. Research conducted with staff re-enforced the overwhelmingly positive impact of the learning programmes throughout the project. Staff highlighted the value of space and time provided by programme funding to test and explore new methodologies for audience engagement, participation and approaches to gallery education.

The following report was commissioned by the An Imagined Museum Partnership via the lead organisation Tate Liverpool. Tate Liverpool has successfully partnered on several pan European projects which consisted of conventional touring exhibition models. An Imagined Museum was framed in a different manner and as such, the effects of working collaboratively could be closely examined with the aim of producing learning to inform future projects.

This report was commissioned to investigate the collaborative working element of the project as a separate aspect to the formal summative evaluation concerning the wider impacts of the programme. The partnership agreed that the project provided a unique opportunity to explore working experiences and to discover how working in collaboration can impact on staff and organisational practices. This research sought to unpick the successful elements of collaboration and to uncover key learning points over a two-year period.

Research findings confirm a positive and inspiring collaborative experience with beneficial impacts for all partners and demonstrative outcomes which could only be achieved through partnership and cooperation. The most successful aspect of the project was the collaborative curatorial experience. The cross institutional team were positioned to reap the most benefits from collaboration. Their decisions formed the framework for the exhibition and learning programme and had to be made at project inception. Attempts to collaborate across other teams were impeded by the project timeline and as such, feedback concerning less impactful experiences should be read with scheduling issues in mind.

This research was conducted by Sue Potts, a researcher at the Institute of Cultural Capital – a strategic partnership between Liverpool John Moores University and the University of Liverpool (ICC). Sue has examined the impact of collaboration in a number of funded programmes, including SILO, Supporting Improved Learning Opportunities for Hard to Reach Adults a pan European project, funded by Erasmus Plus. Sue has recently led the development of a national framework for measuring the impact of collaborative participatory arts and heritage programmes on behalf of the Canal and River Trust. She also received an award from the Cultural Capital Exchange Programme to devise a collaborative curatorial model for the Granby Four Streets Winter Garden artistic programme. Sue was a researcher on the ICC/Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation's Inquiry into the Civic Role of the Arts.

## **2. The Impact Study**

This report presents the findings of an impact study which investigated the collaborative elements of the An Imagined Museum project. The project was supported by a successful Creative Europe application which supported a coproduced exhibition between three art museums from provincial European cities: Tate Liverpool (Lead Partner); Museum fur Moderne Kunst; Centre Pompidou Metz. The main aim of this collaboration was to develop a jointly planned and themed collaborative exhibition using three national art collections. The resulting exhibition was installed in all three museums, with Tate Liverpool acting the lead partner.

This impact study was commissioned via Tate Liverpool on behalf of the partnership and sought to understand the following elements concerning the success of the collaboration:

- Did the collaboration achieve a broadly shared vision?
- Was the process inclusive and transparent?
- Did the collaboration build or strengthen relationships?
- Did the collaboration build knowledge?
- Did the process change practice?
- How are decisions made concerning joint or collaborative conceptualization of exhibitions?
- Who had influence in determining concepts and selection of works?
- Did internal or external factors aid/inhibit using collections for collaborative exhibitions?

### **3. Evaluating Collaboration**

#### **3.1 Evaluating the Impacts of Collaboration**

It is a common expectation that joint or partnership working will achieve aims and ambitions that would be considered difficult to achieve alone. The act of working collaboratively is assumed to have a synergic effect, i.e. the group can achieve more than the sum of the efforts of individuals. However, examining collaborative effort and evaluating its impacts and effectiveness is not an exact science. As stated by Marek et al (2014)<sup>1</sup>, despite efforts by researchers to 'examine collaboration effectiveness, little is known concerning the practices which lead to successful outcomes'. Moreover, there is a lack of tried and tested instruments and empirical research which measures and studies synergic effect (Sandoval-Solis et al, 2011)<sup>2</sup>.

Whilst seeking a suitable framework or lens through which to examine the An Imagined Museum collaboration it is useful to have a clear definition of the process under investigation. Thomson and Perry (2006)<sup>3</sup> offer a succinct analysis "*Collaboration is a process in which autonomous actors interact through formal and informal negotiation, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together; it is a process involving shared norms and mutually beneficial interactions*". In a further study (2008)<sup>4</sup> Thomson and Perry synergise a number of studies which attempt to unpick and describe effectiveness of collaborative projects. The majority of studies focus on whether and how the collaboration met identified goals and objectives. Using their analysis, this study constructed a framework through which to analyse the effectiveness of collaboration in this project.

---

<sup>1</sup> Marek, L; Brock, D-P; Savla, J (2014). Evaluating Collaboration for Effectiveness, Conceptualisation and Measurement. American Journal of Evaluation, Vol 36, Issue 1.

<sup>2</sup> Sandoval-Solis, S. Teasley, R; McKenny, D; Thomas, G; Gomez-Patino, C, (2011). Collaborative Modeling to Evaluate Water Management Scenarios in the Rio Grande Basin. Journal of the American Water Resources Association

<sup>3</sup> Thomson, Ann Marie; James L. Perry; and Theodore K. Miller. 2006. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Collaboration." Paper prepared for presentation at the Collaborative Public Management Conference, Maxwell School, Syracuse University

<sup>4</sup> Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., and Miller, T. K. "Linking Collaboration Processes and Outcomes: Foundations for Advancing Empirical Theory." In L. B. Bingham and R. O'Leary (eds.), *Big Ideas in Collaborative Public Management*. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe, 2008.

### 3.2 Research Framework

Success Factor	Measure
<b>Joint Decision Making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opinions are taken seriously from each partner</li> <li>• Solutions to problems are achieved collectively</li> <li>• Goals are jointly agreed</li> </ul>
<b>Autonomy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the collaboration hinder organisational goals?</li> <li>• Was organisational independence affected by collaborative activities?</li> <li>• Did representatives feel compromised or 'pulled' by the Partnership's expectations and those of their organisation?</li> </ul>
<b>Administration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partners understand their role</li> <li>• Partnership meetings are effective and achieve set targets</li> <li>• Tasks are well coordinated between partners</li> </ul>
<b>Mutuality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partner organisations have combined and used each other's resources to mutual benefit</li> <li>• Partners share information with each other that will strengthen their operations</li> <li>• Partners feel their input to the collaboration is appreciated and respected</li> <li>• Partners achieve own goals better working with partner organisations than working alone.</li> <li>• Partners work through differences to arrive at mutually agreeable solutions.</li> </ul>
<b>Trust</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representatives perceive each other as 'trustworthy'</li> <li>• It is perceived or recognised that partners met their obligations</li> <li>• The partnership achieved longevity (no drop out)</li> <li>• Partners would enter into a collaboration again</li> </ul>

### **3.4 Methodology**

The research took a mainly qualitative approach although some quantitative analysis of survey responses were used to weight opinions and experiential feedback. Data collection involved a wide scale survey to all staff involved in delivering project outcomes. Semi structured interviews were conducted with gallery directors and key members of staff involved in managing outcomes and delivery. Findings from the survey and interviews were tested with a focus group/workshop with members from the three partnership institutions.

## 4. Findings

### 4.1 Survey Results

A survey designed to measure the effectiveness of the collaborative process across the 3 institutions was distributed to all staff involved in the project. By surveying a range of employees across roles and body of expertise, the study attempted to understand if

- Collaboration was embedded throughout the project
- Conditions were created which would achieve collaboration
- How effectively the collaboration worked for staff at all levels

22 people responded to the survey representing the following areas of expertise:

- Communications – 5 responses
- Learning and Education - - 5 responses
- Exhibition, curating and organising – 6 responses
- Grant Administration – 2 responses
- Digital – 2 responses
- Management – 2 responses

Respondents were split across the three institutions as follows:

- Tate Liverpool – 11 respondents
- Museum fur Moderne Kunst – 6 respondents
- Centre Pompidou- Metz – 5 respondents

#### 4.1.1 Sense of Collaboration

The survey asked staff to describe the levels of collaboration they experienced throughout their involvement in the project. The majority of respondents agreed that their experience was collaborative all of the time; around one third of respondents felt part of the collaboration occasionally and 2 respondents did not feel part of a collaboration at all.

Staff were asked to provide illustrative comments describing their experience of collaborative working. Positive comments included *'exchanges between partners have been fluent, enriching and easy'* and most agreed that all were committed to finding solutions to issues or problems. Staff also stated they were able to advise and consult freely with each other. Respondents highlighted the process of developing the exhibition concept or theme as a particularly positive aspect of the collaborative process. This task involved curatorial

staff from the three institutions working together over a number of months to agree the direction of the exhibition, make decisions on works and the accompanying narrative, and production design. This experience included a *'real exchange in the common curatorial team through many Skype meetings and emails'* which, led to collaborative decision making about the exhibition theme, selection of works, ensuring equal representation from national collections and finding *'aesthetic compromises'*.

Scrutiny of multiple survey responses demonstrated that respondents holding curatorial roles experienced the strongest sense of collaboration. They highlighted working collaboratively to come to a shared agreement concerning literature or fiction being the underpinning element of the exhibition narrative as being a positive aspect. This process led to a consensus concerning the use of Ray Bradbury's novel Fahrenheit 451 as a salient model for the exhibition's theme.

Respondents from this team also described how their independent research backgrounds were used collectively via *"differing forms of communication"* to arrive at an agreed concept. This process was described as an *'enriching experience'* which enabled the team members to reflect on a *'shared history'*. Their shared experience brought about discussions concerning similarities in aims and objectives across the partnership concerning civic life in European cities and how this is *"underpinned"* and enhanced with knowledge exchanges and touring exhibitions. The team gained a deeper insight into the significance of each other's key works and how to exploit their joint assets so that this *'imaginary European museum'* was bigger than the sum of its parts.

The strong relationships developed at a curatorial level were not experienced by all staff across the partnership. One respondent stressed that although feeling part of a collaborative process at his/her institution, attempts to communicate with staff in partner institutions were not fruitful. One very positive meeting took place during which shared approaches and ideas were discussed with staff from similar teams and roles. But generally and due to scheduling, collaborative impacts were not achieved across all teams in particular, Learning and Education.

Learning and Education staff attempted to share information and ideas during project initiation. However, it was felt that despite making this effort, that timetabling impinged opportunities for collaborative working. Comments from respondents acknowledged that senior staff were in a better position to work as a collective because of the scheduling of their particular tasks. As the exhibition moved from venue to venue across a period of circa 18 months, it was not vital for other teams, such as Learning and Education to work together. Survey responses confirm that staff holding roles outside of the curatorial team felt that the critical path through the project did not allow for them to collaborate fully and to share ideas.

#### **4.1.2 Collaborative Working**

Staff were asked to describe how their input assisted in achieving the main aims of the collaboration. All respondents demonstrated that they understood how their role, expertise and knowledge contributed to achieving a successful joint project. Responses demonstrated that staff were acutely aware of the collaborative nature of the project and recognised how their involvement was part of a larger network of contributors.

For example, respondents discussed the practical skills and knowledge which needs to be deployed within an artistic collaboration:

*“my input involved liaison between all partners and EACEA (grant-funders) - assisting in Achieving the main aims of collaboration by disseminating what main aims were, as indicated in the application and monitoring all progress against these”*

*“My input has supported achieving the visitor figure, and also in supporting delivery of the Albums feature”*

*“I have attended a number of partner meetings which helped connect my organisation to the other partners”*

*“I am working as registrar and project manager at my organisation on the common project An Imagined Museum involving works from the Pompidou, Tate and MMK collections. I was the preferred contact of the team in order to centralize all the information on behalf of partners”*

A respondent explained the need to create appropriate conditions for a successful collaboration and how this involves constructing considerate and meaningful platforms which enable communication and the sharing of knowledge:

*“I tried to find a framework that would allow different contributors to feel comfortable. On the one side it was important to have an evocative concept on the other it was key for different people to identify with its potential developments”*

Another respondent described how he/she drew on knowledge concerning contemporary debates around the role of art and museums in society.

*“My research quickly led to André Malraux’s text ‘Le Musée Imaginaire’, written against the backdrop of World War II and the associated looting of art*

*museums across Europe. His text envisaged a positive re-definition of the parameters of the museum, not unrelated to the then real possibility of a future without art objects. This linking of fictional to an actual historic context gave the exhibition a political charge which was accepted by all partners, enabling us to celebrate our museum collections as a form of historical inscription”*

Another member of staff described how his/her input would impact on how the final weekend events across the three institutions.

*“Working on ideas for possibilities to participate within the exhibition through labels. Input for ideas for the exhibition programmes with special guiding tours, events, cooperation with school classes and university and the realisation of that”*

Marketing and Communications demonstrated that staff understood their role had a wider remit than usual.

*“Within the communication office I was responsible to carry the project to the outside. With marketing tools, press work and public relation we achieved many different target groups (analogue and digital). The main focus in the communication was the project itself but also the cooperation between three museums from different countries”*

#### **4.1.3 Collaborative Tasks**

When asked to provide examples of collaborative working respondents could describe numerous tasks which involved them stepping outside of their institutions to discuss and liaise with partners. Such tasks involved practical elements of bringing together a collaborative exhibition including agreeing press releases across institutions and working together to address difficulties in the legalities associated with digital rights.

*“We worked with the partners to gather the images of the works needed for marketing and press. Colleagues from MMK stepped in to help us when we were struggling to get permission to use a particular image. They thought that they might be able to persuade the German rights holder to grant permission. It wasn't successful but we appreciated their support”*

The collaboration also involved agreeing how the partnership should work together to fulfil legal and contractual commitments with funders. This element of collaborative projects can be highly technical and involve onerous chores. In leading this process, the project manager/coordinator needs to be adept in ensuring there is an understanding of expectations concerning compliance. As described in this survey response, this collaborative task is vital to ensure smooth running of the project.

*“An initial cooperation agreement was signed prior to application, however once grant funding was confirmed this has since been revised, to further reflect the requirements of the grant and responsibilities of each partner. I have collaborated with colleagues at each venue for their input into revisions, and agreement to proposed changes to ensure the final agreement is one that all parties are satisfied with and fully signed-up to”*

Staff from Learning and Education again expressed concerns within this section of the survey but acknowledged that when the opportunity was presented to share “programme” ideas it helped to assess how strategies for reaching new audiences across the partnership could have “some coherence”. The process of sharing ideas with staff from other teams explored how collaborative strategies for audience development could be beneficial in the project. Respondents recognised that museums must respond to their local audience but suggested that joint agreements could and should be adapted to local conditions.

Feedback from staff within the curatorial team described how they worked together to solve problems:

*“ we had to identify alternatives for works which were not available for all three partners. The August Sander photographs from the Centre Pompidou collection were only available for Tate Liverpool. I therefore quickly investigated and proposed that MMK and Centre Pompidou-Metz present works by Akram Zaatari from the Tate collection. These were strong replacements and maintained the 'time capsule' idea that was important to our curatorial thinking”*

Staff involved in developing the online element of the project initially had a positive collaborative experience:

*“At the first meeting, we brainstormed with the communication teams to set our expectation about the online platform: which audience we would target, how the platform would work, how we would increase the audience... It was a very challenging and exciting talk”*

In summary, based on their experience in this project 72% of staff said that they would work on a collaborative project again, 38% of staff said they would consider working on a collaborative project in the future. All could cite some difficulties concerning working across three very different institutional boundaries. There was a frustration concerning missing an opportunity to develop a broader understanding of what cooperation could achieve if teams could work and plan simultaneously. Staff expressed that higher levels of collaboration could have been achieved in audience development, press and marketing and the delivery of very specific and unique outputs such as digital platforms:

*“Working in collaboration presents some difficulties and challenges, particularly in relation to different organisational structures and priorities, however, ultimately I feel working in collaboration with 2 other partners has been beneficial and has given a depth of insight into how other organisations work which can in turn inform your own working practices”*

*“..the particular nature of this collaboration meant that some of our usual freedoms were curtailed and this made things more complicated. I think this may have affected the way we talked about it to our audience”*

*“In my opinion transnational projects can only be conducted in effective way if the networks of the involved institutions are used. Further, important media partners like arte for example are much more interested in cooperation if the project has a certain relevance”*

*“It was however difficult to deal with exhibition schedules so delayed in time. Our urgencies and requirements were often quite different and, as we have all very time-engaging jobs, it was sometimes tricky to fit to a common timetable”*

*“..all collaborations will be different. In this case, for a number of reasons already outlined, this didn't feel like a genuine partnership. However, this is not to apportion any blame or criticism. ....”*

The challenge experienced by staff concerning a lack of collaborative opportunity should be recognised and could be seen as an opportunity to reconsider strategies in future projects. Methods could be developed to assist staff to experience the supportive structures which were developed during the curatorial decision making process. Staff from this team did not appear to experience the constraints felt by others and were working at a level where detailed tasks and onerous tasks did not distract from the broader context for collaboration:

*“The project itself created a unique opportunity for significant artworks from three major collections to come together and so was testament to the importance of collaborating”*

*“It was also a learning process in the sense that we all gained a fuller understanding of each others' collections and institutional strengths. By collaborating, we were able to share costs and create a major exhibition combining all three collections. It would be impossible for a partner working alone to bring together such a powerful selection of works”*

*“it is an important symbol for European collaboration and friendship at a time when the idea of Europe is in doubt - every outstanding exhibition unifies different approaches, ideas and contradictions”*

#### **4.1.4 Decision Making**

When asked to consider if decision making in the project was collaborative, 15 of the respondents agreed it was, 6 respondents stated that decisions were made collaboratively on occasions and 1 respondent stated the decisions were not collaborative in his/her experience.

Positive comments concern decisions being made cooperatively concerning the exhibition title, and planning for the final weekend event across all venues:

*“The decision on which title the show was going to have were difficult as different institutions were under different pressures, I think we took the decision fairly even if my organisation did not obtain what we wanted”.*

*“The opinions of all organisations were respected. For example, MMK are planning to replicate Tate Liverpool's final weekend event 'A Living Museum' where the artworks are removed from the galleries and replaced by people, who each enact an 'absent' work from memory. Tate Liverpool's event was a huge success enjoyed by over 1,000 people over the two days; we shared our expertise, documentary footage, opinions and planning process to inform our partner's delivery of this event.*

Within this section some respondents expressed disappointment about the quality of information sharing and a lack of understanding concerning the requirements for compliance with the Creative Europe contract.

*“I think that sometimes we just didn't have the whole story about the project, in my opinion it was to spare us tedious technical issues”*

*“information was difficult to obtain from partners from the start of the project and we only had partial information after some time and it wasn't completed. I don't think that colleagues ... understood that ...we were obliged to gather this information and that they were obliged to give it”*

#### **4.1.5 Problem Solving**

A significant problem highlighted in the survey was the development of the shared digital platform. It was apparent from survey responses that this particular task raised problems that were unforeseen at bid development and with hindsight needed a far more detailed technical appraisal, and maybe a proof of concept agreement between institutions. This is a lesson well learnt and partners could consider that risk assessing and obtaining expert opinion for drafting IT specifications for funding applications. It should also be acknowledged by Creative Europe that digital platforms need to be adequately resourced and the need to provide guidance concerning realistic digital solutions. Survey responses indicated a critical need to collaborate to achieve this task. Furthermore, it appeared essential to have information sharing structures in place concerning legalities pertaining to digital rights which needed to be championed at a higher level. As stated by the respondent:

*“Planning a digital experience that transcends the priorities and styles of single organisations”*

#### **4.1.6 Conflict**

Staff were asked to consider if at any point during the project did the collaborative aspect of the project conflict with their institution’s overarching aims and objectives. Staff responded generally about the issue of conflict and demonstrated very little concern, highlighting only a few areas of possible discord:

*“We wanted the show to have more masterpieces from all three collections and some of the other partners had different priorities for the show”*

*“We have very strict time lapses to consider concerning the loan requests we make for works ..., especially for those covering long terms, as those asked for our project We did not manage to submit our final demand in time, what engendered some diplomatic troubles”*

*“The language issue was a point of conflict: ... didn't understand the need of translating the platform”*

#### **4.1.7 Learning**

Two thirds of respondents confirmed they had learned something new during the collaboration, with a third stating that nothing new or useful was learned at all. Positive aspects of learning include gaining an insight into the practices, structures and operations of other institutions and understanding that similar roles and duties in other arts organisations are not always *'dispatched'* in the same manner. A number of respondents said that differences and similarities across roles held in partner institutions had made them reconsider how they go about their daily routines.

Respondents' comments included:

*"An exhibition can also benefit from compromise"*

*"I learned other ways of working, and it was interesting to see what goals the exhibition aimed at for the different institutions"*

*"I learned that the mission of all museums is shared and that our collections articulate a shared European heritage. I also gained a deeper knowledge of the collections of MMK and Centre Pompidou and developed good relationships with peer curators and colleagues"*

#### **4.1.8 Collaborative Outputs**

18 respondents agreed that outputs were shared equally across the partnership, with only 4 respondents claiming that outputs could have been distributed more effectively. 21 respondents agreed that they understood their role in achieving collaborative outputs with only 1 respondent feeling they needed more clarity.

#### **4.1.9 Communications**

12 respondents stated they found it easy to communicate and to discuss tasks with partner organisations. 7 respondents stated that they found communications difficult. As discussed earlier, the digital element of the project was frustrating and troublesome. Respondents commented that the initial scope was not flexible enough to support non English speaking venues and again expressed concern at this not being a consideration at the bidding stage. Another issue which impinged effective communications was the *"staggered nature of the exhibition (i.e one institution hosting the show after another as opposed to at the same time"*. The scheduling and timetabling of the show made it impossible for priorities to be shared. Communications between the curatorial team were effective and this was partly due to the 'helpful' face to face meetings which enabled key objectives to be 'thrashed out'.

#### **4.1.10 Creating Shared Outputs**

12 respondents agreed that they felt as though they were working as part of a transnational team. 8 respondents felt part of a transnational team only on occasions, and only 2 respondents did not feel part of a team. Comments concerning teamwork include:

*“Throughout the process I have felt part of a larger team, viewing colleagues within partner organisations as colleagues within the same project. There perhaps have been some instances where there is some differentiation but on the whole, yes I did feel that I was working as part of a team”*

*The employees of .....provided us with a lot of material. This was really helpful for the conception of the exhibition texts. Furthermore, they gave us many insights in how they handled the last weekend of the exhibition in terms of communication and organisation. Sharing knowledge is a very important part of team work. Nevertheless, the level of communication was too low (at least in my position) to make me feel like working in a transnational team.*

*During the installation at xxxxx, the efficient working relationships between art handlers and conservators from all three institutions was exemplary and demonstrated effective team working.*

*“Obviously working at different institutions and in different countries (with different exhibition schedules and priorities) means that the very nature of the collaboration and its priorities were not always shared”*

*“I felt we were working as members of our institution gathered to fulfill a goal, but we didn't share enough about the project to feel part of a team”*

Positive aspects and examples of teams working cooperatively to achieve shared outputs included the exhibition, marketing, and financial management. Approaches to Learning and Education programmes and digital outputs did not achieve a similar impact. This was mainly due to timetabling and scheduling needs across three organisations and also an assumed *“lack of understanding of the importance of sharing information and data in the planning stages”*. It was also stated that a lot of planning for joint outputs takes place prior to a successful bid and that the development of a collaborative idea involves a lot of liaison.

Other comments included:

*“one of the partners was centralizing the development, and not sharing much about its steps, it's hard to call it a shared output. I feel that the output matches totally only one partner's expectations”*

*“I have learnt that sometimes time-scales need to be adjusted as working with partners' can elongate processes, and regular communication is key”*

#### **4.1.11 Sharing Practice and Resources**

The survey revealed some constructive examples of sharing practice and resources. For example, the management of EU-funded projects requires a high level of skill base and rigorous documentation systems. A respondent highlighted how the sharing of existing, tried and tested systems together with his/her hands on knowledge of EU systems administration had assisted partners to develop effective project management systems. Other examples of sharing practice related to evaluation with particular reference to the final weekend events with each partner learning from the preceding event. Sharing of practice sharing video footage, organisational documentation and working processes. The participatory events provided opportunities for those not involved in the curatorial aspect of the exhibition to share their expertise with partners concerning engaging community groups and commissioning works from non arts professionals. Other interchanges included the use of social media in marketing and promotion.

#### **4.1.12 Enabling Innovation**

The survey asked respondents to reflect on opportunities created by the collaboration which had allowed them innovate. The final weekend programme was highlighted by respondents as a having a distinct value for testing methodologies which seek to determine how audiences consume and understand art works. The events enabled *“public engagement on an unprecedented scale”* and *“brought new art forms and new audiences”* into the gallery space. The joint decision taking by the curation team to take this risk and to enter into a previously untried or tested approach had a transformational effect on interaction the with works. Comments from staff included:

*“The final weekend was a great success and showed how an art audience could be activated in new ways through access to art. I strongly feel that the act of placing the audience ‘centre stage’ was a both political and powerful; the existence of museums depends upon audiences engaging with art. It demonstrated a new way of working and talking about art”*

#### **4.1.13 Digital Resource**

Due to the acknowledged difficulties associated with developing the collaborative digital platform, an area of the survey was designed to establish key learning from this issue.

The digital resource was first imagined to be a Museum Without Walls, providing access to the An Imagined Museum collection and a system through which online audiences can share or add to the collection within the theme of ‘Works to Know by Heart’. This proved to be an insurmountable task due to legalities concerning digital rights and the intricacies of developing a suitable digital platform. It was acknowledged by respondents that this task was only part way achieved. The process of attempting to create such a platform was a steep but useful learning curve. Respondents felt that the idea brought to light the “limits of digital media in the sense that there are restrictions on the free and open sharing of visual imagery due to copyright law”. Staff tasked with this output had to find creative solutions to the issues and resorted to using an existing platform which had a restrictive architecture but enabled successful interaction within the gallery with the works and generated footage and imagery which had a presence across exhibitions.

The development of a collaborative digital resource also highlighted the need for outputs of this nature to be realistically costed, particularly concerning the need for professional translation services and in developing software and interfaces which were comparable to social media platforms such as Pinterest or Instagram. The respondent tasked with delivering this output felt that consideration should have been given to using software which audiences are familiar with.

*“The model was that art ideas should be shared freely; that art can be a magnet for a community to come together and share ideas. Of course, digital resources provide such a powerful means of communication and connection”*

## **5. Semi Structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 13 members of staff who held varying roles and responsibilities within the partner institutions. Interviewees were asked to provide feedback and views concerning their experiences in 5 key areas of the collaboration: Visioning; Decision Making; Working Practices; Curatorial Methods; Awareness of Hierarchy

Staff were interviewed from the following roles/staff teams: curatorial; administration; art handling; young people and children's programmes; digital; interpretation, learning and education; coordinating the final events.

### **5.1 Clarity of Project Vision**

During interviews respondents were asked to describe their initial understanding of the project's reasoning and vision. Responses helped to assess if the project concept and ambitions translated into a shared vision across all collaborators. And, conversely, whether gaps of knowledge in teams or individuals had occurred and if this impinged cooperation and delivery of outputs.

The majority of interviewees agreed that they held a clear vision from the outset concerning the aims of the project and their associated tasks. Clarity of vision was highest within the Curation Team and when tasks were devolved to local teams from curatorial staff. Where ambiguity occurred it was within very specific task driven outputs which required additional resource, external expertise, and were the responsibility of staff and management outside of curatorial staffing structure.

When considering ambiguity, it should be noted that during the interval between grant approval (almost 2 years) and project initiation there were significant changes in staffing, priorities and local conditions at all partner organisations. Some of interviewees felt that clarity of vision would have been improved and risk abated if key institutional personal and external experts had been involved in bid development and had worked together across organisations to develop a basic but crucial framework in for planning and sharing of knowledge:

*“What are we going to put in place? What is it doing in each locality? We need to know what do they want to do right at the very beginning”*

Staff commented that early discussions and relationship building could have asserted the need for staff to share ideas and to plan for joint strategies which would be deployed in stages. Staff who experienced difficulties felt that early solidification of relationships with key staff outside of the curatorial team would have helped to develop shared thinking and thus consideration of sharing ideas and practice could become reciprocally beneficial. In feedback it was acknowledged that it is difficult to have a strategy for certain elements of programming, e.g. learning programmes and audience development across three museums. Strategies within these areas are reliant on local conditions, local priorities and the institution's mission and aims. For example, Tate Liverpool has a key priority concerning coproduction which may not hold significance for the partner institutions. However, it was felt that the need to respond to local conditions need not impede the sharing of strategies and joint learning.

During the interviews it was highlighted that two major outputs specifically lacked clarity: The Imagined Museum Conference and the Digital Resource. The lead partner has responsibility for ensuring all outputs are delivered and yet with reference to organising an international conference there was little information in the funding application concerning its purpose and theme. *"Is it an academic conference? Is it for artists? What is the theme?"* Furthermore, there was little clarity concerning the desired audience for the conference, and who would host and resource its organisation.

Early discussion between the three Curation Teams concerning the possibility of a joint project helped in the development a very clear vision for a future collaboration pre funding application, Curators had discussed how working together could have created a "greater show" in relation to the Drawing the Line exhibition held at Centre Pompidou Metz. Tate had held a similar exhibition and it was suggested that had both museums collaborated they could have produced a greater show with wider appeal.

This idea gathered momentum and from October 2014 the team discussed designing a collaborative exhibition as a way of bringing added value to their national collections. It was stated that the starting point of these discussions was *"mutuality"*. Ideas in these early conversations included creating a digital collection, having a *"dreamt exhibition"* and exploration of the relationship between literature and art works. Although the notion of bringing together *"Masterpieces"* from owned collections was an understanding held by some of the team, this was not the priority. The notion of bringing works together was more concerned with the value of art and finding ways of understanding how audiences connect with works. Staff from the Curation Team stated that discussions concerning the project vision were posed around the following questions:

*"How do we ensure audiences are connecting with works?"*  
*"How do we memorise or understand value in contemporary arts?"*

*“How do we migrate the works into the mind of the audience?”*

Such discussions led to building a consensus on the project theme and the use of the fictional situation presented by Fahrenheit 451 in which key works from literature are memorised and embodied by a community and thus their enactment acts as a form of preservation. During interviews it was stated that this imagined situation although *‘fictional and political, embeds the mission of regional museums to engage audiences in meaningful ways’*.

The idea of works being under threat and the urgency for developing new forms of preservation was easily grasped by all staff. It was theme that was pertinent for all and a concept that would be easily grasped by audiences. Staff highlighted that the decision to form the concept around Ray Bradbury’s novel was not overtly political and cited that Bradbury himself had argued against the book being a political statement. It was felt that using this concept of during a period in which freedom of speech is being curtailed in some countries and arts and culture *“not as valued as they should be”* was timely and salient. These were common concerns within the cultural sector but the exhibition *“wasn’t primary not a protest show”*. The main show’s ambition was to display iconic works through which audiences could find political meaning without it being explicitly stated.

## **5.2 Decision Making**

Discussions about the level of joint decision making within the project brought forth very positive feedback from the Curatorial Team. The project developed a process quite different from the usual manner in which touring exhibitions are managed. In standard exhibitions it was stated that authorship usually remains the responsibility of one institution with responsibility being held by one curator and a lead organisation. During this project all curatorial decisions were made jointly. Positive feedback concerning this process included:

*“It was real collaboration”*

*“..people encouraged each other”*

*“We learned more about our own collections”*

*“Very open discussions, it was enriching”*

Although, some decisions made were not the ideal choices of everyone, all agreed that the process was shared and open, and this resulted in high levels of trust. An example of a debated decision concerned the show not having key “Masterpieces” from collections. It was the opinion of some interviewees that having a “block buster” in the show would have spread risk across a number of factors including audience numbers and ticket sales. It was noted that ticketing operates differently across institutions. Tate Liverpool for example has

ticketed entry for certain shows and free access to the main collection displays. Ticketed shows need to have a certain pull and a block buster piece would have abated fears of reaching desired sales. This was not a critical issue for other partners who have a one ticket sale on point of entry which provides access for all shows.

The decision making concerning using well known works and lesser known works became “*dialectic*”. One partner had recently held an exhibition of “*masterpieces*” and was concerned An Imagined Museum would be a repeat show. Conversely, another interviewee was concerned that in a “*once in a life time*” opportunity, that the public should see at least 10 amazing works.

Decisions concerning works involved each institution agreeing on 10 key works from their own collections then researching the works held by each other’s. Works were selected in themes e.g. power of the image; critical engagement with popular culture. When decisions were made the team would reconvene to discuss the strength of choices. The process took a few months to achieve the desired joint collection.

Freelance staff involved in the production were not involved in collaborative decisions with the partnership but had asserted that they had creative scope within their skill set and were involved in decision making with the institution’s team. They highlighted this as key learning concerning balancing “*the practical with the ethos of the event*”.

Staff involved in technical and administrative duties had less opportunity to make shared decisions but when possible most agreed that decisions were made collaboratively.

*“Yes, each decision for the project was discussed between partners. We did make decisions together concerning the terms of our collaboration for the project. It was important to exchange and discuss on all matters, share our point of views and listen to the needs of the partners”*

Staff from Interpretation Teams felt it would have been beneficial to jointly strategize for describing the works and marketing the exhibition to a broad audience. Tate Liverpool decided to create extended captions which they felt would assist audiences to understand and memorise the works. It was felt that labelling in this manner it would assist with the wider narrative concerning works to know by heart. There was concern that as many of the works in the exhibition were not well known to audiences. Furthermore, Fahrenheit 451 sits within a specific genre and may not resonate widely with audiences. Other examples of unique and innovative interpretation strategies were offered by interviewees and during the focus group discussion. Staff felt that although they were creating methods that would work within their locality, that they depth and breadth of innovation could have been shared

more effectively. Moreover, the opportunities to share in decisions concerning new methods were limited.

### **5.3 Impact on Working Practices**

The majority of staff interviewed agreed that An Imagined Museum had positively influenced their working practices. The openness and possibilities presented by the show's theme appears to be the main contributory factor to the enthusiasm demonstrated in responses.

*“Evolved as something in which all the teams can come together to make something extraordinary”*

*“How can we use this vision and concept of the show, marry it with our priorities and make this a reality?”*

A respondent from the Curatorial Team offered two key reasons why the project had a positive impact. Firstly, a touring exhibition is usually led by one venue, with other venues only receiving the work. Although there may be some flexibility in how exhibition are re-installed, the overriding concept is never a team decision. Secondly, An Imagined Museum involved *“three pots that you have access to, then that gives you much more room to manoeuvre, not limited by using a singular artist. Sharing this collection in principle freedom of choice were much bigger”*

Some interviewees expressed frustration concerning the lack of opportunities to share practice with counterparts in partner institutions. Although introductions were made from the outset some staff found it hard to instigate discussions concerning shared practice and felt it was a missed opportunity to work together to share approaches, particularly concerning the body of work surrounding the final weekend and the possibilities it presented for shared learning:

*“Enhanced logistical skills, 150 performers risk, planning for chance encounters”*

*“Largest event had to be planned as a ‘military operation”*

*“Had a positive impact working with performers in a manner that changed relationships”*

Staff leading the digital resource experienced negative impacts on working practices citing a wider relationship management remit as contributing factor. The interviewee stated that relationships and points of contact changed by the month.

*“First time I had that level of responsibility found it very difficult and get work done by others and with workload increased. It got very messy with the relationship and it got messy and stressful and it wasn’t anyone’s fault”*

*“Hardest thing I’ve ever worked on and least enjoyment and in terms of what I’ve learnt about myself and pushing it out of my comfort zone and now I can stand away from it has helped me in the long term*

*“Made me think that you need to have strong working relationships where you can be frank and honest with people in the future. In my position didn’t know how frank I could be with working with external partners”*

Some interviewees were concerned with the lack of opportunity to travel and to discuss their roles and tasks with staff from the partner institutions. However, most acknowledged that the ethos of the project enabled them to have some creative flexibility in designing programmes and events.

*“Same works and planned events but space to develop own learning programmes relevant to institutions and for their audiences”*

*“...enabled different elements to develop in situ in relation and reacting to local conditions”*

Interviewees also stated that the manner in which the exhibition was planned had led to the development of new processes and enabled the invention of pathways to understand how art is consumed and understood. Highlighted by interviewees was the ability to involve artists in interpretation and how this *“energised the exhibition”* and developed *“new ways of mediating between works and the audience”*. Interviewees also commented that the project had a positive *“professional impact”*.

## **5.4 Curatorial Methodology**

The positive impact on the Curatorial Team has been emphasised throughout this study. During interviews it was stated that the process of working collaboratively to choose works and co-author an exhibition is not easy. However, all those involved in curation agreed that having experienced such positive impacts, that they would be more inclined to work this way in the future. As a result of this project, the partners are exploring if they could collaborate again. But stated clearly that successful collaborations are based on individuals and not institutions, although An Imagined Museum has built enduring relationships, if staff change the partnership across institutions may not be as strong.

### **5.4.1. Attributes of the successful methodology**

- **Access**

Interviewees stated that it was a liberating experience to have access to three national collections and this enabled the team to make a strong and unique selection of works.

- **Agreeing works**

The team agreed a framework for negotiations and making decisions concerning works and authoring sections. This process began with a long list which was edited through a series of at least 6 meetings/Skype calls.

*“Each institution would look at the sections for ideas and the thinking behind other people’s sections”*

*It was very interesting, all kind of doing it for the first time and I felt that I didn’t really have a clear idea of how to get to the end point”*

*“We tried to create a framework or methods a set of themes of aspects to consider as important when selecting works. This assisted us to condense our conversations and to be able to explain to each other why works had been selected. We considered and discussed why this artist is important? It made us question the value of art and why individual pieces deserved to be saved”*

Interviewees commented that there was a lot negotiation and some degree of compromise. One respondent felt that there was “*less straight talking*” than if you were working with one institution and that maybe certain works would haven’t been in a section but they had been argued for quite strongly by another institution. However, decisions were “*always democratic*”.

- **Concept**

Staff from the Curation Team agreed that coproducing the exhibition theme was key in building trust within the partnership.

*“Everyone brought elements which we merged together”.*

*“Why it works? Shared authorship builds trust”*

*“Without trust you cannot build partnerships”*

- **Final Weekend Event**

All staff interviewed, including those outside of the Curatorial Team, agreed that the final weekend events, although a *“big risk”* was an excellent methodology for engaging audiences and innovating in mediation.

*“Final weekend opens up the interpretation to the audience”*

*“They are valuing it and valuing the process. It is co-production”*

One interviewee stated that the event had given the works a life outside of the show. And, the methodology was of value to the sector because it demonstrated how the audience valued the works on display. Although some staff had concerns about quality, most staff agreed that the events were more concerned with participation and audience engagement. Moreover, as the show contained works unknown to the general public, it had been difficult market. However, asking audiences to engage with work, respond to it and become the *“actual artwork”* proved to be extremely popular. This invitation was extended to artists and performers who could also personify a chosen work. The events were truly collaborative and presented an interesting and transferrable method of audience engagement.

- **Audiences**

Interviewees highlighted as an *“important and crucial”* element of the programme being the invitation to audiences to memorise works, and that this had assisted to *“keep works in hearts and minds”*. Audience perceptions were brought back to the museums and induced a *“collective excitement”*. Interviewees emphasised the need to evidence the manner in which audiences had responded to the exhibition. In all partner institution’s missions there is a stated aim to engage and educate. However, the weekend event created a role reversal situation in which the exhibition couldn’t exist without the audience, filling the gallery space with people and giving them the *“task to propagate” the works*. Staff stated that it was risky and some were not confident it would work *“living museum, crazy idea”*. But all events were well managed and brought a great response.

*“It became a campfire, had a flux, hundreds of people surrounding someone telling them about a works”*

*“It really caught the imagination – I’ve written a poem or a piece of stand- up comedy”*

#### **4.6 Hierarchies**

All staff involved in interviews confirmed that they were not aware of any hierarchies or of any individual or institution having a stronger influence than others. Positive comments included:

*“There was not a transactional manner and I felt part of the team, and did not feel as if anyone had any particular influence of decisions”*

*“the relationship was built on what we could bring to the project”*

*“Everyone entered into the relationship in the right spirit. Some elements of the project could have been managed differently but the relationships worked and would work comfortably with those people again”*

## **6. Focus Group/Workshop**

During March 2017 a focus group/workshop conducted in Paris was attended by key staff from curatorial and administrative teams from the 3 partner institutions. The aim of the meeting was to move discussions concerning the impact of the project forward from the survey and interview findings. Analysis of both survey responses and interview transcriptions affirmed that collaboration worked most effectively for roles which have a 'practice' based element. And, the collaboration had predominately achieved the most for those involved in curation. However, this study was commissioned to assess if collaboration had impacted across all staff teams. It is not a direct criticism of the project design to assert that roles which were process based or driven by the need to respond to local conditions found it difficult work cooperatively across institutions. This difficulty relates mainly to how tasks are timetabled and scheduled in a touring exhibition, particularly tasks which are spread across long periods of time. The focus group confirmed that the lack of collaboration across teams also related to the project budget, which was costed for a usual touring exhibition. This meant that there were no funded opportunities for staff to collaborate outside of the curatorial team. Had the budget been larger, ideas for sharing practice could have included visits and meetings for staff from other departments.

Despite the lack of opportunity to collaborate, interview and survey responses demonstrated that most staff felt that their brief was open and exciting. Moreover, where difficulties and obstacles occurred, all were empowered to use creative interventions to achieve their outputs. And, where difficulties arose in process driven roles there was an ensuing high level of creativity involved in order to achieve the desired outcome.

Responses from the focus group asserted that the project theme had developed a "playground" and as such opened up opportunities for staff to design a "philosophical" mediation of the works. This openness was an invitation for staff to develop unique responses. The opportunities presented by emptying the gallery on the final weekend were immense and all the focus group members agreed that this was an innovative way to work with different art forms and to bring audiences into the show. It was felt that the exhibition theme had activated audiences in a radical manner and proven to be a helpful method for demonstrating how deeply audiences can and will engage with art. One focus group member asserted that the project enabled all involved to consider what should be a very basic question: "what does art deliver for audiences".

The group agreed they had learned from the process of co-curation. It was stated that although there was one exhibition, designed via one methodology, there were in fact three very different ways of working present in all decisions and tasks. Also discussed was the pressure felt by Tate Liverpool being the first exhibitor and first to trial the final weekend

event. MMK and Centre Pompidou Metz were able to plan from learning arising from Tate Liverpool's experience. However, decisions concerning planning events and learning programmes at Tate Liverpool had to be made swiftly and they did not receive reciprocal benefits.

The group agreed that although decisions concerning interpretation were not decided at a partnership level, mainly because of the need to respond to local audiences and conditions, responses to the exhibition by interpretation staff across the partnership offered the opportunity for joint learning. A focus group member cited the work in Centre Pompidou Metz concerning working with partially sighted and blind visitors and how a response had been developed which interpreted the works for them. Another member mentioned the use of "tear off labels" which proved very popular and reinforced the notion of works being lost and the need to memorise the meaning of the works. Another example of creative invention concerned the giving of labels as "*gifts or mementos*" which had proved very successful and popular with audiences.

The group were tasked with discussing relationship building, and if and how the partnership will have a lasting impact. The group felt that another collaboration would be easy to achieve as they each held an understanding of partner's collections. They felt the project produced a show with political reasoning. All asserted the need for future projects to have the capacity for Learning and Education teams to work together.

## **7. Conclusion and Recommendations**

### **7.1. Research Questions**

This study sought to answer the following questions set by the An Imagined Museum partnership.

- Did the collaboration achieve a broadly shared vision?
- Was the process inclusive and transparent?
- Did the collaboration build or strengthen relationships?
- Did the collaboration build knowledge?
- Did the process change practice?
- How are decisions made concerning joint or collaborative conceptualization of exhibitions?
- Who had influence in determining concepts and selection of works?
- Did internal or external factors aid/inhibit using collections for collaborative exhibitions?

Findings concur that the collaboration jointly developed a vision for the project which involved working together to devise a theme/concept, and then developing an equitable framework for deciding key works for the exhibition. The highly successful and innovative methodology deployed in each museum for the final weekend events established new participatory approaches for audience development and collaborative events. All respondents had positive impacts from their experience, with the majority of staff agreeing that they would collaborate again.

Relationships were galvanised between the three partnership institutions and it should be highlighted that vital support was given to organisations who had changes in leadership and key team members. There was a determination to ensure that this project was successful, with each partner valuing the unique opportunity presented by Creative Europe. This determination was evident in the supportive structures developed throughout the project timeline.

The project offers key learning which should be applied to future collaborative projects. Firstly, there was sufficient resources given to finding common ground across local conditions and environments. This time and space brought about a mutually relevant theme or concept which could be easily grasped by audiences from the three countries. Curatorial staff valued the opportunity to re-consider their own collections and learn more about the holdings of partner museums. This reconsideration of what is valued and relevant to audiences brought about an innovative approach to engagement with key works.

Secondly, when scoping collaborative projects consideration should be given to enabling a re-organisation or redistribution of tasks in a touring exhibition project plan or timeline. There were limited opportunities to experience collaborative working across the partnership for staff who were outside of the curation team. This is an observation, not a direct criticism. However, if the partnership is truly committed to enabling cooperation across other staff teams, then they should be tasked with finding a solution to this issue.

Conducting this research project brought about key learning concerning the measurement of collaborative efforts. The Impact Framework developed for this project proved at times to be a rigid structure through which to examine what was ultimately a developmental and experimental process. Throughout data collection staff wanted to tell their story of collaboration or to describe their individual pathway through this project. Stories involved highly positive experiences, frustrations and also some unique examples of creative inventiveness. Future impact studies could consider gathering evidence and presenting data using a more experiential approach to impact measurement. Using this approach could bring about a more holistic analysis of synergetic effect which is applicable to the arts and culture sector.

## **7.2 Impact Summary**

<b>Success Factor</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
<b>Joint Decision Making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opinions are taken seriously from each partner</li> <li>• Solutions to problems are achieved collectively</li> <li>• Goals are jointly agreed</li> </ul>	<p>Respondents agreed that opinions were taken seriously and where collaborative decision making was possible that there was mutual respect for choices and opinions.</p> <p>Solutions to problems were achieved jointly where collaboration was possible. This is evidenced in discussions and negotiations concerning choices of art works, budgets and finances and is of particular relevance to finding a solution to the digital resource.</p>

		Some tasks would have benefitted from joint decision making including confusion concerning the planned conference. Deeper impact would have been apparent in this element had a framework for discussion for all collaborative outputs been put in place.
<b>Autonomy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the collaboration hinder organisational goals?</li> <li>• Was organisational independence affected by collaborative activities?</li> <li>• Did representatives feel compromised or 'pulled' by the Partnership's expectations and those of their organisation?</li> </ul>	There was little or no evidence in survey responses, interviews or focus group discussions that the collaboration had hindered organisational goals or independence. Nor did any respondent confirm that he/she had felt compromised by expectations. There were difficulties in developing the proposed digital output, but these were resolved collaboratively.
<b>Administration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partners understand their role</li> <li>• Partnership meetings are effective and achieve set targets</li> <li>• Tasks are well coordinated between partners</li> </ul>	All respondents and interviewees confirmed that they understood their role and that tasks were well coordinated. There was an administrative learning curve for some staff members who had not been involved in European Funding administration before and didn't understand intricacies involved in compliance.

<p><b>Mutuality</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partner organisations have combined and used each other’s resources to mutual benefit</li> <li>• Partners share information with each other that will strengthen their operations</li> <li>• Partners feel their input to the collaboration is appreciated and respected</li> <li>• Partners achieve own goals better working with partner organisations than working alone.</li> <li>• Partners work through differences to arrive at mutually agreeable solutions.</li> </ul>	<p>Resources were combined both in human resource, art works and knowledge capital.</p> <p>Knowledge was shared within the Curation Team with frustration being felt within Learning and Education teams concerning a lack of communication.</p> <p>The Curation Team and the majority of respondents agreed that the collaboration had developed an unique exhibition and a risk taking audience development strategy that would not have been possible along.</p> <p>All respondents agreed that mutual agreements to solutions were found.</p>
<p><b>Trust</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representatives perceive each other as ‘trustworthy’</li> <li>• It is perceived or recognised that partners met their obligations</li> <li>• The partnership achieved longevity (no drop out)</li> <li>• Partners would enter into a collaboration again</li> </ul>	<p>High levels of trust were found within the Curation Team and beyond this team all felt that obligations had been met although there were missed opportunities for collaboration across teams.</p> <p>The project was delivered across a two year time period and all stayed loyal to the proposal despite some financial difficulties being experienced by one partner. All agree that they would enter into a partnership again.</p>

