

Incubate Propagate Scoping Workshops 2017

Networked Ecologies of New Performance-Making

Introduction

Following discussions involving Liz Tomlin (University of Glasgow) and Alison Gagen (Arts Council England) around the potential for greater partnership work between academic researchers, theatre producers and Arts Council England, four consultation workshops were held in May and June 2017 in Birmingham, London, Leeds and Glasgow, bringing together over 60 participants: academics in contemporary theatre and performance, theatre producers, and representatives of the English and Scottish funding bodies, Arts Council England and Creative Scotland.

The aim of the workshops was to bring policy-makers, funders and producers of new work into discussion with academics who were invested in the quality, diversity (aesthetic and demographic) and sustainability of emerging theatre and performance practice in the UK. The discussions were underpinned by the question:

How might policy makers, academics and producers work better together to support and sustain the quality, innovation and aesthetic and demographic diversity of emerging theatre and performance practice in the UK?

Discussion in Birmingham, Leeds and London followed two panels, one in the morning, one in the afternoon; each kick-started by brief provocations from selected participants from each constituency responding to:

What's Working? Where are the gaps?

In Glasgow a shorter, roundtable discussion was held where participants responded to the same initial question.

In the two main sections that follow, this report seeks to:

1. Record the most frequently recurring pre-occupations of the sector across the four events. These will be condensed into thematic subsections, drawing on all four workshops.
2. Conclusions and next steps.

A full list of participants is included in the appendix to the report.

Section One: What's working? / Where are the gaps?

1.

Emerging Artist Development Structures. Across the workshops the following were noted as vital for best practice:

- 1.1 For structures to be open to the specific needs of the artists and projects
- 1.2 For structures to be bespoke
- 1.3 For the emphasis to be on artistic development rather than end product (which then often leads to the development of end products in any case)
- 1.4 For artists to be pushed to stretch their thinking through collaborations across disciplines, backgrounds, cultures etc.
- 1.5 The importance of distributed centres of activity, and fluidity between networks and collectives
- 1.6 The importance of giving time: to think allotment rather than hothouse, the importance of sustained cultivation
- 1.7 How can we combat – in both HE and Industry sectors – the need to know what the thing is, before the thing is. This is an issue with students in neoliberal and commodified educational contexts wanting to know the answer, the right way to do something, the prioritising of the mark over the experience; and also in the structures of making professional work, both in terms of funding and programming – the artists having to 'sell' something before it is made, or they know what it is
- 1.8 The specific role of mentoring emerging artists both practically and emotionally with first projects was also something that came up a number of times – is there someone in place to do this, and are they reimbursed for this labour?

2.

Scaling up emerging artists' work:

- 2.1 The importance of thinking about scale. Both in relation to emerging companies and live artists, how to encourage them to think beyond intimacy and studio spaces? Can they have access to larger spaces simply to think bigger? Could universities offer space for this outside of term time? Or main houses outside when the main stage is not in use?
- 2.2 The need for programmers to think beyond one-offs and build broader visions for their work that artists can contribute meaningfully to. To move beyond scratch and development opportunities – sometimes seen by artists as cheap options without commitment of production [nb this is a different point to the need for early-stage artistic development outlined in 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7 and leads onto 2.3].

- 2.3 The need to distinguish clearly between artist development and product development. The first should remain open-ended, the second should offer a commitment to production. The need for artist development at all stages to be paid.
- 2.4 Progression routes that addressed those at all stages of their institutional life/capital. A particular question was raised about the need to support mid-career artists and continuing progression routes within this ecology. This was felt to be especially important in the London context when emerging work is at most risk of being side-lined/ignored by the mainstream powerhouses who arguably commission the same people all the time. There was debate in a number of workshops as to whether moving into the main houses should necessarily be the aspiration of the independent sector (see 2.5); but it was also felt that cabals and elite gatekeepers retained much of the cultural power in the capital at least. This was noted as a particular issue in relation to musical theatre which doesn't seem to have the capacity/support for an 'emergent stage', perhaps one reason for lack of innovation in the mainstream work. In Glasgow, it was noted that the National Theatre of Scotland did have a good record of supporting and upscaling artists it chose to partner with, but the danger of its considerable pull of resources and prestige within the Scottish ecology was also noted.
- 2.5 A need was identified for contemporary and experimental performance to be more regularly represented on our main stages; the need for cultural re-thinking of our dominant theatre models was regularly expressed. In contrast with continental European contexts in particular it was felt that contemporary practice is always consigned to the margins of large scale practice.
- 2.6 Contrary to the above, there was also a resistance to everything new being incorporated into or aspiring towards, the large and high-profile spaces, and the need to maintain alternative spaces and ecologies for alternative practices. However, there remained a need for the large and high-profile spaces not to be barred to those who aspired to them from a background/aesthetic of difference and not to be characterised by white, middle-class privilege, and for the alternative ecologies to be as well-resourced as the currently dominant ones.
- 2.7 It was noted that larger theatres run by producers rather than artistic directors, or artistic directors who were also happy to play the role of curator, were much more successful in supporting the development of emerging artists into middle scale spaces, than artistic directors whose main preoccupation was directing their own artistic work.
- 2.8 The consequences of putting more resources into scaling up was also noted; mainly that this would be a strategic shift of resources to mid-career artists that might necessitate less funding going to emergent level work, but it was generally considered a high priority for funding and resourcing.
- 2.9 It was felt that recently the upscaling of black and minority ethnic (BAME) theatre to main stages, in England, had undergone real improvement. What was still needed was the right of autonomy of BAME artists to produce the work they wanted to produce, independently of any BAME remit or expectation from the venue's agenda.

3.

Where is the incubation/propagation of new work best supported currently?

- 3.1 Arts Centres, and collaborations between arts centres and independent producers, were felt to be the most productive incubator of new work. Larger theatres were seen as much less well equipped to support new work productively for many reasons: a) they often don't understand/value the nature of contemporary work b) the work is often driven by a single artistic director whose own productions/vision is the priority c) they are restricted by very tight financial margins and so unable to take programming risks d) their resources are tied up in NPO objectives. The vital role of arts centres/festivals/independent producers that are much better equipped to undertake incubation work could perhaps be better recognised in allocation of resources that reflects better where the robust support systems are located.
- 3.2 A large number of HE departments are successfully doing very good work in connecting up students with arts organisations/structures through internships, industry input to modules, introductions into networks etc. North East Artist Development Network / Venues North / Northumbria cited as strong case study from the North East. Leeds Uni (YEP programme) and Leeds Beckett (2nd yr internships) also had strong schemes in place as do many other HE institutions.
- 3.3 A need was identified for those larger theatres who were allocated resources to learn from business models developed by arts centres, independent producers and HE for commissioning, producing and supporting incubation better. It was suggested that the pressure on larger organisations to follow policy initiatives such as 'Talent Development' sometimes meant that institutions were pressured to undertake work they were not best suited for.
- 3.4 In Glasgow it was noted that outside of the central belt of Edinburgh and Glasgow theatres weren't really required to support emergent work in the way that has become common for the Rep system in England. The difficulties throughout the rest of Scotland were that most venues were under-funded and often council-run with no creative overview or curation, with often quite a conservative view of what audiences would want. Outside of Glasgow and Edinburgh new work development in Scotland most often happened with local venues working in partnership with producers – the Creative Scotland Producers' Project and Magnetic North collaboration with Aberdeen's Lemon Tree were flagged as good examples.
- 3.5 The importance of maintaining a vision of the ecology that keeps in sight the whole terrain between the most local to the international was identified (especially in light of Brexit).

4.

The role of universities in incubating practice

- 4.1 To think through best practice pedagogical models of artists/producers as visiting/associate lecturers. Can the work contribute towards the artist's own R&D? Can the necessary risks of making work be maintained despite the increasing bureaucratic emphasis on reducing risk within assessed teaching? Can the best practice (see section 1) of making art outside of the university be replicated inside it, despite the difficulties of assessment, and student expectation, when no 'product' is aimed for, and risks of failure are maintained as essential?
- 4.2 To share (making/performance/office) space and resources with emerging artists/graduate companies

- 4.3 To create sustainable face to face and online networks between producers and researchers
- 4.4 To embed students in local theatre activities, and prioritise the sharing of social capital and existing local networks with graduates, to retain emerging artists in the regions. This was the opposite in the London context where students were encouraged to look elsewhere for support structures under less competition.
- 4.5 To disseminate relevant research/policy documents to producers through network structures

5.

Partnerships between HE and Theatre Producers

- 5.1 the importance of ensuring explicit and transparent agendas – what is each partner hoping to achieve/gain
- 5.2 finding opportunities to meet and engage in dialogue; to gain a deeper understanding of the context, specific nature and conditions of practice of each other
- 5.3 to maintain an awareness of difference in time frames between HE and independent sector; the necessity for HE to maintain robust but flexible frameworks which can remain reactive to opportunities
- 5.4 the importance of lobbying within universities of ways to make industry partnerships more attractive to practitioners – prompt payment structures, more local accountability/flexibility at department / subject level
- 5.5 the need to share information across both sectors – what is the best way of doing this with so much information?
- 5.6 To think through deep partnerships between the sectors, rather than short term expedient ones. What would year long, or longer, partnerships between a producer/producing house and a university department look like? To think through partnerships that were not built around one specific project from the start (eg teaching a module) but a relationship/conversation that was open and maintained and allowed new and surprising elements to spark ideas, where artists and producers could be instrumental in helping to build and inform, as well as contribute to, university new work programmes
- 5.7 The possibility of an active regional producer undertaking a PT role within an arts school or department, who could broker partnerships, manage interdisciplinary teaching and research relationships, internships and other activities
- 5.8 The development of academic/producer friendships that were commitments between individuals to simply maintain regular conversations over a period of time, to enable ideas to develop organically
- 5.9 The development of a database of producers/academics who were happy to be contacted for informal meetings and information sharing sessions over coffee
- 5.10 To better use the capacity for theatre academics/producers brokering further relationships for each other in their respective sectors: academics accessing expertise in other disciplines

for artist/producer-led projects, producers as keyholders for the wider artist community, advising on collaborations, tutors, placements etc. Also for each to enable the other to become more familiar with the management/funder 'buzzwords' in their sectors – such as the impact agenda, which might help artists in conversation with academics around the dissemination of their research through artistic practice

- 5.11 Mechanisms to promote the development of partnerships between producers, artists, researchers in other disciplines and theatre students to create interdisciplinary research with impact and public engagement potential
- 5.12 Is there a role for researchers in collaboration with artistic practice? As dramaturg or outside eye? What are the tensions of such a relationship and how might these be addressed, what are the benefits?

6.

Lobbying within HE

- 6.1 To lobby within universities around the importance of industry-experience posts within departments/schools, and to highlight the need for academics who can be 'intrapreneurs' creating opportunities to embed entrepreneurial skills in the curriculum. This might include addressing the increasing requirement of PhDs to work in HE, the exploration of innovative teaching fellowships, or a broader understanding of action-research in the industry. Also, a highlighting of the invisible labour (in terms of things like promotion, advancement) involved in building and maintaining personal and professional contacts within the industry that enabled the headline outputs of 'employability' and 'impact' to be achieved.
- 6.2 To innovate & lobby within universities for pedagogical practices that 'pushed back' at learning outcomes and specific goals within arts disciplines; to create free spaces for play [University of Exeter's festival was a good model of this]
- 6.3 To look at support for international students and the situation with visas (Tier 1 looked at explicitly here). To argue within the university's drives for international development, that supporting producers to go on producing within the UK following their programme, could be seen as part of universities international development projects wing. To also lobby Creative Industries Federation regarding international student artists and producers.

7.

Aesthetic Diversity and Risk:

- 7.1 How to better think about risk. Why are some works categorised as 'more risky' than others in terms of audiences? The need to build audience development into artistic development – live artists/small scale artists working with audiences as part of their process. How can risks be better shared? Can universities help at all here?
- 7.2 The structures through which we present 'the new' or 'the alternative' can position it precisely as marginal, risky and fetishized, and so consolidate its marginality, appearance of risk.

- 7.3 Strategies of subversion might include framing the 'new' as 'normal', or mainstream, and thus mitigating the sense of risk attached.
- 7.4 To be more careful of what is modelled: if 'black' work comes to mean work that 'reflects the black experience' then this can restrict black artists to thinking only in this way, and so prevent the work made by black artists from expanding to reflect whatever content and form the individual artist requires for their vision. If 'new work' comes to mean something necessarily small-scale, and well suited for a scratch night, then this is the 'new work' that will continue to be made.
- 7.5 For those working with students in universities to take more risks with pushing the structures that exist. To encourage students not to simply make work for existing development structures, but to make work that requires new kinds of structures to be brought into being.

8.

Where Alternative Ecologies/Approaches are required:

- 8.1 The danger was noted of universities/independent producers/ACE consolidating specific 'career routes' for artists that would encourage students merely to replicate models that already existed. In this way innovation suffers, and the potentially disruptive is resolved into existing market structures. There is a political and aesthetic need for different modes of incubation/propagation.
- 8.2 Can universities act as hubs for incubation projects beyond their own students? Or place their students within new contexts as a way of engaging hard to reach communities with theatre practice, and encouraging students to think and encounter more broadly (thus more prepared to innovate)? As civic universities, could theatre departments extend their work to this – look at Leeds University Cultural Institute as eg. Informal training schemes (young producers scheme) for those not studying theatre/performance practice?
- 8.3 The need to undertake / access research into pedagogy through arts practice – ie alternative routes to universities as ways to move into professional performance making. What would a university-led access programme to theatre making look like? Does one exist? In the Leeds workshop it was noted that producers being trained in an independent context specified their preference to remain outside of formal educational structures. Roundhouse, in the London workshop, noted that critical skills such as peer feedback would be something university tutors could offer their outreach programme. To what degree would the contents of university curricula (contexts, histories, analysis etc) be valuable in outreach programmes?
- 8.4 Can universities look further to their responsibility to broaden students' horizons of expectation – to work against the idea of linear career progression / ladders, and remain committed to a much more expansive engagement with different audiences, different methods, different ways of thinking about/making work / sustaining practice. Guard against too prescriptive a model of 'being a professional artist'.
- 8.5 If diversity of artists and audiences is to be encouraged, diversity of producers, critics, is also required. Emerging artists, directors, producers & critics need to be exposed to and engaged

with difference in relation to artists, audiences and form. HE curricula could look to better attend to the diversity of work, artists and audiences their students are exposed to.

- 8.6 Could academic research map, profile and evaluate the potential of existing grass roots R&D spaces, and projects that forge their own ecologies of incubation? Could research map those projects that access other kinds of funding (NHS, Police), to provide models for other producers to develop in different contexts?
- 8.7 The need for research to argue, and for academics to lobby the arts sector/arts funders to shift the dominant understandings of 'artistic excellence' and 'aesthetics' which are still too often understood in opposition to community and political art – or education /engagement /access in ACE grant criteria terms.
- 8.8 The need to work across the divides often in place in larger institutions between education/outreach departments and the 'main business' of art. It was argued that it is often the education/outreach directors that shift the aesthetic direction of larger organisations and these need to be better credited and resourced for their artistic, as well as their educational, developments.
- 8.9 The question was raised as to whether resistant/alternative ecologies of new theatre development should remain distinct from the mainstream or whether it was important that they were in dialogue with them, or embedded within them, or fed into them, in order to influence the ecology as a whole, and give all emerging artists access to the same trajectory and possibilities.
- 8.10 The need for alternative options beyond existing funding structures for producing and artistic advancement, particularly for strongly political community work, and community work that needs to be more reactive than conventional funding structures permit. Could funding bodies also look at their current structures to see how they might permit more open-ended proposals without known outcomes? What were the limits within government funding schemes for strongly political/activist work?
- 8.11 The key to development opportunities are inarguably networks, so the question arose on a number of occasions - who has access to those networks? And who doesn't? How can networks be extended beyond the graduate emerging artists? What might be the missing nodes in the chain? How do we connect those beyond the existing networks? The problem of a sharing economy for those who might have nothing to share, or can less afford to share what they have, was also raised. How do we extend networks and ecologies out beyond their current metropolitan/graduate focus? Individuals who straddle different networks were noted as key to bringing people across from one network to another.
- 8.12 Given the difficulties of sustaining a living, that was a key barrier to emerging artists from lower socio-economic backgrounds, were there different ways of configuring professional lives, practice and aspiration? Do we need to widen an understanding of artistic practice as something that may or may not correspond with being a professional artist? Do we need to advocate non-professional arts practice? Or mixed-portfolio careers in which arts is one aspect? What about the very obvious dangers of this? Are we capitulating to the market forces on this, or is this simply an acknowledgement of the reality that might extend more arts practice into communities etc?

Section Two: Conclusions, Actions Taken and Possible Next Steps

Conclusions in Summary:

What's Working? Where are the Gaps?

There are many regions in the UK that have very well-established networks between HE departments, theatre producers and arts funding bodies. Where these work well, they offer students, graduates and postgraduates excellent routes of access into professional theatre making practice.

This report has noted instances of best practice, strong principles for continued partnership working, and suggestions for further improvements and developments in partnership working between HE institutions and theatre producers. It has also identified best practice in the incubation and propagation structures in the theatre ecology more widely, as well as identifying where things are not as good as they might be.

Areas where it was noted that there was still much more fundamental thinking to be done, concerned the difficulties of 'scaling up' emerging artists to middle-scale; the continued marginalisation and side-lining of work that was perceived 'risky' on various counts; the continued conservatism of the theatre ecology more generally; and the limitations of the existing networks and developments schemes that were targeted predominantly at graduates who were predominantly white. Moreover, those graduates who tended to sustain their artistic activity for any length of time, tended to be the more affluent graduates from the cohort.

Actions Taken:

1. An AHRC network funding application has been submitted by Liz Tomlin, Jessica Bowles, Joslin McKinney and Paul Geary to address the specific question of how to achieve greater socio-economic diversity in emerging artist programmes and platforms by establishing networks that reach beyond graduate pathways. The outcome of this application will be known in spring 2018 with network activity scheduled to start in July 2018.
2. This report has been circulated to participants of the consultancy workshops, and the link to the report has been publicised on SCUDD and via the Producer facebook page to enable the report to be accessed and shared by interested parties.
3. The report will be presented to the SCUDD annual meeting at the University of Birmingham in June 2018. This will afford an additional opportunity to request interest from specific academic institutions / departments to pick up any of the possible next steps detailed below.

Possible Next Steps:

Many suggestions came out of the workshops about ways in which the academic community – in terms of research, resource support, and pedagogical/employability partnerships – might better *'support and sustain the quality, innovation and aesthetic and demographic diversity of emerging theatre and performance practice in the UK'*. The possible next steps noted below draw substantively from the above report, but have also been augmented by further conversations between the project partners. These are not comprehensive, but seek to give a sense of how some of the key findings

might be further addressed. It would be appreciated if any developments drawing on the following were instigated, if brief information could be sent to Elizabeth.Tomlin@glasgow.ac.uk in order that we can track and record as many outcomes of the consultancy workshops as possible.

A: Information Sharing

1. Setting up an informal database of participants willing to meet for an informal coffee with other participants to continue the discussions, exchange information etc.
2. Establish a website/facebook page which can invite new members from academic communities / producer communities to join to extend the current network of participants. Create space for dialogue, and posting of new theatre development projects, useful information, for the benefit of both communities

B. Research Activity

1.

Mapping the Independent Sector through a mapping of Independent Producers

Why?

A map of producers might be the best way to begin mapping the new work ecology, and a map of the new work ecology might increase its visibility and profile

A map would consolidate the sector and potentially increase the sector's capacity to lobby and organise

A map would consolidate and extend access to networks among the sector and beyond it

A map would create a more identifiable 'industry' who can speak on behalf of themselves and the independent sector they manage

2.

Identification, Analysis, Mapping and Dissemination of Innovative Case Studies of incubation/propagation

Why?

To enable the sector to learn about / from best practice

To bring best practice to the attention of scholars and arts funding bodies for better profile and support

To share best practice with teachers and university employability initiatives

To disseminate that information internationally in contexts where artist development is less established

To establish a base or starting point to identify the gaps that need addressing, and from which to build further innovation

3.

Development of innovative incubation/propagation structures focused on any or all of the following:

- a) Models focusing on process not product
 - To combat the 'product-orientated' market ethos of both HE& neoliberal culture
 - To enable greater innovations in form, away from market pressures
- b) Models exploring how to incubate/propagate activist performance
- c) Models exploring possible methods of virtual/distance incubation/propagation
- d) Models exploring how to maximise non-HE routes, and promote wider access
- e) Models of good practice (creation and navigation) for ensuring wider access to networks and opportunities

C. HE/Producer Partnerships & Projects

1.

HE Institutions

To innovate & lobby within universities for pedagogical practices that 'push back' at learning outcomes and specific goals within arts disciplines; to create free spaces for play

To argue within university's drives for international development, that supporting producers, for eg, to go on producing within the UK following their programme, could be seen as part of universities international development projects wing

To lobby within universities around the importance of industry-experience posts (as equivalent to researchers) within departments/schools, and to highlight the need for academics who can be 'intrapreneuers' creating opportunities to embed entrepreneurial skills in the curriculum

To promote the benefits of employing fractional post, working producers to support department/university-wide collaboration with the cultural sector in terms of research/impact/employability

2.

Partnerships

To explore the options of a concrete infrastructure, a consortium of universities/producers, potentially with an annual symposium etc. where good practice, models and questions could be shared

To explore the options of HE depts. operating as regional hubs /nodes for a UK Incubate-Propagate consortium as detailed above. These hubs could seek to:

- hold regional meetings / report to annual symposium
- identify and disseminate case studies in their region
- disseminate publications/podcasts
- map activity in their region

undertake local pilot partnership and research projects

be the hub that facilitates independents and festivals joining up regionally to be more securely funded for the commissioning/incubation work they undertake

look at how they might share resources/risk in the scaling up of emerging artists, through use of larger spaces for R&D and performances, audiences, etc.

Appendix 1 - Participants**University of Birmingham, Tuesday 16 May 2017**

Liz Tomlin (University of Glasgow), Project Lead
Paul Geary (University of Birmingham), Project Partner
Alison Gagen (Arts Council England), Project Partner
Nikki Ralston (Arts Council England)
Jacqueline Bolton (University of Lincoln)
Kate Dorney (University of Manchester)
Taryn Storey (Coventry University)
James Frieze (Liverpool John Moores University)
Pippa Frith (Independent Producer)
Ruby Glaskin (Independent Producer / Derby Theatre)
Tanuja Amarasuriya (Theatre Bristol)
Judy Owen (Independent Producer)
Nisha Modhwadia (Birmingham Rep)
Gareth Nicholls (Little Earthquake Theatre)
Caroline Barth (Derby Theatre)
Nic Wass (Royal Shakespeare Company)

Central School of Speech and Drama, Wednesday 7 June 2017

Liz Tomlin (University of Glasgow), Project Lead
Jessica Bowles (Central School of Speech and Drama), Project Partner
Paul Geary (University of Birmingham), Project Partner
Anna Jefferson (ACE, South East)
Alex James (ACE, London)
Marissia Fragkou (Canterbury Christ Church)
Adam Alston (University of Surrey)

Rebecca Hillman (Exeter University)
Sian Prime (Goldsmiths University)
Chris Grady (Mountview)
Rachel Nelken (Roundhouse)
Neil Mackinnon (Touring and Commissions, Royal Festival Hall)
Marie Ortinau (Royal Festival Hall)
Sarah Wilson-White (Farnham Maltings/Fuel)
George Bednar (Independent Producer)
Jo Crowley (Independent Producer)
Shaiful Mohammad Bin Sawalludin (Independent Producer)

University of Leeds, Tuesday 20th June 2017

Liz Tomlin (University of Glasgow), Project Lead
Joslin McKinney (University of Leeds), Project Partner
Natalie Querol (ACE)
Hannah Bentley (ACE)
Lisa Mallaghan (Mind the Gap)
Evie Manning (Common Wealth)
Amy Letman (Transform)
Annie Lloyd (Compass)
Annabel Turpin (Arc)
Morag Iles (Independent Producer)
Javaad Alipoor (Independent Producer)
Moji Kareem (Utopia Theatre)
Tony Gardner (University of Leeds)
Steve Ansell (Stage@leeds theatre)
Jessica Bowles (Central School of Speech and Drama), Project Partner
Rachel Clements (University of Manchester)
Teresa Brayshaw (Leeds Beckett University)
Neil MacKenzie (Manchester Metropolitan University / Flare)
Kate Craddock (Northumbria University / GIFT)

Sue Hayton (Associate Director, University of Leeds Cultural Institute)

University of Glasgow, Wednesday 29th June 2017

Liz Tomlin (University of Glasgow), Project Lead

Fiona Sturgeon Shea (Playwrights' Studio)

Kat Boyle (Feral Arts)

Jill Smith (Feral Arts)

Verity Leigh (Summerhall, Magnetic North)

Anna Krzystek (Creative Scotland)

David Overend (Royal Holloway, University of London)

Minty Donald (University of Glasgow)

Dee Heddon (University of Glasgow)

Stephen Greer (University of Glasgow)

Vicky Price (University of Glasgow)