**UAL for APPG for Art, Craft and Design in Education, 12 November 2019**

[Preamble: Delighted to be able to host you today. Good to be able to talk about something other than Brexit/election. A line about Chelsea.]

I want to start by welcoming the recent announcement by the Department for Education that from 2020-21, art and design trainee teachers will receive a bursary of £9,000 towards their training. I know NSEAD campaigned vigorously for extending this important financial support to art & design trainees. And I agree that this change cannot come soon enough, although I wish that this decision had been in place earlier in the academic cycle so that this year’s cohort could have also benefited.

UAL has a deep interest in what happens at all levels of education. Our activities span the full length of the education journey. We educate students from Further Education to PhD level. We work in partnership with partnership with over 300 London schools and further education colleges on a range of progression programmes that reached over 2,000 students last year. Through the UAL Awarding Body, we accredit creative qualifications at Levels 2 to 5 at over 120 institutions in the UK and abroad, including X and Y [*TBC - we will* *cite some relevant colleges and the National College for the Creative & Cultural Industries*]. For many years we have opened our doors to school students through Saturday Arts Clubs. And we’re proud to have just launched our latest venture delivering short courses to primary schools – which I’ll say more about later on.

The relationship between creative arts graduates and teaching has a strong history. UAL’s colleges began life as vocational training institutes. Arts teachers in secondary education are art school graduates. Across the sector, around 10% of creative graduates go into education professions – as teachers or in public education programmes such as those found in museums and galleries. *[Figure is the latest HESA figure from DLHE 2016-17; the average for all subjects is 12%; the average across the sciences is 7%.]*

I want to set out UAL’s position regarding art, craft and design in education with a particular focus on schools – and to ask how we can make common cause with you.

My first point is that **access to creativity must start in schools**. Art, craft and design teachers are essential to that access. So it is disturbing that teaching is becoming less attractive as a profession. For the last X years, Government hasn’t fulfilled its teacher training targets. [*We’re checking the figure.*] You’ve quoted the data yourself: 10% fewer art & design specialist teachers, and 16% fewer hours of art and design taught, in schools in 2018 compared to 2010. Meanwhile in the same period, jobs in the UK’s creative economy have grown by 12%. It will take more than just bursaries to reverse this trend, or to maintain that growth in our creative economy.

Consequently, my second point is that **the long-term drop off in creative provision in schools is creating a future crisis**. I want to make common cause with you on this. Britain built its world-leading creative industries on the back of creative education, which therefore needs to be funded in a consistent, joined-up way from primary school. Policy-makers have long understood this for STEM – but not for creativity. Yet science and art teaching in the UK came from the same cradle in provincial design schools in the 1840s.

As a university, it’s crucial that those who apply to study at UAL have creative potential and have been able to access creative opportunities in school. Yet creative education has been downgraded in the curriculum and in funding priorities. In few places is the impact as evident as the Design & Technology GCSE – this year’s Ofqual figures pointed to the 28% decline. And Progress 8 pushes art, craft and design down the pecking order behind Maths, English and the EBacc subjects.

You know all this of course. A while ago in an article I cited NSEAD’s *Art, Craft and Design Educator Survey Report 2014*, which said “the subject lacks value, especially in the state school sector”. At the time I said that was an understatement. Sadly I think that is now even more the case. The discourse about what is valuable to teach and to learn has narrowed.

My third point is that **this is at odds with Industrial Strategy**. Creativity sits alongside numeracy and literacy as a key aptitude for the 21st century workforce. I’ve already mentioned the growth of the creative economy over the period when creative provision has been declining in schools. Squeezing arts and design from the school curriculum will not only damage creative universities: it cuts off the vital pipeline that has, for at least a decade now, fed the success and growth of the creative industries. It is something no government concerned with economic growth and productivity should want to do. And it is evidence of a lack of joined-up policy between DFE and other Government departments.

A simple, achievable solution is to **broaden the Ebacc to include a creative subject**. I have been campaigning on this since the days of the Coalition Government. The same argument is now made by the Durham Commission on Creativity and Education, and by the CBI, whose report earlier this year argued that the education system is leaving young people unprepared for the modern world and explicitly argued for inclusion of creative disciplines in the Ebacc. [[CBI report here](https://www.cbi.org.uk/articles/getting-young-people-work-ready/)] They recognise the significance of creativity for future workforce. Not just in the “creative industries” but “creativity across industry”.

My fourth point is that **T levels are not the answer. They will serve art, design and crafts particularly badly.** UAL has been advising on the design and piloting of T levels. But the language of “technical” and “applied general” incites a hard divide between the “academic” and the non-academic that simply does not apply in practice-based but critically reflective disciplines like the creative arts. Ministers may insist it does not narrow students’ options, but it forces learners to choose a route, at a stage when many are just not ready for it. It inevitably reduces students’ options later in their educational journey.

The Government is also pinning its hope on expansion of Higher Technical education at Levels 4 and 5. It hopes that if it changes the conditions, providers will fill the market. But it is not clear that colleges or students are going to oblige. UAL Awarding Body tells me that only 3 per cent of 18 year olds currently even consider doing a higher level technical qualification – they want to progress to HE, to an Apprenticeship or to work. So we need routes that enable that.

My fifth point is that **the current** **performance measures don’t help creativity to flourish**. UAL students don’t work in straight lines: they flourish and succeed when we allow them to experiment; to work together; to challenge established ways of working. But the recent curricular reforms have forced the opposite on schools: rote-learning, teaching to the test.

Universities have long voiced concerns about this. We now want to see the DFE consider the recommendation in last month’s Durham Commission report that the UK should adopt the new PISA component related to creative thinking. This is being implemented in other countries and the OECD is developing a framework for it, recognising that creativity drives productivity and economic growth. I urge you to pick up the Durham Commission report which raised this point well.

And similarly, the RSA is currently conducting the largest ever randomised control trial research project, on measuring the impact of cultural learning on wider achievement. We look forward to seeing the findings of that in the coming year or so and we hope Government will too.

Speaking of performance measures, the higher education sector is now experiencing something similar to what schools have been experiencing for years. It’s not promising. Performance is increasingly narrowly understood by metrics. I don’t object to the use of metrics: some can have real value. But we need to give them appropriate weight; and we need to have the right ones. Otherwise the risk is we value only what we can measure.

For creative higher education, policy-makers don’t yet measure the right things. Creative education does deliver real outcomes for individuals, as well as the economy and society. But you can’t hope to measure these by looking at salaries. UAL has solid, robust evidence about why this doesn’t work for creative disciplines and careers. We commissioned research from YouthSight into motivations for study among around 2,000 students and applicants. It told us that, for 61% of those choosing creative HE, the most important outcome from their study was the knowledge and skills to succeed in the workplace. By contrast, only 14% said salary was their most important motivation. Similar patterns are borne out in Ian Thompson’s emerging research into the decisions made by 16-18 year-olds. It’s a long-standing trend – it’s been a decade since the research report *Creative Graduates, Creative Futures* found that creatives were “not willing to compromise values to achieve high earnings”.

My final point is that **teachers matter**. The DFE’s reforms threaten not only demand for art, crafts and design. They also undermine the things that make teaching in those disciplines stand out and inspire young people. Art, craft and design teachers are not only creative graduates; they are also frequently creative practitioners – there’s a connection between what they teach and what they do in their life.

Universities have long sought to encourage this. UAL’s creative pedagogy is about learning through enquiry [check terminology], and encourages a commitment to tackling society’s big challenges. NSEAD recently collaborated with us in a symposium with secondary school and college teachers that asked what relevance the Bauhaus model has to creative education in the 21st century. It’s a different model to the “learning to the script” approach encouraged by the DFE. We place the creative self in the centre of the teaching process. And our school teachers have to be a particular kind of animal to facilitate that. This type of work is not unique to UAL: I’m reminded of the CPD opportunities provided by programmes such as the MA Artist/Teacher programme at Goldsmiths.

So there is a deeper perniciousness in the performance culture that has grown up in schools. Combined with the pressures of the Ebacc, it is impacting on the wellbeing of teachers. They feel the pressure of limited resources and teaching to the test. It’s difficult in this environment for teachers to nourish themselves professionally, or to support their students.

Conclusion

In short: they need your help and ours. So I will finish by suggesting what we might do together to help them:

The APPG should keep championing the importance of creativity in our schools and in driving economic and social prosperity.

We need new ways of thinking about what we value in our education system.

We need to understand that creative education is qualitatively different from classroom subjects, and needs a distinct set of policies. [*This is a line from your article a couple of years back in NSEAD’s magazine*]

We should think boldly about the role of creativity in education and beyond: encouraging young people to reflect on the big challenges of tomorrow.

We need to fill the creativity gap in the EBacc and to open the creative education pipeline. UAL has been strengthening our outreach and aspiration-raising in schools. I mentioned earlier that UAL is now piloting short courses for primary schools. We’re working with specific schools (Tunbridge, St Albans, satellites of London) to deliver bite-sized education that will inspire primary learners’ interest in creativity. We try to find all ways of enabling creativity and we’d like to work with you to develop this into a scalable model.

For professional development, teachers should be able to enhance their teaching practice through real-life experiences of the creative sector. Senior leaders need to support them in doing so, both through training and through structured visits to businesses in the creative sector. There should be, as Sutton Trust wrote in 2015, “*Practical steps for making time for professional learning*”.

Finally, Universities are public actors. With time teachers would be able to access UAL resources, many of which are publicly accessible: from the Creative Attributes Framework that guides our curriculum, to the exhibitions and public talks we put on, all available through the events section of our website and What’s on guide. We would like to see more of you and encourage you to bring educators and your students closer to our work.