



**Extending the Campus
Project Report
June 2009**

**Beth Cook
CETLD Research Fellow**



Royal College of Art
Postgraduate Art & Design

RIBA 

V&A

Contents

Introduction	3
Project timeline	3
Project evaluation	5
Project management	5
Researching potential publishers	6
Development of book proposal	6
Identifying potential contributors	7
Negotiating a contract with a publisher	8
Facilitating shared pieces of writing	9
Organising and facilitating group meetings	9
Writing	9
Editing	11
Title	12
Manuscript format	13
Sourcing illustrations and copyright issues	13
Bibliography	14
Submission of manuscript	14
Cover design	14
Dissemination and marketing	14
Final reflections	14
Appendix A: Contributor List	16

Introduction

This project was led by Beth Cook, CETLD Research Fellow, in collaboration with Rebecca Reynolds, CETLD Higher Education Officer, and Catherine Speight, CETLD Research Fellow.

The idea of a book based around the work of the CETLD V&A team was first discussed in the summer of 2007. Our research projects were developing and we wanted to make sure that we were able to both disseminate our findings in a suitable way, and set those findings in the wider context of other work taking place in both the museum and higher education (HE) sector. The ultimate aim of the book was to further debate about the potential role that museums can play in HE, and to provide colleagues in both fields with a useful and thought-provoking resource. It is pitched at a professional audience and draws together contextual, theoretical, and case study elements of practice.

The intended project outcome was:

A completed manuscript delivered to a publisher for a CETLD book, exploring how students and tutors in HE and museum educational professionals use museums and their collections. It will have an emphasis on object-based learning.

The completed manuscript was delivered to the publishers, Ashgate Publishing, on 15 May 2009.

This report considers the process that we have gone through since our initial discussions about the book, through the process of development, writing and editing, and also clarifies what the next steps are in the production of *Looking to Learn, Learning to See: Museums and Design Education*. It reflects upon both the more practical elements of developing a book proposal for the first time (such as the management of the overall process and organising the editing of chapters) as well as on the creative and collaborative side to writing and developing the book to a final outcome.

Project Timeline

The project timetable was developed collectively and was as follows:

Proposed timetable

[0.2fte Research Fellow position begins. Contributors contacted and contracted. Submission of proposal to publishers. Writing of chapters. Liaising with publishers and contributors. Illustration research. Initial editorial work]

[Editing of manuscript and submission of manuscript to publishers]

[Proposal written. Potential contributors identified]

[Extension of final stage of edit for submission]

2008												2009				
January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May

[Draft proposal written. Potential contributors approached. Publishing company research]				[Contributors submitted 250 word abstract]		[Draft proposal sent to Ashgate Publishing. Proposal re-drafted]		[Final proposal sent to Ashgate Publishing. Timetable & Web 2.0 information sent to contributors. Proposal accepted by Ashgate Publishing.]			[Contributor's event]		[First draft chapters due]	[First edit and sending of comments to contributors]		[Second draft chapters due]	[Second edit and final questions to contributors. Copyright and illustration work begins]		[Final edit and submission of manuscript]		[Review and discussion with external contacts]	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------	--	----------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------	--

Actual timetable

Once a manuscript is submitted the process is led largely by the publishers, and takes approximately 9 months. The editors agreed that the final book would be printed and available early in 2010.

Project evaluation

It was initially proposed that we would evaluate the success of the project in the following ways:

Immediate:

- successful completion of the manuscript
- presentation and feedback at the museum and HE colloquium
- peer review from colleagues across the CETLD partnership

Long term

- book sales
- citations
- wider support for the emerging discourse through further funding

The manuscript was successfully completed and submitted to our publishers.

It was initially proposed that we would disseminate the work at the Museum and HE colloquium, *Collecting Experiences: Enriching Design Students Learning in the Museum*, which was organised by Catherine Speight from the CETLD and Debbie Flint from the ADM-HEA. This took place at the V&A on 24 April 2009. The extended book timetable meant that we were not in a position to make any firm presentations about the book at this event, but it was introduced within both Anne Boddington's introductory speech, and the presentation of CETLD research and resources by the V&A CETLD Research Fellows. The success of the day and the diverse audience that attended (well split between both museum and HE representatives) provided helpful confirmation that our rationale for beginning the *Extending the Campus* project was valid – it is clearly an emergent field and demands increasing dialogue for many practitioners. It is anticipated that the book will provide a welcome resource for a developing community of practice.

The manuscript was reviewed by 3 CETLD colleagues at various stages, and their comments were carefully considered by the editors. As a measure of success, peer review from colleagues (both within and external to the partnership) will be critical as a measure of success once the book has been published.

Project management

The process of project management included a number of different responsibilities that are discussed in later sections. The project allowed for a 0.2 fte position to undertake this project management. While the actual management of the role sometimes took less time than this on a weekly basis, it often took more. If the project manager had not also been working at the CETLD on a different project, the process of project management would have

been much more difficult, and ultimately less successful. However, the flexibility of this working arrangement was very beneficial to the project.

One key area of responsibility was keeping stakeholders informed of the progress of the project – these included CETLD management, the publishers and the contributors.

It was thought in early meetings that a Web 2.0 site would be useful as both a repository of documents (works in progress and joint documents such as the publishers guidelines) and as a communication tool. Unfortunately, not many of the contributors chose to actively utilise the site. It proved more time efficient to communicate over email than to try and make contributors interact with a system that they did not feel comfortable with.

Researching potential publishers

At the end of 2007 the project leader began looking at the following publishing houses: Ashgate Publishing, Continuum Books, Facet Publishing, Palgrave Macmillan, and Routledge. These were identified through conversation with colleagues from CETLD and the V&A, and internet research was undertaken to establish their range of interests, publications, and the application process.

Ashgate Publishing and Palgrave Macmillan were contacted initially, as they seemed to be a best fit with the developing book idea. Ashgate Publishing provided initial feedback on a draft proposal.

In May 2008 the project leader met with editors from Palgrave Macmillan and Ashgate Publishing. Ashgate agreed to send the draft proposal out for review.

Development of book proposal

The initial proposal was drafted by Beth Cook, Rebecca Reynolds, and Catherine Speight during the latter part of 2007, with comments from Jos Boys and Morna Hinton. Specific areas of discussion included the potential audience; the format of the book; the content; and the approach that the book would take to the subject. An early meeting discussed for instance the differences between the terms 'object scholarship' and 'visual research'. It was agreed to focus on object scholarship rather than visual research, as we considered there was limited research in this area, and it had real relevance to museums. However, both terms are discussed within the book in various contexts. We also decided to write this book as a 'book for academics' as opposed to an 'academic book'. This decision was made because we were very keen that it should appeal to both HE tutors and designers, and museum education staff – we did not want to limit our potential audience.

A copy was sent to Ashgate in December 2007, and reworked in Spring 2008 after initial feedback from the publisher. This proposal structured the book around a format of an 'umbrella' with discursive chapters followed by case studies.

At this stage potential contributors were approached for their views on the draft proposal and to gauge their interest in taking part.

After the meeting with Ashgate in May 2008, the proposal went out to review in June 2008. After feedback from two external reviewers, we reconsidered the format and structure of the book. We met with Allan Davies, (pedagogic advisor to the CETLD) with two of the potential contributors and with Jos Boys at this stage in order to get further feedback and help us clarify our position.

We considered three different approaches for the book:

- 1) Design studies and museums as a model from which a more general picture can be extrapolated.
- 2) Students of Design and the part museums can play.
- 3) HE students in general and how museums can be used as a resource to enhance their studies.

The team decided to work towards option one, concentrating on Design studies where our research is based, but also commenting on wider issues where appropriate and/or useful.

On the basis of this decision, the final proposal was rewritten by the project leader. This proposal split the book into 4 sections – Why now?; Teaching and Learning; What is particular about Design subjects; and Technologies. This meant that the original chapter/case study approach was abandoned and instead we aimed for one overarching chapter at the start of each section, and then 2 or 3 following chapters/case studies discussing more specific case studies or more abstract/discursive aspects.

The updated proposal was sent to Ashgate Publishing in July 2008 and approved soon after.

Identifying potential contributors

Initial discussions about potential contributors were held at the end of 2007 and beginning of 2008. We considered people whose published work they were aware of already, such as Geoffrey Caban and Carol Scott from Australia, Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, and those who were working on relevant and interesting projects, such as other CETLD fellows, Lars Wieneke from the University of Brighton, and Rhi Smith from the CETL-AURS.

At the end of the project we have reflected on the process we went through of inviting contributors, and whether a more methodological process would have been to put out a general call for contributions. In one sense our approach limited the range of contributions, but overall we believe it was the right one at the time. From a practical point of view a call for papers would have necessitated longer timescale. From a creative point of view, it meant we were able to define the structure and format of the book quite precisely, as we did with the four sections. We selected a range of contributors to fit the themes that we had identified, and are pleased with the way these complement each other in the final piece. We believe that this is result of both

the subjects and projects that we chose to focus on, and the successful nature of the feedback process between the editors and contributors.

Potential contributors were approached with a draft version of the proposal in January 2008, and were asked to comment on it, indicating their interest in taking part, and commenting on our ideas for their contribution.

Contributors were asked to provide their own abstracts by the beginning of April 2008, building on the basic structure outlined in the draft proposal. This allowed contributors to bring their own perspective and ideas in at an early stage of the process.

The list of external contributors was finalised as:

- Kate Arnold-Forster, Head of University Museums & Collections Service, University of Reading
- Jos Boys, Senior Research Fellow, CETLD
- Prof. Geoffrey Caban, Professor Emeritus, University of Technology, Sydney
- Mark Carnall, Curator, The Grant Museum of Zoology, UCL
- Morna Hinton, Head of Learning Services, V&A
- Torunn Kjolberg, PhD student, University of Brighton
- Patrick Letschka, Senior Lecturer (Architecture and Design), University of Brighton
- Dr Karina Rodriguez-Echavarria, Research Fellow, Management and Information Sciences Faculty, University of Brighton
- Dr Carol Ann Scott, Museum Consultant
- Jill Seddon, Principal Lecturer (Historical & Critical Studies), University of Brighton
- Rhi Smith, Undergraduate Learning Officer, Museum of English Rural Life (CETL-AURS), University of Reading
- Lars Wieneke, Research Fellow at the University of Brighton, EPOCH Research Group, University of Brighton

Chris Rose from the University of Brighton and Norbert Jopek from the V&A also took part in the 'Conversation' chapter, and Anne Boddington contributed to the afterword.

Negotiating a contract with a publisher

Once the proposal was passed by the reviewer, Ashgate Publishing sent contracts out to the three editors (received August 2008). As none of the editors had previous experience of this process, Ronit Rose at the University of Brighton provided advice about the content. It was confirmed that, as the book was being produced under the CETLD banner, and during CETLD time, any royalties should be paid to the University of Brighton rather than contributors. Amended contracts were sent out in October 2008, and signed and returned by the editors shortly afterwards.

The book is due to be published under what seems to be their standard offer of a print run of 400 hard-back books. As it is likely to be mainly purchased by

university and museum libraries, the editors did not originally think this a problem. However, subsequently we have considered whether we should have requested a greater print run or paperback version in order to make the book more widely accessible. Ashgate Publishing has confirmed that further print runs (probably in runs of 100) can be carried out.

The book is also due to be published as an e-book which will allow greater access.

Facilitating shared pieces of writing

There were seven collaborative chapters in the book. The job of the project leader in facilitating these varied.

Facilitation was generally minimal in the case of people who had worked together (Caban & Scott; Letschka & Seddon; Rodriguez-Echavarria & Wieneke).

New pairings required different kinds of facilitation. Three of them involved the project leader (Cook & Speight; Carnall & Cook; Boddington, Cook, Reynolds & Speight) and so the facilitation aspect was subsumed into the general process of collaboration and partnership.

With regard to the Arnold-Forster & Speight joint chapter, the project leader facilitated in a small way, mainly in the form of providing clarification regarding overarching book issues, as and when requested by the writers.

Organising and facilitating group meetings

The editors arranged a small contributors' event in September 2008. This was designed so that the various parties could meet each other and discuss any issues – or at least make contact so that issues could be discussed subsequently. It was held at the V&A, and the majority of contributors attended (9 out of 14). This proved particularly useful for the writers of the technology chapters, as they organised subsequent meetings in order to ensure a minimum of overlap.

Other than this, meetings were arranged on an individual basis with contributors, as and when they were necessary.

Writing

Within the team our eventual writing responsibilities were slightly different to those laid out in the original proposal:

- i) In the original proposal the 'Sharing Pedagogies' chapter was to be written by Beth Cook and Rebecca Reynolds, but was eventually written by Beth Cook and Catherine Speight.

- ii) 'Materials Design and Evaluation', originally a collaboration between Rebecca Reynolds and Catherine Speight, became a solo piece by Rebecca Reynolds.

In the first instance this was to more fairly distribute the workload between the team, but the changes also reflected areas that different members of the team had become more interested in during the period between writing the proposal and writing the book.

The team had different experiences of this process, and reflect upon these individually below.

Beth Cook

Writing the Design Student Experience chapter was the most challenging part of the book process for me. However, I am pleased with the final chapter and the intellectual journey that I took to reach it. Although frustrating at times, I think that the writing and rewriting process that I undertook allowed me the space to consider more fully the important processes and issues that the chapter addressed.

Writing the collaborative chapters were two different experiences.

With the Virtual Museum chapter, my involvement only began after the first draft was written. My job in this case was to re-mould what had been written and add in the relevant Design perspective and examples. The amount of words I therefore contributed were far fewer than those of the original contributor, Mark Carnall, and one of my chief concerns was making sure that my additions blended in with his writing style. The final chapter is stronger because of my additions, but the bulk of the credit for it must go to the original author.

In the case of the Sharing Pedagogies chapter, Catherine Speight and I worked closely together on the content from the very beginning – so much so that by the end we could often hardly remember who had written which bit. This meant that consistency of the style of the piece was a much smaller concern, and I feel much more responsible for the content. The process that we undertook of writing and editing in turn worked well with two people, and it was very satisfying to have someone to talk through the issues with who was as closely connected to the subject as I was.

Rebecca Reynolds

I was responsible for three chapters of the book, two of which I wrote on my own, while the other consisted of a recorded conversation between a design tutor and a curator, which I edited and wrote an introduction for.

Writing the chapter on the iGuides project gave me the opportunity to further reflect on the project and develop the implications which could be drawn from it. It also gave me the opportunity to prioritise consideration of the materials design, which was the part of the project I found most interesting.

I found the technology chapter the most challenging to write but this provided a stimulus to consider the topic of museums, technology and HE design more broadly than I had done before, and read authors who I had not previously. I

was extremely grateful to people who gave feedback on the chapter.

Regarding the chapter consisting of a conversation between a Design tutor and a curator, I found it satisfying that contacts made and approaches to interpreting a gallery which had originally been used in the iGuides project could be used in a different way.

Collaboration on the book went smoothly, facilitated particularly by a firm timetable and clear areas of responsibility. I have learnt a huge amount from the process of writing, editing and collaborating on the book, which I hope to apply in future projects.

Catherine Speight

I was responsible for three chapters of the book, one individual chapter and two joint chapters.

I began the process by focusing on my own chapter: Museums and Higher Education: A Specialist Service. It was helpful that for each chapter we had an abstract to follow that helped to guide and structure the text. This was a challenging chapter for me to write because of the content, which was about scene setting and introducing the CETLD baseline research programme. The process of writing and rewriting was very helpful and my confidence grew steadily throughout this process.

At the same time as drafting the 'Specialist Service', I also began writing the 'Collaborative Context' chapter with Kate Arnold-Forster and the 'Sharing Pedagogies' chapter with Beth Cook. The experience of writing collaboratively was different in both cases. Kate and I decided to approach the chapter by drafting separate sections before editing them together. This was a difficult process, complicated by our different writing styles, areas of knowledge and experience. However, we developed a successful system of using a laptop with the text projected onto a screen, which helped us to write and edit the chapter together. I learnt a great deal from this process which I applied to the writing of my two other chapters. We also used a similar system when editing the book itself.

I most enjoyed writing the 'Sharing Pedagogies' chapter with Beth Cook. We decided on a different approach altogether by writing sections of the chapter, which we then passed over to the other for further drafting and editing. This was an interesting process and ensured a consistency of style for the piece. The content of this chapter was challenging and attracted comment and criticism from two external reviewers. In the end, I felt the writing process and comments benefited the chapter and made it stronger in both content and style.

Editing

There were three stages of editing.

- i) Firstly the draft chapters were edited in November 2008. They were divided between the editors in order to maximise efficiency, and then a joint meeting was scheduled to run through the comments before they were fed back to the contributors. There were some overall issues that were discussed at this stage, such as the provision of a glossary (the editors eventually decided

against this) and the use of third or first person narrative (the editors decided to leave this up to the individual contributors. We felt it was more important that the content of the book be of a consistent level than that we be too prescriptive over writing style, and wanted to retain the feeling of a book containing a number of voices).

Comments on individual chapters ranged from copy editing to content ones, and included areas or phrases that needed clarification or expansion. Discussion of areas of potential overlap between chapters was key. There were two chapters in particular that we felt did not address the abstract in the way that we had anticipated. However, discussion with the relevant contributors led to satisfactory solutions.

- ii) In February and March 2009 the second draft chapters were edited. The editorial team worked together on this, going through the chapters together in order. The use of a projector aided greatly in this process.

This was a more drawn out and time consuming process than we had anticipated, but it allowed us to properly discuss the issues that were arising. The editors were pleased with the responses to their initial comments, and this proved to be a valuable process. Final queries were then passed back to the contributors.

- iii) The third stage of editing followed the feedback received from David Gosling and Anne Boddington. Again, the chapters were divided between the three editors but in a different order to the first edit. This was intended to allow 'fresh eyes' to look at each contribution, as far as possible. This was also combined with the formatting and reference checking stage of the process. The third editor (who had not edited the chapter individually in either the first or third stages) also checked over the final version of the chapter in order to try and pick up any mistakes.

The final chapters were then sent to the contributors in order for them to approve these versions.

Title

The project was initially called *Extending the Campus: museums and universities working to support student learning*. The draft proposal submitted to Ashgate Publishing had this title. This title reflected our idea of trying to build a community of practice that included museums and HE institutions and emphasised the importance of communication and working together. The initial review of the proposal included the comment that the title did not accurately enough reflect the content of the book. It also seemed to present the museum as an extension of a university, as opposed to a valuable institution in its own right, which did not accurately reflect our thoughts or our intentions. We came to see more clearly that both institutions need to be considered as part of a larger learning landscape.

By the time we put the final proposal to the publishers, the title was *Learning to Look: Museums as a Resource for Design Education*. This was the title under which the manuscript went through most of its stages of development.

The editors, working from a mainly museum-based background, considered that this was an accurate description of the key process that much of the book considered. The reviewer was also much more confident that it reflected the content of the book.

However, the final title that we submitted the manuscript under was somewhat different. *Looking to Learn: Learning to See: Museums and Design Education* was the suggestion of Anne Boddington. This new title reflects some of the conceptual changes that we went through as we developed the book, a growing understanding of the way that designers and Design students consider the skills of 'looking' and 'seeing', and some of the findings that our research has made.

Manuscript format

The format of the book was prescribed by the Ashgate guidelines.

Sourcing illustrations and copyright issues

A number of chapters include illustrations, which were mainly provided by the contributors responsible. Roland Mathews and Holly Burrows, both from CETLD, helped the editors with the presentation and format of some of the illustrations.

A number are either University of Brighton or V&A copyright, and will be attributed as such within the publication.

There were a few external copyright issues which the editors dealt with, such as gaining permission from the MLA for the use of the Generic Learning Outcomes diagram, and gaining permission from the artist Albert Paley for the use of a photograph of one of his objects (currently in the V&A Ironworks gallery).

The editors are waiting to hear back regarding copyright on illustrations from 2 chapters.

a) Kolb diagram. The editors are in negotiation with the US publishers regarding the use of this diagram. This is a standard copyright request.

b) Second Life screen shots. The issue here is more complicated, because there do not appear to be any firm rules on copyright in this situation. The contributor, editor, and Ashgate Publishing have all researched this, and it appears that the 3 screen shots can be published under a 'fair use' agreement. However, the project leader is also in contact with Linden Labs and is attempting to clarify this issue.

In the future, the editors would endeavour to a) get more support and information from the contributors who provide the illustrations and b) begin the copyright clearance process at an earlier stage.

Bibliography

The bibliography consists of 369 entries.

The editors decided that it would be most useful for each chapter to have an individual bibliography as opposed to having one overall bibliography at the end of the manuscript.

Submission of manuscript

The editors had to request a two week extension from Ashgate Publishing, which meant the submission date became 15 May. This second deadline was reached without incident.

Cover design

The process of cover design is still ongoing. Ashgate are happy for our input, and we are currently researching possible images to supply them with.

Dissemination and marketing

This process has not yet properly started. There have been discussions about a CETLD event in the summer of 2010, which could be used as a book launch or marketing event, but the details of this are not yet finalised.

The editors are waiting to receive a marketing questionnaire from Ashgate Publishing. This should help CETLD and the publishers to decide on both individual and joint dissemination strategies.

Final reflections

In the future there are a number of areas where we would approach this process slightly differently. These include the following:

- Consider negotiation with publishers re: print run etc.
- Press contributors to format properly.
- Provide a more solid brief for contributors to base their abstracts on.
- Start copyright process for illustrations earlier, make contributors take some responsibility.
- Be more confident in the authority of our own knowledge and research.

There are also areas where we feel we have done well. These include:

- Communication generally good with contributors.
- Good timetable. Although some of the work took longer than we had anticipated, the final manuscript was submitted to the publishers only 2 weeks later than originally planned, and we feel that this is a positive result.
- Good teamwork between the editors, facilitated by clear stages and areas of responsibility.

- Dealing with overlap between chapters.
- Building on networks.

This report has not reflected too much on the details of what we have learnt about the subject area, or how our understanding has developed through writing our chapters and through reading and editing other chapters. This is because this information is encapsulated within the manuscript itself, and the purpose of this report is to reflect more on the processes of the project than the details of the final work.

We are very pleased with the range of contributions and contributors that we attracted to this project. We are also proud of the final manuscript, and the process of writing and editing that we developed in order to get it. We look forward to working with Ashgate Publishing on the production of the book, and to the final publication which should be available in Spring 2010.

Appendix A Contributor List

Editors

Beth Cook, CETLD Research Fellow, University of Brighton and V&A

Beth Cook is a CETLD Project Research Fellow based at the V&A. She has worked with students for 3 years, specifically on the Behind the Scenes research project, and has also worked in wider visitor research at the V&A for over 4 years. She studied Archaeology and Museum Studies, and has worked at the Imperial War Museum and V&A.

Rebecca Reynolds, CETLD Higher Education Officer, University of Brighton and V&A

Rebecca Reynolds is the CETLD Higher Education Officer, based at the V&A. Her responsibilities include research into Design students learning in the museum; developing museum-based educational resources for HE Design students, some using mobile learning technology; and museum-based teaching for HE students. Before this Rebecca taught academic English and study skills to Art and Design students from overseas. She has an MA in Museum Studies (University of Leicester, 2007).

Catherine Speight, CETLD Research Fellow, University of Brighton and V&A

Catherine Speight is the CETLD Research Fellow based at the V&A. She is responsible for CETLD's overarching research programme exploring how design students critically engage and reflect upon their practice in the museum environment. She has been working closely with students for three years, developing specific techniques for this research, and linking knowledge about the two sectors. Prior to this appointment, Catherine worked for a number of museums including Brighton Museum and Art Gallery, the Museum of London and the Imperial War Museum. She has also worked as an educational researcher for both Solent University and the University of Brighton.

Contributors

Anne Boddington, Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Architecture, University of Brighton

Anne Boddington is an architect with a research Masters in Cultural Geography. She is Director for the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning through Design (CETLD) and Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Architecture at the University of Brighton. She has a wide range of experience in managing academic development and practice, research and consultancy projects across the fields of architecture and design. She has served on a number of professional committees for the Architects Registration Board (ARB) and the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). Her research interests focus primarily on the relationships of architecture and the built environment to the cultural landscape and on architectural and design pedagogy.

Kate Arnold-Forster, Head of University Museums & Collections Service, University of Reading

Kate Arnold-Forster has worked in the museums sector as a volunteer, curator and consultant for more than two decades. She is Director of the Museum of English Rural Life and Head of University Museums and Special Collections Services at the University of Reading, where she has led a major programme of capital and collections' development. She has undertaken extensive research into the sector through the national (UK) survey of university museums and collections. She is also a Fellow of the University's Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in Applied Undergraduate Research Skills, which focuses on the development of new approaches to collections-based student learning.

She has held positions on a wide range of national and regional bodies and is currently on the committee of the UK University Museums Group Committee. She is a Fellow of the Museums Association.

Jos Boys, Senior Research Fellow, CETLD

Dr. Jos Boys is CETLD Senior Research Fellow in Learning Spaces. Her background is in architecture and she has also worked as an architectural journalist, practitioner and researcher. She has considerable experience as a teacher of architecture in HE, across both design and contextual subjects, and at all stages from Access through to post-graduate. Jos' research explores relationships between architectural space and diverse social and cultural practices. She is currently writing up her PhD, *The Spaces In-Between Architecture, domestic space and struggles over constructing the social 1830 - 2000*, as a book and other publications include *Neutral Gazes and Knowable Objects*. In (1996) Duncan McCorquodale et al (eds.) *Desiring Practices*. Black Dog Press.

Prof. Geoffrey Caban, University of Technology, Sydney

Geoffrey Caban is Emeritus Professor of Design Studies at the University of Technology, Sydney and Life Member of Clare Hall, Cambridge. His appointments have included Visiting Fellow at the Powerhouse Museum in Sydney, Conjoint Professor at the University of Newcastle and Adjunct Professor at the University of the Sunshine Coast. From 1991 to 1998 he was Dean of the Faculty of Design, Architecture and Building at UTS, and from 1988 to 1991 was Dean of the former UTS Faculty of Design. He is a foundation member of the Australian Academy of Design, and has been a member of the Quality Review Committee of the Darling Harbour Authority, a member of the Facilities Review Committee for the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games, and a member of the Foundations for Architecture Advisory Committee of the State Library of NSW.

Professor Caban is the author of a number of books and publications in the areas of design history and design education including the books 'World Graphic Design' (Merrell, 2004) and 'A Fine Line: a history of commercial art in Australia' (Hale & Iremonger, 1984). His recent publications have focused on the value and effectiveness of various educational strategies in the design learning process, including those employed in settings such as museums and

the workplace. In collaboration with co-researchers at the Powerhouse Museum he has published *Museums and Creativity: a study into the role of museums in design education* (Powerhouse Publishing, 2002).

Mark Carnall, Curator, The Grant Museum of Zoology, UCL

Mark Carnall is the curator of the Grant Museum of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy University College London (UCL). He is a palaeobiologist and curates the historic teaching collection, founded in 1828. Recently, he has been working to catalogue the collection, recording specimens with a 3D laser scanner, as well as using other new technologies to bring the relatively hidden collection to a wider audience. As well as having a lifelong interest in natural history and science communication, Mark grew up with videogames and the internet and is particularly interested in applying these technologies to keeping museums pertinent, innovative and engaging to public audiences.

Morna Hinton, Head of Learning Services, V&A

Morna Hinton is a trained art and design teacher with an academic background in History of Art, and an MA in Museum Studies. She joined the V&A Education Department in 1991, working initially as a Schools Education officer. In 1997 she was seconded full-time onto the British Galleries Project as the educator on the Hanoverian gallery team. In this role she developed the interpretation for the Georgian and Regency galleries. She was also responsible for managing the British Galleries programme of audience research and worked on the development of guidelines for gallery text in the project. From February to December 2002 she was Head of Evaluation and Visitor Research at the V&A and she is now Head of Learning.

Torunn Kjolberg, PhD student, University of Brighton

Torunn Kjolberg is undertaking her PhD at the Faculty of Arts and Architecture, University of Brighton, researching the practice of 'visual research' in fashion and textile design education. Her studentship is funded by CETLD and ADM-HEA (Art, Design, Media Higher Education Academy). She also teaches research methods and design theory and history to undergraduate students. Her current research interests include visitors' experiences in museums, design education and practice, and material culture and memory. Torunn has a background in fashion design and has previously worked as a freelance designer, stylist and visual merchandiser. She holds an MA in History of Design and Material Culture.

Patrick Letschka, Senior Lecturer (Architecture and Design), University of Brighton

Patrick Letschka is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Brighton. He is the area leader for Wood and Visual Research on the MDes 3D Materials Practice WMCP and 3D Design programmes. He also teaches Visual Research Methods at the Royal College of Arts, London.

Since completing his Masters Degree in Design by Independent study at The University of Brighton, Patrick has used Moving Image to explore the relationship between the making process and the symbolic function of objects. He also actively designs and makes wide range of ecclesiastical furniture and

artefacts, which have been installed in Churches throughout England, from his studio workshop in the heart of Sussex.

Dr Karina Rodriguez-Echavarria, Research Fellow, Management and Information Sciences Faculty, University of Brighton

Karina is a research fellow at the University of Brighton engaged in research projects concerned with the use of information technologies for cultural heritage; in particular the assembly and visualisation of interactive virtual environments. Karina obtained her computing engineering degree from the ITESM, Mexico in 1999. She completed her PhD at the University of Wolverhampton in the area of knowledge based engineering in 2005 and an MA in Histories and Cultures at the University of Brighton in 2008. Currently, she is co-chair for the International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (VAST2008) and Information Director for the ACM Journal in Computing and Cultural Heritage.

Dr Carol Ann Scott, Museum Consultant

Dr. Carol Scott is the Renaissance London Programme Manager for 2012 working with London's non-national museums to develop their Olympic programs. She was Manager of Evaluation and Audience Research at the Powerhouse Museum in Sydney from 1991-2008, President of Museums Australia 2001-2005, Inaugural Chair of Australia's Special Interest Group in Evaluation and Visitor Research, National Research Manager for CREATE, a Co-ordinator of the National Community Arts Training Unit at the Australia Council for the Arts and worked for 10 years in the field of Aboriginal Education. Her PhD thesis examined a typology, assessment framework and evidence base for museum value. She has published extensively and is in demand as a consultant, facilitator and presenter.

Jill Seddon, Principal Lecturer (Historical & Critical Studies), University of Brighton

Jill Seddon is leader of the academic programme in the History of Art and Design at the University of Brighton, and teaches history and theory of design to practice-based design students. As a member of the University's Gender and Built Space research group, Jill has focused on the work of women designers between the wars, contributing a chapter to *Women and the Making of Built Space in England 1870-1950*¹, published by Ashgate, in 2007. She is also a Principal Investigator researching the public sculptures of Sussex as part of the Public Sculpture and Monuments Association's national recording project.

Rhi Smith, Undergraduate Learning Officer, Museum of English Rural Life (CETL-AURS), University of Reading

Rhianedd Smith BA, MPhil, PGCAP, AMA is the Undergraduate Learning Officer at the Museum of English Rural Life, University of Reading. She is part of a CETL for Applied Undergraduate Research Skills (CETL-AURS) funded project investigating the potential role of university collections in Higher Educational Teaching and Learning. Rhi is also undertaking a CETL for Careers Management Skills (CCMS) Fellowship exploring how volunteering with collections can be used to enhance student employability. Prior to this

Rhi has worked at the Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology, University of Reading and the Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford.

Lars Wieneke, Research Fellow at the University of Brighton, EPOCH Research Group, University of Brighton

Lars graduated as an engineer for media technology in 2003. Since then he worked as a lecturer in the department of Interface Design at the Bauhaus University in Weimar where he taught courses in conceptual design and implementation of new media environments as well as software design of interactive systems. Currently Lars is working as a research fellow at the University of Brighton where he researches in the application of user-created content in museums and cultural heritage. In particular he is interested in the connection of virtual and real world museums and the interactions between museums and their visitors/users.