

**How do Current Economic and Cultural Criteria for Assessing the Effectivity of the  
Liverpool Biennial Impact Upon its Planning, Strategies, and Resourcing?**

**Simon Adam Yorke**

**Appendices**

## Contents

<b>Appendix One: Biographies and Interviews</b>	<b>p.10</b>
<b>Lewis Biggs</b>	
Biography	p.11
Interview	p.13
<b>Paul Domela</b>	
Biography	p.24
Interview	p.26
<b>Paul Smith</b>	
Biography	p.38
Interview	p.4
<b>Appendix Two: Liverpool Cultural Timeline</b>	<b>p.55</b>
<b>Appendix Three: Liverpool Biennial Organisational Accounts and Statistics</b>	<b>p.79</b>
Liverpool Biennial Staff	p.80
Liverpool Biennial Board of Trustees	p.98
Principle Funding Sources of the Liverpool Biennial	p.104
Liverpool Biennial Expenses	p.140
<b>Appendix Four: Liverpool Biennial Festival</b>	<b>p.145</b>
1999	p.146
2002	p.149
2004	p.152
2006	p.160
2008	p.165
2010	p.169
2012	p.173

<b>Appendix Five: Example of England’s Northwest Research Services Questionnaire</b>	<b>p.182</b>
<b>Appendix Six: Liverpool Biennials Use of STEAM</b>	<b>p.188</b>
<b>Appendix Seven: Liverpool Biennial <i>City States</i></b>	<b>p.199</b>
<b>Appendix Eight: Liverpool Biennial Research and Impact Reports Information</b>	<b>p.206</b>
TEAM 2000	p.207
Helen Rees Leahy 2000	p.208
Morris Hargreaves McIntyre 2002	p.214
Graduate Retention Report 2002	p.216
The Mersey Partnership 2004	p.218
England’s North West Research Services	p.219
AJA (2009) Art in the Public and Digital Realms: Evaluation Toolkit. Annabel Jackson Associates, Somerset	p.222
LARC (Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium) (2011) How Audiences and Visitors are Transformed by Cultural Experiences in Liverpool Baker Richards and WolfBrown	p.225
<b>Appendix Nine: Public Art Outside the Festival</b>	<b>p.228</b>
Anthony Gormley – Another Place	p.230
Richard Wilson – Turning the Place Over	p.231
Jaume Plensa – Dream	p.233
2Up2Down	p.234
Everton Park	p.237
Non-Festival Research and Strategies	
Green by Day: Light by Night. Liverpool Housing Action Trust	p.238
<b>Appendix Ten: Education, Learning and Inclusion Projects</b>	<b>p.239</b>
1999	p.242
2002	p.245

2004	p.255
2006	p.271
2008	p.276
2010	p.289
2012	p.290
Conferences	
2002	p.297
2004	p.298
2007	p.299
2008	p.300
2010	p.301
2012	p.302
Public Art	p.303
<b>Appendix Eleven: 2004 Learning and Inclusion Evaluations</b>	p.307
Seminal	p.308
Gossip	p.309
The Journey	p.310
The Liverpool Experience	p.311
Ways of Seeing Volume 2	p.312
Ariel Trust	p.313
Different Angles	p.314
Buddies	p.315
Shoot the Artist	p.316
Sefton Sound Project	p.317
Little Miss Sparkle	p.318
Cityscapes	p.319

Happy Happy	p.320
Resonance	p.321
Future Dreams	p.322
Touching the City	p.323
Identity	p.324
Wish You Were Here	p.325
Vote with your Seat	p.326
Secret Places	p.327
Viral Treats	p.328
Biennial Wednesdays	p.329
Saturday Tours	p.330
Talks	p.332
Visits	p.334
Fusebox 04	p.336
Teacher Tours	p.338
At a Glance	p.339
Made in Liverpool	p.340
Teenage Pregnancy	p.341
<b>Appendix Twelve: Liverpool Biennial Press and Media</b>	<b>p.342</b>
1999	p.343
2002	p.346
2004	p.351
2006	p.354
2008	p.355
2010	p.357

2012	p.359
<b>Appendix Thirteen: Biennial Partnerships</b>	<b>p.360</b>
Partnerships	p.361
LARC – Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium	p.362
Thrive	p.363
COoL – Creative Organisations of Liverpool	p.363
Chrysalis Arts	p.364
Training for Real	p.365
Culture Campus	p.365
VAiL – Visual Arts in Liverpool	p.366
European Biennial Network	p.366
ECOC – European Capital of Culture	p.366
Liverpool Vision	p.366
Friends of Everton Park	p.367
The Land Trust	p.367
New Contemporaries	p.367
John Moores Painting Prize	p.368
Independents Biennial	p.368
Bluecoat	p.368
FACT – Foundation for Art and Creative Technology	p.369
Metal	p.370
North West Disability Arts Forum (NWDAF) / DaDaFest	p.371
STATIC	p.371
Basement	p.372
All Horizons Club	p.372
Parking Space	p.372

Jumpship Rat	p.373
HUB Collective	p.373
Riverside Housing Trust	p.373
LHAT – Liverpool’s Housing Action Trust	p.374
Merseyside ACME	p.374

## List of Tables

### **Appendix Two: Liverpool Cultural Timeline**

Liverpool Cultural Timeline	pp.56-78
-----------------------------	----------

### **Appendix Three: Liverpool Biennial Organisational Accounts and Statistics**

Table 3.1: Unrestricted Revenue Grants 1999 – 2000	p.107
Table 3.2: Unrestricted Revenue Grants 2000 – 2001	p.108
Table 3.3: Unrestricted Grants 2002	p.110
Table 3.4: Foreign Grants Received 2002 – 2003	p.112
Table 3.5: Public Sector Grants Received 2002 – 2003	p.113
Table 3.6: Corporate Sponsorship and Funding Income 2002 – 2003	p.113
Table 3.7: Trust Funds / Foundation Grants 2002 – 2003	p.114
Table 3.8: Unrestricted and Restricted Grants 2003 – 2004	p.117
Table 3.9: Unrestricted and Restricted Donations and Grants 2004 – 2005	p.118
Table 3.10: Unrestricted and Restricted Donations and Grants 2005 – 2006	p.119
Table 3.11: Donations and Grants 2006 – 2007	p.120
Table 3.12: Donations and Grants 2007 – 2008	p.122
Table 3.13: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2008 – 2009	p.125
Table 3.14: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2009 – 2010	p.127
Table 3.15: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2010 – 2011	p.129
Table 3.16: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2011 – 2012	p.132
Table 3.17: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2012 – 2013	p.135
Table 3.18: Total Unrestricted and Restrictive Funds Raised 1999 – 2013	p.140
Table 3.19: Total Unrestricted and Restricted Resources Expended 1999 – 2013	p.141
Table 3.20: Public Arts / Commissions	p.141
Table 3.21: Unrestricted / Restricted Artist Fees 1999 – 2013	p.142
Table 3.22: Unrestricted / Restricted International Festival Costs 1999 – 2013	p.142
Table 3.23: Unrestricted / Restricted Education Costs 1999 – 2013	p.143
Table 3.24: Unrestricted / Restricted Marketing Costs 1999 – 2013	p.143
Table 3.25: Travel Expenses 1999 – 2013	p.144

**Appendix Four: Liverpool Biennial Festival**

Table 4.1: 1999 Biennial Festival Audience Figures p.148

Table 4.2: Biennial Festival Audience Figures 2002 p.151

**Appendix Six: Liverpool Biennials Use of STEAM**

Table 6.1: Estimated Attendance at the Biennial Exhibitions p.192

Table 6.2: Visitors to Liverpool During the Biennial (STEAM Revised) 2006 – 2010 p.195

Table 6.3: Visitors to Liverpool Attending the Biennial 2006 – 2010 p.196

Table 6.4: Visitors to Liverpool During the Biennial 2006 - 2012 p.197

Table 6.5: Visitors to Liverpool Attending the Biennial 2006 - 2012 p.198

**Appendix Twelve: Liverpool Biennial Press and Media**

Table 12.1: 2002 Marketing Objectives (MHM 2002, pp.51-52) p.348

**Appendix One:  
Biennial Biographies and Interviews**

### Lewis Biggs Biography

Lewis Biggs is a freelance Curator, Writer and Cultural Consultant. He is Chairman of the Institute for Public Art, dedicated to the research, propagation and advocacy of artist-led urbanism. After winning a scholarship to Oxford University (to study Modern History) Lewis gained his Master's degree (with distinction) in Art History from the Courtauld Institute, University of London. He learned exhibition making at the Museum of Modern Art Oxford, the Whitechapel Art Gallery London, and Arnolfini Gallery Bristol.

He was Director of Liverpool Biennial 2000 - 2011, after having been a founding trustee of the charitable company in 1998. The 2002 Liverpool Biennial Festival 'broke the rules' by focusing on newly commissioned art, much of it for the public realm, researched collaboratively and realised by a team of locally based curators. This approach – and its success - established Liverpool Biennial as an original and significant contributor to the international spectrum of biennales, and the organisational model it established has become influential around the world, as competition between biennales forces them to differentiate their offer.

The success of the 2002 Biennial contributed to Liverpool winning its (2003) bid to be nominated European Capital of Culture 2008. Lewis played an active role in the formation and leadership of Liverpool Art and Regeneration Consortium, which delivered the majority of the City's arts programmes in 2008, and of Culture Campus, which created links between the arts sector and three Liverpool universities.

Biggs was Director of Tate Liverpool from 1990 to 2000 – a decade in which it was the only dedicated Museum of Modern Art in the UK, and at a time when the Tate 'brand' was associated overwhelmingly with the work of Turner and Constable. The programme he initiated in Liverpool introduced contemporary British and International art to new audiences nationally and especially in the North of England. It included ground-breaking art exhibitions from Japan, Korea, North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa. The programme's structure, and accompanying education programme, were influential on London's Tate Modern when it opened in 2000.

Biggs is now the Curator of the Folkestone Triennial 2017, General Editor of Tate Modern Artists (books on contemporary artists since 2002), International Advisor, School of Fine Arts, Shanghai University and Chair, Organising Committee, International Award for Excellence in Public Art (Shanghai). He was Co-curator, Aichi Triennale 2013, and undertook a consultancy in 2011 - 2013 with Osage Art Foundation, Hong Kong.

He is a member of the Board of International Advisors to the Rockbund Art Museum, Shanghai, a Visiting Professor of Contemporary Art at Liverpool School of Art and Design (he was awarded an Honorary Fellowship at Liverpool John Moores University in 1998) and an Honorary Professor at Glasgow University (School of Art). He is active as a trustee of several boards including the John Moores Liverpool Exhibition Trust (Painting Competition), Chinese Arts Centre, Manchester, Foundation for Art and Creative Technology (FACT), Liverpool and Situations, Bristol

Curator, Folkestone Triennial 2014, 2017, 2021 < [www.CreativeFolkestone.org.uk](http://www.CreativeFolkestone.org.uk) >  
Curatorial Adviser, Kaunas Biennial 2019.

Director, (Chair), Network for Public Art Ltd 2019 -  
 Curator, Land Art Mongolia 2018 [www.landartmongolia.com](http://www.landartmongolia.com)  
 Curatorial Adviser, Public Art and Communities Involvement, Kaunas European Capital of Culture 2022 <http://kaunas2022.eu/en>  
 Distinguished Professor of Public Art, University of Shanghai, College of Art and Design 2015  
 Board member (Treasurer), IAAC (International Award for Art Criticism) 2014 -  
 Chair, Institute for Public Art, 2013 - <http://www.instituteforpublicart.org/>  
 Co-curator, Aichi Triennale (Nagoya, Japan) 2013  
 International Advisor, College of Art, University of Shanghai, College of Art and Design 2011 - 14  
 Trustee, John Moores Liverpool Exhibition Trust 2011 -  
 Series Editor, Tate Modern Artists Series, Tate Publishing 2000 - 2014  
 Trustee CfCCA (Centre for Chinese Contemporary Art), Manchester 2011 - 15  
 Visiting Professor, School of Art and Design, Liverpool John Moores University 2007 -  
 Honorary Professor, Glasgow School of Art 2011 - 14  
 Trustee, FACT (Foundation for Art and Creative Technology), Liverpool 2011 - 2014  
 Consultant, Osage Art Foundation, Hong Kong 2011 - 13  
 Member of the International Council, Rockbund Art Museum, Shanghai, 2011 - 12

**Director**

Liverpool Biennial  
 Dates Employed 2000 – 2011  
 Employment Duration 11 yrs.  
 Chief Executive and Artistic Director

**Director**

Tate Liverpool  
 Dates Employed 1990 – 2000  
 Employment Duration 10 yrs.  
 Executive and Artistic Director

## Lewis Biggs Interview

### Liverpool Biennial Artistic Director / Chief Executive 1999 - 2011

**Biggs, L (2015) Unpublished questionnaire with Lewis Biggs. Created by Simon Yorke, returned 22 February 2015**

Simon – I started to respond to these questions without paying sufficient care to your differentiation between the festival and the biennial. I would have answered the first 19 questions differently if I had realised what you were asking... Actually we were always very aware of the slippage of the phrase Liverpool Biennial to mean A) the organisation, B) the international exhibition C) the festival and we felt that this slippage was in marketing terms very useful: that people would be attracted to visit Liverpool Biennial as a festival/event, and when they arrived in the city they could then be directed to the segment of the programme that interested them most – some people are only interested in local artists, others only in 'curatorial selections', others in 'painting', others in 'street art' etc. etc. I have been through my first 19 answers to try to clarify, but I don't have time to re-write from scratch as I should!

#### **1. What's your favourite type of art and culture?**

I like art / culture that raises questions and makes me think / re-think (or helps me think / re-think) my experience of life.

#### **2. What are the main reasons for holding a biennial festival?**

There are as many reasons for holding a biennial festival as there are biennials, but we started Liverpool Biennial in order to help make Liverpool a better place for artists to live and work (something you can't do without making it a better place for anyone to live and work). As I mentioned when we met, the 'festival' resulted from the fact that we started an 'international exhibition' to show alongside the existing biennial John Moores Painting Competition and New Contemporaries exhibitions. James Moores also funded an 'independent' programme which was initially both 'local' and 'international' (many artists from Germany exhibited in Tracy). We understood both that we could not fund a single international quality show of the scale of Documenta; but we also understood that we could achieve the necessary critical mass (to get people to visit) by rolling different programmes into the same overall brand name. So – critical mass is always an important reason for the creation of a festival, and we embedded the international into a larger critical mass for good reasons.

**3. If it is for tourism and the economy that they bring to the city, how did this impact on the artists that were chosen (as you would want artists that would attract the most people).**

I struggle with your terminology. Gagosian gallery in Kings Cross has become a reason for many people to visit Britannia Street who would never otherwise go there. Would you say that the function of Gagosian is 'for tourism and the economy that they bring' to the area? There have been festivals set up by politicians or council officers for the sake of tourism and the economy. But that was absolutely not the case with James Moores and myself in 1998: our interest was in supporting art and artists, and we were working without the knowledge or understanding of local politicians or council officers.

Art is about faith; it's a belief system. You have to set out to make a good exhibition – which is to keep faith with the art community, who are the core believers. Everything else is accidental. If we could make good exhibitions, then we knew we would help to make Liverpool a better place for artists to live and work. The only ambition was to make brilliant exhibitions. Exhibitions that are not attractive to a fairly large number of people are probably not good exhibitions. Certainly, if I consider the best exhibitions I've seen recently, I have had to struggle with many other people to get to see them. Tell me about an exhibition of brilliant artworks that has had no audience? So no, I never wanted to exhibit artists unless their work thrilled me. And if it thrilled me, there was a good chance it would thrill a fair number of other people (since I'm a very discriminating person, and an art believer).

**4. What sets the Liverpool Biennial apart from all the other Biennials around the world? And as it is now not the only biennial in the UK, how do you think it can keep it unique?**

Every Biennial is unique. In line with true evolutionary principles, there have been many more species of biennial that have become extinct than those that are still active. I remember fondly the Bradford Print Biennial, which was still important internationally in the 1970s. And the Budapest Small Sculpture Biennial, which I think did not survive the fall of the Berlin wall. The soviet countries loved biennials – there were hundreds of them in the 1960s and 1970s. In the end Liverpool Biennial (as a festival) is unique because it's in Liverpool, as Venice Biennale is unique because of Venice. However, as Director of Liverpool Biennial I did consciously try to give the international show a distinctive flavour (additionally to the local colour of Liverpool) through the principles of A) commissioning as much new work as possible B) selecting for the International exhibition almost exclusively artists from outside the UK C) insisting on a curatorial collaboration with locally based curators taking a lead role D) realising as much art in the street as we could afford. All of these are unusual in the international context.

**5. What were your aspirations when you became involved with the Biennial?**

I wanted to make Liverpool a better place for artists and my children to live and work. It was a very divided city in the 1980s; collaboration was a major need before it could become a more pleasant and productive place to live.

**6. Do you think you succeeded in them all?**

Yes, I do. Liverpool was certainly a better place for artists to live and work in 2011 when I left than it had been in 1998 when we set up the Biennial. How much of this improvement was due to my efforts or the Biennial is a difficult question to answer?

**7. What was your proudest moment during your time at the Biennial?**

Of course, when I stepped down from the Biennial and was created a Citizen of Honour of the great city of Liverpool it was an extraordinarily proud moment for me. Especially since I am not a Liverpoolian, and Liverpool is known as a city of music and of theatre, but much less so as a city of visual art. But two other moments also: in 2003 when Liverpool won the bid to be European Capital of Culture 2008, and the jurors cited the Biennial as being an important factor in Liverpool's favour (proof that it could deliver an international festival). And in 2006 / 7 in the run up to 2008, when the collaboration that I had fostered over the previous 15 years (also as Director of Tate) bore fruit in the Liverpool Art and Regeneration Consortium (LARC) and its joint programme for 2008, including Culture Campus. Collaboration was the basis of my approach throughout – in 1992 I attempted to launch a North West Arts Festival, which failed in itself but maybe contributed to the possibility of Artranspennine98, of Liverpool Biennial, and so on.

**8. What has been your favourite Biennial Festival?**

1999 was the most surprising and therefore the most inspiring; 2002 was the most challenging and therefore the most rewarding when it succeeded; 2008 was the grandest.

**9. What has been your favourite artist and work of art in all the Festival?**

I don't have a favourite artist, but my favourite artwork is Richard Wilson's *Turning the Place Over*.

It's interesting how you ask this question. A) I contributed a great deal to the Festival and its marketing and organisation, but I do not think that it was in any sense my own work or my own responsibility. As you know, Liverpool Biennial, the organisation, does not take artistic responsibility for the Festival. The Biennial – the International exhibition – is the bit that I cared most strongly about at the time, and it was enough for anyone to try to make it as

good as possible. B) I'm an art historian first, who happens to be the friend of many artists. I'm interested in artworks first, artists second. Art history is ultimately about what is left when the artist has died and no longer needs to make a living, and the artists' friends can throw away the things they kept on their walls out of friendship rather than because they are good art. Many of the artists who command the greatest respect do so on account of their personality – and their work will not survive them. There are also artists no-one wants to spend time with because they are disgusting narcissists, but their work will influence generations to come. So professionally I try judge all artists by what they do, not by who they are. Because I don't have a 'favourite artist' I can make clear judgements about what is good or not so good art.

**10. What was the artwork about?**

Regeneration.

**11. What did it mean to you? Why did you connect with it so much?**

I gave 25 years of my life to art in Liverpool and its regeneration.

**12. What has been your least favourite piece of art in a Festival and why?**

Fortunately, like everyone, I quickly forget what does not interest me.

**13. What in your opinion makes great art?**

Great art tends to have many layers of meaning, so that it can mean different things to different people, in a convincing way, and so gathers a large public in whom to have its life.

**14. How important is the curating in this process?**

A) In the classical case, the curator's job is to be go-between, between art and its public. Art has no life without a public. The curator represents the artwork to the public and represents the public to the artwork. If the artwork has not been made, then the curator is the artwork's first public, and the life of the artwork will depend much on how the curator helps to bring the artwork into the world.

B) often and unfortunately, in the contemporary case, the curator and the artist both retreat into narcissism: the artist has no interest in the life of the artwork beyond the studio, and the curator is interested only in projecting his / her own ideas onto artworks in

the unique circumstances of a single showing. This restricts the life of the artwork to a dialogue between curator and artist and does not educate the artwork as a citizen of the world.

**15. How did you choose your curators for each Festival?**

I was involved only in choosing curators for the International show / Liverpool Biennial – never for the Festival! We selected in different ways for each Biennial. The ultimate rationale is straightforward, though: resources, ambition and responsibility must all cohere – the financial, infrastructural and skills resources of an organisation are most available to someone who works in that organisation, who is also the person who cares most about the art that gets shown in that organisation and the people who come through the door of that organisation. The 'local' curators are the best curators for the job. The rest is spin – how to widen networks, marketing to the art world or academia, pull in money from galleries or dealers etc.

**16. How involved were you in their decision-making, or did you trust their judgement and give free rein?**

Between the two. You should ask them. I respect different points of view and sensibilities of course, but also I have a great deal of experience in doing the job and can see when decisions are being made for the 'wrong' reasons; so I did try to steer not only the selection of artists and artworks but also the kind of work commissioned and site chosen for it.

**17. What was the remit given to the artists before they started to produce their work? What were the guidelines given to them?**

**18. What is the purpose of the Biennial?**

I covered this above.

**19. What are its strengths?**

As above.

**20. How important is the reaction of the visitors when deciding on artists and exhibitions, as the art is not predominately chosen for the aesthetic experience or beauty, and you know that the novices and general public will not get or like many aspects because of this. With this in mind, how important is this and what steps are taken to combat the negative reaction (e.g., the information, talks,**

**guided tours to show or help improve their knowledge and perception of the work which will affect their experiences and intrinsic value).**

A) If the art is NOT chosen for its ability to communicate, why choose it? The communication of something negative, however, is as much the function of good art as the communication of something positive. The most important quality of good art is that it communicates, it affects the viewer.

B) I do not see myself as different from anyone else who looks at art – simply that I have looked at more art than most people, and I am sure of my judgements as a result. As mentioned above, I sincerely equate 'good art' with the art that is able to communicate itself to a large and diverse public. (This is not the same as saying that art with a big audience is always good art. There is very little good art in the world, and almost none that remains 'undiscovered'; and of course, much art that is highly celebrated is very bad). I often tried to steer my colleague curators towards considering the aesthetics of art (the sensual experience of art) because sensual experience remains an important way to access art and is always a component of 'the best art'. It is impossible for art to communicate to people of different cultures, for instance, without a sensual component, because the exercise of the human senses is what underlies all the different cultures in the world.

**21. How can we improve the Biennial experience?**

The logistics and the content are equally important: in a museum, you need good seats, good food, good information, good lighting, good toilets, good maps, and good discussions, nice companions etc. etc. and you also want a good selection of art to look at. A biennial is just the same.

**22. As most biennial art has a purpose, message or concept, how important is the delivery of the concept to the intrinsic value and experience?**

You are referring to the 'curatorial marketing.' This is the same as any other marketing: it must be immediately attractive, and certainly not off-putting; and it must be sufficiently truthful to the experience that people actually have for them to feel they are not being tricked. It's my belief that a good exhibition, like a good artwork, has as many meanings as there are people looking at it, and so the more narrowly conceived the exhibition the less space there is for the art or for the public to generate meaning.

**23. The actual work of art is the first thing that people see and the main focus of an art exhibition, and is used as the visual representation or tool for delivering the artists intention, so how can you present the information to help achieve the artists message from being understood and an intrinsic value felt?**

Artists know certain things about their art, but maybe not the most important or interesting things. A knowledge of their intentions may or may not be useful in the experience of the artwork. I do think it is good to have the artist's view available to people, but best of all is to have a human being responding to the viewer and the artwork at the same time, to steer the dialogue (the gallery attendant / information assistant). The 'intrinsic value' of the artwork lies in its ability to communicate with a multiplicity of people and generate a multiplicity of readings (not in the artist's intentions).

**24. As part of the creative process, artists think about the reaction of the viewer to their work and it directs this process, as art should cause some form of reaction. If there is no reaction from the viewer, then there was no point in spending time creating something in the first place. So, artists are aware of the eventual intrinsic value of the work. How involved are the artist in the curating, presentation of the work, and the description of the work to maximise the reaction of the viewer?**

I think it's impossible to generalise. Some artists want to control everything, others are happy to let the work live its own life.

**25. The Biennial has many events during the Festival including artists talks, performances etc. What's your favourite part of the Biennial and why?**

I'm someone who likes to spend time with the artworks accompanied maybe by a good friend to talk to. The exhibition is my favourite part.

**26. I see the Biennial as being educational and that the work is there to challenge our perceptions of art and the world around us. How important are these different elements in achieving this?**

Yes, I agree very much with your perspective here. The main obstacles to other people sharing our view is that:

A) the dominant consumer culture is affirmative, it teaches us that it's enough to have more of what we already know and like, or just sufficient novelty to keep us amused and buying stuff.

B) We are being persuaded that anyone who asserts an attitude that causes discomfort to our existing views can be dismissed as 'offensive.'

Unfortunately, the word / category 'art' is used as a means to dismiss experience that does not affirm the consumer culture approach. If it is 'art' it may be dismissed as incomprehensible, alien etc. These are reasons why I like to take art out of the gallery into the street and allow it to become a part of people's conversations in shared (street) space –

because it can duck out of the category of 'art' and become a part of lived experience. Those that want to see it as art can still do so, of course.

**27. How can we get more people involved? Or how can you make them understand and appreciate it more?**

See my response to 27.

**28. In your opinion, what is the main concern that affects the public's cultural experience of the Festival and the intrinsic value? What stops their appreciation or understanding of the art and exhibitions?**

There are too many reasons to mention – some of them logistic (the map, the lack of good places to eat etc.) some of them cultural (because they do not share the values that you and I share, as you expressed in 27. Many people, for instance, do not want an educational experience, they want distraction and entertainment.

**29. How can we change their perception of the art and improve their cultural experience?**

We have to change society!

**30. How important is the information about the work to the intrinsic value placed on it by the viewer?**

This depends very much on the person. As regards the form of information, some people don't like to read, others don't like to talk; some people like audio guides, others only look at moving image. Some people find it hard to have conversations with themselves, others don't. As regards the content of the information, some people find it easy to apply their conceptual framework / experience / ideology to what is in front of them, others need a lot of help.

**31. Why do artists have untitled work? What is its purpose? If the work is untitled, what information would you present with the work? And do you think it is effective?**

Some artists want people to relate to art without words. Is Opus 131 a helpful title for a work of music, or not? What did the composer (or the researcher who came afterwards) intend by calling it Opus 131? Or is music something that is not usefully addressed by words? Neither art nor music are forms of knowledge (information) they are forms of

wisdom (experience). Contemporary society finds wisdom / experience difficult to deal with because it cannot be bought and sold, cannot be taught / learned / paid for in universities – it depends on the existing or developing abilities of the person to process incoming information in a way that creates meaning.

**32. How important is the language used when explaining work, who decides on the complexity for the descriptive or elaborate text?**

There are no answers here. Except to provide as much variety as possible if the objective is to reach different (kinds of) people – to speak in the language of the receiver.

**33. Which would you say would be more effective for people to understand the work and cause an intrinsic value to be felt?**

As 33.

**34. Now that you are no longer a part of the Festival, what do you think of it?**

I think of it with great affection and with optimism for its future.

**35. What do you think the future of the Biennial is?**

It will be challenging, but Liverpool, Glasgow, Newcastle / Gateshead remain the most interesting cities culturally speaking in the UK, because they have an identity that transcends the present.

**Lewis Biggs Personal Emails****Email about Yoko Ono 12 January 2017 14.57**

Dear Simon

I focus on this sentence in your email, and believe you want my reaction to it.

I am writing about Yoko Ono with her work in 2004 and 2008 and why it might not have been received as well and ways that could improve the reception and understanding. this way, I am trying to progress and improve the curation of exhibitions etc

I don't know what your data suggests about Yoko Ono's work in 2004 - 'well received' or not, although I suspect it was 'not.' The editor of the Post and Echo told me that Yoko's work in 2004 stimulated the largest and longest correspondence that has ever taken place in those papers. More than any political or football event, for instance. It also brought me a death threat, not a very serious one. Those are not the only reasons I regard it as one of the most successful artworks I have ever curated, but it is one good indicator of 'effectiveness.' Mike Storey, Leader of LCC at that time, supported it by refusing to take down the banners on LCC sites, and sometime later he said he regarded it as one of the most important preparations for Liverpool's year as ECoC.

So, I have to question your methodology, in which the potential improvement of curating methods is linked to feedback about 'satisfaction levels' among those who completed questionnaires. As a visitor to an exhibition, I may award a 'satisfaction rating' to an artwork that reflects my reaction on that day to that artwork. As a curator, my concern is with a much larger frame of reference, including (in the case of Liverpool Biennial) the cultural development of a city.

As you are aware, Yoko Ono is a feminist and peace campaigner as well as being an artist. It would be extremely surprising if her work, which campaigns for change, received high 'satisfaction ratings' from the people she is trying to change, against their will and vested interests - people hate change. Mike Storey knew the people of Liverpool would have to change (their racism, religious bigotry and xenophobia, which were apparent in the letters published by the Echo - as you will have read in your research) if we were going to have a successful ECoC.

Good luck with the writing

Lewis

Lewis Biggs

Curator, Folkestone Triennial 2017 <> [www.folkestonetriennial.org.uk](http://www.folkestonetriennial.org.uk)  
 Chairman, Institute for Public Art <> <http://www.ipublicart.org>  
 Professor of Public Art, University of Shanghai  
 <> <http://en.shu.edu.cn/Default.aspx?tabid=24750>  
 Trustee, John Moores Liverpool Exhibition Trust  
 <> <http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/walker/johnmoores/>  
 Hon. Treasurer, IAAC (International Award for Art Criticism) <> <http://www.iaac-m21.org/english/>

### **Yoko Ono donation 18 January 2017 13.49**

Dear Simon

I don't recall the precise details about Yoko's donation in 2004. But by donating to the Biennial, she was in effect helping to fund her own work as well as the work of all the other artists.

In 2008 she donated her fee to Alderhay Children's Hospital.

Buddies: yes, it worked well, and I think that we continued it in other forms but maybe didn't call it buddies. The role of the invigilators / information assistants continued to develop and grow, and sometimes this overlapped with the development of students by artists.

Good luck with the rest of it.

All best

Lewis

Lewis Biggs

Curator, Folkestone Triennial 2017 <> [www.folkestonetriennial.org.uk](http://www.folkestonetriennial.org.uk)  
 Chairman, Institute for Public Art <> <http://www.ipublicart.org>  
 Professor of Public Art, University of Shanghai  
 <> <http://en.shu.edu.cn/Default.aspx?tabid=24750>  
 Trustee, John Moores Liverpool Exhibition Trust  
 <> <http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/walker/johnmoores/>  
 Hon. Treasurer, IAAC (International Award for Art Criticism) <> <http://www.iaac-m21.org/english/>

### Paul Domela Biography

Paul Domela was the Programme Director of Liverpool Biennial after being Deputy Chief Executive from 2001 - 2007. In 2010 he initiated City States, an exhibition platform for the cities around the world. He is interested in the intersection between art and urban development and organised a variety of public research programmes: Touched Talks, Urbanism09, Urban Ecologies, City Breaks - Art and Culture in Times of Expediency. He is Co-Founder of the European Biennial Network and member of the boards of Liverpool School of Art and Design, International Foundation Manifesta, The Biennial Foundation, International Curators Forum and the Journal for Art in the Public Sphere. Previously he organised the public programme of the Jan van Eyck Academy, The Netherlands (1992-1999). He holds an MBA from Georgetown University, Washington DC and an MA in Art History of Goldsmiths' College, London.

In collaboration with International Foundation Manifesta, he co-ordinated Manifesta Coffee Break (2004 - 05), a series of meetings addressing challenges for visual art and curatorial work in a contemporary, changing European context; contributors to the resulting publication included Nicolas Bourriaud and Dieter Lesage.

Domela explores new relations between art, city and society. In 2004, he co-curated the Liverpool / Manchester section of Shrinking Cities, Berlin. Between 1992 - 1999, he organised the public programme of the Jan van Eyck Akademie, Maastricht, The Netherlands. (Updated 2005). Most recently he co-curated This is Not Detroit in Bochum, Germany and was commissioned by the British Council to conceive a programme for Nigeria 101 for 2015. He has organised multiple exhibitions, public programmes, publications and international exchanges with an interest in the reverberations of globalisation and art as a field of knowledge production. With Imogen Stidworthy he curated Die Lucky Bush, (Mukha, 2009) and (In) the First Circle, (Tapias Foundation, 2011). He is a member of the boards of International Foundation Manifesta and Manifesta 10 in St Petersburg.

#### Board Member

Company Name

Manifesta 10, St Petersburg

Dates Employed Apr 2013 – Apr 2016

Employment Duration 3 yrs. 1 month

Location St Petersburg

Manifesta 10 takes place between 28 June - 28 October 2014 in St Petersburg in collaboration with The State Hermitage Museum.

#### UK curator

Company Name

This is Not Detroit

Dates Employed Jan 2013 – Oct 2014

Employment Duration 1 yr. 10 months

Location Bochum, Gliwici, Zaragoza, Liverpool

An international project about the future of the city, work and art in Europe between four Opel car factory locations (Bochum, Gliwice, Zaragoza and Ellesmere Port / Liverpool) from October 2013 - October 2014

**Artistic Director Nigeria 101**

Company Name

British Council

Dates Employed Dec 2013 – Apr 2014

Employment Duration 5 months

Location Lagos, Nigeria / London, United Kingdom

Developing an artistic vision and framework for a major arts programme in 2015 working across art forms. Emphasis on new work and new audiences developing lasting engagements between arts organisations in the UK and Nigeria.

Programme Director / Deputy Chief Executive

Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Ltd

2001 – Feb 2013

Employment Duration 12 yrs.

### **Paul Domela Interview**

#### **Liverpool Biennial Programme Director 2001 - 13**

**Domela, P (2015) Unpublished interview with Paul Domela. Interviewed by Simon Yorke, 30 April 2015 09.34-10.22am**

#### **What attracted you to the Biennial?**

Here? Well, it began with.... I had been engaged with an academy in the Netherlands for fine art, design and theory, and it was academic. I studied art history and the Biennial.... It was a very public forum that was sort of exciting.... Of really doing something public instead of a closed environment of an academic institution. And the Biennial had these lofty ambitions to make Liverpool a better place to live and work for artists and I really liked that outward facing.... impulses.

#### **Lewis said the same thing when I asked him the question. So, what was your first role as part of the Biennial?**

For the first six years I was there, I was deputy chief executive and the last six years I was the programme director. So, I guess that for the first six years, I did a bit of anything, from operations and finance, marketing and education. But also, running the 2004 - 2006 International exhibitions and I was engaged in international residencies excreta.... and in 2008 I became programme director-focusing more on international exchanges, the Biennial Network, Biennial Foundation, that sort of thing. For the public talks, higher education and these sorts of things. A more specialist role. But, also working on the relationship between the International exhibition, the Biennial exhibition, and the ongoing programme that we had or started that was more long term.... dealing with urban regeneration and these sorts of things and the two had grown apart and I was keen to formulate ideas between the two that was there.

#### **And, how successful do you think you were in your objectives?**

What personal objectives? Or in relation to the Biennial? Well, it's difficult to prize apart now as there was Capital of Culture and the Biennial was very instrumental in, or if not, key to getting that title to begin with as the jury came in 2002 to like really liked the engagement of the Biennial that really brought engagement of artists across the city. But also attracted the audience to other elements of the Biennial and it sort of became a blueprint for how they would imagine that year to be (2008). I think broadly speaking, the image that the city had internally and externally changed in the twelve-years that I was working with the Biennial, and I think the Biennial was essential in that. But of course not alone but it also became a part of a movement since I arrived. The city was in a really dire state - I thought it wasn't half as dire as it was in the 80's. For me it was (laugh) pretty bad.

And the imagination of the public work, particularly the way that we commissioned artists to work in the public domain, in the public space, really changed the idea for the people of what the city could be. And that came at a moment, well in a perfect storm, in the sense in a way.... there was a city government after many years there was a bidding for this architecture city, which had failed, that changed into the Capital of Culture bid. There was this idea that UNESCO World Heritage could happen. The Biennial came through in private.... James Moores generosity and his sort of vision in the sense was really important. So, the idea that the city could actually be something, the idea that it couldn't be - was ridiculous, but you have to understand the English context. So, from an international point of view, that Liverpool was not a great city was really odd, but in a national context. Of course, this was very different, and I think both the Biennial and European Capital of Culture really changed that.... and also, you know, locally you had the labour.... the liberal democrats nationally, you had labour and so it came at a moment when you had the Tate Modern opening in 2000. You had the Baltic in Newcastle, and you know you had a couple of things that were certainly put the spotlight of contemporary art. Not obviously, just in London but outside London and I think Liverpool was really important in that significant work could be done outside the capital.

**It was London centric, wasn't it?**

Totally, and again it is London centric, but you know there is really good stuff happening outside, in the rest of the country.

**It's a shame isn't it that a lot of people in London think that there isn't any art outside of London.**

Well, you know, I have just spent some time in London. I know that I used to live in Amsterdam and the idea that you used to go to the Utrecht to see something and you know that it's only thirty-five minutes. But like it might as well be the other side of the world, but psychologically there is so much to do and see in the city that I don't blame anybody in London. But you know, I think that's where the national policy has to see.... as in the national entire space and not just as a Capital.

**Yes, there has been some Arts Council report hasn't there, that says that most of the money goes to London.**

Yeh on that sort of level I am not really sure about, but I mean I didn't really go through the statistics, but I mean they look pretty bleak on the surface, but I mean it is difficult to make a straightforward calculation.

**What do you think on the legacy from the 2008 Capital of Culture with the build-up of the biggest Liverpool Biennial and all the cultural organisations and money coming in the city to start cultural organisations? How do you think it has carried on?**

In the sense of the Capital of Culture, it's amazing what happened right? What with the financial crash happening in 2007 and so you know I also think that they have too...? talk about the Duke of Westminster and the shopping centre, which was, you know, accelerated, and was supposed to be ready in 2009 or 2010 and they accelerated it and out an awful lot of more money in to make sure it was open or almost completely open in 2008 and I think that this combination.... without that, I think everything would just have evaporated. I think that an awful lot of people were very critical of the work, particularly of the public realms organised in L1 in the shopping centre. But I think on the whole it has been really successful. You know, it has been a really smooth transition with the rest of the city. Of course, there was a little bit of a pool so that shops relocated, and I think that was a really important stitching together of the missing element that locked in the regeneration of L1 and the regeneration of the Albert Dock in the 80's from the city centre because before that there was this sort of wasteland in-between and it was very difficult to go from one to the other and I mean, you just lost heart. I mean you know; it was like you had to go to through this bleak crappy sidewalk and for the adventurous, it was kind of fun. But most people are not that adventurous, and they want to have convenience and they want to have a good way of crossing that big road. So that was achieved.

**So that was the great thing about the Biennial is that it sorts of gives you a tour of the city. Or it did give you a tour. So, you could explore and see things around the corner, and you could see things that people would not normally see. That was the premise, to use the city as the gallery. (PD. Yes definitely) what do you think of the way that it has changed now, as it has become a lot smaller hasn't it? It has become a sort of condensed, central location.**

Well, I mean it is a little bit difficult for me, as I stopped working for them in 2013 and it has become completely different times, and there is a lot less money around. I still think that there are some attempts to engage the public realm through these ships, these Dazzle Ships, that you can argue that they work or not. And I know that they want to do something at Everton Park which is a long sort of process to do something there. So, I think they are continuing. Yeh it is interesting because erm, in 2002, it was my first Biennial that I was engaged in. There was the Henry Moore Foundation at that time, who took over a school in Mount Pleasant Street, a board school, and it was sort of an extra location on top of the Tate, of the Bluecoat. No, but yeh the Bluecoat was in fact in existence then. And on top, there was this location that highlighted the arm particular conditions within the City, and we reused this building, and we were really, really excited about that. I think, well, in 2004 and 2006 we didn't do that. We did work in the public space, but we didn't take on or open up an additional building. We overthought that actually, you know the success of 2002 was partly because of this exciting other building that was highlighted. The thought that we should put that back into the mix of what we offered. In 2008 it was an addition, also with

2010 and 2012 as well. Well, you know, when you have less money, it is also very expensive to take up another building because you have to make up a health and safety report etc. you usually have to do a lot of work. And now you know if I was faced with the choice now, I wonder if I would do the same thing you know. Why not work with the infrastructure that exists and do something on the street because I think that would work for me that the strength of the Biennial was really visible you know, on the street, in public spaces for people who may not normally want to go out to the Tate, or the Bluecoat, or FACT for example. I think that element was missing for me in 2014.

**I know that it's a frustrating thing about the Biennial has always had bad reviews. I think that it was Frieze that said for the 2006 Festival that if you had a bad opinion, then you were still engaged with the Biennial.**

Hmm (in agreement)

**I know that it's said a lot of the time that its more enjoyable going around the building than the actual artwork, which are intrinsic as they are normally site specific.... it's been said, about a few of the Biennials. That they talk about the buildings being more exciting**

Than the art? Yeh

**But these buildings have been chosen as part of the curatorial process and the work are site specific and they have been chosen for a certain reason. The environment is integral to the work, and the work to the environment. My question is, how do you combat these negative reviews from Frieze and other critics? People don't seem to get the artwork.**

Well, it's a difficult one, isn't it? I don't think the reviews were. Apart from the last Biennial in 2014, which was pretty unanimously panned unfortunately. Well in the past, I think the reviews were mixed, so I don't really think that that's err, such a bad thing, you know. Of course, you want to have praise and all these kinds of thing. The fact that you're trying to do something new, and I think that's not just in Liverpool. So, nationally we were doing something new and also internationally we were doing something new. By trying to sort of make a culmination between the experience of a place which the project took place, and you know the individual artworks and trying to sort of have these two experiences. That's something now that it's a little bit more established perhaps even though it is difficult for the critics.... the convention is to see an artwork in isolation, that is the convention, right? Or you might have a public face of the artwork, you know like.... bleach (clinical) (laugh). A public space becomes sort of part of the work, it is almost like the *mise-en-scène*<sup>1</sup> of the work and I think we tried to do that.... you know, there was this conversation made active you know so the context was not so silent - it was active so intruding in a sense.... of the

---

<sup>1</sup> A French term. The setting of a stage, where the arrangement of everything is apparent at once

experience of the work, you know. A robust mixing, there wasn't a smelting together and that for a lot of the critics was so difficult. You saw them give up halfway through (laugh)

**McMasters wrote about art organisations needing to be risk takers, and that we should try to push art, we shouldn't be afraid to push boundaries. I think that is a difference between and art organisations like the Biennial, and art institutions. The Biennial can take more risks because it is there to challenge a person's perceptions of what art is.**

Yeh well, it's difficult, no? Well yes of course you would do that. I am not sure if that is the difference between an organisation and an institution. But a lot of that report from McMasters was laudable as his encouragement was of the Arts Council being risk takers and all that kind of stuff. I still kind of.... I also remember that after having praised art organisations went through the roof. You know, they also wanted to say.... install some chief executive model that is a bureaucratic way of making something recognisable across the board you know. I think that practically every organisation in the arts in England have now been organised on this model. Whether that is theatre, or visual arts or whatever.... and so, I think in a way, in that the so-called risk taking is a bureaucratic element that is.... it's interesting as there was a review of.... or Minerva by Morgan.... I forge this name, in the art monthly that talks about this institutionalisation that an organisation is set up. A real thrust and emancipatory drive to make people more aware of a certain thing, just by the mechanism of public funding in the early 2000's.

We were corralled into this harness of a mid-level organisation. The Arts Council public funded organisation which didn't really fit (laugh). And so, you can argue that that was the demise of.... I think that there were other reasons, but I think that.... so, what am I saying here? Oh yeh, about the risk taking. So, you constantly have this pressure or challenge of risk taking, which is encouraged for this risk taking, but then at the other end, or at the same time there is always this expectation that risks are looking for a certain way and not the other way. So, the risk you are taking is not the risk that they have in mind. You know, you can still get slapped on the wrist for it. You still have to produce the audience figures. You still have to, you know, do the education programme in a certain way. You have to make a totally explicit distance between what they expect and what you have done. I am a little bit sceptical about the definition of risk, I don't really.... yeh (laugh).

**I think that as long as people have an opinion and they are engaging with the art, then it has actually worked. The problem is that if people do not have an opinion, it was not stimulating in any way to have a negative or positive reaction. It engages them good or bad. Otherwise, it is completely bland and ignored. So, what makes good art excellent?**

Well, that's a difficult one, no? If you believe these McMasters report, it's about peer review. It's a culmination of many factors. I am really hesitant to put a single definition on it. I think that what works for me is that contentious. One of the attractions of the Liverpool Biennial was that there was a different shape of model you know. There was space for

many different things, a conventional painting prize, there was an exhibition for young artists who were recent graduated. You have the Independents that represented the local arts and garnered for all kinds, and then you had the International exhibition which was sort of the curated. That was sort of the authored exhibition but again that was the product of many voices. So again, in terms of critical reception, that is kind of a difficult like model to get your head around.

**Yes, the number of different elements make it harder to Pidgeon hole and comprehend.**

Totally, and so you know it puts, I think it was Chantal Mouffe<sup>2</sup> who talks about the agnostic space<sup>3</sup>. You know, a space of constant turmoil. There is a constant conflict embedded in the public arena. As an active, organising element I think we practiced that in a sense. We didn't do that Carte Blanche, clean it all out, put the vision in and that is the biennial. Which is the normal model of the biennials. Whether you go to.... I mean the last Sao Paulo which I didn't see but I know a lot about as my partner was in it. It presented such a vision of the world if you.... with that it presented it in a building by Oscar Niemeyer<sup>4</sup> which was a purposely designed for this purpose and it's completely cleaned. So, you can put this vision in without any more of a vision marquee working throughout of the fullness of life.

**So, it makes it quite clinical?**

Yeh so something you can apprehend as something that is distinguished or distinct rather. Distinct point of view and I think that this distinctiveness that we were trying to do or argue a work with. This distinctiveness was embedded within many other different views.

**That's the difference between, sort of, a world fair and the expo's is that they take over a large area and site specific away from the city, and each country designs a building and the last one was in Beijing. Each was a site-specific design and exhibition to say how cultural and technologically advanced a country is to promote industry, trade and tourism. Where a biennial is sort of embedded into the city.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Chantal Mouffe, Professor of Political Theory and Director of the Centre for the Study of Democracy, University of Westminster, London. Agnostic Spaces asks if artistic practices can play an important role in subverting the dominant hegemony in this so-called 'agonistic' model of public space, visualizing that which is repressed and destroyed by the consensus of post political democracy.

<sup>3</sup> In a talk for the Biennial Foundation title Agonistic public spaces: Democratic politics and the Dynamics of Passions in which she asks how could, or how can art play an integral and not only peripheral role in relation to the global challenge that affects both the artistic production and reception, especially in light of the damaging effects of reactionary conservative and fundamentalist politics in all social structures of the world today

<sup>4</sup> The Cicillio Matarazzo Pavilion, headquarters of the Bienal de São Paulo Foundation since 1957, is the stage of one of the world's most important art exhibitions: the Bienal de São Paulo. Designed by the Architect Oscar Niemeyer, the pavilion is a heritage-listed building

Yes, well the Liverpool Biennial has or had been doing that. I mean, I appreciate that that had to change (in 2014) so I don't want to be too negative about 2014, even though I didn't like the exhibition in the school for the blind as they called it. But I think there is a certain life to that idea and the city changes so perhaps you have to do something else. But anyway, that is sort of where we were, and it was very exciting for me.

**What are you most proud of?**

Well, the proud moments are when Kafka, when I mean something works and you see lots of people enjoying what you have done. Or you have somebody tell you that it has completely changed their lives or the way they look at life. Something.... you see the light going on in somebodies head. These kinds of moments are really exciting.

**Lewis said the same thing. Art changes the way we look at life and to do this, the work has to challenge the perception of things, it sorts of teaches people to see things in a different way.**

That's sort of a claim you can make. But more often than not, that claim doesn't bear fruit, you know. But they still have a moment. For example, an artist or architect did a workshop in the Klondyke Street that doesn't exist anymore as I think that it was torn down. But you had loads of kids and they were completely wired and running around like mad and there was this one kid who was like, just completely spellbound and listening to every word the artist was saying and looking at slides of the work and the kid was only something like nine or something like that. But there was definitely something that had switched on in his mind and you could see his eyes were on fire. He was so thrilled, and I was so excited that we had come to that neighbourhood and a lot of the people from the art world who came to the event, felt really (laugh) out of place because it was a tough scene, you know, not a rough scene but a tough scene (rough, tough locals and area) and that was sort of a moment that stays with you, and it is so exciting to see that happen. You hope that this happens but when it does happen, well yeh, life comes in (a clash of class and society that doesn't normally mix, but it works).

**Was there sort of a moment or experience that triggered your interest in art?**

No, I think it was a gradual thing. I mean, my grandfather collected old art, antiques and stuff or he traded in it, so you have that, but I think that is a different world from contemporary art and that became a different world again from commissioning. That was another thing that excited me about the Biennial. That you commission works, basically put your trust in an artist on what they have done, and you hope that you get something as exciting or more exciting.

**What happened to the work afterwards?**

Well, I don't think you can give a general answer to that, some of it gets destroyed because it only existed there and then. Or other works were sold, some of them are probably still sitting in storage. A different storage for each one.

**That's what I was wondering, that after so much work being commissioned by the Biennial, what happened to the afterwards. Was there a warehouse somewhere or did the artist keep the work?**

We don't keep any of it. We didn't want it to be a collection, you know.... so, we always tried to make sure that somebody else would look after the work. But there were different arrangements being made, as many of the work was created specifically for site.

**And only had meaning and context in that place at that time? That's a beauty of biennial art as it captures a moment in time really, imbedded in the environment at that time and place.**

Yeh, it's interesting that some artists managed to find an adaptation to reinstall it somewhere else, so we managed to make it work.

**Do you think that in hindsight, retaining the work could have been a meant of finance and a way to fund future Biennials (selling the work?)**

To sell some of the work. Well, yeh, I mean well.... first, well, in the earlier years it wasn't so much of an issue because the funding was easier, it was easier to get public funding and go down that avenue. But I think, as public funding has decreased, I think that biennials are forced to think more commercially and so that becomes, well it comes more into focus. I don't mean anyone has come up with a good strategy yet. Because also galleries specialise in that sort of stuff (selling work) and so the relationship between galleries and biennials and the art market has become a quite interesting one. And you know, I also think that everyone also has to maintain a distinctiveness because if you move too much or too close to the art market, too close to gallery work conditions, then what remains about the ideas of a biennial? So at least, the biennial addresses the public you know. The publicness which is quite different than what galleries are doing. Most galleries sell to private people and hung in their private homes, which are not shown to the public (laugh). There you go.

**Also, I think that the biennial trades in intellectual value-opposed to monetary value like galleries and private art market. The intellectual value is much stronger than the monetary value, as a large proportion are site specific and destroyed afterwards.**

I don't know if that's a distinction. I think that that idea of a distinction for me is about the public, about the public space, of a shared space.... of doing things about the common. You know, these kinds of things - about society. There are different names which are most likely different aspects about what we are talking about and the Biennial sort of sits there, where for me, galleries can support that. I mean many galleries have supported that kind of thing. There is a kind of symbiotic relationship between the two, but galleries do not address that, they address collectors, and those collectors can be public institutions although I don't think they keep up anymore with the price that private collectors do. I think that you can make intellectually valid statements as an artist and sell them to a private collector. I don't think there is anything intrinsically wrong with producing work that is hung within somebody's home. That's not the problem, that's not part of the problem. There are problems with the art market, but that's a different (laugh).

**Again, there is sort of an element or part of the Biennial that deals with the art market, even if it is on a local scale. The Biennial is an opportunity for local artists to show and sell their work to an international audience that the Biennial attracts.**

You think it's about selling?

**It is a product or opportunity, yes. The International show is an ideal platform for local artists to introduce their work to an international art market and hopefully they can either sell their work or be given opportunities to show their work elsewhere.**

I thought it was about visibility and trying to show themselves, for me, what was important was the idea of circulation about bringing people here because I think one of the problems about, or important things about.... an important thing about an artist is that you show their work, right? And if you are based somewhere, you can only show your work, I don't know, maybe about every two years. You want to show to a local audience, and so you need many other places where you can show your work. Most of those places are not local (laugh), they are global. So, I think, or I thought, that's why it was about making people come to the city and also to show the work of people who are based here, it wasn't for me, it wasn't really about selling.... but also, that comes into it. But it's also about curating and curators who can get invited to show somewhere else.

**A lot of the events are commercial based, I have to admit. And the artists want to sell their work, they have to live. Unfortunately, it means a mixture of professional and admittedly, amateur artists.**

Yes, I think there was.... I mean, I think that was a form of.... for me, that was a problem sometimes with the Independents. There was a lot of opportunistic people in there who only come out to be artists, I mean, every two years right? And they didn't do anything in-between, or not visibly anyway, and then I think, only a few people took the opportunity to

be part of the Biennial to push the boat out. To do something different and to do something really.... aspire to be on that level of participating in that conversation, and I think that sort of discredited it. A problem that you also see in the art school, you know, of if you are curious to participate in that conversation.... and even if you don't like the terms of it, you know, you have to! And I still think that, not everyone, but I still think that the local scene is sort of a little bit inward you know. They could focus on a little bit more curiosity and polemic kind of thing.

**Yes definitely, I think that one of the issues with the Independents was that people only think of it every two years and they go quiet for the interim period and only think about promoting themselves for the festival period. They never think of promoting themselves outside of the city.**

Yes, or just learning, I mean to me.... I am not an artist, but I know enough artists to think that a part of being an artist is also to learn. To learn from others, to learn from doing, through you know, to get a better understanding of whether.... this is uncharted territory you know. You're not really in a discipline, that's why artists are a little bit different from say science or humanities. It produces a different kind of knowledge and an uncharted kind of.....and for every artist it's kind of their own path.

**Yes, it's like an individual journey as they are always looking for answers. They have a different perception, mixed with a curious nature about understanding everything through their eyes and brains.**

Yes, it's a curious mixture of a journey which is also deeply shared, you know. You can't.... there is nothing.... you cannot have sort of outsider artists who are outside of a conversation. It's not an individual thing, you know. Its, its.... I mean, you do it yourself, but you cannot do it without being also part of this kind of art system.

**I think artist tell stories, you know, they use visual mediums to tell stories from their perspective. Their perception.**

Well, that one way of putting it. Some artists would take you up on that (laugh).

**I think great art has many different levels. There is a complexity with many different connotations.**

Yes, well it's interesting you know as there is always this sort of question of what is great art? No? But it is capturing a kind of a moment, it changes also.

**It means different things to different people.**

Yes, some artists are great in their lifetime and then completely forgotten, and also the other way around (laugh).

**What do you think is the future of the Liverpool Biennial?**

You mean now? Here? I don't know, you will have to ask Sally (laugh). I don't really know what her plans are.... I was, you know.... I overlapped with her one year and there are many things I agree with, which she wanted to do. I am not sure if I would do them in the same way.... on the evidence of 2014. But certainly, I wouldn't have.... ha, that's a different thing. I have always wanted to do a Biennial that is a big performance you know. A big moment of time erm.... which is not a party, but a performance element, which we did that with Rhys Chatham in 2012<sup>5</sup> which I thought was really great. It was a wonderful experience. I didn't think that the.... that the Hillsborough<sup>6</sup> (the concert?). yeh, the concert was not to me, as exciting you know.... it was you know.... a lot of people I know loved it; I am one of the few people who didn't like it (laugh). To me it was a bit too much of a given. Where Rhys Chatham was not at all. It brought something very different to the City. That to me, was exhilarating and stretched us all logistically. I don't think we thought that it was going to be that popular. So, to me, that was an element that was brought in. where Hillsborough continued something that, which was exciting. It was something that we had never done before. It was about art objects in a sense, so that thinking is really good.

You know the public thing is really difficult because it requires a lot of money, it's expensive to do something that has a certain size. The Dazzle ships are.... I think Peter Blake did a decent job; I mean it's nice. It's nice and fun but at the same time I can't really get rid of the idea that, that the ferry is not a working ferry, it's a tourist attraction mainly, and so you get some tourist attraction and a decorated tourist attraction. I really think there was anything that was changed there. I am not really sure of.... what anybody thinks about World War One. So, for me I like, sort of the fashion world- you know, clash baby clash. I have always liked this sort of incongruity. You put a house wedged in-between two existing houses. A Korean tea house, or you cage the Lions (outside St. Georges Hall)<sup>7</sup> as with have Do Ho Su. Or you make the façade of a building turn in the most unlikely way like Richard Wilson, and

---

<sup>5</sup> A Crimson Grail, due to its huge scale has only previously been performed twice, once in the Lincoln Centre in New York and once in the Sacré-cur in Paris. For this, the third ever performance and UK premiere, one hundred volunteer guitarists and eight bassists joined Rhys Chatham and his team in a performance of A Crimson Grail in Liverpool Anglican Cathedral

<sup>6</sup> Symphony No. 11: Hillsborough Memorial represents the culmination of Michael Nyman's thinking around the tragedies connected with Liverpool Football Club. 25 years after the Hillsborough tragedy, he says that he hopes it will make a small but significant contribution to the healing process still necessary for the families of the lost fans

<sup>7</sup> Art installation by artist Rigo 23 for the Liverpool Biennial 2006 depicting a Caged Lion outside Liverpool's St. George's Hall

something really changed there because it's so.... it's not about being weird, it's not about being out there.... it's about being out of the ordinary in a thoughtful way you know, it's sort of.... it kind of makes sense but it doesn't and there is this kind of.... kind of leap that occurs. This slight shift and that excites me, and I don't think that there.... I think people find it lots of fun, it's also good so I mean it is difficult to say which way it's going to go (the future of the Biennial).

The conversation that Ray Munoz had in San Francisco, I don't know, where you there? A couple of weeks ago, months ago at the Bluecoat. That was really great, so if they actually realise what they were talking about, it will be fantastic. So, it's, I hope it does well but it's going to be.... we will see how it develops. It's difficult, as its difficult times, what with the City council, the way public art is, because it is a publicly supported thing, and if the public support is in the hands of the Arts Council and City council. These kinds of money are no longer there, I don't really think you can have a Biennial like we imagined it. It doesn't make any sense.

**In a way, the legacy is carried on as developing collaboration between organisations, institutions and art groups were always important.**

That is already established.

**True but more than ever as at the last curatorial meeting that I attended, there was thirty-three cultural organisations and groups who were there to discuss the development of all the elements for the next Biennial.**

That is fantastic.

**It's exactly the way that it should be, but with each group / organisation in charge of their own content and funding to develop additional elements for the Festival. They are working together or sharing their project information, but in an autonomous way due to funding and being self-reliant.**

Yes, well the.... it's the non-arts collaborations that are so essential in all of it, of course it is an achievement to get organisations to talk to each other, that is self-evident, but in a sense that has been achieved. That is a given, everybody is doing it now, it's not.... it's just logistics. The art and the non-art conversation are not a given. That still requires a lot of work and I think that continues to be the challenge...we can do art anywhere, but I think we got somewhere, here in Liverpool, and I hope the new people (Sally Tallant and new Biennial staff) can continue or maintain it, so there is a trust between what the Biennial does, what happens within the rest of the city and people continue to feel it is their Biennial and not just an art Biennial. That's the easy bit, to do an art Biennial (laugh).

## **Paul Smith Biography**

Paul Smith was Executive Director of Liverpool Biennial for twelve years (2007 – 2019). He has extensive experience of both the arts and business in the UK and the US, having worked with organisations including Festival Dance, Belfast Waterfront Hall, The Grand Opera House, Prime Cut Productions, Santander and Bank of America.

He has worked with Arts & Business, concentrating on learning, business and organisational development to create stronger and more extensive business and arts partnerships. He has worked closely with Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium (LARC), a collaborative grouping of senior arts leaders which seeks to use their combined influence to create sectoral, cultural and civic change.

This wide-ranging experience has provided knowledge and skills in a number of art forms and in creating partnerships, investment, business management, cross-sector working and governance. Paul will offer this expertise to consortium members to enhance the DCNW vision, development plans, and strategic communications.

As Executive Director at Liverpool Biennial I was responsible for a complex undertaking. For each edition, the Biennial works with up to 70 artists, a dozen exhibition partners, 20 venues across the city, 300 volunteers and 80 funders. Operationally, its public realm pieces are always open to the public, the festival exhibitions are open seven days a week and community engagement projects run for months or years with continually changing activity, venues and participants. Many of the Biennial's temporary locations are particularly challenging as we aim to occupy historic, disused or unique spaces on a temporary basis.

As Executive Director, Smith was responsible for the strategic business functions including the teams that organise, staff, maintain, and promote this great diversity of exhibitions, events, venues, projects and campaigns. The Biennials marketing campaigns created millions of impacts and continually built the brand, particularly on national and international levels.

Smith contributed the ability to continually improve visitor services, mediation and learning. Any meaningful arts programme depends as much on the connections it makes with people as it does on the quality of the exhibitions. Working closely with cultural colleagues, civic authorities and supporters, Paul generated and delivered strategic projects which wrought change in the city and constituent communities along with workforce and organisational development initiatives.

As Regional Director at Arts & Business Smith led a team and a strategy to build relationships between businesses, business people and arts organisations to generate revenue; improve management and governance; and to increase understanding, skills and opportunities for the arts and business to work together to mutual benefit. Smith ran programmes to build sponsorships, commercial relationships and governance, so have considerable expertise in corporate giving as well as philanthropy.

## **Cultural Executive**

Company Name  
Culture Smith UK  
Dates Employed Dec 1996 – Present  
Employment Duration 24 yrs. 7 months  
Location Manchester, United Kingdom

**Executive Director**

Company Name  
Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Ltd Full-time  
Dates Employed Apr 2007 – Oct 2019  
Employment Duration 12 yrs. 7 months

**Stakeholder Relationships**

Company Name  
Senior relationship responsibility at various companies, collaborations and boards  
Dates Employed Oct 1988 – Sep 2019  
Employment Duration 31 yrs.

**Marketing, Communications and Audience Development**

Company Name  
Brand, marketing and communication roles at various companies Full-time  
Dates Employed Oct 1988 – Sep 2019  
Employment Duration 31 yrs.

**Business Specialist**

Company Name  
Business manager at various companies, businesses and organisations  
Dates Employed Oct 1988 – Sep 2019  
Employment Duration 31 yrs.

**Regional Director**

Company Name  
Arts & Business Full-time  
Dates Employed Sep 1998 – Mar 2007  
Employment Duration 8 yrs. 7 months

## **Paul Smith Interview**

### **Liverpool Biennial Executive Director 2007 – 2019**

**Smith, P (2015) Unpublished interview with Paul Smith. Interviewed by Simon Yorke, 30 March 11.07-12.06pm**

I am Paul Smith the Executive Director at the Biennial. Executive Director means more or less that I look after the business function of the Biennial. So, I look after the marketing teams, the finance, also I look after general operations and sort of how things happen. Whereas the programme teams, I suppose you could say, look after WHAT happens.

#### **The content?**

So well, as well as that one view of part of the business, one half of the business, from what everybody else does. I am also the longest serving member of the staff still. The longest memory that is still with it, with the organisation.

#### **When did you actually join the Biennial?**

2007, early 2007 in the run up to 2008. But of course, I had been involved with the Biennial for a lot longer before that. I used to work as the regional Director of Arts and Business which created relations between businesses and arts organisations. So, I knew Lewis, and I knew the team as I had been involved with them, in fundraising ways for a lot longer than that.

#### **What attracted you to the Biennial?**

Well, actually, two things...one was a personal interest. I just enjoyed the Biennials long before I worked here, you know. I had come and I had seen it and I think I recognised really early on that it was going to be something, and it really was something important. You know, you can never look back and tell the exact story. Why something did or didn't happen, but you can certainly know elements of why things did or didn't happen.... and one of the elements of the original formation of the Biennial was.... which seemed quite authentic was this desire to take something that was already happening. So, the John Moores Prize had been supported by the Moores family for a very long time. Newcontemporaries had been around for a long time.... and James Moores in particular, Jane Casey, Bryan Biggs, and Lewis. They certainly looked and said actually.... is there a chance to take those existing things and add a layer of commissioning on top of that...? and make a meeting space and make a lot more art happen that would not happen in any one of those things.... to create something that is greater than that...than all its parts. But that

idea was carried from the beginning of the Biennial and shows in all the things that we do. So, just being interested in what the Biennial was at the time, and was going to be, was important. And then the other bit was just accident. Lewis had asked me to be on the interview panel of a post that was coming up.... and I didn't think about it. I just sort of said yes Lewis I was happy to help. Then over the holidays, the Christmas, and New Year holidays, I looked at the job description and thought actually I would love to do this (laugh). So, I called up Lewis and said 'Lewis, you know, would you be deeply offended if I withdrew from the interview panel' and he said 'well, why?' and I said, 'I think I would like to apply' (laugh). And that was kind of historic. So, it was quite a long application process, but a good one.

**It's good that it is quite an organic process of getting into a job.**

Well yes, but that's been a long-standing feature as well.... so, the thing about the Biennial is, there is always layers of things happening.... and some you see, and some you don't see.... and I am quite sure that just like an iceberg. 90% of what's going on is invisible, so really, it's easy to look at the Biennial and say it's a Festival and add on a few large-scale public-realm works like *Dream*<sup>8</sup> or *Another Place*<sup>9</sup>. A little harder to detect on are things like Homebaked where we were originally involved with *2Up2Down*. Before that was a bigger project in North Liverpool, so it was a decade of working on that project.

**People don't understand all the annual things that you do, they think it's just the Festival every two years. They don't really know what you do in the meantime. It's always these little social inclusion projects like the LHAT type thing in the tower blocks and about getting people involved with art.**

And one of those things is that the organic nature of getting into the Biennial is just that. We have a commitment to trying to, or one of our three main aims is to improve the arts infrastructure. So that's about us. Again 90% that isn't very detectable about some of that is, we are doing things that make a longer-term change with what's happening and working

---

<sup>8</sup>The Big Art Project is an ambitious public art commissioning initiative from Channel 4 supported by Arts Council England. The Big Art Project in St. Helens is being delivered by St. Helens Council, in partnership with the national funders. The work takes the form of the head of a little girl with eyes closed, seemingly in a dream-like state. It is the artist's response to the brief and subsequent conversations with the ex-miners and members of the wider local community who wanted a work that looked to a brighter future and created a beautiful and contemplative space for future generations, not least their own grandchildren, at the top of the former spoil heap.

<sup>9</sup> Antony Gormley's installation comprises 100 cast-iron sculptures made from seventeen different moulds taken from the sculptor's own body, installed on Crosby Beach on the Mersey Estuary, all facing the open sea, and evoking the relationship between the natural elements, space and the human body. The work covers a distance of almost 3km, with the pieces placed 250m apart along the tide line, and up to 1km out towards the horizon. The movement of local tides and daily weather conditions dictate whether the figures are visible or submerged. It has become one of the most well-loved and widely recognised public art works in the UK.

with people is part of that. So, it's less now because of structures and that, but I used to be incredibly proud that 40% of people who worked for us on an employed basis used to be in terms of volunteers. That's pretty good, but we still beat other organisations pretty much with people getting jobs after that, after they have worked for us as well. So, we want to keep doing that, as a kind of daily measure of business. Trying to get people in, to give them enough experience to boost them and move them along on their way. Sometimes, that's kind of working with us in some capacity, sometimes being part of something we do. That organic nature, we recognise the fact that we can only employ a certain amount of people we come to train a certain amount of people, or professional development.... but actually, interacting with people has some benefits. I am interested in answering about instrumental impact and certain things like that. There was a question about the economic impact reports. So, I think I have picked up on those as quite a lot of the time, particularly in these days where there is less money or feeling of vulnerability in the arts because I do a lot of work outside of Liverpool as well. There is a certain national thing that have been there for a long time, certainly since 2008 with the feeling of vulnerability and things declining and such it seems like there is often....

Oh well, it's either instrumental or its intrinsic and it's just not like that, to me. It's like a lot of things, if you have a business you focus on what you can do really, really well. Better than anybody else and that what you aim to do, and I think that for a lot of arts organisations.... that means you make art; you make the best art you can.... what I am only interested in is working with an organisation that does as much as it can.... and say yep that's our starting place. That's how Apple starts, but you will find that any really successful organisation or business also pays attention to all of the other factors that are a part of that business. So, it's lazy or kind of rubbish-making saying that we will only make a great product. And of course, it will just sell itself, of course we will be able to deliver it to the right people, at the right time. Of course, we will make profit if we make a great product. The world doesn't really work that way. I don't approach the idea that there is an instrumental impact which is different from an intrinsic. They don't fight against each other, they support each other. If you make great art, and you have great systems for delivering that and then it's about bringing people in, that's right where I want to be.

**I think the instrumental is just an outcome of everything that you actually do. If you make great art, they will come. If you don't make great art, people don't come and see it or spend money, and you don't get anything.**

Yes and no. when I say that I think the two are in closer dialogue than that because you can certainly programme great art and then try and market it, but the best way of doing it is programming great art and then have a conversation with how that connects to people, and what do you want and sometimes that the artist or the curators. You now have the people build it to begin with, sometimes that works pretty well. Sometimes you have got to have a communication with a campaign that lets people know that it is there. Sometimes you just have to do something like just putting it there so that people are just going to bump into it completely at random. Like when we put the lift in Liverpool One.... we measured how many people intended to come and see that but erm.... there were many times when the number of people were just in Liverpool One to do something else, and

then some of them just walked past and didn't even notice it. They didn't even see it, but some of them walked past and suddenly they had an experience that day that was different from what they expected, and it was different from the other experiences they would have on a typical day. So, to me, the artist never sat down and thought about those people but those people that bumped into that work and the fact that the piece was put in a place where they could bump into it, are just as fundamentally a part of that artwork as anything else, just as much that needs to be recognised.

**It's a dialogue between the artist and the way that the visitor reacts to it. The public is snapped out of their normal day and thinking - they normally are too caught up in their own little world that they do not notice the world around them. They are sleepwalking and the artwork being in someplace that is not expected stops their internal thought processes and they become mindful of the external world. It's a great tool for opening their eyes and giving them a new experience and shows them to be more present and aware of the world. So, it's the same type of thing. One thing that I was thinking this morning is that.... have you found a changing shift in the projects you commission to secure the dwindling funding that is out there?**

No.

**Like social inclusion. Small projects with small amounts of people so that they can be taught the intrinsic value of culture. Have you started to move towards the community arts and social initiative projects started with 2Up2Down?**

I don't think that we have been.... we have been very lucky, and it's not just luck of course, it's been a hell of a lot of hard work to both make and stay in this place. We haven't had to yet, and I am going to try and find some wood to touch (laugh). We haven't yet had to do any work that hasn't started with - ok we want to do this work and then we go out and try to find funding for it. So, in all my years since 2007 we haven't even done a single project where we have said - we have got some money for that, let's go and do it. Which is lucky, I think I feel kind of quite privileged that I think most of my colleagues would say that the way we do and want to work anyway. That doesn't mean that it always works. Sometimes you have a project that you want to do, and you can't fund it, and sometimes like with the Dazzle Ships. Kind of initially, it was going to be one ship, you know. That was the idea for the project, and then suddenly there were three. Which was great, you know. That sort of thing happens as well, where you actually end up with a project that is so good that people want to support it. They feel that it needs to exist or to expand in the world. Like those ones (laugh) needless to say are very.... well, their good.

**I was just thinking maybe Assemble who won the Turner Prize, that there was the question of that type of community initiative is art? Similarly, as you could argue about Homebaked. Where you look at a project like 2Up2Down which morphed into a bakery. A small community active project that bakes bread is a community led project but is it art? That's what I was thinking community workers and start-up businesses have been doing it for many years to aid local communities, but they do not class themselves as artists, they are just community workers. Well, I think.... a long time ago I just came to the conclusion that essentially, art is going to be self-defined, you know. We have seen enough of it that**

people put a label on it and just say this is art. Now that's fine and I think you can do that but for me as an individual person, and not speaking as a representative of the Biennial. The question is, would someone else recognise that as having an effect on them in some way. And then that becomes art in some ways. Anyone can self-define art. For example, if I just moved a book from here to here, or over there, and that is art. Doesn't mean it is good art, and it doesn't mean that you are sitting across the table would recognise that as art. So, there isn't really in my mind that there is a debate or not of us doing work to help make a bakery possible in Anfield. We didn't imagine it at the start, but we did imagine that by bringing in Jeanne van Heeswijk, supporting her and the people around them to explore and make something happen. I think that you can clearly see something, and I am going to say something very old school here, very old school in the arts world, but you can see something beautiful in that process. And that's what makes it art, and all of the other things that happened up there. What could be broadly influenced to other businesses opening locally or property development in the area? You could broadly say that there are loads of that stuff happening so what is the difference of that thing and what you have happening there, and I would say that the process had art in it, whereas a lot of the other stuff didn't.

**So, it is the creative process that defines anything as art?**

Yes.

**I think the great thing about the Biennial is that you are always challenging what people's perceptions of what art is. I know a lot of the time when I have taken people to the Biennial Festivals that they say, 'that's rubbish, I could do that!' but they only see the object in front of them, they do not take into account the creative process and the concepts behind the cultural object. They don't understand that it is challenging people's perceptions. That the art makes you think about it and makes you think about the creative process about what is art or that you think that it isn't art. The art is a tool to start the creative process of critical judgement, so that you explore the visual representation and the ideas and concepts behind the work. It creates a dialogue between the object and the viewer, but you have to put some thought into it. It is not instantaneously gratifying in the appreciation, you have to work and come up with your own concepts to what the work means to you and your perception is governed by your knowledge about the subject and art and your past experiences. Take the Futurist Cinema in 2010, which received the lowest scores on satisfaction of anything else.**

Yeh, it did.

**You could say that they didn't recognise it as art**

Yes, they failed to recognise it.

**I was writing that only 17% of people actually went to visit it or something. But it was virtually opposite the Biennial main exhibition**

Yes, the ABC.

**And just down the road from the main International show and tourism centre at Rapid Hardware. Thousands of people saw it every single day and I was thinking, well you know it was bit rubbish, but the other day I read the description in the catalogue by Lorenzo Fuzi who described it as abandoned and a forgotten age of cinema. I thought, well actually, maybe, it was created so that people didn't notice it as it represented a forgotten age of cinema that was supposed to be the future. Is it a metaphor to the forgotten age and represented the human condition as we all get older and fall apart, becoming obsolete and forgotten as the world progresses around us, always concentrating on the new? One of the Biennial staff said that it was their favourite thing in any Festival because of the photograph in the catalogue= someone nonchalantly looking in the buildings direction without seeing it. But that's the thing, it's the images that last as the work disappears after each Festival, that's what people will use as a reference for the work. I thought how brilliant it is if someone created something that they didn't want people to see in person. They didn't want people to actually visit the artwork as it is about a forgotten age, and about this building that is dilapidated an**

**The last impression is the idea and concept, and the picture is the only visual reference, showing that the idea is more important than the physical representation.**

I mean, there is something to be said about the process that we go through. That... we wouldn't brief an artist to do something like that. An artist might come back to us and say, 'look I actually have an idea for this work, and this is what I mean for it to be.' And some of those artists, what they mean for it to be is something really, really visible you know. So, if you look at the signs, you probably remember those. They were meant to be on the street and both visible and invisible at the same time. They wanted that to be seen but then again it wasn't necessarily recognised in a way. And that's fine if that is what the artist wanted to do. That's about that thing of what is the process, what is the practice that is maybe - we want to see something in there. So, the Biennial doesn't really set out to disrupt people perceptions or make something new happen, but we do hope to create a space for where artists, if they are interested to do that, then totally.

**I suppose it's part of the creative process of art and being open to what they want to do?**

Open within a framework, sometimes projects just practically are not possible, sometimes they just do not fit with.... we get a proposal that comes back that doesn't really fit with what we want to be said in that environment. So, some projects are just not right, so they just don't happen.

**Which question would you like to answer next?**

There is a cluster of questions about how informed the artists are and what helps people to understand it.... how do we help the audience to understand the work better? Being better informed and stuff like that. For me, that touches on something that we were just talking about. The Futurist Cinema and whether it was successful or if you look that far fewer people saw that or far fewer people recognised that they saw it even though it was literally across the road from them. Fewer people recognised that they saw that than others. The thing about audiences is that.... is that audiences, they have a different thing about them

they like, each person does.... the way it crystallises for me is that I went to this branding workshop from some super-hotshot fellow who was very, very good, but one of the things that has kept sticking with me is that.... it was hard at the time; it was very hard at the time, and it took a lot of thought about it afterwards. He said 'actually every brand or undertaking of something, whether it was a political party, or a soft drink has to have something that sits underneath it that is what he called a simple universally recognised truth. It has to have a moment that could connect with anybody or customer or audience pool, or something like that. So that's why you see, even though it's different now, but like Coca-Cola. For a long time, Coca-Cola was about refreshment so whatever words or images that they used in commercials. That piece of what they thought would always....

The way they could always touch people was about refreshment sometimes, brands.... you're going to laugh at this one - VW (Volkswagen) you know? Their touch point was something about trust. Their universally recognised truth was about trust. Their whole marketing was that their cars was trying to sell them and create in customers minds was that they were going to just get a better car. You were not going to get a luxury car, but your car was going to be better than others. Don't worry that you are going to be spending a little bit more, if you appreciate it, you are going to spend a little bit more. It was kind of where they went. For the Biennial....

The closest I could get to that universally recognised truth was to stop and say - well actually we have such vastly different audiences with such vastly different numbers, that you have a level of our audience which are that they are paid, very well recognised highly exposed art critics. They put their view about art out there, they are professional in their viewing of art. That is their job, that is their expertise and for many of them, their vocation, versus you have someone who is just walking through Liverpool One who is just there to get a birthday present for their four year old daughter and they bump into a work of art, and maybe just stop for twenty seconds and look at something and then see something further down the road, and they think about 'I just saw?' and then their world is changing. What is or how is there a recognisably universal truth that connects those vast gulfs of between them? Someone who is highly educated in art and someone who has absolutely no interest in art. That the kind of spectrum that we deal with and the only thing I could think of was something about - ambition of lifting that those people who direct themselves to the Biennial want to be or are (if we do our jobs right) are lifted above someplace that they are now. So, for an art critic, what they want out of coming to a Biennial is to be able to make a cognisant commentary that other people in the art world find interesting. So, they need to see artists that surprise them, or they can talk about.....

### **The intellectual value of art?**

Yes, there is a highly intellectual value of art, or the person who just walks up the road who has no interest in visual art whatsoever, and thinks it's all rubbish but, they see a piece at random while they are out shopping for their four year old daughter and that artwork lifts them out of where they were. Those two things to me are equally valid. They are very different things and if you sat down and designed something you could never design something that would meet those two criteria.

**Exactly, you could give the amount of information for both groups that could meet both types of needs as it is hard to meet both of their level of engagement and the information that either would want or need.**

So, the idea about audiences and how audiences interact with the work.... so sometimes the audience acknowledges and sometimes the audience or member of the audience really profit and are really interested in having a higher level of knowledge and that's why we constantly keep doing a series of talks. Why we try and write articles and arrange publications or debates online. These people need that to lift them to that next level as it were. Other people.... what fits and what suits their life are quite different. We just need to make sure that they come into contact with the work because we can feel very confident that most of the work, we do will cause a reaction - it will cause some thought in people's minds. So, for me, the audience question is - how do we inform them? We try very hard to give them what they need to reach that universally recognised truth which is.... if you experience a Biennial and you have something else that you want, we try to give you a little sense of.... a fulfilment of that ambition.

**There was a psychology field by Csikszentmihalyi that talks about people's experiences where you have to challenge a person to a certain level which then creates a peak experience. Where you are completely focused, you have to be challenged just enough to encourage the effort in a reachable level to experience the rewards. If it is too easy then it doesn't challenge and is boring, it doesn't keep your attention. Too hard and the person gives up as it is not achievable and a deterrent. A peak experience is a feeling that you get from actually understanding a concept or experience that stretches your knowledge and skills. That is what art does and can change a person from a casual consumer of art into a voracious, frequent attendee. As their knowledge increases for constant engagement in art, they look for more challenging art and experiences. I think that as long as the consumer makes a connection and are encouraged to think about what they experience then the art has worked. Any connection, either good or bad, as long as some intellectual value has been achieved through critical thinking and aesthetic judgement, the art has worked.**

For me, the question is.... that the idea of peak experience.... I wouldn't immediately gravitate to. I understand exactly what is being said and I think that is a brilliant ambition, but the question is.... what is a peak experience? In some of our evaluations, particularly in the public realm works. We ask 'is this the most memorable thing you have seen? That hour, that day, that week, that month, that year or ever, of course any one of those.... if someone answers yes to any one of those, then we have done our job. Obviously, what we really want is for people to see something that has long term, lasting memorability and impact. But actually, it's just enough sometimes to give something that stays with them for a period of time. So those kind of questions about what do we do about, or how do we interact with them? Sometimes it's quite important that we interact with them with a degree of richness and intellectual rigour and sometimes it's not important. What is important is to just let people approach and take what they want.... or how they react. There were some questions about how or is it important for artists to talk to other artists

and develop ideas with people in Liverpool to create a stronger artist community, how this can be achieved. By the Biennial being in a strong position to develop....

The question is can you see.... in the future? I can argue, can we see it in a project from the past (laugh). So, I can absolutely see it in our future but if you look back, I told you the story about the start of the Liverpool Biennial. The idea, you might have noticed was to use the words like meeting place, and the sum is greater than its parts. From the very first inclination, the idea was that if you created, not just an exhibition but kind of event or events around that and meeting spaces you would draw in and exchange ideas that make things happen, and it's been there ever since. We are not unique in that, lots of organisations do the same function and intend to. But it's been a pretty core part of it, and we do it in our own way. Some things like the story is told a lot about....

Because we worked with the miners in St Helens Dream project and residence. The story is told quite often on how they said no to the first proposal and the thing that is not always told with that story is the fact that we spent so much time trying to allow them to have artistic experiences that we went on curatorial visits to Europe. Visits to art galleries and exhibitions with them. Not in a patrician sense but actually there is a group of you that are going to help make a decision about what stays here for a long time. How much do you need to feel that you made a valid decision about that? That became a part of it. Or when we did work in the run up to 2008, we did years of work with Kirkdale and Kensington, I can't remember the organisation to the south of the city by the airport which has gone. So, we worked North East, and South of the city and it was on the basis that the organisations and partners that we worked with would actually come in and commission the art. Our only role was to help give them input and to keep the momentum with that and find resources to do it. But the pavilion in Kirkdale was commissioned by them that was their commission and that has always been the way that we have worked. Part of the reason for that is that bit where the questions are.... how does that improve the ability of Liverpool to make art and to do art? How does that improve the networks, so all those things have to be built into the doing rather than the saying, we never sit around thinking how we build a network. We say what can we do and what effect will it have on the network?

Those reports remember, don't take them as being about the economic impact, because they aren't actually. That is one of the outcomes of them. What they are, is a report about our audiences and it helps us to see how they have changed or how they haven't changed. So, for instance, if you compare the kind of growth from 2004 which is when we had the first serious research done, we had some in 2002 but we had the first serious one in 2004 looking through to 2008, 2012. In every one of those years there was a significant.... or there was one of the Biennials.... there is a significant increase in the percentage of our audience. So, while the audience is going up, the percentage of the audience that said that they had little or no knowledge about the arts went up, and so that's why we so that report because we are thinking about what changes do, we want and that gives us a view of that. So, if you look at 2014, it was always thought of and designed as an intellectual Biennial and that's what it was. If you make an intellectual Biennial, you know that elements of the audience will change. It will get better or worse, but they will change, and that report reflected that. That the audience did change and its composition and its attitude to its

general knowledge and so forth. So that report is really part of us trying to figure out what the art means to those audiences.

**You can see at a certain point that there is a lot more students attending the Liverpool Biennial which I think correlates to you doing more work with the university**

Actually, I wouldn't say that there are more students coming. The audience has always been a quarter young people (under 25). It's been fairly constant in that, occasionally we get variations of the upper age spectrum. In the run up to, just after 2008, but in the run up to the Find Your Talent project that was kind of clustered through LARC, that was the initial-LARC never does projects itself, but it starts them and then whatever organisation is right for the project, it's much more of an initiator or catalyst than an administrator. Anyway, Find Your Talent was the project and one of the forms of research to have on all that was to look around at all the arts organisations and see how young people perceive them and I was most gratified (and a little bit surprised I have to say) that young people rated the Biennial as the arts organisation that they found most connected to and that was nearest to their kind of attitude and things. It made sense after I saw it, I would have just thought that FACT or something like that would be higher up the list. It made sense I think the Biennial is kind of quite open aspect to it and I think the way that it works in exhibitions, that you put them in the public realm, and you put them in public places, than putting them in a gallery-resonates with them more with younger people. So, I would say our audience with young people continues it isn't directly connected to universities, although if you look at group visits. The group visits are definitely connected to secondary or university level of education. With young people I mean, so there is definitely a huge market there and that relationship is important to that.

**I noticed within the reports that there is a really high proportion of first-time visitors but then it just seems to drop from people who came for a second Festival or third Biennial Festival. It started me to ask why that is. Why is it always high (with the highest proportion by far) with first time visitors? It's great to say that you are introducing people for the first time that you are developing new audiences but also it shows that you cannot retain that audience to return for successive years.**

I mean there is a number of factors at work in there. One of them is simply that the audience kept expanding and rapidly expanding in those years between.... well actually 1999 and the run up to 2012. So you had to have a larger percentage of new people, the second thing is that because we get very good percentages and ever increasing percentages of people that travel internationally so it was say 3% to begin with (a rough estimate) its 12% now so internationally the percentage of people who come from outside of the region- so their natural first time visitors and just in terms of sheer volume where we might have 2,500 3,000 people turn up in opening weeks who are professionals - those 3,000 people are the ones who most likely will come back either to more Biennials or to come back during the Biennial. Those are vocational I mean but also make up a small percentage of the overall population.... so, the effect of repeat visitors doesn't show up as much either....

To me in a sense, it doesn't necessarily matter as long as the programme is seen as appealing to the right members of the audience, in the right ways. So international visitors

are fantastic that they see something new here every time. For people in the arts industry, their goal is a little bit different, but we make sure they come back every Biennial. So, there are statistical anomalies there in that there are very few people. I haven't even seen all the Biennials, in fact I have never even seen all of any one Biennial (laugh), and because there is always so much there you know. And if you include the Independents and things like that, then it is just so hard to spend so much time to see it all.... and then there are always two projects, St Andrews Gardens in the last time that was such a fabulous thing that I could have spent days there and still not got through it all. So that's about the audiences, there are some statistical reasons why that looks like a bigger thing, it just will automatically grow with audience percentages of those that will return. The interesting thing is, certain things have changed over the course of the Biennial, so our high point was people spending about three days in Liverpool. It's down to around 1.8 days in the last Biennial. That seems to have to do with....

As we have tracked it with the economic decline - I am talking about days in numbers of consolidated visits, it has gotten shorter. Over the last three Biennials, because there is less money around and people spend less, but different Biennials have different patterns of how one person will come back and visit different elements of the Biennial, that's changed as well. Sometimes of course, the definition of first-time visitors is perceived in people's minds differently. So, we did a little bit of looking at this as a couple of questions we were testing at one point. Some people do interpret that.... question is, or as it is, it is the first time to this Biennial so of course they are a first-time visitor, some people interpret it as.... we mean it which is it.... it was the first time you have been to any Liverpool Biennial; it just happens.

**There is an awful lot more too it isn't there. You look at the economic report and it sort of ticks all the boxes to get future funding.... it is the answers that funding bodies are looking for, like the first-time visitors, develops new audiences to culture and the economic impact that the event or festival produces to the local economy. So, you can say it is a tool to secure more funding.**

No, but again I am going to have to dispute you because that not what it is. It is a tool for understanding a lot more about the audience as we have to use a number of tools. So, for instance, our definition of quality art is directly linked, and you can see it in our aims and objectives.... its directly linked to what our international peers would think as quality art. However, that said, part of the reason we do that survey is to understand what exhibitions people are satisfied with and ones they are not satisfied with. And that's not because we are then going to go with the next Biennial and say 'oh people were unsatisfied with this exhibition, let's put this one on so that they are satisfied' it's much more than that, so that we understand kind of, was it worth it? We understand how people react to art if they are satisfied....

Was it because of the art or because they liked the building, we put it in. if they are unsatisfied then it's the same sort of question? So that survey is about us being able to look and say - ok what is happening across our business that is why it's got marketing questions in there. So, we can track how people are being communicated with, and that helps us to

understand what we need to so for instance, more that 20% of the largest single reason people come, is because of word of mouth. So, we asked in.... we started asking in 2008 that the average person told twenty-six other people about Liverpool Biennial. Now that's fantastic marketing power. The interesting thing is, so that meant that we tried to make sure we could equip people with reasons to tell more people about it. But one of the things we can see from doing that research regularly is that how people are telling others has changed. So of course, in those early days, really, the only way you could really do it is if you saw someone, you called them on the phone, maybe you emailed some people, but you were not going to email a lot of people....

These days you might just post it on social media, and I think you are telling an awful lot more people, but you are probably telling them in a way that has less impact for any one of them.... for those groups of people. I, looking you in the eye and saying let's go and see this exhibition will carry a different weight than something else. So that study is actually.... are a much more rounded study and we spend a lot of time with it than us just being able to report back to funders? The economic impact is a figure that we talk about a lot because it lets people know there is validity in continuing that investment and we have to, particularly in this day and age, we have to have to position it as an investment as it's just too hard to win all of the funding that you need to win of its just about art. In many ways we wouldn't want to.... Liverpool Biennial isn't just about an exhibition or a set of exhibitions, it's about a space in time, and in a....

If I can use the word corporate sense, it's about all the changes we want to make, and those changes are.... none of them are about economic impact. Our three aims are to make and present high quality art which is measured by international peers to broaden and deepen our audience, so we want more people to see it and we want them to have a deeper and richer experience when they do see it, and to improve the arts infrastructure. Now obviously the focal point in that is Liverpool but we want to make sure we change or are changing it in London or through our international work through the International Biennial Association. We lead within that organisation so that we can help change biennials and learn from them as well, all of which sounds like a line but that's how we behave.

**That's a really good answer, it explains a lot more from what you initially think the Biennial does. There is so much more work that you do as an organisation than what the public perceive. Are there any other reports or research that you are doing?**

Yes, there are some interesting ones. I think I sent it to you, the model that Anabel Jackson did. I quoted that thing about memorabilia, she did some public realm evaluation in 2010, I think. That was an interesting report, and we use that model for others. That was about kind of trying to understand what effect that had on people. We often work with partners, so I mentioned LARC and WolfBrown who did the Intrinsic Impact report, which actually was a lot harder for us than ticketed venues as you had to have audience surveys filled out at the time of the experience and when that research was going on, we didn't have most of our exhibitions on. So that was less effective for us, but effective in a way that we could see what was happening with Tate, or with Bluecoat and we could extrapolate some of that. That learning from that, so we work with other partners, we work with audience finder or

the Arts Council when they do various levels of research. So, there is lots of stuff out there, searching through it you know and extrapolating meaning from it....

It's harder because you know if you look at... a little while ago the Arts Council decided to look at the reports about the cultural sector and they stopped gathering them at 8,000 because there were so many of them. They knew that digesting them all, and what was in there was virtually impossible. There are a set of formal evaluation processes that we go through. So, as we go through the Biennial, we will do it.... sometimes very formally, sometimes less formally. So, we will try to be tracking and recording things that happen and how they react which is part of.... a lot of that is about process.... but then again also we will have a formal evaluation session a few weeks after we open. So, we would have done some kind of, I guess I would call them technical evaluations. The moment we open, we start to have a series of meetings where we will say 'what is working and what's not working; and sometimes that just about us saying actually.... when we are cleaning this building, it doesn't work, running out of loo roll in the toilets and sometimes it's well....

actually, that work can't be seen because of the lighting spectrum. So, there are initial things that happen quite quickly and then we will do sort of.... with.... we are very careful about it initially because everyone is so exhausted that the things can just feel a bit too raw, but you still need to try and access them so just within the first week or two, when we open, we will just try to go through a process where people just put what they are thinking and what happened down on paper or collect in small teams, and we will start to share that as we go through.... and then we do a kind of much more formal thing at the end point, just after we close...we do a very formal evaluation. The outcomes, the way they are, actually a lot of them are in note form. So, I can give you lists of things that we pay attention to. What I am trying to think about of course is what's interesting.... is where the learning goes from that as there are potentially.... we have lists what people said and what they didn't do, and then those get broken out into.... so, we will say to the programme team.... you really need to handle these things as a means of urgency, you need to think about these things next time. So, I am just trying to think about how you could see.... I mean you can certainly see the lists but how you would see what that meant....

**It would be interesting to see the inside workings.**

Well, it's funny because at every stage of the process, you literally see people saying 'no we kept running out of toilet paper at 3 o'clock on a Tuesday and that would be part of it, and you also get peoples very personal.... and we actually try to encourage that because we want to know what it was like for people - so someone might say actually 'I was disappointed that this didn't happen at this time' or someone said this 'when I was really busy, and it really hurt.' That comes out too sometimes and then sometimes really big questions like.... at the minute we are thinking about our evaluation process, and we are thinking of putting it out to tender and that because some of our partner venues are saying yes this works for us, but these bits don't. How can we do it differently so that's a fundamental question? Those are the things I am more interested in, as that is how you learn, and then there are things like....

I was talking about how we recognise that the last Biennial was very intellectual. So, audiences changed and that immediately asked the question which was ok are we happy with that change? We anticipated it; we knew that that exhibition in that way would produce some of those changes. A couple of them surprised us, more than we wanted to. But are we happy with that and do we need to change the next Biennial? So certain things that we picked up on, like... we always felt that we were getting fewer people than we wanted to from Manchester, and it was.... This was one of the things where we say that we work in partnership a lot. There is a.... we made this happen, actually made this happen, we made this happen, actually I made this happen....

We now have a set of maps of an hour drive time for the visual arts in Liverpool. So, it combines audiences, so we all had our own drive time, but nobody had a kind of visual arts map, drawing the data from the Bluecoat, FACT, Tate, Metal, and things like that and the smaller organisations didn't have any access to that at all because they were not collecting data. We actually have that same map that reflects our drive time from Manchester, one for Cumbria and Lancashire. So, we can see where audiences might or might not come from. But we.... between our own evaluation and informational stuff, we realised we didn't have enough information about what was driving people. We set out last time, to start to explore that with the stated goal of looking at the map and seeing there were certain areas where....

There should have been a high propensity of people to visit but the actual number of visitors was lower, so there is a swelfth in Cheshire for instance that kind of runs down from Warrington or north or Warrington, running to Chester and a swelfth at the edge of Wirral that should be seeing visual arts, but they don't see visual arts, but Manchester is one of those and the other thing.... so, we set up 'right we need more people from Manchester' our evaluation pointed that it was correct. A lot of that was marketing based, we needed to say different things in different places like Manchester. We learned that we.... we upped our audience to double from last time, another target audience was families for instance. But the show, didn't work so well for people attending with children and we realised of course that there were certain practicalities like we didn't talk enough about where you could change your babies and things like that. All of those things will appear differently next time, and it will affect the programme, not directly but the children's Biennial as it is being conceived now, should of course address that issue.... do people with families see that this is a thing they can and want to do with their young children and young adults. The evaluation was the starting point and those kind of layers of evaluation was the seeing that, and then asking ok, what could or should be changed to meet those goals and targets. That was a pretty convoluted answer. I hope you can make sense of it when you play it back. So, there isn't one document that will take you through all that because it was things like....

That audience report that you have seen saying 'ooh look this was our percentage of people in 2012 that attended with families, this was how many people in 2014 that attended with families. We can see it went down instead of going up like we wanted it too. So, what do we do in 2016 if that is still a valid goal which we decided is going to? So, the raft of things we did to evaluate, started with one report as there was an indication there then we went

out and had conversations with people, audiences and things like that, we went back to programme - what do you see or what do you want to see-coming back to the conversation it was quite intellectual. What were the practicalities of front of house? How good were we at telling people that the facilities existed to experience it with children? Where do you park a buggy? Where did we tell people where to park their buggies in the Old Blind School? Well, we didn't, and we should have. So, the evaluation we are talking about had just so many different layers and they weave together here and there and other places.

**That's a good thing as you are always trying to make it better. Improve, and always trying to learn from your mistakes and make it better for future festivals.**

And kind of make those mistakes visibly as well, of course the issue about the buggies.... by talking about it, we build a desire to try and make it better next time.

**And the audiences who couldn't use it last time, let them know so they will come next time and try and get those people back in. You are building a trust. If something is wrong or overlooked, you make changes and make it better for audiences to experience the festivals as they should be for all. An audience should make it accessible to all to try and bring in audiences that have not attended previously or found it difficult. Some of these things should be common sense especially with a history or many festivals. There should be people who are used to producing these festivals who, in the planning stage should think about amenities or access for the general public. These are the things that people like McMasters say are crucial on an organisational level to produce cultural excellence. The difference and issue with events like the Liverpool Biennial are that they are situated within different buildings each time, buildings that have not been used for a long period and are in disrepair. Each time, they have to start from scratch, but there should be a check list of things that are needed for the audience as these do not change from Festival to Festival. If there were these amenities, then people would attend more and spend more time at the venue. It is good that the Biennial learns from each Festival, but it is too late once it has opened. Great art is important, but so is the organisational aspects as it makes it more accessible to a greater proportion of the public and makes their stay more comfortable and enjoyable, which increases the overall experience.**

**Appendix Two:  
Liverpool Cultural Timeline**

<p><b>1988</b></p>	<p>Tate Liverpool opens in the Albert Dock - the Gallery was opened on 24 May 1988 by the Prince of Wales. Alan Bowness was particularly keen for the Prince to be involved because of his interest not only in art and architecture, but also in the rejuvenation of inner-city areas. True to Bowness's aim of using the 'Tate in the North' as a venue for major exhibitions of important modern art, amongst the opening exhibitions was a Surrealism exhibition and also a display of the Rothko murals -important exhibits with a popular appeal that were to draw thousands of visitors to the Gallery. The first exhibition was <i>Starlit Waters: British Sculpture, an International Art 1968-1988</i>.</p> <p>Merseyside Moviola was founded to commission and present work in galleries and other exhibition spaces by international artists working in film, video and new media.</p> <p>Art transport company MOMART begins supporting an artist-in-residence programme at Tate Liverpool.</p>	<p>Myerscough (1988) <i>The Economic Importance of the Arts on Merseyside</i>. Policy Studies Institute, London</p> <p>The document demonstrated, through the use of a multiplier, that direct spending on the arts led to spending in other sectors of the economy, which in turn enhanced wealth and job creation, and made cities appear more attractive to citizens and companies. The Report set the stage for a generation of impact studies, and other analyses commissioned by local authorities and other public funding agencies, which sought to document and argue the case for the role of the arts and creative industries as important agents for economic development and urban renewal and begin to measure this impact in quantitative terms.</p> <p>European City of Culture: West Berlin (West Germany)</p>
<p><b>1989</b></p>	<p>Bluecoat Arts Centre and ARK Records present <i>Pop Mechanica: Perestroika in the Avant-Garde</i>, bringing Soviet musicians and artists to Liverpool for a series of events.</p> <p>Merseyside Moviola organises the first <i>Video Positive</i> Biennial. Works were sited at Bluecoat Arts Centre, Williamson Art Gallery and Tate Gallery Liverpool.</p> <p>Liverpool Council established the Liverpool Film Office, the first organisation of its kind in the UK, which aimed to provide a one stop film liaison service free of charge from enquiry to final post-production for the film and TV industry, to support local film makers and promote Liverpool to national and international producers and directors.</p>	<p>Wilding report published, claiming further underfunding in the regions.</p> <p>The Arts Council of Great Britain's <i>An Urban Renaissance: The Role of the Arts in Urban Regeneration (1989)</i>, and the British and American Arts Association's <i>Arts and the Changing City: an agenda for urban regeneration (1989)</i>.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Paris (France)</p>

	John Moores 16. Prize-winner: Lisa Milroy 1st prize (Purchase prize) £14,000	
<b>1990</b>	<p>Lewis Biggs Becomes Director of Tate Liverpool. The programme he initiated in Liverpool introduced contemporary British and International art to new audiences nationally and especially in the North of England.</p> <p>New North at Tate Liverpool is an exhibition by artists from the North of the UK, curated with input from a team of advisors from galleries in this region. It included work by Jagit Chuhan, Locky Morris, Steven Campbell, Lesley Sanderson and John Hyatt.</p>	<p>The Ministers of Culture launched the 'European Cultural Month.' This event is similar to the European City of Culture but goes on for a shorter period and is addressed to Central and Eastern European countries in particular. The European Commission grants a subsidy for the European Cultural Month each year.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Glasgow (United Kingdom)</p>
<b>1991</b>	<p>Ken Martin establishes the View Gallery in Gostins Building, Hanover Street, presenting mainly Liverpool Based artists until it closed in 2002.</p> <p>New Art North West, a survey of art in the region, shown at Cornerhouse and Castlefield Gallery in Manchester and at the Bluecoat and other sites in Liverpool.</p> <p>John Moores 17. Prize-winner: Andrzej Jackowski 1<sup>st</sup> prize (Purchase prize) £20,000</p>	<p>O'Brien and Feist's (1995) <i>Employment in the arts and cultural industries: an analysis of the 1991 Census</i>, which identified a total number of 648,900 individuals employed within the cultural sector (2.4% of the total economically active population), rising to 664,400 if self-employed crafts-persons are included. The study also showed that the cultural sector was unevenly distributed across Britain, with the heaviest concentration in London, and that there had been a 34% increase in the number of individuals with cultural occupations between 1981 and 1991.</p> <p>Organisers of the different European Cities of Culture created the Network of European Cultural Capitals and Months (ECCM), enabling the exchange and dissemination of information, also to the organisers of future events. ECCM is a non-profit organisation based in Luxembourg and acting in close collaboration to the European Institutions.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Dublin (Ireland)</p>

<p><b>1992</b></p>	<p>Visionfest 92 October</p> <p>Directed by John Brady who put 300 artists and art everywhere, on streets, pubs, billboards, warehouses, galleries, ferries, schools. Visionfest aimed at opening up the processes and practices of art. Using Liverpool site to exploit the range and proximity of temporary spaces, coupled with foreign connections and liaison with the city's mainstream galleries and institutions. The festival demonstrated the critical mass that was possible to achieve for the visual arts in Liverpool and can be seen as the precursor to the creation of the Liverpool Biennial.</p> <p>Virginia Nimarkoh organised The Phone Box project, which involved interventions by artists including Tracey Emin, placing artworks in telephone boxes in the red-light districts of London and Liverpool.</p> <p>James Barton launched the Cream dance music night at Nation nightclub.</p> <p>Trophies of Empire exhibition at the Bluecoat, including work by Nina Edge, Sunil Gupta and Keith Piper.</p> <p>Liverpool Polytechnic becomes John Moores University (LJMU).</p> <p>Liverpool Community College formed, offering art courses. The college provides foundation courses when LJMU closes its course.</p> <p>Mites, the Moving Image Touring and Exhibition Service (a subsidiary organisation within FACT), was established in 1992 and provided specialist resources and support to artists and exhibitors.</p>	<p>Department of National Heritage formed.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Madrid (Spain)</p>
<p><b>1993</b></p>	<p>As one of the poorest areas in the EU (with only 71% of the average EU GDP) Liverpool receives Objective One status - a key boost in efforts at regeneration.</p>	<p>National Lottery Act passed.</p> <p>The first investigation which made explicit reference to the new policy agenda of the social impact of the arts</p>

	<p>Liverpool Housing Action Trust (LHAT) is formed. It took over responsibility for 67 of the city's 71 multi-storey blocks of flats, a total of 5337 dwellings. Of these 44 blocks were demolished and only a small number refurbished. Around 900 replacement dwellings were built – mainly low rise accommodation for the elderly.</p> <p>Tate Liverpool presents Anthony Gormley's first version of <i>Field for the British Isles</i> installation, made by local families from St. Helens.</p> <p>Gilbert and George's exhibition <i>Cosmological Pictures</i> at Tate Liverpool, its only UK showing.</p> <p>Inspired by New Orleans' Neighbourhood Gallery, Joe Farrag opens the Gallery, an open house for artists, poets and musicians in Sandon Street, Liverpool 8. The venue supports Liverpool black artists and brings in touring shows of African art, but unable to attract necessary funding for long term survival.</p> <p>John Moores 18 Prize-winner: Peter Doig 1<sup>st</sup> prize (Purchase prize) £20,000 FACT (Foundation for the Arts and Creative Technology) initiated the new media biennial Video Positive. They have been running successful artist collaborations and established creative partnerships between artists, individuals and groups throughout the City, the Northwest and Internationally.</p>	<p>was undertaken by Comedia and supported by the Arts Council. It resulted in a discussion document, <i>The Social Impact of the Arts</i> (1993). The document identified a consensus across the arts funding system for taking forward an arts impact research agenda, through a number of detailed case studies. Many of the case studies were funded by Regional Arts Boards, in addition to the Scottish Arts Council and a range of local partners.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Antwerp (Belgium)</p>
1994	<p>Visionfest included <i>Signification</i>, 74 flags designed by artists and architects, sited around the city.</p> <p>Mersey Maritime Museum opens permanent gallery, Transatlantic Slavery: Against Human Dignity at the Albert Dock. Its opening programme involved contemporary artists, including Paul Clarkson and Bill Ming, responding to Liverpool's slave legacy.</p>	<p>Arts Council of Great Britain replaced with National Arts Councils National Lottery.</p> <p>Bianchini (with Charles Landry of research agency Comedia) published a paper entitled <i>The Creative City</i>, which developed a methodology for examining 'urban vitality and viability' (Bianchini and Landry, 1994). This extended paper submerged cultural policy analysis within a broader urban</p>

	<p><i>Stuart Sutcliffe-An Exhibition of Works on Paper, Hamburg 1961-62</i> and launch of the Stuart Sutcliffe Scholarship (later Postgraduate Fellowship Award) at Liverpool Art School, Liverpool John Moores University.</p>	<p>strategy analysis and indicated one distinct direction cultural policy research was to develop. European Cultural Capitals and Months (ECCM) carried out a study on the impact of the European City of Culture since its creation.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Lisbon (Portugal)</p>
<b>1995</b>	<p>Visionfest 95</p> <p>Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts (LIPA) is founded.</p> <p>Liverpool Institute of Higher Education becomes Liverpool Hope (gaining university status in 2005), establishing an arts faculty at Everton and a regular exhibition programme on its Cornerstone Gallery.</p> <p>Tate Liverpool's <i>Making It</i> exhibition included artists working in Liverpool, Janet Hodgson, Sarah Raine and Padraig Timoney.</p> <p>The Bluecoat establishes a link with Senegal through an exhibition of Senegalese art for <i>Africa 95</i> and Liverpool artist Paul Clarkson's attendance at the Tenq workshop.</p> <p>Alan Dunn began the Liverpool Billboard Project.</p> <p>John Moores 19 Prize-winner: David Leapman 1<sup>st</sup> prize (Purchase prize) £20,000</p>	<p>European City of Culture: Luxembourg (Luxembourg)</p>
<b>1996</b>	<p>Hub Collective was formed in 1996 by Benjamin Lloyd, Danny May, John Merrill, and Tricky Lowe. They managed to generate work as sculptors, and interior designers. They managed to secure individual educational and art projects for themselves through a series of negotiations with local businesses, art organisations and educational institutions. As a group and</p>	<p>Landry et al, described 15 case studies of cities in Britain and Western Europe where cultural activity had been used as the motor for individual and community development. Cultural programmes in these cities were seen to bring a number of important benefits, including: enhancing social cohesion; improving local image; reducing offending behaviour;</p>

	<p>independently, they managed to secure funds through Arts Cultural Industries Development Fund, Princes Trust – Business Mentor Scheme, Riverside Housing Trust and ACME.</p> <p>They demonstrated how artists can work within the commercial sector by successfully managing projects as interior designers, landscape architects etc. they also found ways of working productively in the ‘education’ sector on many outreach projects</p>	<p>promoting interest in the local environment; developing self-confidence; building private and public sector partnerships; exploring identities; enhancing organisational capacity; supporting independence; and exploring visions of the future.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Copenhagen (Denmark).</p> <p>Lorente, P (ed) (1996) <i>The Role of Museums and the Regeneration of Liverpool</i>. Centre for Urban History, University of Leister, Leister</p>
<p><b>1997</b></p>	<p>Visionfest 97 theme was ‘Escaping Gravity’ and took place in Manchester as well as Liverpool, involving 200 artists and 12 venues.</p> <p>Moviola changed its name to FACT (Foundation for Art and Creative Technology).</p> <p>American artist David Bunn presented <i>Here, There and Everywhere</i> at the Central Library as part of <i>Book Work’s Library Relocations</i> commissions.</p> <p>A second series of <i>Mixing It</i>, was a season of live art performances that was commissioned by the Bluecoat Gallery included the premiere of Jeremy Deller’s <i>Acid Brass</i> (1997), which was performed by the Williams Fairey Brass Band at LIPA.</p> <p>John Moores 20 Prize-winner: Dan Hays (Purchase prize) £20,000.</p> <p>The University Network was conceived and launched. The main premise of the network was to share the educational resources on offer to MA students studying in the North West, Yorkshire and Humberside. The network was managed by the Tate education department and had seven universities working in collaboration.</p>	<p>Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) is created. Chris Smith becomes first Secretary of State for DCMS, a senior cabinet post. The British government threw its weight behind the notion of the cultural economy and for a time, many came to view ‘Cool Britannia’ as shorthand for the governments cultural policy. The government established a cross departmental Creative Industries Task Force in 1997, drawing upon key industry players and policymakers, to identify a range of strategies designed to maximise the creative advantage of the cultural industries.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Thessaloniki (Greece)</p>

<p><b>1998</b></p>	<p>Liverpool Arabic Arts Festival was founded by Liverpool Arabic Centre and the Bluecoat to provide Arabic arts and culture in Liverpool.</p> <p>Liverpool Biennial was established by artist and patron James Moores to improve the city's cultural opportunities and attract national and international attention.</p> <p>Michael Wilford completes the second phase of Tate Liverpool's development. The scheme creates new galleries, more space for education activities and improved visitor facilities. The building reopened with Artranspennine98, 23 May - 16 August. 40 new projects by more than 60 artists over 30 different locations across the Transpennine region. Curated by Lewis Biggs and Robert Hopper. One of the commissions was Taro Chiezo's Superlambanana which became an iconic piece of public sculpture in Liverpool.</p> <p>James Moores established the A Foundation to support the development and exhibition of contemporary art in Liverpool.</p> <p>Paul Sullivan established Static in Roscoe Lane, an arts organisation offering working and exhibition space to Liverpool-based artists and architects is established.</p> <p>Tom Wood's All Zones Off Peak, was a selection of photographs taken on buses on Merseyside over the previous two decades, exhibited at the Bluecoat and Open Eye Gallery.</p> <p>ISEA98- the ninth International Symposium on Electronic Art staged in Liverpool and Manchester including two symposia and 100 artists' projects, directed by Eddie Berg (FACT), Colin Fallows (LJMU) and John Hyatt (Manchester Metropolitan University).</p>	<p><i>Creative Industries: 1998 Mapping Document</i> (DCMS, 1998), which sought to provide a national overview of the economic contribution of the creative industries. The Report estimated that the creative industries generate £60 billion in revenues and an estimated £7.5 billion exports per year, account for over 1.4 million jobs, and have a growth rate of 5%, faster than any other sector in the economy. The authors suggested that if the sector grew by only 4% a year to 2007, it would generate £81 billion in revenues and account for 1.5 million jobs.</p> <p>European City of Culture: Stockholm (Sweden)</p>
--------------------	---	---

	<p>Liverpool failed in its bid to be UK City of Architecture (part of the Arts Council's Arts 2000 project), which was awarded instead to Glasgow. The process, however, is useful preparation for the city's later Capital of Culture bid.</p> <p>Over 30 exhibitions and events involving Liverpool artists staged in its twin city of Cologne under the title Eight Days A Week. Organised by writer and critic Jurgen Kisters with support from the Bluecoat and Artists in both cities, the project developed into an artists' exchange, starting with a reciprocal festival of Cologne art in Liverpool in 2000.</p>	
<p><b>1999</b></p>	<p>The First Inaugural Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art opens 24<sup>th</sup> Sept – 7<sup>th</sup> Nov.</p> <p>TRACE was a thematic exhibition bringing 61 international artists from 24 countries worldwide to realise their work in Liverpool. Liverpool's particular geographical location as a port, and its social, economic and political histories in relation to the rest of the world made it an ideal starting point from which to explore the theme of the trace in contemporary international art.</p> <p><i>TRACE</i> was conceived with the specific conditions and architectural opportunities of the city in mind. By occupying many venues across the city centre, they ensured that visitors could discover the rich character of Liverpool as they experience the art. The exhibition could be traced from the old Cathedral and The Oratory to the Tate Gallery on Albert Dock. Walking down the hill from the Cathedral one encountered installations in the University of Liverpool and John Moores University, the Open Eye Gallery, Bluecoat Arts Centre and the Exchange Flags. Along the way there were also many site-specific works in reclaimed locations, including St John's Shopping Centre and Lewis's Department Store.</p>	<p>Selwood (2001) <i>The UK cultural sector: profile and policy issues</i>. The research established that main job employment in the cultural sector in 1999, based on government employment and earnings data, had risen by nearly three times the rate of total employment since 1995, to represent approximately 2.4% of total employment in main jobs in 1999 (about 647,000 people in main jobs in a cultural industry, a cultural occupation or both). Further that in 1999, over a third of the UK's total employment in cultural industries and cultural occupations was in Greater London, with London and the South East accounting for over half of all employment in cultural industries and cultural occupations. The Report showed that over the period 1995 – 1999 cultural sector employment grew much faster than in the economy as a whole. An important regional dimension was added to the development of an evidence base around the economic contribution of the creative industries, with the establishment in early 1999, of the Regional Issues Working Group by the Creative Industries Task Force. The group aimed to examine issues for creative industries in the regions, their contribution to regional economic and social development and to identify</p>

	<p>Liverpool was the first city in the country to decide to bid to be European Capital of Culture in 2008. The City Council made its formal decision in the autumn of 1999 before the Government had laid down any rules or guidelines. The bid was conceived by the City Council and various members of the arts and academic sectors. Exploratory meetings were held, the idea was canvassed, general enthusiasm was expressed, Whitehall was contacted, and Liverpool's Bid was up and running.</p> <p>Adrian Henri retrospective at the Walker.</p> <p>View Two Gallery was set up in Mathew Street, building on the work of the View Gallery, focusing mainly on painting by local, national and international artists. Adrian Henri retrospective at the Walker Art Gallery.</p> <p><i>Black Diamond</i> arts magazine is established by Liverpool artist Duncan Hamilton.</p> <p>Alan Dunn and Godfrey Burke's Liverpool Billboard Project included works by Fiona Banner, Felix Gonzales Torres, Pierre Huyghe and Erwin Wurm.</p> <p>John Moores 21 Prize-winner: Michael Raedecker 1<sup>st</sup> prize £25,000.</p> <p>Static Gallery started as an architectural, model making and arts organisation. The organisation is founded on a commercial / public partnership and committed to merging various forms of practice bringing for example, art and architecture together.</p>	<p>ways to promote further growth. The group commissioned audits of the contribution of creative industries to regional economies and three regional workshops to establish common ground develop contacts and identify priorities for action. The audits identified regional employment in the creative industries ranging from 1.8% in the North West to around 5% in the South East and South West and 7% in London. The audits confirmed the creative industries sector as fast growing, diverse, with wide variations in growth between sub-sectors.</p> <p>The European City of Culture was renamed the European Capital of Culture, and it is now financed through the Culture 2000 programme. Cork City, in Ireland, was the first city in Europe to hold the prestigious Capital of Culture title. The European Parliament and Council Decision of May 25, 1999, integrated this event into the Community framework and introduced a new selection procedure for the Capitals for the 2005–2019 periods. This was done to avoid overly fierce competition to win the accolade; each EU member nation will be given the opportunity to 'host' the capital in turn.</p> <p>European Capital of Culture: Weimar (Germany).</p>
<b>2000</b>	<p>Lewis Biggs becomes the Artistic Director of Liverpool Biennial festival, and Chief Executive of Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Ltd.</p> <p>Liverpool ECoC bid preparations</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Reykjavik (Iceland), Bergen (Norway), Helsinki (Finland), Brussels (Belgium), Prague (Czech Republic), Krakow (Poland), Santiago de Compostela (Galicia, Spain), Avignon (France), Bologna (Italy)</p>

	<p>Seven feature films were produced back to back, including the 51<sup>st</sup> State, <i>For Up in the Air</i>, collaboration with Liverpool Housing Action Trust, Leo Fitzmaurice and Neville Gabie invited other artists to work in tower blocks in Sheil Park. This is followed by <i>Further Up in the Air</i> (2001 - 4).</p> <p>At Video Positive, Danish artists' collective Superflex worked with tenants from a Liverpool high rise. Their 'Superchannel' project is developed by FACT and Liverpool Housing Action Trust into a long running interactive Internet TV station, <i>TenantSpin</i>.</p> <p>Designer with Jann Haworth of the sleeve for the Beatles' Sgt Pepper record, Peter Blake exhibits <i>About Collage</i> at Tate Liverpool, reconnecting to Liverpool's pop music legacy.</p>	<p>TEAM (2000) <i>Liverpool Biennial 1999 Audience Evaluation Report</i>. Tourism Enterprise and Management, Liverpool.</p> <p>The audience evaluation was commissioned by the Biennial and funded by North West Arts Board and undertaken between September 1999 and March 2000. The main purpose of the research. Was to provide the Biennial with an attendee profile incorporating demographic information, motivations for attendance, responses to publicity and marketing of the Festival and their general perception of the various exhibitions and events.</p> <p>The 1999 Biennial aimed to attract 250,000 visitors. However, no means of measuring visitors was agreed to evaluate whether this and other objectives were achieved.</p> <p>Rees Leahy, H (2000) <i>The Inaugural Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art: Evaluation Report</i>. Liverpool Biennial, Liverpool.</p> <p>Rees Leahy gave forty-three recommendations for future Festivals. the report was intended to provide the Board with a tool for the development of the Biennial in the future, and also as a contribution to the wider debate that the Liverpool and its Biennial had stimulated.</p> <p>Rees Leahy estimated the audience figures for Trace to be 35,703 and 68,223 for exhibition sites.</p>
<b>2001</b>	<p>Cat McCafferty, Myriam Tahir, and Ben Parry initially set up a gallery space in Glasgow in 1998, moving to Liverpool in 2001. They opened Jumpshiprat in July of that year. They support emergent local talent with a strong emphasis on music, performance and the visual arts.</p> <p>The artists working as Jumpshiprat chose to move from Glasgow to</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Rotterdam (Netherlands), Porto (Portugal)</p> <p>Throsby, D (2001) <i>Economics and Culture</i>. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge</p> <p>Throsby, D (2001) <i>Economics and Culture</i>. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge</p>

	<p>Liverpool because they felt the city was burgeoning. They moved to the City to take advantage of the regeneration plans for the City and launched a space that attracted many young graduates.</p> <p>Jumpshiprat highlighted the work of recent graduates and students in various exhibitions and demonstrated a strong commitment to young artists working and living in the City and offer a space where young artists could ‘try’ out their ideas.</p> <p>Consultants Modus Operandi appointed to develop a public arts strategy, ‘<i>Green by Day-Light by Night,</i>’ for Liverpool Housing Action Trust. Several major works were realised over the next four years, including Vong Phaophanit’s <i>Outhouse</i>   Woolton.</p> <p>Major solo exhibition by US artist Paul McCarthy at Tate Liverpool.</p>	
<b>2002</b>	<p>Liverpool Biennial International 2002 (14 September - 24 November 2002)</p> <p><i>International 2002</i> explored the city as a cultural context, proposing a model for connection between art of internationally recognised quality and a particular place and context. Around 80% of the artworks were commissioned or completed especially for the exhibition. The curators invited the viewer – as they have the artists – into a dialogue with Liverpool.</p> <p>Arising out of the curators’ view of the city’s culture of struggle, <i>International 2002</i> suggested approaches to the contemporary urban environment through humour and celebration in the face of difficulty. The curatorial debate informing the selection of works focused on the human desire for control – and its frustration. The realities of natural and artificial environments, of political and social institutions, of misinformation, mischief and fantasy all frustrate the impulse to control. Control</p>	<p>The Arts Council of England and ten regional arts boards merge. The expectation was that this would increase resources and provide a stronger role for local government in the deployment of available resources. The Regional Arts Boards across the country head up the allocation of up to £100million of new Treasury Investment over the next three years.</p> <p>Comedia’s report <i>Releasing the Cultural Potential of our Core Cities</i>, which followed a European wide initiative for regenerating the major cities.</p> <p>European Capital of Culture: Bruges (Belgium), Salamanca (Spain).</p> <p>From 2002-2005, Beatriz Garcia led a research project investigating the long-term legacy of Glasgow 1990, based at the Centre for Cultural Policy Research, University of Glasgow.</p>

<p>and passion are intimately connected: creativity itself is a play between the artist's desire and the irreducibility of material and form, content and interpretation.</p> <p>Housing Market Renewal (HMR) programme was launched, also known as Merseyside 'New Heartlands' HMR programme. This long term programme of refurbishment, re-development and improved management is intended to help local communities to live in decent, desirable homes in attractive, healthier places.</p> <p>Modus Operandi completed a Public Art Strategy for Liverpool City Council that focused on the city centre, and how art can be used in regeneration. This followed up an earlier strategy a decade before for art in public, commissioned from Public Arts Wakefield, a document that remained on the shelf.</p> <p>Fluxus pioneer Ben Patterson visited Liverpool, as a Visiting Fellow at Liverpool School Community College and the Bluecoat.</p> <p>John Moores 22 Prize-winner: Peter Davies 1<sup>st</sup> prize £25,000. Static was awarded redevelopment funding from the North West Arts Board and an SRB6 grant (a local government initiative to assist redevelopment and regeneration) from the local council. The arts organisation is further subsidised by the architectural and model-making business. Major redevelopment on the Static premises was completed in Autumn.</p>	<p>Morris Hargreaves McIntyre (2002) <i>Biennial 2002: Final Report</i>. Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, Manchester.</p> <p>MHM (2002) explain that the potential local market within Merseyside based on the number of people saying they would 'definitely, probably or possibly attend' the Festival was estimated to be around 237,000, and the core or primary market was made up of approximately 104,000 people.</p> <p>The Vocational market in Merseyside represented 5.3% of the total potential market of 237,000 (13,000 people). Based on visits made during the 1999 Biennial and the range of sites participating in the 2002 event, MHM estimated that the Biennial could achieve 246,000 visits (95,000 from Merseyside, 104,000 from the North West).</p> <p>Reitmaier, H (2002) <i>Graduate Retention Liverpool</i> was devised by the Liverpool Biennial in conjunction with the universities so that they could understand and present details of reasons why the city's graduates were leaving Liverpool to seek their opportunities elsewhere. The study looked at the various aspects of Liverpool's cultural map and assessed whether there is ample synergy within the cultural scene. The ambition was to support and retention of young graduates working in the arts. The document suggested recommendations to help increase the cultural environment so that graduates would stay in the city. This would transform the reputation for arts graduates of Liverpool as a city of opportunity and experimentation, strengthening the existing arts organisations and assisting in their growth, whilst offering greater opportunities to the commercial sector and ultimately diversify the arts community and making it more visible and accessible.</p>
---	--

		<p>From March 2002 to April 2002, over 50 individuals, organisations, groups, agencies and members of the local authorities who had direct influence and contact with arts graduates were interviewed to ensure the widest possible range of views were heard to ensure a broad picture of the arts and cultural scene, in relations to Fine Arts graduates.</p> <p>The 2002 Cultural Strategy Document was a report by the Liverpool City Council describes Liverpool's strong international arts programme. This was the basis of the City's reputation in developing leisure and culture. In terms of employment and investments this is one of the City's key industrial sectors and accounts for over 15,000 jobs, attracting in excess of £200million worth of new investment.</p>
<p><b>2003</b></p>	<p>Having operated out of the Bluecoat since the mid-1980's as Merseyside Moviola, FACT (The Foundation for Art and Creative Technology) was opened in February 2003 by its founding executive director Eddie Berg, having cost £10 million to build. It was Liverpool's first purpose-built arts centre for more than 60 years.</p> <p>Year of Learning</p> <p>Liverpool was named as the European capital of culture for 2008, beating a joint bid from Newcastle and Gateshead.</p> <p>The other bids defeated by the Merseyside city were from Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff and Oxford.</p> <p>Liverpool's Waterfront is the single UK nomination for World Heritage Site Status.</p> <p>In March Tatler magazine describe the city 'Livercool.'</p>	<p>The new organisation is named Arts Council England.</p> <p>European Capital of Culture: Graz (Austria).</p> <p>Biennial (2003) <i>Internal Report for the 2002 Biennial Festival</i>. Liverpool Biennial, Liverpool</p> <p>Florida, R (2003) <i>The Rise of the Creative Class: And How its Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life</i>. Basic Books, New York</p>

<p><b>2004</b></p>	<p>Liverpool Biennial International 04 (18<sup>th</sup> September – 28<sup>th</sup> November 2004)</p> <p>The character and culture of Liverpool lie at the heart of the Biennial, which was delivered collaboratively with city venues and organisations. Energy and creativity met in the programme for 2004 consisting of four key strands. Uniquely among the world's biennials, Liverpool specifically commissioned 100% of the artworks shown in <i>International 04</i>. Leading artists from around the world were invited to explore the city as a context for the show, and then developed their works through dynamic relationships with the organisations and communities in which they were set.</p> <p>UNESCO inscribes the Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City as a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Symbolising the economic revitalisation of Liverpool, construction commences on the Paradise Project (Liverpool One), one of the largest city-centre renewal schemes ever undertaken in Europe. Fluxus artist Ben Patterson returns with Eric Andersen and Emmett Williams as Visiting Fellows, performing and recording Fluxus Classics at LIPA and LJMU during Liverpool Biennial.</p> <p>Jude Kelly opened Metal in a house in Kensington, a residency and project space for artists working in different art forms.</p> <p>A refurbished St George's Hall opens to the public.</p> <p>Centenary of the Liverpool Anglican Cathedral.</p> <p>Major gateway art features designed at entrances to the city A580, M62 junction and at Speke.</p> <p>Jorge Pardo's Penelope sculpture, initiated by Tate Liverpool for the</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Genoa (Italy), Lille (France).</p> <p>The European Commission asked Robert Palmer, director of Palmer-Rae Associates, to evaluate the programme of European Capitals of Culture 1994-2004, following an earlier evaluation study examining European Capitals of Culture 1985 - 1993. The latest study comprehensively deals with cultural, economic, visitor, social and European perspectives of the European Capital of Culture action. It comprises two volumes: one of summary findings, analyses and conclusions; a second of individual case studies. Based on Palmer's findings, the European Commission has made recommendations for changing the procedures for selecting and monitoring European Capitals of Culture and for placing increased emphasis on the cultural and European components of the action.</p> <p>Liverpool Biennial (2004) <i>Evaluation Report for the 2004 Biennial Festival</i>. Liverpool Biennial, Liverpool</p> <p>Holden, J (2004) <i>Capturing Cultural Value: How Culture has Become a Tool of Government Policy</i>. Demos, London</p> <p>McCarthy, K. F, E. H. Ondaatje, L. Zakaras, and A. Brooks (2004) <i>Gifts of the Muse: Reframing the Debate about the Benefits of the Arts</i>. The Wallace Foundation and RAND, Santa Monica</p>
--------------------	--	--

	<p>Biennial 2002 and commissioned by the Liverpool Rope Walks Partnership, was installed in Wolstenholme Square. John Moores 23 Prize-winner: Alexis Harding 1<sup>st</sup> prize £25,000 Year of Faith</p>	
<b>2005</b>	<p>Impacts 08 - a joint research initiative of the University of Liverpool and Liverpool John Moores University, which from 2005 - 2010 evaluated the social, cultural, economic, and environmental effects of Liverpool's hosting the European Capital of Culture title in 2008.</p> <p>Commissioned by Liverpool City Council, the research programme examined the progress and impact of this experience on the city and its people. They developed a model for evaluating the multiple impacts of culture-led regeneration programmes that can be applied to events across the UK and internationally.</p> <p>Anthony Gormley's <i>Another Place</i> is installed on Crosby Beach. Garston Cultural Village, a campaign to regenerate this Liverpool suburb through the arts was established by Alex Corina.</p> <p>Year of the Sea</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Cork (Ireland)</p> <p>TMP (March 2005) <i>Market Research Study Report: Liverpool Biennial 2004</i>. The Mersey Partnership, Liverpool.</p> <p>The 2004 Biennial attracted some 350,000 visitors. The total economic impact of the event on the local area was £10,928,330</p>
<b>2006</b>	<p>Liverpool Biennial <i>International 06</i> (16<sup>th</sup> September – 26<sup>th</sup> November 2006) was organised collaboratively by curators at Tate Liverpool, Bluecoat, FACT, Open Eye Gallery and Liverpool Biennial, advised by two consultant curators, Manray Hsu and Gerardo Mosquera. Gerardo focused on the idea of 'reverse colonialism,' a returning flow of ideas and energies into the city. Manray imagined the city as a body suffering both from long neglect and from the suddenness of its regeneration, and he sees art as a form of acupuncture, or 'archipuncture,' with the potential to heal or at least be a palliative. He</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Patras (Greece).</p> <p>Griffiths, R (2006) <i>City / Culture Discourses: Evidence from the Competition to Select the European Capital of Culture 2008</i>. European Planning Studies 14(4), pp.415-430</p> <p>Keaney, E (2006) <i>Public Value and the Arts: Literature Review</i>. Arts Council England, London</p> <p>Holden, J (2006) <i>Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy: Why Culture Needs a Democratic Mandate</i>. Demos, London</p>

	<p>also recognised the way that cities across the world – including this one – are linked visually by a form of ‘hypertextuality.’ The Independents programme included <i>Sinking Towards Wishy Mountain</i>, an exchange exhibition with 2008 non-EU Capital of Culture, Stavanger in Norway, organised by new Liverpool artist’s studio group The Royal Standard.</p> <p>A foundation launches its Greenland Street arts venue in three former industrial Buildings, participating in the Liverpool Biennial with <i>New Contemporaries</i> and exhibitions by Goshka Macuga and others. Liverpool John Moores University decided to sell off buildings including the historic, purpose-built art school on Hope Street to finance a new Art and Design Academy, designed by Rick Mather, to be built next to the Metropolitan Cathedral.</p> <p><i>Walk On</i>, an exhibition by Liverpool artists, curated by Bryan Biggs, was organised by the Liverpool Biennial for the Shanghai Biennale running simultaneously in Liverpool’s Chinese twin city.</p> <p>John Moores 24 Prize-winner: Martin Greenland 1<sup>st</sup> prize £25,000 Year of Performance.</p>	<p>Keaney, E (2006) <i>From Access to Participation: Cultural Policy and Civil Renewal</i>. Ippr, London</p> <p>Bunting, C (2006) <i>Public Engagement: Arts Council England’s Strategic Challenges</i>. Arts Council England, London</p>
<b>2007</b>	<p>800th anniversary of the City of Liverpool’s founding.</p> <p>Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium (LARC) was established to foster a new approach to arts in the city. LARC works with the city government and agencies in new ways and to an unprecedented degree, sharing programming, resources, ambitions and staff and mobilising a wide range of other players. Its first job was to lead the programming of the European Capital of Culture 2008, ensuring world-class events in this pivotal year. LARC was awarded funding from the Arts Council</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Luxembourg (Luxembourg) — Sibiu (Romania).</p> <p>ENWRS (May 2007) <i>Evaluation Report: Liverpool Biennial International Festival of Contemporary Art 2006</i>. England’s Northwest Research Service. The Mersey Partnership, Liverpool.</p> <p>Liverpool Biennial 2006 attracted around 359,532 visits to Liverpool. Visitors to the Biennial spent an estimated £13,563,006 during their time in Liverpool, this was around 24%</p>

	<p>England through the Thrive programme to extend its thinking and practice on how collaborative work could benefit Liverpool and serve as a national model. LARC commissioned 49 new works in 2007 / 8</p> <p>COoL was initiated by Peter Ward, Director of Hope Street Limited, in 2007 to strengthen the small / medium scale arts sector in the lead up to, and following, Liverpool's successful European Capital of Culture celebrations in 2008. We formed to provide mutual support, share information and expertise, form collaborations and improve sustainability of the arts sector in Liverpool.</p> <p>COoL contributes at least £8million to the Liverpool economy each year and creates over 1,000 full time, part-time, freelance, and volunteer opportunities within the Liverpool City Region.</p> <p>Richard Wilson's <i>Turning the Place Over</i>, commissioned by the Liverpool Biennial for a site at Moorfields, was launched. <i>The Ghosts of Songs</i>, a retrospective of the Black Audio Film Collective, curated by FACT.</p> <p>The city council commissioned painting by the Singh Twins (Amrit and Rabindra Kaur Singh), celebrating Liverpool's 800<sup>th</sup> birthday, was displayed in St George's Hall. For 2008, Liverpool Culture Company commissioned another painting from the artists to mark the year's cultural programme. Year of Heritage</p>	<p>above the estimated spend at the 2004 Festival.</p> <p>Vickery, J (2007) <i>The Emergence of Culture-Led Regeneration: A Policy Concept and its Discontent</i>. Research Papers no.9. Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick</p> <p>Belfiore, E, O. Bennet (2007) <i>Determinants of Impact: Towards a Better Understanding of Encounters with the Arts</i>. Cultural Trends, Vol.16(3) pp.225-275</p> <p>The paper argues that current methods for assessing the impact of the arts are largely based on a fragmented and incomplete understanding of the cognitive, psychological and socio-cultural dynamics that govern the aesthetic experience.</p> <p>Bunting, C (2007) <i>Public Value and the Arts in England: Discussion and Conclusions of the Arts Debate</i>. Arts Council England, London</p>
<b>2008</b>	<p>European Capital of Culture Year The Liverpool ECoC attracted 9.7 million additional visits to Liverpool, constituting 35% of all visits to the city in 2008.</p> <p>– These visits generated an economic impact of £753.8million (additional direct visitor spend) across Liverpool,</p>	<p>McMaster, B (2008) <i>Supporting Excellence in the Arts: From Measurement to Judgement</i>. Department of Culture, Media, and the Sports, London</p> <p>European Capital of Culture: Liverpool (United Kingdom) — Stavanger (Norway).</p>

<p>Merseyside, and the wider North West region.</p> <p>– 2.6 million European and global visits were motivated by the Liverpool ECoC in 2008. 97% of these were first-time visits to the city.</p> <p>– The ECoC generated an additional 1.14 million staying visitor nights in Liverpool hotels, 1.29 million in the rest of Merseyside and 1.7 million in the rest of the North West.</p> <p>It is estimated that the additional visits driven by the Liverpool ECoC, including both event attendees and non-event attendees, generated £753.8million of direct visitor spend. With the application of the Cambridge Model multipliers, this creates £201.million in indirect spend, providing a total economic figure of £954.9m for the North West region as a whole, and gives an indicative figure of 14,912 for the number of jobs supported.</p> <p>In total, grants and in-house activity funded or part-funded by the Liverpool Culture Company created over 66,000 days of artist work in 2008 and 123,000 over the four year programme. This is equivalent to an average of 140 full-time artists' jobs for a period of four years. Of the artists and performers involved in work put on or directly commissioned by Liverpool Culture Company, around 70% were unpaid in 2007, and 50% were unpaid in 2008, reflecting the volume of involvement of young people and local amateur performers.</p> <p>Liverpool Biennial MADE UP</p> <p>Celebrating 10 years of commissioning ambitious and challenging new work by leading international artists, the fifth edition of Liverpool Biennial's International exhibition was an exploration of the power of the artistic imagination. It showed the work of 40</p>	<p>Bunting, C, T. Wing Chan, J. Goldthorpe, E. Keane, and A. Oskala (2008) <i>From Indifference to Enthusiasm: Patterns of Arts Attendance in England</i>. Arts Council England, London</p> <p>Holden, J (2008) <i>Democratic Culture: Opening up the Arts to Everyone</i>. Demos, London</p>
---	---

	<p>artists across 13 sites. There was also a huge and varied programme of exhibitions, from Le Corbusier, organised by the RIBA, to commercial gallery shows and 'studio' shows by emerging artists.</p> <p>The public realm projects continued to be a defining feature of Liverpool Biennial International exhibition, with over half of the 30 - 40 commissions situated in the public realm. MADE UP outside the gallery allowed fiction to rub up against the real, inviting artists to carve out space for the imagination in the everyday, whether in imaginary models made manifest as real examples, or playful re-workings of the real.</p> <p>MADE UP was about art's capacity to transport us, to suspend disbelief and generate alternative realities.</p> <p>The first Liverpool Art Prize won by Imogen Stidworthy, the Singh Twins being the 'People's Choice.'</p> <p>The Bluecoat reopens after a three-year closure, with an enlarged gallery housed in a new wing designed by Rotterdam architects Biq. Yoko Ono returned as part of the opening programme, forty years after her first performance at the venue.</p> <p>129 new works were commissioned by LARC in 2008 / 9 and had a total of 1,081 permanent staff (a rise of 9% from 2007 / 8) and in addition provided employment for at least 1,383 contractors, an increase of over 90% on 2006 / 7.</p> <p>Ben Johnson's <i>Liverpool Cityscape</i> painting, part of his World Panorama Series, installed at the Walker. Together with Art in The Age of Steam exhibition. Ceri Hand opens commercial gallery at Cotton Street near Stanley Dock.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Gustav Klimt: <i>Painting, Design and Modern Life in Vienna 1900</i> at Tate Liverpool breaks all attendance records. Over a hundred smaller versions of Taro Chiezo's Superlambana, each individually decorated, appeared at sites across the city.</p> <p>University of Liverpool's Victoria Art Gallery and Museum opens on Brownlow Hill, housing the University's collection and presenting a changing contemporary programme, opening with a Stuart Sutcliffe retrospective. Le Corbusier exhibition staged at the Metropolitan Cathedral, fifty years after the Walker staged an exhibition on the architect's work.</p> <p>A new grants process was introduced by Liverpool City Council in late 2008, for 2009 / 10 and 2010 / 11 financial years, which included significant infrastructural investment (through regular funding commitments and other programmes) in a number of arts and cultural organisations.</p> <p>La Machine brought the 15ft spider La Princesse, which travelled around the city between 3 - 7 September attracting 200,000 visitors. Costing £1.8 million it brought an economic impact of £2,007,588 to the Liverpool economy. John Moores 25. Prize-winner: Peter McDonald 1<sup>st</sup> prize £25,000.</p>	
<b>2009</b>	<p>Year of the Environment' New Biennial commission: May 31 Jaume Plensa's concrete sculpture Dream is unveiled at a former colliery site in Sutton, St. Helens.</p> <p>In January culture secretary Andy Burnham and Phil Redmond, a British City of Culture, with the winning city hosting a year-long art programme and having the opportunity to host events such as the Turner Prize, the Brit music awards, film awards such as the Baftas, architecture awards, and the BBC sports personality of the year. Cities would</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Linz (Austria) — Vilnius (Lithuania) Impacts 08 releases European Capital of Culture Research Programme documents, conducted by Dr Beatriz Garcia. Impacts 08 was a joint programme of the University of Liverpool and Liverpool John Moores University, commissioned by Liverpool City Council. The research sought the views of participants on their experiences of Liverpool's year as European Capital of Culture (ECoC) in 2008 and explored issues of</p>

	<p>compete every four years for the title as the government moves to give the arts a bigger stage in urban regeneration.</p> <p>Metal completed a major renovation of the previously empty, historic buildings at Edge Hill Station, the world oldest active passenger railway station. The building serves as a cultural and creative hub for artists, metal curates an exciting programme of international and UK artists in residence, hosts week-long, residential talent development labs for artists from mixed disciplines and runs a wide range of events, exhibitions and participatory projects that connects artists to audiences.</p>	<p>sustainability in the context of such an intervention.</p> <p>ENWRS (April 2009) <i>Liverpool Biennial of Art 2008</i>. England's Northwest Research Service. The Mersey Partnership, Liverpool.</p> <p>It was estimated that the 2008 Liverpool Biennial received 451,000 visitors who made 975,000 visits to Biennial exhibitions. The total spend by these visitors was an estimated £26.6m.</p> <p>Jackson, A (2009) <i>Art in the Public and Digital Realms: Evaluation Toolkit for Liverpool Biennial and Arts Council England</i>. Annabel Jackson Associates, Bath</p> <p>Kucma, A (2009) <i>The Many Ways of Leaving Venice: Investigating the Process of Biennialization and its Effects on Examples of Large-Scale International Contemporary Arts Exhibitions</i>. MA Dissertation. Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield</p>
<b>2010</b>	<p>Liverpool Biennial <i>Touched</i> The sixth edition of Liverpool Biennial's International Exhibition was <i>Touched</i>, consisting of around 40 new projects by over 60 leading and emerging international artists. Principally around half were commissioned to make new work as well as several key works previously unseen in the UK, <i>Touched</i> was presented across multiple venues: Tate Liverpool, the Bluecoat, FACT (Foundation for Art and Creative Technology), Afoundation and Open Eye Gallery, with half the exhibition sited in public spaces across the city.</p> <p>John Moores 26. Prize-winner: Keith Coventry 1<sup>st</sup> prize £25,000 Year of Health, Well-Being and Innovation.'</p> <p>At a special televised ceremony in Liverpool (15 July) Culture Minister Ed</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Essen (Germany) — Pécs (Hungary) — Istanbul (Turkey).</p> <p>O'Brien, D (2010) <i>Measuring the Value of Culture: A Report to the Department for Culture, Media, and Sport</i>. DCMS, London</p> <p>Case (201a) <i>Understanding the Drivers, Impact and value of Engagement in Culture and Sport: An Overarching Summary of the Research</i>. Department for Culture, Media, and Sport (DCMS) in collaboration with the Arts Council England (ACE), English Heritage (EH), the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) and Sport England (SE).</p> <p>Case (2010b) <i>Understanding the Value of Engagement in Culture and Sport: Technical Report</i>. Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in</p>

	Vaizey announced that Derry / Londonderry is the first ever UK City of Culture	<p>collaboration with the Arts Council England (ACE), English Heritage (EH), the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) and Sport England (SE). Doyle, G (2010) Why Culture Attracts and Resists Economic Analysis. Journal of Cultural Economics 34(4)</p> <p>Van Hal, M (2010) <i>Rethinking the Biennial</i>. MA thesis. Royal College of Art, London</p>
<b>2011</b>	<p>Lewis Biggs resigns as Director / CEO of the Liverpool Biennial in May. In June he was awarded an OBE for services to the arts and became a Citizen of Honour of the City of Liverpool. He became a Trustee of FACT in November.</p> <p>Sally Tallant becomes the Artistic Director and CEO of the Liverpool Biennial in November</p>	<p>European Capital of Culture: Turku, Finland.</p> <p>ENWRS (March 2011) <i>Liverpool Biennial 2010: Visitor Profile and Economic Impact</i>. England's Northwest Research Service. The Mersey Partnership, Liverpool.</p> <p>ENWRS estimated that 628,000 individual trips were made to the 2010Biennial. These 628,000 visitors made 834,000 visits to Biennial exhibitions and spent a total of £27.2m.</p> <p>ERS (2011) <i>Evaluation of the Liverpool Thrive Programme: Final Report (April 2011)</i>. ERS for Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium, Newcastle</p> <p>LARC (2011) <i>Intrinsic Impact: How Audiences and Visitors are Transformed by Cultural Experiences in Liverpool</i>. Baker Richards and WolfBrown for Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium, Liverpool</p>
<b>2012</b>	Liverpool Biennial 2012 'The Unexpected Guest' presented work by 242 artists in 27 locations. The Festival took place in galleries, museums and sites across the city and included a dynamic programme of talks, events, screenings and family activities around the theme of 'hospitality.'	<p>European Capital of Culture: Guimaraes, Portugal</p> <p>Wilson, K, D. O'Brien (June 2012) <i>It's Not the Winning... Reconsidering the Cultural City</i>. A report on the Cultural Cities Research Network 2011 - 12. Institute of Culture Capital, Liverpool</p> <p>Wilson, K (May 2012) <i>Connecting Communities Via Culture-Led Regeneration: The Cultural Cities</i></p>

		<p><i>Research Network 2011 - 12. Connected Communities. AHRC</i></p> <p>Cox, T, D. O'Brien (2012) <i>The 'Scouse Wedding' and Other Myths: Reflections on the Evolution of a 'Liverpool Model' for Culture-Led Regeneration</i>. Cultural Trends 21(2), pp.93-101</p> <p>Drivers Jonas Deloitte (March 2012) <i>Liverpool City Centre Strategic Investment Framework: Baseline Report</i>. Deloitte LLP, London</p> <p>Belfiore, E (2012) <i>'Defensive Instrumentalism' and the Legacy of New Labour's Cultural Policies</i>. Cultural Trends Vol.21(2)</p>
<b>2013</b>	Paul Domela resigns as Program Director of Liverpool Biennial	<p>Garcia, B, T. Cox (November 2013) <i>European Capitals of Culture: Success Strategies and Long-Term Effects Study</i>. European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education, European Union</p> <p>ENWRS (2013) <i>Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art 2012: Visitor Profile and Event Evaluation</i>. England's Northwest Research Service, The Liverpool City Region Local Enterprise Partnership, Liverpool.</p> <p>Data suggested that 692,000 trips were made to the 2012 Biennial (214,000 trips by city residents, 412,000 'day trips' and 65,000 staying trips). Of these, it was estimated that 454,000 were actually influenced primarily by the Biennial (125,000 trips by city residents, 297,000 'day trips' and 31,000 staying trips).</p> <p>In terms of economic impact of the event – excluding spend by residents but including the indirect economic impact – the 2012 Biennial generated at least £20.7m. if expenditure by residents was included, the economic impact of the 2012 Biennial would be £24.4m.</p>

**Appendix Three:  
Liverpool Biennial Organisational Accounts and Statistics**

## Liverpool Biennial Staff

### 1999 - 2000

The strongest message from contributors to the evaluation (Rees Leahy 2000<sup>i</sup>) is that the 1999 Biennial team was extremely hard-working and committed to the project, as they could take much of the credit for the realisation of the inaugural Biennial. Given the lack of staff experience of organising an event on this scale, the achievement was all the greater - as were the pressures on, and among, the staff team.

These pressures were exacerbated by the complex challenges of building an effective team culture and efficient working practices within an organisation where the majority of staff were on short-term contracts and to which new staff were, at times, recruited on an ad hoc basis in response to the pressures of work. Such circumstances are rarely conducive to efficient and creative work, and they required extremely skilled management to enable people to flourish.

Undoubtedly, management difficulties were experienced both internally and externally. For example, internal and external communication clearly suffered as the pressure of work mounted. Rees Leahy explains that externally, contributors had noted a consistent failure to predict the range of problems and issues associated with a project on this scale, and to address them proactively. As a result, there was an external perception of a culture of crisis management, albeit (partly) ameliorated by the productive and friendly bi-lateral relationships that staff at all levels of the Biennial office developed with people with whom they worked (Rees Leahy 2000, p.17).

The absence of systematic and effective management of projects was attributed to the late recruitment of staff, leaving little or no time for planning prior to delivery. No doubt there is some validity in this argument, however the fact that the Education Manager did work to a clear programme with stated objectives, whereas it appears that the Marketing Manager did not, suggesting that individuals pursued their own personal style of work - with varying results.

Biennial staff who contributed to the evaluation, expressed the view that operating efficiency was sacrificed for the sake of economy in areas such as computer provisions, database training, and the absence of a franking machine in an office that frequently dispatched bulk mailshots. Similarly, office systems (including staff induction) were developed on the hoof.

Clearly, the pressures on the General Manager were intense. In the absence of a Chief Executive (and of the Board fulfilling a 'hands-on role'), she was the de facto director of a project that required exceptional skills and experience of managing staff and volunteers, finances, projects, public relations, marketing, fundraising, partnerships with external organisations and, of course, the Board itself. The question as to whether it is realistic to expect any one individual to deliver such a range of tasks is one that the Board is now considering in the context of staff restructuring (p.17).

In view of the critical role played by numerous volunteers in the preparation, administration and invigilation of the 1999 Biennial, the absence of the Volunteer Training Co-ordinator added to the workload of staff who tried to ensure that the experience of volunteers was not adversely affected. As a result, formal training for the volunteers show

that they appreciated the friendly and welcoming environment created by Biennial staff and the amount of responsibility that they were given in order to carry out their duties.

Clearly, youth, goodwill and energy were not a sufficient basis on which to develop the future Biennial Festivals. A disinterested review of functional requirements needed to be undertaken, considering the experience of 1999, and a new staff and volunteer plan needed to be designed, costed, and implemented for the realisation of the 2001 Biennial and beyond. In particular, a means of filling the functional gaps that existed in the organisation should be identified (e.g. fundraising, advocacy, marketing and PR).

Recruiting staff and freelancers at short notice, as happened in 1999, begged questions about the calibre of appointments made in such circumstances and, in turn, raises a wider issue about the skills available in the recruitment pool for short-term posts and freelance contracts in Liverpool. A recruitment strategy is required to compliment the staff and volunteer plan, so that opportunities to work for the Biennial are widely and attractively publicised (not just through print advertising). The objective should be to raise the calibre of candidates for freelance contracts and short-term posts based in Liverpool.

Issues of staff induction and development should be addressed strategically. For example, the Biennial could negotiate with stakeholders, such as North West Arts Board (NWAB), the universities and the City Council, to provide training and project management experience for personnel on secondment. A volunteer and policy for 2001 should be developed in conjunction with training and education partners in Liverpool and beyond.

The large issue arising from the above discussion was - what kind of organisation required to underpin the development of the Biennial into permanent, high-profile feature of the international arts calendar? The answer to the question did not lie in the polarised alternatives of a fully-staffed office operating on a continuous basis or a virtually dormant organisation that comes alive every other year. This is not an issue about staff numbers, but about effective management. The requirement is for a small, strong core management team (whose expertise matches the functional requirements of the project) responsible for the implementation of a strategy agreed with the Board, thereby replacing ad hoc initiatives with a deliverable and measurable work plan for the next Biennial and beyond (p.19).

The number of full time staff employed directly by the Company peaked at nine during the months immediately prior to the opening of the Biennial, with up to forty part time and casual staff and volunteers in addition. The true number of people involved through the partner organisations in the production of the Biennial was, of course, many times this number (as the true level of expenditure was similarly considerably larger than that directly attributable to the Company). The Board wishes to acknowledge the determination and dedication of the staff in achieving this inaugural and successful project for the Company under difficult circumstances, and, through the process of evaluation that accompanied and followed it, helping to map out the ambition of future projects to be undertaken by Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art.

Salaries and wages amounted to unrestricted funds of £75,526 of direct charitable expenditure, and £50,823 under management and administration expenditure.

**Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £118,320

Employer's National Insurance £9,029

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Direct charitable expenditure 7

Management and administration 6

Trustees 9

No employee received remuneration in excess of £40,000

**2000 - 2001**

There were only two members of staff in post at the start of the financial year, plus part time support from Alan McCracken, employed by Macfarlane + Co. the Education Officer resigned in July to join the new staff of Baltic, and the General Manager was awarded a severance package before she started a new job as Director of Sefton Park Palm House. Three new staff were recruited before the end of the financial year – an Administrative Co-ordinator, a Development Co-ordinator, and a Co-ordinator for the International Exhibition.

A programme of Board Development was initiated immediately the C.E. started, and two new members had joined by the end of the financial year. In particular it is to be welcomed that experienced and dedicated specialist members have been recruited and two have taken on the Chairmanship of the Communications and Education and Access Groups respectively.

Salaries and wages amounted to unrestricted funds of £15,764 (2000 £76,526) of direct charitable expenditure, and £49,871 (2000 £50,823) under management and administration expenditure.

**Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £60,237 (2000 £118,320)

Employer's National Insurance £5,399 (2000 £9,029)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Direct charitable expenditure 3

Management and administration 4

Trustees 9

No employee received remuneration in excess of £40,000

No trustee was paid any remuneration in the year, in accordance with the constitution.

Expenses of £538 were repaid to Bryan Biggs, a trustee of the charity, in respect of cost incurred in accordance with the charity's objectives. No other expenses were paid to any trustee.

**2001 - 2002**

The year started with five full time members in place: The Chief Executive, and Administrative Co-ordinator, a Development Co-ordinator, and a Co-ordinator for the International Exhibition; and part time accounting support. By the end of the financial year the staff of nine also included an Education and Access Co-ordinator, a Communications Co-

ordinator, a Deputy Chief Executive, and an Arts Council Fellow (this last paid for by the Arts Council of England for one-year August 2001 - July 2002).

### **Staff Structure 2002**

The structure agreed by the Board in the 2001 - 3 business plan consisted of seven posts: (in order of establishment / recruitment) part-time finance officer, Chief Executive, Administrative Co-ordinator, Development Co-ordinator, International Exhibition Co-ordinator, Marketing Co-ordinator, Education and Access Co-ordinator. The Biennial was fortunate to have an Arts Council Fellowship granted to Ngozi Ikoku, who was able to pursue her personal career development through working with the Biennial for twelve months paid by ACE, and subsequently acted as freelance Registrar for the International. The Board agreed in the autumn of 2001 to the appointment of a Deputy Chief Executive, in recognition of the workload and management requirement placed on the Chief Executive through his direct involvement with the International.

Considerable energy was expended from the spring of 2001 in supporting the City's bid to be nominated European Capital of Culture 2008. However, the closer links to the City generated in this way proved important in preparing the ground for support from the Mersey Partnership and the Northwest Development Agency (and eventually, in the subsequent year, from Liverpool City Council). The Advocacy programme designed by Daniel Harris Associates proved extremely valuable also in the spring of 2002 at a point when there was insufficient income secured to be able to commit resources to print-based marketing. The Education and Access Programme started in the autumn of 2001, and also helped to create a pool of goodwill within the region supporting and promoting the coming Biennial season.

The Trustees had agreed (spring 2000) to invite a 'home team' of curators to select the International exhibition, partly with a view to develop the City's arts infrastructure, partly to create greater ownership within the delivery organisations of the Biennial itself. The company ended the year with a strong programme planned in all areas of activity, with a stable and increasingly confident staff team, and with sufficient goodwill from stakeholders to ensure that the 2002 event would be excellent in every dimension.

Salaries and wages amounted to unrestricted funds of £87,009 (2001 £49,871) under management and administration expenditure.

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £146,906 (2001 £60,237)

Employer's National Insurance £13,919 (2001 £5,399)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Direct charitable expenditure 3

Management and administration 4

Trustees 10

One employee received remuneration which fell within the band of £50,000 to £60,000

The company operates a defined contribution pension scheme. The assets of the scheme are held separately from those of the company in an independently administered fund. The pension cost charge represents contributions payable by the company to the fund and amounted to £7,179 (2001 – nil). There were no amounts due to the scheme at 31 March 2002 (2001 – nil).

Contributions were paid into the scheme by the company in respect of one employee.

No trustee was paid any remuneration in the year, in accordance with the constitution. Expenses were repaid to the following trustee of the charity, in respect of travel and accommodation costs incurred in accordance with the charity's objectives:

Bryan Biggs - £328

No other expenses were paid to any trustee.

## **2002 - 2003**

During the review year, and due very largely to the success of the 2002 Biennial event, the Company had developed from a hands-to-mouth project-based team of staff on short-term contracts to an organisation that confidently awaited revenue funded status in relation to both the City Council and Arts Council.

Instead of starting from zero in terms of skills and experience for each biennium, Liverpool Biennial was in a position to maintain a staff with skills and experience from year-to-year and build its own capacity to manage the process involved in delivering large scale events.

The success of the 2002 event created confidence in the relations between the staff and the Board, with the Directors no longer seeking an executive or 'representational' role on behalf of other organisations but using their personal skills and experience to advise and monitor the staff in their delivery of an agreed business plan.

### **Company Development**

During the review year, and due very largely to the success of the 2002 Biennial event, the Company had developed from a hand-to-mouth project-based team of staff on short-term contracts to an organisation that confidently awaited revenue funded status in relation to both the City Council and Arts Council. Instead of starting from zero in terms of skills and experience for each biennium, it was now in a position to maintain a staff with skills and experience from year to year and build its own capacity to manage the processes involved in delivering large scale events.

The success of the 2002 event created confidence in the relations between the staff and the Board, with the Directors no longer seeking an executive or 'representational' role on behalf of other organisations but using their personal skills and experience to advise and monitor the staff in their delivery of an agreed business plan.

### **Staff Changes and Re-Organisation**

The year started with nine members of staff in place: The Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive, an Administrative Co-ordinator, a Development Co-ordinator, and a Co-ordinator for the International Exhibition; an Education and Access Co-ordinator, a Marketing / Co-ordinator, and a Finance Officer (0.8 post). There was also an Arts Council Fellow (this last paid for by the Arts Council of England for one year August 2001 - July 2002). The Fellow, Ngozi Ikoku, undertook further work as Registrar for the Biennial International show after

the end of her Fellowship. Numbers of voluntary and part time staff were taken on during the Festival itself.

All staff (except the Chief Executive) were on period contracts, and only two of these had their existing Contracts renewed as permanent. The year ended with only three staff in post (CEO, Deputy CEO, and Finance Officer).

A new staff structure was designed in January / February 2003 in anticipation of revenue funding and the potential for permanent contracts, and in order to be able to implement the new business plan. There were two significant changes to the organisational structure.

In recognition that the workload on the post of Marketing Manager is more cyclical than on other posts, the post was amalgamated with the post of Development Manager, and the new joint Marketing and Development Manager post was provided with two assistants (one on a period appointment).

Secondly, priority was given to a continuously operating Education and Access programme maintaining continuous links with communities and local audiences. With the international having a longer development period than all the other programme strands in the Festival, the value of linking this more closely with the Education and Access programme (renamed Inclusion and Life-Long Learning) was recognised by bringing both within a single programme team under the management of the Deputy Chief Executive.

Wages in total resources expended amounted to £125,167 in unrestricted funds. Salaries and wages amounted to unrestricted funds of £71,070 (2002 £87,009) under management and administration expenditure.

#### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £196,237 (2002 £146,906)

Other pension costs £6,654 (2002 £ 7,179)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 4

Managing and administering the charity 4

Trustees 11

#### **2003 - 2004**

The year started with five members of staff in place: The Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive, Learning and Inclusion Co-ordinator, Development Co-ordinator, and Finance Officer (0.8 posts). The Development Co-ordinator successfully applied for the new post of Marketing and Development Manager in April, an Administrative Manager was appointed and a Co-ordinator for the International Exhibition in June. The rationales for these changes were signalled in the previous report to Trustees.

#### **Staff Restructuring March 2003**

In the light of operational experience and in the optimism from becoming a revenue funded organisation changed the organisational structure in March 2003. It was amended to eight permanent 'core' posts: a management team consisting of Chief Executive, Deputy CE, Development and Marketing Manager, Development Assistant, Administration Manager,

Finance Officer (four day), Lifelong Learning and Inclusion Co-ordinator and International Exhibition Co-ordinator. One or two further posts were appointed on fixed term contracts, and the rest of the workload was managed through freelance, agency and voluntary work. The Deputy Chief Executive post was made permanent, as were all the above contracts – Marketing Assistant (appointed September, re-appointed Jan 04) and International Exhibition Assistant (appointed April 2004). Rajwant Sandhu joined the organisation December 2003 as an Arts Council funded Positive Action Trainee on a two-year placement.

### **Recruitment Staff / Termination of Contracts**

Recruitment of staff was undertaken with a commitment of equal opportunities, and the process of recruitment was supported in particular by the HR expertise of Mark Sykes (HR manager for Merseyside Ambulance Service). All staff apart from the Chief Executive were appointed on fixed term contracts to end in the spring of 2003, since this was the maximum, the Board felt able to commit to without the support of public revenue funding. For lack of this commitment at the time of writing, some staff had left the organisation at the end of their contracts, whilst others had agreed to take the risk that funds would come through and their contracts would eventually be renegotiated. The posts of Development Co-ordinator and Communications and Marketing Co-ordinator were amalgamated, and the incumbent contracts could not be renewed. An additional £6,000 was spent on travel, much of which was 'professional development' or training. The need for all types of training should be identified through the process of regular staff appraisal.

Changes were made in September 2003 to Liverpool Biennial recruitment procedures, to bring these further into line with best practice, and a Staff Handbook and Code of Practice was drawn up. This twenty-one-page advisory document notes guidelines for all staff in employment legislation, recruitment procedures, disciplinary and grievance procedures, welfare rights etc. the staff Induction Handbook has also been updated and extended. This gives some historical background to the Biennial guidelines for day to day office management, copies of our policies for Equal Opportunities and Health and Safety, and Board and staff biographies.

### **Staff Appraisal / Performance Reviews**

Although a formal system for staff appraisal was practised in the early period of the biennium, and this process fell into disarray with the increasing pressure of the approaching Festival. The appointment of the Deputy Chief Executive helped to put it back on track, and he was able to provide considerable hands-on support to the co-ordinators even if no formal records of staff appraisal were being kept.

A formal six monthly appraisal system was reintroduced in September 2003. Line managers, with the individual staff members, review targets, monitor performance and set action plans. The performance reviews also highlight areas in need of training and development. By the end of September 2003, three full time staff were qualified First Aiders: Lorna Woods Moses, Sarah Jane Dooley and Sharon Paulger.

### **ACE Fellowship**

The ACE Fellowship scheme was designed to give experienced arts managers further development through placement in an organisation (supported by a bursary and contract with the training agency ShowHom) and, at the same time, testing / training the host organisation further in its commitment to equal opportunities. The Biennial was fortunate in attracting Ngozi Ikoju, who had been a curator of textiles at the Victoria and Albert Museum for seven years and acting Keeper of the Lady Lever Art Gallery. She undertook the production of the Contemporary Map and became involved in each of the areas of the Biennial's work. Her input in the area of equal opportunities and disability / access policies and training, and in devising service agreements with partners was invaluable, as was her role in developing Pleasant Street Board School as a venue. At the end of her year, she was employed freelance by the Biennial as registrar for the International – she then became the Positive Action Officer for the North West Arts Board.

Wages in total resources expended amounted to £136,082(2003 £125,167) in unrestricted funds, and £8,000 in restricted funds, totalling at £144,082 (2003 £135,216). Salaries and wages amounted to unrestricted funds of £83,378 (2003 £71,070) under management and administration expenditure.

### **Volunteer Programme**

The volunteer programme was developed in consultation with all co-ordinators and HMFCP to ascertain numbers required in the run-up and opening period. It was intended that volunteers would fall into one of three areas: production, communication and administration. In the event, depending on the joining date, all volunteers became production volunteers (supporting setup) and then became communications volunteers (invigilating and communicating with the public). Volunteers were recruited through colleges and universities and advertisement on the Regional Arts Board Art jobs website. In all, ninety volunteers participated in the programme. The appointment, five weeks after the opening, of a full time Assistant Volunteer Co-ordinator was very successful and should have been done earlier. Communication with volunteers was by phone until a noticeboard displaying rotas was organised by the Assistant.

The budget for the volunteer programme was set with insufficient cognisance of needs. As a motivational exercise in the last four weeks of the Festival – the £10 per day rate of expenses was raised to £20 per day. Whilst this motivated some volunteers, it provoked indignation in others.

On recruitment, volunteers were informed that there were to be training sessions before the opening. A briefing was given by Lewis Biggs at Tate Liverpool for information Assistants and volunteers. Another training session was held for volunteers, this time focussing on customer care issues. Some staff and collaborators did not take the volunteers seriously enough; volunteers are the people who deal with the public, without whom the Biennial could not open their venues.

Peter Dover, Liverpool Hope University College, responded in April 2002 to an earlier approach from the Biennial, and expressed interest in having some of his Fine Art students participated in a work-based learning placement with the Biennial. two students completed long-term placements, and others from this course proved to be some of the best volunteers. Three people from Liverpool John Moores University completed placements

with the Biennial in order to fulfil the requirements of modules. Several other students from LJMU's Fine Art course volunteered with the Biennial. through Geoff Molyneux at Liverpool Community College, twenty-two students from the HND and HNC Fine Art courses completed placements with the Biennial. three volunteers took the Biennial and the wider topic of art and regeneration as subject matter for dissertations; one person worked towards a BA, while the other two worked towards their MA.

### **Internships**

Four internships were set up in the International show, in Administration, in Communications in Press. A fourth internship was formed for Production once it became apparent that the contribution of one particular volunteer went far beyond the expectation of volunteers. The most environment before and was thus familiar with systems. She was able to take on projects, relieving the workload of the International Co-ordinator.

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £227,459 (2003 £196,237)

Other pension costs £8,424 (2003 £6,654)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 5

Managing and administering the charity 3

Trustees 22

The number of employees whose annual emoluments were £50,000 or more were 1

### **2004 - 2005**

Wages in total resources expended amounted to £203,978 in unrestricted funds, and £12,500 in restricted funds, totalling at £216,478 (2004 £144,082). Salaries and wages amounted to unrestricted funds of £93,147 (2004 £83,378) under direct charitable expenditure.

Wages and salaries £309,624 (2004 £227,459)

Other pension costs £6,369 (2004 £8,424)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 6

Managing and administering the charity 3

Trustees 22

### **2005 - 2006**

Salaries and wages in charitable activities amounted to £254,753 (2005 £216,478).

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £357,218 (2005 £309,624)

Other pension costs £6,624 (2005 £6,369)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 8

Managing and administering the charity 3

The number of employees whose annual emoluments were £60,000 or more was 1.

## **2006 - 2007**

A significant pointer to the future was represented by the appointment of a Biennial officer to work within New Heartland (the funding distributor for Housing Market Renewal in Merseyside – Sefton, Liverpool, and Wirral); and secondly through gaining an agreement that Liverpool City Council would appoint a full time Public Art Officer to sit in the Planning Department) post started in September 2008). The Biennia completed the organisational review and put in place recruitment plans to increase the staff from 13.5 full time staff (March 2006) to 20 (September 2007), the process involved several staff team-building, joint planning and training says during the review year.

During the review period, considerable progress was made in advocating best practice in commissioning public art. Following on from work with the Steering Group (political level) and Working Group (officer level) set up by Laurie Peake to involve the City Council and various development agencies, the City Council agreed to appoint its own Public Art Officer in Regeneration to take over these roles, a major success in getting the Council to 'internalise' the knowledge that it had gained. By the end of the review period, it was felt that in the future, the Steering Group should be administered by the new internal post in the City Council.

Secondly, conversations with the Arts Council resulted in the recruitment of a public art officer (September 2007) to work in the New Heartlands office (responsible for the direction of Housing Market Renewal Initiatives in the three Boroughs of Wirral, Liverpool and Sefton). The appointee, Paul Kelly, had previously worked with Liverpool Housing Action Trust.

The Biennial completed an organisational review and put in place recruitment plans to increase the staff from 13.5 full time staff (March 2006) to 20 (September 2007), the process involved several staff team-building, joint planning and training days during the review year.

Salaries and wages in charitable activities amounted to £254,753 (2005 £216,478).

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £415,107 (2006 £357,218)

Other pension costs £8,200 (2006 £6,624)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 11

Managing and administering the charity 3

Total 14

The number of employees whose annual emoluments were £60,000 or more was 1.

**2007 - 2008****Organisational Development and Business Planning**

The company went through a major re-structuring process in 2006 / 7 to prepare for the challenge of 2008, and its success was proven by our capacity to deliver the celebrated programme that the Biennial did in that year. Further organisational restructuring was undertaken in the winter of 2008 / 9 and an updated Operational Plan for Biennial activities 2009 - 12 was accepted by the Board in March 2009.

The company moved its premises and registered office in August 2007 to 55 New Bird Street in the Baltic Triangle area of the city centre. Although this was dictated by a necessary expansion of space (the staff during 2008 before the Festival was around twenty full time staff and their premises in the Tea Factory had only allowed for fourteen).

The team then grew to twenty-four full time posts to deliver the full programme, and the cyclical organisational review that began in October 2008 reduced that number through non-renewal of contracts to twenty-one posts by the end of the period. Partly as a result of the Biennial activity, there was a pool of experienced freelance project managers available locally on whom they could call as required for specific projects.

During the review period, considerable progress was made in advocating best practice in commissioning public art. Following on from work with the Steering Group (political level) and Working Group (office level) set up by Laurie Peake to involve the City Council and various development agencies, the City Council agreed to appoint its own Public Art Officer in Regeneration to take over these roles, a major success in getting the Council to 'internalise' the knowledge that it had gained. By the end of the review period, it was felt that in the future the Steering Group would be administered by the new internal post in the City Council.

Secondly, conversations with the Arts Council resulted in the recruitment of a public art officer (September 2007) to work in the New Heartlands office (responsible for the direction of Housing Market Renewal Initiatives in the three Boroughs of Wirral, Liverpool and Sefton). The appointee, Paul Kelly had previously worked with Liverpool Action Trust.

The five year business plan (commissioned from David Bournnell Associates in October 2002), and presented to Liverpool City Council, ACE NW and NWDA at the end of March 2003) was clearly out of date by the spring of 2006, and an organisational review was commissioned from Susanne Burns, with the aim of ensuring that the business side of the Company would be as effectively managed as the programme side. A new staff structure was proposed to the Board in September 2006, creating a new post of Executive Director to support the Chief Executive in running the business and allowing him to concentrate more on programme delivery. The new structure was implemented through recruitment from January 2007 onwards, with the new staff complement of twenty posts to be completed by September.

**Staff**

Louise Merrin, the Marketing and Development Manager in the post for the 2006 Festival, resigned in the spring of 2007 to take up a post with FACT. In view of the creation of the new post of Executive Director with responsibility for fundraising, it was decided to focus

the post more closely as Head of Marketing and Communications. Unfortunately, recruitment to this post took a long time, and for the greater part of the review period, the functions of the post were undertaken by consultants – Helen Palmer and Elaine Lees – who had been responsible for marketing the Manchester International festival. Antony Pickthall, already a colleague through his temporary post at the Bluecoat, finally joined the staff in the spring of 2008 and led the team through the challenging environment of Liverpool's year as European Capital of Culture.

The Biennial had been successful in significantly developing their digital and online presence, including the appointment of Sean Hawkrige as Digital Content Co-ordinator – this activity would make their website much more accessible and interactive. Increased control over the site from the Biennial office made it more readily updatable and combined with a new presence on external sites such as Flickr, YouTube and Facebook, making the work reach new audiences around the world and encouraged participation.

The restructured staff team, incorporating a new Executive Director post, had been operating well, and grew in order to provide the capacity to deliver the enhanced programme for 2008. The Biennial kept significant focus on developing their capacity to deliver in the area of private income, and had been putting in place the required foundations, including brand development and expanded media reach.

The list of posts at the end of the review period was twenty (year-end 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008): Director, Executive Director, Programme Director (Public Art), Programme Director (International Exchange and HE), Programme Manager (Learning and Inclusion), Programme Manager (International Exhibition), Operations Manager, Operations Assistant, Development Co-ordinator, Finance Officer, Finance Assistant (part time), Head of Marketing and Communications, Website Co-ordinator, Marketing Assistant, Learning and Inclusion Co-ordinator, Learning and Inclusion Assistant, International Co-ordinator, International exhibition Project Assistant, Public Art Co-ordinator, and Public Art Assistant (part time).

### **Trustees**

Reimbursed travel expenses totalling £1,579 were paid to the trustees during the year.

For the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £557,450 (2007 £415,107)

Other pension costs £31,997 (2007 £8,200)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 16

Managing and administering the charity 3

Total 19

The number of employees whose annual emoluments were £60,000 or more was 1.

## 2008 - 2009

The enlarged staff needed to provide the capacity to deliver the enhanced programme for 2008 was reviewed in October. The resulting structure allowed greater focus on the Biennials core activity of commissioning art, along with some planned shrinkage at the end of the 2008 year was also necessary, and at the end of the review period, a new staff structure was being put into place (from April 2009) with many staff transferring into permanent contracts. The Biennial also kept significant focus on developing their capacity to deliver in the area of private income, and have been putting in place the required foundations, including brand development and expanded media reach. As mentioned above, the structure of the programming staff was also changed to form a single, more fluid commissioning team, as opposed to separate departments for each element of programme.

### Culture Campus

Originally conceived in 2003 as a visual-arts led postgraduate 'campus' to address the issue of graduate retention in the City (the lack of a vibrant post-graduate culture in Liverpool had previously been identified as the single factor most damaging to development of the visual arts infrastructure). Culture Campus continued to consolidate its position in relation to the Universities and had found an expanded role as an interface between all the LARC organisations (not just visual arts) and the HEIs. Lewis Biggs resigned as Chairman of the company in January 09 after an extended term of office, but the Biennial remained a key partner and leader of the initiatives, and became a steering group for NW Cultural Observatory, Impacts 08 and a CPD project.

### VAIL

Senior staff continued their leadership of the Visual Arts in Liverpool advocacy campaign (initiated early 2007), which added value to the work of all the visual arts organisations through promoting and articulating the city's programme as a whole. The aim was to make Liverpool the 'first in mind' city in the UK after London for the visual arts certainly appeared to be proven for the 2008 year. This initiative was a natural extension of the visual arts partnership represented by the Festival and contributed to the Biennials aim of strengthening the visual arts infrastructure and developing audiences.

The Biennial team (2008 / 2009) had to grow to twenty-four full time posts to deliver all the projects, and the cyclical organisational review that began in October 2008 reduced that number through non-renewal of contracts to twenty-one posts by the end of the period. Partly as a result of their past activity, there was now a pool of experienced freelance project managers available locally on whom they could call as required for specific projects.

The Biennial completed an organisational review, recruiting new staff and lost other staff through non-renewal of contract, so effecting a planned shrinkage of the staff from twenty-four to nineteen as at April 2009 (this still exceeded the staff complement in 2007), and all staff were issued with revised and updated contracts.

New positions include a permanent Development Officer, to enhance their capacity to secure private sector support, a temporary Visitor Service Officer post to co-ordinate the Biennial Festival visitor programme and ensure a high-quality experience for all visitors, and a part-time Finance Assistant to support the organisation in timely financial management.

There were twenty-one posts at the end of the review period (March 2009). Posts included: Director, Executive Director, Programme Director (Public Art), Programme Director (International Exchange and HE), International Curator (Vacant), Development Manager, Development Officer, Executive Officer, Administration Assistant (part-time), Finance Officer, Finance Assistant (part-time), Head of Marketing and Communications, Digital Content Co-ordinator (part-time), Marketing Officer (Vacant). Partnership Co-ordinator, HMRI Public Realm Manager, Project Curator, Programme Assistant (International Exchange and HE), Programme Assistant (International exhibition), and two Programme Assistants (Public Art) (part-time).

### **Use of Volunteers**

Seventy-four volunteers were recruited through a process of advertising and interview, they received training and then contributed a total of thirteen. 304 hours towards technical support, stewarding, information, sales and security during the ten week Festival.

### **Trustees**

Reimbursed travel expenses totalling £695 were paid to the trustees during the year.

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £555,786 (2008 £507,539)

Social security costs £52,441 (2008 £49,911)

Other pension costs £22,341 (2008 £31,997)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 20

Managing and administering the charity 3

Total 23

### **Per Diem**

Staff when travelling abroad received £30 per day, receipts did not need to be supplied. If the staff were on Biennial business within the UK, they could claim per diem for overnight stays of £30 a day.

### **2009 - 2010**

The staff had been busy during 2010 / 11 in other realms – in Visual Arts in Liverpool, Culture Campus and in the Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium which had drawn all aspects of the city's art world together to demonstrate that they were stronger together. Paula Ridley (Biennial Chair) explains that the Liverpool Biennial is not an over-staffed, lush organisation, but a team of people working hard and successfully to deliver one of the country's finest cultural offerings (Liverpool Biennial Annual Report 2010 / 11 p.2).

The revised staff structure put into place at the beginning of 2009 remained largely stable with appropriate staff turnover and limited adjustment to roles and posts until the end of the 2010 Festival, at which point a number of contracts could not be renewed. Staff members who left during the period due to new opportunities or the end of contracts were: Melenie Thorpe, Raj Sandhu, Peter Merrington, Depa Miah, Joel Ava Makinson, Mary Linnell Simmons, Leon Seth, Sacha Waldron and Paul Kelly.

Staff, Board and management awaydays were held within the year to build understanding, commitment and motivation and to develop strategic plans. The management team (all managers and directors) completed a management development programme to improve management of the organisation and the teams within it.

### **Volunteers and Interns**

Volunteers remained important to the Biennial, and the successful delivery of a Festival would be all but impossible without this essential resource. The Biennial was supported throughout the year by a number of interns and volunteers. Inspire Fellow MA Amanprit Sandhu, joined early October 2009, to work on projects across the programme team – a two year fellowship. Zainab Djavanroodi worked within the International team, Zoe Culley worked one day a week as a volunteer on the archive for three months, and Catherine Hibbert took over for three more months before going to the National Gallery. For the marketing team, Daniela Trentin from Trentino University was an intern July – Sept 2010 and Maggie Lister volunteered from July until December 2010 and Maggie Lister volunteered from July until December 2010.

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £520,719 (2009 £555,786)

Social security costs £42,479 (2009 £52,441)

Other pension costs £24,647 (2009 £22,341)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 17

Managing and administering the charity 3

Total 20

There was one employee in the year whose annual emolument was £60,000 or more (2009 – 10).

### **2010 – 2011**

Paula Ridley (Chair of the Biennial) explains that the staff continued to be busy in other realms – Visual Arts in Liverpool, Culture Campus and in the Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium which had drawn all aspects of the city's arts worlds together to demonstrate that they are all stronger together. The Liverpool Biennial was not an overstaffed lush organisation, but a team of people working hard and successfully to deliver one of the country's finest cultural offerings as they operated on a greatly reduced budget. Reductions of staffing levels was managed, largely through turnover with a strong team maintained.

### **Staff**

The revised staff structure put into place at the beginning of 2009 remained largely stable with appropriate staff turnover and limited adjustment to roles and posts until the end of the 2010 Festival, at which point a number of contracts could not be renewed. Staff members who left during the period due to new opportunities or the end of contracts were

Melanie Thorpe, Raj Sandhu, Peter Merrington, Depa Miah, Joel Ava Makinson, Mary Linnell Simmons, Leon Seth, Sacha Waldron and Paul Kelly.

Staff, Board and management awaydays were held within the year to build understanding, commitment and motivation and to develop strategic plans. The management team (all managers and directors) completed a management development programme to improve management of the organisation and the teams within it.

### **Volunteers and Interns**

Volunteers remain important to the Biennial, and the successful delivery of a Festival would be all but impossible without this essential resource. The Biennial was supported throughout the year by a number of interns and volunteers. Inspire Fellow MA Amanprit Sandhu, joined early October 2009, to work on projects across the programme team – a two-year fellowship. Zainab Djavanroodi worked within the International team, Zoe Cully worked one day a week as a volunteer on the archive for three months, and Catherine Hibbert took over for three more months before going to the National Gallery. For the marketing team, Daniela Trentin from Trentino University was an intern July - Sept 2010 and Maggie Lister volunteered from July until December 2010.

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £517,668 (2010 £520,719)

Social security costs £51,326 (2010 £42,479)

Other pension costs £29,166 (2010 £24,647)

The average monthly number of employees during the year was:

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 20

Managing and administering the charity 3

Total 23

There was one employee in the year whose annual emolument was £60,000 or more (2009 – 0).

### **2011 - 2012**

To compensate for reductions in principle sources of income, staff concentrated on diversifying income streams, maximising the benefit of partnerships and providing high quality artistic programme which, though it was part of a cohesive Liverpool Biennial, is delivered by other organisations that are driven by the value they could derive from exhibiting in Liverpool Biennial 2012. Although resources had been restricted, the charity continued to be proud that the exhibitions for the Biennial would remain free and available to all.

### **2Up2Down**

During the year, artist Jeanne van Heeswijk worked with a group of people, young and old, not in education, employment or training to develop places and spaces for their neighbourhood in the empty terraced housing and vacant ground around Liverpool Football Club's stadium in Anfield.

Throughout the year, a group of around twenty young people. Worked with architect Marianne Heaslip of Urbed to remodel the building as a community bakery with training kitchen alongside a small housing scheme for two to four households. The first phase architectural design was developed in conjunction with the community and design professionals including Wayne Hemmingway (to RIBA Stage C). meanwhile, a cross-generational group of local residents developed the Homebaked Community Land Trust that collectively own and operate the scheme and a Consumer Co-operative to manage the bakery.

### **Volunteers and Interns**

Liverpool Biennial is rooted in the communities and worked with thirty-one volunteers from a variety of backgrounds throughout the year. Most of these volunteers contributed to *2Up2Down* and the associated Homebaked activities and were long-term volunteers. As part of the Biennials commitment to professional development and learning, they also welcomed a variety of interns and work placement students throughout the year.

Staff costs £26,762 (2011 £48,792)

### **Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £377,508 (2011 £517,668)

Social security costs £37,251 (2011 £51,326)

Other pension costs £7,806 (2011 £29,166)

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 10 (2011 20)

Managing and administering the charity 3 (2011 3)

There was one employee in the year whose annual emolument was £60,000 or more (2011 – 12).

### **2012 - 2013**

Financial performance was closely in line with planned outcomes and the critical fundraising and expenditure targets for the year were achieved. However, reduced income had a number of effects, resulting in reduced marketing budgets and staffing levels. The management team worked through most of the period at 80% of their contracts. These changes were undertaken to preserve their ability to present high quality programme and make it widely available.

### **Volunteers**

Liverpool Biennial is rooted in its communities and worked with thirty-one volunteers from a variety of backgrounds throughout the year. Most of these contributed to *2Up2Down* and the associated Homebaked activities and are long-term volunteers. As a part of their commitment to professional development and learning, they also welcomed a variety of interns and work placement students throughout the year.

As the UK Biennial, robust international artistic connections build their position and professional practice. The Biennials curatorial staff are invited to present at and attend events, conferences and seminars across the world and these visits help them to research

and commission the best possible artists to make work in the UK, as well as leading to invaluable financial support.

The end of European Regional Development Fund and the regional development agency meant that there was a significant reduction in the amount of funding that was available to the Biennial. This had an immediate effect on planning and expenditure and resulted in a reduction of staff, marketing and programme budgets, and the artistic programme had to be prioritised and cuts to the programme expenditure had been minimised as much as possible.

To compensate for reductions in principle sources of income, staff concentrated on diversifying income streams, maximising the benefit of partnerships and providing high quality artistic programme which, though it is part of a cohesive Liverpool Biennial, is delivered by other organisations that are driven by the value they can derive from exhibiting in Liverpool Biennial 2012.

Staff costs £19,762 (2012 £26,762)

**Employment costs**

Wages and salaries £551,171 (2012 £377,508)

Social security costs £49,070 (2012 £37,251)

Other pension costs £7,020 (2012 £7,806)

Activities in furtherance of the charity's objects 32 (2012 10)

Managing and administering the charity 3 (2012 3)

There were two employees in the year whose annual emolument was £60,000 or more (2012 - 1).

## **Liverpool Biennial Board of Trustees**

### **Directors' Responsibilities**

Company Law requires the directors to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the company and of its surplus or deficit for the year. In preparing those financial statements, the directors are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and apply them consistently
- Make judgments and estimates. That are reasonable and prudent
- Prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the company will continue in operation

The directors are responsible for keeping proper accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the company, and to enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the Companies Act 1985. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the company and hence for taking reasonable steps to the prevention and detection of fraud or other irregularities.

### **1999**

Under the provision of the Companies Act 1985, all elected trustees also serve as directors of the Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Limited for the purpose of company law, are responsible for the preparation of the accounts and for being satisfied that they give a true and fair view.

Bryan Biggs (appointed 29 October 1998)  
 Lewis Biggs (appointed 29 October 1998 and resigned 22 June 2000)  
 Beverley Bytheway (appointed 12 February 1999)  
 James Moores (appointed 29 October 1998)  
 James Ross (appointed 29 October 1998)  
 Paul Senior (appointed 12 February 1999 and resigned 30 November 1999)  
 Julian Treuherz (appointed 12 February 1999)  
 Mark Sykes (appointed 1 October 1999)  
 James Warnock (appointed 24 June 1999)  
 Eddie Berg (appointed 20 April 2000)

### **2001**

Bryan Biggs  
 Lewis Biggs (resigned 22 June 2000)  
 Beverley Bytheway  
 James Moores  
 James Ross (resigned 4 April 2001)  
 Julian Treuherz  
 Mark Sykes (resigned 4 April 2001)  
 James Warnock  
 Eddie Berg (appointed 20 April 2000)  
 Darren Warburton (appointed 3 April 2001)

Mac Gibson (appointed 3 April 2001)

## 2002

Bryan Biggs  
Beverley Bytheway  
James Moores  
James Ross (resigned 4 April 2001)  
Julian Treuherz  
Mark Sykes (resigned 4 April 2001)  
James Warnock  
Eddie Berg  
Darren Warburton (appointed 3 April 2001 and resigned 19 March 2002)  
Mac Gibson (appointed 3 April 2001)  
Walter Brown CBE (appointed 5 June 2001)  
Declan McGonagle (appointed 13 November 2001)  
Kate Cowie (appointed 13 November 2001)

## 2003

E. Berg  
B. Biggs  
W. Brown CBE (appointed 5 June 2001)  
B. Bytheway  
K. Cowie  
M. Gibson (resigned 19 March 2003)  
F. McEntegart (appointed 12 November 2002)  
D. McGonagle  
J. Moores (resigned 20 May 2003)  
J. Treuherz (resigned 19 March 2003)  
J. Warnock

## 2004

E. Berg  
B. Biggs  
W. Brown CBE  
B. Bytheway  
K. Cowie  
F. McEntegart (appointed 12 November 2002)  
D. McGonagle  
J. Warnock  
J. Casey  
A. Jones  
A. Sunderland  
J. Wentworth  
R. Goddard

**2005**

E. Berg  
B. Biggs  
W. Brown CBE  
B. Bytheway  
K. Cowie  
F. McEntegart  
D. McGonagle  
J. Warnock  
A. Jones  
A. Sunderland  
J. Wentworth  
J. Kelly  
R. Goddard

**2006**

B. Biggs  
W. Brown CBE  
B. Bytheway  
K. Cowie  
F. McEntegart  
D. McGonagle  
J. Warnock  
A. Jones  
A. Sunderland  
J. Wentworth  
R. Goddard

**2007**

B. Biggs  
W. Brown CBE  
F. McEntegart  
D. McGonagle  
J. Warnock  
A. Jones  
A. Sunderland  
J. Wentworth  
R. Goddard

**2008**

B. Biggs  
W. Brown CBE  
D. McGonagle  
J. Warnock  
P. Ridley

L. Chalmers  
 A. Jones  
 A. Sunderland  
 S. Mackinnon  
 J. Wentworth  
 T. Wilson  
 R. Goddard

The Directors of Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Ltd. During the review year were as follows:

Prof. Declan McGonagle (Chairman until March 2008), Paula Ridley (Chairman from March 2008), Bryan Biggs MBE, Walter Brown CBE, Roger Goddard, Alison Jones, Francis McEntegart (resigned February 2008), Alistair Sunderland, James Warnock (Vice Chair), Jane Wentworth. New members were Lesley Chalmers (elected June 2007), Jim Gill and Simon McKinnon (elected December 2007).

The Biennial were successful in developing the Board membership, and in securing business engagement at a higher level. Paula Ridley, previous Chair of the V&A, commenced her role as Chair of the Biennial board in March. Declan McGonagle stepped down as Chair but remained on the Board. Other new board members included Jim Gill (Liverpool Vision), Tony Wilson (Hill Dickinson), Simon McKinnon (Corning China) and Lesley Chalmers (English Cities Fund).

## 2009

P. Ridley  
 L. Chalmers  
 J. Gill  
 A. Sunderland  
 S. Mackinnon  
 J. Wentworth  
 T. Wilson  
 R. Goddard  
 G. Pillay  
 D. Ades  
 M. Cox

One third of Board members stand down each year by rotation unless resignations provide this turnover. New members are recruited in accordance with the requirements of the Company for particular skill sets and experience: Development / Fundraising, Marketing and PR, Finance, Company Law and HR, Academic / HEIs, International Art Exhibitions, etc. from time to time the Company has requested support in recruitment from the 'Board Bank' operated by Business in the Arts Northwest. New Board members are assigned a member of staff as a first point of contact for communicating experience, and Board induction / training days take place once each year or as required.

The Directors of Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Ltd. During the review year were as follows:

Paula Ridley (Chairman from March 2008), Prof. Dawn Ades, Bryan Biggs MBE (resigned Sept 08), Walter Brown CBE (resigned Sept 08), Lesley Chalmers, Michael Cox, Jim Gill, Roger Goddard, Alison Jones, Prof. Declan McGonagle (resigned Spring 2009), Simon McKinnon, Prof. Gerald Pillay, Alistair Sunderland, James Warnock (resigned Sept 08), Jane Wentworth, Tony Wilson, Frances McEntegart (resigned June 2008).

**2010**

P. Ridley  
L. Chalmers  
J. Gill  
A. Sunderland  
S. Mackinnon  
J. Wentworth  
T. Wilson  
R. Goddard  
G. Pillay  
M. Cox  
J. Shield

**2011**

P. Ridley  
L. Chalmers  
J. Gill  
J. Wentworth  
T. Wilson  
D. Ades  
G. Pillay  
R. Gander  
M. Cox  
J. Shield

**2012**

P. Ridley  
L. Chalmers  
J. Gill  
J. Wentworth  
T. Wilson  
D. Ades  
G. Pillay  
J. Shield  
P. Hyland  
P. Mearns

**2013**

P. Ridley  
L. Chalmers  
J. Gill  
T. Wilson  
D. Ades  
G. Pillay  
J. Shield  
P. Hyland  
P. Mearns  
R. Nashashibi  
R. Heald

P. Hyland and P. Mearns were both appointed as trustees on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2011. M. Cox resigned as a trustee on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2011 and R. Gander resigned as a trustee on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2011. L. Biggs resigned as company secretary on 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2011 and P. M. Smith was appointed as company secretary on 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2011.

Under the provisions of the Memorandum and Articles of Association the trustees have the authority to appoint new trustees from time to time, as opportunities arise. The minimum number of trustees permitted by the Article is three but shall not be subject to any maximum unless determined by ordinary resolution.

The trustees meet tri-monthly, and they have delegated the day to day operations of the charity to the senior management team, under the leadership of Sally Tallant. Committee meetings are also held in-between the full trustees' meetings.

The major risks to which the charity is exposed, as discussed by the trustees, have been reviewed and systems have been established to manage those risks. Full details are given in the Chief Executive's Report.

The Trustees confirm that they have referred to the Charity Commission's guidance regarding Public Benefit and are satisfied that the charity's objects and principle activities are for the public benefit and that they comply with the duty set out at Section 4 of the Charities Act 2006. Full details are given in the Chief Executive's Report.

## **Principle Funding Sources of the Liverpool Biennial**

The company's name is Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Limited (and in the financial documents is called 'the Charity'). The Company was incorporated under the Companies Act 1985 on 29<sup>th</sup> October 1998 was registered as a charity on 15<sup>th</sup> February 1999. On 28<sup>th</sup> February 1999 the assets and liabilities of The Liverpool Biennale (a charitable trust) were transferred to the Company.

The Charity's objects ('the Objects') are to provide, maintain, improve, and advance education by cultivating and improving public taste in the visual arts; including classical, modern, and contemporary arts and sculpture, and undertaking all such things as are incidental thereto and (without prejudice to the generality of the forgoing) to promote the same by the following means:

- To educate the public by the initiation and perpetuation of an International Arts Festival and multiple exhibitions throughout the Merseyside region in the field of visual arts
- To communicate and co-operate with businesses, authorities and government, national, local or otherwise and to obtain from such bodies any rights, privileges and concessions for the attainment of the Charity's objects or any of them
- To organise, manage, provide or assist in the provision of management of lectures, seminars, masterclasses, study groups, competitions, prizes and scholarships to further the appreciation of and cultivate the public's interest in the visual arts

## **Directors' Responsibilities**

Company Law requires the directors to prepare financial statements for each financial period which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the company and of its surplus or deficit for that period. In preparing those financial statements, the directors are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and apply them consistently
- Make judgements and estimates that are reasonable and prudent
- Prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the company will continue in operation

The directors are responsible for keeping proper accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the company, and to enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the Companies Act 1985. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the company and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud or other irregularities.

## **Funds**

### **Reserves Policy**

Liverpool Biennial holds sufficient funds to maintain liquidity: cover unforeseen short-term cash requirements; provide continuity in the case of unexpected, temporary changes in trading conditions; and maintain a provision for anticipated unmet. Future needs due to

development of changes in the operating environment. Normally, this means holding sufficient reserves to cover operational costs for six months including any outstanding contracted expenditure. In calculating the reserves figure, trustees have excluded restricted income, fixed assets, and designated funds.

Unrestricted funds to income received or generated for the objects of the charity without further specified purpose. Income and expenditure are allocated to the general fund in accordance with the policies set out. Unexpended funds are carried forward to future periods. The charity has committed certain funds to support its planned transformation activities, programme and the viability of the Festival.

Restricted funds relate to all income received where the donor has specified its use. Related expenditure is also allocated to restricted funds. Due to the Biennial cycle, a surplus may be carried forward from the first year of the cycle to the second in order to fund activity in a Festival year. These funds are separate from the reserves and are planned and managed appropriately.

### **1999 – 2000**

Without the financial contribution of the AFOUNDATION, signifying James Moores' visionary commitment to the concept, the 1999 Biennial would not have taken place. In addition, he has agreed to pump-prime 2001 Biennial. Thereafter, the project must achieve alternative means of sustainability. Far from weakening the Biennial, Moores' challenge strengthens it by providing a context to bring in new partners to an event which was now established. However, the fundraising record of the Biennial had not reached the targets that were vital to achieve for its future sustainability.

The two largest corporate sponsors in 1999 were Citibell and Bloomberg News and in both cases, James Moores played a direct role in eliciting their support. However, overall, the opportunity to use the inaugural Biennial to generate corporate support was missed. This is partly due to staff changes and the absence of a dedicated Development Director throughout the period running up to the Biennial launch. There is little evidence of the (Draft) Fundraising Strategy of August 1998 having been pursued or even updated. Partly as a result of this, sponsors received inconsistent credits on print publicity, and the contractual arrangements between sponsors and the Biennial appear to have been very ad hoc.

Although the Biennial secured significant support from the arts funding system (NWAB and ACE) in 1999, the levels of support thus far committed are not yet consonant with its aspirations as the largest, regular international contemporary visual arts event in the UK. The success in securing overseas (including government) funds for the international exhibition in 1999, had prompted Anthony Bond to suggest that, in 2001, the Biennial should aim to raise 50% of artists direct costs (travel, freight, installation) from foreign agencies and governments.

Through the 1999 Biennial programme, the Company partially addressed eight of the nine Aims of the Charity drawn up in June 1998 satisfactorily. The aim that was least satisfactorily addressed was 'to attract increased and long-term funding to the region for contemporary visual arts.' Commercial sponsorship received during the year amounted to

£80,000 against a gross expenditure of £1.065m, thus demonstrating the continuing dependency of the visual arts in Liverpool on funds from Trusts, Foundations and public sources. Although funding was attracted from a variety of sources including Bloomberg News, Littlewoods, Foundation for Sport and the Arts, Liverpool City Council, foreign governments, other foundations and arts funding bodies, the overwhelmingly most significant contribution came from 'a' Foundation (the patronage on which the Biennial had been entirely dependent for its credibility and ongoing solvency).

Fundraising is an activity which demands an effective working relationship between the non-executive Board and the executive staff, each complementing the other in terms of contracts, expertise, and professionalism. Fundraising was a priority, irrespective of whether or not the Board was successful in appointing new senior staff to the organisation. It was the Board's responsibility to secure adequate resources to implement a development strategy for 2001 and beyond.

The membership of the Board further raises the issue of a potential conflict of interest between the fundraising ambitions of partner venues and of the Biennial as a whole. Of course, this situation is not unique, and can be addressed via different strategies; however, it did reinforce the need for recruitment of the Board members who were willing and able to contribute to the fundraising effort.

### **Financial Review**

Incoming resources for the period ended 31 March 2000 amounted to £558,768. The Statement of Financial Activities gives details of total resources expended for the period of £1,064,867, and a resulting net negative movement of funds of £506,099. A transfer of net assets of £8,801 from The Liverpool Biennale leads to a total negative balance of £497,298 carried forward. £525,000 loan from the 'a' Foundation has been received to provide funding cover for the deficit.

**Table 3.1: Unrestricted Revenue Grants 1999 – 2000**

	<b>Unrestricted Funds</b>	<b>2000 Total</b>
<b>Revenue grants</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
'A' Foundation	202,900	202,900
Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs	3,000	3,000
Irish Department for Foreign Affairs	3,016	3,016
Danish Contemporary Art Foundation	2,352	2,352
Canadian High Commission	1,291	1,291
The Art Gallery of New South Wales	8,627	8,627
Goethe Institute	2,500	2,500
L'agent Compatable De L'institute Francais De Rpyaume-Uni	2,000	2,000
Embajada De Espana	750	750
Institute Fur Auslandsbeziehungen	19,592	19,592
Association Francaise d'Action Artistique	7,374	7,374
Arts Council of Switzerland	1,825	1,825
Liverpool City Council	10,000	10,000
The Arts Council of England	15,000	15,000
North West Arts Board	6,117	6,117
Merseyside Arts, Culture and Media Enterprise	10,000	10,000
The Granada Foundation	10,000	10,000
The Esmee Fairbairn Charitable Trust	15,000	15,000
Liverpool Hope University College	10,000	10,000
Instituto Nacional De Bella Artes	3,080	3,080
Fundacao Bienal De Sau Paulo	15,000	15,000
Littlewoods Retail Limited	20,000	20,000
Jupiter Asset Management	25,000	25,000
Danzas	1,373	1,373
Bloomberg	35,000	35,000
P H Holt Charitable Trust	5,000	5,000
Tate Gallery	41,179	41,179
Liverpool Chamber of Commerce	784	784
Trident Training Limited	1,568	1,568
<b>Donations</b>		
The Foundation for Sports and the Arts	60,000	60,000
Sotheby's	100	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>539,428</b>	<b>539,428</b>

The Rees Leahy (2000) report began with forty-three recommendations for action - the majority of which reiterated the theme running throughout the paper: namely, the need to shift gear from the realisation of a bold experiment to the achievements of medium - and long-term sustainability and strategic effectiveness. This process of change was required in every aspect of the Biennial organisation and, in this sense; many of the recommendations were interconnected. The Company needed to create a holistic strategy for development, informed by the evaluation of the Biennial's early record in project management, marketing, education, fundraising and building stakeholder relationships.

Although the loan was repayable upon demand, the 'a' Foundation confirmed that it would only be recalled when it would not affect the ability of the company to continue as a going

concern. James Moores was a Trustee of the 'a' Foundation who had provided a grant and loan to the company during the year. He was also a Trustee of the Liverpool Biennial which transferred its net assets to the company at the start of the period.

## 2000 – 2001

### Financial Review

Incoming resources for the year ended 31 March 2001 amounted to £4,575. The Statement of Financial Activities gives details of total resources expended for the year of £134,373, and a resulting net negative movement of funds of £129,798. A further loan of £107,506 was received from the 'a' Foundation to provide funding cover for the deficit, taking the total balance to £632,506.

**Table 3.2: Unrestricted Revenue Grants 2000 – 2001**

	<b>Unrestricted Funds</b>	<b>2000 Total</b>
<b>Revenue grants</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
'A' Foundation	202,900	202,900
Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs	3,000	3,000
Irish Department for Foreign Affairs	2,352	2,352
Danish Contemporary Art Foundation	2,352	2,352
Canadian High Commission	1,291	1,291
The Art Gallery of New South Wales	8,627	8,627
Goethe Institute	2,500	2,500
L'agent Compatable De L'institute Francais De Rpyaume-Uni	2,000	2,000
Embajada De Espana	750	750
Institute Fur Auslandsbeziehungen	19,592	19,592
Association Francaise d'Action Artistique	7,374	7,374
Arts Council of Switzerland	1,825	1,825
Liverpool City Council	10,000	10,000
The Arts Council of England	15,000	15,000
North West Arts Board	6,117	6,117
Merseyside Arts, Culture and Media Enterprise	10,000	10,000
The Granada Foundation	10,000	10,000
The Esmee Fairbairn Charitable Trust	15,000	15,000
Liverpool Hope University College	10,000	10,000
Instituto Nacional De Bella Artes	3,080	3,080
Fundacao Bienal De Sau Paulo	15,000	15,000
Littlewoods Retail Limited	20,000	20,000
Jupiter Asset Management	25,000	25,000
Danzas	1,373	1,373
Bloomberg	35,000	35,000
P H Holt Charitable Trust	5,000	5,000
Tate Gallery	41,179	41,179
Liverpool Chamber of Commerce	784	784
Trident Training Limited	1,568	1,568
<b>Total</b>	<b>479,328</b>	<b>479,328</b>

The end of year accounts gave no reason for complacency, with the encouragement of NWAB, an application for a Breakthrough Lottery grant from ACE was made in early November, and this was successful in attracting £200,000. Negotiations for revenue funding from NWAB also succeeded in a pledge for funds (£35K pa) before the end of the year. These sums helped to secure the future of the Biennial, and also helped to lever further monies from commercial sources and foundations, but the security of the Biennial in the short and medium term was still absolutely dependent on the loan to the Biennial from the 'a' Foundation. The size of this loan as against any possible income from other sources was such that the impression of the technical insolvency was hard to avoid.

Before the end of the financial year, much work had been done on the Biennial Magazine, although this did not appear until June, and on a press-event built around the Jessica Voorsanger Football art project under the 1999 Education Programme (April 2001). By the end March, it was clear that the new structure and focus of the organisation would allow more thorough and detailed planning (provided the partner organisations could be persuaded to play their part).

Although the loan was repayable upon demand, the 'a' Foundation had confirmed that it would only recall when it would not affect the ability of the company to continue as a going concern. As stated at note twelve and in the Trustees report, the loan received from the 'a' Foundation was being used to provide funding cover for the deficit.

James Moores was also a Trustee of the 'a' Foundation who had provided a loan to the company during the year. Bryan Biggs was also a director of the Bluecoat Art Centre. A total of £209 was paid to the Bluecoat Art Centre during the year in respect of expenses which the Centre incurred with regards to the work of Bryan Biggs for the Biennial. No amount was outstanding at the year end.

Eddie Berg was also a director of FACT. A total of £2,012 was invoiced to the Biennial during the year in respect of expenses which they incurred with regards to the work of Eddie Berg for the Biennial. the total amount of £2,012 was outstanding at the year end.

## **2001 – 2002**

### **Review of Activities**

Following a year of very reduced activity, while the Board evaluated the success of the first Biennial event and restructured the company, the year ending 31 March 2002 saw the rebuilding of the staff team and an extended period of fundraising and planning. The plans for the realisation of the 2002 event were pursued in accordance with the draft Business Plan presented to the Board February 2001 and agreed in revised form September 2001. The Board itself had seen some development, with a new member offered specialist skills in Personnel was appointed in November and the new Chair appointed in January 2002. Board development remained ongoing.

### **Financial Review**

Incoming resources for the year ended 31 March 2002 amounted to £272,421. The Statement of Financial Activities gave detail of total resources expended for the year of

£463,057, and a resulting net negative movement of funds of £190,636. A further loan of £155,000 had been received from the 'a' Foundation to provide funding cover for the deficit, taking the total balance to £787,506.

The first Biennial was held in 1999 and the second held in the Autumn of 2002. Significant costs had been incurred in establishing the events, and a substantial deficit had arisen. The trustees worked hard towards reducing this deficit, and in the long term, establishing reserves for the future.

**Table 3.3: Unrestricted Grants 2002**

	<b>Unrestricted Funds</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>
<b>Revenue Grants</b>	<b>£</b>		<b>£</b>
Australia Council	809	809	
Arts Council	180,000	180,000	
North West Arts Board	48,114	48,114	
Liverpool John Moores University	4,350	4,350	
Granada Foundation	5,000	5,000	
Liverpool HAT	14,825	14,825	
<b>Total</b>	<b>253098</b>	<b>253098</b>	

The end of year accounts showed the company continued in a weak position as a result of the loan being carried forward. In addition, targets set in the spring of 2001 for raising funds the corporate sector were shown to be over-optimistic in the light of nationally declining arts sponsorship, and the changed business environment following the events of 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001. It was not possible, during the year, to secure the promise of future revenue funding from public sources at the viable level. However, the company ended the year with a strong programme planned in all areas of activity, with a stable and increasingly confident staff team, and with sufficient goodwill from stakeholders to ensure that the 2002 event would be excellent in every dimension.

As stated in the Trustees report, the loan received from 'a' Foundation was being used to provide funding cover for the deficit. James Moores (director of the company and trustee of 'a' Foundation) provided a further loan of £155,000 to the company during the year. The total balance outstanding at the year-end was £787,506 (2001 £632,506). No interest is payable on the loan and although the loan is repayable upon demand, the 'a' Foundation have confirmed that it will only be recalled when it will not affect the ability of the company to continue as a going concern.

## **2002 - 2003**

### **Review of Financial Position**

The end of year accounts showed the company managing to balance the income and expenditure thanks to the continuing support of Afoundation. However, it continued to be in a weak position as a result of the Afoundation loan being carried. In addition, fundraising targets for the biennium set in the spring of 2001 (incorporated in the Business Plan agreed

in September 2001) from the corporate sector were shown to be over-optimistic in the light of nationally declining arts sponsorship, and the changed business environment following the events of 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001.

It was not possible, by the year-end, to secure the promise of future revenue funding from public sources at a viable level, although both Liverpool City Council and Arts Council England had indicated their intention to support the Biennial in this way. Subsequently, not thirteen set out the position of the post year end events. However, Afoundation had expressed its willingness to write off its loan to the Company once these bodies had signed an agreement for recurrent funding.

At the beginning of the review period, the marketing strategy was fully implemented organisationally, with the appointment and management of outside agencies (in relation to the art and news press – Catherine Braithwaite, political advocacy – Daniel Harris, and promotional campaign – Love Creative).

By June 2002, however, it had become seriously delayed by shortages of funds due to the lack of success with corporate fundraising. The subsequent application for funds from ERDF and other public sources although reasonably successful, came too late for a fully effective promotional campaign over the summer months. For lack of corporate support, close relations were developed with The Mersey Partnership and Northwest Development Agency, the bodies were responsible for tourism locally and regionally, and the Biennial was able to ally itself creatively with the Make it Merseyside and englandnorthwest campaigns.

The reward of these initiatives was the title of Event of the Year in the Mersey Tourism / Echo Tourism Awards (Feb 2003) and Liverpool's achievement in winning the title of European Capital of Culture 2008 (for which the judge's citation mentioned the Biennial specifically). In all, the profile and street presence of the event were greatly enhanced in comparison with the 1999 event, and the brand was in a strong position for extension.

### **Development / Fundraising**

The Business Plan of September 2001 asserted the strategic requirement to find public funding to replace the private patronage of the Afoundation, and much staff energy had been devoted to this over the months up to September 2001. Unfortunately, the push for corporate funds planned for that autumn coincided with the economic slide following 9 / 11. The review period therefore started with an extremely pessimistic outlook as far as corporate funding was concerned – and this remained the case at the end of the period, with a grand total of £5000 cash raised from corporate sources against an original target of £170,000. Other arts organisations and festivals in the North West had exactly the same experience (e.g. the Lowry and Commonwealth Film Festivals both failed to raise any Corporate funds).

However, the shortfall was eventually compensated in outline terms by exceeding public sector targets. The late arrival of these public funds (e.g. the ERDF Objective One funds were agreed only in July) was damaging to the programme, the period of eligibility was too short to enable the Biennial to run a full-scale promotional campaign. Funds were raised against specific activity that was not originally part of the Business Plan. The impulse to create capability through partnership and sponsorship in kind was therefore extremely strong, and there were several notable successes with regional promotional deals.

During this period, the Biennial was without a Trustee of the Board with wide experience of / links with the Corporate sector, and this lack of experience was acknowledged as harmful to the Company's ability to raise funds. Nevertheless, the Company ended the review year in an improved position in relation to future stakeholders to enable it to build funding to a level to match ambitions for the future. For this Festival year (2002) it is practical to split the funding into separate tables to clearly indicate the moneys received for the newly formatted Biennial Festival.

The Company started the review period with the Business Plan, agreed in September 2001, designed to see through the 2002 Biennial event. With the successful implementation of this plan, it became apparent that the over-riding needs to establish core revenue funding for the delivery of events in 2004, 2006 and into the future, required a longer term planning document that all the public stakeholders could agree on. The Arts Council provided the funds to engage a consultant, David Bournnell, to write this document between November 2002 and March 2003, when it was agreed by the Trustees and delivered to Liverpool City Council and the Arts Council (along with NWDA and the Cultural Consortium).

**Table 3.4: Foreign Grants Received 2002 - 2003**

	<b>Unrestricted</b>	<b>Restricted</b>	<b>Total 2003</b>	<b>Total 2002</b>
<b>Foreign grants received</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Australian Council	-	3,725	3,725	
Government of Canada	-	1,213	1,213	
Government of Quebec	-	500	500	
Goethe Institute	-	770	770	
Mondriaan Stichting	-	3,577	3,577	
Institut fuer Auslandbeziehungen	-	3,800	3,800	
Institut Francais	-	1,000	1,000	
Department of Arts, Sport, and Tourism	-	3,267	3,267	
Pro Heivetia Arts Council of Switzerland	-	1,784	1,784	
Mexican Embassy	-	4,653	4,653	
<b>Total</b>		<b>24,289</b>	<b>24,289</b>	

**Table 3.5: Public Sector Grants Received 2002 - 2003**

	<b>Unrestricted</b>	<b>Restricted</b>	<b>Total 2003</b>	<b>Total 2002</b>
<b>Public Sector grants received</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Liverpool Culture Company	25,000	8,000	33,000	
Arts Council England	20,000	20,000	40,000	
ACME	-	4,000	4,000	
Regional Arts Board	35,000	8,800	43,800	
North West Development Agency	-	355,000	355,000	
Liverpool City Council	-	110,000	110,000	
North West Arts Board	6,680	44,275	50,955	
Visiting Arts	-	9,450	9,450	
ERDF	-	47,313	47,313	
North West Cultural Consortium	-	5,000	5,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>86,680</b>	<b>611,838</b>	<b>698,518</b>	

**Table 3.6: Corporate Sponsorship and Funding Income 2002 - 2003**

	<b>Unrestricted</b>	<b>Restricted</b>	<b>Total 2003</b>	<b>Total 2002</b>
<b>Corporate Sponsorship</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Ethel Austin Properties Limited	5,000		5,000	
<b>Funding Income</b>				
NWDAF	-	1,500	1,500	
Henry Moore Foundation	-	15,366	15,366	
'A' Foundation	-	3,374	3,374	
Talk guides	-	122	122	
Tate Gallery	-	2,254	2,254	
Partner Recoveries	-	8,616	8,616	
New Contemporaries 2002	-	2,200	2,200	
International Foundation Manifesta	-	7,014	7,014	
Bluecoat Arts	-	1,254	1,254	
FACT	-	1,000	1,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>42,700</b>	<b>47,700</b>	

**Table 3.7: Trust Funds / Foundation Grants 2002 - 2003**

	<b>Unrestricted</b>	<b>Restricted</b>	<b>Total 2003</b>	<b>Total 2002</b>
<b>Trust funds/Foundation grants</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Granada Foundation	-	5,000	5,000	
The Elephant Trust	-	2,000	2,000	-
Henry Moore Foundation	-	68,500	68,500	-
Paul Hamlyn Foundation	-	5,000	5,000	-
P Holt Charitable Trust	-	5,000	5,000	-
'A' Foundation	-	5,000	5,000	-
Liverpool Housing Action Trust	-	26,330	26,330	-
Foundation for Sport and the Arts	-	10,000	10,000	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>126,830</b>	<b>126,830</b>	
<b>Combined Overall Total</b>	<b>91,680</b>	<b>805,657</b>	<b>897,337</b>	

### Stakeholders

The Liverpool visual arts community was wholly supportive of the 2002 Biennial event in principle and practice. The Biennials ability to add value to, and create audiences for, the ongoing programmes of the arts organisations was recognised and proven – and this was attractive equally to arts organisations outside the City, such as Henry Moore Foundation Contemporary Projects, a major contributor to the international. The event as a whole was a challenge and stimulation both to local organisations and to artists. Helped by the context of the City's bid to be nominated European Capital. Of Culture, some local politicians (who had been distanced from, or unaware of, the 1999 event) also became enthusiastic supporters, and those who witnessed the opening events, fully grasped the civic potential of the Biennial. The period coincided with the merging of the Arts Board to form Arts Council England, and thanks also to the work of the North West Development Agency and North West Culture Forum, the argument for the regional and national significance of the Biennial emerged forcibly.

### Business Plan

The Company started the review period with the Business Plan, agreed in September 2001, designed to see through the 2002 Biennial event. With the success implementation of this plan, it became apparent that the over-riding needs to establish core revenue funding for the delivery of events in 2004, 2006 and into the future, required a longer term planning document that all the public stakeholders could agree on.

James Moores, a director of the company, is also a Trustee of the 'a' Foundation which has provided a further loan of £312,494 to the company during the year. The total balance outstanding at the year-end is £1,100,000 (2002 - £787,506. No interest is payable on the loan and although the loan is repayable upon demand, the 'a' Foundation have confirmed that it will only be recalled when it will not affect the ability of the company to continue as a going concern.

The 'a' Foundation made donations to the company during the year totalling £6,374 (2002 – nil). Bryan Biggs, a director of the company, is also a director of Bluecoat Art Centre who supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £15,860 (2002 – £608). The total balance outstanding at the year-end is nil (2002 - £283).

Eddie Berg, a director of the company, is also a director of FACT who supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £34,985 (2002 - £759). The total balance outstanding at the year-end is £4,895 (2002 – nil).

The Arts Council of England have confirmed that they will provide funding for the charity over the next three years as follows:

- 2003/04 - £35,000
- 2004/05 - £254,434
- 2005/06 - £376.664

## **2003 – 2004**

As an interim year between Biennials 2002 and 2004, the focus of the Company's activities for the year was business and financial planning, negotiating longer term financial security with funders, staff restructuring, and research and development for the programme for 2004.

### **Development / Fundraising**

As a result of submitting the Business Plan, which made the case for revenue. Funding, to our key funders in January 2003, the work of the Development Manager was focused on establishing the revenue stream and then finding the considerable additional funds needed to fund the programme. The two revenue funders are Liverpool City Council and the Art Council England. Liverpool City Council confirmed revenue funding of £150,000 for 2003 / 4 financial year with the stated 'intention' of providing £2000,000 in 2004 / 5, paid quarterly throughout the period.

Due to the three year planning horizon at ACE, it was not possible for the Arts Council to provide revenue funding immediately (from April 2003). In Sept 2003, as a result of an application from ACENW. Arts Council England offered the Biennial £200,000 for the 03/04 financial year through its Stabilisation Fund. In addition, ACE: NW contributed £35,000 for the same year (final tranche of three-year funding from a Strategic Initiatives Fund agreed in 2001) with revenue funding (at a level rather below that requested in the Business Plan) to commence from April 2004.

Discussions with North West Development Agency held during the autumn of 2003 produced extremely positive feedback on potential funds available to support both the marketing and public art activity. An application for £200,000 support for Marketing was submitted and agreed in November 2003, and an application for £70,000 for public art was submitted January 2004. This latter was still under consideration when the news broke April 2004 that the NWDA was heavily overcommitted.

One of the intentions of the Business Plan had been to encourage revenue funders to agree a longer-term level of support (over five years, for instance) for better long term planning

for the Biennial as well as in regard to the European Capital of Culture year. This has failed in relation to The Mersey Partnership, EDRF and NWDA.

The Biennial team unfortunately wasted time as a result of the encouragement of The Mersey Partnership to include the Biennial within their Tourism bid to ERDF (September 2003). The TMP campaign was to be funded by ERDF up to 2008, with a contribution of £350,000 towards each Biennial (three in number). By November, TMP were asked to make a request on our behalf, and when submitted to Government Office North West our request for almost £1m over five years was considered too high a risk and we were advised to ask an agency such as TMP or LCC to submit on our behalf.

All approaches to international funding agencies and Embassies to allocate funds for the artists proposed for the International exhibition were made direct from the Biennial office. Due to the relative lack of experience in corporate sponsorship of the team, the decision was made in October 2003 to work with a consultant, John Regan, on this aspect of fundraising. John had previous experience with fundraising for Chester Zoo and has been able to introduce his existing successful contacts to the Biennial as a sponsorship offer. Generally speaking, such relationships blossom only in the long term, so the hope of a result for the 2004 Biennial is not great. In addition, the team has maintained contact with Arts and Business NW and are Business in the Arts North West for advice on packaging sponsorship proposals.

### **Financial Review**

The company continued to be in a weak position as a result of the 'a' Foundation loan. But, the 'a' Foundation had expressed its willingness to write off its loan to the company once these bodies have signed an agreement for recurring funding, and on 18 August 2004 the trustees of 'a' Foundation confirmed that they would forgo repayment of their loan, subject to certain alterations to the company's Memorandum of Association, and the Biennial looked forward to the long-term position in which the release of the loan would facilitate.

In May 2003 Arts Council England confirmed funding for the Biennial as a Revenue Funded Client 2003 – 6. For the financial year 203 / 4, the grant remained at the previously agreed project award of £35,000, but a further £200,000 from ACE's central stabilisation funds was confirmed in June 03. For 2004 / 5 the Arts Council has signalled its intention to provide £254,434 and in 2005 / 6 £376,664. Whilst this level of funding is below the request in the Business Plan, this significant increase in pledged resources from ACE, and the City Council's intention to provide £200 per annum, together represent security for the future of the Festival.

However, the funds for the bulk of the artistic programme still had to be raised from other sources – project funding from European, national and regional public sources, from overseas government and agencies, from Trusts and Foundations, and from Corporate funds – and that this represents a continuing challenge of some magnitude. There was a particular problem with the need to meet a Festival deadline as funds agreed by public funders on a project basis are always agreed too late for the deadline – nine months to a year being the 'normal' period of assessment for projects that may only be fully planned half a year in advance of the production moment.

**Table 3.8: Unrestricted and Restricted Grants 2003 - 2004**

	<b>Unrestricted</b>	<b>Restricted</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>
<b>Foreign grants received:</b>	£	£	£	£
Canadian High Commission		1,311	1,311	
Goethe Institution		810	810	
Sumeon Taideakat		2,672	2,672	
<b>Public sector grants received:</b>				
Arts Council England	235,000	15,050	250,050	
Liverpool City Council	150,000	-	150,000	
Creative Partnership		6,000	6,000	
<b>Other grants:</b>				
'A' Foundation	100,000		100,000	
Manifesta		4,923	4,923	
Arts & Business Ltd.		1,000	1,000	
English Heritage		3,000	3,000	
Lioba Reddeker Hotel	85		85	
ACE Internship grant		4,500	4,500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>485,085</b>	<b>39,266</b>	<b>524,351</b>	<b>897,337</b>

James Moores was a director of the company until his resignation on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2003 and was also a Trustee of the 'a' Foundation, which had provided a loan to the company. Jayne Casey, who was appointed as a director during the year, was also Chief Executive of the 'a' Foundation. The balance outstanding at the year-end was £1,100,000 (2003 - £1,100,000).

No interest was payable on the loan and although the loan was repayable upon demand, the 'a' Foundation confirmed that it would only be recalled when it would not affect the ability of the company to continue as a going concern. The trustees of the company were negotiating the release of the loan with the trustees of the 'a' Foundation.

The 'a' Foundation also made donations to the company in during the year totalling £100,000 (2003 - £8,374).

Bryan Biggs, a director of the company (also a director of Bluecoat Art Centre), supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £10,014 (2003 - £15,860). The total balance outstanding at the year-end was £2,750 (2003 – nil).

Eddie Berg, a director of the company (also a director of FACT), supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £12,468 (2003 - £34,985). The total outstanding balance at the year-end was £5,218 (2003 - £4,895).

## **2004 – 2005**

### **Review of Financial Position**

During the year, the £1,100,00 loan from the 'a' Foundation was released. This contributed towards total income for the year of £2,831,957. Expenditure for the year was £1,717,195,

resulting in a net income for the year of £1,114,762. As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £59,277.

### Reserves Policy

The first Biennial was held in 1999, the second in Autumn 2002 and the third in Autumn 2004. Significant costs were incurred in establishing these events which initially led to a substantial deficit on funds. During the year, the 'a' Foundation's loan was released - which contributed to a large surplus for the year of £1,114,762 and funds at the year-end of £59,277.

**Table 3.9: Unrestricted and Restricted Donations and Grants 2004 - 2005**

	Unrestricted	Restricted	2005	2004
	£	£	£	£
<b>Donations and gifts</b>				
'a' Foundation	1,100,000		1,100,000	
Yoko Ono		3,500	3,500	
In kind donations		19,532	19,532	
Foreign grants received		36,483	36,483	4,793
<b>Public Sector grants received</b>				
Arts Council England	254,434	24,400	278,834	250,050
Liverpool City Council	200,000		200,000	150,000
NWDA	23,144	676,856	700,000	
ERDF		130,000	130,000	
H18US		12,000	12,000	
Visiting Arts		10,000	10,000	
Community Foundation Company		5,000	5,000	
Liverpool Culture Company		4,000	4,000	
Creative Partnerships		3,000	3,000	6,000
<b>Other grants</b>				
'A' Foundation	100,000		100,000	100,000
The Foyle Foundation	50,000		50,000	
Henry Moores Foundation		30,000	30,000	
ACE Internship grant		12,500	12,500	4,500
Others		26,000	26,000	9,008
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,727,578</b>	<b>993,271</b>	<b>2,720,849</b>	<b>524,351</b>

Jayne Casey, a director of the company, was formerly the Chief Executive of the 'a' Foundation which had previously provided a loan of £1,100,000 to the company. During the year, the 'a' Foundation had agreed the release of the loan.

The 'a' Foundation also made donations to the company in during the year totalling £100,000 (2004 - £100,000).

Bryan Biggs, a director of the company (also a director of Bluecoat Art Centre), supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £5,670 (2004 - £10,014). The total balance outstanding at the year-end was nil (2004 - £2,750).

Eddie Berg, a director of the company (also a director of FACT) supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £14,374 (2004 - £12,468). The total outstanding balance at the year-end was nil (2004 - £5,218).

## 2005 - 2006

### Financial Review

Total income for the year was £718,713 (2005 £2,831,957). Expenditure for the year was £611,910 (2005 £1,717,195) resulting in a net income for the year of £106,803 (2005 £1,114,762). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £166,080 (2005 £59,277)

**Table 3.10: Unrestricted and Restricted Donations and Grants 2005 - 2006**

	<b>Unrestricted</b>	<b>Restricted</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Donations and gifts</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
'A' Foundation				1,100,000
Yoko Ono				3,500
In kind donations				19,532
Other donations	130		130	
<b>Foreign grants received</b>		5,950	5,950	36,483
<b>Public Sector grants received</b>				
Arts Council England	376,664	7,636	384,300	278,834
Liverpool City Council	200,000	1,000	201,000	200,000
NWDA		16,464	16,464	700,000
Liverpool Culture Company		32,250	32,250	4,000
ERDF				130,000
H18US				12,000
Visiting Arts				10,000
Community Foundation Merseyside				5,000
Creative Partnerships				3,000
<b>Other grants</b>				
Paul Hamlyn		653	653	
Elanor Rathbone		426	426	
Planning for Art in the Public Realm	1,200		1,200	
Manifesta	(13,000)		(13,000)	
ACE Internship grant	8,000		8,000	12,500
'A' Foundation				100,000
The Foyle Foundation				50,000
Henry Moores Foundation				30,000
ACE Internship grant				26,000
Others				
<b>Total</b>	<b>598,994</b>	<b>64,379</b>	<b>663,373</b>	<b>2,720,849</b>

### Related Parties

Bryan Biggs, a director of the company (also a director of Bluecoat Arts Centre), supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £5,400 (2005 £5,670). The total balance outstanding at the year-end was nil (2005 nil).

Eddie Berg, formerly a director of the company (also a director of FACT), supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £3,000 (2005 £14,374). The total balance outstanding at the year-end was nil (2005 nil).

### 2006 – 2007

#### Financial Review

Total income for the year was £3,148,147 (2006 £718,713). Expenditure for the year was £2,729,058 (2006 £611,910), resulting in net incoming resources for the year of £419,089 (2006 £106,803). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £585,169 (2006 £166,080).

**Table 3.11: Donations and Grants 2006 - 2007**

	2007	2006
<b>Donations and legacies</b>		
Donations and gifts	10,980	130
Grants receivable for core activities	2,864,762	704,002
<b>Grants receivable for core activities</b>		
Unrestricted funds:		
Liverpool City Council	291,000	200,000
Arts Council England	437,300	376,664
Public Art Funding	417,493	52,959
Corporate Funding	40,500	10,000
Restricted funds:		
Foreign grants	42,909	5,950
NWDA	683,536	16,464
Arts Council England	284,910	7,636
Liverpool City Company		1,000
Liverpool Culture Company	169,244	32,250
Henry Moore Foundation	30,000	
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation	45,000	
Northern Way	345,000	
Granada Foundation	12,000	
Housing Trusts	21,000	
Other grants	44,870	1,079
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,740,504</b>	<b>1,408,134</b>

Bryan Biggs, a director of the company (also a director of Bluecoat Arts Centre), supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £3,210 (2006 £5,400). The total balance outstanding at the year-end was nil (2006 nil).

## 2007 – 2008

### Financial Review

Total income for the year was £1,881,880 (2007 £3148,147). Expenditure for the year was £1,818,089 (2007 £2,729,058) resulting in net incoming resources for the year of £63,393 (2007 £419,089). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £648,562 (2007 £585,169).

As a 'non-Festival year' 2007 / 8 was largely devoted to planning, recruitment, and fundraising for the exceptional programme to be realised in the calendar year 2008, although there were notable aspects of the programme was also realised during 2007.

The Biennial was contracted by LCC to deliver the city's programme of public art for European Capital of Culture year. This consisted of three new series of commissions – Pavilions, Virals and Winter Lights, as well as a new, high profile 'big thing' specifically for 2008. Covering the whole of Liverpool, the 08 commissions were built throughout the year and culminated with the opening of the Biennial Festival in September 08, when they represented a kaleidoscope of high-quality visual art interventions across the cityscape.

On the resources side, a significant pointer to the future was represented by the appointment of a Biennial Officer to work within New Heartlands (the funding distributor for Housing Market Renewal in Merseyside – Sefton, Liverpool and Wirral); and secondly through gaining an agreement that Liverpool City Council would appoint a full time Public Art Officer to sit in the Planning Department (post started September 2008).

The short term financial outlook continued to be good, although there may have been challenges beyond the Biennium due to the worsening economic situation and the lower investment in culture due to the end of Liverpool's year as European Capital of Culture. The strength of Liverpool Biennial's finances has largely rested on the strength of its partnerships. These stem from the Biennial's reputation for delivering the best art experiences and using these to help partnerships meet their own aims. Therefore, the company has benefited from renewed and increased investment from the NWDA and Liverpool Vision and Liverpool City Council through Liverpool Culture Company. Culture Company funding had the biggest impact on finances and activity during the period as the company commenced delivery of a £1.2 million contract to commission public art for the city during 2008. The Culture Company also agreed a programme enhancement funding of £300,000 in relation to Liverpool Biennial during the Capital of Culture year.

Importantly, two major stakeholders made significant long-term commitments. The Gulbenkian Foundation agreed to fund the company for £100,000 per year for three years and Arts Council England: North West also made a three year regular funding commitment which increases by 50% over three years. The funds raised during the year totalled £1,881,080 and the Company ended the year with a net surplus of £63,393.

### Development / Fundraising

Organisationally, the Biennial had been successful in developing their capacity to deliver an increased level of year-round activity, and by the end of the review period had moved well into the delivery stages of the 2008 Capital of Culture public art programme.

In addition to the £1.2 million programme managed on behalf of Liverpool Culture Company which allowed the Biennial to earn income through management fees, they had been successful in attracting increased funding for their won core activities, including enhancement support towards the Festival from Liverpool Culture Company, two-year support from the Gulbenkian Foundation for their European commissions, an increase in the amount of international funding attracted, and support from ACE, New Heartlands, and the RSLs towards the HMRI post. The Biennial were particularly pleased with the confidence shown by ACE in the uplift in revenue funding from 2008, taking this as an endorsement of the quality of their programme, staff, and company structure / governance.

Securing corporate sponsorship required further effort and investment, although the Biennial still hoped to secure project support for 2008 and were in conversations regarding party sponsorship and in-kind support. The sponsorship market was competitive that year, but the Biennial had done a significant amount of work in developing their sponsorship offer and proposal documents, and they hoped that the work, as well as experience of the Festival offered during the 2008 Festival would help them in attracting headline sponsorship in 2010. Their aim for the year had been to focus on positioning themselves as a sponsorship asset within the business community, and to support this, they sponsored the Think!Sponsorship event at the Hackney Empire, which had an extremely positive effect on awareness and understanding of Biennial activity amongst the delegates, and also arrange for advertising and advertorial in the Art section of the Find!Sponsorship directory which is distributed to the top 1,500 sponsoring brands in the UK.

**Table 3.12: Donations and Grants 2007 - 2008**

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Donations and legacies</b>		
Donations and gifts	2,122	10,980
Grants receivable for core activities	1,702,694	2,864,762
<b>Grants receivable for core activities</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Unrestricted funds:		
Liverpool City Council	298,275	291,000
Arts Council England	400,000	437,300
Public Art Funding		417,000
Corporate Funding		40,500
Restricted funds:		
Foreign grants		42,909
NWDA / Liverpool Vision	206,163	683,536
Arts Council England	37,850	284,910
Liverpool Culture Company	604,906	169,244
Henry Moore Foundation		30,000
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation	100,000	45,000
Northern Way		345,000
Granada Foundation	7,500	12,000
Housing Trusts	9,00	21,000
New Heartlands	39,000	
Other grants		44,870
	<b>3,407,510</b>	<b>5,740,011</b>

Bryan Biggs, a director of the company (also a director of Bluecoat Arts Centre), supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £346 (2007 £3,210). The total balance outstanding at the year-end was nil (2007 nil).

### **Financial Review**

The Biennial was delighted that the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation had confirmed funding over the three years 2008 - 10 for a programme of 'Gulbenkian European Commissions' within the Festival. The Biennial's programme of fundraising over the year was very successful. As at 31<sup>st</sup> March 08, the Biennial had secured 89% of the budget for their enhanced 2008 Festival programme, which exceeded the total amount secured for the 2006 event by 5%. The Biennial also attracted a further £1.9m against additional activity outside of the Festival, including the 2008 public art programme for Liverpool Culture Company, and the City Centre Pavilion, supported by NWDA.

### **End of Year Accounts**

The end of year accounts shows the Company ending the financial year with a net positive movement of funds of £63,393. The company continued its operational reserve and had total funds to be carried forward to 2008 / 9 of £648,562. £259,191 of which were restricted funds and £300,000 of which were designated funds, leaving unrestricted funds to be carried forward to 2008 / 9 of £89,371.

Total income for the year was £1,881,880 and expenditure was £1,818,487, resulting in a net surplus for the year of £63,393. For 2008 the Arts Council would provide £400,000 and the City Council £298,275, providing increased ongoing security for the Company. However, funds for the bulk of the artistic programme still had to be raised from other sources – project funding from European, national and regional public sources, from overseas governments and agencies, from Trusts and Foundations, and from Corporate funds – and that this represented a continuing challenge of some magnitude.

## **2008 – 2009**

### **Financial Review**

Total income for the year was £3,345,572 (2008 £1,881,880). Expenditure for the year was £3,448,996 (2008 £1,818,487) resulting in net outgoing resources for the year of £103,424 (2008 incoming £63,393). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £545,138 (2008 £648,562).

The strength of the Biennials finances largely rested on their good relations with stakeholders. This in turn, due to the Biennials reputation for delivering the best art experiences and using these to help stakeholders meet their own agendas. For this year, they had been working with new stakeholders – New Heartland, and RSLs in the north of the city – and the Biennials success in delivering to their agendas and expectations would only be apparent in the coming year. The NWDA and Liverpool Vision continued to be their largest stakeholders, with very solid and important support from ACE; Liverpool City Council still contributed a relatively small portion considering that it is the City that benefitted most substantially from the investment made.

The funds raised during the year totalled £3,345,572 and the Company ended the year with a net deficit of £103,424. The overall financial picture for the two-year Biennial cycle 2007 / 08 – 2008 / 09 saw funds secured totalling £5,227,452 and a net deficit of £40,031.

### **Development / Fundraising**

Organisationally, the Biennial had been successful in developing their capacity to deliver an increased level of year-round activity, proven by the success of the 2008 programme. In addition to the £1.2m programme managed on behalf of Liverpool Culture Company, the Biennial were successful in attracting increased funding for their own core activities, including support towards the Festival from Liverpool Culture Company, two-year support from NWDA for the city centre pavilion and the Festival commissions, three-year support from the Gulbenkian Foundation for their European commissions, an increase in the amount of international funding attracted, and support from ACE, New Heartlands and the RSLs towards the HMRI post. The Biennial was particularly pleased with the confidence shown by ACE in the uplift in revenue funding from 2008, taking this as an endorsement of the quality of their programme, staff and company structure / governance.

Securing corporate sponsorship required further effort and investment, and the Biennial were disappointingly unable to achieve this in a major way for 2008, although there was some very welcome small scale support for the party and in-kind production costs. The sponsorship market remained highly competitive, and they have done a significant amount of work in developing their sponsorship offer and proposal documents. The Biennial have also now added a Corporate Sponsorship Assistant to their team, and they hoped that this, as well as the experience of 2008, would help them to attract headline sponsorship in 2010.

**Table 3.13: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2008 - 2009**

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Donations and legacies</b>	£	£
Donations and gifts	7,743	2,122
Grants receivable for core activities	3,278,229	1,702,694
<b>Grants receivable for core activities</b>		
Unrestricted funds:		
Liverpool City Council	325,032	298,275
Arts Council England	500,000	400,000
Public Art Funding	93,369	
Corporate Funding	12,471	
Restricted funds:		
Foreign grants	110,367	
NWDA / Liverpool Vision	190,040	206,163
Arts Council England	(11,034)	37,850
Liverpool Culture Company	1,050,050	604,906
Henry Moore Foundation	20,000	
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation		100,000
Granada Foundation	7,500	7,500
Housing Trusts	9,800	9,000
Liverpool Vision	843,837	
New Heartlands	81,697	39,000
Other grants	45,100	
	<b>6,586,269</b>	<b>3,407,510</b>

Bryan Biggs a director of the company, is also a director of Bluecoat Art Centre who supplied goods / services to the company during the year totalling £9,494 (2008 £346). The total balance outstanding at the year-end was £6,174 (2008 nil).

### Financial Review

#### Principle Funding Source

The principle funders of the company are Arts Council England, and Liverpool City Council (via Liverpool Culture Company in 2008), and the Biennial are grateful for their continued support of their work. The Northwest Regional Development Agency with Liverpool Vision provided invaluable investment in their public realm programme and promotional activity. The Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation agreed a three-year funding package over 2008 - 10 for a programme of 'Gulbenkian European Commissions' within the Festival.

The Biennial are grateful to a number of charitable trusts and foundations for project support, including the Henry Moore Foundation, as well as numerous international agencies and Embassies, with particular support from EU-Japan Fest in 2008, as well as continued support from the Australia Council.

### **Financial Outlook:**

The Biennial was aware that 2009 - 11 would be a challenging period in terms of securing funding and had increased internal resources for fundraising in response to this. Their income target for 09 - 11 was £4.28m, of which 55% was confirmed. The Biennial was pleased to have commitments in place for 2009 / 10 and 2010 / 11 for an increase in funding from Arts Council England, and standstill funding from Liverpool City Council. The Biennial was seeking to replace the 'enhancement' and project funding received from the City during 08 in order to continue to develop their core programme using 2008 as a catalyst for growth. The commitment from the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation for a programme of 'Gulbenkian European Commissions' in 2010 would provide valuable support, and they were hopeful of securing a significant proportion of their Festival programme and marketing budget from an application for NWDA and ERDF support, championed by Liverpool Vision (decision was due August 09). While the funding received in 2008 for 'additional' programme such as the 08 series of public art commissions is no longer available, new partnerships and projects were opening up other resources, such as New Heartlands and RSL support for the Canal Programme. The Biennial continued to invest in developing relationships with businesses with the aim of being well positioned to take advantage of future upturns in the economy.

### **End of Year Accounts**

The end of year accounts showed the Company ending the financial year with a net negative movement of funds of £103,424. Total income for the year was £3,345,572, and expenditure was £3,448,996.

With a surplus of £63,393 carried forward from 2007 / 09, which included restricted income for expenditure due to take place in 2008 / 09, the company had utilised an amount of its operational reserve totalling £40,031. The decision to use reserves in this way was unwelcome but taken advisedly and reflected the requirements that the company take every advantage possible from the opportunity provided by Liverpool's year as European Capital of Culture, knowing that this was not the moment to spoil the ship for a ha'pennyworth (or £40,000) of tar.

The company had the total funds carried forward to 2009 / 10 of £545,138, of which £300,000 were designated funds, £54,661 was restricted funds unspent as of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009, and £190,527 were free reserves.

For 2009 / 10 the Arts Council provided £550,000 and the City Council £305,732 providing increased ongoing security for the Company. However, funds for the bulk of the artistic programme still had to be raised from other sources – project funding from European, national and regional public sources, from overseas governments and agencies, from Trusts and Foundations, and from Corporate funds – and that this represented a continuing challenge of some magnitude.

Per Diems

Rates per day:

- The Operations Manager should be given one week notice for per diems

- Artists: £25 per day, receipt in the form of Per Diem Receipt form signed by the artist

June 07

- Staff when travelling abroad receive £30 per day, receipts need not be supplied. (in exceptional circumstances the Director may decide a higher per diem in advance)
- If staff are on Biennial business within the UK, they can claim per diem for overnight stays of £30 a day

## 2009 – 2010

### Financial Review

Total income for the year was £1,714,200 (2009 £3,345,572). Expenditure for the year was £1,649,214 (2009 £3,448,996) resulting in net incoming resources for the year of £64,986 (2009 net outgoing resources of £103,424). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £610,124 (2009 £545,138). The balance sheet shows the breakdown of funds held at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010, including £280,781 unrestricted funds.

**Table 3.14: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2009 - 2010**

	2010	2009
<b>Donations and legacies</b>	£	£
Donations and gifts	891	7,743
Grants receivable for core activities	1,632,189	3,278,229
<b>Grants receivable for core activities</b>		
Unrestricted funds:		
Liverpool City Council	305,732	325,032
Arts Council England	550,000	500,000
Public Art Funding		93,369
Corporate Funding		12,471
	855,732	930,872
Restricted funds:		
Foreign grants	45,803	110,367
NWDA / Liverpool Vision	308,994	190,040
Arts Council England		(11,034)
ERDF	83,994	
Liverpool Culture Company	20,000	1,050,050
Henry Moore Foundation		20,000
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation	75,000	
Paul Hamlyn Foundation	35,000	
Granada Foundation		7,500
Housing Trusts	17,769	9,800
Liverpool Vision		843,837
New Heartlands	114,998	81,697
Other grants	42,910	45,100
Find Your Talent	20,145	
Mersey Public Arts Strategy	11,844	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,121,001</b>	<b>7,517,141</b>

**2010 – 2011****Financial Review**

Total income for the year was £2,599,878 (2010 £1,714,200). Expenditure for the year was £2,412,558 (2010 £1,649,214) resulting in net incoming resources for the year of £187,320 (2010 £64,986). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £797,444 (2010 £610,124). The balance sheet shows the breakdown of funds held at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011, including £262,323 of unrestricted, non-designated funds.

The outturn for the year produced a surplus of £187,320, the majority of which was designated to support the next Biennial as income is greatly reduced. However, the economic situation remained unstable and income from public and private sources was certain to shrink. The medium term outlook presented considerable change, as the availability of funds was the biggest risk facing the organisation.

At the very end of the review period, ACE confirmed both their funding for the forthcoming year 2011 - 2012, and that they were to be given National Portfolio status, meaning that the volume of their national funding through 2013 - 2015 was set.

**Development / Fundraising**

The Biennial was successful in attracting the sufficient funding for core and new activities in 2010 - 2011 despite the difficult climate. The key factor in this was a history of excellent results, both artistically and in meeting partners objectives, and a strong brand. Significant difficulties were apparent in the market for private funding and earned income, but support through regeneration and civic partners remained significant investors in the Biennial's development activity.

The European Regional Development Fund and Northwest Regional Development Agency with Liverpool Vision supplied considerable, and very welcome, programme support. Investments from Arts Council England and Liverpool City Council continued to enable the Biennial to reach out across the arts world and through the city. Early indications towards the end of the year gave some hope that the new programme would open up new funding streams from private foundations. The available level of foreign government funding remained uncertain. For the short term, fundraising was on target and adequate to meet the organisations aims, although both operations and scale of the Biennials ambitions had to be scaled back considerably.

The Development Officer post created 2009 significantly increased the Biennials ability to manage relationships with businesses, and they produced their first dedicated sponsorship package in 2010, which helped attract both cash and in-kind support. A number of partners sustained their involvement and were keen to enhance their relationships. The Biennial targeted sponsors for the 2012 Festival with new package (updated spring 2011), with a significantly longer lead-time before the Festival during 2010 / 11 the Biennial. continued to seek and obtain support from private and international sources, thanks to excellent and sustained relationships, and regularly approached new trusts and foundations and EU funds, and maximised support from artist's galleries and explored co-commissions.

**Table 3.15: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2010 - 2011**

	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Donations and legacies</b>	£	£
Donations and gifts	3,738	891
Grants receivable for core activities	2,507,151	1,632,189
<b>Grants receivable for core activities</b>		
Unrestricted funds:		
Liverpool City Council	305,732	305,732
Arts Council England	596,503	550,000
NWDA	150,000	
	1,052,235	855,732
Restricted funds:		
Foreign grants	75,824	45,803
NWDA / Liverpool Vision	516,006	308,994
Esmee Fairbairn Foundation	30,000	
ERDF	516,006	83,994
Liverpool Culture Company		20,000
Henry Moore Foundation	10,000	
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation	125,000	75,000
Paul Hamlyn Foundation		35,000
Granada Foundation	15,000	
Housing Trusts		17,769
Forestry Commission	27,000	
New Heartlands	87,600	114,998
Other grants	47,303	42,910
Find Your Talent		20,145
Mersey Public Arts Strategy	5,177	11,844
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,070,275</b>	<b>4,121,001</b>

## Financial Review

### Financial Management and Reserves

Financial management policies were in place and reviewed regularly by the Sub-Committee of the Board. These policies included regulations for the authorisation limits for all transactions. The Biennial's policy is to hold sufficient funds to maintain liquidity, to cover short-term cash requirements, to provide continuity in the case of unexpected, temporary changes in trading conditions and to maintain a provision for anticipated unmet future needs due to development or changes in the operating environment. Normally, this means holding sufficient reserves to cover core operational costs for 6 months including any outstanding contracted expenditure.

At the end of the period, the Biennial held £262,323 in unrestricted charitable funds. This was sufficient to meet the target of six months' worth of operating costs in a non-biennial year. These figures made allowance for contracted programme delivery, but do not make further allowance for programme costs. There was an additional £525,000 held as designated funds. As part of the company's risk management process, the charity identified an ambition to increase available reserves in order to support future programme activity at times when funding is likely to be considerably more restricted.

### **Principle Funding Sources**

The Biennials principle funders are Arts Council England and Liverpool City Council. The European Regional Development fund and the Northwest Regional Development Agency with Liverpool Vision provided invaluable investment in the 2010 Festival programme and promotional activity. The Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation concluded their three-year investment in a programme of 'Gulbenkian European Commissions' within the Biennial exhibition, and the Biennial would not have been able to undertake its activities without this investment.

The Biennial was grateful to a number of charitable trusts and foundations for project support, most particularly the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, Paul Hamlyn Foundation and Granada Foundation for their support towards their 'ON the Street' project, while their partnership with New Heartlands until October 2010 delivered activity within the neighbourhood HMR areas through the 'Art for Places' initiative.

A wide range of foreign governments. Trusts and foundations as well as commercial galleries contributed to the Biennial, and together with the Regional Development Agency and European funding, their grants make up a considerable proportion of the resources required for the International Exhibition.

### **Financial Outlook**

The year 2010 - 11 was challenging in terms of securing funding despite having increased internal resources for fundraising. The Biennials income target for the 2012 biennium was £2.24 million. The Biennial had commitments in place for 2011 - 2015 for regular funding from Arts Council England and for 2011 from Liverpool City Council, which together form the backbone of Liverpool Biennial's resources and enable us to lever in many times their input in other funding.

The Biennial planned to significantly reduce their revenue in the near to midterm as they knew that reductions in funding against the previous biennium would be approximately 40%, and project funding would also become more difficult to obtain. This would affect the scale and scope of the company and its activities for some time.

### **End of Year Accounts**

The end of year accounts showed the Company (at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011) with a net positive movement of funds of £ 187,320. The total income for the year was £2,599,878, and expenditure was £2,412,558. The normal pattern of budgeting over a two-year cycle meant that the company's planned forecast income and expenditure to account for the expected activity over the two years, especially concerning the Festival. In the biennium ended March 2011, income totalled £4,314,078 and expenditure £4,061,772 which produced a surplus over the biennium of £252,306.

The company had total funds to be carried forward to 2011 / 12 of £797,444 of which £525,000 were designated funds, £10,121 were restricted funds unspent as of 31 March 2011, and £262,323 as free reserves. For 2011 / 12 the Arts Council would provide £555,344 and the City Council £275,158, providing a solid foundation for the Company's

operations. However, funds for the bulk of the artistic programme were to be raised from other sources – project funding from European, national, and regional public sources, from commercial galleries, from overseas governments and agencies, from Trusts and Foundations, and from Corporate funds – represented a continuing challenge.

## **2011 – 2012**

### **Financial Review**

Total income for the year was £1,288,364 (2011 £2,599,878). Expenditure for the year was £844,064 (2011 £2,412,558) resulting in net incoming resources for the year of £444,400 (2011 £187,320). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £1,241,744 (2011 £797,444) of which £519,532 were designated funds, £112,813 were restricted funds unspent as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012, and £609,399. Were free reserves, much of which was planned to be expended in the charity's normal activities in the following financial year as part of the normal Biennial cycle.

Financial performance was closely in line with planned outcomes and the critical fundraising and expenditure targets for the year were achieved. However, reduced income had a number of effects, resulting in reduced marketing budgets and staffing levels. The management team worked through most of the period at 80% of their contracts. These changes were undertaken to preserve their ability to present high quality programme and make it widely available.

The financial year was characterised by being the first year of the biennial cycle and marked by continued uncertainty and adjustment by funders and supporters. In accordance with the Biennial's financial planning, financial activity focused on generating resources that would be expended in financial year 2012 / 12. The operating surplus of £444,300 would be fully expended in the next financial year. The overall financial picture for the two-year Biennial cycle 2011 - 12 forecasted funds secured totalling £2,519,438 and expenditure of £2,572,430 for a deficit of £52,992. This deficit was met through funds designated to support Liverpool Biennial 2012.

The end of European Regional Development Funds and the regional development agency meant a significant reduction in the amount of funding available to the company. This had an immediate effect on planning and expenditure and resulted in reductions to staff, marketing and programme budget. Artistic programme was prioritised and cuts to programme expenditure was minimised as much as possible.

The Biennial continued to receive revenue support through Arts Council England and Liverpool City Council. In common with all Regularly Funded Organisations, the funding from Arts Council England was cut by 6.9% to £555,844. Liverpool City Council also implemented a uniform reduction for its Cultural Drivers and reduced its revenue support by 10%. Further reductions in coming years were also anticipated, and the impact of inflation further reduced the financial capacity of the company.

The funding from the Housing Action Trust represented monies received by the charity number of years ago which were used to support match funding projects all of which have now been completed and the outputs satisfactorily achieved. On completion of these projects, the trustees believe it is now appropriate to release these monies into this year's accounts.

**Table 3.16: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2011 - 2012**

	<b>2012</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>Donations and legacies</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Donations and gifts		3,738
Grants receivable for core activities	1,161,217	2,507,151
<b>Grants receivable for core activities</b>		
Unrestricted funds:		
LCC Culture Liverpool ACIP Grant	275,158	305,732
Arts Council England	553,844	596,503
NWDA		150,000
Housing Action Trust	111,060	
	940,062	1,052,235
Restricted funds:		
Foreign grants	16,281	75,824
NWDA / Liverpool Vision		516,006
Esmee Fairbairn Foundation	40,000	30,000
ERDF		516,006
Henry Moore Foundation		10,000
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation		125,000
Granada Foundation		15,000
Forestry Commission		27,000
New Heartlands		87,600
Other grants	32,340	47,303
Mersey Public Arts Strategy		5,177
Liverpool Primary Care Trust	40,000	
Australia Council for the Arts	22,534	
Arts Council England Grants for the Arts	50,000	
Liverpool Vision	20,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,262,496</b>	<b>6,070,275</b>

The following designated funds had been approved:

- £300,000 to support the quantity and quality of the marketing and programme for Liverpool Biennial 2012 and 2014
- £69,532 to provide match funding for the continuation of Liverpool Biennial's public realm works or fund their decommissioning
- £150,000 to establish initiatives that will make step changes in the sustainability and resilience of Liverpool Biennial

## 2012 – 2013

### Financial Review

Total income for the year was £1,288,364 (2011 £2,599,878). Expenditure for the year was £844,064 (2011 £2,412,558) resulting in net incoming resources for the year of £444,400 (2011 £187,320). As a result, funds held at the year-end totalled £1,241,744 (2011 £797,444) (of which £519,532 were designated funds, £122,813 were restricted funds)

unspent as at 31 March 2012, and £609,399 were free reserves, much of which was planned to be expended in the charity's normal activities in the following financial year as part of the normal Biennial cycle.

Financial performance was closely in line with planned outcomes and the critical fundraising and expenditure targets for the year were achieved. However, reduced income had a number of effects, resulting in reduced marketing budgets and staffing levels. The management team worked through most of the period at 80% of their contracts. These changes were undertaken to preserve their ability to present a high quality programme and make it widely available.

The financial year was characterised by being the first year of the biennial cycle and marked by continued uncertainty and adjustment by funders and supporters. In accordance with the Biennial's financial planning, financial activity. Focused on generating resources that would be expended in the financial year 2012 / 13. The operating surplus of £444,300 was fully expended in the next financial year. The overall financial picture for the two-year Biennial cycle 2011 - 2012 forecasted funds secured totalling £2,519,438 and expenditure of £2,572,430, for a deficit of £52,992. This deficit was met through funds designated to support Liverpool Biennial 2012.

The end of European Regional Development Fund and the regional development agency meant that there was a significant reduction in the amount of funding that was available to the Biennial. This had an immediate effect on planning and expenditure and resulted in a reduction of staff, marketing and programme budgets, and the artistic programme had to be prioritised and cuts to the programme expenditure had been minimised as much as possible.

The Biennial continued to receive revenue support through Arts Council England and Liverpool City Council. In common with all Regularly Funded Organisations, the Biennials funding from Arts Council England was cut by 6.9% to £555,844. Liverpool City Council also implemented a uniform reduction for its Cultural Drivers and reduced its revenue support by 10%. Further reductions in coming years were also anticipated, and the impact of inflation would further reduce the financial capacity of the company.

To compensate for reductions in principle sources of income, staff concentrated on diversifying income streams, maximising the benefit of partnerships, and providing high quality artistic programme which, though it is part of a cohesive Liverpool Biennial, is delivered by other organisations that are driven by the value they can derive from exhibiting in Liverpool Biennial 2012.

### **Reserves Policy**

The Biennial holds sufficient funds to maintain liquidity, cover unforeseen short-term cash requirements; provide continuity in the case of unexpected, temporary changes in trading conditions, and maintain a provision for anticipated unmet future needs due to development of changes in the operating environment. The trustees consider that it is appropriate to maintain free reserves at a level that can cover six months running costs plus an amount for any outstanding contracted expenditure. This is after having designated sufficient funds to help support the anticipated unfunded costs of the next two Biennials.

### **Designated Funds**

The Trustees have committed to certain levels of expenditure within the next two to three years, but the timing and exact amount of these expenditures will respond to conditions and opportunities. Therefore, the board designates funds to meet the needs of the company up to and beyond the current planning framework. This allows the charity to provide for future programmes, the requirements of existing public realm work and ensuring Liverpool Biennial.

The following designating funds were approved:

- £300,000 to support the quantity and quality of the marketing and programme for Liverpool Biennial 2012 and 2014
- £69,532 to provide match funding for the continuation of Liverpool Biennial public realm works or fund their decommissioning
- £150,000 to establish initiatives that would make step changes in the sustainability and resilience of Liverpool Biennial

The funding from the Housing Action Trust represented monies received by the charity number of years ago which were used to support match funding projects - all of which have now been completed and the outputs satisfactorily achieved. On completion of these projects, the trustees believe it is now appropriate to release these monies into this year's accounts.

**Table 3.17: Donations and Unrestricted / Restricted Grants 2012 - 2013**

	<b>2013</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Donations and legacies</b>	£	£
Donations and gifts	46,445	
Grants receivable for core activities	1,207,979	1,161,217
<b>Grants receivable for core activities</b>		
Unrestricted funds:		
LCC Culture Liverpool ACIP Grant	267,147	275,158
Arts Council England	655,344	553,844
Housing Action Trust		111,060
	922,491	940,062
Restricted funds:		
Foreign grants	78,334	16,281
Esmee Fairbairn Foundation	40,000	40,000
Granada Foundation	10,000	
Other grants		32,340
Liverpool Primary. Care Trust		40,000
Australia Council for the Arts	19,624	22,534
Arts Council England Grants for the Arts	50,000	50,000
Liverpool Vision	10,000	20,000
Kamel Lazaar Foundation	5,000	
LUMA Foundation	16,059	
Harpo Foundation	5,441	
Rayne Foundation	15,000	
Mondriaan Foundation	6,000	
Annenburg Foundation	30,030	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,384,894</b>	<b>3,262,496</b>

### Artistic Values

The Biennial has always had an integrated programme of public programmes and learning to continue to broaden the audience profile. To be accessible to the widest possible audience, the exhibitions remain free across the venues, with limited exceptions where events require a minimum ticket price. Much of the Biennial work is placed in the public realm, minimising barriers to participation and bringing the best international artists into contact with people from every background. As part of this, its public realm programme aims to:

- Engage with a high calibre of artists to make exemplary commissions that help reinforce Liverpool's reputation as a leading city for the visual arts in the UK
- Commission site specific work that is integrated and responsive to the city
- Work in partnership with a wide range of local organisations and people in order to engage with local expertise, widen access to high quality art and help embed art into the locality
- Commission both temporary works that help draw people to the Biennial, and temporary and permanent works that help create better public realm for residents and visitors alike
- Achieve sufficient and sustainable funding to deliver the vision

## Learning and Inclusion

The Biennial generates opportunities for active participation in the arts process as they believed it was vital to address and engage the city, and its communities as much as the world of international art. ‘International +’ was the name given to the Biennial’s Learning and Inclusion programme (previously the Education and Access programme), showing that it was an integral part of the organisation as a result of 2002 evaluation. Participants were given the opportunity to discover and express their own creativity, as well as the creativity of others. The programme was closely linked to the International exhibition, by presenting a fertile environment for conversations and collaborations between the artists and local community groups, school pupils and students. The Learning and Inclusion programme facilitated thirty-one different projects and engaged approximately 1500 participants.

The visitor programme was aimed at developing new audiences for the Biennial Festival and contemporary art, by linking the art in the International to other topics. These activities attracted special interest groups who would not usually attend arts events, by delivering talks and tours in diverse subjects in unusual venues to appeal to broader audiences. These included ballroom dancing in the Adelphi hotel to UFO sightings. Ten talks were conducted by artists and related specialists, with tours being held every Saturday of the Festival. Each tour was led by a different guide, and focused on themes such as architecture, film and local history. During the first month of the Festival, ten community groups were given supported visits to the city, each group was provided with their own guide, transport and refreshment. These groups were chosen based upon known barriers to accessing contemporary art, as a follow up to one of the series of talks, or because the exhibition had particular relevance to their community. This is the focus of Chapter Four, where I will discuss the validity of social inclusion projects and describe the Learning and Inclusion projects that the Biennial has provided across Festivals.

## 2Up2Down

The project received a capital grant of £54,000 from a highly competitive and high-profile grants programme: The Empty Property Community Grants, applied through the Department for Communities and Local Government. Metabolic Studio, through the Annenberg Foundation, an American philanthropic trust, invested significantly in the development of the bakery as an enterprise, offering financial yeast to the raw ingredients and allowing the transformation of the bakery as a community-owned co-operative from beautiful idea to functioning business, through a co-produced development process.

‘Homebaked’ was an ambitious project that attracted national, and international media attention. In an age when there is very little money and even less trust in the old models of regeneration, it is being visited by a growing number of agencies and community groups keen to learn from what is going on. Homebaked is beginning to influence the regeneration debate in many different areas and is increasingly being cited as a potential way forward. The author and housing commentator Lynsey Hanley described the project as a ‘model for local rebuilding in the wake of failed regeneration projects.’<sup>10</sup> The project has attracted much attention from housing associations, Liverpool’s Plus Dane Group have used it as a model project and have brought groups such as MerseyCare to the bakery to find out more about its method of community engagement.

<sup>10</sup> [www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/aug/13/solve-the-housing-crisis](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/aug/13/solve-the-housing-crisis)

The project has been presented at many housing, community and co-operative conferences, workshops, and events locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, including the National CLT Conference and Chair - Co-op International Conference on Community Housing. It is widely discussed and disseminated by both Jeanne van Heeswijk and Liverpool Biennial team in contemporary and cultural context, with significant impact on profile. *2Up2Down* encourages people of all ages to acquire urban design, architecture, and construction skills as well as the capacity to develop social enterprises of their own, including baking. The number of residents getting involved continues to grow throughout the years and gain an understanding of the housing regeneration process in their neighbourhood whilst acquiring skills and confidence in playing an active role.

### **European Capital of Culture**

The ECoC jurors cited the Biennial as being an important factor in Liverpool's favour (proof that it could deliver an international Festival). Domela explains 'in relation to the Biennial? Well, it's difficult to prize apart now as there was Capital of Culture and the Biennial was very instrumental in, or if not, key to getting that title to begin with as the jury came in 2002 to like really liked the engagement of the Biennial that really brought engagement of artists across the city. But also attracted the audience to other elements of the Biennial and it sort of became a blueprint for how they would imagine that year to be (2008).'

The city centre lost around half its population between 1971 and 1991 but it grew from 10,000 in 1991 to 15,000 in 2005. Liverpool has reduced the exodus of students leaving the city and has reinvented itself through improved housing and a new, bold infrastructure to attract cultural start-up businesses and a thriving cultural sector, retailers and corporate offices that has drawn visitors and residents back into the city. An evaluation as a cultural signifier, indicated that 2,167,626 people visited a Liverpool museum or gallery between April 2007 and March 2008, a rise in 28% over the previous year. Liverpool's year as Capital of Culture saw 15 million visits to the city's arts venues and events, a rise of 30% on 2007<sup>11</sup>. The Liverpool Capital of Culture programme secured a total income of £130 million over six years - the highest for any European Capital of Culture. The Liverpool Culture Company, the umbrella group for the city's culture programme, reported an £800m boost to the region's economy.

In a year that saw both the Turner and Stirling prizes head north, Tate Liverpool and Merseyside Maritime museum attracted more than one million visitors for the first time - a combined increase of 65% on 2007. Liverpool Biennial, François Delarozière's twenty-tonne mechanical spider, and exhibitions on Gustav Klimt and Le Corbusier all helped attract a further 5.2m visitors to the city, in a programme of events involving over 10,000 artists in hundreds of venues.

Councillor Warren Bradley, leader of Liverpool city council, said: 'The experience of being European capital of culture has reshaped Liverpool - the way it looks, thinks and acts. Seventy percent of people in the city visited a museum or gallery in 2008, against a UK

---

<sup>11</sup>The House of Commons (December 2008) National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside Annual Report and Accounts 2007-2008. The Stationery Office, London

average of 59%.' José Manuel Barroso, president of European Commission, said the year had turned out to be 'one of the most successful capital of culture programmes that we have ever had' and congratulated the city on delivering a diverse programme of film, music, theatre and art.

Liverpool City Council made a commitment to ECoC legacy by maintaining current funding levels for the arts for the next two years, worth £8.2m. With major infrastructure developments worth a further £200m - including a new museum of Liverpool life and design academy at John Moore University which became the John Lennon Liverpool School of Art and Design situated below the Metropolitan Cathedral. Unfortunately, all legacies expire and due to a restriction in funding, cultural organisations that were created for 2008 closed. Even so, Liverpool has continued to develop itself as a cultural city and continues to host events and the Liverpool Biennial to date.

Impacts 08 led by Dr Beatriz Garcia was a five-year research programme that analysed the social, economic and cultural impact of the 2008 title and found that the Festival year saw 9.7m visitors to the city, an increase of 34%, and generated £753.8m for the economy. Media coverage of Liverpool's cultural attractions doubled and for the first time in decades, positive stories outweighed negative ones that had predominately focused on social issues.

The success can be seen in the change in the perceptions of the city, as 85% of Liverpool residents agreed that it was a better place to live than before. The report noted a 10% rise each year in arts audiences across Liverpool, and increased levels of interest in museums and galleries. Visitor numbers at the seven largest attractions peaked at 5.5 million in 2008. Throughout that year, visitor numbers increased by 34%. Of the visitors surveyed, 99% said they liked the general atmosphere and 97% felt welcome. This is the positive outcome of culture and a culturally rich city. It boosts the economy through tourism, and the cultural tourism.

Garcia (2009) states that studies of the impacts of major cultural festivals mostly take the form of event evaluations carried out for organisers or funding bodies, which seem to function primarily as evidence of the positive economic value of the events. The most common approach in these studies is the analysis of visitor expenditure data in order to determine the direct, indirect and induced contribution of the event to the local or regional economy. Data is typically collected from a variety of sources, including visitor surveys, box office data, and stakeholder interviews. (pp.3-4)

Garcia (2009) explains the main research gap noted in report recommendations is the lack of attention for long-term impacts. A number of studies, particularly those of an academic nature, have noted the inappropriateness of the traditional focus on short-term economic impact research. While the majority of studies, especially those carried out as commissioned work, still involve primarily ex-post assessments of impacts, some of the studies considered here do stretch over a number of years, typically starting some time before the event and ending sometime after its ending, which suggests that this issue is progressively being addressed.

Despite the frequent reference to gaps in the available literature, the heightened visibility and ever-increasing interest in hosting cultural events, be it on a large, medium or small scale, is having an effect on the range and quality of research approaches. Since 2000, studies are diversifying and longitudinal research, as well as multi-dimensional

methodologies – beyond the economic sphere – are becoming more common and expanding beyond the academic environment. This situation calls for a follow-up literature review on this still young but quickly expanding subject matter for impact research so that we can ascertain the improvement and diversity of available literature in this area. (pp.9-10)

## Liverpool Biennial Expenses Tables

### Principle Funding Sources of the Liverpool Biennial

#### Funds Reserves Policy

Liverpool Biennial holds sufficient funds to maintain liquidity: cover unforeseen short-term cash requirements; provide continuity in the case of unexpected, temporary changes in trading conditions; and maintain a provision for anticipated unmet. Future needs due to development of changes in the operating environment. Normally, this means holding sufficient reserves to cover operational costs for six months including any outstanding contracted expenditure. In calculating the reserves figure, trustees have excluded restricted income, fixed assets and designated funds.

Unrestricted funds to income received or generated for the objects of the charity without further specified purpose. Income and expenditure are allocated to the general fund in accordance with the policies set out. Unexpended funds are carried forward to future periods. The charity has committed certain funds to support its planned transformation activities, programme and the viability of the Festival.

Restricted funds relate to all income received where the donor has specified its use. Related expenditure is also allocated to restricted funds. Due to the Biennial cycle, a surplus may be carried forward from the first year of the cycle to the second in order to fund activity in a Festival year. These funds are separate from the reserves and are planned and managed appropriately.

**Table 3.18: Total Unrestricted and Restrictive Funds Raised 1999 - 2013**

	<b>Total Unrestricted</b>	<b>Total Restricted</b>	<b>Total</b>
1999			
2000	558,768		<b>558,768</b>
2001	4,575		<b>558,768</b>
2002	272,421		
2003	113,546	805,657	<b>919,203</b>
2004	493,761	39,184	<b>532,945</b>
2005	1,805,336	1,026,621	<b>2,831,957</b>
2006	654,334	64,379	<b>718,713</b>
2007	1,469,678	1,678,469	<b>3,148,147</b>
2008	877,461	1,004,419	<b>1,881,880</b>
2009	998,215	2,347,357	<b>3,345,572</b>
2010	937,743	776,457	<b>1,714,200</b>
2011	1,114,962	1,454,916	<b>2,599,878</b>
2012	940,062	221,155	<b>1,161,217</b>
2013	1,080,607	285,488	<b>1,366,095</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,321,469</b>	<b>9,704,102</b>	<b>21,025,571</b>

**Table 3.19: Total Unrestricted and Restricted Resources Expended 1999 - 2013**

	Total Unrestricted £	Total Restricted £	Total £
1999			
2000	922,572		<b>1,064,867</b>
2001	134,373		<b>134,373</b>
2002	463,057		<b>463,057</b>
2003	360,416	807,110	<b>1,167,526</b>
2004	480,490	41,885	<b>522,375</b>
2005	690,574	1,026,621	<b>1,717,195</b>
2006	547,531	64,379	<b>611,910</b>
2007	1,050,589	1,678,469	<b>2,729,058</b>
2008	1,042,923	745,228	<b>1,788,151</b>
2009	897,059	2,551,937	<b>3,448,996</b>
2010	847,489	801,725	<b>1,649,214</b>
2011	938,420	1,474,138	<b>2,412,558</b>
2012	725,601	118,463	<b>844,064</b>
2013	1,534,652	378,818	<b>1,913,470</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,575,728</b>	<b>9,688,773</b>	<b>20,466,814</b>

**Table 3.20: Public Arts / Commissions**

Commissions – Production and installation of public art works and community engagement activities.

Date		Balance at 1 April	Public Realm Works
1999			
2000			
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008	100,000		
2009	54,611		
2010		54,611	
2011	531,785	29,343	
2012	79,823	10,121	75,000
2013		62,638	69,532
<b>Total</b>	<b>766,219</b>	<b>156,713</b>	<b>144,532</b>

**Table 3.21: Unrestricted / Restricted Artist Fees 1999 - 2013**

Date	Unrestricted Funds £	Restricted Funds £
1999		
2000	152,340	
2001	469	
2002	10,395	
2003		135,216
2004	78,383	4,184
2005	113,850	592,882
2006	56,582	5,314
2007	80,520	1,153,950
2008	270,534	492,801
2009	180,198	1,044,764
2010	151,834	397,385
2011	97,099	531,785
2012	12,676	
2013	101,313	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,384,576</b>	<b>4,358,281</b>

**Table 3.22: Unrestricted / Restricted International Festival Costs 1999 - 2013**

International / Biennial Show – artists fees, travel, production, and installation expenses for the International exhibition artworks.

Date	Unrestricted Funds £	Restricted Funds £
1999		
2000		
2001		
2002		
2003		
2004	3,450	
2005	16,126	36,483
2006	14,289	4,667
2007	114,616	
2008		
2009		730,931
2010	2,060	86,933
2011		472,539
2012	124,983/119,515*	
2013	376,806	103,998
<b>Total</b>	<b>652,330/646,862</b>	<b>1,435,551</b>

\*Discrepancy with the total stated in the 2013 and 2012 Biennial accounts submitted to Company House

**Table 3.23: Unrestricted / Restricted Education Costs 1999 - 2013**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Unrestricted Funds £</b>	<b>Restricted Funds £</b>
1999		
2000	14,737	
2001		
2002	20,308	
2003		106,026
2004	22,262	20,951
2005	41,291	59,400
2006	2,673	17,174
2007	218,369	145,414
2008	2,262	85,334
2009		149,533
2010	13,550	42,553
2011		49,919
2012		16,802
2013		67,624
<b>Total</b>	<b>335,452</b>	<b>760,710</b>

**Table 3.24: Unrestricted / Restricted Marketing Costs 1999 - 2013**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Unrestricted Funds £</b>	<b>Restricted Funds £</b>
1999		
2000	188,816	
2001	7,089	
2002	99,122	
2003	47,224	97,230
2004	47,292	3,828
2005	34,536	325,356
2006	20,336	9,005
2007	72,146	302,649
2008	48,169	50,000
2009	75,770	224,832
2010	88,381	85,406
2011	165,001	301,592
2012	52,100	1,058
2013	304,077	25,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,250,059</b>	<b>1,426,756</b>

**Table 3.25: Travel Expenses 1999 - 2013**

	£
1999	
2000	10,381
2001	90
2002	14,480
2003	35,119
2004	7,312
2005	13,735
2006	21,110
2007	9,465
2008	22,750
2009	20,678
2010	16,469
2011	11,693
2012	7,767
2013	10,878
<b>Total</b>	<b>201,927</b>

**Appendix Four:  
Liverpool Biennial Festivals**

**Overview: Liverpool Biennial 1999****TRACE 1999**

The curator Anthony Bond explained that the theme *TRACE* suggested materials or objects that allowed people to reconstruct histories through our personal memories and associations, creating an exhibition full of tangible experiences:

*'Many of the artworks are highly sensual, using sound, smell and touch as well as vision. Art that employs the concept of TRACE encourages every experience of the work to be personal, thereby ensuring constant renewal of its meaning with every encounter. Many of the artists involved in the exhibition reveal specific histories and views of the everyday through their installations. Others look inward, examining the nature of consciousness, memory, loss and desire. In each case the viewer is invited to enjoy the diversity of approach while also discovering the common threads that make up TRACE.'*

**The International Exhibition: TRACE**

*TRACE* was a thematic exhibition bringing sixty-one international artists from twenty-four countries worldwide to realize their work in Liverpool. Liverpool's geographical location as a port, and its social, economic and political histories in relation to the rest of the world made it an ideal starting point from which to explore the theme of the trace in contemporary art. Given this context, the exhibition was ideally positioned to investigate the opportunities as well as the dilemmas of international cultural exchange.

**John Moores 21**

The UK's biggest national open exhibition for contemporary painters, selected by a jury of experts, came of age in 1999 and formed a central attraction for the Liverpool Biennial. Founded in 1957 by Sir John Moores of Littlewoods Pools fame, the exhibition is held every two years with a consistent track record for spotting rising talent.

**New Contemporaries 99**

New Contemporaries 99 was the annual exhibition of contemporary art by students and recent graduates from fine art colleges throughout the UK. Offering the first platform to the newly-emerging artist, the exhibition was chosen from 1100 entries and features 33 of the most promising artists working in a diverse range of media ranging from a specially scaled up etch-a-sketch painting to works based on misprinted fabric found in a football strip factory.

**TRACEY**

Local, national and international artists with initiative, blooming with radical visions and thought, showed their work in found spaces in and amongst the architectural splendours of the city and beyond.

**THE BOARD AND STAFF OF THE 1ST LIVERPOOL BIENNIAL  
BOARD MEMBERS OF THE LIVERPOOL BIENNIAL****DIRECTORS**

Lewis Biggs - Director Tate Liverpool Gallery  
Bryan Biggs - Director Bluecoat Arts Centre  
James Moores - Trustee AFOUNDATION  
Jayne Casey - PR Director Cream  
Paul Senior - Partnership Secretary Bermans Solicitors  
James Ross - Chairman Littlewoods Organisation  
James Warnock - Management Consultant  
Mark Sykes - Director Merseyside Regional Ambulance Service

**OBSERVERS**

Bernadette Turne - Councillor Liverpool City Council  
Keith Davies - Head of Tourism, Arts and Heritage Services, Liverpool City Council  
Howard Rifkin - Director Visual & Media Arts North West Arts Board  
Bev Bytheway - Administrator, Newcontemporaries '99  
Jonathan Swain - Co-ordinator, Tracey  
Julian Treuherz - Keeper of Galleries, NMGM

**STAFF OF THE LIVERPOOL BIENNIAL 1999**

Elizabeth-Anne Williams - General Manager  
Anthony Bond - Curator  
Cindy Hubert - Venues Manager  
Gillian Miller - Development Manager  
Emma Thomas - Education Co-ordinator  
Malcolm Duffin - Marketing Co-ordinator  
Sophie Forbat - Curatorial Assistant  
Alan McCracken – Finance / Administration Officer  
Clare Danek - Office Administrator  
Holly Welsh - Marketing Assistant  
Karen Jackson - Research and Administration Assistant

**Audience Figures****The International Exhibition: Trace**

Excluding external sites, for which no data is available, the maximum number of visits to the 1999 Biennial was around 190,000. This figure includes everyone who entered the venues containing Biennial exhibits and may, therefore, include some who did not actually see Biennial work.

The table below (from the 1999 Evaluation report) breaks down this 190,000 figure into individual sites.

**Table 4.1: 1999 Biennial Festival Audience Figures**

Site	Visits in 1999
TRACE:	
Exchange Flags	9,375
Tate (free)	77,000
Tate (paid)	7,485
Senate Building, Liverpool University	6,000
Bluecoat Arts Centre	8,788
Open Eye Gallery	3,080
The Oratory	575
The Central Library	400
John Moores 21, Walker Art Gallery	19,000
New Contemporaries, Exchange Flags	7,500
Tracey	7,020
Educational Sites:	
The Blackie	1,720
Liverpool FC Museum and Visitor Centre	7,511
Maritime Museum	32,000
St George's Hall Launch Party	1,300
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>188,754</b>

Includes VIP launch

To 7 Nov, exhibition continued to 21 Nov

88,475 in Tate as a whole

Estimate

Estimate to 7 Nov

Total of 27,648 for total run

From 24 Sept to 9 Jan 2000

*Nb: excludes public sites, billboards, shopping centres, the Anglican Cathedral*

## 2002

### **Overview: Liverpool Biennial 2002**

Liverpool Biennial 2002 is the unique combination of four major exhibitions and an exciting programme of events. Starting from the extraordinary energy of Liverpool's contemporary visual arts, International 2002 explores art from many countries in dialogue with the city itself. The Independent presents new initiatives while the established John Moores 22 focuses on the vitality of a single medium. The work of young and emerging artists is presented in Bloomberg New Contemporaries 2002.

### **International 2002**

International 2002 explored the city as a cultural context, proposing a model for connection between art of internationally recognised quality and a particular place and context. Around 80% of the artworks was commissioned or completed especially for the exhibition. The curators invite the viewer – as they have the artists – into a dialogue with Liverpool. The themes in the International 2002 concerned the interplay between passion and desire on the one hand, and frustration of the mechanisms of control on the other. *Control* – the will to dominate our social or material environment – is a necessary fact of life for every person, but perhaps more evident in a city in which many people have to struggle for material necessities. The realities of natural and artificial environments, of political and social institutions, of mischief and fantasy all frustrate the impulse to organise our surroundings in order to satisfy our desires.

### **John Moores 22**

The John Moores exhibition of contemporary painting is the UK's most prestigious painting competition, showcasing some of the finest British-based artists. Organised by National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, and supported by the John Moores Exhibition Trust, John Moores 22 was displayed in the newly refurbished galleries at the Walker – national gallery of the North.

### **Bloomberg New Contemporaries 2002**

Bloomberg New Contemporaries 2002 was launched at the independent artist-run space, STATIC. New Contemporaries is the annual exhibition of work by students and recent graduates from fine art colleges throughout the UK. First established in 1949, New Contemporaries is recognised for supporting new work and generating critical debate in the visual arts and for providing valuable support for artists at the start of their professional career. By its very nature, the exhibition is always fresh, lively and experimental.

### **The Independent**

The Independent 2002 was a collection of twenty-two exhibition and eleven projects that was generated by 400 artists, architects, filmmakers and other practitioners under one general heading and umbrella organisations. The format allowed for multiple curatorial strategies across the city in a wide range of exhibition spaces and sites including disused buildings and car parks. This added significantly to the vibrancy of the Liverpool Biennial as an event. Not only because of the sheer quantity of exhibitions / artists but because the open format allowed for a range of practices produced outside of the hegemony of contemporary art discourse, leading to interesting observations around questions of quality and professionalism.

**LIVERPOOL BIENNIAL 2002 PERSONNEL**  
**LIVERPOOL BIENNIAL BOARD**

Eddie Berg  
Bryan Biggs  
Walter Brown  
Bev Bytheway  
Kate Cowie  
Mac Gibson  
Declan McGonagle (Chair)  
James Moores  
Julian Treuherz  
James Warnock (Deputy Chair)  
Observers to the Board  
Jayne Casey  
Cllr Beatrice Fraenkel  
Andrea Hawkins  
Paul Kurthausen  
Sally Mediy  
Cllr Bernadette Turner  
Hoi Yeung

**LIVERPOOL BIENNIAL STAFF LIST**

Lewis Biggs - Chief Executive  
Catharine Braithwaite - Press Consultant  
Clare Danek - Administrative Co-ordinator  
Paul Domela - Deputy Chief Executive  
Judith Harry - Development Co-ordinator  
Ngozi Ikoku - Arts Council of England Fellow  
Alan McCracken - Finance Officer (until April 2002)  
Sharon Paulger - Education and Access Co-ordinator  
Cathy Skelly - Communications Co-ordinator  
Richard Wilson - Finance Officer

**Table 4.2: Biennial Festival Audience Figures 2002**

Sites	Visits	Merseyside	Other NW	UK	Overseas
		(35%)	(40%)	(18%)	(7%)
<b>International:</b>					
Tate (free)	77,000	27,000	30,800	23,000	9,000
Tate (paid)	7,500	2,600	3,00	1,300	500
FACT	25,000	8,750	10,000	4,500	1,750
Liverpool Museum	60,000	21,000	24,000	14,400	5,600
Bluecoat Arts Centre	8,800	3,100	3,500	1,600	600
Maritime Museum	32,000	11,200	12,800	5,700	2,200
Open Eye Gallery	3,000	1,000	1,200	550	200
Pleasant Street School	500	175	200	90	35
John Moores, Walker Art Gallery	19,000	6,650	7,600	3,420	1,330
Newcontemporaries (6 wks.)	7,500	2,625	3,000	1,350	525
<b>Independents:</b>					
Jump Ship Raft	500	175	200	90	35
Parking Space	500	175	200	90	35
Basement	500	175	200	90	35
<b>Educational sites:</b>					
The Blackie	1,700	1,700			
The Door	1,000	1,000			
<b>Launch Party</b>	1,300	500			
<b>Totals</b>	<b>245,800</b>	<b>94,800</b>	<b>104,000</b>	<b>56,400</b>	<b>22,000</b>

*Figures for the Live Art Programme and the conference programme are not available. The externally sited work and public spaces such as the Pavilions have not been included in this analysis*

## 2004

### Overview: Liverpool Biennial 2004

The third Liverpool Biennial Festival, the UK's international Festival of contemporary art launched on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2004 and ran until 28<sup>th</sup> November. The character and culture of Liverpool continued to lie at the heart of the Biennial, which is delivered collaboratively with city venues and organisations. Energy and creativity met in the programme consisting of four key strands. The character and culture of Liverpool continued to lie at the heart of the Biennial, which was delivered in association with the city's major visual arts organisations Tate Liverpool, The Walker, Bluecoat Art Centre and the Foundation for Art and Creative Technology (FACT), as well as smaller galleries and some surprising alternative spaces. Energy and creativity defined the Biennial's programme through the four key strands of International 04, John Moores 23, Bloomberg New Contemporaries 2004 and Independents 04.

Researchers Sabine Breitweiser (Vienna), Yu Yeon Kim (New York), Cuahtémoc Medina (Mexico City) and Apinan Poshyananda (Bangkok), selected artists whose practice has an affinity for the culture of Liverpool.

Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Ltd is supported by its principal sponsors: Afoundation, Arts Council England, Liverpool City Council, and the Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWDA).

Lewis Biggs, Chief Executive of Liverpool Biennial said:

'Liverpool Biennial gives an adrenalin boost to the bloodstream of the city, one dose every two years. This year the Biennial has built on the successes of the past two events, to bring to Liverpool the very best in contemporary art from across the world. Liverpool residents and visitors can enjoy art within and beyond the museum walls and can even become part of the UK's largest visual art event.'

### International 04

International 04 was the critical focus of the Biennial, unique among the world's biennials; Liverpool Biennial specifically commissioned 100% of the artworks shown in International 04 giving visitors a unique experience of Liverpool. The commissioning process emphasised research of the city by inviting leading artists from around the world to explore the city as a context for the show, and then developed their works through dynamic relationships with the organisations and communities in which they were set.

### John Moores 23

Over 1900 painters entered John Moores competition, a show that celebrates the vitality of contemporary British painting. John Moores 23 is the UK's most prestigious and longest-running national open painting competition. Organised by National Museums Liverpool and supported by the John Moores Exhibition Trust, the exhibition has been hosted by The Walker since 1957. Celebrating the vitality of contemporary British painting, it is open to artists living and working in the UK and in 2004 offers a first prize of £25,000 that was announced during the opening of Liverpool Biennial. The five judges were Ann Bukantas, the Walker's curator of fine art; Jarvis Cocker, musician and collector of contemporary art; Gill Hedley, director of the Contemporary Art Society; Callum Innes artist and former John Moores prize-winner; Gavin Turk, artist.

**Bloomberg New Contemporaries 2004**

Selected from UK art schools and graduating fine art students, New Contemporaries provides an opportunity to see the fresh creative talent of emerging artists in a show that is always stimulating, vibrant and dynamic. Established in 1949, New Contemporaries is recognised for supporting new work and generating critical debate in the visual arts and for supporting artists at the start of their professional careers the exhibition was launched at Liverpool Biennial and was selected by curator Kate Bush and artists Dinos Chapman, Tacita Dean and Brian Griffiths.

**The Independents**

Independents 04 was a series of exhibitions generated by artists, architects, filmmakers and other practitioners. The multiple exhibitions offered a city-wide counterpoint to the International 04. Lively, intriguing and playful, independent artists and curators presented a rich diversity of shows across the city – it took place in a variety of venues, ranging from existing galleries, on the streets, in shop windows, to temporary spaces in disused buildings and renovated buildings, there was even a whole Independent District in downtown Liverpool Established. Independents presented emerging British, UK regional and international artists that showed works which surprised engaged and challenged.... It provided an opportunity for the region's artists to exhibit their own work and to present art from the UK and abroad. The Independents was Initiated by the Afoundation and consisted of independent artists and curators.

**LIVERPOOL BIENNIAL BOARD**

Eddie Berg  
 Bryan Biggs  
 Walter Brown  
 Bev Bytheway  
 Jane Casey  
 Kate Cowie (until June 2004)  
 Roger Coddard  
 Alison Jones  
 Jude Kelly  
 Francis McEntegart  
 Declan McGonagle (Chair)  
 Alistair Sunderland  
 Julian Treuherz (until February 2003)  
 James Warnock (Vice-Chair)  
 Jane Wentworth

**OBSERVERS**

Cllr Beatrice Fraenkel Andrea Hawkins  
 Paul Kurthausen

**STAFF**

Lewis Biggs - Chief Executive  
 Sorcha Carey - International Exhibition Assistant  
 Mark Daniels - International Exhibition Coordinator  
 Paul Domela - Deputy Chief Executive  
 Sarah Jane Dooley - Development Assistant  
 Judith Harry- Development and Marketing Manager  
 Nadja Kuenstner - Marketing Assistant  
 Sharon Paulger - Programme Coordinator: Learning and Inclusion  
 Raj Sandhu - Projects Assistant  
 Richard Wilson - Finance Officer  
 Lorna Woods Moses-Administration Manager

**CONSULTANTS**

Catherine Braithwaite - press consultant  
 Daniel Harris Associates - public relations  
 John Regan - corporate relations  
 TM3 - website developers  
 Love Creative - brand and campaign creative designers  
 Unit Communications - media buyers  
 Alan Ward — International 04 catalogue, leaflet and graphics

**INTERNS**

Sue Algelsreiter, Lisa Baker, Amanda Barwise, Andrew Bullock, Louise Clennell, Martyn Coppel, Somali Datta, Wayne Dawber, Rachel Eade, Marie Noelle Farcy, Tamzin Forster, Linzi Harries, Sean Hawkrige, Annie Houston, Clare Hunter, Matthew James, Sally Lupton, Paul Luckcraft, John O'Hare, Clare Parker, Melanie Peck, Regina Peldszus, Renae Pickering, Anna Rowland, Sam Skinner, Elpiniki Vavritsa, Stella WingYan Fong

**EXTERNAL PROJECT MANAGERS**

Cecilia Andersson  
Donna Berry  
Sara Black  
Joanne Cook  
Paul Kelly  
Cressida Kocienski  
Andrea Lansley  
Rebecca Reid  
Catherine Sadler

**LEARNING AND INCLUSION PROGRAMME**

Liverpool Community College- Wally Brown, Tracy Brown  
Knowsley Arts Services- Charlotte Corrie, Sarah Craven, Jo Dry, Sarah Haythornthwaite  
Gill Curry, Wirral LEA- Andrea St John  
St Benedict's College- Carol Dockwray  
Campion Catholic High School- Kay Wilkin, Liverpool LEA Philip Wroe  
Sefton Council- Karen Gallagher  
Merseyside Dance Initiative- John McDonald, David Ward  
Windows Project- Julia Midgeley  
Liverpool School of Art and Design- UMU Roger Appleton, Broadside Films

### 2004 Economic Impact

- The total economic impact of the event on the local area was £10,928,330 based on
  - 350,000 visitors attending the Biennial
  - 28% being residents of Liverpool
  - 58% being day visitors
  - 14% being staying visitors
  - An average spend per trip of £107.43 for staying visitors, £22.24 for day visitors and £11.73 for resident visitors

£1,748,533 of this spend was generated by Biennial marketing and promotional activities.

- The total estimated spend generated by the Biennial from outside of Merseyside was £8,997,783 based on:
  - 206,500 visitors attending. The Biennial from outside Merseyside
  - 77% being day visitors
  - 23% being staying visitors
  - An average spend per trip for non-Merseyside visitors of £107.76 for staying visitors and £24.40 for day visitors
- £1,439,645 of this spend was generated by the Biennial marketing and promotional activities (TMP 2005a, p.8)

### 2004 Biennial Demographic Impact

- The Biennial attracted some 350,000 visitors from all over the world. 41% of respondents were from Merseyside (which equated to 144,550 people), while 64% were from the Northwest of England (225,050 visitors). Visitors from the rest of the UK accounted for 23% of visitors to the Biennial (81,900 visitors). 4% of respondents were from overseas, which equated to 14,700 visitors. 8% of visitors (which equated to 28,350 people) refused to disclose details of their hometown
- Visitors from outside the Northwest were most likely to come from Yorkshire (7% of respondents) or Staffordshire (4% of respondents). The greatest numbers of overseas visitors were from the Republic of Ireland, closely followed by the USA and Australia. As interviewers were not bilingual it was not possible to interview non-English speakers, who were not represented in the results
- The 2004 exhibitions attracted a large proportion of young people (aged 16-24) and people from the higher social grades. These respondents were particularly keen on less traditional, more risky artworks
- 14% of respondents said that they were staying in the local area. The remaining respondents were either day visitors or Liverpool residents. Two-thirds (67%) of staying visitors were from the UK, while 33% were from overseas
- Just over a fifth of staying visitors (22%) were staying one night, while 70% were on a short break of three nights or less. Staying visitors were most likely to be staying with a friend or relative (48%), almost a third were staying in a licensed hotel (32%) and 13% were staying in a youth hostel. 74% of staying visitors were staying in the

city, while 24% were staying in other parts of Merseyside. The remaining 2% of respondents were staying in Cheshire

- Over a third of respondents (36%) claimed to have specialist knowledge of visual art, while almost half said they had a general knowledge. Only 17% said they had little or no knowledge of visual art. Almost half of all respondents said that they had a professional or academic involvement in the visual arts
- 22% of respondents go to a lot of art exhibitions and prefer experimental contemporary work, while a slightly lower proportion (16%) prefer more traditional art by well-known artists. Only 13% of respondents said that they did not regularly attend art exhibitions. 84% of respondents said they felt confident in art galleries, 13% occasionally lack confidence while only 2% were generally not confident in art galleries
- The majority of respondents (71%) said that they were prepared to take risks with less well-known work where they did not know what to expect. Only 12% of respondents said that they liked to have a clear idea of what to expect from an exhibition and only saw work that came highly recommended
- The response to the Biennial was generally very positive, with the majority of respondents strongly agreeing that it attracted visitors to the city, it is an exciting event for Liverpool and that it was something the city should be proud of. A very high proportion of visitors (90%) strongly agreed that the Biennial offered a chance for new artists to show their work. A slightly lower proportion (82%) strongly agreed that the Biennial develops new audiences for contemporary art in Liverpool
- Respondents had a very high awareness of the John Moores 23 exhibition, with 60% of respondents having heard of it. Almost a third of respondents said that they had heard of International 04 and Bloomberg New Contemporaries. Least awareness was shown of the Independents 04 exhibition
- The Walker, the Open Eye Gallery and Tate Liverpool were the most popular exhibition venues, with each having been visited by over a third of respondents. The Bluecoat Art Gallery was also a popular venue, visited by 31% of respondents. These venues were also those that the highest proportion of respondents said that they intended to visit
- Respondents generally felt that the exhibitions at International 04 and Independents 04 were much as they had anticipated. Over 40% of respondents felt that the John Moores 23 exhibition at the Walker was 'much better than expected,' while a similar proportion felt that the Bloomberg New Contemporaries exhibition at the Coach Shed was 'better than expected'
- The John Moores 23 exhibition at the Walker received the highest mean score. Of the International 04 exhibitions, FACT received the highest mean score while the Yoko Ono city centre banners received the lowest. Of the Independents 04 exhibitions, the Kiff on Parr Street received the highest mean score while the Static Gallery received the lowest
- Just over a quarter of respondents were influenced to visit as a result of school, college, or university, reflecting the high proportion of students and young people attending the Biennial. word of mouth recommendation was the next biggest influence on visits, followed by impulse visit. With regard to promotional material,

the Biennial guide, newspapers and posters/banners had the biggest influence on visits

- Over two thirds of respondents were on their first visit to the Biennial while 12% of respondents were regular visitors, having also visited the Biennial in 1999 and 2002. Visitors who had attended the Biennial in 1999, 2002 and 2004 were older than the average visitor, were less likely to be students and were more likely to be travelling alone. The majority of frequent Biennial attendees were from Merseyside and were most likely to have been influenced to visit by word of mouth recommendation, a previous visit or the Biennial guide
- The majority of respondents did very little planning in advance of their visit. 29% of respondents had only just decided to visit the Biennial that day, while a further 38% of respondents had only made the decision a couple of days before the visit. Just over a fifth of respondents planned the visit a couple of weeks in advance
- Respondents had very high satisfaction levels with most aspects of the Biennial. the highest number of respondents gave value for money the highest rating of 'very good,' while signposting and event publicity and promotion received the lowest ratings. Value for money and overall enjoyment received the highest mean scores, while event publicity and promotion and signposting received the lowest
- Respondents were asked what they liked most about their visit to the Biennial. the highest number of respondents chose specific paintings or works by a particular artist. A slightly smaller number said that they liked the paintings and work in general. 8% of respondents appreciated the variety and diversity of the exhibitions
- Respondents were also asked what they liked least about the Biennial. 30 respondents (3%) said that Yoko Ono's posters were what they liked least (compared to six respondents who said that was what they liked best, particularly the controversy surrounding them). Other respondents commented on the poor quality of the art. Other than the artwork, the most common complaints were regarding how difficult it was to follow the map in the guidebook (TMP 2005a, pp.6-8)

#### **Attitudes to Visual Art and the Biennial**

- Almost half of all respondents said that they had a professional or academic involvement in the visual arts. A third (33%) of visitors describing themselves as having a general knowledge of visual art described themselves as having a professional or academic involvement in the visual arts
- 22% of all respondents said that they go to a lot of art exhibitions and prefer experimental contemporary work, while a slightly lower proportion (16%) said that they preferred more traditional art by well-known artists
- Only 13% of respondents said that they did not regularly attend art exhibitions, and that their interest in the Biennial was part of a wider interest in popular culture. This result was consistent with research carried out by TEAM profiling visual arts visitors on Merseyside, which found that only 11% of visitors had not visited a visual arts venue within the last twelve months. These results suggested that the

Biennial is not attracting high numbers of general interest visitors or appealing to new audiences, but is mainly attracting an existing specialist market

- The majority of respondents (71%) said that they were prepared to take risks with less well-known work where they did not know what to expect. Only 12% of respondents said that they liked to have a clear idea of what to expect from an exhibition and only saw work that came highly recommended. Younger people from the higher social grades are significantly more likely to be risk-takers. Older respondents and those lower down the social grades were much more likely to stay with art they considered familiar
- The vast majority of respondents (84%) said that they felt confident in art galleries, reflecting the high number of visitors who either have an academic / professional interest in visual art or who were regular visitors to art galleries. 13% of respondents said they occasionally lacked confidence while only 2% said that they rarely, if ever, felt confident in art galleries (ENWRS 2005a, p.15)
- The response to the Biennial was generally very positive, with the majority of respondents strongly agreeing that it attracted visitors to the city, it was an exciting event for Liverpool and that it was something the city should be proud of. A very high proportion of visitors 90% strongly agreed that the Biennial offered a chance for new artists to show their work. A slightly lower proportion (82%) strongly agreed that the Biennial developed new audiences for contemporary art in Liverpool
- Only 11% of respondents did not agree that visual art played an important role in their life (mostly higher social grades), reflecting the high proportion of respondents who said that they had at least a general knowledge of visual art

## 2006

### Overview: Liverpool Biennial 2006

#### International 06

International 06 was organised collaboratively by curators at Tate Liverpool, Bluecoat, FACT, Open Eye Gallery and Liverpool Biennial, advised by two consultant curators, Manray Hsu and Gerardo Mosquera. Gerardo focused on the idea of ‘reverse colonialism,’ a returning flow of ideas and energies into the city. Manray imagined the city as a body suffering both from long neglect and from the suddenness of its regeneration, and he sees art as a form of acupuncture, or ‘archipuncture,’ with the potential to heal or at least be a palliative. He also recognised the way that cities across the world – including this one – are linked visually by a form of ‘hypertextuality.’ Gerardo’s and Manray’s ideas are further expanded in the catalogue.

Lewis Biggs

*Chief Executive, Liverpool Biennial*

#### John Moores 24

The 24th John Moores exhibition of contemporary painting arrived at the Walker Art Gallery, bringing with it numerous painterly themes, from cats to the cosmos, memory to Mondrian. With a £25,000 first prize, four further prizes of £2,500 and the media spotlights shining brightly on the winning paintings, the competition, open to UK-based painters, attracted 2,300 entries, the largest number in forty-three years.

#### New Contemporaries

The annual review of new work by artists emerging from UK art schools. The exhibition was selected from a national submission, open to all final year undergraduates of Fine Art at UK colleges and to artists who graduated in the previous year.

Liverpool Biennial provides ‘umbrella’ strategic co-ordination to several organisations and exhibition programmes that make up the Festival. As a charitable organisation, Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art Ltd is responsible for the organisation and financing of three core areas of the Festival:

**The International:** the showpiece exhibition and the critical focus of the event. It aims to be an internationally acclaimed exhibition showing significant new works by international artists commissioned specially for the City of Liverpool.

**A Learning and Inclusion Programme:** that delivers Liverpool Biennial’s educational objectives. The approach is project based with three broadly defined audience groups: communities, formal education and visitors.

**The Communications Programme:** that promotes the Liverpool Biennial brand through an umbrella campaign, integrating marketing and public relations. The strategy is informed by the partner organisations delivering the exhibitions and by the regional organisations involved in the promotion of culture.

## 2006 Economic Impact

- Liverpool Biennial 2006 attracted around 359,532 visits to Liverpool. The 359,532 visits to Liverpool resulted in 400,370 visits to Biennial exhibits. The Festival directly generated 194,147 visits. A further 165,385 visits were made to Biennial exhibits whilst visitors were in Liverpool for other reasons
- Visitors to the Biennial spent an estimated £13,563,006 during their time in Liverpool, this is around 24% above the estimated spend at the 2004 Festival £10,928,330. This estimate was based upon:
  - 359,532 visits to the city and 400,370 visits to Biennial exhibitions
  - 40% being Liverpool residents
  - 43% being day visitors
  - 17% being staying visitors
  - an average spend of £134 per staying visit, £21.74 per day visit and £13.99 per visit by Liverpool residents
- The total estimated spend directly generated by the Biennial is £7,478,184. This estimate was based on:
  - 194,147 visitors in Liverpool for the Biennial spending an average of £36.38 per visit
  - 165,385 visitors in Liverpool for other reasons spending £2.51 per person on visiting museums and galleries
- The amount spent per person per trip by staying visitors on food and drink and accommodation has risen sharply in comparison to the data from the 2004 Festival. Overall spend per staying visit had not risen from £107.43 to £134.00, which represented an increase of around 25% (ENWRS 2007a, p.6)

## 2006 Biennial Demographic Impact

- 68% of respondents were residents of the Northwest. Half of all respondents were residents of Merseyside. 13% of respondents were from other areas scattered around the UK and 1% were from overseas. Visitors were interviewed from Chile, Denmark, Ireland, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the USA. The remaining 18% of respondents refused to give details of their home address
- In comparison to 2004, the 2006 Festival attracted more staying visitors (17%, compared to 14% at the previous Festival). As in 2004, 70% of staying visits were short breaks lasting 1 to 3 nights. 30% of staying visits were holidays lasting a minimum of 4 nights. The proportion of staying visits lasting just one night has risen from 22% in 2004 to 27% in 2006
- 41.5% of residents considered themselves to be residents of Liverpool. The same proportion considered themselves day visitors to the city
- Almost one third of respondents (31%) said that they visit the city once each year or less
- 60% of respondents said the 2006 Biennial was the first that they had attended

- The profile of visitors in 2006 were very close to that identified in 2004 in terms of age, gender, social grade, employment status and visiting party structure. 52% of the respondents were female, 48% were male. Around half of respondents were in employment (49%), while 37% were students. The most common visiting party consisted of friends (36%), while 31% were visiting alone
- As with 2004, the exhibition attracted a large proportion of young people (aged 16-24) and people from the higher social grades. These respondents were particularly keen on less traditional, more risky artworks
- The majority of respondents (78%) said that they were prepared to take risks with less well-known work where they did not know what to expect. Only 8% of respondents said that they liked to have a clear idea of what to expect from an exhibition and only saw work that came highly recommended
- 10% of respondents were just passing (compared to 14% in 2004) therefore a large proportion (90%) of respondents had decided to come to Liverpool to see the Biennial
- When asked about their knowledge of visual art, almost half of respondents (47%) claimed to have specialist knowledge, 38% claimed to have a general knowledge and 15% described themselves as having 'little or no knowledge.' The proportions claiming specialist and general knowledge have almost reversed since 2004 when 36% of respondents claimed to have specialist knowledge and 47% general knowledge

### **Audience Profile**

- 60% of respondents said the 2006 Biennial was the first that they had attended
- The profile of visitors in 2006 was very close to that identified in 2004 in terms of age, gender, social grade, employment status and visiting party structure. 52% of the respondents were female, 48% were male. Around half of respondents were in employment (49%), while 37% were students. The most common visiting party consisted of friends (36%), while 31% were visiting alone
- As with 2004, the exhibition attracted a large proportion of young people (aged 16-24) and people from the higher social grades. These respondents were particularly keen on less traditional, more risky artworks
- The majority of respondents (78%) said that they were prepared to take risks with less well-known work where they did not know what to expect. Only 8% of respondent said that they liked to have a clear idea of what to expect from an exhibition and only saw work that came highly recommended
- 10% of respondents were just passing (compared to 14% in 2004) therefore a larger proportion (90%) of respondents had decided to come to Liverpool to see the Biennial
- When asked about their knowledge of visual art, almost half of respondents (47%) claimed to have specialist knowledge. 38% claimed to have a general knowledge and 15% described themselves as having 'little or no knowledge.' The proportion claiming specialist and general knowledge have almost reversed since 2004 when

36% of respondents claimed to have specialist knowledge and 47% general knowledge

### Visitor Experience

- Respondents indicated very high levels of satisfaction with regard to value for money at the Biennial. respondents also gave average satisfaction ratings of more than 4 out of 5 for overall enjoyment, event organisations and staff, suitability of the venues, event quality and facilities provided. Respondents gave lower satisfaction ratings for the event publicity and promotion (3.53 out of 5) and signposting (3.26 out of 5)
- The response to the Biennial was generally very positive. The majority of respondents (85%) strongly agree that it attracted visitors to the city, it was an exciting event for Liverpool (83%) and that it was something the city should be proud of (86%). A very high proportion of visitors (86%) strongly agreed that the Biennial offered a chance for new artists to show their work. A slightly lower proportion (78%) strongly agreed that the Biennial developed new audiences for contemporary art in Liverpool
- Respondents felt that some of the less established exhibitions including the Open Eye Gallery, Fusebox and the Coach Shed were better than in 2004 whilst the more prominent FACT, Tate Liverpool and The Walker received lower satisfaction scores than in 2004. St Luke's Church and FACT received the highest average satisfaction ratings overall. The least appreciated exhibits were Hans Peter Kuhn's question mark and the Priscilla Monge's football pitch
- A large proportion of the respondents (88%) felt that the exhibition they were at had inspired them to visit more of the Biennial
- The most visited exhibitions were the Walker, Ken Lum's pavilion, Priscilla Monge's football pitch, Hans Peter Kuhn's question mark and FACT, collectively these exhibitions received an estimated 246,331 visits. Fusebox, Biennial Centre, the Open Eye Gallery and Out of the Bluecoat were the least visited though access to the latter began two weeks after the Biennial started and was then restricted to just two days each week
- Respondents were asked what they liked most about their visit to the Biennial. Popular responses were the artworks generally, the contrast, and variety of pieces, John Moores 24, FACT (despite liking it less than in 2004) and St George's Plateau
- Respondents were asked what they liked least about their visit to the Biennial. respondents complained that they struggled to find the exhibitions because of poor maps, guides and signage. For previous Festivals, the entire marketing process was managed by the Biennial office, however in 2006, the Independents sector produced their own map and publicity material. This may have impacted on the responses received. Respondents also found the Tate exhibition disappointing and felt some of the pieces could have benefited from more interpretation

**Marketing and Communication**

- One third of visitors said that the biggest influence on their decision to visit the Biennial was word of mouth. Advertisements in newspapers and magazines influenced 16% of visits. The Biennial Guide influenced 14% of visits and the Biennial website 13%
- Marketing had a significant role to play in the income generated by the Biennial. Of the total spend generated, 14% (£1,898,821) was influenced by the guide and print, 8% (£1,085,404) was influenced by the website (ENWRS 2007a, pp.6-8)

## 2008

### Overview: Liverpool Biennial 2008

Liverpool Biennial's scale and quality is remarkable. Selected by prestigious panels from a massive entry, John Moores 25 and Bloomberg New Contemporaries 08 represented the work of 100 of the best artists from across the UK. The International exhibition, MADE UP, showed the work of forty artists across thirteen sites. There was also a huge and varied programme of exhibitions, from Le Corbusier, organised by the RIBA, to commercial gallery shows and 'studio' shows by emerging artists.

### MADE UP

Celebrating ten years of commissioning ambitious and challenging new work by leading international artists, the fifth edition of Liverpool Biennial's International exhibition was an exploration of the power of the artistic imagination.

MADE UP sees imagination (called 'invention' in the 18<sup>th</sup> century) as the dynamo of art. At the heart of this exhibition's broad ranging exploration of 'making things up' (which includes utopias and dystopias, narrative fiction, fantasy, myths, lies, prophecies, subversion and spectacle) was the emotional charge which powers the artistic imagination. Whether mischievous, constructive or iconoclastic, MADE UP was about art's capacity to transport us, to suspend disbelief and generate alternative realities.

**FACT:** 88 Wood Street, Liverpool, L1 4DQ

### Stranger than Fiction

*Stranger than Fiction*, in Gallery two and in public spaces at FACT, presents a number works that reference sensory deprivation, the unearthing of memory, objects and history, where the audience is invited to build their own connections in confronting the void.

All the artworks contribute to the wider themes of abstraction and storytelling explored in *MADE UP* at FACT. Sometimes the narrative is seemingly evident, but the truth is distorted or abstracted. In other cases, historical stories are merged with a re-working or a gradual disintegration of meaning, to place the audience once more in the position of articulating the spaces in between.

### Tate Liverpool, Albert Dock

*The Drawing Room* - Conceived to further explore the theme of 'Made Up,' *The Drawing Room* at Tate Liverpool highlights the importance of the medium of drawing in the cognitive and physical act of making up. The act of drawing is familiar to all, provoking childhood memories: we are all taught to draw, and drawing is often used as a means of expressing our hopes and dreams, or creating fantasy places, and is strongly connected to the idea of story-telling. This room at Tate Liverpool contains work by four artists who frequently use drawing as their primary practice.

### Visible Virals (Public Realm)

Taking place across the city's public transport, parks, and urban spaces, *Visible Virals* engaged thousands of people as they spread across the city during 2008.

Transient in nature, and light touch, the artworks infiltrated public spaces and infrastructures in the city, building in magnitude and inviting participation. Two commissions addressed two different aspects of city life: Stockholm artists collective A-APE made interventions on walls and in spaces in the city centre, and British artist Nils Norman produced a media campaign that encouraged exploration of its parks.

*Visible Virals* were at the forefront of the public realm programme, commissioned by the Liverpool Culture Company as part of European Capital of Culture 2008 and managed by Liverpool Biennial, and were part of a broad and inclusive programme of work that reflects Liverpool's cultural life and its varied communities including the city centre's surrounding neighbourhoods.

### **Urban Spaces**

For their project titled *One Year in Liverpool*, Stockholm artist's collective A-APE investigated the concept of 'the average Liverpudlian' through their life, behaviour and consumer habits. The project took its basis from statistics, gradually feeding unusual facts into the public realm throughout 2008 and inviting people in the city to provide information about themselves. The project then manifested itself in a series of installations that spread through unexpected locations in the city centre to reveal the bigger picture. A-APE are Akay, Kidpele, Made and Eric Ericson.

### **Transport and Parks**

Artist Nils Norman has spent the first half of 2008 working closely with Liverpool's Parks & Environment Service and parks experts – exploring and photographing Liverpool's major green spaces including Greenbank, Everton, Princes and Sefton Parks and Wavertree Botanic Gardens, and Birkenhead Park on the Wirral. The result was a light-hearted advertising campaign, launched on 3 June, which drew attention to Liverpool's unique and often little-known parks. Complementing the campaign, he linked the parks through the city's public transport system by creating online maps so that everyone can explore the secrets of the city's parks.

Exploring and recording these diverse and historic public spaces on foot and by public transport, Nils developed an interesting spin on the conventional advertising campaign and revealed the hidden places and activities of each park. This playful campaign repackaged the parks as if they were a product or holiday location, sometimes alluding to phrases and buzzwords of classic popular adverts. The posters were rolled over the summer on buses, bus shelters, in stations, and billboards citywide.

In parallel to this poster campaign, a unique interactive website was developed so that the public can explore the parks online using Google maps and highlighting the parks' histories, curiosities and interesting details as well as special walks between and inside the parks. Visitors to the site are encouraged to email their own parks images and favourite places about to be added to the site – creating a very special online archive of material for each park.

### **Antony Gormley (UK)**

*Another Place* (2007) 100 cast-iron sculptures. Commissioned by Liverpool Biennial in partnership with South Sefton Partnership  
Venue: Crosby Beach, Liverpool

Frequently using his own body as the subject of his work, Antony Gormley makes sculptures that explore the relation of the human form to space at large. In a career spanning nearly forty years, Gormley's practice often exists outside the confines of a gallery, producing large scale sculptural works, such as *The Angel of the North* and increasingly participatory projects, as in his Fourth Plinth commission *One & Other*.

In 2005 Liverpool Biennial in partnership with South Sefton Partnership, brought Antony Gormley's *Another Place* to Crosby Beach. The installation comprises 100 cast-iron

sculptures made from seventeen different moulds taken from the sculptor's own body, installed along beach on the Mersey Estuary, all facing the open sea. The work covers a distance of almost 3km with the pieces placed 250m apart along the tide line, and up to 1km out towards the horizon. The movement of local tides and daily weather conditions dictate whether the figures are visible or submerged.

The installation was honoured in the waterside regeneration category of the 2006 Northwest Business Environment Awards and has also been recognised as best tourism experience of the year in the Mersey Partnership Tourism Awards and as one of the best examples of regeneration in the region by the RENEW Northwest Exemplar Learning Programme. While initially installed on a temporary basis, the work has since been secured by Sefton MBC to remain permanently on the beach.

Gormley was awarded the Turner Prize in 1994, the South Bank Prize for Visual Art in 1999 and the Bernhard Heiliger Award for Sculpture in 2007. In 1997 he was made an Officer of the British Empire (OBE). He is an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects, an honorary doctor of the University of Cambridge and fellow of Trinity and Jesus College, Cambridge. Gormley has been a Royal Academician since 2003 and a British Museum Trustee since 2007.

### **Impact of the 2008 Biennial**

It is estimated that the 2008 Liverpool Biennial received 451,000 visitors, who in total made 975,000 visits to Biennial exhibitions or displays. The total spend by these visitors is an estimated £26.6m. However, in terms of calculating the direct spend attributable to the event itself:

- Approximately 269,000 visitors are estimated to have been drawn to visit Liverpool primarily because of the Biennial; these visitors spent approximately £13,892,000
- A further 14% of the total visitors indicated that although they were in Liverpool primarily for an 'other' reason, but that the Biennial was of 'some' influence; including these would add some £1,678,000 to the economic impact figure, making the spend generated £15,660,000
- It was estimated that, of the total economic impact £2,010,000 was generated by the Biennial Map, £1,930,000 by the Biennial Guide and £1,822,000 by the Biennial Website

### **Visitor Profile**

- It was estimated that some 45% of visitors to the Biennial were Merseyside residents; and a further 21% from elsewhere in Northwest England. Some 25% of the audience were from locations elsewhere in the UK and 9% from overseas locations (both of these groups being 3% higher than in 2006, 22% and 6% respectively)
- Visitors were most likely to be attending a Biennial exhibit on their own (30%) although some 27% were with friends and 15% with their partner. Just 5% were visiting with their children
  - 4% of all visitors were children

- 13% of all visitors were of retirement age
- 40% were aged 17 - 21 (including those in organised groups)
- The average group size was 3.0 people
- Those attending the Biennial tended towards the higher social grades; 40% were A / B and 45% C1
- 23% of all visitors were on a staying visit; considerably higher than the 17% recorded in 2006. This reflects the background trend, with the number of city centre rooms sold having increased by 19% from October – November 2006
- The average length of stay was 3.6 nights
- 62% were using serviced accommodation, 30% staying with friends or family. 69% were staying in Liverpool, 12% elsewhere on Merseyside
- For 60% the Biennial was the main reason for visiting Liverpool. Other than this 20% were in Liverpool on a general tourism visit and 5% each for shopping or to visit friends or relatives
- In terms of influence to visit, 'word of mouth' was the largest factor (56%). If instead we focus on specific media channels, this appears to be dominated by material produced by the Biennial themselves, with the top mentions going to Biennial map (22%), Biennial Guide (19% up from 14% in 2006)
- Other channels of advertising were somewhat lower; 13% mentioned a newspaper or magazine advert, 9% having seen some visual signage or poster and 6% had found out the event through the visitliverpool.com website

#### **Attitudes Towards Art and the Biennial**

- 41% of visitors professed to a specialist knowledge of visual art, 19% had little or no knowledge
- 53% of those mainly in Liverpool for the Biennial had a specialist knowledge
- 31% of those in Liverpool for other reason had little or no knowledge
- 22% disagreed that the visual arts 'play a valuable role in my life'
- The majority though (87%) appeared to have a high attitude towards art, stating 'I always feel confident in art galleries'
  - 97% agreed 'Liverpool Biennial is something that people in Liverpool should be proud of'
  - 96% agreed 'the Biennial would attract visitors to the city'
  - 96% agreed 'Liverpool Biennial is an exciting event for Liverpool'

**2010****Overview: Liverpool Biennial 2010**

Liverpool Biennial presented *Touched*, the International 10 exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial 2010 that was delivered 18<sup>th</sup> September – 28<sup>th</sup> November 2010.

The International exhibition for Liverpool Biennial 2010 presented the work of over sixty artists; around half were commissioned to make new work. The exhibition took place in five art galleries – A Foundation, the Bluecoat, FACT (Foundation for Art and Creative Technology), Open Eye Gallery, Tate Liverpool – and several non-gallery sites as well. The most prominent of these was in Renshaw Street, where there were three further groupings of artworks within the exhibition: paintings not previously exhibited in the UK under the title *The Human Stain*; installations and actions that re-animate a disused shop with the aim of *Re:Thinking Trade*; and the final act of Tania Bruguera's legendary *Cátedra Arte de Conducta* from Havana, with continuing performances over the ten weeks period by twenty Cuban artists that reinvented Allan Kaprow's Happenings.

The show was developed in dialogue, the curator from each gallery elaborating her or his own particular interest in the overall theme *Touched*; the artists share the practice of contemporary art as a globalised activity, but the value of their work comes from their ability to communicate the specifics of their cultural experience and viewpoint. The curatorial team started with the recognition that the practice of some artists (and it's not such a large number) speaks directly to a wide variety of individuals from different cultures, without mediation, without the intercession of saleroom or celebrity.

What defines art that has this ability to communicate directly, this width of cross-cultural appeal? Emotional experience is common to all humanity. Art that evokes emotion in one individual, despite all the cultural specifics that determine that person's reactions, will reach out to many other individuals with varied cultural backgrounds. *Touched* presented art with emotional impact. Art that not only gained our attention but that moved us, motivated us, and allowed us to find a way to change ourselves.

Art without emotional force is without intellectual power. Brian McMaster, in his 2008 report *Excellence in the Arts*, suggested that 'excellence in culture occurs when an experience affects and changes an individual. An excellent cultural experience goes to the root of living.' While we may believe strongly in making art as accessible as possible, the experience of the best art does not come entirely 'free.' In some sense it's an attack on our individual sovereignty, by requiring us to find commonality with others. So, the best art is not to everyone's taste. Who can afford the time, attention, energy to be touched? To be touched, it is necessary to be bold, to be vulnerable.

Lewis Biggs

Artistic Director, Liverpool Biennial

***Re-Thinking Trade***

Since the social activism of the 1960s, many artists have taken a critical stance towards the dominant consumerism of 'advanced' societies. Bypassing, resisting or intervening in the mechanisms of late capitalism, they have sought to make socially relevant art that works outside or against the constraints of consumerism, bringing producer and consumer back into a human relationship.

As a distinct themed section within *Touched, Re: Thinking Trade* proposes to ‘touch’ the city where it has been affected by globalisation with a suite of commissions that re-appropriate the transactions of everyday economies. Artworks will offer ‘customers’ a variety of alternative ways to trade their time and attention in exchange for a benefit. This may be tangible, a real product, or it may be more ethereal and impalpable: an intellectual or emotional device to touch the recipient’s general well-being or self-perception. The artists in this grouping have been selected for their interest in critically rethinking systems of trade and exchange. However, theirs is not so much an antagonistic critique of these systems as a reframing of the act of economic transaction. By providing services, which are of real benefit to individuals, they seek to reclaim individuality from the anonymity and indifference of standard systems of economic exchange and to recover the reciprocity, generosity and human gestures remaining between individuals in the reciprocal acts of production and consumption.

The negotiation between an artwork and its audience already encapsulates a basic economic principle: I give you something in exchange for something you give me. Art has to offer a broad range of emotions, affect and vision, the cost of which would be high if translated into monetary terms. An event such as a biennial does not provide or disperse this value for free. One can instead say that such events are highly demanding, since they ask for what is most valuable in contemporary life: attention, acknowledgement and time. *Re: Thinking Trade* is a hub for the alternative transaction of ideas, experiences and ultimately of ‘humanity,’ envisioning new ways to trade people’s time and attention with artworks that seek out the possibilities for a virtuous process of economic exchange.

### ***Human Stain***

Since the late 1950s, a plethora of urban anthropologists, sociologists, urban planners, cultural geographers and historians have focused their attention on how our existences are affected by the social texture and infrastructures that have remodelled and informed the notion of ‘the city’ in contemporary terms (the ‘de-industrialised’ and the ‘post-modernist’ cities being particularly relevant cases at hand).

The transformations of the human ecology in these realms constitute the core matter of this section of the exhibition. With *The Human Stain* we are not looking at the macro-representations of these phenomena, but are trying to deconstruct their meaning, breaking it down to the finite experience of the individual.

In recent times we have become accustomed to public art in the context of ‘representational cities’ – a methodological approach according to which ‘messages encoded in the environment are read as text.’ The all-embracing and inter-disciplinary methodology derived from this approach, although undeniably useful for framing and narrating the city in its complexity, nevertheless seems to fail in convincingly depicting the individual / personal sphere.

The artists included in *The Human Stain* address the Foucauldian idea that ‘corporeal resistance produces subjectivity, not in an isolated or independent way but in a complex dynamic with the resistances of other bodies.’ Nonetheless these practitioners start from the individual body and its corporeal presence in order to investigate this chain-reaction of correlated resistances. Ultimately, the selected paintings represent ‘the resistance and struggle’ necessary to the production of subjectivity, central not only to the sabotage and subversion of current forms of power, but also to ‘the constitution of alternative forms of liberation.’

We devised this part of *Touched* as a visual and emotional journey that progressively moves in the direction of the inner labyrinths of the Self. We proceed by degrees of approximation, penetrating the different layers that separate the notion of collectivity from the Freudian Id, that is to say, the rioting sphere of the unexpressed or repressed Self. These six degrees are envisioned as short stories that can be read either in a continuous narrative line or separately. Each step of this journey towards the intimacy of the Self is named after a book that somehow suggests an atmosphere or state of mind.

Their sequence unfolds as follows: *The Cement Garden* (Zbyněk Sedlecký), *Confessions of a Public Speaker* (Oren Eliav), *One, No one and One Hundred Thousand* (Aimé Mpane, Y. Z. Kami), *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Edi Hila), *The Seed of Lost Souls* (Tim Eitel) and *Naked Lunch* (Csaba Kis Róka, Markus Schinwald).

### Impact of the 2010 Biennial

- It was estimated that the 2010 Liverpool Biennial received 628,000 visitor trips, which in total resulted in 834,000 visits to Biennial exhibitions or displays. This is a growth of over 50% on the 410,000 visitors to Liverpool Biennial 2006, although less than in Liverpool's exceptional year as European Capital of Culture in 2008
- The total spend by Biennial visitors was estimated as £27.2m, over three times the level of spend generated in 2006
- In terms of calculating the direct spend attributable to the event itself, approximately 475,000 visitor trips were generated directly by Liverpool Biennial. This consists of 35,000 staying visitors, 345,000-day visitors and 96,000 Liverpool residents
- £17.1m generated in direct visitor spend by visitors to the city, with indirect spend raising this to a total of £25.1m, and a further £1.5m generated by resident spend
- Using calculations from The Mersey Partnership, it is estimated that the event supported 222 direct jobs and a further 163.9 indirect job

### Visitor Profiles

- It was estimated that 8% of all those attending the 2010 Biennial were aged over 65 and 4% were children; there appeared to be a concentration towards the younger age bands, with 33% being 16-24 and 31% being 25 - 44. Compared to 2008 there were far fewer 'students'
- 44% of those attending the Biennial lived within the Liverpool City Region; 30% came from elsewhere in the UK and 11% from overseas. There appeared to be a growth in the proportion of visitors at the Biennial who were from these geographies – in 2006 the figures were just 21% and 6% respectively. Connected to the growth in visitors from further afield, this year a third of attendees were on a staying trip in the city centre – typically staying for 3.3 nights. Even if we focus just on those who were in the city solely for the Biennial, 26% of these were on a staying trip

- The average group size was 2.2 people. Whilst local visitors to the Biennial tended to be visiting on their own, visitors from further afield were more likely to be visiting with their partner / spouse or with friends
- 57% of those attending Biennial installations indicated that it was the main reason for being in the city (20% indicated they were on a sightseeing trip in Liverpool, a far greater proportion than was previously seen)
- 60% were on their first ever visit to the Biennial – this includes 48% of local residents
- The Biennial might be expected to attract an arts audiences; whilst 35% indicated that they had ‘specialist knowledge of visual art;’ however, almost a quarter (23%) cited ‘little or no knowledge;’ this is a higher proportion than the Biennial had seen before and may particularly reflect on the growth visitor market in the city itself
- Amongst those in the city specifically to visit the Biennial, the single biggest influence had been ‘word of mouth’ (25%); however, marketing by the Biennial seems particularly strong, and the following were the ‘main’ reason:
  - Biennial Website (11% - an estimated 57,000 visitors)
  - Biennial Guide (9% - an estimated 41,000 visitors)
  - Biennial leaflet (7% - an estimated 32,000 visitors)
  - Biennial invitation (6% - an estimated 18,000 visitors)
- Press adverts were particularly strong in generating visits from elsewhere in the UK and Facebook / visitliverpool.com in generating overseas visitors

### Satisfaction

- Widespread satisfaction with the event was recorded, with \*%% rating their overall enjoyment as having been good or very good
- The only real areas of weakness seemed to revolve around the ‘publicity and promotion’ and ‘signposting’ – but here we see a very significant improvement on previous years
- ENRS estimated that of all Biennial attendees, some 47% were wholly influenced to visit the city by the event and 17% were partially influenced. These proportions were 42% / 13% for visitors staying in the city and 54% / 11% for those on a day visit from home (ENWRS 2011a, p.3)

**2012****Overview: Liverpool Biennial 2012****The Unexpected Guest**

The Cunard Building and various locations around the city

*The Unexpected Guest* explores notions of hospitality. Leading and emerging artists have been commissioned to make permanent and temporary public artworks as well as long-term community-based projects. Works by over sixty artists from across the globe, unfold across the city in its major galleries (the Bluecoat, FACT, Open Eye Gallery, Metal, Tate Liverpool, and The Walker Art Gallery), as well as a variety of public realm sites including The Cunard Building, the Liverpool John Moores Copperas Hill Building, The Royal Standard, The Monro, Liverpool ONE, Everton Park and Anfield and Breckfield.

Hospitality is the welcome we extend to strangers, an attitude and a code of conduct fundamental to civilisation, as well as a metaphor whose conditions and energy inspires artists. In a globalising world, increasing mobility and interdependence are changing the rules of hospitality. There are different 'cultures of hospitality' often increasingly co-existent in the same place.

Our awareness of such complexity and migration between nations and cultures makes clear distinctions between host and guest increasingly difficult. Where lies the threshold? Hospitality, after all, is based on power, a temporary accord between host and guest subject to negotiation. If we extend this metaphor to include the influence of technology in fields such as communication, medicine and biology the picture becomes even more complex.

The Cunard Building occupies an unrivalled waterside position within Liverpool taking centre stage as one of the city's famous 'Three Graces,' sited between the Port of Liverpool Building and the Royal Liver Building. The building was once the Headquarters and main passenger terminal for the world's most famous shipping company, the Cunard Steamship Company.

It was constructed between 1914 and 1917 with the firm relocating from their previous headquarters situated at the junction of Water Street and Rumford Street on the adjacent side of the strand from Pier Head. The Cunard Steamship Company later merged with the White Star Line, the owners of the fateful Titanic, who were previously located within Albion House, situated close to the Merseyrail James Street Transport Interchange.

The Cunard Building acted as the central headquarters for the shipping line providing office accommodation, administration accommodation and ship designing facilities on the upper floors. The lower floors of the building were utilised for passenger facilities both ahead of, and following, their departure / arrival on the Cunard passenger liners in Liverpool.

A range of facilities were in place within the building including first, second and third class passenger waiting rooms and canteens, storage facilities for customers luggage and

facilities for the Cunard employees based both on land and at sea. The Cunard Line vacated the building in the 1960's, relocating to new headquarters in Southampton.

Merseyside Pension Fund purchased the property in November 2001, to add to their growing property investment portfolio. The building today is occupied by a range of public and private organisations playing an integral part within the developing Liverpool business community.

### **City States**

Address: LJM Copperas Hill Building  
Copperas Hill  
Liverpool  
L3

Starting from the premise that the state of cities increasingly determines the future of states, *City States* presents thirteen exhibitions developed in relation to the theme of hospitality.

More than half of the world population lives in cities and people continue to be drawn to urban life. This migration gives rise to a double allegiance: to the city we live and work in, and the place of our nationality, birth, culture or ancestry. In cities different cultures of hospitality often co-exist in the same place. The exchange of knowledge and experience between cities increasingly constitutes a new urban geopolitics that is both particular to each city and globally linked.

*City States* gives form to this idea with an architecture that is specific to the thirteen exhibitions and integrated in the open plan space of this post-postal industry building. Each exhibition is distinct, yet all are connected in offering an understanding of hospitality for our times.

*City States*: Project List

#### **Birmingham: The Magic City**

BAZ, Helen Brown, Home of Metal, Napalm Death, plan b, David Rowan, Bedwyr Williams

#### **Copenhagen: Approaching Journey**

Yvette Brackman, Ismar Cirkinagic, Jens Haaning, Jane Jin Kaisen

#### **Gdansk: Unwanted Visitors**

Yael Bartana, Oskar Hansen, Alicja Karska & Aleksandra Went, Janek Simon, Kama Sokolnicka, Robert Kusmirowski

#### **Hong Kong: All Are Guests**

Chow Chun-fai, Leung Mee-ping, CoLAB x SLOW

#### **Incheon: Terra Galaxia: Aerropolis**

Sen Chung, Kyungah Ham, Seoung Won Won, Wil Bolton, Sukgeun Oh

**Lisbon: Air Print**

Miguel Palma

**Makhachkala: *Topography of Masculinity***

Taus Makhacheva

**Oslo: Palestinian Embassy**

Goksoyr &amp; Martens

**Reykjavik, Nuuk, Torshavn: North Atlantic Pavilion**

Hanni Bjartalio, Sigurour Guojonsson, Jessie Kleemann

**St. Petersburg: Interior**

Masha Godovannaya

**Taipei: Metro-Wonderland: Taiwanese Artists and Urban Morphology**

Chen Chia-Jen, Chiu Chen-Hung, Hsu Chia-Wei

**Vilnius: Black Pillow**

Audrius Buacas &amp; Valdas Ozarinskas

**Wellington: Watermarking**

David Bennewith, William Hsu, Marnie Slater

Sky Arts Ignition: Doug Aitken - The Source

Address: Tate Liverpool

Albert Dock

Liverpool

L3 4BB

What is the source of a creative idea? Where does it start and how is it realised?

Musician Jack White, British actress Tilda Swinton, late artist Mike Kelley and many other celebrated cultural figures discuss the roots of their creativity with leading contemporary artist Doug Aitken in *Sky Arts Ignition: Doug Aitken – The Source*.

Aitken's first public realm installation in the UK, *The Source* showcased the artist's pioneering approach to public art. The work is a multi-sensory installation on Liverpool's historic Albert Dock featuring a pavilion designed in collaboration with British architect David Adjaye OBE.

During the day visitors were able to enter the pavilion, while at night it took on a new life, when its internal projection screens became visible through the semi-transparent walls.

Courtesy of Doug Aitken Workshop; 303 Gallery, New York; Galerie Eva Presenhuber, Zürich; Victoria Miro Gallery, London; and Regen Projects, Los Angeles.

**Everton Park H.Q. and Foraging Spiral**

Address: Everton Park  
Heyworth Street  
Liverpool

Fritz Haeg occupied a sheltered bowl-shaped site at the top of Everton Park for the summer leading up to Liverpool Biennial 2012.

Working with the community, the first phase of the project, commencing in late May, was conceived as an expedition into the park, featuring a 'base camp' headquarters for a series of experiments to publicly present the range of activities and features that local people would like to see in their park.

Treating the hollow space as a microcosm of the entire park, the series of modestly scaled elements included anything from semi-permanent plantings and paths, working up to a week of programmed events and workshops housed in a temporary domed structure during the opening week of the Biennial.

Architect, gardener and educator, Fritz Haeg's recent projects include *Edible Estates* (2005-ongoing), an agricultural project replacing suburban lawns with productive, consumable landscapes. Haeg's edible gardens are developed in partnership with local residents, responding to the unique nature of each site and challenging preconceptions of land use and development patterns. In 2008 Haeg debuted *Animal Estates* at the Whitney Biennial. The project proposes the reintroduction of native animals into cities through designs for urban dwellings.

***2Up2Down / Homebaked***

Address: 197 Oakfield Rd  
Liverpool  
Merseyside L4 0UF

'Housing is the battlefield for our time, and the house is its monument'

Jeanne van Heeswijk has been working with the community of Anfield for the last two and half years since the neighbourhood was targeted for major regeneration in 1998. In recent years, hundreds of homes in the area were cleared for demolition in anticipation of multimillion investment.

*2Up2Down* creates a situation where the community can take matters into their own hands, with a people-centred, intimate approach to re-imagining the area, claiming the right to live well. A group of more than twenty young people worked with architects and other design specialists to re-use a block of empty property comprising a former bakery building and two adjoining terraced houses. Taking the community as their client, they designed an affordable housing scheme and shop, as well as meeting and project spaces.

Simultaneously, a cross-generational group of local residents set up Homebaked Community Land Trust – a co-operative organisation with its roots in the garden city movement. This initiative enabled the collective community ownership of properties in the area and allowed the group to reopen the Bakery as a social enterprise.

Loaf by loaf, and brick by brick, *2Up2Down* is building a new idea of community, work, and social space, and with it a new community resilience.

### **Thresholds**

Address: Tate Liverpool  
Albert Dock  
Liverpool  
L3 4BB

Presented as part of *The Unexpected Guest*. All works in the exhibition were from the Tate Collection.

Featured artists and works:

Hurvin Anderson *Jersey*, 2008  
Keith Arnatt *A.O.N.B. (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)*, 1982 - 84  
Kader Attia *Untitled (Ghardaïa)*, 2009 *Oil and Sugar #2*, 2007  
Yael Bartana *Kings of the Hill*, 2003  
Sophie Calle *The Hotel, Room 47*, 1981 *The Hotel, Room 44*, 1981 *The Hotel, Room 29*, 1981 *The Hotel, Room 28*, 1981  
Layla Curtis *United Kingdom*, 1999  
Eugenio Dittborn *To Return (RTM) Airmail Painting No.103*, 1993  
Jimmie Durham *Dans plusieurs de ces forêts et de ces bois, il n'y avait pas seulement des villages souterrains groupés autour du terrier du chef mais il y avait encore de véritables hameaux de huttes basses cachés sous les arbres, et si nombreux que parfois la forêt en était remplie. Souvent les fumées les trahissaient. Deux de...*, 1993  
Peter Fischli and David Weiss *Visible World*, 1997  
Gilbert and George *England*, 1980 *Cunt Scum*, 1977  
Simryn Gill *Dalam*, 2001  
Thomas Hirschhorn *Drift Topography*, 2003  
William Kentridge *Cambio*, 1999 *Dogana*, 1999 *Pensione*, 1999  
Pak Sheung Chuen *A Travel without Visual Experience*, 2008  
Martin Parr *Common Sense*, 1995-99  
George Shaw *Scenes from the Passion*, 2002  
Mark Titchner *We Want to Nurture and Protect*, 2004 *We Want Strong Leadership*, 2004  
Mark Wallinger *Royal Ascot*, 1994 *Yukinori Yanagi*, 1996

**WCS Presents *Inhospitable Landscape***

Address: Wolstenholme Creative Space  
11 Wolstenholme Square  
Liverpool  
L1 4JJ

WCS Presents *Inhospitable Landscape*, a cross-art form exhibition with a programme of events, created and produced by Wolstenholme Creative Space, including several commissions from selected outside artists including The Hive Collective and Craig Sinclair.

Visually focusing on the physical landscape with a large-scale installation that literally brings 'the outside, inside,' *Inhospitable Landscape* toys with concepts of social and cultural landscapes, the uncomfortable and inhospitable aspects of humanity. The Hive Collective presented *Dystopia*, a new commission for WCS in the form of an immersive and interactive video piece that views humankind as the unwanted guest within an otherwise balanced and harmonious planet earth, within a specially installed temporary space in WCS as part of the *Inhospitable Landscape* exhibition.

The installation also included a specially commissioned piece of work by Tomo (Liverpool Art Prize 2012 People's Choice Winner) inspired by the exhibition themes.

WCS is a Creative Producer and a not for profit Contemporary Gallery and Venue based in Liverpool city centre with the aim to platform contemporary visual art and music. As well as providing a unique atmosphere for exhibitions, the gallery regularly plays host to a number of inspirational and experimental live music acts.

The Hive Collective are a group of audio visual artists with previous commissions that include work with FACT and Future Everything as well as self-produced works.

**THE ROYAL STANDARD *Service Provider***

Address: The Royal Standard  
Unit 3, Vauxhall Business Centre  
131 Vauxhall Rd  
Liverpool  
L3 6BN

In its first year as an official partner to the Liverpool Biennial, The Royal Standard explored the festival's core theme of *The Unexpected Guest* by initiating *Service Provider*, a ten-week project in which five artist groups explored the boundaries of hospitality and the provision of resources.

The groups: Tether, Generator Projects, Form Content and Laura Mansfield and Sovay Berriman, occupied The Royal Standard's galleries, with their every move viewable through the 'Foyer,' a purpose built observation zone. Each group controlled methods of entrance and exit, managing interactions and access to the provision of services.

A web-based manifestation of Service Provider was also launched, in which The Royal Standard invited Bubblebyte.org to take over their website, again ceding control of their virtual space to artists under the implicit set of expectations that exist between host and guest.

The unique environment of an international biennial gave The Royal Standard an opportunity to examine the role it plays as an autonomous organisation in a regional and national arts ecology built on individuals, collectives, organisations and institutions. By exploring the broad notion of the service sector as anything that does not produce tangible products, The Royal Standard opened up a dialogue around the artist-led space as a location that facilitates cultural production and the dynamics of the relationships formed during this process.

Through a process of outsourcing to selected organisations, The Royal Standard became immersed as a guest within its own territory, able to experience first-hand the interface between the public encounter and the provision of experience and observe how these movements are affected by the imposition of borders, values and procedures.

The Royal Standard acted as an observer, monitoring the shifts in responsibility between the hosts and guests, responding to the power dynamics within the relationships of both. Through this process, they questioned the permanence of experience and the legacy of hospitality in an increasingly inhospitable age.

### **WALKER ART GALLERY John Moores Painting Prize 2012**

Address: Walker Art Gallery  
William Brown Street  
Liverpool  
L3 8EL

The bold, the beautiful and the audacious of contemporary painting are brought together once more for the John Moores Painting Prize.

As the UK's biggest painting prize the exhibition promises to bring the most exciting and cutting edge paintings to our attention. The exhibition, a major strand of the Liverpool Biennial, always fascinates with its often quirky, sometimes controversial but never boring works. Described by 2010 judge, Sir Norman Rosenthal, as 'the Oscars of the painting world' the John Moores has a track record for spotting rising talent. Previous winners read like a roll call of the most influential artists from the past 50 years of British painting. Including the likes of Jack Smith, Richard Hamilton, Mary Martin, David Hockney and Peter Doig, the latest to join this elite list was Keith Coventry who won the £25,000 first prize in 2010.

Open to all painters based in the UK, the works are selected anonymously from an open submission by an independent jury, who also award the main prizes. With a different panel for each exhibition, the judges' selection is inevitably as distinctive and individual as the works themselves.

This year the judges are Alan Yentob, creative director of the BBC; previous John Moores exhibitors and Turner Prize nominees, George Shaw and Angela de la Cruz; Merseyside-born YBA and Turner Prize nominee Fiona Banner, and, hailed as the art world's most influential woman by the Financial Times, director of the Whitechapel, Iwona Blazwick. Previous judges have included the artists Tracey Emin and the Chapman brothers, musician Jarvis Cocker and writer Germaine Greer.

### **Impact of the 2012 Event**

- Data suggested that 692,000 trips were made to the 2012 Biennial (214,000 trips by city residents, 412,000 'day trips' and 65,000 staying trips). Of these, it is estimated that 454,000 were actually influenced primarily by the Biennial (125,000 trips by city residents, 297,000 'day trips' and 31,000 staying trips)
- Indications from tourism board data suggested that there was 5.5m visitors in the city during the period covered by the Biennial (5.2m day visitors and 424,000 staying visitors)
- Data suggested that 692,000 trips were made to the 2012 Biennial (214,000 trips by city residents, 412,000 'day trips' and 65,000 staying trips). Of these, it was estimated that 454,000 were actually influenced primarily by the Biennial (125,000 trips by city residents, 297,000 'day trips' and 31,000 staying trips)
- Based on an average spend of £27.63 by day visitors and £150.14 by staying visitors (both below levels seen in previous surveys), combined with the numbers above, suggests that direct spend in the city attributable to the Biennial was at least £15.2m
- In terms of economic impact of the event – excluding spend by residents but including the indirect economic impact – the 2012 Biennial generated at least £20.7m. It is also worth noting that during this period an estimated 33,000 hotel room nights were generated by the 2012 Biennial. We also note that if expenditure by residents is included, the economic impact of the 2012 Biennial would be £24.4m (ENWRS 2013a, p.3)

### **Visitor Profile**

- Excluding those who were in organised groups (which can skew the survey demography), some 8% of those attending the Biennial were children and 7% were aged over 65; the audience is dominated by those aged between 17 and 39 though, and this accounted for 53%
- Data in 2012 suggested a significant increase in the proportion of children present – historically this had been closer to 5%
- Visitors were most likely to be visiting the Biennial with friends (28%), on their own (27%) or with their partner / spouse (25%) – these being (statistically) all equally likely

- Overall, 42% of visitors to the 2012 Biennial could be described as being 'local,' living within the Liverpool City Region. Some 15% came from its natural hinterland, but there was also significant levels of visits from further afield in the UK (especially the London area) and it is noted that 12% were visitors from overseas. As a trend, local / regional visits seem to have reduced, but visits from further afield showing a strong rise
- 62% of all those attending the 2012 Biennial were on their first ever visit to the event – similar to the level observed in previous years
- At a course level, some 53% of respondents described the Biennial as their main reason for visiting Liverpool (this being a drop on 2010 and 2008). Much of this reduced 'draw' owes something to the location of some public art being within Liverpool One – 12% were primarily in the city not for the Biennial but for shopping and this is higher than previously seen. Amongst 'other' drivers were city sightseers (15%), those visiting a specific attraction (7%) and those visiting friends or family (7%)
- There is evidence that the nature / location of the public art is helping to broaden the appeal of the event. 35% of respondents, described themselves as having little or no knowledge of visual art, much higher than previously seen, and this is especially true of Liverpool residents. Some 29% of the audience – most likely to be those from further afield – described themselves as having specialist knowledge of visual art
- Looking at the marketing channels, the 2012 Biennial saw extremely strong recall of the Biennial website, being mentioned by 26% of all respondents. Other significant drivers seem to have been a word of mouth recommendation (16%), the Biennial guidebook (11%) and a feature in a newspaper or magazine (6%). In terms of other electronic channels, although Facebook was mentioned by 5% given the significant level of visitors from further afield, the influence of visitliverpool.com was perhaps lower than might be expected (6%)
- The Biennial continued to record high satisfaction levels on a par with those reported in previous years; 84% of visitors described their visit as being 'good' or 'very good,' and this was significantly higher when viewing just those who had been drawn to the city in order to attend the event
- The only areas recording significant level of dissatisfaction were the signposting (24% dissatisfied) and the publicity and promotion of the event (19% dissatisfied). Although undoubtedly not positive, tourist board data suggested these two areas tend to be areas where it is difficult for events to achieve high satisfaction levels in (ENWRS 2013a, pp.3-4)

**Appendix Five:**  
**Example of England's Northwest Research Services Questionnaire**

England's Northwest Research Service  
 THE MERSEY PARTNERSHIP  
 12 Princes Parade, Liverpool L3 1BG  
 Tel: 0151 227 2727 Fax: 0151 227 2325  
 Liverpool Biennial  
 of Contemporary Arts Ltd

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ..... and today I am conducting a short survey on behalf of the Biennial organisers. Can you spare a few minutes to help with this survey?

Yes - go to question 1

RespondentDetails

Name: .....

Address: .....

.....

Postcode: .....

Tel: .....

Email: .....

RespondentClassification

<u>AgeGroup</u>		<u>Gender</u>	
15 or under	1	Male	1
16-24	2	Female	2
25-34	3		
35-44	4	<u>SocialGrade</u>	
45-54	5	AB	1
55-64	6	C1	2
65+	7	C2	3
		DE	4

RespondentType

Staying Visitor 1  
 Day Visitor 2  
 Resident 3

I declare that I have recruited this respondent in strict accordance with your instructions. The respondent was not known to me prior to the interview. I have checked the questionnaire for accuracy and completeness.

Interviewers Name: .....

Signed: .....

Date: .....

Sampling point: .....

If the respondent refuses to help, circle the next number in the box below and re-use the questionnaire. Do not count towards quota.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

1. How close to the end of your visit are you? (read list)
- |                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Just leaving                       | 1 |
| Will probably stay a little longer | 2 |
| About half way through             | 3 |
| Just arrived                       | 4 |

If the respondent has just arrived, circle the next number in the box below and re-use the questionnaire. Do not count towards quota.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

2. During this visit will you observe or take part in any of the Biennial events?
- |                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Observe             | continue |
| Participate or work | close    |
| Both of the above   | close    |
| Neither             | close    |
3. Is the Biennial the main reason for your visit to Liverpool today?
- |     |            |
|-----|------------|
| Yes | 1 Go to Q6 |
| No  | 2 Go to Q4 |
4. Were you aware that this work is part of the Liverpool Biennial festival?
- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No  | 2 |
5. Has this work inspired you to visit other works in the festival?
- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No  | 2 |

6. Which of these phrases best describes your personal group? (Show card A)

- On my own 1
- With family (inc children) 2
- With family (exc. children) 3
- With friends 4
- Organised trip 5

7. Including yourself, how many people are there in your personal group on this trip? (By that I mean your family/close friends and immediate travelling companions).

8. Please describe your party by placing numbers in the boxes below?

	Male	Female
0 to 5		
6 to 10		
11 to 16		
17 to 21		
22 to 29		
30 to 39		
40 to 49		
50 to 59		
60 to 64		
65 +		
Total Party		

9. How long are you staying in the local area?

- Staying trip (go to 10) 1
- Day trip (go to 12) 2
- Live here (go to 12) 3
- Don't know (go to 10) 4

10. How many nights are you staying in the local area on this trip?

11. What type of accommodation are you staying in? (Show card B)

- Licensed hotel 1
- Unlicensed hotel 2  
(inc guesthouse, B&B, farmhouse)
- Rented house or flat 3
- Home of friend/relative 4
- Second home 5
- Caravan 6
- Camping 7
- Youth Hostel 8
- Hall of Residence 9
- Holiday Centre 10
- Other 11

Specify: .....

Where is this accommodation?

.....

12. How would you describe your knowledge of visual art?

- Specialist knowledge 1
- General knowledge 2
- Little or no knowledge 3

13. Which of the following BEST describes your approach to visual art? (show card C)

I have a professional or academic involvement in the visual arts. 1

I go to many art exhibitions and prefer more experimental contemporary work. 2

I go to art exhibitions but prefer traditional or historic work by well-known artists. 3

I do not go to many art exhibitions; visual art is part of my wider interest in design, fashion and popular culture 4

14. Which of the following statements applies to you? (Show card D)

- I am prepared to take risks with less well-known work where I don't know what to expect and without much recommendation. 1

---

- I take limited risks where I don't know what to expect but the exhibition will include well-known artists and has been recommended by friends or reviewers. 2

---

- I avoid taking risks by seeing work where I have a clear idea of what to expect and the exhibition includes familiar artists and comes highly recommended. 3

15. Which of these statements best describes you? (Show card E)

- I always feel confident in art galleries 1

---

- I sometimes lack confidence in art galleries 2

---

- I rarely/never feel confident in art galleries 3

Show card F

16. Using the following scale:

- 1 = Agree strongly
- 2 = Agree slightly
- 3 = Disagree
- 4 = Don't know

Would you say you agree or disagree with the following statements?

The Biennial is an exciting event for Liverpool	
The Biennial develops new audiences for contemporary art in Liverpool	
The Biennial offers a chance for new artists to show their work	
The Biennial is something that people in Liverpool should be proud of	
Visual art plays a valuable role in my life	
The Biennial is for the general public, not just for visual arts specialists.	
The Biennial will attract visitors to the City	

17. I will now read you a list of Biennial exhibitions. As I read the names, can you tell me whether you've heard of each one in turn or not? Lets start with... (tick start/rotate)

- International 06 1
- John Moore's 24 2
- Bloomberg New Contemporaries 06 3
- Independents Biennial Liverpool 4

18. Which of the following Biennial exhibitions have you already visited and which do you intend to visit? (read list again, tick as appropriate)  
Show card G

19. And how would you rate each exhibition that you've visited against the following scale. Read the names of each event that the respondent has already visited.
- 5 Much better than expected
  - 4 Better than expected
  - 3 Much as expected
  - 2 Worse than expected
  - 1 Much worse than expected

Exhibition	Know of Y/N	Already been	Intend to go	Rating 1 to 5
<b>International 06</b>				
Tate Liverpool				
FACT				
Open Eye Gallery				
Bluecoat				
Hanover St – temp				
Fusebox				
Biennial Centre				
Question Mark				
Hans Peter Kuhn				
Football Pitch				
Priscilla Monge				
St Luke's Church				
Matej Andraz Vogrincic				
Glass Pavilion				
St Johns Gardens				
Ken Lum				
Others				
<b>John Moore's 24</b>				
The Walker				
<b>Bloomberg New Contemporaries</b>				
The Coach Shed				

20. Which (if any) of these things most influenced your decision to visit the Biennial? (Show card H)

- Biennial Guide/Print 1
- Find It leaflet 2a
- Follow It leaflet 2b
- Make It leaflet 2c
- Explore It leaflet 2d
- Poster/Banner 3
- Biennial website 4
- Visitliverpool.com 5
- Other website 6
- Word of mouth 8
- Newspaper/Magazine advertising 10
- Newspaper/Magazine coverage/review 11
- Been before 12
- Just passing/impulse 13
- Don't know 0
- Other (specify) .....

21. Have you visited this event before?

- First visit 1
- Came in 2004 2
- Came in 2002 3
- Came in 1999 4

22. How often do you visit Liverpool?

- Resident 1
- Weekly 2
- Monthly 3
- Every few months 4
- Annually 5
- Less than once a year 6

23. How far in advance did you plan your visit?

- Today 1
- Within a couple of days 2
- Within a couple of weeks 3
- Within a month 4
- 2-3 months ago 5
- Longer (pls specify) 6
- .....

24. Approximately how much do you think you will be spending during this trip?

Spend on	Amount
Shopping	£
Food & drink	£
Attractions & Entertainment	£
Travel & transport	£
Accommodation	£
Other	£
Total	£

25. Over how many days will you have spent this money?

26. How many people does this amount cover?

27. How would you rate the Biennial against this scale (show card I), in terms of:  
 1 = Very poor    2 = Poor  
 3 = Average    4 = Good  
 5 = Very Good    6 = Don't know

Event publicity and promotion?  
1 2 3 4 5 6

Signposting?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Suitability of the venues?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Facilities provided?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Value for money?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Event organisation and staff?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Event Quality?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Overall enjoyment?

1 2 3 4 5 6

28. What have you enjoyed most about this event?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

29. What have you enjoyed least about this event?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

30. By choosing an answer from the following card, how would you describe your main activity?

- Full time work (30+ hrs/wk) 1
- Part time work (<29 hrs/wk) 2
- Self employed 3
- Govt Training Scheme 4
- Unemployed 5
- Looking after home/family 6
- Retired from paid work 7
- Long term sick/disabled 8
- Student 9
- Other (specify) 10

.....

31. What is the occupation of the chief income earner in your household (or previous if retired)?

.....  
 .....

Thank respondent and close

Record Respondents	Ethnic Group	
(Show card J if unclear)		
White British		1
White Irish		2
White other		3
Specify: .....		
Mixed White & Black Caribbean		4
Mixed White & Black African		5
Mixed White & Asian		6
Other Mixed Background		7
Specify: .....		
Asian/Asian British – Indian		8
Asian/Asian British – Pakistani		9
Asian/Asian British – Bangladeshi		10
Other Asian Background		11
Specify: .....		
Black/Black British – Caribbean		12
Black/Black British – African		13
Other Black Background		14
Specify: .....		
Chinese		15
Other Ethnic Group		16
Specify: .....		

**Appendix Six:  
Liverpool Biennial's use of STEAM to Estimate Economic Impact of Festivals**

There are two main methodologies used to estimate tourism's economic impact to a local area. These are the Cambridge Economic Impact Method, and STEAM method. The key difference, however, between both models is that in the majority of applications the Cambridge Model disaggregates the regional breakdowns from national survey data to produce the critical volume estimates, whereas STEAM primarily uses locally-generated data – notably occupancy information.

### **The Cambridge Model**

The Cambridge Model produces estimates from existing national and local information (e.g. accommodation stock, inbound trips) of the level of tourism activity within a given area. The volume of visits is translated into economic terms by estimating the amount of visitor spending per trip, and the estimated effect of visitor spend on business turnover and jobs, giving a true economic picture of tourism in your area. Such data is invaluable when compiling funding bids and evaluating the true year-on-year success of your tourism activity.

The Cambridge Model was designed as a multistage process, which could operate at different levels of sophistication according to the budgets available. In its basic form, the model uses minimal local statistics to generate a view of the value, volume, and economic impact of visitor activity in the area. One could argue that this is one of the strengths of the Cambridge Model, as it is affordable to destinations with modest tourism budgets yet remains a quality product with the estimates deemed to be robust, with the margins of error acceptable and in line with other modelling techniques.

### **STEAM Model**

STEAM (Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor) is a tourism economic impact modelling process which approaches the measurement of tourism from the bottom up, through its use of local supply side data and tourism performance and visitor survey data collection. The STEAM process is designed to engage the client and maximise the benefit of local tourism expertise. STEAM is capable of delivering robust outputs at a variety of geographical levels and, as such, has been adopted for use throughout the United Kingdom and overseas by tourist boards, local authorities, regional development agencies, national park authorities, and many other public and private sector organisations. The STEAM process is essentially a structured framework with the capacity to accept a wide range of tourism input data. All of these inputs can be adjusted monthly, to reflect seasonal variations in supply and demand or to reflect specific reporting requirements.

The 'STEAM' model has often been described as a 'bottom-up model' and the Cambridge Model as being 'top-down' – both use a range of locally and nationally generated statistics. In this respect, both models have top-down and bottom-up elements and, as both models evolve, the data sources used are often not too dissimilar. For example, many Cambridge Models use a range of local data above their basic inputs – notably occupancy data and visitor survey results. These may be used, depending on the quality and availability of local data, to either weight or replace data produced by the standard model (e.g. day visitor expenditure, the volume of trips to different types of accommodation). Similarly, STEAM also uses national survey data (International Passenger Survey (IPS), United Kingdom Tourism Survey (UKTS) and United Kingdom Day Visits Survey (UKDVS) to calibrate or

'benchmark' volume estimates, estimate Visual Flight Rules (VFR) levels, and calculate tourist expenditure. As with the Cambridge Model, the level of use of the national survey data within the STEAM model reflects the availability of specific types of local data.

STEAM quantifies the local economic impact of tourism, from both staying and day visitors, through analysis and use of a variety of inputs including visitor attraction numbers, tourist accommodation bed stock, events attendance, occupancy levels, accommodation tariffs, macroeconomic factors, visitor expenditure levels, transport use levels and tourism-specific economic multipliers. Throughout the year, we continuously review STEAM input data and consider, for each reporting area, the robustness of the inputs. This review process ensures that any identified weaknesses in data flow can be addressed. STEAM uses the above input data to generate a series of impact analyses, relating to four key visitor types:

- Staying in Serviced Accommodation
- Staying in Non-Serviced Accommodation
- Staying with Friends and Relatives (SFR)
- Tourist Day Visitors

Within the model, the above visitor types are broken down further into sub-categories of accommodation use and, where required, subtypes of day or SFR visitor. This allows the model to ensure that its outputs reflect the differences in supply and consumption of tourism services between different types of tourism business. It carries a further benefit in that the outputs relating to specific subcategories of visitor can be presented in isolation, excluded, or combined to reflect specific reporting needs.

## **Liverpool**

To estimate the volume and value of tourism, the Liverpool City Region uses the STEAM model – this model is widely (though not universally) used across the UK, including other tourist boards in North West England. STEAM is owned and operated by Global Tourism Solutions (UK) Ltd. STEAM relies on local-level data to drive the estimates, principally:

- Accommodation stock
- Local occupancy surveys
  - Visits to attractions / events
- Visits to Tourist Information Centres
- Hotel Occupancy in the City Region

A key component of the way in which STEAM works is its definition of 'day visitors;' this is defined as a person travelling to a district other than that in which they live, for a non-routine purpose, with a stay of over three hours. For example, someone making a trip to Southport Pier from Liverpool could be classed as a day visitor, but not someone making a similar trip who lived in Formby. The important note to make here is that the number of the day visits recorded by STEAM for the Liverpool City Region will contain a certain amount of intra-city region tourism.

### **England's Northwest Research Services (ENWRS)**

STEAM is the primary method used by the Liverpool LEP and many tourist boards in the UK to measure the value and volume of tourism. The analysis for the Liverpool Biennial deals with the quantification of results – the actual number of people who it estimates visited the event. In order to calculate this ENWRS used both survey data and Tourist Board STEAM data and has been employed for all previous Biennial evaluations. ENWRS note that calculations of Economic Impact for the purposes of ERDF do not allow the use of modelled sources such as STEAM, and hence a separate narrower approach was used.

### **Liverpool Biennial 2004**

The estimated attendance at the 2004 Liverpool Biennial was 350,000 visitors based on three indicators:

- Liverpool estimates of tourism volume and value
- TMP research conducted at the 2004 Biennial
- Termination data collected during the respondent interviews

The Mersey Partnership uses the Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor (STEAM) in order to produce statistics on the volume and value of tourism to Liverpool. This model defines visitors as 'people crossing a boundary for an irregular purpose for a length of at least three hours.' STEAM estimates that each year 18.5 million people visit Liverpool city centre for an irregular purpose. 3.9 millions of these visits occurred during the Biennial, i.e. 17<sup>th</sup> September to 28<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

The termination data collected during the interviewing period indicated that for non-Liverpool residents, for everyone eligible respondent interviewed the interviewers had to stop 15.5 people who were not visiting the city to observe or take part in any Biennial related activities e.g. exhibitions, performances, screenings, talks etc. 1 in 15.5 is equal to 6.5%; therefore it could be assumed that 6.5% of the 3.9 million visitors to Liverpool between 17<sup>th</sup> September and 28<sup>th</sup> November were visiting because of the Biennial. This equates to 253,500 visitors.

In addition to Liverpool visitors, the Biennial also attracts Liverpool residents, TMP research indicated that 28% of respondents were Liverpool residents, while 72% of respondents were visitors to Liverpool. This ratio can also be used to estimate that a total number of 98,5000 Liverpool residents visited the Biennial between 17<sup>th</sup> September and 28<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

Collectively the two groups result in an estimated 352,000 visits to the Biennial, which is rounded to 350,000 for the purpose of estimating the total economic impact of the 2004 Liverpool Biennial.

The table below shows the total economic impact of the event on the local area, and is based on:

- 350,000 visitors attending the Biennial
- 28% being residents of Liverpool
- 58% being staying visitors
- 14% being staying visitors
- The average spend per person per trip for each of the different visitor types. The average spend per trip for staying visitors was £61.04 x the average length (1.76 nights) = £107.43

## 2006

There were an estimated 400,370 visits made to the exhibitions forming the 2006 Liverpool Biennial. This figure was constructed by totalling the estimates of the visits to the various Biennial exhibitions. The estimated visits to the exhibitions were produced using a formula, which draws from three relevant data sets. These were:

- Liverpool estimates of tourism volume and value (from STEAM), which can be used to produce monthly estimates of day and staying tourism
- Termination data collected during the respondent interviews, which indicate the proportions of people at the sites observing the exhibitions and the proportion simply passing by
- TMP research conducted at the 2006 Biennial exhibitions, which shows the profile of respondents and from desk research estimating footfall at (a selection of) the exhibition venues

This system is identical to the one used to estimate attendance at previous Biennial Festivals. These estimates have been adjusted after consultation with the Festival organisers who were able to supply the actual visitor figures collected for some venues. The agreed estimates of attendances at the various exhibitions are listed below.

**Table 6.1 Estimated Attendance at the Biennial Exhibitions**

Exhibition	Attendance estimates
The Coach Shed	12,000
The Walker	38,031
Glass Pavilion, St. John's Gardens, Ken Lum	61,500
St. Luke's Church, Matej Adraz Vogrincic	13,250
Football Pitch, Priscilla Monge	58,000
Question Mark, Hans Peter Kuhn	51,800
Fusebox, Biennial Centre	51,800
Out of the Bluecoat, Hanover Street	6,000
Open Eye Gallery	5,719
FACT	37,000
Tate Liverpool	12,800
Other	100,000
Total	400,370

These estimates will include some double counting (where a staying respondent visits more than one of the exhibitions on the same trip). This anomaly is, the whole, restricted to the 17% of respondents that were staying visitors since the residents and say visitors typically

viewed exhibitions at around one per visit (but made a number of visits to see a number of exhibitions). If each staying respondent visited 2.5 exhibitions per visit the visitor number will be slightly lower estimates of 359,532 visits generated (to view 400,370 exhibitions 'events'). The estimates of 359,532 relates to visits to Liverpool that involved one or more of the Festival exhibits. The actual number of visiting individuals will be lower because many respondents made multiple visits to the Festival however evaluation studies typical estimate visits (rather than people) because this is what drives the economic impact i.e. a visitor making two-day visits has roughly the same economic impact as two individuals making one day visits each.

In the above table 'others' is a verbatim response. This could be interpreted as respondents visiting artworks or exhibitions, they feel are part of the Biennial (which may not be) or respondents not being sure which of the exhibitions they have visited and / or not being able to supply an identifiable name for an exhibition they have been to.

- 359,532 visitors attending the Biennial
- 40% being residents of Liverpool
- 43% being day visitors
- 17% being staying visitors

## 2008

The most recent estimates from STEAM showed that in 2006 Liverpool received the following number of visitors:

- 19,859,000 Visitors
- 18,261,000 Day Visitors
- 1,598,000 Staying Visitors
- 829,000 Staying Visitors in serviced accommodation

Obviously ENWRS could not use these figures as a baseline due to:

- a) National growth in Liverpool's tourist industry
- b) The impact of Capital of Culture expecting to surpass these numbers

STEAM does not include local residents as these are not counted as 'tourists.' However, ENWRS know from the Biennial survey work the ratio of Liverpool residents to other visitors, and this had been used to calculate the figure shown. Percentages share Staying / Day was adjusted before being applied to the total STEAM figure.

The STEAM results for 2008 were not expected to be released until mid-2009; an initial calculation suggested the following may be the numbers of visitors:

- 26,485,000 Visitors
- 24,688,000 Day Visitors
- 1,797,000 Staying Visitors
- 979,000 Staying Visitors in serviced accommodation

The numbers were based on:

- a) Initial % increased between 2006 and 2007, as forecasted by the initial STEAM results
- b) % increase for day visitors between 2007 and 2008 based on increases in visits to attractions, as recorded by The Mersey Partnership
- c) % increase for staying visitors between 2007 and 2008 based on increases in city centre hotel rooms sold, as recorded by The Mersey Partnership

At this stage the STEAM model for 2007 and 2008 was undergoing a NWDA – led revamp, which resulted in considerable variation in the above figures; when this took place, a revised report would have been used.

The figures shown above were based on whole-year data. Segmenting this using proportions in STEAM to cover just those dates when the Biennial took place suggested that the following were the number of visitors to the city through the period.

- 4,198,000      Visitors
- 3,898,000      Day Visitors
- 300,000        Staying Visitors
- 198,000        Staying Visitors in serviced accommodation

## 2010

### Background

Previous Biennial reports have used STEAM data together with data on venue attendance to quantify visits.

STEAM (Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor) is the core mechanism used by The Mersey Partnership to estimate the Value and Volume of tourism within Liverpool. A widely used model in the UK, STEAM relies upon local tourism data (such as Visits to attractions and hotel occupancy) to produce its figures and is called 'Scarborough' after the first place it was implemented in the UK.

STEAM is owned and operated by Global Tourism Solutions.

During 2009 extensive research was conducted by the Northwest Regional Development Agency, which has dramatically changed the baseline data used in STEAM: accordingly, ENWRS present both the revised Biennial 2008 data alongside the expected results for 2010.

The most recent estimates from STEAM show that in 2009 Liverpool received the following numbers of visitors:

- 27,625,000      Visitor trips

- 28,890,000 Day Visitor trips
- 1,735,000 Staying Visitor trips
- 938,000 Staying Visitor trips in serviced accommodation

Note One:

The STEAM results for 2010 were not expected to be released until mid - 2011; however, based on recent performance data gathered by the tourist board, this has showed that in 2010:

- There were 16.5% more visitors staying in hotels in 2010 than in 2009
- There were 6.2% more visitors to the core city attractions in 2010 than in 2009

Accordingly, ENWRS use these figures as a coefficient to 'update' respectively the day and staying visitor levels in STEAM.

Note Two:

The figures shown are based on whole-year data. Segmenting this using the monthly proportions in STEAM to cover just those dates when the Biennial took place suggests that the following were the number of visitors to the city through the period.

**Table 6.2 Visitors to Liverpool During the Biennial (STEAM Revised) 2006 - 2010**

Visitor types	2006	2008	2010
Visitor trips (Total)	4,206,000	5,409,000	5,320,000
Day Visitor trips	3,899,000	5,053,000	4,964,000
Staying Visitor trips	302,000	356,000	356,000
Staying Visitor trips (serviced)	187,000	236,000	242,000

Applying STEAM data to the Biennial (2011 p.58)

A key point here is in measuring how many of the visitors to the city (indicated in section 7.3.1) were in fact attending the Biennial. In order to do this, interviewers recorded the proportion of all visitors they stopped who indicated they were not attending any Biennial event whilst on their trip. Although these were not selected for interview, a ratio was calculated, and the estimate is that some 7.7% of all visitors to the city over this period were attending the Biennial. (This compares to some 10.7% in 2008 and 6.5% in 2006.

This gives:

**Table 6.3 Visitors to Liverpool Attending the Biennial 2006 - 2010 (STEAM revised p.58)**

Visitor types	2006	2008	2010
Trips (Total)	410,000	815,000	628,000
Resident trips	137,000	236,000	154,000
Day Visitor trips	242,000	523,000	402,000
Staying Visitor trips	31,000	55,000	72,000
Staying Visitor trips in serviced accommodation	18,000	33,000	43,000

Thus, in 2010, there were a total of 628,000 trips to the Biennial – compared to 815,000 in 2008 and 410,000 in 2006. There were:

- 402,000 ‘day trips’ made to see the Biennial
- 72,000 ‘staying trips’ made to see the Biennial

Note one: STEAM does not include local residents as these are not counted as ‘tourists.’ However, ENWRS know from the Biennial survey work the ratio of Liverpool residents to other visitors, and this had been used to calculate the figure shown.

Note two: in earlier years the STEAM Day / Stay split had lower reliability – and was accordingly split by what the Biennial findings indicated as being the true ‘Day’ / ‘Stay’ split. The work undertaken by NWDA had increased the robust level of the STEAM data. Thus, in the ENWRS calculations they had split the appointment. For venues where their survey sample was above 100, they used the split indicated by survey data; for other venues, they used that estimated by STEAM. This produced overall a much greater share of day visitors than earlier estimates but given the substantial increase in the STEAM baseline would otherwise lead to significant overestimates of the staying visitor market.

## 2012

Previous Biennial reports have used STEAM data together with data on venue attendance to quantify visits.

STEAM (Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor) is the core mechanism used by The Mersey Partnership to estimate the Value and Volume of tourism within Liverpool. A widely used model in the UK, STEAM relies upon local tourism data (such as Visits to attractions and hotel occupancy) to produce its figures and is called ‘Scarborough’ after the first place it was implemented in the UK.

STEAM is owned and operated by Global Tourism Solutions.

The most recent estimates from STEAM show that in 2009 Liverpool received the following number of visits:

- 30,495,000 Visitor trips
- 28,511,000 Day Visitor trips
- 1,984,000 Staying Visitor trips
- 1,155,000 Staying Visitor trips in serviced accommodation

**Note One:**

The STEAM results for 2012 are not expected to be released until mid – 2013; however, based on performance data gathered by the tourist board, this shows that in 2012:

- There were 11.3% more visitors staying in hotels in 2012 than in 2011
- There were 2.5% more visitors to the core city attractions in 2012 than in 2011 (this excludes the impact of the new Museum of Liverpool)
- 'SFR' trips are expected to show a slight drop

Accordingly, ENWRS used these figures as a coefficient to 'update' respectively the day and staying visitor levels in STEAM.

**Note Two:**

The figures shown above are based on whole-year data. Segmenting this using the monthly proportions in STEAM to cover just those dates when the Biennial took place suggests that the following were the number of visitors to the city through the period.

**Table 6.4 Visitors to Liverpool During the Biennial 2006 - 2012 (STEAM) (2013 p.54)**

Visitor types	2006	2008	2010	2012
Visitor trips (Total)	4,206,000	5,409,000	5,320,000	5,646,000
Day Visitor trips	3,899,000	5,053,000	4,964,000	5,227,000
Staying Visitor trips	302,000	356,000	356,000	424,000
Staying Visitor trips (in serviced accommodation)	187,000	236,000	242,000	307,000

**Applying STEAM data to the Biennial**

A key point is to measure how many of the visitors to the city indicates above in fact attended the Biennial. In order to do this, interviewees recorded the proportion of all visitors they stopped who indicated they were not attending any Biennial event whilst on their trip. Although these were not selected for interview, a ratio was calculated, and the estimate is that some 7.8% of all visitors to the city over this period were attending the Biennial. (This compares to some 7.7% in 2010 and 10.7% in 2008). This gives:

**Table 6.5 Visitors to Liverpool Attending the Biennial 2006 - 2012 (STEAM p.55)**

<b>Visitor types</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2012</b>
Trips (Total)	410,000	815,000	628,000	692,000
Residents trips	137,000	236,000	154,000	214,000
Day Visitors trips	242,000	523,000	402,000	412,000
Staying Visitors trips	31,000	55,000	72,000	65,000
Staying Visitor (in serviced accommodation)	18,000	33,000	43,000	47,000

Thus, in 2012, there were a total of 692,000 trips estimated to the Biennial – compared to 628,000 in 2010 and 815,000 in 2008 (although with this being ‘Capital of Culture year’ a comparison here may be a bit unfair).

This includes:

- 412,000 ‘day trips’ made to see the Biennial
- 65,000 ‘staying trips’ made to see the Biennial. This is lower than seen last year, although estimates seem to indicate this is more down to the lower level of the ‘SFR’ (Staying with Friends / Relatives) market. An ongoing growth of visits from those staying in hotels and serviced apartments is more evident

Note:

STEAM does not include local residents as these are not counted as ‘tourists.’ However, ENWRS know from the Biennial survey work the ratio of Liverpool residents to other visitors, and this has been used to calculate the figure shown.

**Appendix Seven:  
Liverpool Biennial City States**

**2010**

*City States* at Novas Contemporary Urban Centre represented the work of many different countries, with dance as well as contemporary pieces making fascinating encounters, and reinforcing the international flavour of the Festival which contributed so much to visitors' appreciation. Indeed, local appreciation of the Festival was as high as ever: 96% thought the Biennial is an important event for the city, and visitor figures, not just from Merseyside but from round the country and abroad reflect this. Independently audited figures showed that visitor numbers were nearly as high as during Capital of Culture two years previously.

The *City States* programme was particularly important for the future standing of Liverpool Biennial. In the 2008 Festival, there were a number of exhibitions, independently organised and funded by overseas governments and agencies, several of which were shown at the Contemporary Urban Centre (CUC) in Greenland Street. The Biennial saw this trend as capable of considerable development and took a proactive lead by offering the CUC building to these agencies under their overall direction, creating a new platform within the 2010 Festival. Exhibitions were organised by the Korean Cultural Centre, Quebec City, NICE festival (Northern Countries), ArtSchool Palestine, Bahamas / Barbados / Martinique and Vilnius.

**18 September - 28 November 2010**

*City States* was a new collaboration between Novas Scarman Contemporary Urban Centre Liverpool and Liverpool Biennial for the 2010 Biennial festival. The Grade II-listed warehouse was converted to be a vibrant cultural and community centre at the heart of the Baltic Triangle, including a restaurant, café, bar, cinema, conference facilities and performance and gallery space.

The building provided the ideal context in which to show contemporary art from cities around the world, and introduce the artists, organising bodies and audiences to the fabulous opportunities provided by the Centre to local people.

*City States* was an exhibition of art focused on life in cities around the world. The greatest challenges faced by humanity are in the cities, where the majority of the population now lives. City-to-city learning is the quickest and most effective way of addressing these challenges.

*City States* consisted of a cluster of six international exhibitions, initiated and wholly supported by embassies, foreign governments, international agencies or galleries, that explored the cultural dynamics between cities and states.

***Media Landscape – Zone East***, one of the projects forming part of *City States*, features a group of artists working internationally in locations from Seoul, Tokyo, Beijing, Taipei and Singapore to New York, Düsseldorf and London. Seoul, representing South Korea, invited ten Korean artists and nominated twelve other artists, from Japan, China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Indonesia and Singapore, to take part in the project.

The contributing artists for the exhibition *Media Landscape – Zone East*: CHUN Kyungwoo (Korea), FONG Silas (Hong Kong), HO Tzu Nyen (Singapore), HU Xiaoyuan (China), IZUMI Taro (Japan), JUNG Yumi (Korea), KIM Kira (Korea), KIM Young Eun (Korea), KOO Jeong A (Korea), KUSWIDANANTO Augustomis a.k.a JOMPET (Indonesia), MA Qiusha (China),

MIOON (Korea), OH Min (Korea), PARK Junebum, (Korea), SAKAKIBARA Sumito(Japan), SHIN Kiwoun (Korea), TAGUCHI Yukihiro (Japan), WU Chi-Tsung (Taiwan), YI Hyunchul (Korea) and ZHAO Yao (China).

The eight artists chosen for NICE's **Nordic Pavilion** find inspiration from urban landscapes, social environments, identities, rhythms in movement and fetishised commodities. These imaginative geographies help us to look at our own ritualised ways of living, everyday experiences of the city's environment, and the materials with which we identify ourselves. Contributing artists included: Knut Åsdam (Norway), SÅren Thilo Funder (Denmark), Hrafnhildur Arnardottir AKA 'Shoplifter' (Iceland), Hrafnkell Sigurdsson (Iceland), Marianna MÀrkÀre and RannvÀj KÀjradÀttir (Faroe Islands), Kalle Brolin (Sweden) and Johanna Lecklin (Finland). The Nordic Pavilion was curated by Claudia Lastra in collaboration with NICE (Nordic Intercultural Creative Events)

**Future Movements - Jerusalem** featured artworks that draw inspiration from the city of Jerusalem and its changing urban structure. The exhibition took the viewer to places outside the spiritual and holy Old City to urban locations that, despite their importance in shaping the contemporary urban city, have rarely been referenced or addressed in literature and visual art. Fourteen artists were invited: Basel Abbas and Ruanne Abou Rahme (Palestine), Jawad Al Malhi (Palestine), Sarah Beddington (UK), Anna Boggon (UK), CAMP Group (India), Raouf Haj Yihya (Palestine), Alexandra Handal (Palestine/UK), Shuruq Harb (Palestine), Maj Hasager (Denmark), Jakob Jakobsen (Denmark), Bouchra Khalili (Morocco/ France), Larissa Sansour (Palestine / Denmark) and Oraib Toukan (Jordan).

The exhibition unravelled Jerusalem as an urban structure in all its physical, social, economic and political complexity, demonstrating how urban space is divided, conquered, abandoned and occupied again. Supported by the Barjeel Art Foundation, the Danish Arts Council, Foundation for Arts Initiative, Zina Jardaneh, the Palestinian Ministry of Culture and Visiting Arts. *Future Movements* is curated by Samar Martha and organised by ArtSchool Palestine in cooperation with Al Hoash Gallery, Jerusalem, and Visiting Arts.

**Three Moments – The Caribbean** Stuart Hall, in his essay *Modernity and Its Others: Three 'Moments' In The Post-war History of the Black Diaspora Arts* revisits modernity through three historical art movements from the perspective of the Diaspora. This discourse stands as the theme of this pavilion where three moments will become symbolised by three Caribbean islands: the Bahamas, Martinique, and Barbados.

The featured artists – Ewan Atkinson, Ishi Butcher, Akyem Ramsay (from Barbados), Kendra Frorup, Heino Schmid, John Beadle, Lynn Parotti, Lavar Munroe and Blue Curry (from the Bahamas) and David Damoison, Christian Bertin and Jean-François Boclé (from Martinique) – were selected on their ability to make work that responds to contemporary and historical global themes. For the first time artists from the Caribbean region are collectively making new work that responds to the city of Liverpool while maintaining a distinctive stance on what Stuart Hall might call a 21<sup>st</sup> century Caribbean modernist aesthetic.

*Three Moments* is selected and curated by Dominique Brebion (Martinique), Alissandra Cummins (Barbados), Holly Parotti (Bahamas) and Allison Thompson (Barbados) in collaboration with the ICF.

**City Without Walls – Vilnius** is an exhibition whose title draws on disparate sources: an Old Testament passage, a poem by W.H. Auden (1969) and Andre Malraux's 'museum without

walls.’ The exhibition’s allusions are used as a foil for the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius. If Lithuania resides at the geopolitical nexus between the eastern periphery of the European Union and Belarus, Russia and beyond, then Vilnius is its cosmopolitan epicentre, whose cultural openness and diversity makes it metaphorically a ‘city without walls.’

*City Without Walls* was curated by Raul Zamudio and Laura Rutkute with the assistance of Augustina Matuseviciute, and organised by VARTAI gallery, Vilnius

### **15 September - 25 November 2012**

Starting from the premise that the state of cities increasingly determines the future of states, *City States* presents thirteen exhibitions developed in relation to the theme of hospitality.

More than half of the world population lives in cities and people continue to be drawn to urban life. This migration gives rise to a double allegiance: to the city we live and work in, and the place of our nationality, birth, culture or ancestry. In cities different cultures of hospitality often co-exist in the same place. The exchange of knowledge and experience between cities increasingly constitutes a new urban geopolitics that is both particular to each city and globally linked.

*City States* gives form to this idea with an architecture that is specific to the thirteen exhibitions and integrated in the open plan space of this post-postal industry building. Each exhibition is distinct, yet all are connected in offering an understanding of hospitality for our times.

#### **City States: Project List**

##### **Birmingham: The Magic City**

BAZ, Helen Brown, Home of Metal, Napalm Death, plan b, David Rowan, Bedwyr Williams

##### **Copenhagen: Approaching Journey**

Yvette Brackman, Ismar Cirkinagic, Jens Haaning, Jane Jin Kaisen

##### **Gdansk: Unwanted Visitors**

Yael Bartana, Oskar Hansen, Alicja Karska & Aleksandra Went, Janek Simon, Kama Sokolnicka, Robert Kusmirowski

##### **Hong Kong: All Are Guests**

Chow Chun-fai, Leung Mee-ping, CoLAB x SLOW

##### **Incheon: Terra Galaxia: Aerotropolis**

Sen Chung, Kyungah Ham, Seoung Won, Wil Bolton, Sukgeun Oh

##### **Lisbon: Air Print**

Miguel Palma

##### **Makhachkala: Topography of Masculinity**

Taus Makhacheva

**Oslo: Palestinian Embassy**

Goksoyr &amp; Martens

**Reykjavik, Nuuk, Torshavn: North Atlantic Pavilion**

Hanni Bjartalio, Sigurour Guojonsson, Jessie Kleemann

**St. Petersburg: Interior**

Masha Godovannaya

**Taipei: Metro-Wonderland: Taiwanese Artists and Urban Morphology**

Chen Chia-Jen, Chiu Chen-Hung, Hsu Chia-Wei

**Vilnius: Black Pillow**

Audrius Buacas and Valdas Ozarinskas

**Wellington: Watermarking**

David Bennewith, William Hsu, Marnie Slater

Since 2006, Liverpool Biennial has included ‘collateral’ events organised and supported by embassies, international agencies or galleries, and promoted by Liverpool Biennial as a part of the programme. In 2010, for the first time, Liverpool Biennial solicited exhibitions organised overseas and promoted under the title *City States*. *City States* started from the premise that artists and their art are inspired by the ‘freedom of the city.’ People continue to be drawn to cities, with over 70% of the world’s population projected to live in cities by 2050.

This migration and its focus gives rise to a double allegiance: to the city we live and work in, and the place of our nationality, birth, culture or ancestry. Cities demand enormous resources and are the greatest economic drivers. For these reasons the state of cities increasingly determines the future of States.

*City States* also responds to the theme of hospitality and contributes to its wider exploration. *City States* 2012 brings together over sixty artists from seven countries, exploring the dynamics between cities and states with new and pre-existing works. *City States* will present work from cities such as Copenhagen, Gdańsk, Hong Kong, Incheon, Lisbon, Makhachkala, Reykjavik, Oslo, Taipei, Vilnius, Wellington. The artists invited to create *The Unexpected Guest* and *City States* 2012 question our ability to be ‘unprepared.’ Can we afford to be hospitable in these critical times?

**City States: Project List****Birmingham: Birmingham The Magic City**

BAZ

Helen Brown

Home of Metal

Napalm Death

plan b

David Rowan

Bedwyr Williams

**Copenhagen: Approaching Journey**

Yvette Brackman  
Ismar Cirkinagic  
Jens Haaning  
Jane Jin Kaisen

**Erbil: Untitled**

ArtRole

**Gdańsk: Unwanted Visitors**

Yael Bartana  
Oskar Hansen  
Alicja Karska & Aleksandra Went  
Slawomir Lipnicki  
Janek Simon  
Kama Sokolnicka

**Hong Kong: All Are Guests**

Chow Chun-fai  
LEUNG Mee-ping  
CoLAB × SLOW

**Incheon: Terra Galaxia**

Sen Chung  
Kyungah Ham  
Seoung Won Won  
Will Bolton  
Sukgeun Oh  
Yoon Suknam

**Lisbon: Air Print**

Miguel Palma

**Makhachkala: Topography of Masculinity**

Taus Makhacheva

**Oslo: Palestinian Embassy**

Goksoyr and Martens

**Reykjavik, Nuuk, Tórshavn: North Atlantic Pavilion**

Hanni Bjartalíð  
Sigurður Guðjónsson  
Jessie Kleemann

**St. Petersburg: Interior**

Masha Godovannaya

**Taipei: Metro-Wonderland: Taiwanese Artists and Urban Morphology**

CHEN Chia-Jen  
CHIU Chen-Hung  
HSU Chia-Wei

Simon Adam Yorke

Appendices

**Vilnius: Black Pillow**

Audrius Bučas and Valdas Ozarinskas

**Wellington: Watermarking**

David Bennewith

William Hsu

Marnie Slater

**Appendix Eight:  
Liverpool Biennial Research and Impact Reports Information**

**TEAM (Tourism Enterprise and Management) 2000**

The TEAM audience evaluation was commissioned by Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art (LBCA) and funded by North West Arts Board. It was undertaken between September 1999 and March 2000. The main purpose of the research was to provide the Biennial with an attender profile, incorporating demographic information, motivations for attendance, responses to publicity and marketing of the Festival and their general perception of the various exhibitions and events.

The TEAM research sits alongside the Helen Rees Leahy's evaluation that assessed the relationships of the Biennial to different sectors and helped to signal strategic routes for development. The objectives of the research were to provide the Liverpool Biennial with attender information in the following areas:

- To ascertain how respondents found out about the Biennial
- To establish in broad terms how respondents felt about Liverpool holding the Biennial and its general impact on the city
- To monitor the effectiveness of the marketing campaign
- To ascertain which factors motivated respondents to attend the Biennial
- To gather general feedback comments about the Biennial from attenders
- To provide basic demographic information on audiences (gender, age, geographic location, occupation, art attendance)

Interviews were conducted over the course of the Biennial and produced a sample size of 328. People's availability for further research was sought at the stage to provide TEAM with names of potential focus group attenders, telephone interviewees, and people to whom they could send a further questionnaire. Unfortunately, the sample did not produce enough people willing to take part in the telephone depth interviews, and so in consultation with the Biennial, it was decided to carry out a second wave questionnaire which produced a sample size of thirty-three.

TEAM facilitated two focus groups with attenders from the Biennial, the first group was made up largely of young attenders (under 25), the majority of whom were studying art related subjects. The second group was made up of older attenders who were habitual gallery attenders. A total of eight people attended the groups, this exhausted the data collected from the 328 sample as outlined above. There was no recruitment criteria and groups were not deliberately segmented.

**The Inaugural Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art; Evaluation Report**  
**Helen Rees Leahy**  
**May 2000**

The broad objectives of the Rees Leahy evaluation of the inaugural Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art were summarised as:

- To realise the concept of creating the first biennial of contemporary art in the UK
- To build on the creative momentum established by previous and existing initiatives among artists and visual arts organisations within (and beyond) Liverpool (including Visionfest, artranspennine98, Video Positive &c)
- To create collaborative opportunities for venues, organisations and artists based in Liverpool, and to form partnerships to produce an event which is greater than the sum of its parts
- To realise the untapped potential of the people, spaces, buildings and organisations in Liverpool, and thereby to create an artistic event that has the potential to change the perception of the city, from within and without

Rees Leahy argued that such statements are both broad and ambitious, reflecting the experimental nature of the inaugural Biennial. By their general nature, they also risk meaning all things to all men. However, contributors to the evaluation showed that, to a large extent, both the vision and the purpose of the Biennial were understood and shared by the large numbers of people who, in different ways, were involved in its realisation-as Board members, staff, artists, partners and volunteers. Unfortunately, research into audience response to the Biennial by TEAM was not sufficiently detailed to provide clear evidence as to whether or not visitors and residents also shared this view of the purpose of the Biennial.

Of course, the question as to whether the inaugural Biennial achieved these aims in another matter. In general, as this evaluation report indicates, the above objectives were fulfilled by the inaugural Biennial. This is a considerable achievement in which everyone involved should take pride.

However, without diminishing the scale of this accomplishment, the Rees Leahy (2000) report showed that the means by which the first Biennial was realised did not provide a viable blueprint for the future. As the inaugural Biennial, the 1999 event was, perhaps inevitably, organised as if it was a one-off experiment, rather than the first in a strategic series of regular events. Rees Leahy argued that this was not a criticism, merely a statement of a fact which probably could not have been entirely avoided. Few of those involved (with, perhaps, the notable exception of Anthony Bond) had previous experience of an event on this scale and of such complexity, and it was not surprising that mistakes were made which, with the benefit of hindsight, need not be repeated. Equally, reality follows rhetoric, and without both vision and hype the 1999 Biennial would not have happened. The immediate challenge to the Board was to shift the modus operandi of the enterprise from short-term opportunism to long-term sustainability.

As the evaluation report demonstrated, many of the more detailed operational objectives for the Biennial that were included in the (undated) 'Business Plan 1998 - 2000' were not realised in 1999 - including, for example, the implementation of 'a well-structured marketing plan' and the establishment of 'operational systems to support clear delivery.' It was clear that in Autumn 1999 the pressures on staff of responding to events and demands

became so great that the disciplines of planning and systematic working were (or had to be) abandoned.

In the absence of specific targets and performance measures for the 1999 Biennial, Rees Leahy found that it was impossible to evaluate fully its success in, say, promoting cultural tourism to Liverpool, let alone such 'soft' factors as its contribution to the quality of life in the region. It is only possible to evaluate against evidence, but for 1999, the data needed for analysis of, say, the potential contribution of the Biennial to civic policies for cultural and economic regeneration is not available.

Rees Leahy stated that the absence of clear, agreed targets for the delivery of the future Biennials will undermine its case within the arts funding system and within the political and business contexts that are crucial to its strategic development. While the broad and general nature of the objectives set for 1999 were appropriate for the inaugural event, in future objectives should be agreed with specific performance measures and data capture systems attached.

Setting joint objectives (at the outset of planning each successive event) with partners, funders and stakeholders would also help to embed the Biennial within the cultural, social, and political life of Liverpool - and the UK. Criteria for evaluation and the use of evaluation as a tool for planning and delivery should be integral to the management of successive Biennials, rather than as a project commissioned after the event. Rees Leahy set the evaluation out in the following format:

### **The Board**

1. A programme of Board development should take place now, including an audit of Board skills, systematic recruitment of new members, agreement of Board objectives and a review of Board procedures &c.
2. The Board recruitment strategy should include a succession plan for the Chair.
3. The issue of the representation of partner organisations on the Board should be addressed in order to pre-empt a perceived conflict of interest between the fiduciary responsibilities of non-executive directors and the professional responsibilities of contractors of the Biennial.
4. A priority now for the Board to lead an initiative to achieve financial sustainability for the future Biennials.

### **Section 5: Staff**

5. A disinterested review of functional requirements should be undertaken, and a new staff and volunteer plan should be designed, costed and implemented for the Realisation of the 2001 Biennial and beyond.
6. A recruitment strategy is required to complement the staff and volunteer plan, with the objective of raising the calibre of candidate for freelance contracts and short-term posts based in Liverpool.
7. Issues of staff induction and development should be addressed strategically, possibly in partnership with regional stakeholders and other agencies.
8. A volunteer strategy and policy for 2001 should be developed in conjunction with training and education partners in Liverpool and beyond.

**Section 6: Programme: Partnership and Structure**

9. The challenge for 2001 (and beyond) is to recreate and to extend the positive effects of the partnership model that was established in 1999, without necessarily repeating the same artistic and curatorial formulae.
10. The Biennial must attract additional, rather substitute, funding so as to enable organisations of unequal means to work together as artistic equals.
11. The significance of the role and participation of the Tate in future Biennials must be considered both within the Tate and also by the Biennial Board.

**Section 7: Programme: The International Exhibition: Trace**

12. The appointment of the curator(s) for 2001 should demonstrate that the 1999 Biennial does not represent a formula that will always be repeated. The International exhibition should again take place in non-museum buildings
13. Lines of responsibility for delivery, as well as for the conception, of the 2001 International exhibition should be clearly defined at the outset, and contrasts with venues (as well as with artists) should explicitly assign roles and responsibilities
14. A venue steering group should be established in advance of each Biennial to address common venues management issues
15. Longer term planning should facilitate liaison with Liverpool City Council with regard to planning. Health and Safety and access issues arising at external venues, thereby making better use of LCC expertise and support in identifying and using diverse spaces throughout the city
16. The Curator(s) of the next Biennial should work with the Biennial office to assess which of the concerns expressed by artists (relating to operating systems and project management resources) are valid and should be addressed

**Section 8: Programme: John Moores 21**

17. The Walker Art Gallery should continue to consider how best to preserve (and refresh) the special relationship between the John Moores Painting Prize and the Gallery within the structure of the Biennial
18. The potential benefits of developing the partnership between the Biennial and the National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside (including the Walker Art Gallery) should be pursued

**Section 9: Programme: Newcontemporaries**

19. The Board of Newcontemporaries (and of the Biennial) should consider how Newcontemporaries (as an annual event) can be sustained and develop in the interim years, perhaps as a Biennial 'trail blazer'
20. A more sophisticated and proactive press and PR strategy for the Biennial in relation to its constituent parts is required in future, in order to redress the reduction in dedicated press coverage for John Moores 21 and Newcontemporaries in 1999
21. The issue of the Biennial's ability to attract additional funds should be addressed, in order to ameliorate the funding constraints encountered by its partners (such as Newcontemporaries) and also to add further value to the Biennial as a whole

**Section 10: Programme: Tracey**

22. In 2001, artists should be enabled again to take control of the 'fourth dimension' through the provision of seed funding at an early stage, thereby sending out a clear signal of engagement at the outset
23. The Biennial should heed and, if appropriate, facilitate, the debate that it has stimulated among artists regarding the representation of their work

**Section 11: Education and Public Access Programme**

24. The success of the strategy of distributing resources in order to ameliorate potential imbalances in the education programme should be pursued in the contexts both of future education programmes and the future Biennials as a whole
25. The interim years between Biennials should be used to sustain and develop relationships with community groups and also to conduct continuing research and advocacy for the education and public access programme.

**Section 12: Marketing**

26. Now that the Biennial 'brand' has been established in Liverpool, the task for 2001 is to promote its recall among those who became aware of it in 1999, as well as to extend awareness and interest in the project next time round. The strategy for 2001 should be informed by front-end research
27. The marketing strategy for 2001 must be agreed by the Biennial Board and responsibility for its delivery against performance measures should be delegated to the executive staff
28. The assumption that contemporary visual art appeals primarily to young people should be questioned, and the interests and needs of other groups of people should be taken into account in developing a strategy for audience development.
29. Closer links with the City Council and Mersey Tourism &c should be pursued in order to market the Biennial more effectively both inside and beyond the city

**Section 13: Press and Media**

30. It is recommended that the Biennial establishes its own press office (employing a press officer on a short-term contract) to devise and implement future policy. If additional external support is required, this should be supplied as back-up, not a substitute, for in-house management
31. The Board of the Biennial must agree on the PR relationship between the centre (Biennial office) and the participants and devolve responsibility for its implementation to the contract press officer
32. A press agency in New York should be retained / contracted for the 2001 Biennial in order to build on the foundation laid in 1999, and to stimulate more critical coverage of the second Biennial in the
33. A strategy for developing the International profile of the Biennial should be developed in conjunction with key stakeholders (particularly, the City Council)

**Section 14: Audience**

34. A strategy is required now that identifies (new and existing) target audiences for 2001 and systematically nurtures their interest in the Biennial

35. Thorough market research to identify and understand the Biennial's constituencies is required in the future. Research should be conducted before (to establish the baseline), during and after (to measure lasting effects) each Biennial, so as to measure the impact of the Biennial as a regular event
36. Given the inherent stop/start nature of the Biennial, audience development strategies should be devised, in conjunction with partnership venues and organisations, to develop and sustain the impact of each successive Biennial during alternate years

### **Section 15: Fundraising**

37. Fundraising is a priority now, and it is the Board's responsibility to secure adequate resources to implement a development strategy for 2001 and beyond.
38. There is a need to recruit Board members who are willing and able to contribute to the fundraising effort
39. The precedent set in 1999 for raising funds overseas should be taken up as a challenge to meet increased targets in 2001

### **Section 16: Strategic Partners**

40. A planned programme of high-profile advocacy is now required to establish partnerships across the city and beyond
41. The Board now requires additional advocacy tools, including a Report and Accounts for the Inaugural Biennial, a Business Plan and Artistic Strategy for 2001 and appropriate funding / partnership proposals for potential supporters

The Rees Leahy report began with forty-three recommendations for action, the majority of which reiterated the theme running throughout the paper: namely, the need to shift gear from the realisation of a bold experiment to the achievement of medium – and long-term sustainability and strategic effectiveness. This process of change was required in every aspect of the Biennial organisation and, in this sense, many of the recommendations were interconnected. Rees Leahy warned that cherry picking those recommendations which appeared most attractive or realisable would not suffice: the need was to create a holistic strategy for development, informed by the evaluation of the Biennial's early record in project management, marketing, education, fundraising and building stakeholder relationships. (2000, p.49)

A strategy was required that identified (new and existing) target audiences for 2001 that systematically nurtured their interest in the Biennial. Rees Leahy argued that the Board should consider a policy for reaching audiences that were not attracted to the 1999 Biennial – such as families and senior citizens. In addition, Rees Leahy explained that the potential to promote the Biennial as a destination for visitors beyond Liverpool and its regional hinterland had yet to be developed – in turn, raising the issue of how strong the civic / regional identity of the Biennial was received beyond the North West.

Rees Leahy argued that thorough market research to identify and understand the Biennial's constituencies was required in the future and should be commissioned and managed by the Biennial itself (not NWAB). Research should be conducted before (to establish the baseline), during and after (to measure lasting effects) each Biennial, so as to measure the impact of the Biennial as a regular event.

Rees Leahy advised that a distinction should be made between perception of, and attitudes to, the biennial in particular and to contemporary visual art in general, and research conducted into the effect of the Biennial in developing an audience for contemporary art. For example, the Harris research centre report on the impact of the year of visual art in the north of England showed that support for the year of visual art exceeded people's interest in contemporary visual art per se. The Harris report also showed that a rolling programme of related events was required to sustain the interest engendered by the year's events. Given the inherent stop / start nature of the Biennial, audience development strategies should be devised, in conjunction with partnership venues and organisations, to develop and sustain the impact of each successive Biennial during alternate years.

This report was intended to provide the Board with a tool for the development of the Biennial in the future, and also as a contribution to the wider debate that the Liverpool and its Biennial had stimulated.

**MHM (2002) Biennial 2002 Final Report. Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, Manchester****INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT**

This research project addressed a clear brief with a varied methodology designed to fit with the resources available. A number of assumptions underlie the interpretation of the findings. These assumptions are important as they provide a context for some of the interpretations and conclusions. They are:

- That the Biennial 2002 would have broadly the same target for visits that the 1999 Biennial had set, which is 250,00
- That, in the absence of any accurate method of evaluating the total number of visits in 1999, and on the basis of the visitor profile and behaviour, the number of visits was below target
- MHM holds data for such events as the Dali exhibition at the Tate Liverpool, general visitor profile for the Tate Liverpool, the Belfast Festival, the Edinburgh Festival, and the Edinburgh International Film Festival. On the basis of this intelligence, it was assumed that if the Biennial wanted to meet the target of 250,00 visits it is realistic to assume that the largest proportion of these will be drawn from the Merseyside and North West region, especially in the early years
- This balance of regional visits to cultural tourists might change overtime as the Biennial achieves another aim of raising the profile of Liverpool as a cultural tourism destination but whilst the profile might be raised, attitudes altered and visitors attracted, the local and regional audience will always constitute the larger proportion of visits if the Biennial wants to achieve its targets

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The research objectives were to:

- Test the strength of the 1999 Biennial brand
- Understand the expectations of the 2002 Biennial amongst target audiences
- Test the proposed 2002 offering
- Understand motivations and obstacles to attendance
- Make recommendations on communications and audience development strategies
- Identify marketing objectives and evaluation methods

**METHODOLOGY**

The methodology included:

- A review of current documents in 1999 and 2002 Biennial
- Focus groups of existing and potential attendees
- Depth interviews with peers and stakeholders
- Population survey within Merseyside

The brief identified a large number of market segments. In the light of resources that were available, the research sample had to be set at 250 interviews. It was therefore agreed to

keep the population survey confined to Merseyside in order to feel confident about the robustness of the findings. There was not the budget available to do any quantitative research on the potential national or international market.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS**

### **ACHIEVING VISITOR TARGETS**

For the Biennial to achieve a target of 250,000 visits the marketing strategy should prioritise communicating effectively with the local and regional markets as well as national and international Vocational and Cultural tourism markets, since local people will have to make up the highest proportion of attenders.

#### **How should the Biennial communicate with its market segments and what are the implications for the Marketing Strategy?**

Publicity needs to convey the creativity, ingenuity, and innovative quality of the event itself as well as the fact that this is something special, exciting, international, and different, and on a world stage. The gritty, ironic, self-depreciating, dark and light character of Liverpool needs to lie at the heart of the brand identity.

The marketing strategy and development of the Biennials brand identity will need to recognise that the Biennial offers a different proposition to different segments, which have different needs and motivations and different obstacles to attendance. The details of these considerations are outlined in the report.

It is important that the communications activity can inform local and regional people of the nature of the Biennial, and of its aspirations, whilst conveying a friendly, accessible, engaging event open to anyone with contemporary or arts interests.

Assumptions should not be made about audiences knowing what a Biennial is or being familiar with the names of artists. Whilst this information might be important to the Vocationals group it is meaningless to the majority of total and regional attenders.

### **Measuring Success**

To ensure that the marketing operation contributes to the overall corporate aims of the Biennial and that success can be measured marketing objectives need to be set which are clearly focused on a task, and measurable. The means of measuring them need to be agreed and planned in advance of the implementation of the strategy.

The objectives recommended would necessitate an evaluation method which comprises:

- Clear counting of visitors at all sites by common, agreed method-establish frequency of visiting and cross-over
- Mini survey on site to:
  - Capture postcode and contact details - for origin of visitors
  - Measure awareness pre- and post-visit
  - Establish levels of international and incidental visiting:
- Population survey of attender's post event-to profile attenders, gauge responses to event test effectiveness of marketing activity
- Population survey in Merseyside to measure brand awareness and support
- Desk research to compare local tourism data with that of non-Biennial year
- Depth interviews with peers and stakeholders

## The Graduate Retention Report 2002

The report was commissioned by the Liverpool Biennial on behalf of the Visual Arts Group (author Heidi Reitmaier). The premise of the research was developed because the city of Liverpool has a better provision for the exhibition of contemporary fine arts in Britain than any city outside of London. There is a large number of undergraduate and graduate courses in the arts producing a much larger number of expertly qualified individuals in this field. However, many of the graduates of fine art courses chose to leave the city and seek opportunity elsewhere. Many of the directors of leading institutions and the senior management inside the academies were aware that graduates choose to leave Liverpool, often immediately on graduation and that there was a shortage of young developing talent in the city. In conjunction with the organisations, the city council was keen to encourage the cultural life of the city. Social and cultural capital are essential to attracting a creative community to develop economic wealth. A city or town's social and cultural capital makes it an attractive place to be for knowledge workers: what the American academic Richard Florida in *The Rise of the Creative Class*<sup>ii</sup> has called the 'super creative core' of architects, educators, artists, designers, and media workers. These creative professionals bring to a city or region great economic power and growth. Florida's 'creative class' can generate new ideas and develop high-tech responses to a whole range of social, technical and economic problems.

A thriving creative class provides a new impetus to a region or a city; having a strong creative class is seen as vital in today's global economy. Cities which attract and retain creative individuals prosper, those that do not stagnate. The research was an important step in developing new strategies as the business community and economic developers are increasingly interested in the qualities which allow cities to become attractive to creative classes, and this is where good place management by local government comes in. Liverpool has always been ideal as an area that tolerates difference with diversity, as multi-cultural city based on the river traffic of import and export of the docks and tourism as a port, making it a vibrant and exciting place for redevelopment. As cited in the 2002 Cultural Strategy Documents for Liverpool, the most defining characteristics of the North West as an urban agglomeration was its sheer mass, scale and diversity in research, education, market potential, specialist skills, art and culture, sports, air and sea transport and economic activity. A twenty-year strategy by the North West Development Agency offered a vision to create a region which:

- Attracts and retains skilled and talented people
- Nurtures its environment, heritage and culture
- Kindles creativity, innovation and competitiveness
- Transforms its image
- Strengthens its infrastructure
- Attract new investment

To attract the creative classes, and retain creatives after graduation it was essential to nurture the current visual arts community and stimulate creative arts-based ventures. This would transform the reputation for arts graduates of Liverpool as a city of opportunity and experimentation, strengthening the existing arts organisations and assisting in their growth, whilst offering greater opportunities to the commercial sector and ultimately diversifying the arts community and making it more visible and accessible. Equally important today is

the technological infrastructure of broadband, wired hotspots, high levels of media and computing provision – all of this allows new, creative ways of working, which were later developed pre and post ECoC as investment in cultural capital is vital as a step change in a city's future. All of this will attract, stimulate, support and help Liverpool retain its creative class. The art providers of Liverpool were keen to co-ordinate effectively the richness and diversity of the city's arts and cultural opportunities to ensure that young graduates could see these many new possibilities that were available to them in the city.

It is imperative that measures are taken in the future to viably sustain and improve upon this environment for them. The document suggested recommendations to help in the delivery of this. A commitment to deliver on any agreed objectives was essential to achieving the goal of retaining graduates, and the ambition of the study was to understand and present detailed reasons why graduates were leaving the city to seek their opportunities elsewhere. The study looked at the various aspects of Liverpool's cultural map and assessed whether there was ample synergy within the cultural scene in its present state and consider the proposals for cultural growth. The study also commented on the adequacy of current structures and methods for fostering the ambitions of many young cultural practitioners such as internships, professional and business advice, formal training opportunities etc. The cultural breadth of the city continued to increase, particularly in terms of the representation of the visual arts, pre-European Capital of Culture success (2003). This developing infrastructure probably played a role in the successful bid. Culminating in a striving cultural sector running up to 2008 (ECoC) and its legacy.

**The Mersey Partnership 2004**

The reports present the findings of surveys to visitors to the Liverpool Biennial Festivals. The studies have been produced by the in-house research team at The Mersey Partnership, the tourist board for the Liverpool City Region. The team produce numerous key publications for the region, including the annual Economic Review and Digest of Tourism Statistics, as well as managing many regular research projects including Liverpool Destination Benchmarking and the Liverpool John Lennon Airport Gateway study. Under the badge of England's Northwest Research Service (ENWRS) the team conduct numerous commercial research projects in the Economic Development and Visitor Economy fields, with a particular specialism in event evaluation.

The research objectives included:

- Establish the number of participants in the Biennial Festivals that are Merseyside residents, domestic day visitors, domestic staying visitors and overseas visitors, based on the hometown of respondents
- Conduct a sociodemographic profile of people at exhibitions and segment them by their approach to art generally and their attitudes towards the Biennial
- To describe the types of visits that the Biennial audience are taking in terms of group structure, motivation, transport and accommodation used, length of stay etc.
- To investigate which elements of the Biennial the audience are aware of and which they visit
- To gauge the audience reaction to the various elements of the Biennial against their expectation
- To gauge the audience reaction to the event as a whole
- To evaluate the economic impact of the Biennial by calculating a separate average (mean) spend per visit for each of the visitor types and overlaying the relevant spend per head figures onto the estimated total size of each segment
- To quantify the impact / success of the Biennial marketing and promotion activities by comparing the proportion of visitors from each segment who were influenced by the marketing to the total economic impact of the exhibitions
- To identify the most appropriate overseas target markets segments for the next Biennial Festival
- To set that data in an appropriate context by supporting the primary research with secondary data wherever possible. Specifically, this secondary research draws comparisons between the Biennial and other events and identifies examples of best practice in the development and marketing of similar events
- Where appropriate, to make recommendations that could be used to improve the next Biennial

### **ENWRS (2004 – 2012) Methodology and Reporting**

To meet these objectives, 1,000 (600 interviews at the art installations and 400 interviews with passers-by on the city's main thoroughfares) interviews were carried out by the TMP IQCS trained interviewing team in and around the four exhibition strands during the Festival period. Sample sizes were chosen so as to give 95% confidence in the survey findings).

Much of the analysis data came from interviews conducted at the Biennial installations. The interviews were conducted at various exhibitions by the ENWRS interviewing team.

Respondents were not eligible for interview if any of the following applied:

1. They had only just arrived in Liverpool, since these visitors would not have experienced enough of the Biennial to complete a valid questionnaire
2. They were participating or working in Biennial exhibitions rather than observing

As the interviewers were not multilingual, it is difficult to ensure that the views of overseas visitors were properly represented. In order to give respondents that didn't speak English every chance to take part in the research, interviewers were allocated three tools with which to record the respondent's home country. Respondents could record their origin by:

1. Telling the interviewer where they come from
2. Picking their country's flag from an image card
3. Placing a cross on a map of Europe of the world

The interviewers were set a quota of twenty-four interviews per day. The aim was to collect data from a cross-section of Biennial venues, however at some venue's low visitor numbers or the nature of the exhibition venue made it difficult for interviewers to reach their quotas, in which case an alternative location was allocated.

The questionnaire used to conduct the interviewing was short (around 5 – 7 minutes) containing around thirty questions (quantitative) covering respondent profile, opinions and behaviour. The majority of questions were closed questions to allow a direct comparison and statistical analysis of the results using SPSS. Five-point Likert Scales were used in the survey to try and quantify the qualitative (e.g. satisfaction) and presented a mean score, where 1 equalled Very Poor and five equalled Very Good. Some open-ended questions (qualitative) were included to allow respondents to express their opinions on any issues of relevance. Before the data collected by means of the questionnaire could be analysed, the questionnaires were edited, and coding frames made for each open-ended question (e.g. Why?). A large proportion of this report has been laid out as a normal visitor survey. The results are presented in tables, charts and graphs, which have been selected on a case-by-case basis with the aim of presenting the findings as clearly as possible to the reader. Completed questionnaires were data entered into SNAP with analysis being conducted in SPSS; this allowed both a wide range of crosstabulations to be produced together with mean calculations; SPSS also enables further exploration and segmentation of the data should this be required.

Simple random sampling was used as it was decided that this was the best means to secure a representative sample. The interviewer guidance notes, and training ensured that interviewers understand and are aware of the potential to introduce bias to the sample.

The ideal random sample process would instruct the interviewer to interview every 'nth' person, however in order to get as many interviews as possible towards the target once an interview was completed the interviewer then attempt to interview the next person to pass. Only adults aged sixteen or over were interviewed, unless the interviewer had the permission of an accompanying adult.

The social grade was always calculated based upon the employment profile of the head of the respondent's household. ENWRS used social grading as they can predict certain lifestyle and spending patterns from other external survey work, including the National Readership Survey (NRS). In particular with regards to the Festivals research, higher social grades were assumed to be consistent with higher spending power. Social grades are equivalent to the following employment categories:

- A / B = Higher and Intermediate managerial / administrative / professional
- C1 = Supervisory / clerical / junior managerial / administrative / professional
- C2 = Skilled manual workers
- D = Semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers
- E = On state benefit / unemployed / lowest grade workers

STEAM (Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor) is the primary tool used by The Mersey Partnership and the NWDA (North West Development Agency) to monitor the volume and value of tourism throughout the Northwest of England. A modelled approach to visitor levels, it relies on locally gathered data from attractions, hotels and gateways. STEAM does not include local residents as these are not counted as 'tourists.' However, ENWRS know from the Biennial survey work that ratio of Liverpool residents to other visitors, and this had been used to calculate the figures in each report. Also, percentage share Staying / Day was adjusted before being applied to the total STEAM figures where applicable, Biennial figures were compared against other tourist board figures including *Digest of Tourism Statistics* and *LJ Forecaster* to give a true representation of the Festivals impact to Liverpool and surrounding areas.

### **Sampling Error**

As the result of the survey are based on a selection of visitors to the area, the statistics quoted may differ from those that would have been produced had every visitor been surveyed. This potential difference is known as the 'sampling error.' The sampling error for any particular percentages as presented in the tables depend upon the size of the sample on which the percentage is based, and on the value of the percentage itself. The selection of respondents was not a true random or systematic sample, but efforts were made to produce a representative selection of respondents. Although it cannot be measured, it is considered that any bias given to the results through lack of true random sampling will be minimal.

### **The Code of Conduct**

The principles of the Code of Conduct, to which all clients participating in the market research process must adhere, are set out below:

Research is founded upon the willing co-operation of the public and of business organisations. It depends upon public and business confidence that it is conducted honestly, objectively, without unwelcome intrusion and without harm to respondents. Its

purpose is to collect and analyse information and not directly to create sales nor to influence the opinions of anyone participating in it. It is this spirit that the Code of Conduct has been devised.

The general public and other interested parties are entitled to complete assurance that every research project is carried out strictly in accordance with this code and that their rights of privacy are respected. In particular, they must be assured that no information, which could be used to identify them, will be made available without their agreement to anyone outside the agency responsible for conducting the research. They must also be assured that the information they supply will not be used for any purpose other than research and that they will not be adversely affected or embarrassed as a direct result of their participation in a research project. Wherever possible respondents must be informed as to the purpose of the research and the likely length of time necessary for the collection of the information. Finally, the research findings themselves must always be reported accurately and never used to mislead anyone in any way. (ENWRS 2005, pp.57 - 8)

**AJA (2009) Art in the Public and Digital Realms: Evaluation Toolkit. Annabel Jackson Associates, Somerset**

The Evaluation Toolkit was written by Annabel Jackson and piloted with Liverpool Biennial, and other members of Visual Arts in Liverpool (VAiL) in conjunction with Arts Council England. The Evaluation Toolkit complimented the Visual Arts Sector Toolkit for Collecting Audience Data. The Toolkit gives guidance and questionnaires to help arts organisations and projects carry out their own evaluations. Information from the Toolkit is intended to be used to engage larger audiences more deeply, to inform programming, and attract more resources through a better evidenced case as art in the public and digital realms, and its evaluation is important to the Arts Council plan of Great Art for Everyone. The toolkit concentrated on:

- Visual arts, including public art and other art forms
- The digital environment, as an increasingly important element of public space  
Digital art does not include a distinct category of artistic practice, but rather an approach to building relationships with audiences. This was consistent with the Arts Council's priority of Digital Opportunities. Work which uses digital technologies, but takes place in a gallery setting, is included within the visual toolkit, but excluded in the research

Public art practitioners have tended to be cautious about evaluation and the research admits that there is very little formal evaluation of public art. The research started by reviewing the literature already out there, using sixty reports on public art. Most focused on process evaluation for internal consumption rather than impact analysis, with the existing quality of evaluations as generally disappointing, with the exception of reports by Liverpool Biennial and other VAiL members.

Literature suggested that an evaluation toolkit for art in the public and digital realms needs to meet these requirements:

- Relevance to a wide range of practices. Public art includes temporary and permanent products as well as activities that range widely in character, scale, meaning and intention. Digital art can include artwork in a public space, official and unofficial representations of that artwork, commentaries, discussions, and representations of the artwork as well as art designed intentionally for the digital realm. The Evaluation Toolkit has been designed to be relevant to programmes such as Liverpool Biennial, but also to individual works of art in the public and digital realms
- Acknowledgement of the different way's audiences can have contact with public and digital art. Contact can be intentional or accidental, conscious or subconscious, direct or indirect. The audience typically includes people who travel specifically to see or take part in the public art, people who use the space of which it is a part, people who drive or walk past it without conscious awareness of its presence, and people who hear only of the public art through word of mouth or the media. For digital presentations, contact can be through the Internet, social networking sites, and / or through mobile technologies. The audience might relate to the work for practical purposes such as way-finding or meeting points. In the digital realm the audience might encounter the work as part of a wider search for content and not think of it as art at all

- Consideration of intangible outcomes. The relationship between public / digital art and the public - whichever public is intended - varies widely in strength and nature. Intended outcomes are often perceptual rather than experiential or action based. For example, specific pieces or acts of art might be intended to symbolise, challenge or channel perceptions from, or of, the local community. The Evaluation Toolkit has been designed to evaluate the quality of experience, as well as demographic and profile information on audience numbers
- Acknowledgement that the impact might be negative. Questions need to be neutral and unloaded
- Acknowledgement of the way that outcomes to art in the public and digital realm are often lagged. Reactions to public art evolve over time. For example, reactions might be initially strong and highly negative but then evolve over time to become highly positive. Or reactions might be initially weak but strengthen over time. Similarly take up of digital representations can experience exponential growth in take up long after the original presentation
- Focus. Evaluation needs to consider a few key issues rather than attempting to be all encompassing. We are extremely conscious of the practical limitations on arts organisations. The Evaluation Toolkit is designed to be useful to small arts organisations working without the assistance of evaluation professionals, as well to larger organisations or programmes
- Link to professional evaluation practice. We follow the standards and practice of the American Evaluation Association

The research also asked a number of questions about the public / digital work included within Liverpool Biennial 2008 and used a number of formats. These methodologies included:

### **Web Survey of Liverpool Biennial**

The website address of the survey was distributed through a number of group email lists including the '08 Card' mailing list; this was a list of people operated by Live Smart (which is owned by Merseytravel) which consisted of 60,000 people who signed up for information about the Capital of Culture activities in return for a discount card with offers from cultural partners. The Biennial 08 took place between September and November 2008, but the research was conducted in January and February 2009 which is a strange time to conduct research so far after the event. The responses would not be accurate as they would be entirely from memory. Surely the research should have been conducted during the Festival period which would have given more accurate responses and they would have had more participants than the 536 who replied. The Liverpool Biennial offered respondents a small incentive in the form of copies of the catalogue, with 77.1% of respondents leaving their emails to be entered into the draw. This illustrates that incentives have merit when conducting research.

### **Face-To-Face Survey of the Liverpool Biennial**

Liverpool Biennial already carries out face to face surveys through The Mersey Partnership (as seen within this thesis). The research included information to show the value of combining different evaluation methods. Some of the questions were different from those

recommended for the Evaluation Toolkit, in part because the desire was to maintain some consistency with the Visual Arts Sector Toolkit for Collecting Audience Data.

Questions included what contact you have had with the public / digital work, which work in the Biennial have you seen etc. Some methodologies proved successful, like which was the best work? The web survey asked an open question for respondents to explain why they liked their favourite pieces. The research then classified the comments and quantified the frequency of each. In 2008 they carried out a similar exercise for 2,910 public comments on the Fourth Plinth using a fifty-point classification. For this research they produced a simpler classification that took less time to apply and could be used by other arts organisations. Unfortunately, quantifying qualitative research restricts to answers to a number of set responses, and loses the descriptive qualities needed to explain reactions like emotional responses as they had to bracket them into basic descriptions (i.e. happy, sad, amused, annoyed, angry, bored etc.).

Other examples of questions were more enlightening. For example, classification and quantification of comments on memorability: the most common response was that the art works were memorable because they were original or different. However, there were many other reasons why the works were memorable, demonstrating that the arts have many inherent advantages in terms of memorability. 81.1% of web survey respondents said that they talked to other people about the work in the Biennial. Overall, this additional contact list amounted to 10,235 people. The average number of respondents talked to 26.2 people. The ENWRS survey estimated that Liverpool Biennial received 451,000 visitors, equating in the 26.2 people that each person spoke to, implies a social multiplier effect of 11,816,200 people.

Other questions were either similar or identical to the questions conducted by The Mersey Partnership which would only give a comparison to the effectiveness of both methodologies. The face to face survey provided a better context in which to evaluate economic impact, but the web survey was successful in generating comments to understanding the quality of experience. Whilst the research did raise a few interesting propositions and responses, the majority was a rehashing of existing research and seemed pointless. It had the potential to develop new strategies and methodologies that could gather additional, more robust and informative answers, but failed to add any new ideas. Maybe the research was underdeveloped due to the technology and lack of expressive forms of social media etc. Throughout the thesis I will suggest a number of ways that would give the visitor chances to express and develop new strategies to enhancing their understanding and cultural experiences whilst gathering quantitative and qualitative research. These suggestions will be hypothesised to issues and weaknesses that I will find throughout the research.

As I have shown throughout the thesis, the Liverpool Biennial Festivals have systematically drawn greater attendance figures, and the economy these cultural tourists have brought with each progressive Festival as will be shown in the Economic Impact chapter.

**LARC (Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium) (2011)**  
**How Audiences and Visitors are Transformed by Cultural Experiences in Liverpool**  
**Baker Richards and WolfBrown**

This report investigates the intrinsic impact of the cultural visitor's aesthetic experience. To do this, they asked – how are people transformed by art experiences? Attendance figures and box office receipts do not tell the full story of the transformative impact of the arts. In this collaborative pilot study, eight arts and cultural organisations in Liverpool (acting together as the Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium, of LARC) surveyed audiences and visitors about the impact of their experiences over the 2009 – 10 seasons. A protocol template was devised so that a common set of mandatory questions could be asked across the eight organisations, whilst allowing each organisation some latitude to customise its protocol. In total 3,332 surveys were completed by audiences and visitors at twenty-five different programmes using a mix of intercept and in-venue mail-back survey methods. Results were provided to each organisation in an interactive dashboard tool. The report discussed the range of findings with respect to audiences' 'readiness to receive' the art and the six constructs of intrinsic impact: captivation, emotional resonance, spiritual value, intellectual stimulation, aesthetic growth and social bonding. The diversity of impacts observed across the numerous events illustrates how different programmes creates different impacts. Results stimulated conversations about artistic programmes, audience engagement, customer service and other topics, and also helped to advance a longer arc of learning about impact assessment underway in the UK, USA, and Australia.

The pilot study was undertaken by LARC as a key element of its Thrive programme, funded by Arts Council England. The study complemented LARC's research on the economic and social impacts of the arts and is intended to help LARC partners understand the true impacts of their work and to develop another way of defining 'success' beyond conventional measures such as income and attendance. More specifically, the study aimed to:

- Reflect deeply on the audience and visitor experience and on how audiences and visitors respond to different types of arts and culture
- Develop a new vocabulary and a shared framework for talking about the transformative experiences that audiences and visitors have at arts and cultural events
- Assist curators and artistic leaders in better understanding the consequences of their programming decisions
- Complement economic studies in order to paint a more complete picture of the public value of the arts and culture
- Provoke funders of cultural organisations to think more broadly about how they define success and create impact indirectly through their funding (LARC 2009, p.5)

To accomplish these goals, a programme of survey research was launched in autumn 2009, supplemented by an effort to gather anecdotal 'stories of impact' through interviews. Data collection efforts continued into autumn 2010 and conducted with surveying of visitors of the Liverpool Biennial.

Underlying this study was an essential philosophical debate about the role of audience and visitor feedback in an artistically driven organisation with an educational mission. It is useful to measure what happens to an audience member or a visitor as a result of attending an

arts experience? If so, what are the appropriate uses of this information, and what uses are inappropriate?

LARC / WolfBrown acknowledged that it is impossible to fully understand how art works on people, because the 'received impact' is inherently idiosyncratic and impossibly complex. The same work of art can have profoundly different impacts on different people, or different impacts on the same person depending on that person's state of mind. Observing the impact of an arts experience on an individual is like observing the footprint of a wild animal left in the sand. You can investigate the footprint, but the thing itself is too elusive to ever glimpse directly. Moreover, it is all but impossible to second-guess the intended impacts of a work of art.

### **The Constructs: 'Readiness to Receive' and Intrinsic Impacts**

The theoretical basis for this study grows out of WolfBrown's work for the Major University Presenters consortium in the U.S. The original study, *Assessing the Intrinsic Impacts of a Live Performance*, was released in 2007. In the original study, audience members were surveyed both before performances, to assess their 'readiness to receive' the art, and after performances, to assess the impacts they derived from the experience. In the LARC study, the methodology was streamlined so that only one survey had to be administered after the experience. Also, the survey protocol was adapted for gallery and museum visitors in reference to a specific exhibition.

The design of the survey focused on two constructs of 'readiness to receive' as six constructs of intrinsic impact:

#### **Readiness to Receive**

In a given audience, some people have a lot of knowledge about what they are about to see, while others have more limited knowledge. There are three constructs of Readiness, two of which were investigated in the study:

**Context:** The overall level of preparedness an audience member has for the experience, including prior knowledge of the art form and familiarity with the specific work(s) to be presented. For example, Before the performance, how familiar were you with the specific piece(s) or repertoire?

**Relevance:** The extent to which the arts activity in question is relevant to the participant, primarily to identify individuals who do not normally attend the arts (not investigated in the study but included for definitional purposes). For example, how much do you agree with the statement 'the people I normally socialise with go to the theatre.'

**Anticipation:** An audience member's psychological state prior to the experience, especially the degree to which they are looking forward to the event. For example, how excited were you about attending?'

The study explored six categories of types of intrinsic impact – the core benefits that can accrue to individuals by virtue of visiting an exhibition or attending a performance.

**Captivation:** the extent of which the audience member was absorbed in the performance or exhibition. Captivation is the lynchpin of impact – if you are captivated, other impacts are likely to happen, whereas if you are not captivated (or, worse, if you sleep through a

concert), other impacts are less likely to happen. For example, did you lose track of time and forget about everything else during the performance?

**Intellectual Stimulation:** The degree to which the performance or exhibition triggered thoughts about the art, issues, or topics, or caused critical reflection. For example, afterwards, did you discuss the performance with others who attended?

**Emotional Resonance:** The extent to which the audience member experienced a heightened emotional state during or after the performance or exhibition. For example, what was your emotional response to the performance?

**Spiritual Value:** Being inspired, transported to another plane of existence for a period of time, or leaving the performance or exhibition with a feeling of renewal or empowerment. For example, did the performance have spiritual meaning for you?

**Aesthetic Growth:** The extent to which the audience member was exposed to a new style or type of art, a new artist, or become a better appreciator of art. For example, did this performance expose you to a style or type of theatre with which you were unfamiliar?

**Social Bonding:** Connectedness with the rest of the audience, new insight on one's own culture or a culture outside of one's life experience, or new perspective on human relationships or social issues. For example, did you feel a sense of connectedness with the rest of the audience?

## Methodology

The eight LARC organisations were provided with a template and asked to customise their questionnaire based on a fixed set of questions. A handful of questions were mandatory, allowing for some consistency across the cohort, while many questions were optional, allowing each organisation to focus on the impacts in which they were most interested. Generally, the surveys ran four pages in length, or about thirty questions. The questions were tested with a focus group of RLP attenders and also benefitted from the input of Paul Rees, Editor at National Museum Liverpool. Some small adjustments were also made after the initial pilot tests of the surveys at Liverpool Everyman and Playhouse, Tate, and National Museums Liverpool.

Only respondents aged eighteen and over were eligible to respond. Data collection was conducted by one of the following means, decided upon in consultation with the organisation as to what methodology worked best in their space and for their patrons:

A modified intercept methodology by which visitors to the Bluecoat, FACT, Tate, and Liverpool Biennial were intercepted by gallery attendants, asked for their email address, and emailed a link to an online survey about their experience. Response rates were not available for the methodology, because the number of refusals was not tracked.

**Appendix Nine:  
Public Art Outside the Festival**

### Public Realm Works

Antony Gormley's *Another Place* on Crosby Beach (owned by Sefton Council) and Jaume Plensa's *Dream* (owned by St. Helens Council) where both commissioned outside of the Festival, successfully remained on view. However, the Biennial was unsuccessful in persuading Liverpool City Council to take ownership (or temporary responsibility) for the public art legacies from Liverpool's year as European Capital of Culture 2008. This meant that Richard Wilson's *Turning the Place Over* was switched off, the same was true of Diller Scofidio + Renfro's *Arbores Laetae*. The decommissioning of *Rockscape* was unavoidable. Gross Max's *Rotunda Folly* remained on site and was supported through in-kind work by the local community. With regards to the long-term prospects for artworks in the public realm, with the demise of Northwest Regional Development Agency, scaling back of Liverpool Vision and restrictions of Liverpool City Council has meant that even those that are too big to fail will do so unless they receive support from local authorities, even if this means only in-kind support through sites maintenance. Works of art in the public realm, without long term maintenance become sad reflections of their former selves, become scruffy eye sores, and can add to the dereliction of the city's landscape (which is opposite to the initial intention).

The three-year funding for the *Art for Places* programme (Sefton, Wirral, and Liverpool) finished in October 2010. In North Liverpool, the Biennial continued to aim to create connectivity through the artistic excellence of their projects in Anfield and Everton Park. They hoped to communicate the adjacency of areas that were seen as distant, by connecting up neighbourhoods separated by green spaces, roads, canals, and entrenched attitude. In Anfield, *On the Street* enabled vulnerable young people to explore their community and its regeneration through a commission by New York artist Ed Purver (April 2010) that transformed an Anfield street as part of the PCT's *Living Sketchbook* week. The success of this project demonstrated its potential for expansion, and it later evolved into the *2Up2Down* project by Dutch artist Jeanne van Heeswijk. This project involved up to 40 NEET young people and other residents working with professionals to transform a derelict terrace into usable housing units and developing a range of skills in the process. The two-year scheme was part of the 2012 Festival with funds raised on a rolling basis.

**Anthony Gormley - *Another Place***

*Another Place* was installed along Crosby Beach, in Merseyside, in the summer of 2005, the year of the sea. It consists of one hundred cast iron life size figures, each 189cm tall on a 3m high piling, spread out along 3.5km of the foreshore and one km out to sea. The figures, each weighing 650kg, are made from a cast of the artist's body. All are positioned looking out to sea, with some meeting the incoming tide, so as to appear to rise out of the sand. In this work, human life is tested against planetary time. This sculpture exposes to light, and time. The nakedness of a particular body. It is no hero, no idea, just the industrially reproduced body of a middle-aged man trying to remain standing and trying to breathe, facing the horizon busy with ships, moving material and manufactured things around the planet. The work is seen as a poetic response to both the individual and universal sentiments associated with emigration: the sadness at leaving, but the hope of a new future in another place. Each visitor will experience the work in a different way depending on the state of the tide, the weather conditions and the time of the day they are visiting. At particular high tides, all the figures can be submerged.

The UK 2007 National Census ranked South Sefton amongst Britain's worst 0.1% of localities for income and unemployment. *Another Place* was a short-term project designed to contribute to long term sustainability by highlighting the areas potential. Previously the work had been shown at Cuxhaven in Germany in 1997, Stavanger in Norway and De Panne in Belgium. It was intended to move the work to New York in 2006, but its popularity and economic impact prompted a campaign to keep the work for the duration of nearby Liverpool's Capital of Culture year in 2008 and beyond. Along with the significant increase in positive media coverage, visitor numbers had nearly doubled, and businesses had reported a noticeable upturn in takings. And as with the *Angel of the North*, the sculptures have had unexpected interventions and have been used as mannequins by fashion students and clothed in local football shirts. Members of Another Place Ltd. A charitable trust set up to raise the £2 million needed to keep the work in Merseyside, submitted plans for permanent planning permission which was approved in March 2007. The only proviso was that sixteen of the iron men sculptures were relocated along the beach. Another Place demonstrates that a public artwork does not need to be large to be monumental or a landmark, but it does need to refer to the place and people who experience it.

### **Richard Wilson: *Turning the Place Over***

As a European Capital of Culture for 2008, Liverpool has the opportunity to depict the city in a new light and to change perceptions of a pre-conceived identity through its cultural programme. The aspirations for any ambitious city must include artworks by artists of high calibre that turn people's heads and get them talking, and Richard Wilson's sculptural installation *Turning the Place Over* (commissioned by the Liverpool Biennial) had been promoted as: 'the most daring piece of public art ever commissioned in the UK.' Work began on it in February 2007, in and on, what is officially known as Cross Keys House at 37-41 Moorfields, a formally empty and nondescript flat fronted five story 1960's building opposite Moorfields train station. Owned by the Northwest Regional Development Agency, it was colloquially referred to as 'Aussie Whites' by local taxi drivers as it was on the site of the former Yates's Wine Lodge.

As the work arose from a pre-existing idea, the site did not determine the form. Located on a slight incline, surrounded by new office blocks, the frontage was in a tired and timeworn state-accepted and unaltered by Wilson who turned down the offer of replacing missing signage or making the façade different in any way. In and on because the work is an oval section cut from the façade of the building, which gyrated on a central rotating axis, completing its revolutions in just over one minute, and offering a teasing glimpse of the interior and a view of the exterior as a whole before it glided away. The space left by the cut was 8m long and 6m wide, spanning three floors of the building and leaving a 5cm gap. The plan to create such an ambitious work by necessity involved the artist working with a design team made up of specialist contractors from the North West and benefiting from their expertise in sectors such as the shipbuilding industries. 'what I do is tweak or undo or change interiors of space-predominantly the interiors of museums and galleries when given permission-and in many instances actually enlist parts of the building as part of the sculpture, and in that way unsettle or break people's conceptions of space, what they think space might be.' The raw cut through the building inevitably references the work of Gordon Matta-Clark but this is a false comparison. Matta-Clark's work is inherently involved in a destruction of the architectural space, while Wilson's is more concerned to subvert the idea of space, using architecture as a sculptural form. An exact cut created a rotating section, which delineated the internal space. The whole thing could be seen from the street, inside and out, and the view into the interior of the building allowed a brief sight of beautifully detailed radiators and pipes delicately cut. It took time to take this work in. the dance of the ovoid continued during daylight hours, attracting attention from passers-by who stop to observe its elliptical trajectory, which took on a different aspect, depending on the viewpoint of the spectator, even appearing to be circular if viewed at a certain level from the office block opposite. *Turning the Place Over* played with the pre-conceptions of space and order with the added dimension of time. It oscillated, turning the building on its head and then put it in place again. Play, according to Wilson, is hard work, both self-governing and self-discovering. *Turning the Place Over* was a spectacle that has to be experienced, as video or photography could not fully capture the use of architectural space. Unfortunately, the only thing that remains as evidence of this piece of public art, is the images captured during its lifespan. During the Festival period *Turning the Place Over* video received over 600,000 hits online. 93.9% of respondents said that it was memorable, and 78.7% said that it was one of the most interesting things they had seen all year or ever.<sup>12</sup> Works like this

---

<sup>12</sup> Jackson, A (March 2009) Art in the Public and Digital Realms: Evaluation Toolkit. For the Liverpool Biennial and Arts Council England. Annabel Jackson Associates, Somerset

have been at the heart of the Biennials curatorial vision, work in the public realm that takes something out of the ordinary in a space, creating a memorable experience for the general public who witness it. It creates a sense of wonder and memories through cultural experiences that are at the heart of the Biennial and the work in the public realm.

**Jaume Plensa *Dream* (2009)**

Commissioned by St. Helens Council as part of the Big Art Project<sup>13</sup>, *Dream* stands twenty meters high on the site of the former Sutton Manor Colliery. It was chosen by a group of examiners and takes the form of the head of a little girl with eyes closed as if dreaming. Overlooking the M62, a gateway sculpture for both Merseyside and Greater Manchester at the heart of the Northwest. The work is surrounded by woodland and offers great views across the Cheshire and Lancashire plains, out to the mountains of Snowdonia, the Pennines, the Peak District, and some of Manchester's landmarks, including the Beetham Tower and Old Trafford football stadium. Parking for *Dream* is available at The Smithy Manor pub (Jubits Lane, St. Helens WA9 4BB) at the base of Sutton Manor, from where it is a 10-minute walk up to *Dream*. The work was the result of many conversations with the examiners and members of the local community who wanted a work that looked to a brighter future and created a beautiful and contemplative space for future generations, at the top of the former spoil heap. This special piece has become a well-loved landmark, not only for the residents, but for commuters all across the North West.

The work takes the form of the head of a little girl with eyes closed, seemingly in a dream-like state. It is the artist's response to the brief and subsequent conversations with the examiners and members of the wider local community who wanted a work that looked to a brighter future and created a beautiful and contemplative space for future generations, not least their own grandchildren, at the top of the former spoil heap. Paul Smith explains that the Liverpool Biennial worked with the miners in St Helens *Dream* project and residence. The story is told quite often on how they said no to the first proposal and the thing that is not always told with that story is the fact that we spent so much time trying to allow them to have artistic experiences that we went on curatorial visits to Europe. Visits to art galleries and exhibitions with them. Not in a patrician sense but actually there is a group of you that are going to help decide about what stays here for a long time. The work has been fabricated in pre-cast concrete, with a very white, almost luminescent finish using a white marble / concrete aggregate mix in marked contrast to the black of the coal that still lies below.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Big Art Project is an ambitious public art commissioning initiative from Channel 4 supported by Arts Council England. The Big Art Project in St. Helens is being delivered by St. Helens Council, in partnership with the national funders

## **2Up2Down**

In Anfield, *On the Street* enabled vulnerable young people to explore their community and its regeneration through a commission by New York artist Ed Purver (April 2010) that transformed an Anfield street as part of the PCT's *Living Sketchbook* week. The success of this project demonstrated its potential for expansion, and it evolved into *2Up2Down* with Dutch artist Jeanne van Heeswijk. The project involved up to forty NEET young people and other residents working with professionals to transform a derelict terrace into usable housing units, developing a range of skills in the process. The two year scheme was part of the 2012 Festival, with funds raised on a rolling basis.

During the year (2011/12), artist Jeanne van Heeswijk worked with a group of people, young and old, not in education (as in previous projects) employment or training to develop places and spaces for their neighbourhood in the empty terraced housing and vacant ground around Liverpool Football Club's stadium in Anfield. Throughout the year, a group of around twenty young people worked with architect Marianne Heaslip of Urbed to remodel the building as a community bakery with training kitchen alongside a small housing scheme for two to four households. The first phase architectural design was developed in conjunction with the community and design professionals including Wayne Hemmingsway (to RIBA Stage C) meanwhile a cross-generational group of local residents developed the Homebaked Community Land Trust that would collectively own and operate the scheme and a Consumer Co-operative to manage the bakery. Liverpool Biennial's principle role was as instigator and engine for the project, passing the running of its legacy to Homebaked CLT. Homebaked Community Land Trust, a co-operative organisation inspired by the UK's Garden City movement, to enable the collective community ownership of the properties and co-operative business to reopen the bakery as a social enterprise. The group was presented with the Award for Excellence in Community Engagement at the National Community Land Trust Conference in May 2012.

The project received a capital grant of £54,000 from a highly competitive and high-profile grants programme: The Empty Property Community Grants, applied through the Department for Communities and Local Government. Metabolic Studio, through the Annenberg Foundation, an American philanthropic trust, invested significantly in the development of the bakery as an enterprise, offering financial yeast to the raw ingredients and allowing the transformation of the bakery as a community-owned co-operative from beautiful idea to functioning business, through a co-produced development process.

The project had full support from Liverpool City Council members, LCC's Housing renewal and regeneration teams. The project has been developed through close dialogue with Mark Kitts, Assistant Director Regeneration and Tony Mousdale, Head of Housing Strategy. Cabinet Member for Housing Cllr Ann O'Byrne has also championed the project throughout.

The bakery has been used as a venue for a wide range of events from book readings to workshops. On 1 May 2013 Homebaked hosted a visit by Nelson McCausland, Minister for Social Development in the Northern Ireland Assembly who travelled to Liverpool to learn how the city was working with regeneration. The Minister was extremely interested in finding out more about Homebaked as an innovative artist led community project and social enterprise.

In September 2013 Liverpool Biennial organised the Future City Forum, which brought together thinkers and practitioners in the fields of art, architecture, and visual culture, as well as council directors and urban planners. The programme of interdisciplinary conversations investigated the connections and asymmetries between various cities and considered optimistic agendas for urban transformation. As part of the Forum *2Up2Down* artist Jeanne van Heeswijk lead a seminar at the bakery about the project.

*Homebaked* was an ambitious project that attracted national, and international media attention. In an age when there is very little money and even less trust in the old models of regeneration, it is being visited by a growing number of agencies and community groups keen to learn from what is going on. *Homebaked* is beginning to influence the regeneration debate in many different areas and is increasingly being cited as a potential way forward. The author and housing commentator Lynsey Hanley<sup>14</sup> described the project as a 'model for local rebuilding in the wake of failed regeneration projects.'<sup>15</sup> The project is attracting much attention from housing associations; Liverpool's Plus Dane Group have used it as a model project and have brought groups such as MerseyCare to the bakery to find out more about its method of community engagement. Homebaked CLT has become emblematic for the growing community-led housing and Land Trust Movement, an exemplar project in terms of expanding the movement from its more affluent and rural base into urban contexts. Similarly, the bakery has been adopted wholeheartedly as an exemplar by the Co-operative movement.

The project has been presented at many housing, community and co-operative conferences, workshops and events locally, regionally, nationally and internationally, including the National CLT Conference and Chair -Co-op International Conference on Community Housing. It is widely discussed and disseminated by both Jeanne van Heeswijk and Liverpool Biennial team in contemporary and cultural context, with significant impact on profile. *2Up2Down* encourages people of all ages to acquire urban design, architecture and construction skills as well as the capacity to develop social enterprises of their own, including baking. The number of residents getting involved continues to grow throughout the years and gain an understanding of the housing regeneration process in their neighbourhood whilst acquiring skills and confidence in playing an active role. Assemble can be seen in continuing the philosophy and project designs of *2Up2Down* to help the regeneration of areas for, and by the residents in social art. Assemble was nominated for the Turner Prize 2015 for projects including the ongoing collaboration with local residents and others in the Granby Four Streets, Liverpool. The Granby Four Streets are a cluster of terraced houses in Toxteth, Liverpool that were built around 1900 to house artisan workers. Following the Toxteth riots in 1981, the council acquired many of the houses in the area for demolition and redevelopment. Hundreds of people were moved out the area and houses subsequently fell into disrepair.

Assemble are a London-based collective who work across the fields of art, design and architecture to create projects in tandem with the communities who use and inhabit them. Their architectural spaces and environments promote direct action and embrace

---

<sup>14</sup> Lynsey Hanley is the author of *Estates: An Intimate History* (Granta Books), and a visiting fellow in cultural studies at Liverpool John Moores University Available from

<sup>15</sup> [www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/aug/13/solve-the-housing-crisis](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/aug/13/solve-the-housing-crisis)

a DIY sensibility. Assemble worked with the Granby Four Streets CLT and Steinbeck Studios to present a sustainable and incremental vision for the area that builds on the hard work already done by local residents and translates it to the refurbishment of housing, public space and the provision of new work and enterprise opportunities.

## Everton Park

At the invitation of Liverpool City Council, the Biennial organised a visioning workshop for Everton Park in May 2010. It was led by Bruce Mau Design, an urban design company based in Ontario and Chicago. Liverpool PCT invested in the first phase of the development (for 2010 Year of Health and Well-Being – the Biennial wanted the revisioning of the park to be a flagship legacy project for the new Decade of Well-Being). The PCT, City Council and Mersey Waterfront all contributed to the R&D phase of the project over the summer of 2010. The workshop formed the basis for LB stakeholder consultation, the success of which led to the City giving the Biennial a mandate to progress an art commission for Everton Park. The development of Everton Park included the Biennial's commission was officially adopted by LCC as a cornerstone in the new North Liverpool Strategic Regeneration Framework jointly commissioned by Liverpool Vision, HCA, NWDA and LCC.

This project was for Everton Park, a hundred-acre green space that is ten minutes from Liverpool City Centre. Formed from the area left by successive waves of post-war slum clearance, the park offers breath-taking views of the city, the river and the sea but was regrettably underused. Sandwiched between some of the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods in the UK and the economic heart of the city, it appeared to function as a vacuum between the two. Liverpool Biennial worked with Liverpool City Council and Liverpool Primary Care Trust to commission and integrated art and landscape scheme for the space as a cornerstone of the city's economic and social regeneration plan for the area. The Biennial invited James Corner Field Operations to draw up an initial design proposal in collaboration with artist Fritz Haeg. The long-term aim of the project was to make Everton Park a destination for residents and tourists, providing Liverpool with a high quality contemporary green space that performed as a civic and neighbourhood function by transforming it into a productive, beautiful and compelling place that delivered environmental aesthetic and recreational benefits to the city.

Fritz Haeg re-activates the present and re-imagines the future of Liverpool's Everton Park in partnership with local residents and collaborators. Haeg occupied a sheltered bowl-shaped site at the top of Everton Park for the summer leading up to Liverpool Biennial 2012. Working with the community, the first phase of the project, commenced in late May, and was conceived as an expedition into the park, featuring a 'base camp' headquarters for a series of experiments to publicly present the range of activities and features that local people would like to see in their park. Treating the hollow space as a microcosm of the entire park, the series of modestly scaled elements included anything from semi-permanent plantings and paths, working up to a week of programmed events and workshops housed in a temporary domed structure during the opening week of the Biennial. Working with the community, the first phase of the project, commenced in late May, was conceived as an expedition into the park, featuring a 'base camp' headquarters for a series of experiments to publicly present the range of activities and features that local people would like to see in their park.

Architect, gardener and educator Fritz Haeg's (Minnesota, USA) projects include 'Edible Estates' (2005-ongoing), an agricultural project replacing suburban lawns with productive, consumable landscapes. Haeg's edible gardens are developed in partnership with local residents, responding to the unique nature of each site and challenging preconceptions of

land use and development patterns. In 2008 Haeg debuted 'Animal Estates' at the Whitney Biennial. The project proposed the reintroduction of native animals into cities through designs for urban dwellings.

## **Non-Festival Research and Strategies**

### ***Green by Day: Light by Night. Liverpool Housing Action Trust-Public Art Strategy***

The Liverpool Housing Action Trust (LHAT) appointed Modus Operandi Art Consultants in May 2000 to research and write a public art strategy for the benefit of its residents and the broader public of Liverpool. The purpose was twofold:

- a) Research and recommend sites, artists and budgets for three principle commissioning opportunities and
- b) Write public art commissioning guidance's and recommendations for the HAT as a whole strategy

The LHAT's mission statement for public art stated: 'Liverpool Housing Action Trust aims to implement a public art strategy and a series of commissions and initiatives which create both international impact and instil local pride as an integral element of Liverpool's future social and cultural renaissance.' The introduction in part one of the strategy positions Liverpool HATs public arts initiatives within the context of its existing arts policy and presents the case for the HAT taking a lead role in the cultural development of Liverpool, acting as an initiator, enabler and pump-primer through the funding of its three major public art commissions. A synopsis of the major visual arts and public arts initiatives in Liverpool is presented and the need highlighted for a new city-wide Public Art Strategy. The aim and objectives of the LHAT's Public Art Strategy were embodied in part one and a set of eight key principles identifies as guiding elements of the strategy. These covered Artistic Scope and profile, Environmental Quality, Community Consultation and involvement, Unique Identity, Partnerships (local, regional, national, and international), Best Value and Maximising Budgets, effective Project Management, ownership and maintenance.

**Appendix Ten:  
Education, Learning, and Inclusion Projects**

### **The Liverpool Biennial Education and Inclusion Programme**

Since inception the Liverpool Biennial has conducted a programme of Educational, Learning, and Inclusion projects. These are separate to, and more effective (possibly) than other social inclusion / impact projects that are conducted by other cultural organisations, which focus on changing tastes and consumption. Written within the Memorandum of Association that was submitted to Companies House in 1998 that registered the creation of the Liverpool Biennial Charity stated the objective of the organisation was to ‘provide, maintain, improve, and advance education by cultivating and improving public taste in the visual arts; including classical, modern, and contemporary arts and sculpture, and undertaking all such things as are incidental thereto and (without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing) to promote the same by the following means:’

- i. To educate the public by the initiation and perpetuation of an International Arts Festivals and multiple exhibitions throughout the Merseyside region in the field of visual arts
- ii. To communicate and co-operate with businesses, authorities and government, national, local, or otherwise and to obtain from such bodies any rights, privileges and concessions for the attainment of the Charity’s objects or any of them
- iii. To organise, manage, provide or assist in the provision or management of lectures, seminars, masterclasses, study groups, competitions, prizes and scholarships to further the appreciation of and cultivate the public’s interest in the visual arts

Therefore, throughout the years and in-between the Festivals, the organisation has continued to work with local communities, schools, and groups to:

- to broaden the audience within Liverpool for contemporary art through creating access to contemporary international art, providing educational / community programmes, creating diversity of product, and creating employment and fun

Liverpool Biennial achieves this by providing an ‘umbrella’ of co-ordination to several organisations and exhibition programmes that make up the Festival. As a charitable organisation, Liverpool Biennial is responsible for the organisation and financing of three core areas of the Festival.

- The International: the showpiece exhibition and the critical focus of the event. It aims to be an internationally acclaimed exhibition showing significant new works by international artists commissioned specifically for the City of Liverpool
- A Learning and Inclusion Programme: that delivers Liverpool Biennial’s educational objectives. The approach is project based with three broadly defined audience groups: communities, formal education, and visitors
- The Communications Programme: that promotes the Liverpool Biennial brand through an umbrella campaign, integrating marketing and public relations. The strategy is informed by the partner organisations delivering the exhibitions and by the regional organisations involved in the promotion of culture

Education is at the core of the Biennials programme and developed in partnership with a number of educational institutions (i.e., primary, secondary, and college etc.) and community groups by incorporating a participatory creative aspect in conjunction with international artists to develop exhibitions and catalogues as part of the Biennial Festival. To do this, the Biennial wants to learn and work together with the city to support and develop new ideas of social change and action through art. The education programme includes family workshops, free learning resources, and long-term partnerships with Liverpool schools. Participants are taught methods to enhance their perceptions of contemporary art and are encouraged to discuss and express their own personal perception of Biennial art. A number of workshops are conducted with Biennial mediators, teachers and artists and the programmes develop to include participants into the creative process.

Participants learn new skills and are introduced to creative writing, critical thinking, aesthetic judgement, and visual thinking strategies that can be applied to all aspects of life, not just for the appreciation of contemporary art and the cultural experience. Another applaudable distinction that sets aside the Biennials work to short term social inclusion projects, is their consistency of working with previous participating organisations, schools, and community groups. This develops trust, strengthens partnerships and educational content, sub-contracting employment to grass roots artists, teachers and specialists building the local cultural infrastructure.

**1999 Festival: TRACE 24<sup>th</sup> September – 7<sup>th</sup> November****Training / school / colleges / universities**

An Education Working group was formed to support the development of the Education and Access programme for the 1999 Biennial. Membership included representatives from formal education establishments and gallery education staff. A similar group was reformed in order to support the work of the Education and Access programme for the 2002 Biennial. the group also acted as a conduit for sharing information about Biennial exhibitions with staff from the exhibition venues and local colleges. Wally Brown (Liverpool Biennial) and Alison Jones (North West Disability Arts Forum) joined the group during 2000 (Wally acting as Chair).

The group provided useful networking opportunities. Members of the group did not have a history of working with each other and the EWG helped to build relationships between the different organisations and enabled more partnership working across arts organisations in Liverpool. It would have benefited from closer working with the curatorial programme teams.

The Biennial and the Tate were alone among the partners in having a theoretical two year lead in time to the programme. However, the content of the programme would not be known until a few months in advance of the opening. It was noticeable that more opportunities for partnership working arose closer to the time of the Biennial. these opportunities couldn't be followed up because the Biennial was already committed to a programme of work.

**TRACE 1999**

The project was to produce a video film looking at the social history of Liverpool, namely the cultural origins of young people in Liverpool reflecting the diverse cultural heritage of people in the city. The project explored the personal histories of the young people and 'tracing' the heritage of their parents and the circumstances behind their arrival to Liverpool. This exploration of their journey reflected Liverpool's maritime history, in addition to the contribution settlers have made to the city's economic and political life.

Participants engaged in the pre-production and production in the project, researching their cultural origins and conducting interviews. They undertook training during this process in video production, but the post-production (editing) was undertaken by the media tutor The project was run with the Dingle Girls Project who are based at Shorefields Community School in Dingle. The overall aim of the project was to highlight the multi-cultural community in Liverpool and raise awareness about their contribution to the city. The aim was to improve the self-esteem and confidence of young people by instilling a pride in their racial identities, as well as providing them with in video production.

***A Trace of Me 1999***

A Trace of Me was a collaborative project whereby two artists (working separately) explored the same criteria using different approaches and skills. The results of this process were combined to provide a single piece of work (instillation based) produced by young people and relating to the theme of *TRACE*.

**Aims**

- To increase young people's awareness of identity through their personal histories and memories
- To recognise and celebrate the unique and rich cultural diversity within the city
- To explore Liverpool's global links through its geographical location as a port, as an exporter of culture and an importer of tourism

**Objectives**

- To provide the client group with memorable, enjoyable involvement in visual art, craft and design
- To offer alternative working formats that give the participants the opportunity of working in small groups with the artist, as sole creators and a group work and also as a wider group
- To encourage participants to harness their observations, memories and feelings and to communicate them in a visual form

Prior to the project start date workshop participants were furnished with the relevant information in order to gather tokens and thoughts that informed their work. The materials, tools and techniques used would be varied. Some soundtracks would be included.

The work looked at four distinct but inter-linking areas:

- Self / identity
- Family— immediate or extended/heritage
- Liverpool— the world / Cultural and global links
- Desire / Destinations

The finished work took the form of a drop sided trunk linked to four charts or maps, linked to a raised bed of passports, linked back to the four charts, linked to each other. All of this work including the linking systems was made by all workshop participants. The trunk was a container for the finished works and a central point of reference. It was made in two sections with the workshop participants: the map case by Kim Laycock and the passport tray by Milly Tint. The artists hoped to establish talks regarding the instillation of this work in a suitable site that would encourage the participation of a new audience to *TRACE*.

***Traces in Wax 1999***

As part of the Education and Public Access Programme central to the International Exhibition, six artists were invited to take up residencies in primary, secondary, and special schools throughout Merseyside. The artists and pupils explored the theme of the International Exhibition - *TRACE* using methods as varied as digital photography and computer-based design skills, batik, painting, filmmaking, and instillation. The work produced during these residencies was displayed at the Merseyside Maritime Museum, Museum of Liverpool Life, Exchange Flags, Huyton Art Gallery, Smith Kline Beecham (St Helens College) and the Williamson Art Gallery (Birkenhead).

***Traces in Wax***

Artist Sian Hughes worked with four special schools in St Helens on the theme of *TRACE* to produce batik designs. The schools involved were Hamblett School, Penkford School and Hurst School. Together they explored different aspects of trace from animal footprints and traces found in the natural world to industrial traces left on the landscape. Batik, or 'writing in wax,' is a dye-resist process thought to have originated in the Far East. Alternating layers of wax and repeated dyeing to produce strong designs and vivid colours.

Pre-residency visits to the schools revealed how unique each of the settings of the schools was. The environment of the school then became the focus for exploring the theme of *TRACE*. For example, the focus of Hamblett School's work was their farm, Hurst School has its own woodland, Penkford School is situated on the edge of the Sankey Valley and Mill Green wanted to use a more literal translation of *TRACE*, as in tracing the body.

Sian worked with small groups of approximately ten pupils at each school. These groups were then divided into smaller groups of five pupils, each group alternating between working on batik and producing support work with another member of staff. These residencies were one of a number of opportunities for special schools to participate in the artistic activity (including visual arts, music and dance) within the St Helen's area.

**2002 Festival: 14<sup>th</sup> September – 24<sup>th</sup> November**

The Education and Access Programme for the 2002 event started in the autumn of 2001. It helped to create a proof of goodwill within the region supporting and promoting the coming Biennial Festival.

**Visitor Programme Talks**

Groups visiting the Biennial were able to book introductory talks with the Information Assistants. In line with similar services offered by other visual arts venues there was a charge of £17.50 per talk. People attending group talks ranged from MA students, local community groups and special needs groups. College groups visiting from outside Liverpool were keen to visit as much of the Biennial as possible in a day. When booking the group visits, they expressed more interest in help with travel and orientation around the city, rather than talks about the art.

**Information Assistants**

Five freelance Information Assistants were employed for the duration of the Biennial. The Information Assistants delivered free 'drop-in' talks to visitors to the International Exhibition and also arranged group visits. The Information Assistants delivered a total of sixty talks to 592 people. Feedback about the talks was very positive indicating that the Information Assistants managed to pitch the information at levels appropriate to the various groups. To make full use of the Information Assistants time the Biennial offered free talks to local schools and community groups during quiet periods. All the Information Assistants stated that the experience of working for the Biennial was a valuable part of their professional development.

**Joined Up Talks**

A series of free 'drop-in' talks were organised for visitors to the International 2002 exhibition. The talks took place on Wednesdays and Fridays and began at Lime Street Station. After an introduction to the Biennial and the work at Lime Street, visitors were directed to Pleasant Street Board School for a follow-on talk about the work at that venue. After lunch the talks resumed at Bluecoat Arts Centre. Visitors were then directed to Villa Victoria at Derby Square for a further talk. Visitors were then able to go on to Tate Liverpool and join in with one of their programmed introductory Talks.

Curators talks: A series of talks by the International 2002 curators were organised to take place on Wednesday lunchtimes.

Audio description / BSL interpreted talks: British Sign Language and an Audio Described talk were organised for each of the International Exhibition venues.

On the whole, take up of the Talks Programme was low. Whenever attendance for the talks was low the Information Assistants would be proactive in gathering an audience from the

casual visitors present in the venues. On these occasions the visitors were surprised but also very pleased to receive the information and have the opportunity to talk about the work. The Information Assistants suggested that more publicity in the venues would have helped to inform visitors.

## **Community Programmes**

### ***Shoot the Artist***

*Shoot the Artist* was a video production project through which five community groups researched the work of contemporary visual artists and made creative documentaries about the artists. The projects were delivered by video training agencies MediaStation and First Take. The five groups that participated in the project were:

- The Initiative Factory consisted of a co-operative that was set up by the sacked Liverpool Dockers, who chose to make their video about Liverpool based artist David Jacques
- Merseyside Deaf Association
- Liverpool Yemeni Arabic Group made their film about Fee Plumley and Ben Jones. The artist's work concerned ring tones and logos for mobile phones and their work was featured in the Independent exhibition
- Friends of Palestine chose to make a video featuring artist Jamie Reid. As the art director for the Sex Pistols, Jamie created punk's seminal 'God Save the Queen' image and also exhibited in the Independent exhibition
- A group of residents from LHAT (Liverpool's Housing Action Trust) chose to make their video about Vong Phaophanit who had been commissioned to create a piece of public art for the LHAT Woolton site

The project met with many delays, which were mainly caused by the difficulties in co-ordinating times when the artists, the groups and the trainers could all come together. The final videos varied greatly in the styles and issues they explored. This gave an insight into the multitude of considerations there are when looking and experiencing art. An unexpected outcome was the way in which the artists reacted to the project. The artists all enjoyed the encounters with audience groups and welcomed the chance to discuss their work. Jamie Reid expressed that it was the best project that he had been involved with for ten years.

A screening of the films took place at Liverpool Community College Arts Centre on the evening of November 21<sup>st</sup> and an exhibition of images from the project was displayed in the foyer of the Arts Centre from November 21<sup>st</sup> - 24<sup>th</sup>. Approximately forty people attended the screening event. During the Biennial, the videos were shown as part of an Education and Access programme exhibition at Toxteth Library throughout November. The film made by Merseyside Deaf Association was shown at Tate Liverpool from November 9<sup>th</sup> - 24<sup>th</sup>.

**Dogs**

Artist group Space Cadets worked with LHAT residents to design five giant inflatable dogs. Sixty residents from Adlington, Sefton Park, Sheil Park, Hetherlow and Bispha came up with designs for a Poodle, Afghan Dalmatian and Scottie Dog. Following on from this, pupils from Summerhill School, Maghull did a project, which expanded the topic of dogs into Literacy. The pupils looked at characters of dogs, wrote stories, poems and reports. SpaceCadets facilitated a workshop about inflatables with the pupils. The pupils were then asked to design a dog. Aspects of three of the children's designs were chosen to be incorporated into an inflatable weather dog, and the dogs visited various exhibition sites during the Biennial.

**STAR**

As part of the education and access programme Liverpool Biennial carried out an action research project. The project was to research effective ways that contemporary visual arts can enhance curriculum-based teaching in special needs schools. In collaboration with North West Disability Arts Forum (NWDAF), Liverpool Biennial identified Merseyview School, and Sandfield Park Schools to participate in the project. Sandfield Park is a school for pupils with physical disabilities, and Merseyview is a school for pupils with learning disabilities. With the project, they wanted to move away from the artist residency type of project that schools are familiar with. Rebecca Doughty and Emma Burrows worked as lead artists, with two less experienced artists, and the training opportunity was taken up with an ex-pupil of Merseyview. The trainees who took part in the project were Ross Clarke, Jeff Wade, and John Williams.

January - July 2002 Liverpool Biennial worked with seven schools across Merseyside on the *STAR* (Schools, Teachers, Artists, Research) Project. *STAR* was an action research project that explored ways in which contemporary visual art can support the teaching of non-art subjects. Results of the project were exhibited at Toxteth Library and on the Biennial's Education Microsite. Holly Lodge Girls College and West Derby School displayed work in the windows of the Maritime Housing Building from October 14<sup>th</sup> – November 9<sup>th</sup>. Speke Community School and Elimu Academy displayed work in the foyer of Liverpool Community College Arts Centre from 30<sup>th</sup> October – November 6<sup>th</sup>. The project involved 160 pupils and provided employment for eleven local artists.

*STAR* Extension: Following the *STAR* project, Liverpool Biennial identified four schools who needed specialist support to enable them to visit Liverpool Biennial exhibitions, and successfully gained funding from the Paul Hamlyn Foundation to support the project. The schools that participated in this project were Elimu Academy, a school for disaffected young people, Speke Community School, working with young people studying the alternative curriculum, Sandfield Park School, working with disabled young people and Merseyview School working with pupils with challenging behaviour. In each of the schools an artist worked with the teachers to organise visits to Biennial exhibitions and facilitated complementary workshops in the schools. Evaluation showed it was very successful extension to the *STAR* project, that it broadened the young people's knowledge of contemporary art and that the young people enjoyed the visits. The teachers also felt that the project was really valuable and supported other activities in the schools. All the schools were keen to work with the Biennial.

The *STAR* project looked at developing a method of work that was more sustainable so that artists, and teachers could work together to leave a legacy. The project was to be delivered by disabled artists working alongside the teachers, in schools for pupils with special needs. It took place in two secondary schools. The project addressed the barriers that exclude the group from participating in and attending contemporary visual arts events. The aim was to research a model of practice that engages artists, teachers and students, and looked at the particular needs of the schools and teachers, and the issues for the artists running the workshops. The research process involved dialogues with the artists, with the teachers and pupils at the schools, with visual arts institutions in Liverpool, and with the Liverpool Biennial.

The project was managed by the Biennial's Education and Access Co-ordinator. In collaboration with North West Disability Arts Forum (NWDAF) Liverpool Biennial recruited two experienced disabled artists to lead workshops and identify two suitable schools to participate in the project. They would also recruit two disabled artists with less experience to shadow the workshop leaders. Hoping to launch the project at NWDAF's DaDaFest 2001 festival in December 2001 they would be contributing to raising the profile of their disability and deaf arts programmes. The Education staff at both Tate Liverpool and NMGM / Walker Art Gallery were involved in the project, hosting and facilitate visits to their exhibition spaces and participated in the research process (they were also hoping to involve some smaller artist led exhibition spaces in the same way).

Schools resources: Freelance project manager Carolyn Murray worked with the Biennial and Tate Liverpool to develop an education microsite [www.biennial.org.uk/education](http://www.biennial.org.uk/education). The micro-site included case studies from the *STAR* exhibition, downloadable worksheets and suggested school activities relating to the International.

Preview evenings for teachers: two were organised to introduce teachers to the Biennial and highlight opportunities for schools to work with the Biennial. the first was at Toxteth Library on July 4<sup>th</sup> at which Lewis Biggs gave an introduction to the Biennial and Carolyn Murray gave an introduction to the Education Micro-site. This event was attended by twenty-seven teachers and learning mentors. Unfortunately, the Biennial could not do a presentation of the website at the event because a firewall blocked access to the site. Although this caused much embarrassment on the evening, it did highlight a problem of which they were previously unaware. The second teachers evening took place at on October 7<sup>th</sup> at Peasant Street School. Eddie Berg gave an overview of the International 2002 exhibition; Jackie Ley from Holly Lodge Girls College gave a short presentation about schools working with artists and Carolyn Murray gave a presentation about the education micro-site. The evening was attended by twenty-five teachers and student teachers.

The objectives of the project were to:

1. Investigate how contemporary visual art activities can benefit cross curriculum-based teaching in schools for people with special needs
2. Investigate how artists with disabilities and teachers in schools for people with special needs can work together to develop effective and innovative teaching methods

3. Investigate how education and access programmes within arts organisations can create genuine professional development and training for disabled artists.
4. Produce a relevant and influential research document of the process which will benefit other schools, artists, and arts organisations in the planning of artists working with teachers in schools

The project was successful in using creative approaches to achieve sustained interest in educational activity among disaffected young people. Groups of disabled young people improved their number recognition and multiplication skills using collage. Photography and painting workshops helped to generate interest among pupils in local history and also to familiarise them with sources of information regarding locality. Gallery visits successfully worked as a stimulus for creative writing and storytelling activities.

The experiences of the *STAR* project were developed into a web-based resource for schools. These resources included case studies from the school projects, information for schools wishing to organise visits, and suggested starting points for activities exploring the Biennial's International 2002 exhibition. A sharing event in the form of an exhibition took place at Toxteth Library 27<sup>th</sup> June to 4<sup>th</sup> July. The exhibition included work produced by the schools during the project, plus case studies which highlighted the processes and outcomes. Two hundred people visited the exhibition, and seventy arts education professionals were invited to the sharing event. Alongside this project, Liverpool Biennial worked with three other schools to explore the same issues, who were included in the exhibition and web-based resource in order to put the work in a wider complex.

As part of Liverpool Biennial's on-going Education and Access programme, the *STAR project* was an important opportunity to build links with the schools involved. Having built these links, it was important to continue contact with those involved, so that they could build the legacy. To do this, the Biennial was awarded a grant from the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, so they could take the schools on supported visits to Biennial exhibitions.

### **TenantSpin: *Ways of Seeing***

TenantSpin was a tenant-run Internet TV channel supported by FACT, the High-Rise Tenant Group and LHAT (Liverpool Housing Action Trust). *Ways of Seeing* was a special six-part series of interactive webcasts where Liverpool High Rise Tenants talked to directors, funders and curators of the Biennial. The series ran between April - September 2002 and featuring tenants Paul Myott, John Asbridge, Pauline Vass, Maria Stukoff, and Steve Thomas in conversation with Jayne Casey, Lewis Biggs, Paul Sullivan, Paul Domela, Torsten Schmiedeknecht, Chris Miller, and Rafael Lozano-Hemmer<sup>iii</sup>. Excerpts from the live chat during the first show (Lewis Biggs) was included in TenantSpin's 'Chat Files' publication (edition of 1000, 2002). Joint publicity material (1000 gold postcards) was produced, and these helped to increase awareness of the webcasts and enhanced the idea of the six shows forming part of an ongoing series. The chat during the first show included a heated debate amongst online tenants as to whether the Biennial should 'be brought down to tenant's level' or whether it should in fact be 'brought up to their level.'

**LHAT 2002**

After a little delay in identifying a group to take part, the project eventually got off the ground with a meeting between the artists, participants, representatives from LHAT and the Biennial Education and Access programme. At the meeting the participants were given an outline of the projects aims and how these might be achieved, which included visits to galleries both locally and nationally, visits and talks by artists and creative workshops.

TAG worked with a group of nine LHAT tenants on a project aimed at increasing the tenants understanding, knowledge and experience of contemporary visual art. The main aim and objective for the proposal was that the actual project and its outcomes, including participant's responses, would act as stimulation to other LHAT tenants and older citizens of Liverpool to encourage the use of local art provision in the city, and including visits to the Liverpool Biennial 2002. The main tool for achieving this was an event / exhibition, and a publication. The majority of the group had a limited exposure, understanding, and therefore, appreciation of contemporary art. From the outset, the artists approach was to facilitate situations in which the participants could engage with artworks from the perspective of derivation, formation, and design which they believed could lead to critical awareness and aesthetic enjoyment. The project included gallery visits, visits to studios, talks by artists and practical workshops. These activities took place in the lead up to the Biennial. An exhibition of work created during the project was displayed in the foyer of Liverpool Community College, Clarence Street from November 4<sup>th</sup> - 24<sup>th</sup>. A special event was organised to celebrate the achievements of the project and took place on December 24<sup>th</sup>, 2002.

The methods incorporated visits to the group by local contemporary practicing artists who had recently or were currently exhibiting their work. As well as the slide presentations and the very important contextualisation of the artist's work, participants were able to discuss other issues with the artists relating to media, and technical considerations in the creation of their work. TAG also set out to demystify basic art practices, which would allow the participants to make their own work, and experience certain creative processes for themselves. Furthermore, as the participant's appreciation and enjoyment of conceptual, contemporary art developed, they would be able to express this new awareness in the publication about the project.

The group enjoyed all the gallery visits, especially those at Leeds, Bradford and Nottingham. The visit to the TATE Liverpool contained the most challenging exhibition, with some of the participants not very impressed with Mark Quinn; whilst others enjoyed Nottingham Castle and Andy Warhol, and Bradford, the cameras were really good, Bradford exciting.

Most of the workshops were rated as excellent, enjoyable, interesting and informative. Commenting on the painting workshop, one participant said that it was fascinating; from making a frame, preparing a canvas, choosing a topic, mixing paints; never done any painting before. The entire group said that they would have liked more time and more workshops.

The aim of the project was for LHAT tenants to gain an understanding and knowledge of contemporary visual art, encouraging them to make use of local arts provision. This was carried out via a series of activities; that of gallery visits, visiting artists, workshops, Biennial visits and events, the production of a publication and a final exhibition of their work. Overall, the group voted the whole project as excellent.

The members of the project group gained a lot of knowledge and critical awareness of contemporary art, so when they visited the Biennial exhibitions, they were able to discuss the work confidently and intelligently. The participants enjoyed the shows immensely as they appreciated the artists involved who patiently explained aspects of all their works on display; they were all great, how do you choose the best out of them all. The exhibition of the group's artwork, made during the workshops, was displayed in window spaces of the City Community College. Again, this scored high in the evaluation ratings. The group was surprised at how good their work looked professionally hung.

The publication, which contained examples of the exhibition artwork, poetry and creative writing made during the project, was received with enthusiasm and comments of excellent. The entire group appreciated that it was a great reminder to keep, first class, considering we are raw beginners - the publication makes an effective summing up of all our efforts. Some projects overlapped with other meetings, and some would have liked an event every week, although they did realise that not everyone would be able to attend; and another comment was that the programme was well carried out, but the accommodation was cramped (i.e., the practical workshop space at Sheil Road).

A consensus from the group was that they really enjoyed working with TAG, they learned a lot, found them easy to understand, and thought their approach and presentation was excellent. On project development the comments were that they would like it to continue and visit museums in Paris and New York! Also, they would wish to take part in some more practical workshops to learn more art techniques. Apart from wishing to travel further afield on gallery visits the group commented that longer sessions would be helpful with bigger workshop space and that I could have worked all day and had the project go on forever.

### **TAG (The Artist Group)**

TAG worked with a group of nine LHAT tenants on a project aimed at increasing the tenants understanding, knowledge and experience of contemporary visual art. The project included gallery visits, visits to studios, talks by artists and practical workshops. These activities took place in the lead up to the Biennial. An exhibition of work created during the project was displayed in the foyer of Liverpool Community College, Clarence Street from November 4<sup>th</sup> - 24<sup>th</sup>. A special event was organised to celebrate the achievements of the project and took place on December 24<sup>th</sup>, 2002. This involved group and invited guests meeting at the Clarence Street building to view the exhibition of their work.

The group also produced a booklet about the project. The booklet had originally been intended to be ready at the beginning of the Biennial and to include details of Biennial exhibitions and to act as an older person guide to the Biennial. The project met delays due to the commitment of the residents to other projects and activities and this caused the production of the booklet to go behind schedule. As the booklet was not available during the Biennial the content was altered to represent that eventuality. A programme of exhibitions was presented by the group at LHAT community centres. Each of these exhibitions will be accompanied by a workshop facilitated by TAG and project participants. These were aimed at engaging further LHAT tenants to creative activity. When asked about future work with the Biennial, the group agreed that they would continue to visit exhibitions and would particularly like to visit exhibitions in Paris and New York.

*Beyond the Brillo Box* explained in their evaluation report that the 'benefits the group gained from the project included making them more aware of the city, meeting interesting people and looking more intently at any work of art. Many felt that the project enabled them to not become couch potatoes and was a chance to use their brains and enjoy other people's company.'

### ***Lighten Up!***

This was a training project for local artists, and it was managed by Chrysalis Arts. The training began with a two-day seminar which was followed by a 'Training for Real' project. The two-day intensive course looked at art in public spaces with the context of regeneration schemes and engagement with communities. The course was free and took place at Tate Liverpool. The seventeen artists who attended the seminar found it extremely valuable and informative, and the artists were invited to apply to work as one of six placements on the 'Training for Real' project.

### **Training for Real**

The 'Training for Real' project was designed to give six artists hands on experience of working on a public art project as well as training in community consultation and involvement processes. The project was based around the theme of light with the artists working towards creating temporary pieces of work for LHAT sites.

A group of LHAT tenants visited Chrysalis Arts at the Art Depot as an introduction to the project. They had a great day out, but they didn't like the food that was provided for lunch! Two LHAT tenants were then chosen to help to interview and select the artists to work on the project. The six artist selected to work on the project were Susan Leask, David Crawley, Kate Mathews, Eleanor Heath, Nicki McCubbing, Lauren Sagar. These artists worked alongside three lead artists from Chrysalis Arts to create a series temporary public art installations. The training began with the artists spending a weekend at the Art Depot getting to know each other, finding out more about the project and timetabling activities. For the next two weeks the LHAT provided the artists with studio space in one of the tower blocks at the Hetherlow site. The artists created four installations:

- Buckingham House, Croxteth Drive, Sefton Park; with the support from the artists, tenants created a series of light works, which took elements of Sefton Park and built them into the designs for their garden
- Heathgreen, junction of Queens Drive and Cherry Tree Avenue; strings of light connected two tower blocks to a nearby tree. Sawdust circles radiated out from the trees back towards the tower blocks
- A projection from the existing community centre. A peephole into the community centre showed images of people and their flats.
- The Clock Community Centre, Domingo Road, Everton; fifty lanterns featuring images of past and present tenants decorated the garden of the new community centre

### ***Airbath***

Artists group SpaceCadets and Graham Clayton Chance worked in collaboration with HND students from Liverpool Community College to create an installation of inflatables for Dingle reservoir. The aim of the project was to inspire and introduce the students to new artistic skills, and techniques as well as some of the practical aspects of putting on an exhibition, project planning and professional practice. The project also aimed at bringing together students from different disciplines to work on a collaborative piece and was the first time that the college had worked on a cross department project.

The first showing of the breathing installation *Airbath* was situated in the disused reservoir and took place on June 21<sup>st</sup> - 22<sup>nd</sup> 2002 when over one hundred people visited the event. The college felt that although the students had benefited from working with the artists, some of the students did not feel any ownership of the final piece. It was agreed that the installation would be repeated during the Biennial, and the students would be given the opportunity to work in the space or add to the installation. The dance students were the only ones to take up the invitation and choreographed a piece of dance for the installation. For the second showing of *Airbath* (5<sup>th</sup> - 6<sup>th</sup> October during the Biennial period), was attended by eighty people, and was the first time that Dingle reservoir had been used for a public event.

### ***Teflon!***

Ten thousand postcards were produced which highlighted the art / architecture concerns of the International 2002 exhibition. They were distributed through the different exhibition venues. Each of the cards included an artist drawing / design plus a piece of text by Lewis Biggs which looked at issues of Private and Public Space, Using Urban Space and Gateways to Liverpool / Regeneration of Liverpool. Posters of the images and text were also produced, and these were displayed in the foyer of Liverpool Community College Arts Centre (November 6<sup>th</sup> - 17<sup>th</sup>).

Five postgraduate architecture students worked on a project to create a piece of work in response to Liverpool Biennial 2002. Their project explored the success of the Biennial in creating an inclusive event and vehicle for regeneration. Urban Splash supported the project by allowing the group to use St. Peters Church for an event, which took place on

November 22<sup>nd</sup>. Unfortunately, the 'large architectural structure' was not finished in time, but the event went ahead, and nobody seemed to notice that everything wasn't in place.

The students were disappointed that they hadn't achieved what they set out to do and also felt that they let the Biennial down. A meeting was held to review the progress of the project and it was agreed that rather than finish building the structure, the group would produce a booklet documenting the ideas behind the project and highlighting the things they had learnt. One participant explained 'the whole experience was memorable. I think I went through every emotion. It was a total eye-opener about the level of organisation, co-operation and stamina needed for such an event. It was the first time for all of us that people we did not know had come to see work we had done-it felt good.'

**2004 Biennial Festival: 18<sup>th</sup> September – 28<sup>th</sup> November****Lifelong Learning and Inclusion – Projects**

This programme (the renamed Education and Access programme) has been established as an integral part of the International as a result of the evaluation process following the 2002 programme. Since the Biennial's ambition is to make available to regional communities the skills and experience of established artists, the simplest way to achieve this is for the communities to meet these artists directly.

Sharon Paulger, the Lifelong Learning and Inclusion Co-ordinator established two new groups (again as a result of evaluation following 2002) in order to facilitate planning and negotiate ownership of delivery. The Community Network Group was set up June 2003, and included representatives from AIR, LHAT, NWDAF and Media Station. This advisory group contributes to planning the community-based project for the education programme. The Education Network Group was set up December 2003, with the active support of Liverpool Community College.

Using funds from the Regional Arts Lottery, a project called Wild! Was set up before the 2002 Biennial. This had continued as a partnership with the FACT Centre, Static and Bluecoat, and developed with three focus groups (people with learning difficulties, artists and young people).

L1 Partnership approached the Biennial with a view to exploring how the Biennial could develop public art projects within the regeneration plans for the area, and this resulted in the Bosnian artist Azra Akzamija designed a series of events for the Square, taking place during the International 04 and documented in the foyer of Tate Liverpool. There is a possibility that the Biennial may develop a long-term partnership over 6-10 years to contribute art to the development of a string of sites in the L1 area.

In a continuation of the successful *Shoot the Artist* initiative for the 2002 Biennial, Broadside Films were commissioned to document five artists' visits. The films focused on the dialogue between the artists and local residents and will be shown in the 2004 Biennial.

Projects had been developed in association with Creative Partnerships in three schools. At Halewood Community Comprehensive School, for instance, 280 year nine pupils researched International 04 artists as part of their ICT curriculum studies.

Unfortunately, some Learning and Inclusion events – notably a series of 'impromptu Lectures' had to be cancelled because of lack of certainty as regards funding in the spring of 2004.

**International 04 / Learning and Inclusion Events**

Engage (The National Association of Gallery Education) in collaboration with the Biennial, Tate, FACT and the Bluecoat Arts Centre organised a conference on the theme of Diversity at FACT in October 2003. This had originally been scheduled to take place during the 2002 Biennial period.

The Biennial organised and hosted a one-day conference called Re: place at 68 Hope Street premises of Liverpool Art School on 26 / 27 March 2004. The theme was the intersection between globalisation and the specifics of place and culture. The four International 04 Researchers were contributors, as were Declan McGonagle and Ronaldo Munck.

**International +**

Liverpool Biennial generated opportunities for active participation in the art process, and believe it is vital to address and engage the city and its communities as much as the world of international art. They actively strive to give people the chance to discover and express their own creativity as well as accessing the creativity of others. For 2004, participating artists were contractually required to participate in Learning and Inclusion activities. The title International + referred to the ongoing negotiation of the place of activities within the art process, as 'add-on,' augmentation and connection between different communities of both artists and non-artists.

***Ways of Seeing***

*Ways of Seeing* was a series of live webcast discussions on the theme of the Liverpool Biennial, hosted by community-driven webcasting channel tenantspin, in which artists, funders, community representatives, curators, and invigilators explored the Biennial from numerous angles and points of view. All twelve webcasts were archived at [www.tenantspin.org](http://www.tenantspin.org)

Tenantspin was a community-driven internet channel that was co-managed by FACT's Collaboration Programme and city-wide high-rise tenants, the majority of whom were over the age of fifty. First piloted in 1999 in conjunction with the Liverpool Housing Action Trust (LHAT), tenantspin delivered webcasts on subjects as diverse as anti-social behaviour, Elvis, rent increases, the Hillsborough Justice Campaign, e-democracy, Will Self, smart homes, care, Margi Clarke, money, CCTV and the paranormal.

***CITYSCAPES***

Artist Yael Bartana, Francesco Jodice, Wolfgang Muller and Susan Hefuna were introduced to a group of young people from Merseyside. The young people took inspiration from the artists and from exhibitions in the city.

Working with Andrea Lansley and a video producer, the groups developed ideas in response to the artist's work. They learned the technical skills of video recording and editing to

create two short films reflecting their own experiences of Liverpool. Shopping, the city centre, young people and clothing, identity. Quiggins as a cultural hotspot for young people, portraits putting themselves at the centre of the work. (Lansley 2004, pp.227-8)

### ***Different Angles***

The Learning and Inclusion Programme was concerned with the dual role of both enabling access to the Festival by the broad spectrum of Merseyside residents, with an emphasis on those who are often socially excluded, while simultaneously encouraging engagement and dialogue with the work shown. In addition, for the first time, the 2004 Biennial commissioned all new artworks for the International Festival, requesting that the artists theme their work on some aspect of the Merseyside context.

The *Different Angles* project was designed with these three features in mind. In summary, the project enabled a cross-section of Merseyside residents from a range of community groups, to actively engage with individual pieces in the International exhibition. The process was participatory, taking place over a number of weeks, with participants being offered a series of creative writing workshops, and a visit to an International exhibition venue to look at and discuss the works shown. This culminated in participants writing one review each about a piece of work. In this way, members of six community groups wrote thirty-four reviews. These reviews were collected into a relatively substantial publication, which was then distributed as a free booklet to the main venues of the International exhibition to enhance and supplement the other information available to visitors. Feedback on the publication was positive: it being seen as 'a really nice set of writing about the Biennial' (Sharon Paulger, Learning and Inclusion Co-Ordinator at the Biennial) and descriptions of it 'walking off the shelves in three minutes flat' (Information Assistant at the Tate). There is some evidence that a bigger print run would have been beneficial.

Prior to this distribution, a successful launch evening was organised for the community participants and others who had input into the project. The launch event was held at the Biennial Resource Centre in the city centre, with the project being warmly introduced by the Deputy Chief Executive of the Biennial. There was a series of performance poetry readings given by the creative writing tutors who had worked with the community groups. This event worked particularly well as a way of 'honouring' the participants, being well organised and high quality, but non-threatening, for the majority of participants who attended.

The project was overseen by Sharon Paulger, with the organisation of the workshops sub-contracted to The Windows Project (an established creative writing organisation). For the Biennial, this was a successful collaboration with a well-chosen partner. The Windows Project contributed to the planning of *Different Angles* by approaching appropriate community groups, and recruit creative writing tutors to work with them, as well as co-ordinating the various aspects of the project. Within the scope of the project, efforts were made to represent the diversity of Liverpool's communities across five boroughs. As much as possible, all groups were chosen to represent a spectrum of Merseyside residents in terms of age, cultural diversity, disability, and geographical locations, especially groups that are often socially excluded. They also identified six community groups to be involved and

engaged creative writing tutors to work with members of each group. The community groups were:

1. The Pagoda Chinese Community Centre
2. South Drive Resource Centre
3. Venus-Working Creatively with Young Women
4. Halewood University of the Third Age
5. Mary Seacole House
6. Windows project tutors

Five creative tutors were engaged to work with these groups for a total of six sessions each. These lessons were to introduce individuals to the concept of writing reviews; build confidence in the individual's ability, and the validity of their opinions, and views; visit and discuss a number of artworks included within the International exhibition and facilitate the writing of a response to one piece each, in the exhibition. The objectives of Different Angles:

- Provide opportunities for dialogues between local residents, and international artists
- Give members of local communities a voice, and the opportunity to share their knowledge, and experiences
- Collect a number of 'home-grown' reviews in a publication, and make this available to exhibition visitors, giving them an insight into how the International exhibition relates to the city
- Make the International exhibition more accessible by offering an alternative to conventional art criticism
- Draw on local language and knowledge to help build the confidence of local audiences through presenting ways of thinking about art that are relevant to their own lives
- Present a range of opinions, and thoughts that will help to recognise the value of diversity, and individual viewpoints

The creative writing tutors were chosen specifically for their skills and experience with working with the chosen community groups. However, none had written reviews before, therefore a one-day training workshop was incorporated into the structure. An external evaluator was engaged from the beginning, enabling information and feedback to be gathered as Different Angles progressed. This was seen as good practice, as 'having someone around from the beginning asked us awkward questions kept me on my toes' (Dave Ward, Director of the Windows Project).

It was envisaged that there would be forty participants in total, the same number of works in the International, and that each participant would be assigned one work each to review. In actuality, thirty-four reviews were written, and some works were reviewed more than once. A successful launch evening was organised on 2<sup>nd</sup> November for the participants and others who had input into the project. The launch had a series of performance poetry

readings given by the creative writing tutors and others. This worked particularly well as a way of 'honouring' the participants, being a well organised and high quality, but non-threatening event, which nearly all the participants attended. It was also unexpectedly, a harmonious interaction of the worlds of creative writing, performance poetry, and the visual arts.

The Biennial gained PR capital from working with the six community organisations, none of which had previously been involved with the Biennial. They valued the project highly, and all were keen to work with the Biennial again. The groups played a role in disseminating the publication, and with it, awareness of the Biennial to an audience who would normally be harder to reach. It was unanimously experienced as an impressive and high calibre project. It was noted that if one of the enduring principles of participatory arts is to provide consistently high projects and delivery, to people who may not be used to having such quality and value attached to them, then the Different Angles project was deemed exemplary.

### ***Tracking 2004***

For this project, the Biennial appointed four researchers to visit Liverpool, and then suggest twelve artists each for the inclusion of the exhibition. These forty-eight artists were then invited to Liverpool to develop proposals for the exhibition. The Liverpool Biennial worked in partnership with five Merseyside secondary schools, who each identified a teacher to help with co-ordinate activities. Each school was allocated one of the international artists to work with groups of ten pupils. The project aimed to:

- Raise awareness and knowledge of contemporary art among secondary school pupils in Merseyside
- Provide opportunities for creative activity among secondary school pupils in Merseyside
- Provide opportunities for young people to explore their own culture and the culture of other cities
- Produce interpretation material for the International 04 exhibition that is relevant, and effective with secondary school pupils

The programme of activities included presentations by artists, practical workshops, visits, and discussions. The programme took the form of ten half day workshops running from September 2003 to July 2004. A freelance project co-ordinator was employed to co-ordinate activities and facilitate workshops. All workshops took place in the schools. The group of pupils met the artists to discuss their previous work and talk about Liverpool culture. The programme was developed to:

- Enable pupils to follow the process of the artists project, that was being developed
- Develop communication between the artist and the group
- Activities to explore issues that were relevant to the artist's work
- Carry out locally based research for the artist

Each school group was asked to produce handouts about the artists and the project would be used as a school's resource, and support material for the International 2004 exhibition. Each participant was invited to have a 'behind the scenes' visit to the exhibition as it was being installed and given the chance to discuss the final artwork with the artist. The project was highly successful in raising awareness of contemporary art among students, through meeting the artist and researching the issues around the display of their work. Students were exposed to the work of an International contemporary artist, and some of the processes behind the realisation of a contemporary art exhibition. The student's visited Liverpool to look at existing works, including FACT that introduced them to aspects and areas of the city many were previously unfamiliar with. The project also injected a greater degree of creativity into the student's experience of the IT curriculum. The students created a data capture form to record people's views about where to best place the artist's work. They analysed the information and compiled a report of their findings. Students increased their level of achievement from level four, to five and improved their behaviour in lesson time.

Crowds pushing, hectic corridors, loud bells. All evoke the atmosphere of a typical comprehensive until you pass through the double doors of the art department of Sutton High School. The department was inspired by Derek Boak, artist and teacher. Derek greets students wearing overalls spattered in paint; his world revolves around not only his own work, but also making exciting projects happen for his student.

The entrance foyer of the art department was transformed into a small gallery. Classical music played quietly in the background. Young artists (pupils) moved around the space with serious intent. The space was visually dramatic. Skylights illuminated objects large and small – from old boots to window frames, from chairs to trumpets – suspended from the ceiling.

A group of nine sixth-form students sat in the middle of the gallery space animatedly discussing their ideas for the Biennial exhibition, *Tracking*. *Tracking* was about these nine students working in collaboration with artist Amanda Coogan, the Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra, pyrotechnics experts and filmmakers, to research and produce art for the Liverpool Biennial. *Tracking* focused on the idea of students breaking out of the classroom, exploring new territory and making the impossible happen.

Six months before the students met the musicians from the Philharmonic. At the meeting they heard Amanda Coogan explained her proposal for the Liverpool Biennial, entitled *A Choir of Performers Headbanging for Approximately Seven Minutes of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony*.

Students Amanda Houghton, John Harley, Lisa Robinson and Claire Corfield described to the group their current negotiations with the Philharmonic. Explaining how they wanted to film

the encore at the end of a performance and then project it as a continuous loop, so that ‘the bowing and applause will go on and on forever.’

Nicola Ellis, Kerry Burns and Heather Farquhar produced a series of elaborate drawings, translating the words used in Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony into hieroglyphics. They joked about their recent price-haggling meeting with the sales rep at St Helens Glass for a better deal for sandblasting the symbols onto glass panels. More serious deliberation followed as they discussed how to display the glass safely in an open and busy space. The students planned a schedule and budget to work with the filmmaker and pyrotechnics experts to explore a cello with fireworks. The Philharmonic granted permission for the group to project the finished film onto the wall of the entrance hall. (Mackinnon-Day 2004, pp228-9)

### **City Dreams 2004**

The *City Dreams* project made it possible for residents from the L1 Partnership area to work with South Korean artist Yeondoo Jung<sup>16</sup> in creating images which represented their dreams, and visions for the future of Liverpool. The project worked with L1 residents, who were part of the Decant Programme; families who have moved home and are therefore required to make important decisions about their future. *City Dream* began in June 2004 with an introduction to Yeondoo, and his work. Project participants were then taken through a creative visioning process, including photography workshops with the artist, and discussion-based sessions which explored aspirations, and cultural difference. This added a new perspective on how participants thought about their future within the city of Liverpool. Participants worked with the artist to create images of their collective dreams which they displayed on a city centre billboard, and in a series of postcards as part of the Festival in September. Through the presentation of the work, participants were given the opportunity to share their ideas with a local, national and international audience.

*City Dream* aimed to work with local communities to demonstrate a confidence and faith in Liverpool’s future. This was to be done through:

- providing opportunities for involvement in creative activities, raising the confidence of individual participants
- encouraging participants to think imaginatively about their hopes and dreams for their futures
- inform the Decant Programme and inform future planning and regeneration for the area
- identifying, and sharing common hopes for the future

*City Dream* encouraged participants to think positively about Liverpool and its future and used art as a tool to facilitate community empowerment. The final distribution and display

---

<sup>16</sup> His work is based on the idea of making people’s dreams come true. He has previously worked with individuals from Seoul, Beijing, Tokyo, New York, and Amsterdam, staging photographs that represent individual’s dreams for the future.

of the work gave participants a platform through which they could contribute to local debates, and their ideas were distributed to key decision makers to inform future planning of the city. The project was aimed at increasing city pride.

Information about participant's hopes for the future would be distributed to key decision makers in the city to inform future planning. *City Dream* raised the profile of the area through involvement in an international arts festival, increase participant skills and confidence, and increase pride in the city and local areas.

### ***Happy Book 2004***

For the Liverpool Biennials International exhibition, forty-eight artists from all over the world were invited to visit Liverpool. They were asked to research the city and then put forward a proposal for a piece of artwork they would like to make for Liverpool. All artists carried out their research in different ways. Some of the artists wanted to meet local people, some wanted to find out about the history of the city, some wanted to look at the architecture and buildings, and some wanted to know what sort of jobs people in Liverpool do. As well as talking to people and visiting places, they read books, studied magazines articles, and looked on the internet. After the research, the artists sent their ideas to the Biennial staff who worked to make the process happen. When artists are planning their projects, they keep sketch books with drawings, and notes of their ideas. They might also collect things and stick them in their books. The project used the ideas of sketch books to get pupils to explore their own local environment, think about what interests them and to find out more about contemporary art.

*Happy Book* was a project designed for pupils at the transition stage between Primary and Secondary School. The project was written by Andres St John, Head at St Benedict's College, the mixed college of South Liverpool and Carol Dockwray, Campion Catholic High School. The project gave pupils the chance to learn about contemporary art and artists, and took a number of different approaches, whilst also giving them the opportunity to develop their own creative skills, and ways to look and approach artworks during the Festival period. To do this, they picked a participating Festival artist, and researched them. Over six lessons, the pupils worked through the project to create their own *Happy Book* which looked at their Past, Present, and Future. Each page was filled with images and information, and pupils were encouraged to write their own opinions, and ideas as they progressed through the book. This built their knowledge of the artist, encouraged reflection, developed their critical thinking, creativity with mixed media still-life collage, and print. Mind maps were used to demonstrate the pupils thinking strategies, and pupils were asked to be photographed in a pose that represented their future careers. The project was a reflection on the artistic process and gave the pupils an insight to the creative process of research that the Festivals artists conducted. They would then take their *Happy Book* with them to Secondary School, this would introduce them to their new school, demonstrate their art skills, and knowledge.

**WILD! 2004**

*Wild!*<sup>17</sup> Was part of a desire by the Liverpool Biennial to carry out a piece of comprehensive audience development research to inform the activities of the ongoing Education and Access Programme, and Events Programme. The aim was to develop new, and existing audiences through targeted programmes of activity, and communication. The plan was to work with three specific groups, in two stages, over a two-year period of research. The *Wild!* programme of activities was developed by focus groups brought together for the project, who developed activities aimed to engage their peers in contemporary visual arts. Within the planning of the project, the groups were encouraged to be daring and innovative, providing a rare opportunity to experiment in a climate that allowed for failure.

The Biennial worked with three focus groups representing young people, people with learning disabilities and artists living and working in Merseyside. The project's wish was to work with their partner visual arts organisations in the city who deliver the Biennial's exhibition programme and had continual programmes of contemporary art context for the research between Biennials.

The *Wild!* Programme of activities was developed by focus groups brought together for the project. The focus groups involved developed activities aimed to engage their peers in contemporary visual arts. In the planning of this programme the groups were encouraged to be daring and innovative, providing a rare opportunity to experiment and in a climate that allows for failure.

These groups were identified through the Biennials Education Working Group as specific community groups who could benefit from new approaches to engaging with contemporary visual arts. Through the Biennial's partner organisations, they identified focus group members to participate in the project. This was done through established contacts and community-based networks. Each group was attached to a host venue which included FACT, Bluecoat, and STATIC. These were selected because of their commitment to working with the target groups: FACT hosted the young people's focus group, STATIC the artists group, and Bluecoat the group with learning difficulties. It was expected that individual members of the groups might change throughout the project period, but that continuity be established through the on-going programme of activity, and the appointed group co-ordinators, and work with them to provide the knowledge, training, and support they required to develop a programme of activities.

For Stage One of the project Liverpool Biennial worked alongside three partner organisations that acted as host venues to three focus groups. Each of the focus groups visited Liverpool biennial 2002. The participant's experience of the Biennial was evaluated, and this informed the development of a programme of facilitated activities enabling the groups to programme their own events. At the end of Stage One further evaluation was carried out and this was used to inform the planning for Stage Two.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Wild!* was funded by Arts Council England North West as the Biennials audience development action research project.

Each of the focus groups visited the 2002 Liverpool Biennial Festival. The participant's experience of the Biennial was evaluated, which informed the development of a programme of facilitated activities, enabling the groups to programme their own events. At the end of Stage One, further evaluation was carried out and this was used to inform the planning for Stage Two. For stage two, both STATIC, and Bluecoat remained involved with their groups. The FACT group dissolved and was replaced by a Biennial-led project whilst still working with young people. One member of the original FACT group of young people joined the Biennial for the second stage. *Wild!* was funded by Arts Council England: North West as Liverpool Biennial's audience development action research project. Both publications were incredibly successful in providing enjoyable and rewarding experiences for participants, and communicating to new audiences in a relevant, and accessible format.

### **STATIC: *Seminal***

STATIC Gallery worked alongside local artists on stage one of the *Wild!* Project encouraging them to debate and develop their own practice in relation to exploring the theme of audience. These experiences were drawn together in a seminar (January 2004), 'Who is our Audience?' Building on the experience of 'Who is our Audience?' STATIC's wish was to prepare a large-scale seminar, aimed at and involving recent art graduates, and emerging artists. In order to encourage this engagement, STATIC developed *Seminal*, an open writing competition seeking ten promising artists whose writing is requiring, perceptive, opinionated, and articulate.

In order to survive and thrive in the contemporary world, young artists must take control of how their work is presented and must understand how to articulate their ideas in many ways. Whatever medium an artist uses, at some point the ability to describe his / her thoughts in writing is essential. Eight writers were ultimately chosen and invited to an all-expenses paid two-day workshop to explore Liverpool Biennial. Following their visit, each writer developed a new text focussing on a chosen aspect of Liverpool Biennial. These texts were then published online with the writer's involvement discussed at the *Seminal* seminar, held in STATIC in the closing weekend of the Biennial (November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2004).

Through discussion and experiment, eight recently graduated art students critically explored what it is to build an audience, starting with building an audience for their own work. Since its inception Static sought to question the parameters of artistic practice, so an inquiry into audience presented a relevant challenge. Static was invited to work with recently graduated artists, reflecting the organisation's interest in building critical structures that support practice. However, Static was uneasy about entering into such a partnership, not wanting to serve the agendas of another organisation, nor to enter into a relationship that was unquestioning. When Jo Lansley began to recruit the group and gently initiate dialogue it became apparent that Static's questions also lay in the minds of the artists forming the group. Just why should a group of self-defining young artists serve the needs of other artists or even other organisations, including Static? In the early weeks of discussion, it became clear that these artists wouldn't function as unpaid researchers. However, the act of developing an audience for their own practice, as artists who may be in the Independent or International shows one day, was a task worth their while.

During months of visits, discussions, interviews, social and surgeries with experts, curators, and artists, Jo Lansley provoked the group to consider how they might take practical steps to develop their own audiences. Democratic decision-making and group action were difficult, and Jo experimented with ways to foster decisions, through constantly changing the relationship between individual and group, and the emphasis placed on one or the other. It became apparent that one single group work was not going to happen. The reasons for this remained unknown. Some speculated that artists are historically self-seeking and unable to work as a group, but it seemed that far from being selfish, these artists were too sensitive to each other's needs, and this was limiting progress. Finally, any hand-holding stopped, and the project was put firmly back into the artists' hands. They were commissioned to make their own work, but with a greater consideration of audience.

Some of the artists made no work, reaching the conclusion that being an artist was not the life they wanted to lead. While this was an unexpected, and of course indirect, outcome of the project, it seemed a healthy and positive result. The other artists developed a range of activities. Barbara Jones closed a city-centre road and met over 500 people in her project to study the current political distribution of peace and disease. Laura Pullig produced a faux-promotional set of postcards for mass distribution while Steven Lloyd invented a web-based alter ego for himself. John Borley made football matches, Caroline Black organised tea parties, while Andy Poole proposed a late-night discussion on love and hate. Steven Renshaw, with the help of the whole group, organised an event. 'whole is our Audience?' inviting international speakers to explore ideas of audiences and generating Statics biggest audience for live discursive events so far. However, more importantly than numbers, the event and the project as a whole gave *Wild!* And Static grounds for serious thought about audiences, access, ownership, and the problems of generating healthy debate. (Becky Shaw 2004, pp.231-2)

### **Bluecoat: The Journey**

Since November 2002, two groups of people with learning difficulties worked in partnership with Bluecoat on the *Wild!* Project. The participants visited contemporary art venues throughout Liverpool and created their own work in response to the exhibitions they had seen. The project participants were involved in a series of workshops fostering creative activity. For Stage Two, the groups developed their workshop activities further, creating new work that was scheduled to be exhibited as part of Liverpool Biennial 2004.

Artist Leo Fitzmaurice worked with adults with learning difficulties from L8 Resource Centre and Fazakerley Croxteth Day Services to create a short film of people's journeys to an exhibition at Bluecoat Arts Centre. Initially, the group decided to visit contemporary art exhibitions in Liverpool and to create their own work in response. Having looked at a good deal of work they concluded that contemporary art, rather than being a highbrow thing, is essentially about everyday experiences. Leo described the moment of realisation.

'We'd been to the Shopping exhibition at Tate and the From a Distance exhibition at Bluecoat and were looking at how artists used consumer culture. It was now lunchtime and we had returned to our room at Bluecoat to talk about what we had seen. We were inspired to produce our own work photographing the products in our packed lunches, each taking it in turns to arrange our lunch on the table and photograph it. Then we all went home. To our surprise, next week one of the group members came in with some photographs he had taken. He had spent the week photographing most of the possessions in his home. The photographs he produced were at the same time strangely exotic and oddly normal. I think it was things like this that gave us the confidence to look at our own lives as Art.'

The group wanted to create a piece of work about their everyday experiences on the project and decided to make a film of their individual journeys to a gallery. As the participants live in different areas of Liverpool, the journeys approach the city at varying angles from the peripheries, allowing the group to explore the physical relationship each member had to the city and at the same time to produce a portrait of the city itself. Leo said: 'I think it has become quite psychological, about how a journey allows our thoughts to wander and about how arriving can be like waking from a dream.'

The group wished to produce a work that somehow related to their project experiences, with the decision made to make a short film of their individual journeys to an exhibition at Bluecoat Arts Centre. The climax for *The Journey* project, had participants attend a red-carpeted film premiere event, held at Bluecoat (November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2004). Together they explored the experience of being a visitor in Liverpool. The group took the notion of 'visiting' as their inspiration, producing a large mural and lightboxes. The exhibition of their work then toured museums, libraries, and galleries before resting at its permanent site inside Halewood Resource Centre.

The most important aspect of the project had been its longevity. The group members worked together for eighteen-months, making it necessary for them to focus on a long-term goal and work towards it in a fairly systematic way. They all looked forward to the climax of the project, which was a glitzy premiere of their film at Bluecoat on 25<sup>th</sup> November. All the group members were keen to continue, and their support workers obtained funding for training that enabled them to develop arts projects themselves, leaving a definite legacy. (Rebecca Jones LB 2004, pp.226-7)

### **The Liverpool Experience**

Through this eighteen-month collaborative project, artist Andy Weston and a group of adults with learning difficulties from Halewood Resource Centre in Knowsley have explored the experience of being a visitor in Liverpool. The International 04 artists each visited Liverpool to absorb its unique atmosphere and gain inspiration for their proposed pieces of work. The group took 'visiting' as a starting point, visiting arts and cultural venue in the local area and acting like tourists in their own city.

Carefully documenting their *'Liverpool Experience'* through photographs, the group often attached special memories to particular images based on actual experiences or very personal associations. From the resulting archive of photos each group member selected one favourite image and worked to enlarge and simplify it through a process using sheets of acetate and a projector. Once the group had decided on a composition, the images were transferred onto MDF boards with pencil. Finally, using masking tape and acrylic, the group members painted their images in a selection of colours. The finished product was a mural twelve-feet square representing the highlights of the *WILD! 'Liverpool Experience.'*

An important feature of the project was 'ownership' of the images used. When visiting the art galleries, museums and other cultural venues, each member of the group selected several views that they wanted to capture. In this way each individual could feel directly connected to a group of images. At Bluecoat Arts Centre, one member of the group was drawn to the brickwork in the corner area of the front courtyard because he thought it looked like 'chocolate blocks.' A photograph was taken and whenever the image was viewed, the group associated it with chocolate blocks. The group members talked about this project with support staff and other users of their Resource Centre knows the chocolate blocks image! This and other memory triggers and associations were vital elements of the project.

The mural toured to venues including a city centre location, libraries, and other resource centres accompanied by a photographic display, information about the processes used and six lightboxes showing further images associated with the *WILD!* Project. The group members were excited at the prospect of seeing the mural in different places and experiencing people's responses to their work. After the tour the mural was to be permanently sited in a prominent position inside Halewood Resource Centre. (LB Catalogue 2004, pp.225-6)

**FACT: *Gossip***

The FACT group dissolved during stage one of this project and was replaced by a Biennial-led project whilst still working with young people. Staff changes at FACT meant that key workers involved in stage one, were no longer physically available to continue to foster this project. One member of the original FACT group of young people joined the Biennial for the second stage.

The decision to use the format of a magazine grew out of the original conversations from the FACT group of young people, who were looking at interesting means to market, produce, and programme contemporary art. When this group dissolved, they discovered the use of a magazine was still relevant to young people, and this partly ensured their ability to recruit another five young people to the project. *Gossip* began as an invitation to a group of young people to collaborate and create a means to engage, and educate their peers about contemporary art. To do this, it was decided that the group would use the

format of a magazine as a means to present information in an interesting format that would also appeal to their peers. The young people were given a 'backstage pass' and the means to follow the production of the exhibition and meet the artists and curators. Writing and design workshops were provided to develop the group's skills in these areas, resulting in a young person's guide to Liverpool Biennial International 04.

## **BUDDIES**

International 04 artists staying in Liverpool were matched with a 'buddy.' The 'buddy' was a student who had an interest in art and who knew Liverpool well. This scheme was designed to give the volunteer experience regarding contemporary arts production as well as providing assistance for the artist.

The proposal to set up visiting artists with undergraduate Fine Arts students from Liverpool conjured up visions of a cross between a blind date and a script for a road movie. The potential for both success and disaster was there in equal measures. Whichever way, the experience would be an education. Many of the visiting artists had worked on major international projects prior to coming to Merseyside. The vast majority of the Liverpool Community College Fine Art students had experience of previous Liverpool Biennial events, some invigilating at city centre venues in 2002. Both expectations and concerns would be high for both parties.

'I was apprehensive meeting Azra.... However, I need not have been concerned, as before the end of the day we had become friends; we briefly shared our life stories. At the finish of the project, we shared a personal moment when a woman in the café took a photo of us.... I look forward to seeing and working with her again. (Cath Stevenson, HND Fine Arts, working with Azra Aksamija)

For a successful liaison, the aim would be to pair needs, interests, and skills.

'as Ursula explained her intentions about her work, I realised that her interests had an identity with my own background and experiences as an asylum seeker. It was exciting to be part of a work in progress, being able to assist with many of the technical problems that arose and finding the right locations. I feel really privileged to be a part of this and it will definitely influence the way that I work in the future. (Aboubaker Abdullah, HND Fine Arts, working with Ursula Biemann)

All the 'buddies' felt part of the process and were able to witness at first hand the drive and enthusiasm of the artists in the realisation of their works over and above everything else. The words most frequently used by the 'buddies' in describing the attitude of the visiting artists were 'planning,' 'preparation' and, above all, 'professionalism.'

'Jill knew exactly where she wanted to go and how she wanted to work. One of the memories I have was standing in front of the door leading into the main room of the Philharmonic pub, so that the landlord and the barmaid could not see Jill with her tripod and camera filming the room and the customers having a drink – Jill's confidence and friendliness ensured the cooperation of everyone being filmed within minutes.' (Des Shaw, HNC Fine Arts, working with Jill Magid)

None of the students involved in this initiative had any hesitation in recommending the Buddies scheme to others. (Geoff Molyneux HND / HNC Fine Arts course leader, The Arts Centre, Liverpool Community College)

### ***VIRAL TREATS***

In January 2004, BA (Hons) Multimedia Arts students at Liverpool School of Art and Design, Liverpool John Moores University, embarked upon a brief set by the Liverpool Biennial and Love Creative to design and create a series of 'viral treats' to promote the Liverpool Biennial 2004. Viral treats are digital entities, designed to be forwarded by email, to promote events, artists and specific exhibitions in the Biennial. 'Treats' included interactive playthings and games, animations and screensavers.

A key requirement of a viral treat is that it can be distributed by email; another is that the recipient would choose to forward it – perhaps to everyone in his or her address book. Successful viral treats include those which engage, inform, challenge or entertain the user. It was proposed that a selection of treats would be emailed to promote the event. The treats were designed to be quickly shared locally, nationally and internationally, promoting the Biennial, the city and also the student designer.

Sharon Paulger of the Biennial met up with the students to introduce the history and philosophy of the Liverpool Biennial and to present artists' projects and previous work. She provided a full set of artists' proposals for the forthcoming Biennial and, since many of the students had not been living in the city in 2002 and had not attended the previous event, she also provided a catalogue and information about the Liverpool Biennial 2002. This helped to contextualise the event and provided a useful starting point for seminar discussions.

Although the project was initially proposed for Level three students, interest quickly grew, and staff decided to open the project up to all three years. This proved to be very successful, increasing communication, support and healthy competition between levels. Students responded well to the fact that this was a live brief and that their work might actually be used as part of the campaign or as part of an exhibition.

Representatives of the Biennial and Love returned to critique the work on completion and all Level three students, and a selection of Level two students presented their work to the panel. This was a valuable opportunity for students to gain feedback from industry representatives and the panel were extremely impressed by the quality of work presented.

Working on this project made the Biennial a much more personal event for those involved and there was a high level of anticipation from students eager to see how their proposals had actually been realised. The project was considered a success by all involved and the body of work provided staff with a useful resource with which to introduce the next group of students to the Liverpool Biennial. (Carole Potter 2004, pp.230-1)

## 2006 Biennial Festival 16<sup>th</sup> September – 26<sup>th</sup> November

### Biennial Big Table (neighbourhood network)

The Biennial Big Table was founded in the spring of 2005 with the aim of forming long-term relations with Rotunda (Kirkdale / Vauxhall), Metal (Kensington) and Garston Cultural Village. The purpose of the network is peer-led learning between all four participating organisations effected through the realisation of collaborative programme. From the point of view of the Biennial specifically, it offered the opportunity of a multiple base in the neighbourhoods for future Biennial exhibitions as well as a means to develop audiences.

During the review period, with the support of the Learning and Inclusion team and the Public Art team, the network planned and delivered Franck Scurti's Jackpot, a three-part neon artwork in three different forms installed in three different areas, as a contribution to the City's *Winter Lights*. The initial proposal was to show these from November 2007 – March 2008, but to save costs of de-installation, and in celebration of 2008, it was decided to maintain them over the summer of 2008 to become part of the 2008 Winter Lights, the culmination of the three-year project.

Early discussions as regards an International Exchange with Liverpool Culture Company's 'Cities on the Edge' partners evolved through active research and development into a planned programme called For the Likes of Us, to be realised in the following year.

### 'Pavilions'

Active planning took place during the year towards the *Pavilions* – major commissions designed to draw attention and audiences to the neighbourhoods (these were realised after the end of this review period). Working with Rotunda Community College, internationally acclaimed landscape architects GROSS Max planned a 'folly' and a community garden. Columbian artists Luis and Juan Pelaez worked with Metal in Kensington to plan Nexus, a sea of glowing columns along the disused approach to Edge Hill Station, while Garston Cultural Village invited Michael Trainor to stage a 'cultural revolution' declaring an Artistic Republic of Garston. All three commissions launched April / May 2008 with great success.

### Winter Lights Two

The second commission in the proposed three-part series of *Winter Lights* was Jackpot by Franck Scurti, delivered successfully in November 2007. It created and provided a number of challenges and lessons. While the successes of the project were the quality of the artwork, securing new international artwork outside of the city centre, and the reaction to it by local press and media, the commission was challenging in terms of its delivery. Working with a number of different partners in different locations led to questions about overall responsibility and accountability – an ongoing challenge of the Big Table. Difficulties in securing sites for the works until the last-minute meant that there was less community consultation and engagement than desired.

For *Winter Lights* Three the Big Table addressed these concerns, as they sought to generate increased opportunities for peer-led learning, through networking and sharing of partners' knowledge and experiences, while ensuring clear responsibilities for each individual partner to lead on the commission for their areas, with the Biennial taking a supportive role. A clearer artist brief, and a focus on securing sites earlier in the cycle, allowed for increased community engagement and ownership. The Biennial looked at plans for 2009 / 10 to involve artists in longer-term residencies in the Big Table communities.

### **Animal by Ron Haselden**

Rabbit by Ron Haselden followed the success of 2006's Animal series in which Haselden collaborated with the children of Kirkdale, Kensington and Garston transforming their drawings into three large neon creatures. The light drawings were switched on at night and were a great excuse to explore new neighbourhoods. Rabbit launched on 26<sup>th</sup> September.

Locations of Animals:

Rabbit, St James Church, Upper Parliament Street, Toxteth in collaboration with St Vincent de Paul Primary School.

Camel, corner of St Mary's Road and Moss St, Garston in collaboration with Gilmour Infants School.

Cat, Stanley Street at Great Mersey Street, Kirkdale in collaboration with Hope Valley Community School.

Polar Bear, on the C7 building, corner of Sheil Road and Derby Road in collaboration with Phoenix Primary School.

### **Liverpool Jackpot by Franck Scurti**

Franck Scurti took an investigative approach within communities and his engaging and playful artworks found a natural home within the neighbourhoods of Liverpool. Liverpool Jackpot transformed buildings into giant fruit machines suggesting ideas of luck, money, and revolution!

Ideas Cannot Be Killed, corner of St Mary's Road and Clifton St, Garston.

Power to the People, Tunnel Road opposite Edge Hill Station, Kensington.

Hold Your Nerve and Think Big, Stanley Road at Great Mersey Street, Kirkdale.

Rabbit was part of the Neon Attractions project granted the London 2012 Inspire Mark as part of the Cultural Olympiad.

**Burst 2006****Context**

Liverpool Biennial aim was to broaden the audience within Liverpool for contemporary art through creating access to contemporary international art. To help the Biennial achieve this aim it has an on-going Learning and Inclusion programme through which it creates opportunities for local communities to engage with the International exhibition.

Between 2002 and 2004 the Learning and Inclusion programme worked with over 300 people on short to medium term projects. Evaluation of this work shows that the participants increased their understanding and awareness of contemporary art and that they are interested in further supported involvement with Liverpool Biennial.

The evaluation of the Biennial's visitor programme also indicated that in order to fully support the engagement of new audiences the Biennial needs to provide more effective interpretation resources. The Biennial recognised that finding meaning in contemporary art is often challenging. New audiences can be bewildered by the lack of narrative or representational view and the use of non-traditional techniques. The audience for contemporary art can be diverse and each individual brings knowledge, experiences, and ideas to looking at the art that will influence that meaning they find in the artwork itself.

*Burst* was a project that had been developed in order to address the need to sustain the Biennial's relationship with the project participants whilst also enabling them to use the diversity of their knowledge and experiences to develop effective and accessible interpretation resources.

*Burst* was an innovative, new project, integral to the Biennial's Learning and Inclusion programme for 2006 Festival. It was developed to address the need to sustain and strengthen relationships with participant of previous Learning and Inclusion projects, whilst also enabling them to use the diversity of their knowledge and experiences to develop effective and accessible interpretation materials for Liverpool Biennial 2006.

They worked with participants to produce Bi-annual '*bursts*' (publications) which included responses to the International 06 artists, the region and their ideas about contemporary art. International 06 artists and researchers would be invited to contribute. A bumper issue would be produced for the launch of the Festival, which would in part act as an interpretation tool and school resource.

The aims of the project:

- To develop existing relationships with local community groups
- To embrace cultural diversity and inclusion
- To create effective and accessible interpretation resources for Biennial visitors and schools

- Increase awareness of contemporary visual arts amongst hard-to-reach sectors of the community
- To develop the skills base and confidence of participants and encourage independence

This process presented unique opportunities for Merseyside residents to become involved.

Burst:

1. A programme of facilitated workshops with groups already familiar with the Biennial introduced participants to the processes behind the development of International 06. Artist-led workshops and a series of artist talks supported the development of a comprehensive collection of information sources relating to the International 06 artists. The materials were collected in a variety of formats, including books, articles, audio, and video, and will be available to all project participants where possible; meetings with the artists, researchers, and curators will be incorporated into the programme
2. The groups would contribute to Bi-annual publications, aimed at presenting an exploration of the exhibition, through the voices of Merseyside communities. Each participant would be assigned one International 06 researcher or artist to focus on. Their responses might include creative writing, poetry, photography, collage, reviews, wallpaper, interviews, art, stickers, data, film, diary entries, art crawls / trails or anything else the participants may wish to create. The contributions would be collected together into editions to be published in October, distributed through partner organisations, schools, colleges, universities, day centres and the public realm
3. Alongside the workshops, they would develop an information network, to broaden participant's experience of contemporary art, enabling them to make steps towards becoming independent art visitors. The network provided communication, support and regular information to individual members about contemporary art events across the region. Members received invitations to exhibition previews, talks and other relevant events. A familiar Biennial representative was present at all events to act as host. A bi-monthly bulletin was circulated to project participants inviting them to arts activity and as a regular, anticipated means to keep them informed. This bulletin was also provided in hard-copy format for those participants without access to email
4. The 'bumper' publication in September 2006 served as an interpretation tool for visitors to the exhibition. The aim was to reflect the diverse nature of Liverpool Biennial's audience and highlight the many different ways of looking at an artwork. It will also work with project participants to develop a series of specialist tours and seminar events relating to International 06 Visitor Programme. The resources and events were open to school and community groups and independent visitors to the exhibition
5. Participants worked towards the fourth edition focussing on a review of the Biennial. This completed the cycle of the project, returning to the aim of creating a project existing in non-biennial years, providing a means for new project

participants to take part. The original participants would take ownership of the project, being given the means to become facilitators towards International 08, maintaining their involvement in a higher capacity. As ambassadors, they would be encouraged to source fresh participants and Merseyside community groups otherwise uninvolved and unaware of contemporary visual arts activity within the North West

### **Why *Burst* was Important**

The aim to broaden the audience within Liverpool for contemporary art, through creating access to contemporary international art, providing education / community programmes, creating diversity of product, and creating enjoyment and fun. Finding meaning in contemporary art is often challenging for new audiences, who can be bewildered by the lack of narrative or representational view, and the use of non-traditional techniques. This project would present diverse and individual responses to new audiences, sharing knowledge, experiences and ideas. It offers local people, often from under-represented groups, the opportunity to participate and interact with international artists. It forged and developed strong links with community groups and enhanced the experience of all Biennial visitors through its essential contributions to the 2006 visitor programme. The interpretive materials would encourage engagement with the city and with the Biennial Festival, and the participants themselves would act as ambassadors for Liverpool Biennial, enabling communication with a harder to reach sector of the Merseyside community.

## 2008 Biennial Festival MADE UP 20<sup>th</sup> September – 30<sup>th</sup> November

### 2007

The early part of the review period was dominated by the need to recruit a new team following the departure of both Sharon Paulger, the Learning and Inclusion Programme Manager, and Renea Belton the Co-ordinator. The Biennial was delighted to be able to her team Franny George and Ros Hyde, both of whom had previously worked for the Biennial as interns. In light of the continuing development of the company, the Festival and the relationship between the two. Judy reviewed the ongoing projects to which the team was committed and decided to implement some changes.

*Burst* was a project that had evolved over two previous Festivals as a means of engaging a variety of other organisations in an ongoing critical relationship with the development of the programme. The most visible output was a magazine, written, designed, produced and distributed by the young people involved. It was decided that the output in future should be online activity, and the project, now called 'Inter-view' had been successfully recast in the mould.

*Triangles* was another series of projects designed to engage groups with the international exhibition, each project involving a local artist, international artist and local user-group. Plans were put in place during the review period to work with Walton Prison (Manfredi Beinati and Big House), Venus Resource Centre and Merseyside Dance Initiative.

During the year, the Biennial redesigned their activities to ensure that their approach to engagement was fully integrated within the commissioning process, supporting the development of sustainable relationships and maximising opportunities for communities to work directly with international artists. Before the L&I team was redeployed, specific projects delivered to meet the needs of local communities and Festival visitors including:

- **Schools projects 2008:** a series of professional development activities for teachers, including a school's exhibition and conference
- **Inter-view** – a web based project involving ten community groups who researched the processes behind *MADE UP*, generated their own critical commentary of the ongoing development of the exhibition, and finally reviewed the show
- **Triangles** matched community groups in Liverpool with local artists and either a *MADE UP* artist or artwork
- **Making it Up:** a documentary film commission delivered by local young people
- **Made Up in Liverpool:** an open film competition for young people. A partnership with FACT to commission young people (12 – 19 years) to make films and present them in their won specially created film Festival
- **Future, Fiction and Fantasy** – Liverpool Biennial's Schools Project involved staff working with *MADE UP* artists and eighteen schools across Merseyside

- **RE – TOLD** – one unexpected outcome of the Biennials work was the decision by thirty of the team of volunteers, some of whom also happened to be art students, to mount their own response to *MADE UP* with **RE: TOLD**. The exhibition took place in Arena Studios
- **MADE UP Artists' Talks and Conversations** enabled visitors to hear from and question eight of the artists at individual events throughout the Festival
- **Pool Pool**: a group of local artists to provide support for the Biennials L+I programme. They were receiving training and delivering workshops and activities
- **Visitor Programme**: plans were created for activities which commenced 2008, including a series of talks and tours around the Biennial Festival artworks. The programme included a welcoming Visitor Centre on Lime Street as a starting point for exploration of the Festival, and the base for group tours led by curators, artists, and critics, as well as diverse cycling and dog-walking tours
- **'I Made it Up'**: planning for a kids and families half-term story-telling competition
- **The first Long Night of the Biennial** saw Festival venues and the wider city art scene throw open its doors late into the evening, with alternative activity and events taking place across the venues. In one night, there were 6,500 visits to venues and events across the city, and reaction was overwhelmingly positive and there were hopes for it to become an annual event

### The Liverpool Biennial Schools Project 2008

The Liverpool Biennial Schools Project 2008 built on the success of the Learning and Inclusion Schools, and Creative Partnerships projects that took place in 2004 and 2006. The primary aim was to increase awareness of contemporary art practice for pupils, and teachers in the run up to the Festival. It gave pupils and teachers the opportunity to meet, and work with (local and international) artists, and culminated in an exhibition and a Masterclass event for GCSE students and teachers during the Festival period. Liverpool Biennial worked with teachers from six schools on the Wirral, and twelve within Merseyside to take part in a programme of professional development (slightly more than the fifteen intended in total). The teachers were invited to participate in workshops with International 08 artists and attend artists' talks. After the workshops, they were supported by a local curator to develop a project that aimed to involve them working in collaboration with pupils to create work for exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial 2008. The project also generated a set of learning resources that can be used both in an exhibition environment, and back in the classroom. Although the project initially aimed to work across different subject areas, and not focus upon art teachers and pupils exclusively, there was only one instance of a non-art teacher being directly involved with the project. There were also a small number of projects that made direct links with other departments within the school.

The qualitative evaluation attempted to identify the extent to which the project was successful in meeting its primary aim of developing a model that could increase the use and profile of contemporary art for teaching and learning for creativity, and cultural enrichment across the curriculum. It also looked at each of the other three project aims in turn. This report drew heavily on the views of the teachers involved<sup>18</sup>, also taking into account the

---

<sup>18</sup> Sources of evidence: initial self-assessment of needs at introductory teachers meeting;

feedback from some of the pupils, visitors to the exhibition, some of the Festival invigilators working at the exhibition, and observations of the project evaluator.

Some of the main findings and recommendations were mentioned in the 2008 Tate publication *Teaching through Contemporary Art: A Report on Innovative practices in the Classroom*.<sup>19</sup> There was also reference to the initial findings of a paper written at Liverpool John Moore's University<sup>20</sup> on the effectiveness of the previous Biennial School's Project in 2006. The comments taken from both publications were only used to contextualise, or back up findings from the current project, or to remark on the ongoing legacy of Liverpool Biennial Schools Projects in general. In general, within the report, the sources of the views being expressed were identified but did not identify individuals or their schools.

Liverpool Biennial hoped that the report did adequate justice to all the hard work that everyone put into the project. In this section, the focus was to evaluate the extent to which the project had met its primary aim of developing 'a model that could increase the use and profile of contemporary art for teaching and learning for creativity, and cultural enrichment across the curriculum.' In this section the evaluation focused on whether the teachers involved had developed their understanding and use of contemporary art, and also on whether this had impacted the school itself. One teacher worried at the beginning of the project that contemporary art 'can be justifying poor quality work.' In the same introductory session, another teacher suggested that a successful project for him would be 'for above action research programme' (of increasing the use and profile of contemporary art). Many of the teachers were able to attend a number of the workshops led by international artists and then returned to school to dedicate a lot of their time to developing a project with their GCSE students.

### General Awareness

Generally, the Biennial was seen to have a very positive status. When asked how they saw the organisation, teachers responded positively as it gave them the opportunity to refresh and expand their knowledge by being outside of their comfort zones. The Liverpool Biennial Schools Project 2008 was viewed as a success mostly. All feedback about the work produced for exhibition was extremely positive, as the teachers noticed that the Biennial was interested in their teaching practices and passionate about introducing students to contemporary art. Many of the teachers, pupils and Biennial staff had worked extra-long, unpaid hours to make the project work. A considerable number of teachers and pupils had also taken risks, or stepped out of their comfort zones, reporting back about their refreshed attitudes and energy for using contemporary art within their lessons. The new addition of the 'Pool Pool' had offered the opportunity for pupils to work directly with artists. The

---

feedback from the Wirral Schools Coordinator, questionnaires completed by 5 teachers at end of project (28% of possible returns), six student questionnaires, two festival volunteers; comments from visitors' book at exhibition; emails; draft report by LJMU on effect of participation in Liverpool Biennial Schools Project 2006

<sup>19</sup> Adams, J. K. Worwood, D. Atkinson, P. Dash, S. Herne, and T. Page (2008) *Teaching Through Contemporary Art - A Report on Innovative Practices in the Classroom*. Tate Publishing, London

<sup>20</sup> What has been the long-term impact in schools of engagement with contemporary arts practice through the Liverpool biennial 2006? by Sandra Hiett, Gaynor Walker, Sarah Reilly, Katie Musgrove and Jenny Walsh

experiment of the masterclass paid off with some teachers reporting that it was the event that possibly allowed pupils to learn more than in other stages of the project.

The question the evaluation raised was: How far reaching are these positive learning opportunities? In some cases, the cross-curricular projects had already started, in others the learning might just have spread within the department. There was not a big turnover of teachers between projects to pass on the message to their pupils, but for some teachers, this was their third Biennial project. This size of budget *could* be having an impact on a much larger number of pupils. The evaluation did not present any answers but raised some questions that the next Learning and Inclusion Team might have wanted to develop for future projects.

### ***Making it Up* Project Overview**

*Making It Up* was a commissioned work that was a youth-led documentary looking at the installation of selected pieces from Liverpool Biennial *MADE UP* exhibition. It provided a film for the Liverpool Biennial to show in the visitor centre and host venues, by giving additional interpretations of the Festival. The project provided participants with the opportunity to document their own perceptions about contemporary art and the Biennial Festival at large, giving an insight into how young people interact with and interpret art. The project also gave young people the opportunity to develop filmmaking skills, learn how to plan and carry out a documentary project and engage with contemporary art.

*Making it Up* was a successful film that was informative, and entertaining as it contributed to the interpretation of *MADE UP* by allowing the viewer to see behind the scenes and understand some of the artist's motives. This is important as it gives an understanding into the concepts and perceptions of what motivates the artist and fulfilled its aim to act as interpretation for the Learning and Inclusion team. One Biennial volunteer commented in their exit interview that the documentary was helpful as it presented information directly from the artists about their work, an important factor for developing cultural excellence (McMasters 2008). One Biennial volunteer commented that since being installed in the visitor centre it has allowed people to relax, sit down and take it in, and made people more confident in spending time in, and making use of, the learning space. It was also successful because it provided those involved, with new skills and confidence in filmmaking. The project wasn't without several challenges and sometimes lacked direction and drive, particularly in the middle of October when the group had to re-shoot some work. Ultimately it exceeded the intended finish date by nearly two months, which affected the usefulness for a wider audience, but as a finished product it was something that participants could be proud of achieving. The project gave the opportunity to develop new skills, not only practical skills about film making, but developed confidence in interpreting and the perception of art, and how to express their opinions when discussing contemporary art.

### ***Made Up* in Liverpool Youth Film Festival 08 Evaluation**

Building on the success of *Shoot the Artist* and *Made in Liverpool* 2004 and 2006; Liverpool Biennial, FACT and Liverpool Culture Company wished to develop a new open submission film project within Merseyside. The original *Made in Liverpool* project was an open

submission call for locally made films. The films submitted were screened locally during the 2004 Biennial exhibition period, creating an opportunity for local residents to present Liverpool in their own voice. The project was also repeated in 2006 as an open submission project, with the addition of a specifically commissioned film. In 2008 the project was aimed at young people. At the first project steering group meeting, it was agreed that the project should be referred to as *Made Up in Liverpool* young person's film Festival. By referring to it as a film Festival, it helped to avoid any negativity that may be associated with the word 'competition.' Working in collaboration, the project was also an obvious progression for FACT's Liverpool Film Night, and the First Light Special Effects Awards that took place in April 2008. *MADE UP* in Liverpool was also linked to the wider Liverpool Biennial *MADE UP* International 08 Festival celebrating the created, imagined and distorted, *Made Up* was the theme for film submissions.

The project aimed to involve members of the local community and youth groups. The groups had a part to play in the selection process of the films, and the decision-making processes of curating the film programme. The film programme was to be screened as Liverpool Biennial worked with community partners in Garston, Kirkdale and Edge Hill, with whom long-standing relationships have been built through several community projects and collaborations along the years. In the run up to the submission deadline, a series of workshops offered young people the chance to find out about the project and develop their film making skills. The workshop opportunities were facilitated by a local filmmaker, creating professional development and encouragement, these eight sessions took place at FACT, and also one in a community setting. ICDC (International Centre for Digital Content) delivered four mobile movie workshops in Garston and Kirkdale, allowing young people to learn new skills in filmmaking, and create short films on mobile phones using video DJ software. They then had the option to submit the films as entries if they wished. The submission process was extended as there were some late submissions, bringing the total to an impressive fifty film submissions. Ten of these films were shortlisted for the final. The final ten films were made into a show reel, and an accompanying programme was made by the Young People at FACT. The outcome of the project resulted in a series of screenings as part of Liverpool Biennial 08.

The selected films became a virtual experience, extending the life of the project and adding to the overall archive of the Biennial. The project successfully fulfilled its aims and objectives as many young people were given the opportunity to showcase their talents at creative filmmaking within the sphere of the UK's largest Contemporary International Arts Festival. The six young artists involved through FACT threw themselves into the project designing the call out flyer, an advertising brochure, Festival programmes, a trailer for the film Festival (which was shown at FACT before film screenings), and six T-shirts for them to wear for the film night. They resourcefully planned, hosted, and compered the film night.

The quality of the designs for publicity was extremely high. The young people were extremely ambitious, and already had designs and feelings about how to improve the event in future years. They curated the film Festival, watching submissions, and deciding which films would be part of the film night based on a judging template they produced themselves. In regard to the film night, they were proud of themselves for 'running an event for 220 people that was completely accessible.' The film night was very successful and was a slick and professional event that showcased young people's work, the young

people involved were particularly pleased with this aspect. Over the course of the workshops, they built on a range of skills and learnt many new ones, and thought about the audience response to the night, and how to engage an audience.

There were a series of voting events and community screening events, this helped fulfil the organisation's objective to extend the scope of Liverpool Biennial Festival out from the city centre, and helped them to engage with the work of young people and contemporary art. At the community voting events, the groups chose their top three films, and the results were totalled up for their community choice film. Large film screens were hired for the community screenings and a cinema atmosphere was created. The community screenings were a huge success, as they were hotly anticipated following the schedule of workshops and voting sessions. The ten films were diverse in content, style and mood. Some used animation and modern technology and they addressed a range of issues personal to young people in Liverpool, including one film which dealt with the perception of teenagers and 'hoodies.' The DVD was a nice lasting documentation of the work and project. Perhaps the young people who were involved in 'producing' the Festival could have had more responsibility. A documentary of the process of making the film Festival was also produced. It would have been nice to have seen more of this, especially at the community events. This would have been an opportunity for the Biennial to show to the general public, all the work that they do for education and inclusion within schools and community groups.

### ***I Made It Up! Storytelling Competition***

The project was intended to be a creative, inclusive, fun, family friendly project. All events were free to participate in, and it was hoped that taking part would encourage participants to look closer at their environment, as well as introducing them to Liverpool Biennial. 5 – 10 -year-old children were invited to respond to six Liverpool Biennial artworks through storytelling. The artworks selected for the competition were Yayoi Kusama, The Gleaming Lights of the Souls, Yoko Ono, Liverpool Skyladders, Sarah Sze, Untitled, U-Ram Choe, Opertus Lunula Umbra (Hidden Shadow of the Moon), Ai Weiwei, Web of Light, Diller, Scofidio and Renfro, Arbores Laetae (Joyful Trees).

The artists were chosen for their child friendly nature, and children were encouraged to make up stories about them using words, images, or a combination of both. Specially designed post-boxes were also created so that it was easy to drop off entries at any of the Biennials partner locations and Biennial visitor centre. Overall Aims of the project included:

- Increasing knowledge and understanding of contemporary art within Merseyside communities
- Create opportunities for Merseyside communities to engage creatively in response to the Liverpool Biennial
- Increase awareness of Liverpool's history and built environment within Merseyside communities
- Produce high quality artwork
- Build new audiences for Liverpool Biennial

**Overall Objectives:**

- Provide international platform for work produced by Merseyside communities
- To create positive experiences and events to happen within the community and within the context of Liverpool Biennial
- To extend community knowledge of contemporary art through participation and through the medium of storytelling
- To celebrate creativity within the region

Talking to people there was a real sense of pride and achievement and gave encouraging evidence that the project had created new audiences for Liverpool Biennial. The storytelling events were aimed at 5 - 10-year olds, much like the competition, in the hope that if people were involved in one of them, they would be more likely to be inspired to participate in the other. It was felt that it was important for the performers to have a clear idea of their audience to enable them to write and address their audience at a suitable level. Ullaloom<sup>21</sup> had previously worked with The Walker on some storytelling events with great success so it seemed a good idea to involve them in the project as they had already an established audience there and the venue could be used to advertise the event.

The early part of the review period was dominated by the need to recruit a new team following the departure of both Sharon Paulger, the Learning and Inclusion Programme Manager, and Renea Belton the Co-ordinator. The Biennial was delighted to be able to her team Franny George and Ros Hyde, both of whom had previously worked for the Biennial as interns. In light of the continuing development of the company, the Festival and the relationship between the two. Judy reviewed the ongoing projects to which the team was committed and decided to implement some changes.

*Burst* was a project that had evolved over two previous Festivals as a means of engaging a variety of other organisations in an ongoing critical relationship with the development of the programme. The most visible output was a magazine, written, designed, produced and distributed by the young people involved. It was decided that the output in future should be online activity, and the project, now called 'Inter-view' had been successfully recast in the mould.

*Triangles* was another series of projects designed to engage groups with the international exhibition, each project involving a local artist, international artist and local user-group. Plans were put in place during the review period to work with Walton Prison (Manfredi Beinati and Big House), Venus Resource Centre and Merseyside Dance Initiative.

---

<sup>21</sup> Petite Ullaloom are the sister company to Ullaloom. The company produces original writing and commission-based work for children with a dark twist. They have worked for NML, The Bluecoat, Liverpool Biennial, Sunlight Vision, Everyman / Playhouse Liverpool, St George's Hall, and have collaborated with Unity Theatre on The Tinder Box, 'The Snow Queen' and 'The Red Shoes.' Petite Ullaloom toured Spooky Tales and were proud to be part of The Big Imaginations Festival

During the year, the Biennial redesigned their activities to ensure that their approach to engagement was fully integrated within the commissioning process, supporting the development of sustainable relationships and maximising opportunities for communities to work directly with international artists. Before the L&I team was redeployed, specific projects delivered to meet the needs of local communities and Festival visitors including:

- **Schools projects 2008:** a series of professional development activities for teachers, including a school's exhibition and conference
- **Inter-view** – a web based project involving ten community groups who researched the processes behind *MADE UP*, generated their own critical commentary of the ongoing development of the exhibition, and finally reviewed the show
- **Triangles** matched community groups in Liverpool with local artists and either a *MADE UP* artist or artwork
- **Making it Up:** a documentary film commission delivered by local young people
- **Made Up in Liverpool:** an open film competition for young people. A partnership with FACT to commission young people (12 – 19 years) to make films and present them in their won specially created film Festival
- **Future, Fiction and Fantasy** – Liverpool Biennial's *Schools Project* involved staff working with *MADE UP* artists and eighteen schools across Merseyside
- **RE – TOLD** – one unexpected outcome of the Biennials work was the decision by thirty of the team of volunteers, some of whom also happened to be art students, to mount their own response to *MADE UP* with **RE: TOLD**. The exhibition took place in Arena Studios
- **MADE UP Artists' Talks and Conversations** enabled visitors to hear from and question eight of the artists at individual events throughout the Festival
- **Pool Pool:** a group of local artists to provide support for the Biennials L+I programme. They were receiving training and delivering workshops and activities
- **Visitor Programme:** plans were created for activities which commenced 2008, including a series of talks and tours around the Biennial Festival artworks. The programme included a welcoming Visitor Centre on Lime Street as a starting point for exploration of the Festival, and the base for group tours led by curators, artists, and critics, as well as diverse cycling and dog-walking tours
- **I Made it Up:** planning for a kids and families half-term story-telling competition
- **The first Long Night of the Biennial** saw Festival venues and the wider city art scene throw open its doors late into the evening, with alternative activity and events taking place across the venues. In one night, there were 6,500 visits to venues and events across the city, and reaction was overwhelmingly positive and there were hopes for it to become an annual event

## **2008 International Exchange and Higher Education**

### **Archive**

In 2008 Liverpool Biennial's Archive project was launched – a great achievement that sees the Biennial after ten years able to show off its unique history. Liverpool Biennial's Archive features all of the artwork and artists featured in the International exhibition from the previous Festivals, and its online access means that it is accessible to people around the world.

### **European Biennial Network**

The European Biennial Network is a collaborative structure for the Biennials of Liverpool, Athens, Berlin, Lyon, and Istanbul. It aims to promote dialogue, interaction and collaboration between these contemporary art biennials in Europe. It intends to use the knowledge, experience and wealth of information accumulated by organisers of large-scale periodic art events, in order to support the communication and mobility of artists and art professionals. The Liverpool Biennial has worked to map out the unique aspects of each event and extend collaborative possibilities. Liverpool Biennial hosted a meeting of the Network and a public discussion about Biennials during the Festival opening weekend.

## **DECEMBER 2008**

### **Residency Programme**

#### **OPEN CALL FOR APPLICATIONS**

#### **Liverpool Biennial**

**The European Biennial Network inaugurated its Residency Programme.** In the following months, the member Biennials of the European Biennial Network issued Open Calls for residency positions. **Liverpool Biennial** offering one of these residencies.

The Residency Programme of the European Biennial Network aimed to offer to successful applicants the opportunity to conduct original research on contemporary art in a major city, while supported by the organisers of a biennial exhibition. The knowledge and experience of the host and its relationship to the specific locality will provide the resident access to the local art scene, historical records, archives, academic collocutors, and any other support necessary for research. Each member Biennial of the European Biennial Network is individually responsible for the resident it will host. Applications must be made for the specific residency position. The successful applicant for this residency position will be selected by the Liverpool Biennial.

The successful applicant was offered travel to and from their host city and accommodation, as well as a stipend of 1.000 euros per month. Additional funds for equipment and/or transport of work could also be available, depending on the specifics of the residency.

***For the Likes of Us***

*For the Likes of Us* showcased a collaboration between the Big Table organisations and their counterparts in Naples, Marseilles and Gdansk in association with Liverpool Culture Company's 'Cities on the Edge' programme.

11 September – 23 September

La Dolce Vita – Rotunda

Alan Dunn and David Jacques with Rotunda, napoliest and Liverpoolitalia

An eighty-foot by one-hundred foot digitally printed and hand-painted billboard outside Rotunda at the corner of Stanley Street and Great Mersey Street designed by local artists David Jacques and Alan Dunn. Based on conversations between Liverpool and Naples and a set of photographs of the Bay of Naples taken by Peter Forster in 1960.

***Augmented Reality by Adelin Schweitzer***

Edge Hill Station

*Augmented Reality* means 'supplementing our perception of the real world while adding to it some non-perceptible fictitious elements.' Multimedia artist Adelin Schweitzer spent three weeks in residence at Metal investigating the technology of Virtual Reality. A multimedia project supported by Lezarp'art, northers Marseille and Metal, Kensington and supported by John Moores University.

***Invisible Lives by Joanna Biela Garrido***

Garston

Garrido took photographs of anonymous people without their knowledge. She installed numerous tiny photographs of unknown people directly on the street of Garston (barely visible like the people they depict) with the audience having to make an effort to find people they usually ignore.

***Under the Bridge by Agnieszka Chojnacka and Sean Hawkridge***

*Under the Bridge*, Church Road L19

The area in Garston known as 'under the bridge' has a distinctly different feel to the 'village.' Two sides are separated by a bridge that is partially responsible for the decline of the economy on both sides, since the bridge carries the new bypass that took the majority of the traffic and custom away from the village. The artists used sound, performance and intervention to disrupt the darkly ominous atmosphere under the bridge, in a reciprocal collaboration between Garston and Gdansk, which has a similar bypass. Garston Cultural village also hosted a 'Best Decorated Shop' competition throughout November. The Garston projects were facilitated by Kevin Hunt, Rita Slater, Angieszka Culazinska.

***Cities on the Edge***

13 November – 18 December

Novas, CUC – McGarry Room

*Cities on the Edge* was a new photography work commissioned by the Liverpool Culture Company for 2008. The exhibition and book on the theme of people and places features Liverpool in relationship to five other European port cities. Featuring six photographer – artists – Gabriele Basilico (Naples), Ali Taptik (Istanbul), Philippe Conti (Marseille), Wojtek Wilczyk (Gdansk), Sandy Volz (Bremen) and John Davies (Liverpool) who was also curator of the exhibition. All presented their own conclusions in comparing Liverpool to their home port city. The Cities on the Edge programme was part-financed by the European Union under the Culture 2007 – 2013 Programme.

**Martha Rosler's Library**

This touring exhibition was hosted in Liverpool by Liverpool Biennial and exhibited at Liverpool John Moores University. The Library travelled to Frankfurt, Antwerp, Berlin, Paris, and Edinburgh, as well as Liverpool. Martha Rosler was an exhibiting artist in the 2006 International exhibition.

***MADE UP Weekend***

This 'unconference' was a subversive mix of truth seeking amidst make believe with special guests, special events and an extended club-night. This extended the themes of the International with an eclectic series of performances, happenings, talks, debates and fun.

***Future, Fiction and Fantasy – Liverpool Biennials Schools Exhibition***

30<sup>th</sup> October – 20<sup>th</sup> November

Black – E / Great Georges Community Cultural Project

Nineteen schools from the region took part in the Liverpool Biennial Schools Project. Teachers from these schools attended talks and workshops given by the artists participating in the International 08 exhibition *MADE UP*. The teachers, supported by a curator, then worked with their pupils to develop new artworks influenced by this context. Future, Fiction and Fantasy was the outcome and teachers, and students were encouraged to check out and download the Liverpool Biennial resources [www.biennial.com](http://www.biennial.com)

**The 2008 programme: *Pavilions, Winter Lights, Visible Virals, the 'Big Thing'***

The Biennials Big Table programme, with partners in Garston, Kensington and Kirkdale, exemplified how they worked at the interstition of the local and the international. In spring 2008 the Biennial Big Table realised three *Pavilions* – large scale projects by top artists intended as a source of inspiration and aspiration for those areas, allowing these organisations to offer destinations for visitors and an exciting new resources for their communities.

- Kensington: Nexus. Luis and Juan Pelaez with METAL. Metal Kensington invited the celebrated Columbian teams to transform the disused approach to Edge Hill Station. The sea of flowing columns along the length of the space, refers to the design of the original 1830 flooring in the station
- Kirkdale: The Rotunda Folly. GROSS Max with Rotunda Community College. Derelict land in front of the College was turned into a community garden divided into two parts: a folly with a vertical garden inside contained spaces for activities and events; the second part was divided into 'Bar Code' garden strips of varying widths tended by local groups throughout the year creating a multi-textured environment for everyone to enjoy
- Garston: The Artistic Republic of Garston. Michael Trainor with Garston Cultural Village. Garston Cultural Village worked with the artist to stage a 'Cultural Revolution' on 31 May 2008. The disused Wellington Street School was declared to be a republic, complete with palm trees, fountain, sculpture garden and a balcony of waving dignitaries. The official staterooms inside were available to hire for community programming

Intended as temporary commissions, Rotunda worked to secure their Pavilion long-term due to the positive effect it had on the area, including reports from the police that nuisance calls from youngsters had dropped by 60% since the launch of the commissions.

At the end of the year Michael Pinsky realised the third in a series of annual Winter Lights for those neighbourhoods. As with all the Biennials commissions, engagement was an essential element of the Winter Lights series – which included Ron Haselden's Animal (2006), and Franck Scurti's Liverpool Jackpot (2007). All three sets of Winter Lights lit up Liverpool neighbourhoods throughout 2008.

In the summer, the Biennial began to bring their programme into the city centre, and for the *Visible Virals* project, they commissioned Nils Norman to work with Merseytravel and the City Parks Department to raise awareness of the city's green spaces, while A-APE collective from Stockholm worked with local communities and starting statistics to ornament the city centre. Visible Virals engaged hundreds of thousands of people as the project spread across the city during 2008. Designed to have a light touch and to be transient in nature, the artworks infiltrated public spaces and infrastructures in the city, appearing unannounced in surprising locations.

Artist Nils Norman worked closely with Liverpool's Parks and Environment Service and parks experts – walking and photographing Liverpool's major green spaces which included Sefton, Princes, Greenbank, Everton and Wavertree parks and Birkenhead park on the Wirral. The website [www.liverpoolparks.org](http://www.liverpoolparks.org) was an ongoing photographic depository and interactive database of Liverpool's amazing parks and green spaces, compiled by the artist in collaboration with the city's Park Rangers and public. Each park visited had been walked and photographed, in order to share and draw attention to the unique architecture, history, design and natural details of each.

This playful campaign repackaged each park's identity as if it were a product or holiday destination, sometimes alluding to phrases and buzzwords of classic popular adverts. The posters are appearing on buses, bus shelters, in stations and on billboards citywide during 2008. Nils Norman asked the public to submit their images, walks and special places by emailing the artist through [www.liverpoolparks.org](http://www.liverpoolparks.org) who would then upload them onto the park maps to create a diverse and unique database of visual and anecdotal material of Liverpool's historic public spaces.

Intended as a companion piece to *Turning the Place Over*, the '*Big Thing*' was Ai Weiwei's *Web of Light*, launched within the *MADE UP* strand of the Biennial Festival. This was a highly ambitious, highly successful, and visually stunning commission, which captured the imagination of the media and visitors alike. It was the most frequently visited of all the *MADE UP* artworks (TMP data – 181,000 visits), and the second most frequently mentioned in the press. In response to its popularity, and at the request of the city and the site owner, the work remained in place until February 09 in order to stay until the close of the 08 celebrations.

**2010 Biennial Festival Touched 18<sup>th</sup> September – 28<sup>th</sup> November**

The three-year funding for the *Art for Places* programme (Sefton, Wirral, Liverpool) ended in October 2010. In Liverpool, the Biennial continued to aim to create connectivity through the artistic excellence of their projects in Anfield and Everton Park. The hope was to communicate the adjacency of areas currently seen as distant, by connecting up neighbourhoods separated by green spaces, roads, canals, and entrenched attitudes.

In Anfield, *On the Street* Enabled venerable young people to explore their community and its regeneration through a commission by New York artist Ed Purver (April 2010) that transformed an Anfield street as part of the PCT's *Living Sketchbook* week. The success of this project demonstrated its potential for expansion, and it evolved into 2Up2Down with Dutch artist Jeanne van Heeswijk. The project involved up to forty NEET young people and other residents working with professionals to transform a derelict terrace into usable housing units, developing a range of skills in the process. The two-year scheme was part of the 2012 Festival, with funds raised on rolling basis.

At the invitation of Liverpool City Council, the Biennial organised a visioning workshop for Everton Park in May 2010. It was led by Bruce Mau Design, an urban design company based in Ontario and Chicago. Liverpool PCT invested in the first phase of the development (for 2010 Year of Health and Well-Being – they expected the re-visioning of the park to be a flagship legacy project for the new Decade of Well-Being). The PCT, City Council and Mersey Waterfront all contributed to the R&D phase of the project over the summer 2010. The workshop formed the basis for their stakeholder consultation, the success of which led to the City giving the Biennial a mandate to progress an art commission for Everton Park. The development of Everton Park including the Biennial commission was officially adopted by LCC as a cornerstone in the new North Liverpool Strategic Regeneration Framework jointly commissioned by Liverpool Vision, HCA, NWDA and LCC.

## 2012 Biennial Festival: *The Unexpected Guest* 15<sup>th</sup> September – 25<sup>th</sup> November

### 2Up2Down

#### Artistic Concept

In 2010 Liverpool Biennial Commissioned Dutch artist, Jeanne van Heeswijk, to create a way for local people to take matters into their own hands regarding the future of their North Liverpool neighbourhood; the resulting project was *2Up2Down*. Using creative processes, and by bringing together local experts together with recognised innovators, the project aimed to develop individual and collective capacity to rethink the future of their neighbourhood and develop social and environmental change.

Liverpool Biennial invited artist Jeanne Van Heeswijk to develop the project as she has strong experience and knowledge of combining public spaces and art projects, offering local residents a voice to be heard amongst the key decision makers. Jeanne had a proven track record of successfully engaging local communities to think about the impact their decisions can have collectively and have the important decision makers around them take notice.

The project commenced with a period of workshops and design activities, Jeanne Van Heeswijk's programme of activity incorporated a 'Build Camp,' a Dutch model within which participants developed a scale model of proposals for their intervention. Designs were created and developed by a group of thirty-four young people, who took the whole community as a client. They worked alongside architects URBED to produce a RIBA Stage C, and Stage D report.

Jeanne Van Heeswijk worked with residents in developing and renewing redundant terraced housing and vacant ground into spaces to create a real community asset that is sustainable, 'owned' by the community, and has the potential to be built into long-term regeneration plans for the area. This change has been manifested in the form of Homebaked, a small community-owned and led development now operating on the site of the former Mitchell's bakery. *Homebaked* has two distinct parts:

- Homebaked Community Land Trust which explores affordable housing for local residents, some of which has been designed by local young people to meet the needs of individuals rather than market forces
- Homebaked Co-operative Anfield, a community bakery and social enterprise that offers much-needed economic activity for local people as well as a neighbourhood social space

*'Homebaked* is built brick by brick and loaf by loaf by the Anfield community.'

- Derived from one of the community workshops.

### Interest and Influence

Liverpool Biennial's principle role was as instigator and engine for the project, passing the running of its legacy to Homebaked CLT. Homebaked Community Land Trust, a co-operative organisation inspired by the UK's Garden City movement, to enable the collective community ownership of the properties and co-operative business to reopen the bakery as a social enterprise. The group was presented with the Award for Excellence in Community Engagement at the National Community Land Trust Conference in May 2012.

The project received a capital grant of £54k from a highly competitive and high-profile grants programme: The Empty Property Community Grants, applied through the Department for Communities and Local Government. Metabolic Studio, through the Annenberg Foundation, an American philanthropic trust, invested significantly in the development of the bakery as an enterprise, offering financial yeast to the raw ingredients and allowing the transformation of the bakery as a community-owned co-operative from beautiful idea to functioning business, through a co-produced development process.

The project has had full support from Liverpool City Council members, LCC's Housing renewal and regeneration teams. The project has been developed through close dialogue with Mark Kitts, Assistant Director Regeneration and Tony Mousdale, Head of Housing Strategy. Cabinet Member for Housing Cllr Ann O'Byrne has also championed the project throughout.

The bakery has been used as a venue for a wide range of events from book readings to workshops. On 1 May 2013 Homebaked hosted a visit by Nelson McCausland, Minister for Social Development in the Northern Ireland Assembly who travelled to Liverpool to learn how the city was working with regeneration. The Minister was extremely interested in finding out more about Homebaked as an innovative artist led community project and social enterprise.

In September 2013 Liverpool Biennial organised the Future City Forum, which brought together thinkers and practitioners in the fields of art, architecture, and visual culture, as well as council directors and urban planners. The programme of interdisciplinary conversations investigated the connections and asymmetries between various cities and considered optimistic agendas for urban transformation. As part of the Forum *2Up2Down* artist Jeanne van Heeswijk lead a seminar at the bakery about the project.

*Homebaked* was an incredibly ambitious project and has therefore attracted national and international media attention. In an age when there is very little money and even less trust in the old models of regeneration, it is being visited by a growing number of agencies and community groups keen to learn from what is going on.

*Homebaked* began to influence the regeneration debate in many different areas and is increasingly being cited as a potential way forward. The author and housing commentator Lynsey Hanley described the project as a 'model for local rebuilding in the wake of failed regeneration projects.' The project is attracting much attention from housing associations,

Liverpool's Plus Dane Group have used it as a model project and have brought groups such as MerseyCare to the bakery to find out more about its method of community engagement.

Homebaked CLT has become emblematic for the growing community-led housing and Land Trust Movement, an exemplar project in terms of expanding the movement from its more affluent and rural base into urban contexts. Similarly, the bakery has been adopted wholeheartedly as an exemplar by the Co-operative movement.

The project has been presented at many housing, community and co-operative conferences, workshops and events locally, regionally, nationally and internationally, including the National CLT Conference and Chaire-Co-op International Conference on Community Housing. It is widely discussed and disseminated by both Jeanne van Heeswijk and Liverpool Biennial team in contemporary and cultural context, with significant impact on profile.

### **Media and PR**

During Liverpool Biennial 2012, *2Up2Down* generated more column inches than any other single commission in the exhibition, across a wider array of media productions than any other project.

The Anfield Home Tour was created by the artist, with local collaborators, to 'tell the story' of the project. It gained great press and public acclaim. Running throughout Liverpool Biennial and continuing into 2013 due to popular demand, the tour served a double purpose both to raise awareness for the project and to give the volunteers a sense of ownership over the project. The success of the tour was due to the excellence of the script commissioned by Jeanne from local novelist Deborah Morgan.

'I highly recommend joining one of the weekly 'Anfield Home Tours,' which are affiliated to a particularly inspiring community art project. Dutch artist Jeanne Van Heeswijk has worked with the residents of the area around the famous football ground, a neighbourhood that has been decimated by a regeneration programme gone wrong, with houses boarded up and shops closed. The tour – with humour and sadness – explains the situation, before finishing at a community-run bakery that is acting as a beacon for a better future.'

25 November 2012, RA Magazine

The Anfield Home Tour was covered locally, regionally, nationally and internationally in print and online. Coverage ranged from pieces in the Liverpool Post and Liverpool Echo to The Guardian, The Independent, The Observer, The New York Times, Frieze and Tate. It featured as part of the general coverage of the Biennial, as well as in specific features with regards the project in relation to architecture and arts and regeneration.

In November 2012 Jeanne van Heeswijk won the Curry Stone Prize for Social Design which referred to *2Up2Down* as a prime example of Van Heeswijk's artistic practice that 'presents a transformative contribution to the design world-in her vision, art actively works in shaping society, and the ultimate artistic production lies within the evolution of the people involved in the process.'

The project was also featured on the BBC One Show

### **Jeanne Van Heeswijk**

Van Heeswijk's work on the *2Up2Down / Homebaked* project led to two prestigious international awards: Leonore-Annenberg prize in 2011 and the Curry Stone Design Prize in 2012. The project was also shortlisted for the Zumtobel Group Award 2014, under Urban Development and Initiatives.

The project generated international exposure to Van Heeswijk's work, bringing her name and artistic practice to a wider audience. Van Heeswijk reported that her professional networks and contacts increased greatly over the course of the project, alongside the exposure of her work to other art forms and forms of artistic practice.

Liverpool Biennial's audience in 2012 was 700,000 of which 12% were international visitors and 35% of visitors from outside Liverpool had specialist knowledge of the visual arts, so as well as extensive coverage through media, talks, conferences and publications, Jeanne's work was seen and discussed by a great many visual arts professionals.

The project became a highlight of Liverpool Biennial 2012 because critics, curators, artists, and visitors recognised the exemplary artistic practice and commitment to the project.

### **Evaluation**

Liverpool Biennial has commissioned two evaluation studies of the project. One carried out by Shared Intelligence in March 2013 which told the story of the project and looked at the impact it had, the challenges it faced and the lessons it could teach others.

Shared Intelligence set out key lessons learned from the development of the project. One of the key features of *Homebaked* is that it constantly evolved. Creative improvisation and opportunistic approach to spotting and grabbing opportunities – most notable the potential for reopening the bakery – have been more important than rigid systems or processes.

The cited the flexibility and open-mindedness of Liverpool Biennial in continuing to support an open-ended venture as being crucial to its success. Likewise, many of those involved in

the project have also been inspired by Jeanne van Heeswijk's belief that communities can't be programmed and must be given the space to debate and develop their own ideas.

The second study, produced by Sue Potts of John Moores University's Institute of Cultural Capital identified the instigating forces, functional dynamics and the evolutionary and transformational effects of the network of support and skills which grew around the Homebaked project in Anfield. Sue Potts evaluation can be found in its third issue of the publication *Stages*, which drew together and presented a comprehensive body of thought around Homebaked and Jeanne's work.

#### Summary of Findings:

- The study found that the presence of integrity in both practice and intent was a factor which developed a trusting relationship between Liverpool Biennial, the resident artist, the staff team and volunteers and community participants. A social network of like-minded people grew around the project which assured its longevity
- Principles of co-production were clearly defined and applied throughout the project from inception, through idea formulation, planning stages and letting go
- *Homebaked* has enabled a sense of place and belonging within a locality which has seen continual change through demolition and 'tinning up' of properties. The former Mitchell's bakery is a key tangible heritage asset through its longstanding presence in the Anfield community. The survival to date of the building and its re-opening has assisted in re-establishing community asset
- The Homebaked Network grew stronger by creating a space and place for like-minded people to meet and work together to create change for the community. It is a resource for the mobilisation of existing social capital in the area and a mechanism to be powerful in a seemingly powerless situation

Because the project has been complex and it evolved throughout, it was felt that a more detailed publication was needed to document the impact it has had on the area and the valuable contributions from those involved. In August 2014 Liverpool Biennial published a third issue of its publication *Stages: Homebaked a Perfect Recipe*.

In the introduction it states, 'this is not a project it is a communal ongoing process.' The incredible journey that Liverpool Biennial, local artists, writers and Anfield residents have been taken on, by Jeanne van Heeswijk's work for Liverpool Biennial 2012, is chronicled in this publication. [Liverpool Biennial – Journal Issue-2](#)

'Van Heeswijk believes communities should co-produce their own futures. That's why she embeds herself, for years at a time, in communities from Rotterdam to Liverpool, working with them to improve their neighbourhoods and empowering them to take matters into their own hands, creating an alternative to the urban planning schemes which rarely take embedded culture into account, that are often foisted upon by local authorities' (Journal, issue 2, August 2014).

### **Everton Park H.Q. and Foraging Spiral**

Fritz Haeg occupied a sheltered bowl-shaped site at the top of Everton Park for the summer leading up to Liverpool Biennial 2012. Everton People's Park: Foraging Spiral and Basecamp commissioned by the Liverpool Biennial was a long-term project to reconcile a distant deep natural history and a more recent fraught social past with a collectively re-imagined future for Liverpool's Everton Park in partnership with local residents and collaborators.

Working with the community, the first phase of the project, commencing in late May, was conceived as an expedition into the park, featuring a 'base camp' headquarters for a series of experiments to publicly present the range of activities and features that local people would like to see in their park. Treating the hollow space as a microcosm of the entire park, the series of modestly scaled elements included anything from semi-permanent plantings and paths, working up to a week of programmed events and workshops housed in a temporary domed structure during the opening week of the Biennial.

### **Basecamp Dome**

At the centre of the Foraging Spiral was a circle of logs inviting people into conversation. From September 14th to 16th, 2012 a large geodesic dome tent was installed on this site during the opening of the Liverpool Biennial serving as a temporary drop-in interpretive centre to present stories about the natural and social past of the park, and for the community to convene and discuss their future visions for the place.

### **Journal Scroll**

During the course of the four days of events in the Basecamp, a journalist in residence contributed reports on the park conversations and presentations for a journal, printed in scroll form, as an archival record of historical overviews, new ideas, interviews, transcripts, reports, quotes, opinions, photos, maps, diagrams, etc. which will be edited, designed and produced in the space each day.

### **Video Stories**

A video featuring interviews with local archaeologists, gardeners, historians, ecologists, and especially local residents, to tell the story of the natural and social history of Everton Park - it's condition - and imaginations for it's possible future - was presented in a local museum and in the Basecamp events.

### **Ongoing Public Art commissions:**

#### ***Turing the Place Over, Another Place, Dream***

In 2007 the Biennial completed two fantastically popular projects signalling their ambitions for 2008. Liverpool Biennial secured Antony Gormley's *Another Place* in its permanent home on Crosby Beach, providing the North West with a powerful icon and the Biennial launched Richard Wilson's *Turning the Place Over*, dubbed by Sir Nicholas Serota as 'one of

the best pieces of public art in Europe.’ The Biennial continued to work with Sefton Council on the development of Another Place Ltd and continued to manage and maintain *Turning the Place Over* for as long as the site remained operational. The Biennial worked on behalf of St Helen’s Council on the realisation of *Dream*, Jaume Plensa’s commission for Sutton Manor Colliery, part of Channel 4’s Big Art Project. The commission has since been launched (May 09) and the TV series screened.

### **Art for Places Programme**

Paul Kelly was appointed September 2007 as public art officer with New Heartlands (responsible for the direction of Housing Market Renewal Initiatives in the three Boroughs of Wirral, Liverpool, and Sefton). The three-year post was partly paid for by ACE and was line managed by Laurie Peake. The programme to be delivered by the post was called Art for Places and resulted in a commission in South Sefton (2009), Wirral (2010), and North Liverpool (2011).

### **Urbanism 09**

In October 2008, internal discussions resulted in the decision to spotlight the work of Paul Kelly’s post through developing a programme of art in the communities of North Liverpool / South Sefton, involving the Registered Social Landlords / Housing Associations of the area and staging a conference aimed at professional peers and local residents in September 2009.

This first year’s programme would act as a pilot (action research) and after evaluation might become the model for further Biennial programmes / conferences to be held in the alternative year to the city centre Biennial Festivals. Called Urbanism to recognise the broad and complex content for art in a community regeneration setting, the programme created a balancing activity to the city centre Festival and International exhibition. Lessons learned in each setting can be applied in the alternative situation, thereby providing the perfect ‘intersection of the local and the international’ which remains the Biennial’s guiding principle.

### **Everton Park**

Discussions concerning a major project for Everton Park (in collaboration with the Echo and Liverpool City Council) continued, and Hope University was drawn in to become a major partner. Assuming the success of the pilot Urbanism 09, there was the potential for Everton Park to become the location for Urbanism 2011, with the third Art for Places commission forming the centrepiece of that year’s programme.

## Conferences

### Seminar 2002

A seminar titled METAMORPHOSIS on the experience of the city as a cultural site and how social change and the built environment influences and impacts on artistic practice. Professor David Dunster, the Roscoe Chair of Architecture, chaired the seminar at the University of Liverpool. Speakers included International 2002 artists – Steven Powers, Chloe Piene, Doreen Massey, Professor of Geography at The Open University Simon Sadler, Paul Mellon, Fellow for Studies in British Art and an architecture historian with the University of California – sixty-eight people attended the seminar.

Colour Stereo: Tate Liverpool and Bluecoat Arts Centre. In partnership with Bluecoat Arts Centre and Tate Liverpool – a series of dance workshops were organised for people with learning disabilities.

The Wellcome Trust: The Trust approached the Biennial wishing to do their Sciart and Science on Stage and Screen Symposium in Liverpool and as part of the Biennial. The Wellcome Trust was already in contact with the Liverpool School of Art and Design who agreed to host the event.

Changing State 8: Art Circuits, Art, and Circuses. InIVA (Institute of International Visual Arts) approached the Biennial wishing to do a seminar during the Festival as a part of their Changing States programme of seminars. It was held at the Bluecoat Arts Centre.

Critical Forum: Art: Money: Parties. Tate Liverpool in collaboration with the University of Liverpool produced a conference for the Biennial, which explored the changing relationship between State, commerce and contemporary art. Speakers at the one-day conference included Sadie Coles, Andrew Brighton and Stewart Home.

Manifesta: Coffee Breaks was the title of a two-day professional conference organised with thirty international curators in collaboration with International Foundation Manifesta. It was part of a three-year research programme on the position of Biennials in contemporary art.

Urban Ecologies: The Culture Company invited Liverpool Biennial to organise a professional seminar as part of the GLittter Festival. The seminar explored the role contemporary art and artists may play in the remediation of an 'urban ecology' and the resultant contribution to a sense of community and citizenship.

**2004****Hospitality**

Hospitality was the theme for a two-day conference organised in collaboration with International Foundation Manifesta as a part of the New Manifesta Network. This was the second in a series of events collectively called Coffee Break, and was part of a three-year research programme on the position of Biennials in contemporary art. The first day, 20<sup>th</sup> February, was held at the Tate and was an open session attended by seventy people, with the second day a 'closed session' at the Martins Bank building attended by thirty curators invited from thirteen countries in Europe.

Local artists and arts organisations were invited to contribute at a series of evening events called UPDATE (the first was on 24<sup>th</sup> June, followed by others in November and June 2004). The purpose of the event had been to facilitate communication about planning the Biennial between the organisation itself and the many local artists and arts organisations who might wish to be involved. The event in June 2004 was attended by Robyn Archer, the recently appointed Artistic Director for European Capital of Culture 2008.

The Biennial, through Paul Domela, took an advisory role in relation to a project called Shrinking Cities funded by the German federal bureau of culture. Manchester/Liverpool had been selected to be one of four city regions explored by the exhibition (with Detroit, Halle-Leipzig and Ivanova).

Discussions took place during the last six months of the review period between the City Council and the Chief Executive over the 'outsourcing' of the Council's interest in public art. This evolved by the end of March 2004 into the signing of an agreement between the Council and the Biennial whereby the Biennial delivered certain actions in return for a fee.

**2007****International Exchange and Higher Education****New Network Talks**

New Networks: Contemporary Art in West Africa.... In the Arab World and.... In the Caribbean.

Three seminars looked at the emergence of (or our awakening to) regional collaboration between artists, curators, critics and institutions in the Middle East and North Africa, in the Caribbean and in West Africa. While London, Paris and New York may retain their functions as brokerage and refuge, the Biennial was interested in exploring how emergent networks between neighbours brought about new possibilities for artistic production. The seminars sketched the impact of these collaborations on the practice of a new generation of artists and discussed how more localised networks changed the dynamic of the globalised art world. Three times four eminent curators, artists and academics in discussion.

**International Curators Forum**

Participation in the inaugural symposium Venice Biennial, June 2007 on the African Pavilion.

**European Biennial Network**

The European Biennial Network is a collaborative structure that aims to promote dialogue, interaction and collaboration between contemporary art biennials in Europe. It intends to use the knowledge, experience and wealth of information accumulated by organisers of large-scale periodic events, in order to support the communication and mobility of artists and art professionals. Meetings were held in Berlin and Bolzano and workshops in Athens.

**2008****European Biennial Network: Between Biennials****Short term effect or long-term results?****20<sup>th</sup> September****A Foundation**

What are the long-term results of Biennials in their host cities? Or is the primary role of Biennials to provide a short-term injection into the bloodstream of art and place. Can they do both? Since the expansion and proliferation of biennials in the 90's, we can now begin to detect accumulative benefits within their local arts ecologies. If so, why does criticism focus mainly upon the reception of authored curatorial strategies in an ever-expanding global art world?

This debate brought a number of European Biennials together to focus the spotlight behind the scenes and looked at different approaches of biennials to connect curatorial models with the cultural infrastructure in their cities. An expert panel of invited international curators, artists, commissioners and writers respond those responsible for the organisation of the biennials.

Chaired by Paul O'Neil, GWR Research Fellow, Situations University of the West of England. With Kerstin Bergendal, artist, author Kunstplan Trekoner; Paul Domela, Programme Director Liverpool Biennial, Annie Fletcher, curator van Abbe museum, Eindhoven; Bige Orer, Director Istanbul Biennial, Jack Persekian, Artistic Director Sharjah Biennial; Renate Wagner, Co-ordinator Berlin Biennale, Jan Verwoert, art critic and co-curator of ArtSheffield08, Augustine Zenakos, founder and co-director Athens Biennial.

**International Curators Forum: Raising the Curtain: a conversation in two parts****20<sup>th</sup> September****A Foundation**

We all experience artworks at different velocities, and much has been said of the need for artworks to engage us both within the spectacular flash of first impact and the slow retinal aftershocks of perception. This vertiginous moment is perhaps most precarious within the context of the international Biennial when as the curtain rises the accumulation of ideas is exposed and the work becomes a spectacle in an international melee of artworks.

Hosted by David A Bailey, Director of ICF and senior curator at Autograph, with contributions from Lina Dzuverovic Curator of Nordic Biennial 2009; co-founder and Director of Electra; Cedar Lewisohn curator of Tate Modern Street Art and Tate Triennial; Michael M. Thoss, Director of the Allianz Cultural Foundation; Axel Lapp, writer and curator; Jiyoung Lee Director of SUUM and curator of Fantasy Studio Project; Patricia Bickers, Editor Art Monthly, Polly Staples, Director Chisenhale Gallery and Editor at Large Frieze and Artists Anonymous.

**2010****European Biennial Network conference****20<sup>th</sup> September****A Foundation**

Between Biennials: 'Biennials: Short term effect or long term results?' and 'Raising the Curtain: a conversation in two parts.'

European Biennial Network and International Curators Forum European Biennial Network Forum chaired by Paul O'Neill, GWR Research Fellow, Situations, University of the West of England. With Kerstin Bergendal, artist, author Kunstplan Trekoner; Paul Domela, Programme Director Liverpool Biennial, Annie Fletcher, curator van Abbe museum, Eindhoven; Frédérique Gautier, Artistic Coordination Lyon Biennial; Bige À-rer, Director Istanbul Biennial; Sally Tallant, Head of Programme Serpentine Gallery, Jan Verwoert, art critic and co-curator of ArtSheffield08, Renate Wagner, Coordinator berlin biennial, Augustine Zenakos, founder and Co-director Athens Biennial.

International Curators Forum hosted by David A Bailey, Director of ICF and senior curator at Autograph, with contributions from Lina Dzuverovic, Curator of Nordic Biennial 2009, co-founder and Director of Electra; Cedar Lewisohn, curator of Tate Modern Street Art and Tate Triennial; Michael M. Thoss, Director of the Allianz Cultural Foundation; Axel Lapp, writer and curator; Jiyoon Lee, Director of SUUM and curator of Fantasy Studio Project; Patricia Bickers, Editor Art Monthly; Polly Staple, Director Chisenhale Gallery and Editor at Large Frieze and Artists Anonymous.

**2012****Symposium: Reconstruction Work****Bluecoat**

This symposium will explore a differentiated notion of solidarity informed by the educator, thinker and writer Stuart Hall. It takes John Akomfrah's newly commissioned film *The Unfinished Conversation*, as the starting point for debate. The participants will investigate the impact Stuart Hall has had on cultural studies and media theory, but also raise wider questions of politics, memory and archive, identity and race and their relationship to the image.

With John Akomfrah, David Scott, Angela McRobbie and Ros Gray. Chaired by Mark Sealy.

John Akomfrah will discuss *The Unfinished Conversation*, which draws upon Hall's memories and personal archives extracted and relocated in an imagined and different time, reflecting the questionable nature of memory itself.

David Scott's presentation will frame the question of Hall's cultural-political preoccupations against the background of the Jamaica of the 1930s and 1940s, the Jamaica from which he departs as a young man for Oxford.

Angela McRobbie's paper offers a series of backwards and forward reflections on Stuart Hall's work on race in the urban environment, media, moral panic, and the rise of neoliberal times.

Ros Gray will focus on the unique culture of cinema generated by the Mozambican Revolution at the centre of a trans-national movement that sought to decolonise the moving image and harness cinema to the cause of the African emancipation in the mid to late twentieth century. It maps how Mozambican cinema was not only at the vanguard of the 'cultural front' against capitalist imperialism, but produced new aesthetics and alliances of cinematic militancy, becoming a focal point for a new kind of transnational public sphere.

**Public Art****2007**

During the review period, considerable progress was made in advocating best practice in commissioning public art. Following on from work with the Steering Group (political level) and Working Group (officer level) set up by Laurie Peake to involve the City Council and various development agencies, the City Council agreed to appoint its own Public Art Officer in Regeneration to take over these roles, a major success in getting the Council to 'internalise' the knowledge that it has gained. By the end of the review period, it was felt that in the future the Steering Group should be administered by the new internal post in the City Council.

Secondly, conversations with the Arts Council resulted in the recruitment of a public art officer (September 2007) to work in the New Heartlands office (responsible for the direction of Housing Market Renewal initiatives in the three Boroughs of Wirral, Liverpool and Sefton). The appointee, Paul Kelly, had previously worked with Liverpool Housing Action Trust.

Aside from these advances in advocacy and developing 'political' understanding of the potential of public art, the Biennial continued, like other public art agencies around the country, to commission and project-manage artworks on behalf of clients. A major opportunity arose in this year to deliver the European Capital of Culture programme of visual art on behalf of the Liverpool Culture Company. The programme consisted of Turning the Place Over, by Richard Wilson, Visible Virals, and (described under Big Table) the Pavilions project and the second and third commissions of Winter Lights.

**Turing the Place Over (TTPO) – Richard Wilson**

This commission had been called the most daring piece of public art ever commissioned in the UK, and at the time, was the artists most radical intervention into architecture, turning a building in Liverpool's city centre literally inside out. It was launched in June 2007 to international acclaim, including coverage on BBC News 24 and CNN. Titan date from the advertising billboard on the site suggested that the work was seen by 47,000 times every two weeks. This translated to over 950,000 views during each year. There was extensive public interaction with the work, with just one of the ninety videos of the work on YouTube attracting over 480,000 views. Tours of the building started after the end of the review period. It was a significant driver of traffic to the Biennial website – during the June launch, 7 out of 10 terms finding the Biennial site related to the work.

TTPO received praise for its innovation, impact, public appeal and quality of delivery within a wide number of different sectors, including arts, regeneration, heritage, construction and engineering. There was a huge amount of stakeholder buy-in, from funding partners to Biennial contractors, who were proud to be associated with the work and had been carrying out their own PR activity to promote their involvement. Liverpool City Council recognised the potential of the work, and established it as a must-see experience for

tourists, and promoted it within the tourist information centres and supporting the tours programme operated by Liverpool Biennial.

Public comments praised the quality of construction, including the smoothness and quietness of operation, and the attention to detail. The contractor, Askams, received an increase in enquires on the basis of TTPO. The work received acclaim, with its benefits widely recognised, that conversations began about how the work could be preserved beyond 2008, with Wayne Colquhoun of Liverpool Preservation Trust even asking English Heritage to list the work! TTPO was also shortlisted in The Mersey Partnerships annual tourism awards for 'best tourism experience.'

- A flagship project demonstrating Liverpool's position as the richest visual arts environment in the UK outside of London, particularly in delivering world-class new commissions
- News of the launch of the work travelled around the world, with coverage on BBC News 24 and CNN
- Titan advertising data suggested 950,000 views to date
- Generated extensive public interaction, with visitors posting and sharing their own footage of the work online. YouTube hosted over 90 videos; one alone received over 480,000 views (2007)
- Online content facilitated international engagement, with media coverage directing people to online videos. TTPO received coverage in Spain, Canada, Germany and the Netherlands, and featured on British Embassy websites around the world, including Kabul and Russia
- To be included in Ripley's 'Believe it or not' annual, and within a new David Morrissey film
- Won the Small Projects Award for Engineering Excellence from the Association of Consultancy and Engineering

### **Visible Virals**

These commissions were designed to 'animate the streets' and were originally structured in response to the city's priorities of unifying the perception of the transport infrastructure, promoting the city's parks and green spaces, and addressing the sites of urban dereliction (especially bombsites) in the city centre. The first two priorities were ultimately addressed in the single project, Nils Norman's Parks project, launched after the end of the review period. The urban dereliction priority was addressed by the artists collective A-APE, from Stockholm, who installed their first wave of text installations in January 2008 and continued with their 'One Year in Liverpool' activities throughout the year.

A-APE investigated the concept of 'the average Liverpoolian' through their life, behaviour and consumer habits. The project took its basis from statistics, gradually feeding unusual facts into the public realm over the year and inviting people in the city to provide information about themselves. The project manifested itself in a series of installations that would spread through unexpected locations in the city centre to reveal the bigger picture. Transient in nature and light in touch, the artworks infiltrate public spaces and infrastructure in the city, building in magnitude and inviting participation. The project had its own interactive website – [http:// a-ape.org/](http://a-ape.org/). It also secured interest and coverage by European media channels and had an underground art following.

Projects undertaken independently, both of which were publicly funded and of strategic importance in a tourism and regeneration context were:

### **Sutton Manor**

A major commission for St Helen's Council / Channel Four's Big Art project (at Sutton Manor) was curated by Laurie Peake. A sculpture by the Barcelona-based artist Jaume Plensa, called 'Dream,' had an estimated completion date of November 2008.

### **Another Place**

Although the Biennial was successful in gaining permanent planning permission for Antony Gormley's Another Place, and then arranging for the purchase of the work for Sefton Council, in March 07 (before the review period) the conditions of the planning permission required the relocation of nineteen figures. This was delayed by objections from Natural England (finally resolved June 2008). Liverpool Biennial continued to maintain a curatorial relation to the artwork through the separate company Another Place Ltd.

### **Everton Park**

Discussions concerning a major project for Everton Park (in collaboration with the Echo and Liverpool City Council) continued to grow in significance, while the discussion concerning a possible artwork for Bidston Moss (with the Forestry Commission and Peel Holdings) have for the moment been set aside.

The Biennial commissioned thirty-two national and international artists for International 08 – which took the title MADE UP. Artists working in the public realm were Richard Woods (UK), Gabriel Lester (Netherlands), Sarah Sze (USA), Manfredi Beninati (Italy), Jesper Just (Denmark), Leandro Erlich (Argentina), Atelier Bow Wow (Japan), Tomas Sareceno (Argentina), Otto Karvonen (Finland), Ai Wei Wei (China) – The ‘Big Thing’ for 2008, Yayoi Kusama (Japan), Alison Jackson (UK), Yoko Ono (Japan), Annette Messager (France), Diller Scofidio + Renfro (USA) – The ‘City Centre Pavilion.’

**Appendix Eleven:  
2004 Learning and Inclusion Evaluations**

**Seminal**

★★★

**Data / Statistics**

9 local artists

40 students

As part of **Wild!** a group of Liverpool-based artists, worked with STATIC to organize a seminar exploring issues related to audience engagement and dialogue. The seminar took place on 24 January 2004 with the question '**Who is our Audience**' and studied audience development from an artist's perspective. The group then developed the idea for **Seminal**, a discussion exploring the impact of the Biennial on local and regional artists and art students. Regionally based students were invited to submit written reviews and a shortlist of those submitting work were then invited to write a review of Liverpool Biennial 2004.

Their thoughts on the Biennial formed the starting point for the **Seminal** discussion. The reviews of the Biennial will also be brought together in a publication.

**Strengths**

As a long term project, it enabled the Biennial to build good relationships with some of the participants.

Involvement in the Biennial built experience of local artists.

Commitment of participants.

Events had good attendance.

Marketing of events through peers was very successful.

**Weaknesses**

Due to the long term nature of the project some participants dropped out.

Participants and STATIC were busy with other projects during the Biennial and therefore didn't have sufficient time to commit to the project.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

*\*An integration with the International programme was not part of the original aims and objectives of Wild!*

**Recommendations**

To continue to develop the relationships we have forged with **Wild!** groups. To develop a creative publication that each group can contribute to for publication between Biennials, and in leading up to Liverpool Biennial 06 with a Bumper Issue published for distribution during the Biennial.

**Gossip**

★★★★

**Data / Statistics**

5 participants, 3 artists, 5000 booklets.

For this stage of **Wild!** we invited a group of young people to collaborate and create a means to engage and educate their peers about contemporary art. Their result was **Gossip**, a young person's guide to Liverpool Biennial *International 04*.

**Strengths**

Commitment of the young people to the project.

A successful launch event well attended by invited art professionals.

A quality end product.

A strong relationship was fostered with the young people with their collective desire to work with Liverpool Biennial in the future.

'It's so funny now though in college as the art teachers all seem to love me for taking part in the biennial! They got me helping in lessons and everything. They used to hate me to!' Dave O'Hara

'I've really enjoyed **Gossip**; it was a great experience and challenge and I'm really proud to have been part of it.' Lesley-Ann O'Connell

**Weaknesses**

Too short a timescale for stage two of the project.

Incorrect spelling in final publication of participant's name.

More co-ordination and time required for opportunities for the young people to meet visiting *International 04* artists.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

*\*An integration with the International programme was not part of the original aims and objectives of Wild!*

**Recommendations**

To continue to develop the relationships we have forged with **Wild!** groups. To develop a creative publication that each group can contribute to for publication between Biennials, and in leading up to Liverpool Biennial 06 with a Bumper Issue published for distribution during the Biennial.

**The Journey**

★★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 12 participants
---

Since the 2002 Biennial, artist Leo Fitzmaurice has worked with a group of adults with learning difficulties from L8 Resource Centre and Fazakerley Croxteth Day Services. They created a short film of people's journeys to an exhibition at Bluecoat Arts Centre.

**Strengths**

Commitment of day-centre staff.  
High quality end product.  
Project was included in *International 04* catalogue.  
Production of exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial's *International +*.  
Successful and well attended launch event.  
Well managed by Bluecoat arts centre staff.

**Weaknesses**

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

*\*An integration with the International programme was not part of the original aims and objectives of **Wild!***

**Recommendations**

To continue to develop the relationships we have forged with **Wild!** groups. To develop a creative publication that each group can contribute to for publication between Biennials, and in leading up to Liverpool Biennial 06 with a Bumper Issue published for distribution during the Biennial.

## The Liverpool Experience

★★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 12 participants.
--

Through this 18-month collaborative project artist Andy Weston and a group of adults with learning difficulties from Halewood Resource Centre in Knowsley have explored the experience of being a visitor in Liverpool. Their finished product is a large mural that has toured museums, libraries, galleries, and resource centres.

### Strengths

Commitment of day-centre staff.  
High quality end product.  
Project was included in *International 04* catalogue.  
Production of exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial's *International +*.  
Successful and well attended launch event.  
Well managed by Bluecoat arts centre staff.

### Weaknesses

Target groups	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

*\*An integration with the International programme was not part of the original aims and objectives of Wild!*

### Recommendations

To continue to develop the relationships we have forged with **Wild!** groups.  
To develop a creative publication that each group can contribute to for publication between Biennials, and in leading up to Liverpool Biennial 06 with a Bumper Issue published for distribution during the Biennial.

**Ways of Seeing Volume 2**

★★★

**Data / Statistics**

7 artists, 4 curators, 6 webcasts.

Ways of Seeing (Volume 2) is a six-part webcast series hosted by community-driven internet television channel tenantspin. A joint Liverpool Biennial-FACT venture, tenantspin is co-managed by city wide high-rise tenants from Liverpool Housing Action Trust and FACT, Foundation for Art and Creative Technology. **Ways of Seeing** placed at its centre of debate the working methods of both local and international artists and collaborators. Each webcast established the form of an open group discussion unravelling the methods of artists developing work in, for and about Liverpool.

**Ways of Seeing 2** included:

- 14 April, Amanda Coogan with John McGuirk, Mark Daniels, Hilary Thorn, Catherine Gibson, and Cathy Butterworth
- 12 May, Walter Riedweg and Mauricio Dias with Mark Daniels, Laura Britton, Hilary Thorn and Wiebke Holt
- 16 June, Wong Hoy Cheong talked with Marilyn Vaughn
- 14 July, Dorit Margreiter with Patrick Henry
- 18 August, SPLICE talked with Paul Kelly, Paul Domela and John McGuirk
- 15 September, Luis Camnitzer and Cuathemoc Medina took part

**Strengths**

Wong Hoy Cheong met Sean Hawkridge who provided invaluable assistance with the production of his project for *International 04*.

Involvement of tenant John McGuirk and his continual involvement with *International 04* projects thereafter.

No costs to the Learning and Inclusion programme.

Generated interesting discussion and debate.

**Weaknesses**

Valeska Soares committing but not being able to take part.

Although the tenants were involved in recording **Ways of Seeing** their presence/involvement was not felt in the audience or through the live web chat.

Not enough people engaging with the live web chat.

More time needed to develop the broadcasts with the artists and speakers.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Look at developing **Ways of Seeing Volume 3** as an artist's project.

**Ariel Trust**

★

**Data / Statistics**

2 artists, 1 trainee

This project worked with trainee Paul Moran who had recently completed a radio presenting and editing course with Ariel Trust. This project involved Paul researching and then undertaking two interviews with Werner Kaligofsky and Yeondoo Jung. The results of the interview were then edited and were due to be broadcast on the local radio station, through Merseyrail and put on the biennial website. The quality of the interviews was not high enough for us to do this.

**Strengths**

Paul gained some beneficial experience of interviewing and editing a broadcast. Ariel Trust were keen to allow more trainees who had completed the course to be involved, unfortunately this was not possible due to funding.

**Weaknesses**

The interviews did not develop into being broadcast by Ariel Trust.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Discuss different ways the Biennial can work with Ariel Trust in the future. Develop a project with Ariel Trust for the Learning and Inclusion programme and Biennial marketing programme as a joint initiative.

**Different Angles**

★★★★★

**Data / Statistics**

33 participants

Participants from five Merseyside community groups have written reviews of work in Liverpool Biennial's *International 04* exhibition. These reviews were gathered together in the publication **Different Angles**. The project enabled a cross-section of Merseyside residents from a range of community groups to actively engage with individual works in the *International 04* exhibition. The reviews in **Different Angles** were written by representatives from Halewood University of the Third Age, Mary Seacole House, The Pagoda Chinese Community Centre, Venus Resource Centre, and The Windows Project. The process was participatory, taking place over a number of weeks, with participants being offered a series of creative writing workshops and a visit to an *International* exhibition venue, to view and discuss the works shown. This culminated in the participants writing one review each of a piece of work and the collection of these reviews formed the content of the **Different Angles** publication. The launch of the booklet was held in the Biennial Centre on November 2 and the booklet was distributed as a free publication throughout exhibition partner venues.

**Strengths**

Substantial engagement of 33 Merseyside residents with the *International 04* exhibition. Grassroots PR and marketing amongst the family, friends, and colleagues of the participants, leading to greater awareness of the Biennial amongst a wider section of the Merseyside audience.

A strong and successful publication and launch.

Strengthening of Merseyside arts infrastructure by providing opportunities for artists, art specialists and by helping to retain arts graduates by offering local, viable professional opportunities at the start of their careers.

**Weaknesses**

A longer lead-in time was required with more workshop sessions with participants to enhance the overall experience for the community groups involved.

No opportunity provided to meet *International 04* artists.

The recent design graduates from LJMU were inexperienced and they misjudged how long elements of the design process would take.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

To continue to develop the relationships we have forged with these groups.

To develop a publication that each group can contribute to for publication between Biennials, and in leading up to Liverpool Biennial 06 with a Bumper Issue published for distribution during the Biennial. A larger print run is viable with a wider distribution.

A longer lead-in time with the publication realised closer to the Biennial opening.

**Buddies**

★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 8 participants
--

Liverpool Biennial buddies are local art students who were matched up with *International 04* artists on their production visits to our city. The scheme is a knowledge exchange: buddies share their familiarity with Liverpool, artists share their experience in art practice and how the art world works.

**Strengths**

Geoff Molyneux from Liverpool Community College and his commitment to the project and the co-ordination of the students from his Fine Arts Department.

'As Ursula explained her intentions about her work, I realised that her interests had an identity with my own background and experiences as an asylum seeker. It was exciting to be part of a work in progress, being able to assist with many of the technical problems that arose and finding the right locations. I feel really privileged to be part of this and it will definitely influence the way that I work in the future.' Aboubaker Abdullah, HNC Fine Arts, working with Ursula Biemann.

Commitment of both the students and the artists involved to the buddy scheme. Leon Jakeman and Francesco Jodice's working relationship with Leon going on to become Francesco's production manager for his work for *International 04*.

Low budget demand for Biennial.

**Weaknesses**

This project has never been done before and because of this was not realised to its full potential with subsequent elements of trial and error.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Offer both artists and researchers buddies from their initial visits right through to their final visits to the city.

Specify the requirements of the artists so that their buddies may be suitably matched.

Translation / Technical skills / Hospitality etc...

Specific budget required.

**Shoot the Artist**

★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 30 participants
---

Five short films documenting encounters between *International 04* artists and Liverpool residents. Azra Aksamija from Bosnia met residents from the L1 Partnership area plus Adrian Devers, Councillor Steve Mumby, the community liaison police officer for the area and a representative of the L1 Business Support Centre.

Yang Fudong from Shanghai met representatives from the Pagoda Centre, the Chinese Youth Orchestra, the Wah Sing Centre, and the Chinatown Business Association.

Esko Mannikko from Finland met Liverpool Housing Action Trust residents.

Amanda Coogan from Dublin met women from the Venus project in Bootle.

Aleks Danko from Australia met students from Liverpool Community College.

**Strengths**

Both Esko and Azra developed projects for the communities that they met through the project.

Helped the Biennial develop new links with community groups.

Developed a valuable resource of films documenting artist's visits and the processes involved in contemporary art projects.

**Weaknesses**

The initial plan for the project was to film three stages - the artists' research visit, the production visit and the community's reaction to the final artwork. Project was not completed fully because of budgets cuts.

Delay in getting videos on to website.

Translation from Chinese to English for the Yang Fudong film took a long time and went past deadline. The edit file for this was also lost and had to be done again causing further delays.

Resources only available on the web.

Sharon's frustration with the project and budgetary problems affected project's motivation.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Full budget needs to be agreed before a project starts.

Explore cheaper methods of delivering project.

Screen videos on monitors as part of fusebox.

**Sefton Sound Project**

★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 12 participants
---

Responding to Cildo Meireles' project for *International 04*, and encouraged by artist Steve Renshaw, young people from Sefton's Family Placement Scheme created an audio piece, combining painting, scratching, and manipulating of records. Originally the young people were to respond to the work of another *International 04* artist Oswaldo Macia. Unfortunately, the artist was unable to attend the planned workshops so local artist Steve Renshaw did the workshops in his place. The resulting audio piece then concentrated on a creative response to Cildo Meireles' project and was shown throughout the Biennial in the Biennial Centre space.

**Strengths**

Steve Renshaw was a good workshop facilitator and effectively engaged the young people in the project.

Enthusiasm, commitment, and support of Sefton Council staff.

Low budget demand for Biennial.

Low demands on Biennial time.

Use of *fusebox* to display work.

Celebratory event at Biennial Centre – the young people have very little opportunity to come into the city centre.

Interest from visitors in buying a copy of the CD.

Production of high quality artwork.

**Weaknesses**

*International* artist dropping out at last minute.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Talk to Philip Wroe and start planning a project for 2006.

Look at using a triangular model - *International* artist, local artist and local community group all working in collaboration.

**Little Miss Sparkle**

★★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 20 participants
---

*International 04* artist Yeondoo Jung and local artist Donna Berry helped children from Liverpool 1 to draw their dreams. One of these dreams was chosen to be copied, photographed, and displayed on a city centre billboard in Hanover Street. Local residents worked together to recreate the drawing into a three-dimensional set that was photographed by Yeondoo Jung.

**Strengths**

Local community working with one of the *International 04* artists  
 The project brought a Liverpool based artist and International artists together on a project.  
 Production of high quality artwork.  
 Support from council enabled a second billboard to be printed on vinyl and to be displayed indefinitely on Great Georges Street.  
 Commitment of Donna and Yeondoo to the project.

**Weaknesses**

Printing and display of poster on Hanover Street was problematic. Quality of the print was poor, and the poster was pasted incorrectly three times.  
 Project very demanding on time.  
 Role of project manager for local artist may not be accurate or complete description of role –Donna contributed as an artist and this needs to be fully recognised.  
 Insufficient budget.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Explore possibilities for further work with L1 community.  
 Develop further project work involving local artists and international artists working together with a community group. In future look at this being a more collaborative process between all parties.

**Cityscapes**

★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 10 participants.
--

The **Cityscapes** project brought together young people from Merseyside with no previous experience in film-making. Inspired by workshops with *International 04* artists, Yael Bartana and Francesca Jodice, the young people were then supported by artist Andrea Lansley and video technician Bronek Kram to make their own films. The groups created two very distinct and exciting films:

- **Portrait** - a thoughtful portrait of youthful identity and city centre life using familiar cultural icon, Quiggins, as their backdrop
- **Shopping** – a reflection of the energetic activities of a group of young girls coming into Liverpool city centre from Kirkby; how they look at the city and what they most love to do there

**Portrait** and **Shopping** was shown alongside the work of *International 04* artists at the Biennial Centre.

**Strengths**

Increase in participants confidence.

The speed with which project participants responded to handling of technical equipment. Participants were able to meet *International 04* artists and work with a member of the Biennial marketing team and a professional designer.

Pride was expressed by the participants at having their work included in a prestigious arts festival.

**Weaknesses**

Main weakness was establishing a commitment of young people during the summer months with many young people having increasing job commitments or having holidays booked away.

Difficulty in getting the group together regularly and the young people not committing to the project.

Many of the young people travelled from outside of the city centre on public transport and this caused problems with timekeeping.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Reconsider the length of the project and the time of year, designing instead a shorter full-time project with shorter sessions for younger age groups.

More time to be spent on the recruitment process with certainty gained on the commitment of the young people.

**Happy Happy**

★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 54 participants.
--

*International 04* artist Choi Jeong Hwa and local artist Nicki McCubbing worked with Knowsley Arts Service and community groups from Knowsley to create a gallery installation of everyday objects which was displayed in Kirby Gallery between the 18 September and 17 November. Members of the local community were invited to attend free workshops, bring along some objects and become a contributing part of the exhibition.

**Strengths**

Local communities working with one of the *International 04* artists  
The project brought a Liverpool based artist and International artist together on a project.

**Weaknesses**

Knowsley Arts service unfamiliarity with Choi Jeong Hwa's work and working with an international artist.  
Health and safety concerns affected the final display of the work, with the artist not very happy with results.  
Workload too heavy for Sharon to spend time on the project when it most needed it.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Look at developing similar project for 2006 but ensure Knowsley Arts Service are involved at an earlier stage and meet with the artist earlier.  
Develop further project work involving local artists / curators and international artists working together with a community group. The triangle models. In future look at this being a more collaborative process between all parties.

**Resonance**

★★★★★

**Data / Statistics**

9 participants.

Nine students from Sutton High Sports College, St Helens worked in collaboration with artists Amanda Coogan and Patricia MacKinnon-Day, the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic, pyrotechnicians, and filmmakers to research and produce artwork for Liverpool Biennial 2004. Their subsequent artwork was exhibited between 1 - 8 November in Liverpool Philharmonic Hall.

**Strengths**

Students working in collaboration with *International 04* artist Amanda Coogan, Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra, pyrotechnics experts and filmmakers.

Strong relationship developed between the Biennial and the Philharmonic's Education department.

The commitment to the project by artist Patricia MacKinnon-Day and Head of Art, Derek Boak.

Students increased knowledge and understanding of contemporary art.

Production of high quality artwork.

Production of exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial's *International +*.

Additional funding was raised to produce extra work for the exhibition.

Project was included in *International 04* catalogue.

**Weaknesses**

Timescale and people resource short for installation of work, installation not completed in time for opening as advertised in the guide.

Extra funding was required however the school also conducted successful fundraising of their own.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Continue to maintain contact with schools involved in the run up to the opening of *International 06*.

Repeat this working model within other Merseyside schools but only within a committed art department.

**Future Dreams**

★★★

**Target Groups**

This project worked with sixth form students.

Over the course of ten weeks photographer John MacDonald and Head of Art, Andrea St John, worked with a group of eighteen sixth form students from St Benedict's School, Liverpool. The students looked at the work of *International 04* artist Yeondoo Jung and used this as a starting point to explore their aspirations for the future. The work produced by the pupils was displayed during the Biennial at The Door, Hanover Street L1.

**Strengths**

Students increased knowledge and understanding of contemporary art.  
 Production of high quality artwork.  
 Production of exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial's *International +*.  
 Launch at The Door with the students then attending the *International 04* preview.  
 Yeondoo Jung visited the exhibition.  
 Additional funding was raised to produce extra work for the exhibition.  
 Head of Art, Andrea St John developed ICT skills and introduced the use of ICT into art lessons.

**Weaknesses**

This group did not meet the artist although with more time Sharon could have organised this.

Target groups	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Continue to maintain contact with schools involved in the run up to the opening of *International 06*.  
 Repeat this working model within other Merseyside schools but only within a committed art department.

## Touching the City



<b>Data / Statistics</b> 20 participants.
--

A project with year nine students at Halewood Comprehensive to explore ideas about public art and in particular the work of *International 04* artist Choi Jeong Hwa. The students expressed their concern that his work may be vandalised whilst housed in Lime Street Station. A debate on the display of art in public places commenced which included the students taking their own tour of public sculpture in Liverpool's city centre. Artwork produced in response to this was displayed at The Door, Hanover Street, L1 during the Biennial.

### Strengths

Students increased knowledge and understanding of contemporary art.  
 Students met *International 04* artist Choi Jeong Hwa, researched issues around the display of his work and were exposed to some of the processes behind the realisation of a contemporary art exhibition.  
 Students incorporated a greater degree of creativity into their current IT curriculum. ICT achievements for the class were higher than usual.  
 The school have used this same model with other students in other classes to teach.

### Weaknesses

Problems with email and computer software meant planned elements of the project were not achieved and that alternative exercises had to be created.  
 A class with pre-existing discipline problems was selected to take part in this project, in the hope that this would engage difficult students and encourage more active class participation. Initially this was achieved, however towards the end of term discipline deteriorated and the attendance of pupils fluctuated considerably.  
 This school did not visit the Biennial.  
 The plan to link the project with a school in Broken Hill, Australia did not go ahead.

### Target groups

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

### Recommendations

Continue to maintain contact with schools involved in the run up to the opening of *International 06*.  
 Repeat this working model within other Merseyside schools but only within a committed art department.

**Identity**

★★★★

<b>Data/Statistics</b> 12 participants.
--

Aleks Danko did a two-day workshop at Prenton High School. The work produced during these two days and follow-up work conducted at school was displayed at The Door, Hanover Street, L1 November 9 - 26.

**Strengths**

Commitment and enthusiasm of art teacher and artist.  
School students working with one of the *International 04* artists.  
No budget demands on Biennial.  
Low time demand on Biennial.

**Weaknesses**

Display of work at the needed Door needed more support from Biennial and more financial investment.  
Planned display of work at Bluecoat didn't happen due to confusion over dates.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Continue to maintain contact with schools involved in the run up to the opening of *International 06*.  
Repeat this working model within other Merseyside schools.

**Wish You Were Here**

★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 150 participants.
---

Merseyside teachers were invited to involve their Year 8 pupils in an exhibition which was displayed at The Gillian Dunne Gallery, Sandheys, Holly Lodge Girls' College: 22 November – 17 December.

Inspired by the ideas behind Yeondoo Jung's Bewitched project, Year 8 pupils were asked to create an imaginative postcard for the Wish You Were Here exhibition. The postcards were visual and written messages from themselves in the year 2054 to their present self.

**Strengths**

Students increased knowledge and understanding of contemporary art.

Production of high quality artwork.

Production of exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial's *International +*.

Little Biennial money or time required.

**Weaknesses**

No involvement with *International 04* artist Yeondoo Jung, the inspiration for their project.

No plan for a future use of the postcards as a resource or further displays.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Explore possibilities of displaying postcards again.

Involvement of one of the *International 06* researchers / artists and a local arts specialist (curator) in the production of the school's exhibition programme. The triangle models.

**Vote with Your Seat**

★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 25 participants.
--

In response to 'LiverPOLL,' *International 04* artist Sanja Ivekovic's project for Liverpool Biennial, pupils from Holly Lodge Girl's College explored ideas of democracy and identity. 25 pupils from year 10 carried out surveys around issues that concern them and used the statistics to create an exhibition based on graphic representations of their findings. Their work was displayed at Liverpool Community College Arts Centre November 6 - 13.

**Strengths**

Students increased knowledge and understanding of contemporary art.  
Production of high quality artwork.  
Production of exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial's *International +*.  
Little Biennial money or time required.

**Weaknesses**

No involvement with *International 04* artist Sanja Ivekovic, the inspiration for their project.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Secret Places**

★★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 24 participants.
--

Working alongside *International 04* artist Lara Almarcequi, 24 Gifted and Talented students from five Wirral Schools took part in an exploration of secret and hidden places. The results of this workshop form the creative content of an exhibition which was displayed at Liverpool Community College Arts Centre November 16 - 28.

**Strengths**

Students increased knowledge and understanding of contemporary art.  
 Production of high quality artwork.  
 Production of exhibition as part of Liverpool Biennial's *International +*.  
 A successful launch that was well attended.  
 The commitment of Gill Curry from Wirral Council LEA and Wirral Council's investment in the Biennial's Learning & Inclusion Programme by granting Gill extra work hours to work on the project.

**Weaknesses**

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

Continue the strong relationship developed with Liverpool Community College Arts Centre as a location for the presentation of future school exhibitions.  
 Introductions / workshops for Wirral schools with the artists visiting for *International 06*.  
 As a follow up to the Wirral model continue working with students across 5 schools but in each of the Merseyside boroughs.  
 The triangle model, developing further project work involving local artists and international artists working together with a school group.

**Viral Treats**

★★★★★

**Data / Statistics**

33 students

Multimedia students at JMU were given a brief to design an online viral ‘treat’ that would start conversations about the Biennial and encourage the public to find out more about the event itself. Three of the students were then asked to develop their ideas further to create animations and interactive games for the Biennial website based on the projects of *International 04* artists. These interactive tools were published within the school’s resource section of the website. One of the animations was also used as part of Aleks Danko’s project and a series of the animations was displayed on the BBC big screen in Clayton Square during the course of the Biennial.

**Strengths**

Little Biennial money and time required.  
Quality end product.  
Animations displayed on BBC big screen.  
Three students’ projects formed part of the school’s resource.

**Weaknesses**

Difficulty in the ‘treats’ being placed on the website promptly.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

To repeat this project with a specific brief in line with school resources and the *International* artists projects.

**Biennial Wednesdays**

★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 20 participants
---

Second year graphics students worked on live action drawings of the Biennial. These drawings were displayed at Blackburne House 11 - 29 November.

**Strengths**

Second time this project has been conducted and a success on each occasion.  
Project developed further in that this time a public exhibition of the work was shown.  
Enthusiasm, commitment, and support of college staff.  
No demands on Biennial budget.  
Low demands on Biennial time.  
Engaged the students with *International 04*.  
Production of high quality artwork.

**Weaknesses**

Unsuccessful at developing a 'use' for the drawings.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Explore possibility of putting some of the drawings of the 2004 Biennial on the website.  
Repeat project for 2006 but build in a 'use' for the images.

**Visitor Programme**

A series of visitor programme activities was aimed at developing new audiences for Liverpool Biennial and contemporary art. By linking the art in the *International 04* to other topics these activities attracted special interest groups who would not usually attend art events.

Ten talks were conducted by artists and related specialists, exploring interests such as dancing and diving in relation to art. Ten tours were held each Saturday of the *International 04* exhibition, each led by a different guide, and focusing on themes such architecture, film, and local history. Ten community groups were given supported visits to the Biennial with their own tour guide.

All activities were free and disability access support was provided on request.

**Saturday Tours**

★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 129 participants.
---

Each Saturday at 11am during the Biennial there has been a tour of the *International 04* exhibition. Each tour was led by a different guide and focused on one of the themes of the exhibition. The guides acted as cultural commentators and came from a variety of backgrounds, including artists, architects, historians, performers, and writers. The guides related the exhibition to the built environment, looking at the relationship between the artworks and the city from their own unique perspective. The selection of the guides and the content of the tours also endeavoured to make connections with other events in the city such as Black History Month and Dadafest.

Tours departed from the Biennial Centre at 82 Wood Street, L1 from 11 am as follows:

- Julia Hallam 25 September

Widely published senior lecturer in Politics and Communication Studies at Liverpool University. Julia's research specialties are in the areas of film and television drama

- Steve Binns 2 October

Steve Binns is the community historian for Liverpool City Council and Radio Merseyside. Steve is renowned for his guided tours of the city's civic buildings, made intriguing by his astonishing local knowledge

- Hilary Oxlade 9 October

Blue Badge guide extraordinaire and confessed Beatles aficionado, Hilary combined her expertise in both fields in her informative tour of Liverpool, with special emphasis on the Beatles legacy

- Eric Scott Lynch 16 October

Eric Lynch is a black scouser with a fascination for Liverpool's untold history. His research concerns the city's connection with slavery and race. Jamie Reid 23 October

Liverpool artist Jamie Reid is responsible for producing some of the most provocative designs in rock music, including his work for The Sex Pistols. His works have been exhibited everywhere from the ICA in London to the Pompidou Centre in Paris

- Curtis Watt 30 October

Performance poet Curtis Watt regularly performs across Merseyside, and has toured in the USA, South Africa, Germany, and Czechoslovakia. He has contributed to many Liverpool film and television productions both as a writer and as an actor. His tour focused on the historical and actual condition of the black community in Liverpool

- Joseph Sharples 6 November

Following the publication of his Pevsner Architectural Guide to Liverpool in May 2004, former Walker art gallery curator Joseph Sharples brought his extensive knowledge of Liverpool's built environment to a tour of the city

- Jon Carricker Liverpool City and Pub Tours 13 November

Liverpool resident Jon Carricker conducts fascinating and novel City and Pub tours across the city centre. For *International 04* he focused his attention on Pier Head and Albert Dock. The tour included informative commentary on these two locations, their surroundings-and an opportunity to socialise over a drink at one of Liverpool's public houses

- Tony Eccles 20 November

Co-founder of the Merseyside Anomalies Research Association, Tony has investigated over 150 UFO sightings. Project consultant to *International 04* artist Francesco Jodice, Tony brings his expertise on the night sky's unusual phenomena to a tour of known UFO sites across Merseyside

- Rachel Duerden 27 November

Rachel Duerden is a visually impaired artist who studied Fine Art at the University of Wales in Cardiff. Currently a workshop leader at North West Disability Arts Forum Rachel focused on the contemporary issue of disability access whilst providing us with a sensory tour of the gallery space

#### Data / Statistics

Tours	Attendance Data	Capacity 25
Julia Hallam	14	
Steve Binns	12	
Hilary Oxlade	10	
Eric Scott Lynch	10	
Jamie Reid	20	
Curtis Watt	6	
Joseph Sharples	30	
Jon Carricker	6	
Tony Eccles	15	
Ben Cove	6	

#### Strengths

Providing tour guides from Liverpool was recognised as a positive approach because of the intimacy they have with the city.

Commitment of the tour guides to providing a quality experience for the Biennial visitor. Using local personalities and people known to the public as tour guides attracted a wider audience.

Variety across the tours helped to develop a returning audience.

Growth in audience numbers was established by past tour visitors who then became advocates for the programme.

Connections made with other concurrent city events.

#### Weaknesses

Clearer indication as to tour approach in publicity as some visitors came expecting a comprehensive tour covering the majority of the *International 04* show.

Lack of knowledge of contemporary art by some of the tour guides required Biennial Learning and Inclusion Assistants' input.

Target groups	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

#### Recommendations

Development of tour programme after requests from schools, colleges, and universities for concurrent tours to those offered on Saturdays and aimed at their specific requirements.

Tours to be led by both a local personality and an arts specialist.

**Talks**

★★★

**Data / Statistics**  
 365 participants.

Ten talks were conducted by artists and related specialists, exploring interests such as dancing and diving in relation to art.

**Talks programme:**

Tuesday, September 14, 6.30pm Adelphi Hotel / Sefton Suite

**Valeska Soares** in conversation with **Adrian George** (Curator, Tate Liverpool)

Performance included by ballroom dancers

Tuesday, September 21, 6.30pm – leaves from William Brown Street

**Martha Rosler**, Bus Tour / Talk on board a bus traveling around Liverpool

Sunday, October 3, time 2pm Museum of Liverpool Life

**Yael Bartana.**

Tuesday, October 5, 6.30pm Adelphi Hotel

**Wong Hoy Cheong** in conversation with **Hou Hanru** (Independent critic and curator)

Wednesday, 6 October, 6.00pm Tate Liverpool

**Navin Rawanchaikul**

Thursday, 7 October, 6.30pm FACT Centre

**Jill Magid** in conversation with **Geert Lovink** (Independent media theorist and net critic)

Saturday, 9 October, 2.00pm – 3.00pm Tate Liverpool

**Oswaldo Macia**

Thursday, 14 October, 6.30pm Blackburne House, Blackburne Place, L1

**Satch Hoyt** in conversation with **Zachary Kingdon** (curator NML)

Tuesday, 19 October, 6.30pm - 7.30pm Tate Liverpool

**Carl Michael von Hausswolff** in conversation with **Brian Gilgeous** (Diver, Extreme Oceaneering),

Thursday, 21 October, 6.30pm Open Eye Gallery

**Francesco Jodice** in conversation with **Helen James** (writer)

Tuesday, 23 November, 6.30pm Liverpool Community College Sebastian Soleri (Performance Artist) in conversation with Amanda Coogan

**Data/Statistics**

<b>Talks</b>	<b>Attendance Data</b>	<b>Venue Capacity</b>
Valeska Soares	50	110
Martha Rosler	40	49
Yael Bartana	4	30
Wong Hoy Cheong	40	110
Navin Rawanchaikul	30	100
Jill Magid	50	50
Oswaldo Macia	30	100
Satch Hoyt	30	125
Carl Michael von Hausswolff	30	100
Francesco Jodice	40	40
Amanda Coogan	40	80

**Strengths**

Connections made with other concurrent city events.  
 Effective development of working together with partner organisations to plan and deliver the talks programme across the different organisations.  
 Disability support was available on request for all the talks.  
 Werner Kaligofsky gave a talk to students at Wirral Met through this talk he came into contact with Kwan May Ling who became his second guide.  
 Good discussions were generated.  
 Other than Yael's talks, they all were reasonably attended which is good considering all the events taking place during the Biennial.

**Weaknesses**

Use of a variety of venues, some of which were not traditional venues for lectures at times proved problematic.  
 Difficulty in sourcing audience / or audience outside of a professional art public.  
 Funding from five art cities resulted in change of criteria focusing on new audiences.  
 All the talks took place during the ten weeks of the Biennial and not during the lead up to the opening.  
 There were many openings, seminars and talks to attend at this time, there is not a large enough existing audience for this amount of activity.  
 Recordings were not made for all the talks due to technical problems.  
 Not all the talks generated new audiences.  
 More publicity and promotion were needed this could have been possible if all the artists had confirmed their participation much earlier.  
 Yael Bartana's artist talk was arranged very late on, wasn't included in the talks programme flyer and was very poorly attended.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Propose a talks programme that operates on varying scales commencing from the researchers visits onwards. Include researchers in the talks programme.  
 All talks to be documented.  
 As part of the intern's programme, they should be visiting schools, colleges, universities in the North West to talk about the Biennial in general but also all the talks on offer.  
 Proposing three stages for the talks programme and that all talks are documented for the fusebox physical, web and school resources.

## Visits

★★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 136 participants.
---

During the first month of the Biennial ten community groups were given supported visits to the city. Each group was provided with their own guide, transport, and refreshments. Groups were chosen based upon known barriers to accessing contemporary art, as a follow up to one of the series of talks provided, or because the exhibition had particular relevance to their community. Supported visits took place for the following groups during the first four weeks of the Biennial:

- **Yemeni Arabic Association**, Liverpool 25 September

The club offers training and advice to Yemeni and Arabic speaking people in Merseyside. This visit was for their youth group ages 6-14 years.

- **Halewood Resource Centre**, Halewood 28 September

Halewood Learning Disability Service forms part of the Knowsley Social Services Department. The service provides support for adults of employment age with a learning disability.

- **Creative Initiatives**, Birkenhead 29 September

Creative Initiatives is a Wirral based work experience co-operative providing art skills and employment experience in a workshop setting. This visit was for a group of people affected by substance misuse.

- **Merseyside Pensioners**, Liverpool 30 September

This group exists to promote the interests and rights of pensioners. This tour was for a group of older people as part of a desire to offer the older community an extensive calendar of social events that are held throughout the year.

- **Being Involved Group**, Huyton 5 October

The Being Involved Group forms part of Knowsley Disability Concern, a local charity that has been providing support for disabled people since 1977.

- **Holy Trinity School**, Southport 7 October

This Southport primary school offers UK curriculum education to children here as refugees or asylum seekers.

- **Youth Parliament**, Huyton 9 October

A group for young people from Merseyside which aims to give young people a voice which will be heard and listened to by local and national government, and providers of services to young people.

- **Henshaws Society for the Blind**, Liverpool 12 October

Henshaw's provide a range of educational, residential, day care and community services in response to the needs of blind and visually impaired people of all ages across the North West.

- **Sandfield Park School**, Liverpool 14 October

A school for disabled young people, who actively seek to integrate participation in the arts with their curriculum.

- **Liverpool Housing Action Trust tenants**, Croxteth 15 October

Liverpool Housing Action Trust is a housing-led regeneration agency working with a wide range of partners to achieve its aims, with the tenants taking a leading role in their work. The tenants from the Altbridge high-rise blocks attended this visit, a group that worked alongside artist Esko Mannikko to realise his project *Organised Freedom: Liverpool Edition for International 04*.

**Data / Statistics**

	<b>Attendance Data</b>	<b>Capacity 25</b>
Yemeni Arabic Association	20	
Halewood Resource Centre	14	
Creative Initiatives	9	
Merseyside Pensioners	15	
Being Involved Group	12	
Holy Trinity School	18	
Youth Parliament	14	
Henshaws Society for the Blind	10	
Sandfield Park School	10	
LHAT tenants	10	

**Strengths**

80% of the groups invited had not before visited a Biennial, or a number of the permanent Liverpool art institutions that we toured.

The visitors enjoyed themselves!

After the introduction to *International 04* in the form of a tour in the first two weeks of the Biennial, Halewood resource centre went on to bring a further seven groups to the Biennial. Connections made with other concurrent city events-Black History Month / Dadafest.

Project generated interest in arts for health and social purposes among community workers and their group members.

Quote from Henshaws Society for the Blind: 'I would like to thank you very much for our visit you kindly arranged on the 12<sup>th</sup> of October for our centre users. The pieces we visited were very interesting and mostly tactile making it more enjoyable for our visually impaired clients. You also arranged for Ann who is an audio describer to come along and describe the artwork, which made the day.'

**Weaknesses**

Clearer guidelines need to be drawn up with groups with regards to support needs and co-ordination of the visit itself.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Develop a series of preview tours specifically for community workers so that they may return to the Biennial with their own groups and with a background knowledge.

Where possible to develop the relationships, we have made with these groups towards 2006.

Repeat project for Liverpool Biennial 2006.

**fusebox 04**

★★★★

Data / Statistics

**fusebox 04** provided comprehensive information to support *International 04*. Offering practical orientation information and material about the participating artists and their creative processes, the central fusebox site in Wood Street also revealed the connections made between Liverpool and the themes, sites, and artists of *International 04*. Information was available in a range of formats, including publications, web-based, audio and video.

**Venue based fuseboxes**

Each of the *International 04* venues were installed with their own fusebox space which focused on the work of the artists in that particular venue.

**Web-based information**

Developed as part of [www.biennial.com](http://www.biennial.com), links were provided to artist pages providing entry points to more complete information on the *International 04* artist's project, background, image bank, links, and further information.

**Strengths**

The integration of the **fusebox 04** within the *International* exhibition through the Biennial centre - three elements of the *International 04* exhibition, marketing for Biennial activity and **Cityscapes** was important to the success of the **fusebox**.

A project manager was appointed to develop and implement the project.

Fusebox / Biennial Centre was a great facility and point of contact for visitors and press.

Support from interns encouraged visitors to use the resources.

Only three books were missing at the end of the Biennial.

The **fusebox** had a strong identity.

**Weaknesses**

Budget not finalised early enough.

Contributions for resources from the *International 04* artists were not received early enough.

Themes required further development with schools to encourage the use of physical resource.

Production and delivery of fuseboxes in the *International* venues was not followed through due to budgets and time.

fusebox 04 was not clearly branded in terms of design, presentation of information and identity with partner venues.

Resources were not collected by both the Biennial and partner venues, as planned.

Disability access – signage and equipment were not in place from the opening of the Biennial.

Problems with ordering books so close to the opening.

Web-based resources difficult for some to navigate from a visitor's perspective.

Computers for the fusebox were purchased very early on, this resulted in an unclear change over for staff who were using these, and some were then left without the use of their computers.

We did not have control over the space with regards to the included *International 04* projects.

Development of artist pages was badly managed.

Delay in the display of the artist pages on the website

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

<b>Recommendations</b>	
The book lists for each artist to be created through conversations with them, possibly during their first visit.	
Budgets need to be agreed much earlier, which would allow us to gather resources. This would not only help with the writing of the catalogue texts but give the Biennial and partner venues a better understanding of the artists involved.	
Develop further conversations with partner venues regarding the identity and branding of the fusebox, the importance of all the education spaces having a clear and consistent link.	
Communicate the value of the resource space to artists.	
Clearer defined space is needed for the fusebox.	
Through discussions with the programme team, we need to develop the resource as an archive / ongoing resource that will establish an active profile for the Biennial during non-exhibiting years.	
Develop involvement of local students in the design for central fusebox space and the venue-based fuseboxes.	

**Teacher Tours**

★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 10 teachers.
--

A free service provided to teachers across Merseyside which included a guided tour and talk about *International 04* and an introduction to the school's resources developed for *International 04*.

**Strengths**

Needed little Biennial money and time.  
Investment in audience development.  
Enthusiasm by visiting teachers in our programme and the sharing of this enthusiasm between their students, work colleagues, family, and friends.

**Weaknesses**

Information sent to schools about tours not reaching relevant staff.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

To foster our teacher tour activity so that more Merseyside teachers are aware the service exists.  
Invite teachers to tour early enough to enable them to build in school visits in their programme.

**At a Glance**

★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 2000 packs distributed
--

**At a Glance** is a series of postcards and web-based resources created for schools interested in visiting Liverpool Biennial *International 04*. The resources reflected on the exhibition and studied the different directions in which it can take its audience. The postcards directed teachers to [www.biennial.com/schools](http://www.biennial.com/schools) where further resource, downloadable worksheets and teacher notes were stored. **At a Glance** is designed for use by secondary schools at key stages 3 and 4.

**Strengths**

The animations and games are great fun.  
Development of ideas for teachers directly relating to *International 04*.

**Weaknesses**

Delay and poor quality in printing of packs meant they were available at beginning of Biennial.  
Confusion over involvement / responsibilities of marketing team and Love Creative in project.  
No monitoring of use of pack built into project.  
Difficulties in getting animation and games on to the website.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Explore needs of schools with formal education network.

**Made in Liverpool**

★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 125 participants.
---

A screening of a selection of films / moving image pieces that had been made by local people in the last two years. The screening took place at Central Hall on September 26. The project created an opportunity for local residents to present Liverpool, in their own voices, to the Biennial audience. Working alongside Capital of Culture the project was managed by three trainees from CADT.

**Strengths**

Commitment of students managing the project.  
Little financial input from Biennial.  
Support / partnership of Capital of Culture.  
Quality of event.

**Weaknesses**

Took up a lot of Sharon's time.  
Late confirmation of Capital of Culture support.

**Target groups**

Academic / specialist	
Primary / secondary schools	✓
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	

**Recommendations**

Continue to talk to Capital of Culture about repeating project in 2006 – inviting people to make films for the event.

**Teenage Pregnancy**

★★★★

<b>Data / Statistics</b> 25 participants.
--

For Liverpool Biennial 2004, Croatian artist Andreja Kuluncic proposed an art project with young mothers from Liverpool. The project planned to use advertising sites to give a voice to the young people and to highlight teenage pregnancy as a problem in the city. The Biennial chose to exhibit Andreja's proposal rather than realise the campaign that the artist had wanted to develop. During the Biennial a round table discussion was held to discuss these and other concerns about the project. Health professionals, artists, curators, and young mothers were invited to the discussion. Liverpool Biennial are now in conversation with South Liverpool Housing to use the outcomes of the discussion to inform the development of an art project with young parents from Speke and Garston.

**Strengths**

A desire created to build relationships / networks between local art and health professionals, with the opportunity to collaborate in the future.  
Discussion itself a success... 'I haven't changed my perspective on teenage pregnancy, but I have on the Biennial, and I have a desire to work with the Biennial again.' Julie Kelly (Primary Care Trust North Liverpool)  
The social responsibilities that exist as an artist working within a community were addressed.

**Weaknesses**

Concerns over what benefit this project has provided to the young people the project is about.  
Timescale for the realisation of this project was too short.  
Belief held that this project should have been done in full consultation with young parents and this was not achieved.

<b>Target groups</b>	
Academic / specialist	✓
Primary / secondary schools	
communities defined by inclusion agendas	✓
exhibition visitors	✓

Integration of Learning and Inclusion Programme with <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided contextual information regarding <i>International 04</i> .	✓
Provided opportunities for artists and non-artists to work together	✓

**Recommendations**

To use the outcomes of the discussion to develop an arts project locally, with full involvement of the young parents from the start.  
To raise awareness of the issues facing young parents in Merseyside.  
To create high quality artwork with a local community for Liverpool Biennial 2006.  
To have a cross venue discussion exploring good practice in the collaboration of *International* artists with community groups.

**Appendix Twelve:  
Liverpool Biennial Press and Media**

**1999**

Market research cost £188,816 at the end of 31 March 2000, – totalling £188,816.

Market research cost £7,089 at the end of 31 March 2001, – totalling £7,089.

Research on the 1999 audiences at the time suggested that 55% found out about the Biennial by word of mouth, between 26% and 29% found out through print or banners, 25% through press coverage – direct mail attracted 7%. The figure for word of mouth was high and reflected the fact that students and the visual arts community were strong reference groups. It also implied that the rest of the 1999 Biennial's marketing and communication failed to have a strong impact. This was borne out by the qualitative research and depth interviews. There was considerable comment in the focus groups on the lack of publicity for the 1999 Biennial. the materials themselves were criticised for being drab.

Although the Biennial contracted a press agency in Liverpool (Paver Downes Public Relations) to provide PR support, in the event, a member of the Biennial staff (who had not been employed for this purpose) assumed day to day responsibility for handling the press enquiries that came directly to the Biennial office. The task of managing an external agency under the pressure of opening a major exhibition cannot be underestimated and, as is not infrequently the case, the client felt frustrated that the agency did not perform according to its expectations.

The retention of an agency (Fitz & Co) in New York was considered to be more successful, perhaps because the potential for developing the profile of Liverpool and the visual arts in the US press as so much greater. In the event, Fitz & Co obtained news coverage in key art media, including Art in America, artnet.com, Art Auction, Travel & Leisure, New York Times (Travel) and Artforum. As well as raising the international profile of the Biennial, the value of this exposure is that it provides a context for Liverpool artists to develop new and existing links with artists and galleries in New York.

At home, much of the coverage in the national press was as much a metropolitan response to a conception of Liverpool, as it was to the idea and content of the Biennial itself. some headlines captured fond and positive clichés<sup>22</sup>, while other critics were hostile to the very idea of a biennial taking place in Liverpool, notably Adrian Searle who commented that, 'the whole act is taking place for its own sake.'<sup>23</sup>

The characteristic position of the local press – notably, the Liverpool Echo and Daily Post – was benign scepticism. Consistently focussing on the most outlandish gestures and projects, the local newspapers provided the Biennial with a constant stream of publicity carrying the basic message: 'its weird.... But go and have a look for yourself.'<sup>24</sup> Although this

---

<sup>22</sup> Cork, R (1999) 'We Love You, Yeah, Yeah, Yeah.' The Times 29<sup>th</sup> September 1999

<sup>23</sup> The Guardian 28<sup>th</sup> September 2000

<sup>24</sup> For example: 'Crossing the boundaries between airy city galleries and the cold, wet pavements filled with frantic mums with screaming toddlers, the Biennial exhibits stand in a surreal world of their own, appreciated and understood best by highbrow intellectuals who stand, stare and comment' (Daily Post, 24<sup>th</sup> September 1999). However, the article subsequently discusses ways in which artists engaged directly with local people as well

daily digest of snippets was scarcely profound, it was effective in sustaining awareness of the Biennial among local readers, from start to finish – in contrast to regional television coverage, which was primarily focused on the opening. Analysis of the press coverage in 1999 reinforced the desirability of encouraging a more nuanced reading of the Biennial both as a whole and in relation to its component parts.

Before the end of the financial year, much work had been done on the Biennial Magazine, although this did not appear until June, and on a press, event built around the Jessica Voorsanger Football art project under the 1999 Education Programme (April 2001). By the end of March, it was clear that the new structure and focus of the organisation would allow more thorough detailed planning (provided the partner organisation could be persuaded to play their part).

The Biennial 1999 allocated one-fifth of the total budget to marketing the event. There was criticism of the marketing strategy for the 1999 in that it was largely unplanned, unstrategic and reactive in its execution. The research revealed that brand awareness was very low and that the printed marketing material was visually and aesthetically poor and lacking effectiveness as communication tools. Design, distribution and readability of the print were all criticised. It was also felt that publicity material deliberately targeted young people and art interested people, thereby excluding people not in these groups. (MHM 2002, p.13)

46% were motivated by an interest in educational studies and a further 20% were motivated by professional or work interest. This indicated that the Biennial chiefly reached a very active art-interested and art-professional audiences. The implication of this is that the communications message was very tightly targeted, the publicity failed to reach a non-arts audience and suggested that the actual audience reached would have been far smaller than hoped, since the Vocational segment alone numbers around 12,553 people within Merseyside.

Participants in audience focus conducted by TEAM revealed mixed views about the effectiveness and impact of the print publicity for the Biennial. While some felt that the information provided on leaflets was comprehensive and effective in arousing interest, others felt that the type was illegible and the layout – especially of the map leaflet – was confusing. Many contributors were particularly critical of the map leaflet. For example, some Tracey artists were annoyed that there was insufficient space to include their exhibitions, although café and bars were detailed. Others felt that it simply did not function as a practical guide to getting around the city. Overall, there was a sense that too much information had been over-designed into too little space. (Rees Leahy 2000, p.36)

Focus group participants on the whole disliked the colour and design of the print and felt that the format was impractical for use as a guide or map, and the design did not help easy reference. Participants also felt there was not enough information offered on the artists or the exhibitions. There was a feeling that the publicity, including in some cases, the street dressing and signage, conveyed off-putting or over-whelming features of the Biennial (350 artists, 61 sites) rather than the benefits for potential attenders.

The group that was most confident and articulate about contemporary art (Vocationalists) felt there was a need for information and orientation guidance to make the event more accessible and less intimidating for people. This group felt that banners and street-dressing were an important feature in helping people orientate themselves and giving a sense of

cohesion to the event, and there was a recognition that different market segments might need different levels of information. (MHM 2002, p.16-7)

Weaknesses included:

- **Brand** - The brand identity of the 1999 was undeveloped. No one spoken to could begin to articulate the brand identity
- **Awareness** – Awareness levels of the Biennial were very low amongst the potential market and confined largely to those in the arts sector. Whilst individuals did participate in projects and see some of the exhibits there is evidence that they did so without being made aware of the Biennial brand or of the nature of the Biennial event. Although there was some street dressing and banners of which attenders were aware, they did not seem to make much impact on potential attenders
- **Press Coverage** – There was insufficient media coverage of the event, its nature and its aims
- **Publicity** – There was insufficient publicity activity in advance of the event. The style of the publicity material did little justice to the aims of the event and did not engage a non-specialist audience. The creative approach belied the artistic aims of the Biennial. The communications message excluded people rather than engaged them
- **The Audience** – The audience comprised chiefly locally-based Vocationals and art-students
- **Poor Organisation** – There was an impression of poor organisation and lack of cohesion between venues and exhibitions. Insufficient signage and directional guidance between exhibitions (MHM 2002, p.19)

Biennial attenders wanted better information and practical help in attending the event in order to be able to maximise the number of events they experienced. They required more detailed orientation information to help them to find their way around the City by laying out routes with careful directional signage. And help with access and parking, as well as suggestions on where to stop for a drink or food.

**2002**

Unrestricted funds for Marketing cost £99,122 at the end of 31 March 2002, – totalling £99,122 (2001 - £7,089).

Marketing research of unrestricted funds cost £47,224 at the end of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £97,230 – totalling £144,454.

One of the greatest challenges of the marketing of Biennial 2002 was reconciling the different expectations of the various audience segments. The Biennial needed to establish itself amongst the family of international visual arts Biennials in terms of credibility, prestige, must-see attractiveness and general weight and status.

At the beginning of the review period, the marketing strategy was fully implemented organisationally, with the appointment and management of outside agencies (in relation to the art and news press – Catharine Braithwaite, political advocacy – Daniel Harris, and promotional campaign – Love Creative).

By June 2002, however, it had become seriously delayed by shortage of funds due to the lack of success with corporate fundraising. The subsequent application for funds from ERDF and other public source although reasonably successful, came too late for a fully effective promotional campaign over the summer months. However, all in all, the marketing campaign did produce excellent results. Working with the partner organisations, a unified approach to publicity involving colour coding was developed across the guide, posters, banners, maps and listings, the design, legibility and ubiquity of all these were much improved.

For lack of Corporate support, close relations were developed with The Mersey Partnership and Northwest Development Agency, the bodies responsible for tourism locally and regionally, and the Biennial was able to ally itself creatively with the Make it Merseyside and englandsnorthwest campaigns.

The reward of these initiatives were the title of Event of the Year in the Mersey Tourism / Echo Tourism Awards (Feb 2003) and Liverpool's achievement in winning the title of European Capital of Culture 2008 (for which the judge's citation mentioned the Biennial specifically). In all, the profile and street presence of the event were greatly enhanced in comparison with the 1999 event, and the brand was in a strong position for extension.

Interactivity was considered an important way of avoiding elitism and engaging people. The Traditionals, in particular, expressed the need for education and outreach work to interest the young, as well as a long-term education project informing the residents of Liverpool – what a Biennial is and why it is important for Liverpool.

The branding and communications strategy needed to operate at four broad levels in order to meet the expectations of each of the market segments:

- Level One – Vocationals / Peers
- Level Two – Culturally Active. Contemporary interested – regional, national, and international cultural tourists
- Level Three – Culturally Active. Traditional interests – regional, potential interest but risk averse
- Level Four – Contemporary. Lifestylers – Regional. National – Urban cultural tourists. International – City Break market

Whilst the Biennial brand essence needed to be ‘Liverpool’ for groups one and two, it needed to carry all the confidence and weight of the family of Biennials. This identity needed to appeal to potential sponsors and stakeholders. However, for groups three and four and to a large extent group two, the Biennial brand would probably be most successfully communicated if the words Biennial, contemporary art and artists (or artists names) were not given a great deal of prominence. The requirement and the expectations of the Lifestylers generally related to the marketing and communication of the event. Whilst they were attracted by the cutting edge dimension of the Biennial they were put off by its defining language – the terms contemporary art, exhibition and Biennial were seen as suggestive of something that was not really for them.

Marketing understood that it was not possible to target all of the segments with the same message. As soon as group three and four sensed that they were being targeted with the same message as groups one and two they would register the event as ‘not for the likes of me’ and exclude themselves. MHM (2002) recognised that they wouldn’t support the event in principle, they just wouldn’t expect to enjoy it or belong within the market. Therefore, in order for the Biennial to be adopted within Liverpool and engage the people of Liverpool the brand development needed to incorporate some treatment which perhaps self-consciously, ironically, and self-depreciatingly acknowledges the strange or elite connotations that this event might have, whilst not undermining the status and prestige it does have on the national and international stage. All of the potential attendees wanted to see creative, imaginative, and useable publicity well in advance of the event.

### **Marketing Objectives**

Morris Hargreaves McIntyre suggested a number of marketing objectives that the Biennial could use as a basis for performance indicators and a platform for evaluation for the 2002 visual arts Festival. For each of the marketing objectives suggested by MHM, there was a set of guidelines for how these objectives can be measured and evaluated. Some or all of the measurements could be combined to create an evaluation programme for the Biennial 2002 involving a range of stakeholders and organisations in the City.

**Table 12.1: 2002 Marketing Objectives (MHM 2002, pp.51-52)**

<b>Corporate aim</b>	<b>How realised</b>	<b>Marketing objective</b>	<b>How measured</b>
Raise profile of L's external image as a cultural centre for tourism	High media visibility	Xx column centimetres in national international general, tourism and specialist media	No of centimetres coverage in identified types of publications
	Positive media attitude about Liverpool	Encourage supportive press coverage and endorsement	% of positive and supportive column centimetres
	No of cultural tourists to Liverpool	% rise in cultural tourists to Liverpool	No of hotel beds occupied during event compared to same time in 2000. No of enquiries or web-site hits to Merseyside Tourism compared to same time in 2000 Evaluation research
	No of visitors from outside Merseyside to Biennial	Attract x% of tourists including day-visitors from outside Merseyside	Mini-data collection postcards a prelude to main survey, obtaining contact details and postcode
Broaden the audience for the CVA in Liverpool	Biennial attracts people who wouldn't normally attend art galleries	Attract xx% of new or lapsed CVA attenders	Quantitative survey to measure frequency of gallery attendance
			No of people involved in educational work
	Interests new people in CVA	% of people who plan to see 2004 Biennial	Post event population survey intention and brand awareness questions

MHM advised that publicity needed to convey the creativity, ingenuity and innovative quality of the event itself as well as the fact that this was something special, exciting, intentional and different, and on a world stage. The gritty, ironic, self-deprecating, dark and light character of Liverpool needed to be at the heart of the brand identity.

The marketing strategy and development of the brand identity of the Biennial needed to recognise that the Biennial offered a different proposition to different segments, which

have different needs and motivations and different obstacles to attendance. The details of these considerations were outlined in the MHM report. It was important that the communications activity could inform local and regional people of the nature of the Biennial, and of its aspirations, whilst conveying a friendly, accessible, engaging event open to anyone with contemporary or arts interests.

MHM explained that assumptions should not be made about audiences knowing what a biennial is or being familiar with the names of artists. Whilst this information might have been important to the Vocationals group, it was meaningless to the majority of local and regional attenders.

For the Biennial to achieve a target of 250,000 visits, the marketing strategy needed to prioritise communicating effectively with the local and regional markets as well as national and international Vocationals and Cultural Tourism markets, since local people would make up the highest proportion of attenders.

Considerable energy was expended from the spring of 2001 in supporting the City's bid to be nominated European Capital of Culture 2008. However, the closer links to the City generated in this way proved important in preparing the ground for support from the Mersey Partnership and the Northwest Development Agency (and eventually, in the subsequent year, from Liverpool City Council). The Advocacy programme designed by Daniel Harris Associates proved extremely valuable also in the spring of 2002 at a point when there was insufficient income secured to be able to commit resources to print-based marketing. The Education and Access Programme started in the autumn of 2001, and also helped to create a pool of goodwill within the region supporting and promoting the coming Biennial season.

Much greater promotional force was achieved for the Biennial brand, and under the Biennial 'umbrella,' greater clarity was achieved in relation to the separate branding of the four exhibitions and the events programme. The (new) generic titles of International and Independent became accepted alongside New Contemporaries and John Moores, and the Events programme strand was conceived as a time-specific counterpart to include Live Art, Education and Access events, conferences, seminars etc. the programme was larger and more ambitious than that of 1999, and the degree to which local artists were able to participate in a structured way was increased, with Afoundation working successfully to further establish the Independent.

### **Catalogue**

The proposal was to provide information on the artists in printed form for the opening days, to be followed at a later stage by a CD-ROM offering documentation of the artworks as finally installed. The CD-ROMs (the images were also available on the website) were sent out free to anyone who brought a copy of the catalogue and returned a postcard with their contact information. This 'data capture' of names and addresses also created a very high quality database for marketing the next Biennial.

The concept of the catalogue was to offer art=world visitor some thoughts as to why a Biennial should have been founded in Liverpool, and its aspiration compared with other large exhibitions world-wide. Lewis Biggs' introduction to the International 2002 exhibition and Declan McGonagle's contextualisation of the project of Liverpool Biennial as a whole were followed by an interview with Lynne Cooke which gave a global context at the start of the twenty-first century. Michael Bracewell's text suggested some larger cultural trends in

the UK over the past twenty-years, and Christoph Grunenberg's and Lewis Biggs' texts on Liverpool as a historical and cultural context provided some clues to the team's curatorial sensibilities.

**Publicity and Interpretive Material**

Specialist advertising for the International was taken out in Art magazines national and International, although at the date that it was necessary to place this adverts, the funds to do so had not been raised, and so much less advertising than planned was placed.

The interpretative leaflet designed to inform visitors about the exhibition was produced in a run of 50,000, of which only 25,000 were needed. However, it was felt to be very successful, as were the text panels for display in the venues, written by the curators and produced to a uniform design with the catalogue and labels by Alan Ward of Axis Design. The strong simple graphics helped to unify the exhibition despite its being spread over eight sites. The colour coded flagpoles and banners commissioned from LADT and installed at all Biennial venues including the International venues were helpful in signalling and celebrating the show. (Biennial Report 2001 – 2003, pp.7-8)

**2004**

Marketing research of unrestricted funds cost £47,224 at the end of 31 March 2003, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £97,230 – totalling £144,454.

Marketing research of unrestricted funds cost £47,292 at the end of 31 March 2004, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £3,828 – totalling £51,120.

Market research carried out by The Mersey Partnership demonstrated the Biennials audience's positive reaction to the Festival: Out of a maximum score of 5, event quality scored 4.63, event organisation and staff scored 4.65, overall enjoyment scored 4.66 and value for money scored 4.86. With regard to promotional material, the Biennial guide (7%), newspapers (7%), and posters / banners (6%) had the biggest influence on visits. But less than 1% of respondents said that they had been influenced by Biennial leaflets.

The Marketing Programme promotes the Liverpool Biennial brand through an umbrella campaign, integrating marketing, communications, and public relations. The strategy is informed by the partner organisations delivering the exhibitions, and by regional organisations involved in the promotion of culture.

The Business Plan proposed the amalgamation of the posts of Marketing and Development Manager, and the continuance of contracting out functions to outside agencies responsible for developing and delivering parts of the strategy. The new post was appointed April 2003, and negotiations to re-contract these agencies took place summer 2003: Catherine Braithwaite (art press, and international, national and local press); Daniel Harris (political / stakeholder advocacy), Love Creative (brand development, creative graphics and promotional campaign), TM3 (website architects and web providers, to designs by Love Creative).

Simultaneously, relations were reaffirmed and renegotiated with The Mersey Partnership and Northwest Development Agency, the bodies responsible for tourism locally and regionally, allied to the Make It Merseyside and englandsnorthwest campaigns. The announcement of Liverpool's gaining of the title European Capital of Culture 2008 on 4 June 2003, had to wait on the appointment of staff (only a reality at the end of the review period) before negotiating a close relationship over marketing with the Liverpool Culture Company. (However, a Biennial Marketing Strategy Group with representatives of NWDA, TMP and LCC met several times April – July after the end of the review period).

**Brand Visibility**

As the Liverpool Biennial has only a limited public identity between Festivals, in order to strengthen the brand and boost brand awareness and recall. So, it was important that the Biennial maintained a strong visual identity across all print and communications year round. The main opportunities the Biennial had was to promote their brand through marketing, print and publicity materials.

2004 saw the development of a generic creative identity for Liverpool Biennial by Love Creative design agency to reinforce their brand identity, and to be applied across everything produced by the Biennial. this included: the logo, as established in 2001; the

colour blocks which are taken from the logo palette containing the text 'Liverpool Biennial,' 'International Festival of contemporary art,' the dates of the coming Festival and the web address; and also, guidance on the use of fonts and palettes. An advocacy booklet, published July 2003, had a short but productive life as a 'calling card' to support approaches to trusts and foundations, stakeholders and businesses, while waiting for the new graphic design.

Three applications of the creative were developed:

1. Corporate identity, for use on all print and design produced by the Biennial
2. Marketing Campaign creatives, which included all elements of the corporate identity, and incorporated the use of silhouetted figures in eight designs. These creatives were applied to marketing print, venue signage, banners, and advertisements. They were also used for some of the Learning and Inclusion print
3. Guidelines, for the four exhibition strands to tie in their creatives to the Biennial umbrella campaign

While the marketing campaign and corporate identity applications were used successfully, the creative guidelines were not. The four strands each produced their own separate print, which in places referenced the Biennial creative but also used their own design elements. This is an area that will need to be reconsidered in the development of the 2006 strategy.

The Biennial brand development and marketing campaign for 2004 led to a successful creative campaign which was effective, high profile and easily recognisable, both in print, outdoor advertising and in the city. The Biennial planned to sustain the brand by continuing to use the 2004 creative of logo, coloured black, standard fonts and pantone colours for all corporate communications such as their letterhead and business cards. The Biennial proposed to develop a new campaign creative for the 2006 Festival, taking the existing full colour logo rather than other elements of the corporate identity as a starting point.

Press coverage of the 2004 Festival increased dramatically by 171% on Liverpool Biennial 2002, with 573 press articles, of which eighthly-four were in national daily / weekly publications and 150 in national magazines and attracted coverage in a large number of overseas countries. The opening weekend press trip was attended by key journalists, and 150 press packs were distributed to visiting journalists. The Festival was the feature of a thirty-minute Channel Five, Fivearts cities documentary. There was also a dramatic increase in website hits, with 115,836 in September 2004.

Yoko Ono's controversial artwork '*My Mummy was Beautiful*' was responsible for generating a high volume of press activity in publications which otherwise would have been unlikely to feature the Biennial. photographs of Peter Johansson's '*Musique Royale*' (the Red '*Abba house*') at Liverpool's Pier Head, set against the contrasting backdrop of the Three Graces, proved very popular with the media, and forms an enduring image of the 2004 Festival.

Many key journalists attended a press trip on 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> September 2004 with a press registration desk at the Adelphi Hotel, with more attending after the opening event. Over 150 press packs were given to journalists visiting the Festival. The Biennial worked with The Mersey Partnership to invite tourism media to the press launch. These journalists joined

part of the Biennials press trip but were led by TMP to take in more of Liverpool's tourist offering. The press section of the Biennial website was an important media tool, allowing press to access online articles, press releases and quotations, and register online for a press account and access to the Biennial image bank.

A significant achievement of the 2004 campaign was the Biennials partnership with Channel Five's Fivearts cities series, resulting in a Channel Five documentary on the Biennial. This thirty-minute programme covered all four Biennial strands and included interviews with a number of International 06 artists, including Jill Magid, Peter Johansson, Valeska Soares, Aleks Danko and Yoko Ono. Also featured were the live art performances of Amanda Coogan's *'Beethoven. The Headbangers'* and Aleks Danko's *'Rolling Home,'* a number of public realm works including Peter Johansson's *'Musique Royale'* and Paolo Canevari's *'Seed,'* a look at the International 04 exhibits at Tate Liverpool and FACT, as well as visits to the John Moores 23 at the Walker, Bloomberg New Contemporaries at the Coach Shed, and opening weekend events in the Independent district. The PR activity also led to Biennial features on BBC 2 Newsnight Review, regional news, extensive local radio coverage and Cable TV show 'Living In....'

The Festival was positively regarded amongst arts professionals, with 49% of Liverpool Biennial 2004's visitors claiming a professional or academic involvement in the visual arts, and around 500 arts professionals registering for accreditation to the opening weekend of Liverpool Biennial.

The perceived traditional target markets for arts-based Festivals are those with a professional involvement or specific interest. There is some evidence that these groups would be predisposed to visit Biennial exhibitions and so marketing is unlikely to result in a large return on investment.

The Biennials research has shown that the market for the Biennial is predominantly younger people who are prepared to take risks with their art. TMP believes that a better marketing strategy for the next Biennial would be reduce the marketing to those segments who would probably come anyway and instead focus on less traditional, younger audiences from the UK and western Europe in particular Germany, Spain and Italy since these countries have been chosen by TMP for their European City Breaks campaign. The Mersey Partnership and VisitBritain could both support marketing for the 2006 Biennial. an enhanced online presence including a message-board for suggestions and feedback could be backed up by an email campaign and supported by marketing to universities and in student media.

**2006**

Marketing cost £34,536 at the end of 31 March 2005, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £325,356 – totalling £359,892.

Marketing cost £29,341 at the end of 31 March 2006.

One third of visitors said that the biggest influence on their decision to visit the Biennial was word of mouth. Advertisements in newspapers and magazines influenced 16% of visits. The Biennial Guide influenced 14% of visits and the Biennial website 13%.

Marketing had a significant role to play in the income generated by the Biennial. Of the total spend generated, 16% had seen newspaper or magazine advertisements, 14% (£1,898,821) was influenced by the guide and print, 8% (£1,085,040) was influenced by the leaflets and 13% (£1,763,191) was influenced by the website.

Respondents were asked what they liked least about their visit to the Biennial. Respondents complained that they struggled to find the exhibitions because of poor maps, guides, and signage. For previous Festivals, the entire marketing process was managed by the Biennial office, however in 2006, the Independents sector produced their own map and publicity materials.

**2008**

Marketing cost £72,146 at the end of 31 March 2007, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £302,649 – totalling £374,795.

Marketing cost £29,341 at the end of 31 March 2008.

In terms of influences to visit, 'word of mouth' was the largest factor (56%). If instead ENWRS focus on specific media channels, this appears to be dominated by material produced by the Biennial themselves, with the top mentions going to:

- Biennial Map (22%)
- Biennial Guide (19%, up from 14% in 2006)
- Biennial Website (17%, up from 13% in 2006)

Other channels of advertising were somewhat lower, 13% mentioned a newspaper or magazine advert, 9% having seen some visual signage or poster and 6% had found out about the event through the VisitLiverpool website. It was estimated that, of the total economic impact, £2,010,000 was generated by the Biennial Map, £1,930,000 by the Biennial Guide and £1,822,000 by the Biennial Website.

**Marketing and Communications**

Louise Merrin, the Marketing and Development Manager in the post for the 2006 Festival, resigned in the spring of 2007 to take up a post with FACT. In view of the creation of the new post of Executive Director with responsibility for fundraising, it was decided to focus the post more closely as Head of Marketing and Communications. Unfortunately, recruitment to this post took a long time, and for the greater part of the review period, the functions of the post were undertaken by consultants – Helen Palmer and Elaine Lees – who had been responsible for marketing the Manchester International festival.

Antony Pickhall was already a colleague through his temporary post at the Bluecoat, joined the staff in the spring of 2008 and led the team through the challenging environment of Liverpool's year as European Capital of Culture. The Biennial was successful in significantly developing their digital and online presence over the year, and Sean Hawkrigge's post as Digital Content Co-ordinator made the website much more accessible and interactive. The Biennial increased control over the site from the Biennial office to make it more readily updatable and combined with a new presence on external sites such as Flickr, YouTube and Facebook so that the work could reach new audiences around the world and encourage participation.

During 2008 the Biennial received coverage in over 850 press, media, and online articles around the Festival and non-festival public art commissions, including reviews in the Independents, Times, Observer, Telegraph, Guardian, and Financial Times, as well as arts press such as Frieze, Art Monthly, and Art Forum. The PR value of this coverage was estimated by Durrents to be over £2.2m. although inevitably not every review was entirely positive, with the most common criticism being the sheer scale and variation of the Festival

when taking into account all the independent exhibitions, the Biennial was very pleased with the quality of coverage and the overall reaction to the Festival.

'It's a giddy finale to the city's stint as European Capital of Culture. After two days there I felt I'd seen more work of real quality than I did in the whole of last year's Documenta.'  
Richard Dorment, The Telegraph

'This constantly intriguing and often anarchic festival is now a major fixture on the international cultural calendar.' Prime

'An exhilarating outpouring of artistic license.' Richard Cork, Financial Times

'Liverpool's fifth art Biennial, which opened last week, in many ways eclipsed both London Fashion Week and the London Design Festival.' Wallpaper.com

'For Liverpool, this year's European Capital of Culture, the biennial is a crowning cultural moment, one final proof that Liverpool can hold its head high.' Michael Glover, The Independent

'Liverpool Biennial is for everyone, acting as a magnet for art lovers and professionals worldwide.' Time Out

'The city is the European Capital of Culture 2008, and their excellent and varied art Biennial shows why.' Icon Magazine

**2010**

Marketing cost £75,770 at the end of 31 March 2009, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £224,832 – totalling £300,602.

Marketing cost £88,381 at the end of 31 March 2010, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £85,406 – totalling £173,787.

Amongst those in the city specifically to visit the Biennial, the single biggest influence had been ‘Word of Mouth’ (25%); however, marketing by the Biennial seemed particularly strong, and the following were the main reasons:

- Biennial Website (11% - an estimated 57,000 visitors)
- Biennial Guide (9% - an estimated 41,000 visitors)
- Biennial leaflet (7% - an estimated 32,000 visitors)
- Biennial invitation (6% - an estimated 18,000 visitors)

The Biennials investment in visitor services (including volunteer customer care training run by John Lewis) paid off, with their visitor survey reporting increased levels of satisfaction compared to 2008 in terms of value for money, event organisation and staff, suitability of the venues, and event quality, all of which scored above 4.4 out of 5. There were also significant improvements in the traditionally lower coring areas of signposting, publicity and promotion. The marketing campaign itself had gone further than ever before in creating a ‘presence’ in the city and beyond, with the Biennial achieving a higher profile internationally and across the country, but particularly in London.

The Biennial exceeded expectations in terms of marketing reach. The advertising reach for the Festival was 48.6 million people, an increase on 2008. Over one-hundred journalists and critics attended the media preview, and from August 2009 – March 2011 the Biennial received coverage in 675 articles nationally and internationally with a total potential online viewership of 825 million. The Biennial continued to innovate in terms of their digital offer, introducing a live-action game that utilised social media, expanding their repertoire of ways of making the exhibition accessible to new audiences.

Each of the communications activities undertaken during the year was aimed at either increasing audiences or increasing individual’s engagement with contemporary art.

- To support continued website development, Juice Digital created, and Alister Beech implemented a multi-stranded social media campaign. The website was revamped to improve the visibility of the mission and critical debate
- A number of tools and techniques were implemented to increase the Biennial’s online profile and drive traffic to the website. Additional tools to allow online sales, ticketing and relationship management were begun
- The marketing strategy was developed in collaboration with a range of agencies and groups: partners included the Northwest Regional Development Agency, All About Audiences, Visual Arts in Liverpool (VAiL) associates, and Liverpool Art Regeneration Campaign (LARC)

- The 2010 Festival campaign was developed and implemented in association with creative agency Thoughtful; artist Carlos Amoraless' concept was widely recognised as outstanding. The campaign built the profile of Touched using guerrilla marketing as well as more traditional tools

**2012**

Marketing cost £165,001 at the end of 31 March 2011, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £301,592 – totalling £466,593.

Marketing cost £52,100 at the end of 31 March 2012, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £16,802 – totalling £68,902.

Marketing cost £304,077 at the end of 31 March 2013, other costs relating to restricted funds in marketing cost £25,800 – totalling £329877.

Marketing and communications were recognised during the year for the 2010 campaign. The campaign was shortlisted for Best Marketing Campaign at The Mersey Partnership Awards and the Northern Marketing Awards. The Festival was shortlisted for Best Tourism Event at The Mersey Partnership awards.

Looking at the marketing channels, 2012 saw extremely strong recall of the Biennial website, being mentioned by 26% of all respondents. Other significant drivers seem to have been a word of mouth recommendation (16%), the Biennial guidebook (11%) and a feature in a newspaper or magazine (6%). In terms of other electronic channels, although the Biennial saw Facebook mentioned by 5%, given the significant level of visitors from further afield, the influence of visitliverpool.com was perhaps lower than might be expected (6%).

Although the previous paragraph presented an overview of marketing influences, if you want to understand the impact of marketing, it is of more use to show what the key influences were for those indicating the Biennial was their main reason for visiting Liverpool. Thus, below shows which channels generated visits not just to Biennial installations, but also the city itself.

- Liverpool Biennial Website 42.9%
- Liverpool Biennial guidebook 17.0%
- Featured in a newspaper / magazine 9.6%
- Facebook 6.7%
- VisitLiverpool.com 3.9%
- Liverpool events guide 3.9%
- Twitter 2.5%
- Liverpool Biennial Blog 2.1%
- YouTube 0.4%
- Other 47.5%

**Appendix Thirteen:  
Biennial Partnerships**

## Partnerships

As a partnership organisation, the Biennial invests considerable time and important resources into their work with other companies, charities and agencies. The Biennial Festival is based on partnerships and maintaining an active relationship with Festival partners is critical. The curatorial staff are invited to present at, and attend events, conferences and seminars across the world, and these visits help to research and commission the best possible artists to make work in the UK, as well as leading to invaluable financial support. As well as working alongside partner organisations under the Biennial Festival umbrella (Tate, Bluecoat, Walker, John Moores Painting Prize, New Contemporaries, and Open Eye Gallery), the Biennial is committed to working and developing a cultural infrastructure throughout the year with other organisations. To do this, the Biennial invests in local relationships and play a leadership role in several collaborative networks that are focussed on the development of Liverpool and the arts infrastructure. These collaborations include Liverpool Arts Regeneration Campaign, Visual Art in Liverpool, the Contemporary Visual Arts Network, and Culture Campus.

One of the key objectives of the 1999 Biennial was to create collaborative opportunities for venues, organisations and artists based in Liverpool, and to form partnerships to produce an event which is greater than the sum of its parts. This evolved to an objective to strengthen the arts infrastructure (buildings, funding, organisations) and profession (artists, curators, arts administrators, and networking) in Liverpool, and develop these through partnerships. The Biennial aims to 'add value' to work with other organisations as partners, to spread good practice in commissioning good art. The Biennial's ambition should be that those organisations eventually develop the capacity to commission good new art for themselves without the Biennial's support (leaving the Biennial free to develop new partnerships). As a 'partner' organisation without a public building (without doors), the Biennial differs from all those organisations whose aim is to bring more members of the public through their doors. The Biennial's ability to operate in future (also as a Festival organisation) depends on the health of arts and community organisations throughout the city region. Ultimately, the Biennial wanted their own staff not to be working with individual members of the public, but only through the commissioning of artworks through other organisations.

These partnerships resulted in the success of a number of initiatives and strengthened the infrastructure of cultural partnerships within Merseyside. Sharon Pauger (the Lifelong Learning and Inclusion Co-ordinator) established two new groups (as a result of the evaluation following 2002) in order to facilitate planning and negotiate ownership of delivery. The community Network Group was set up in June 2003, including representatives from AIR, LHAT, NWDAF and Media Station. The advisory group contributed to planning the community-based projects for the education programme. The Education Network Group was set up in December 2003, with the active support of Liverpool Community College. Using funds from the Regional Arts Lottery, the project WILD! was set up before 2002. The project continued as a partnership with FACT Centre, Static and Bluecoat, and developed with three focus groups (people with learning difficulties, artists, and young people).

The Liverpool Biennial consistently develop new projects and programmes before giving them to the most appropriate organisation, or group to take over. This way they instigate

and nurture exciting opportunities and give support and guidance for the project leaders. This way the projects go to the most qualified organisations or groups who can fulfil the projects. This is partly due to financial matters and time restraints as the Biennial does not have the resources to manage these programmes after their initial involvement. This works as it gives new, and other groups the opportunity to develop the ideas build up their organisations reputations and professional ability to complete projects. For the 2008 European Capital of Culture, a number of new cultural entities arose within Liverpool. Throughout the year, the Biennial continued to add value to the city's arts infrastructure through collaboration and leadership within strategic partnerships, these included:

### **LARC (Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium)**

The Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium (LARC) was established in 2007 to foster a new approach to arts in the city. LARC played a significant part in shaping the success of the European Year of Culture as a whole, and senior staff played a significant role in this forum. Using funds derived from the Arts Council's 'Thrive not Survive' national organisational development initiative. The Biennial work with LARC associates on Creative Apprenticeships, the 'Long Night,' and advocacy and audience development initiatives. Liverpool has one of the greatest concentrations of major cultural institutions in the UK outside of London. Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium is an alliance of eight of the city's major cultural organisations and was set up to play a leading role in helping regenerate Merseyside. The seven-member organisations are Liverpool Biennial, FACT, Liverpool Everyman and Playhouse, Royal Liverpool Philharmonic, Tate Liverpool, the Bluecoat, and Unity Theatre. The city also has a large number of dynamic smaller arts organisations, many working closely with communities in the most deprived areas of Merseyside. There is therefore a lively and dynamic creative industries sector, and the eight LARC organisations shared a fundamental belief in using the power of art and culture to change lives far beyond the confines of galleries, museums, theatres and concert halls.

Making the case for support of the arts in Liverpool can only be undertaken through thorough research, evaluations, and appropriate advocacy. It built on this foundation by undertaking robust research on economic and intrinsic impact studies, considering ways to enhance the existing collaborative infrastructure within Liverpool. The LARC organisations considered that regeneration is achieved through realising the creativity and aspirations of the people of Merseyside. They aim to enable people of all ages to fulfil their own potential and to play a full role in the social and economic renewal of the City region. Specifically, LARC aimed to:

- Position itself to have key influence within regeneration agencies and partnerships and within key public services, in order to establish a clear understanding of the role that cultural organisations can play in enhancing the delivery of everything from education and health, to planning and community development
- Research new opportunities for regeneration through arts and culture, working in partnership with key agencies and with the community and voluntary sectors
- Give people the skills needed to lead, administer and sustain the future development of Merseyside's arts and cultural industry
- Take a leading role in projects to regenerate parts of Liverpool that are still experiencing many challenges and high levels of deprivation

- Work together to give both visitors and local people the best possible experience when they take part in the cultural life of the city
- Gain new investment for arts and culture

Liverpool Biennial senior staff have played active roles within LARC: there are communications, programme, operations, human resources and other subgroups which met regularly. Collaborative activity has emerged as an important concept on the national political stage, and it is important on both practical and political levels for the Biennial to continue to work productively and generatively with LARC. This collaborative action delivers a host of operational, and programme benefits and helps fulfil their aim of improving the arts infrastructure.

### **Thrive!**

The eight leading cultural institutions in Liverpool established a unique, collaborative partnership to ensure that they played a key role in the regeneration of Merseyside. This group was established in 2007 and grew in influence as the contribution of the arts and heritage to the city's future developed. The mission of Arts Council England's Thrive! Programme was to provide a systematic approach to developing organisational performance in order to build capacity to respond to and influence a rapidly changing environment. It supported a number of organisations across England, including several consortia. The Liverpool Thrive! Project was offered one of the largest awards within the scheme, of £1.34 million. The Thrive programme allowed partners to review the mechanisms for cascading information within the sector and there have been joint programming meetings between LARC and COoL (Creative Organisations of Liverpool).

The Thrive programme boosted cross sector working, with the result that expertise of non-LARC organisations in terms of connecting with communities was maximised and shared. The work supported to building the capacity of community organisations in North Liverpool to engage with culture is perceived as one of the successes of the programme. The programme and continued LARC work have been able to provide support for collaborative audience development and marketing activities. LARC partners worked collaboratively to, in particular, develop a shared approach to family friendly programming and marketing. The Thrive! Programme came to an end in 2012, but LARC continues to work for the benefit of its core aims within Merseyside. Developing new audiences and increasing the quality of participation for existing audiences remains a major priority for LARC and will work to secure the longer-term engagement of people who attend the arts for the first time, encouraging them to return for other events. LARC continues to work on improving ease of access for current and potential audiences and to encourage audience to try a wider range of venues and art forms.

### **COoL (Creative Organisations of Liverpool)**

COoL is a collective of thirty-one key arts organisations in the Liverpool City Region) and other cross-group meeting attendance to develop mentoring schemes, and the development training for emerging leaders. It is the leading cultural partnership model of its kind in the UK. Their members create exciting art in many forms, including visual arts,

theatre, film, dance, comedy, music, literature, multimedia, craft, design, and festival production. COoL play a pivotal role in promoting the cultural offer of the Liverpool City Region by championing inclusivity, diversity, participation, and collaborative working practices COoL:

- Creates arts partnerships locally, nationally, and internationally
- Encourages pioneering artistic practices
- Passionately promotes access, diversity, and inclusion
- Actively lobbies and advocates for the arts

To achieve this, their members actively collaborate across four subgroups to drive forward our collective activities. These subgroups are marketing and advocacy, development, CPD skills and resources, and Festival Forum. COoL also facilitates collaborative projects that bring together the strengths of member organisations to create new exciting opportunities and work packages.

Economic Impact:

- COoL contributes at least £8 million to the Liverpool City Region economy every year

Participation:

- COoL members' activities have a collective audience of over 3 million people annually

Employment:

- Every year COoL creates over 1,000 full-time, part-time, freelance, and volunteer opportunities within the Liverpool City Region

Creating:

- Over 800 newly commissioned artistic projects and 4,000 events each year with work winning awards and critical acclaim worldwide

COoL places emphasis on developing new regional, national, and international partnerships in order to strengthen the resilience of small-to-medium cultural organisations and the sector.

### **Chrysalis Arts Development**

Chrysalis Arts was founded by Rick Faulkner and Kate Maddison in Cheshire in 1985. The company moved to North Yorkshire in 1988. Christine Keogh became a Co-Director in 1998. Chrysalis Arts Development addresses the need for excellent art and for high quality support for talent development across a challenging geographical area. They believe that artists can transform places and invigorate communities both through the work they make and through their contribution to the wider social and economic infrastructure.

Central to their work is a commitment to environmentally responsible arts practice and to supporting artists and audiences to develop new skills and knowledge so that they may engage with the cultural and environmental context in which we live.

In 2006, Liverpool Biennial Festival of Contemporary Art in partnership with Liverpool Housing Action Trust, invited Chrysalis Arts to develop a 'live' public art training project for artists from Merseyside and the North West. The project enabled six artists to undertake paid placements with Chrysalis Arts, combining a collaborative team approach with

mentoring support. The main outcome of this 'live' training process was the opportunity the placement artists had to engage with local residents in the creation of temporary public art installations at four Liverpool Housing Action Trust sites. Lead Artists were Rick Faulkner and Leif Strengell, a Finnish artist and lecturer with whom Chrysalis has collaborated on many occasions.

'The lead artists gave every opportunity for us to contribute; we were constantly encouraged to take the initiative, to explore and experiment but gently pulled back into the fold when necessary.' Susan Leask

'The project proved a tremendous success, achieving far beyond our expectations; the quantity and quality of work produced in such short space of time was inspiring' Paul Kelly, Community Development Manager, Liverpool Housing Action Trust

'I was delighted with the final installations. The work reflected the environments with great understanding.' Education and Access Co-ordinator, Liverpool Biennial

### **Training for Real**

The concept of Training for Real was developed over a series of projects which offered the artists who were selected the opportunity of undertaking a paid commission whilst being supported by members of Chrysalis and other mentors through each stage of the creative process, from inception to installation and presentation. This programme was developed collaboratively by Rick Faulkner, Christine Keogh and Kate Maddison and predominantly focused on temporary installations in public spaces.

### **Culture Campus**

Originally conceived in 2003 (after the Biennials research into art graduate retention within the city 2002) as a visual-arts led postgraduate 'campus' to address the issue of graduate retention in the City (the lack of a vibrant post-graduate culture in Liverpool has previously been identified as the single factor most damaging to development of the visual arts infrastructure). Culture Campus continued to consolidate its position in relation to the Universities and found an expanded role as the interface between all the LARC organisations (not just visual arts) and the HEIs. Culture Campus provides opportunities for undergraduates, postgraduates and cultural industries focused research. They develop ideas, talent, production and post-production development, with resources shared in common by capturing and archiving the work of international artists when they are in Liverpool. Culture Campus will work with Higher education providers, cultural organisations and private sector businesses to develop a firmer framework for internship, research, and work placements, driving up the quality of these valuable experiences and increasing professional development opportunities for cultural management and leadership. It enables networking and relationship building, increasing the accessibility of opportunities and information to those wishing to build careers or businesses in the creative and cultural industries. Lewis Biggs resigned as Chairman of the company in January 2009, but the Biennial remains a key partner and leader of the initiative. It is a partnership bringing together the University of Liverpool, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool Biennial, FACT, and Tate Liverpool.

**VAiL (Visual Arts in Liverpool)**

Senior Biennial staff (Paul Smith replaced Lewis Biggs) continued their leadership of the Visual Arts in Liverpool advocacy campaign (initiated early in 2007), which added value to the work of all the visual arts organisations through promoting and articulating the city's programme as a whole.

The campaign aims to make Liverpool the 'first to mind' city in the UK after London for the visual arts. The initiative is a natural extension of the visual arts partnership represented by the Festival and contributes to the Biennials aim of strengthening the visual arts infrastructure and developing audiences. VAiL is a part of the ACE National Turning Point Network and Biennial directors have been asked on several occasions to represent VAiL to the national network.

**European Biennial Network**

The European Biennial Network is a collaborative structure for the Biennials of Liverpool, Athens, Berlin, Lyon and Istanbul. It aims to promote dialogue, interaction and collaboration between these contemporary art biennials in Europe. It intends to use the knowledge, experience and wealth of information accumulated by organisers of large-scale periodic art events, in order to support the communication and mobility of artists and art professionals. The Biennial created a map out of the unique aspects of each event and extend collaborative possibilities. In 2008 the Liverpool Biennial hosted a meeting of the Network and a public discussion about biennials during the Festival opening weekend.

**European Capital of Culture ECoC**

The ECoC jurors cited the Biennial as being an important factor in Liverpool's favour (proof that it could deliver an international Festival). Domela goes on to explain 'in relation to the Biennial? Well, it's difficult to prize apart now as there was Capital of Culture and the Biennial was very instrumental in, or if not, key to getting that title to begin with as the jury came in 2002 to like really liked the engagement of the Biennial that really brought engagement of artists across the city. But also attracted the audience to other elements of the Biennial and it sort of became a blueprint for how they would imagine that year to be (2008).'

**Liverpool Vision**

Liverpool Vision is the city's economic development company which integrates economic development and business and enterprise support designed to accelerate the city's growth and build a sustainable economy. Liverpool Vision has played a pivotal role in co-ordinating the delivery of the city's economic and physical renaissance over the last decade working within the strategic leadership of the City Council and the Mayor of Liverpool. As the city's business facing company our primary focus is showcasing Liverpool's opportunities in international markets, maintaining our position as a cultural capital and maintaining the conditions in which the private sector can create a dynamic and innovative economy

### **Friends of Everton Park**

'Developing Everton Park into a place of beauty, history, ecological interest, health and wellbeing, education, arts and culture, sports and fitness, cultivation and social and employment opportunity - for generations to come.' The idea of a wheel park within Everton Park was initiated by the Friends of Everton Park in September 2012 when a working group was established to bring the project to fruition. The group has continued to meet regularly since then to guide the project. Events in the Park are core business for the Friends who are nearing the end of their 2014 programme which will have supported or delivered a total of nineteen separate events within the Park since May this year, attracting thousands of residents and visitors. The whole regeneration and development of Everton Park is scheduled for completion in 2025. <http://www.friendsofevertonpark.org>

### **The Land Trust**

The Land Trust is a not for profit organisation that provides a cost-effective management solution for open space and green infrastructure. This land can deliver significant community benefits, improving health, social cohesion, providing an educational resource and uplifting the local economy. The aim of the Trust is to provide long-term sustainable management of open spaces across the country. We have around 2,000 hectares of land in our portfolio and a strong balance sheet to provide financial stability. Our open spaces are a crucial part of the social landscape, delivering a range of significant benefits for residents and businesses. Safe and accessible open space allows communities to come together and individuals to develop and relax through physical activity and recreation. Well designed and maintained open spaces are outdoor classrooms, gyms and theatres. They change lifestyles and improve health and well-being, so we take them seriously. The proposed works received formal authorisation for capital expenditure via cabinet authority (18 July 2014) and revenue support for maintenance was allocated in future Community Services budgets. <http://www.thelandtrust.org.uk>

### **New Contemporaries**

New Contemporaries is an organisation in the UK that works to support emerging artists at the beginning of their careers by introducing them to the visual arts sector and to the public through a variety of platforms, including an annual exhibition. Artists, whether still studying or having recently graduated, are given opportunities to make contacts and gain professional experience outside of their educational institutions. For the annual exhibition, artists are invited to submit a portfolio of work, from which a selection is made by a panel of judges. The selection is made by artists and writers, and often the selector will have previously been exhibited in a New Contemporaries show.

An annual exhibition for the final selection of New Contemporaries is staged in a leading UK arts venue; New Contemporaries has exhibited as part of the Liverpool Biennial since its launch in 1999. The importance of regional impartiality is recognised in the anonymity of the contributor's school, age, and nationality during the selection process and by the annual exhibition having no fixed location. A catalogue is printed to accompany the exhibition each year.

### **John Moores Painting Prize**

The John Moores Painting Prize is a biennial award to the best contemporary painting, submission is open to the public. The prize is named for Sir John Moores, noted philanthropist, who established the award in 1957. The winning work and short-listed pieces are exhibited at the Walker Art Gallery as part of the Liverpool Biennial Festival since 1999. As a well-established feature on the art scene, the Biennial presented the organisers of John Moores 21 with a fresh context for marketing and audience development, and a chance to review its function as part of a larger event. The new chapter in the history of the competition, and related exhibition was signified by the increase in the value of the prize (to £25,000) and saw the largest number of entries (2,100) for over a decade. The partnership created an increase in the number of visitors to John Moores 21 to 27,648 compared with 24,741 to the John Moores 20. The Prize has been one of the most popular and visited parts of the Biennial Festival.

### **Independents Biennial**

Tracey was the original iteration of the Independents (becoming the Independents in 2002) and was the fourth element of the Liverpool Biennial 1999 (TRACE) and was a series of independent exhibitions and events happening all over Liverpool with over 80 projects involving artists on a local, national and international level. The organisation of an autonomous fourth dimension of the 1999 Biennial reflected the view shared by James Moores, Liverpool City Council and North West Arts Board (joint funders of Tracey) that the three 'official' elements offered insufficient opportunities for Liverpool-based artists to participate in the biggest contemporary visual arts event ever held in Liverpool. Rees Leahy (2000) explained that if the Biennial could tap into the energy of the city's artists, then the encounter could be mutually beneficial. The result, Tracey, was much larger than anyone, including its organisers, had anticipated and, on balance, was the part of the Biennial that attracted the most positive response among contributors (pp.30-1).

The Independents was an eclectic mix of exhibitions, live art, performance and interventions initiated by artists across the North West, which emerge from galleries into the wider public domain to occupy streets, markets, shops, bars, churches and other historic buildings. The Independents were proud to create as a high quality, diverse, inclusive, and accessible contemporary arts 'fringe festival' that achieves a complementary presentation of the work of independent artists and curators within the context of an international festival of contemporary art.

### **Bluecoat**

The Bluecoat is a multi-art form arts centre presenting a programme of visual arts, performance, literature, and live arts throughout a number of spaces in the building. The building is Grade 1 listed and recently underwent a £12.5 million refurbishment programme including building a new wing of galleries. The refurbished Bluecoat was re-opened in March 2008. The Bluecoat has been in continuous use as an artists' space since 1907 when as an unused former Bluecoat School building, it was occupied by the Sandon Group of artists.

The building houses twenty-six artist studios and office spaces and hosts a range of arts organisations, creative businesses and individual artists – including two studios for international and graduate residencies and a Print Studio. There is good outdoor space with a garden, a courtyard and a small internal garden.

### **FACT (The Foundation for Art and Creative Technology)**

FACT was established in 1989 (formerly as Merseyside Moviola) and was based at The Bluecoat until the move to their new building in 2003. The FACT building, designed by local architects, Austin Smith Lord, was the first purpose-built arts venue to be built in the city since the new Philharmonic Hall opened in 1939. FACT is a leading UK video, film and new media arts organisation and curated exhibitions, education and research projects. The organisation aims to pioneer new forms of artistic and social interaction with individuals and communities. FACT runs a regular research programme in partnership with Liverpool John Moores University including a series of collaborative PhD studentships.

FACT has a long-standing relationship with Arena Housing, jointly running a community engagement programme, TenantSpin, as well as education linkages through its schools and learning programmes. FACT has a research relationship with Liverpool John Moores University and hosts collaborative PhD studentships with the university.

### **Open Eye Gallery**

Launched in 1977, Liverpool's Open Eye Gallery was one of the UK's first dedicated photography galleries. Excluded from the programmes of art galleries, photographers and others with an interest in the medium established their own network of galleries in the 1970s and '80s, drawing on newly available funds from the Arts Council and a growing sense of photography's artistic, social and political potential.

Open Eye Gallery emerged as part of an organisation called the Merseyside Visual Communications Unit (MCVU), whose mission was to "make more people aware of the many positive ways in which film, photography, video and sound recording can be used in a social, cultural and educative context". Whilst MCVU was located in the former Grapes Hotel, on the corner of Whitechapel and Hood Street in central Liverpool, Open Eye Gallery occupied what had been the public bar from 1977 - 1988. The building's upper floors housed facilities for media training and production, including film and video editing suites, darkrooms and recording studios.

Founded by Colin Wilkinson, Open Eye Gallery's early days were a heady mix of art and activism. Alongside its exhibitions programme Open Eye Gallery published a magazine, ran workshops and training courses, hired out equipment, screened films, commissioned photographic, performance and moving image works, and organised campaigns and community projects.

Based in its Whitechapel location until 1988, Open Eye Gallery was one of the city's creative and social hubs. It had the city's main bus station on its doorstep, a popular cafe next door and the radical bookshop News From Nowhere (now on Bold Street) as a close neighbour. The gallery exhibited national touring exhibitions by established photographers and showcased the work of up-and-coming photographers based in the region. The emphasis was on UK artists with regular shows by European and American photographers.

Independent documentary and art photography appeared alongside community projects and exhibitions that explored photography's role in contemporary culture.

#### **Bold Street: 1989-1995**

In 1989, due to the building's increasing dilapidation, Open Eye Gallery moved to 110 - 112 Bold Street, forming an umbrella organisation with the Women's Independent Cinema House (WICH), Community Productions Merseyside (CPM) and the Community Arts Trust (CAT). Open Eye Gallery remained on Bold Street until 1995, placing greater emphasis in its programmes on documentary work and local artists.

#### **Wood Street: 1996-2011**

In June 1995, grappling with funding, premises and organisational problems, Open Eye Gallery left Bold Street and moved to the developing Concert Square area of Liverpool's Ropewalks. In November 1996 the Gallery was re-launched in an architect-designed space on Wood Street as 'Open Eye Photographic and Media Arts'. A stronger element of moving image work was introduced into exhibitions, but a diverse photography-based programme was maintained. From 2004 Open Eye Gallery's increasingly international programme combined work by emerging and established artists, frequently presenting UK debut exhibitions. In mid-2009 Open Eye Gallery entered the main phase of a major capital relocation project, maintaining an interim programme of partnership exhibitions and pilot projects.

#### **Mann Island: 2011-Present**

In November 2011 the Gallery moved to new premises in Mann Island. A step change in audience focused exhibitions and growing relationships with local, national and international partners has ensured by 2016, the gallery attracted a 500% increase in visitors as compared to the former Wood Street gallery. Located on the Liverpool Waterfront the Gallery is near RIBA North, the Museum of Liverpool, Tate Liverpool and the Albert Dock.

### **Metal**

Metal was founded in London in 2002 by Jude Kelly CBE, working with current Artistic Director, Colette Bailey since inception. Metal have been active in Liverpool since 2004, in Southend-on-Sea since 2007 and in Peterborough since 2012. In each place, they work from buildings of historic significance that we have transformed from empty or derelict spaces into vibrant cultural community hubs.

Metal work out of Edge Hill Station, the world's oldest active passenger railway station. Metal completed a major renovation of the previously empty, historic buildings in 2009. The original 1836 Engine House, Boiler Room and Accumulator Tower now serve as a cultural and creative hub for artists, the neighbourhood and Merseyside, carrying on the building's proud history of innovation, aspiration and technology. They curate an exciting programme of international and UK artists in residence, host week-long, residential talent development labs for artists from mixed disciplines and run a wide range of events, exhibitions and participatory projects that connect artists to audiences and audiences to artists.

Metal believes that artists can affect change in our society, and to this end Metal Liverpool acts as a catalyst for art and artists to create innovative societal change. It is their goal to bring creative imagination and ideas to the neighbourhoods of Edge Hill, Kensington, Wavertree and Toxteth, creating a positive impact for the people living there.

Metal produces an exciting programme of international / UK artists in residence, artist development labs, eclectic dinners, plus a wide range of social events, education programmes and creative projects, all designed to encourage the participation of local people and communities.

### **North West Disability Arts Forum (NWDAF) / DaDaFest**

DaDaFest was founded as Arts Integrated Merseyside (or AIM) as a part of the Shape Arts network in 1984. AIM was integral to the early campaign for greater equality and access for disabled people but was not disability led.

With John McGrath as its Development Officer, the organisation became one of the UK's first disability control-led arts forums after it broke away from the Shape Network and set itself up as North West Disability Arts Forum (NWDAF) in 1986. It was formally constituted in 1990, with Mandy Colleran becoming its director. Ruth Gould was appointed as the Creative Director of the NWDAF in 2001, she is now the Chief Executive Officer of DaDaFest. Whilst working for the NWDAF in 2001, she was asked to create something for *International Disabled People's Day*, but she claimed that 'one day was not enough' and set about producing a festival with the help of a steering group. The result of this was the first DaDaFest in December 2001 and the subsequent change of 'DaDaFest' as a one off festival into its own brand. The organisation eventually rebranded itself to 'DaDa - Disability and Deaf Arts' in 2008 and again to 'DaDaFest' in 2012.

DaDaFest is a disability arts organisation based in Liverpool, UK. It delivers an international, biennial festival and organises other events to promote disability and deaf arts from a variety of cultural perspectives. Alongside the festival and events, DaDaFest organises opportunities for disabled and deaf people to gain access to the arts. This includes training and a youth focused programme.

DaDaFest is funded by Arts Council England and Liverpool City Council as well as other private and public sector partners. DaDaFest delivered its first international festival in 2001 and continued to put on yearly festivals until 2010 when it became a biennial. The festival has since taken place in 2012 and 2014 (8 November 2014 - 11 January 2015).

### **STATIC (2002)**

STATIC is an architectural, model-making and arts organisation. It has been running since 1999. In 2002, it was awarded redevelopment funding from North West Arts Board and an SRB6 grant (a local government initiative to assist redevelopment and regeneration) from the local council. The arts organisation was further subsidised by the architectural and model-making business.

In its short life span, STATIC managed to build a solid reputation in the City, and managed to secure partnerships with John Moores University, the Liverpool Biennale, and the Young Contemporaries amongst others.

STATIC secured funds for a collaborative fellowship, to be launched in partnership with John Moores University, which supported the practice of one or two recent graduates. The residents were offered a free studio and a small bursary for twelve months. The

organisation was also instrumental in assisting the development of the student art group, Artworks. The organisation also launched an online and off-line publication which was a vehicle for critical debate about culture in the City.

The organisation is founded on a commercial / partnership and committed to merge various forms of practice bringing for example, art, and architecture together. STATIC was also in development with Riverside Housing Trust regarding a low cost housing project that would insist on the integration of artists who would be responsible for programming a series of art projects and events within the complex. There would be an allocation of low-cost live / workspace.

### **Basement**

This organisation was run by two artists, Sue Leask and Margareth Schoning with a focus on facilitating exchange between artists working internationally and in Liverpool. Basement managed to bring artists from Russia, Madrid and Ireland to the city and organise exhibitions of their work. The organisation worked with alternative spaces and received money project and scheme funds from the NWA.

Basement was committed and has been successful in bringing international artists to Liverpool and allowed artists from Liverpool to travel abroad. As Basement was initiated and run by artists, the organisation demonstrated that ingenuity and commitment can result in long-term benefits for local artists and recent graduates.

### **All Horizons Club, Black Diamond and White Diamond**

Duncan Hamilton ran all three of these and they all had similar remits as they organised a number of cultural events focusing on everything from music to the arts for the public and private sector. The projects existed in alternative venues around the city and the organisation received projects and schemes funds from the NWAB.

The organisation showed the potential of multi-tasking and how inventive artists, and curators could be. For example, The Horizon Club and its many manifestations managed to illustrate the diversity of practice in the North West. But like many emerging arts organisations All Horizon Club lacked funding and business support to develop further as it lacked the skills and resources to develop long-term strategies.

### **Parking Space**

Lucienne Cole a graduate of LJMU, had directed this organisation for the previous eight years. Parking Space managed to secure and manage a number of alternative spaces in the City centre and had held over fifty exhibitions with local and international artists. In 2002 they worked without a permanent venue and had focused on commissioning and programming exhibitions. The organisation received money from the NWAB through their projects and schemes fund.

Parking Space was respected for its innovative programme and commitment to local artists and the organisation had a successful history for sourcing and securing alternative spaces in the City centre. The organisation also showed the potential of multi-tasking and how

inventive artists, and curators could be. Parking Space was in need of some professional development and business support to assist in developing and nurturing the organisation as much of their resources in the past had been used for securing buildings and launching new ventures and they lacked the skills and resources to develop a long-term strategy.

### **Jumpshiprat**

Cat McCafferty, Myriam Tahir, and Ben Parry initially set up a gallery space in Glasgow in 1998, moving to Liverpool in 2001. They opened Jumpshiprat in July of that year. They supported emerging local talent with a strong emphasis on music, performance, and the visual arts. Initially they received seed money from the Liverpool City Council, and the PH Holt Trust, and they received money from the foundation and the NWAB through their projects and schemes fund.

The artists working as Jumpshiprat chose to move from Glasgow to Liverpool because they felt the city was burgeoning. They managed their short time in the City to take advantage of the regeneration plans for the City and launch a space that attracts many young graduates.

The organisation highlighted the work of recent graduates and students in various exhibitions. They demonstrated a strong commitment to young artists working and living in the City and offer a space where young artists could 'try' out their ideas. Like many emerging arts organisations the organisation lacked funding and business support to develop further and lacked the skills and resources to develop long-term strategy.

### **Hub Collective**

Benjamin Lloyd, Danny May, John Merrill, and Tricky Lowe formed the Hub collective in 1996. They managed to generate work as sculptors, and interior designers and managed to secure individual educational and art projects for themselves through a series of negotiations with local businesses, art organisations and educational institutions. As a group and independently they managed to secure funds through Arts Cultural Industries Development Fund, Princes Trust – Business Mentor Scheme, Riverside Housing Trust and ACME.

The group of artists demonstrated real ingenuity in securing funds from a diverse range of trusts, funding bodies and sponsors. They demonstrated how artists could work within the commercial sector by successfully managing projects as interior designers, landscape architects etc., and they found ways of working most productively in the 'education' sector on many outreach projects.

### **Riverside Housing Trust**

Riverside Housing Trust is one of the largest housing associations in Britain and owns or managed 24,000 properties from Merseyside to the east Midlands in 2002 and have a staff of 500 and annual turnover of £54 million. They work in partnership with more than one-hundred other organisations including some of the biggest names in the public, voluntary, and private sectors.

**Liverpool Housing Action Trust (LHAT)**

Liverpool HAT was a short life government-sponsored body that was established under the 1988 Housing Act. Its main task was to redevelop and improve the high-rise blocks and improve the environment, social, and economic conditions in the area before it finished in March 2005. It would spend more than £200 million over its lifetime (about £20 million per year) on development and regeneration.

The Liverpool Housing Action Trust was a key regeneration agency which placed cultural practice at the heart of infrastructure and environment development. As an organisation primarily dedicated to enfranchising local people's desire for high-quality affordable housing within the city's boundaries, the LHAT was firmly committed to challenging common preconceptions by the way in which 'culture' can be offered to local people and visitors to the city.

The Liverpool Housing Art Trust had set a precedent of working with artists and particularly working closely with FACT. But, although working closely with FACT on a number of new projects, there was no clear long-term commitment from the housing association on how to strengthen and build on its many successful partnerships.

The Liverpool Housing Action Trust appointed Modus Operandi Art Consultants in May 2000 to research and write a Public Art Strategy for the benefit of its residents and the broader public of Liverpool. The purpose of the Strategy was two-fold:

- Research and recommend sites, artists, and budgets for three principal commissioning opportunities
- Write public art commissioning guidelines and recommendations for the LHAT as a whole

The strategy was informed by consultation with a number of key organisations and individuals, including LHAT residents, officers, architects, Liverpool City Council, arts organisations, and potential funding bodies. The recommendations in the strategy were ratified at a LHAT Board meeting in December 2000. The key recommendations included the implementation of major permanent and temporary public art commissions and a 'Percent for Art' Policy whereby a target of at least 1% of agreed capital cost for new build, refurbishment, landscape and demolition expenditure was earmarked for artists' involvement.

**Merseyside ACME**

Merseyside ACME is an economic development agency designed to stimulate growth in the creative industries in the region. They played a crucial role in developing the creative industries in the region. Firstly, to encourage the development of specific organisations and initiatives in the cultural industries, and secondly to make a significant impact upon the policies of a range of existing and emerging agencies and to and to influence thinking about the importance of the creative industries as a potential driver for social and economic development.

Merseyside ACME was dedicated to increasing training and developing new opportunities for those working in the creative industries locally and within the region. At that time (2002) they were interested in expanding their scope to also benefit local artists but had a lack of commitment and focus on fine art, and fine art sector.

---

<sup>i</sup> Rees Leahy, H (2000) Liverpool Biennial of Contemporary Art 1999: Evaluation Report. Liverpool: North West Art Board

<sup>ii</sup> Florida, R. L (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class: and How it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books