Author: **Jonathan Vickery**, Centre for Cultural and Media Policy Studies, School of Creative Arts, Performance and Visual Cultures, Faculty of Arts, University of Warwick.

Please note: this paper is an expansion of a script of the above presentation, which was conducted with a series of images on a PowerPoint presentation (which cannot be reproduced here for reasons of copyright).

In Memoriam Craig Spivey (1971-2024)

'Big Dilemmas and New Thinking in Local Cultural Policies'

Addressing this conference theme, I will offer a general overview of some of the local cultural policy innovations in the UK, along with more detailed case-based discussion on my university city of Coventry. I will not, in this paper, discuss methodology, even though this is implied by my approach and my empirical case and discourse-based observations on the status and complexion of 'policy knowledge'. Obviously, the role of research in local or place-based policymaking is of interest to all of us, and by implication so is the role of culture itself as a knowledge-generating activity. My focus, however, is on the immediate impact and implications of research-informed policymaking, largely generated by university partnership with a municipal authority. My research question is a methodological one, however: *why should knowledge production be at the centre of local cultural policymaking?*

Introduction: *the local*

A modish but significant policy term in the UK is 'hyper-local', which has a conceptual history of targeted and focussed concerns now applied to the urban landscape and indicating a policy desire for 'local knowledge' (or the kinds of knowledge of a place only common to the people who live there). However, *the local* is never a defined unit, like 'the national' – it is more like 'the international', as a dynamic series of relations, permeated by its opposite. It is both a political (or government) and social category, and not a stable 'object' of policy without prior qualification. Historically, of course, the local ceased to be a substantive category with the advent of industrial modernity, the collapse of organic or traditional community, the dissolution of Parish-based culture, the appearance of TV, foreign travel, mass immigration, the internet, and so on and on.

My first point is a simple one: the 'local' is a complex of many determinations, and shaped by many forces, and so substantive, specific, knowledge is surely the first priority of local cultural policies. In my city of Oxford, the local is largely defined by the University, in the sense that the city's historicity is embedded in the creation of territorial boundaries in land ownership. The University of Warwick is just outside the city limits of Coventry in the West Midlands (60 miles NW of Oxford), and I would say

whose 'locales' are defined more by the people – *social class, ethnicity, religion.* But, this will depends on whom it is that is doing the 'defining', and for what purpose. Cultural policy often use political boundaries, cultural strategy often uses cartographical-planning boundaries, but the framing mechanism for mission and cultural visionioning would be different than for programming or public engagement (the latter looking for the 'social' identity or make up of a place). Then, in the UK more generally, we have a strong (if often ignored) cultural policy ambiguity with regard the 'rural-urban' dichotomy. The 'rural local' is not much of a cultural policy category, but is arguably a substantive social one, if poverty statistics are of significance. The 'rural local' is certainly a political category, indicating a more uniform disposition towards embedded tradition, heritage and the symbolic language of the nation state, as well as 'nature, horticulture and agriculture', obviously.

Part 1: *Europe, Policy thinking and UK devolution*

It's an historical truism that local cultural policies historically precede the national – the quadrennial Olympic Games are a regular reminder that what we now call 'event-based culture' represents the most ancient cultural policy, and one which was almost always local (city or place-based). And colonialism, of course, mediated all kinds of cultural policy, from the promotion of imperial authority to missionaries and the globalisation of church institutions, and the more explicit policy-based colonial management of local people and their customs, elders and ways of life. Yet, the concept of cultural policy we use today is historically a European one and — my own MA in International Cultural Policy and Management is an example — one that is embedded in a narrative of Europe emerging from World War II. This is culture as nation-state building, which along with UNESCO and the new forms of internationalism that emerged with this, has defined the historic institutions around which cultural policy is, implicitly or explicitly, formed. Institutions are such a large part of a cultural budget, their priority is almost inevitable whatever other aims a cultural policy may have. Of course, European cultural policy is not one cohesive field of thought and planning, or one unified discourse, unless we now locate this within Brussels or Strasbourg, which it never was. We have Nordic, Germanic, Mediterranean, French, Anglo-Saxon established approaches to cultural policy, all formed (and deformed) by the evolution of 'public' culture and democratic governance in their political or national centres. As separate 'models' these all still exist, but are now brought together by various transnational forces, like the EU and the policy transfer and the trends we are all familiar with (like creative cities and cities of culture, contemporary heritage management, regional cultural strategies, and so on). We all now inhabit a common discourse of public government officers, arts professionals and researchers or academics, and the spread of English-speaking MA degrees have played a significant role in this, as has ENCATC, The Nordic Conference on Cultural Policy Research (NCCPR) and the ICCPR or International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (which aims to be global in scope, though remains more European).

What's important to note, however, is how pan-European and international policy institutions have shaped national and regional understandings on the role of cultural policy, and continue some features of a prior historical evolution:
—Cultural Patronage, then markets: historically, cultural policy in Europe was systems of patronage, of monarchs, regional or local courts, aristocrats, guilds, and religious institutions, all commissioned and even managed or cultivated the evolution of certain genres of art, of craft, or generally a cultural life of artists, writers, musicians, and

scholars. This is indicative of an early history of so-called 'European civilisation'. And so was the emerging markets, international, regional and local, some today benefit from Intellectual Property protections (geographic indications, or appellations).
—Welfare State Social institutions, national cultural ministries, arts councils and local arts and cultural centres: post-war 'nation building' was also the emergence of the welfare state model of the arts across Europe, building national cultural institutions as well as extending access to culture and facilitating cultural participation in non-cultural institutions (schools, universities, church alliances, unions, and others).
—The Council of Europe: founded in 1949, the transnational regional institution of the Council has been instrumental in promoting democratic and Rights-based cultural policy development and cooperation across Europe. The European Cultural Convention (adopted 1954) aimed to unify Europe's cultural diversity and heritage through a contemporary democratic cooperation.
—Since the 1950s, a rejection of both US-style capitalism and Eastern Bloc communism enabled an evolution of a hybrid but distinctively European model of 'social democracy'. This allowed for culture to emerge in 'civil society' organisations that still benefitted from State funding, and where a 'public sphere' of culture was distinctly different from, if still hugely influenced, by the USA.

Turning directly to the question of the local: in the UK, 'political devolution' is in motion, the political discourse of which takes place on two registers — the devolved national parliaments (of Scotland, particularly, which is probably the only viable 'nation' that could survive economic independence), and what is called 'local government', (which has changed over the years multiple times). 'Devolution' is another means of 'decentralisation' as calibrated to a 'localisation' of political decision making. However, it is fraught with complexity, as any new centres of power may continue to work within national policy frameworks and that the 'local' is never as coherent, cohesive or autonomous as the 'national'. The most recent developments in the UK follow from the Localism Act of 2011, where Prime Minister David Cameron's political vision of a 'Big Society' attempted to combined anachronistic notions of a 'caring' general public with a reconfigured social policy and public services within smaller geographic units of delivery. As a policy vision, it never developed, but actual political devolution has today seen large changes in the landscape of political representation and governance (albeit on a regional not just local level). Currently, a broad 'Levelling Up' agenda sees various redistributory mechanisms of funding spread around England, along with 'Devolution Deals' that award various regional or city-based (usually 'mayoral') authorities some substantive powers and resources. Within this, responsibility for culture has changed in two respects: local cultural property and assets have expanded (most where already local authority responsibility), and national agencies (like Arts Council England) have been tasked more with supporting local projects and particularly the strategy development of local authorities extending devolved competencies through culture as other areas.

The first feature of the changes in governance is simply the densification of cultural activity and funding. As a general summary, in the UK and across Europe we expect a common menu of local cultural policies and initiatives: it is good to remind ourselves on this spectrum, as we all too often take it for granted:
—Governance and management of institutions, as they form a local 'infrastructure' of provision, historical reference, and resource (usually, libraries, archives, museums, exhibition halls, theatres, opera houses, arts, cultural and community centres).

—Cultural organisations, artists, performers, cultural research and consultancy agencies, funding, grants, support, training and networking schemes.
—Programming, promoting, organising and managing local cultural events, festivals, civic, official or religious celebration, commemoration and memorialism, exhibitions and performances.
—Preserving, documenting and communicating local cultural heritage, traditions, landmarks and visitor attractions (through professional, volunteer, project or research-based conservation, education, and hospitality).
—Public, social or stakeholder engagement — access and participatory programmes, residencies, workshops and activities for citizens or visitors.
—Resident, community, membership, ethnic, religious or 'newcomer' engagement.
—Public information, discussion and debate, reporting and deliberation, political and community-based participation in research, consultancy, collaborative public and decision-making processes.
—Thematic cultural programming, such as city of culture, diversity, inclusion or social cohesion promotion, multiculturalism and sub-cultural groups, values and normative principles (peace; human rights; etc.).

I have listed these here, as they picture a huge range of policy subjects, aims, professional competencies, and the range of institutional facilities that are often regarded as 'part of the furniture' by a local public, and to a younger generation, tend to be uninteresting as compared to, say, their digital devices or screens. And yet, while this represents an interconnected spectrum of activities and organisations, it does not necessarily add up to a 'public culture': the identity of 'public', as I will note later, remains in question. Many of these areas can be supported or promoted as a matter of a 'tactical' approach to cultural policy — not necessarily a strategic supporting of a public culture. In my University city of Coventry, two very historical challenges for local cultural policies have been observed: local policy is usually just a translation of *national* policy into local – and often not even 'cultural' policy but an economic policy of culture, or a social policy delivered through culture or where culture is a contributor; and, policy itself is perceived to be a weak mechanism for facilitating change — though this reflects perceptions on the effectiveness of the institutions or agencies of governance.

I will be focussing on a case — the city of Coventry's recent innovations in research-led policy thinking. This has taken place against a backdrop of the appearance of a new regional ('devolved') regional governance — this is the 'West Midlands Combined Authority'. While in the Appendix I include a register of most of the city's arts organisations, I do not attempt to represent the whole of the city's culture. Many cultural developments have emerged through either 'cultural entrepreneurship' (such as the Coventry Biennale, set up and run by a number of committed artists) or even private business (for example, Fargo Village, which looks like an 'alternative' DIY creative urban culture, but is a initiative of a local property developer).

Much has changed since the Covid pandemic (obviously) — in social behaviour, consumer habits, and even politics, religion or beliefs. Yet, as Europeans, there remains a profoundly historical dimension of continuity to our basic conception of cultural policy, even beyond our emphatic conception of 'public'. We believe that culture is mediated through historic institutions, professions and expertise (as well as citizenship and democratic governance – in fact, our conception of 'democratic cultural institutions' or democratic cultural management, is actually weak: our insistence on historic institutions, professions and cultural expertise seems itself to embody

democratic norms, yet these are equally unstable and unsure today (certainly in the face of the student-age population). The norms of knowledge and the sense of scientific objectivity inherited from the European enlightenment, along with our established assumptions on the public sphere and its embodiment of 'freedom of expression', and so forth, are not forever internal to the regional political ontology that is Europe. Recent populism, internet disinformation, Islamic radicalism, to name just three, has threatened Europe's sense of itself simply by opposing norms we assumed to be more enduring than they perhaps are.

I am currently working on two multi-partner research projects —for both projects, it had become clear that most of us were 'intellectual Europeans' and not really perceiving how far our assumptions on cultural policy were being contested. The recent cultural history of Europe features perpetual 'threats' yet they were all weathered and now seem passé: the rise of 1960s counterculture, Maoism and other anti-Bourgeois radical politics, concurrent with the irrepressible rise of 'pop culture', consumerism, or art movements starting with Pop art and the post-1960s avant-garde itself (in Europe, Situationism, Fluxus, CoBra, and so on). The rise of media and TV contended for command over the visual imagination, and in the 1980s, the rise of the entrepreneur and creative industries presented yet more challenges to the credibility, relevance of an institution and professional-driven culture. By the 1990s, the very concept of 'culture' did not signify one field of knowledge or practice: with the rise of both standards of living and travel, culture became appended to other policy fields, particularly leisure and tourism; the increase in population and urban development, the rise of social movements and demands for greater democracy, all saw culture increasingly appended to politically motivated agendas, some of which re-cast the citizens in the form of the consumer, demanded greater service-based programming for culture, and all managed by new waves of US corporate strategic management steadily making their way through European business schools. Many if not most municipal authorities and cultural institutions now appoint CEO-type executives and management boards that demand strategy-making, financial planning, stakeholder engagement, monitoring and evaluation, all making for a very different organisational culture than post-War Europe or before 1980.

And yet, today I doubt we see any of these as enduring dilemmas. There are two current dilemmas, however, that I do consider to be serious in terms of their claim on the intellectual and geo-political parameters of European culture – and they both involve demographics, notably the generational shift and the population shift through mass migration. First, there are evidently generational changes taking place, involving youth populations that are not so committed to historical European democracy, and not so rooted in the material coordinates of specific artistic disciplines, genres, movements or place-based institutions. Digital media has changed what 'culture' and 'creativity' mean and feel for young people; moreover, the all-pervasive role of social media means that for young people the categorical separation of state and civil society, culture and media, art and commerce, no longer have a normative function. Digital media makes everything culture and politics all at once: we have to return to Walter Benjamin to find an era when this happened so rapidly and seamlessly as it is now.

Secondly, is the impact of non-European cultures, the beginning of which is only upon us. Past multicultural frames of reference remained blithely secure in the notion of 'ethnic minorities' that our large populace continent could easily absorb (i.e. without challenging historic European culture). That is no longer the case, and perhaps this is

why 'multicultural cultural policies' have little profile in the research domain and do not appear to have been developed as part of EU or member state public policies. There is a sense of denial — of the fact that culture in Europe is dense with 'historicity' and its assumptions are not immutable (assumptions on secularism, on civil orders of administrative procedure, on institutional authority and the role of the professions and scholarship in the broad governance of culture, and so on). European culture is not just historical (evolving over centuries of interconnections, art movements, mobility, intellectual diasporas, exiles, and so on) it is embedded with *historicity* – i.e. much of it is only 'intelligible' through an understanding of history, a possession of cultural memory, of intellectual depth. This, however, is now confronted by two forces of change, which I think are serious policy 'dilemmas' not the subject of enough policy research: (i): *Decolonisation*, or the radical cultural politics of social justice – European culture is being cast as 'racial' and as serving to mask and repress historical memory of those cultures, lands and peoples, impoverished by the forces of its colonial self-aggrandisement; and (ii): *Political Devolution* — culture as the means by which people are made into citizens in a social cohesive common identity and sense of belonging: this was a social instrumentalisation of culture that we assumed would steadily educate young people into 'citizens' — and become willing European subjects who identified with the official historical narratives visually illustrated by cultural institutions.

On the first of these issues – decolonisation – I will only make 2 comments. I am referencing the now famous protest of June 2020 of Black Lives Matter-inspired group pushing a bronze statue of a city patron Edward Colston (1636-1721) into the harbour, where slave boats once were docked almost 300 years ago. While the public media attention and controversy was considerable, it did not in itself generate *substantive* arguments on public space and policies beyond the city of Bristol, and no widespread public policies beyond a generalised awareness of the historical identity of the memorialised figures from the past. The lack of substantive outcomes for local cultural policies nationally – and lack of development of this as a region of policy knowledge – has meant that the participation of institutions, local democratic policymaking (that can be scaled up and challenge national norms) is not in evidence. This is, in part, because of claims about history and the present state of Britain is not entirely credible, but it is also that decolonisation, while theoretically important, is more a protest movement than an intellectual or scholarly one. Having rejected the actual scholarly movement of 'post-colonial studies', there is little left but a range of (partly spurious) American 'critical race theory'. There have been a lot of commentary, media articles, short news items, and some very interesting public debating events, but it has all largely 'blown over' with not much actual policy revision to show for it.

Secondly, we come to political devolution: referring to the recent legislative and policy history of the UK above, I will tabulate some of the strategic innovations happening in the UK:

Strategic Innovations in local cultural development		
Area	**Operation**	**Link**
Capital Development	National Arts Council managed, ministry funded, scheme for facility and infrastructure-led growth	https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/our-open-funds/cultural-investment-fund/cultural-development-fund-round-four
Financial investment	*Regional authority*	https://www.wearecreative.uk/northoftyne/

	financial and business support programme	
National Local alliances	*Public statement of intent, with Action Plan*	https://www.local.gov.uk/topics/culture-tourism-leisure-and-sport/arts-council-england-and-lga-joint-statement-2023-2025
'Creative Health' Strategy	*A partnership delivery plan using 'creativity, culture and heritage'*	https://gmintegratedcare.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/gm-creative-health-strategy-exec-summary.pdf
Social Access projects	*Regional partnership agreement plan delivering social access*	https://www.westofengland-ca.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/West-of-England-Cultural-Plan.pdf
Priority Places	*54 targeted place for national strategic development*	https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/your-area/priority-places-and-levelling-culture-places
Creative Corridors	*Geo-spatial approach to cross-sector economic development*	https://www.thersa.org/design-for-life-our-mission/hubs/creative-corridors
Creative Land Trust	*A land and space approach driven by property portfolio management*	https://creativelandtrust.org/

All these developments are quite independent and have their own policy origins, but are interconnected as a 'new wave' of policy thinking in developing local cultural policies. Devolution has become a catalyst for cultural development as well as for political change or a change in governance structure. Here I list a range of resources for policy research or just more information.

Resources for research in local cultural development		
Area	Resources	Link
Pan-regional development planning	Consortium, pan-local hub and network developer	https://www.creativeestuary.com/
Academic-policymaker engagement	Academic research centre working as catalyst, advocate, resource provider and partnership manager	https://www.culturalvalue.org.uk/ https://www.culturehive.co.uk/CVIresources/research-digest-culture-and-placemaking/
Public Policy survey (academic project)	National survey-based assessment and portal distribution of local and place-based cultural strategies	https://www.southampton.ac.uk/publicpolicy/support-for-researchers/policy%20briefs/cultural-strategies.page
Public Information and Policy Research Resource portal	National distribution of knowledge, research and guidance	https://culturalplacemaking.com/about/
Facilitation	Consultant managers and delivery partners for cultural regeneration and peer learning	https://fivetentwelve.com/
Advocacy	Northern Culture parliament-based advocacy group, commissioning research for lobbying on policy priorities	https://northernculture.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/NCAPPG-The-Case-for-Culture-Report.pdf

As a general observation, the incursion of political devolution as a discourse impacting cultural policy, has exhibited some common features:

(i): reducing the dominance of professionals and institutions in defining and using 'culture' for local people.

(ii): involving cultural workers with local people in participatory activities around the policy making process.

(iii): engaged consultation and public information: new hubs, labs, student consultations and public fora for enhancing the 'voice' of the local in defining policy agendas.

Part 2: *Case: Coventry, West Midlands, and a role for Research Knowledge*

All these are in evidence in my university city of Coventry, and this has demonstrated some significant innovations in generating knowledge on political devolution in culture through research-based policy discourse. The Coventry UK Capital of Culture websites that host the research I will be referring to, are often labeled 'Impact' – and it is the category of 'impact and evaluation' that research is all too often positioned by a commissioning authority within large civic projects. Universities are often invited to contribute on this basis, but in this case the research team gradually extended their influence (and membership) and opened a space that defined how researchers, creative practitioners, students, and others, could play a role in generating knowledge of the city — and how that knowledge would become interconnected with the kind of knowledge used in the policymaking process. The political economy of the city is usually a series of disconnected silos of power, from otherwise detached universities to local artists to the politicians, local budget planners and city executives — whose positioning all became more clearly visible. This was not done in any overt way, and the UK City of Culture framework itself served to expose the city's governance to some closer scrutiny, but research became a means, intentionally or not, of making the city itself – its people, industry, organisations, institutions, and governance — more 'transparent' and so open to question or participation.

One function of active research knowledge is therefore 'transparency', and another is 'diagnosis' — this City of Culture research was more than a framework or contribution to a celebratory cultural event; it was *diagnostic* and generated a framework of evaluation where the 'cultural' was social, economic and political (and so was a de facto assessment of the city itself). And this diagnostic function extended to other policies: interestingly, the previous city cultural strategy was very good, creative, socially engaged and aspirational. But it did not succeed (and few people ever took much notice). Indeed, great plans fail as strategies – as it became clear from the research in the process of forging the new one — as they either have no policy basis (longer term political commitment to resourcing and delivery); and have no role in the city's public service infrastructure — the public goods of which the city's public lay claim).

Yes, the research team fulfilled the expectations of the city with impact studies, evaluation metrics, data and statistics, and so forth — they were called the 'Monitoring and Evaluation Team' — but they were more than this. Reflecting on their research content, they provoked a significant change in the intellectual dimension of policy discussions in the city. They were a visible interconnection of research knowledge with the bureaucratic policymaking, and also defined an advocacy process, persuading decision makers to see the value of a model of policymaking that had the dynamic of knowledge production at its center.

There will be those who observe that this process only partially succeeded, as the political instability of the city throughout this time meant that personnel and governance processes did not remain consistent enough to evolve in any sustainable way. But what is important here is what we can learn concerning the knowledge production as research *management* — as it became critical within the city's new-found enthusiasm for local cultural policy.

The UK Coventry City of Culture was not merely a mega-event, like the proverbial travelling circus that arrives with great fanfare and then leaves and everything returns to normal. It was used as both a catalyst (for a change in the transparency of the city) and as a means of further developing the Strategy itself. Key city stakeholders began to consider 'culture' a mandatory topic in serious policy discussions: 'culture' became more than the funding of city assets and facilities and visitor numbers. The UK City of Culture bid — the initial national competition for the award itself — took place in in 2016 and was successful in part as the collaboration between the universities and the City Council in generating a credible new Cultural Strategy: the key elements of the strategy were:
(i): Partnership-based in both formation and delivery (not bureaucratic or local government-based).
(ii): Iterative — with a 'refresh' in 2022 then in 2024, where new research emerged, with new participants, and a new public engagement through events.
(iii): up-to-date empirical data – new coordinates for a resource-mapping of the city, generating a more detailed picture on how the cultural, social and economic were interconnected or at least overlapping.
(iv): It defined artistic aspirations and ideas that could evolve in public debate. (i.e. not just pre-defined policy objectives).

This, today, has arrived at a public cultural governance model that continues to be responsible for the Strategy: called 'Culture Works', culture is defined as a public service, but not the usual bureaucratic governance-type service. It is an 'ecosystemic governance'. While the concept of 'ecosystem' can function like a myth that convinces everyone that culture is an organic spectrum of mutually enhancing organisations; but it is often not. This city was not harmonious; it was a competitive, difficult and a sometimes unengaging cultural space that was starved of resources. The 'ecosystem' therefore needed to be constructed, not assumed, and an ecosystem approach begins as collaborative, in part as the public governance of the City Council is not equipped to provide most of the resources (intellectual, financial, material) that is required. An ecosystem is manifest principally in work – cultural labour – and this requires the *material conditions*. The city's new 'Cultural Gateway' [the ex-IKEA building] will provide this [see design, planning and strategy websites below]. The material conditions of labour, if we use this old Marxist term, requires not merely a concrete place, with people, but a location or positionality, here embedded in the public realm of the city. This was conceived as a *hub networking* space for cultural partners, with space for a student gallery, café, library and exhibition space, dance studio, conference area, artists' studios, post-production filming facilities and a shop to sell students' artwork — in other words, all the spaces that the research analysis of the city had identified as lacking.

The Gateway is also symbolic communication, in the broader battle for political capital and the resources that follow in terms of regional and national investment. It is an aspirational project, a visible commitment to outstanding achievement, of the kind that

attracts investment or funders, inspires education and research innovation, it will have space for a policy testing lab, prototyping of strategy techniques, and the material conditions that developing the Strategy itself would need. Space was always a precondition of cultural permanence — and culture is a longitudinal enterprise: while finances can always dissolve, on the level of strategy this signifies a long-term commitment. And this is perhaps the most significant dimension of this great building — it is not another cultural 'white elephant' (of the kind that relies on shrinking public resources and keeps creative youth outside with its professional panache) but an embodiment of a shift in the psychology of financial strategy – or the appearance of one. The funding of culture is not here conceived in the usual 'dependency' way — the 'begging bowl' of funding scheme chasing, professional form fillers, and so on. This long-term commitment demands that all financial strategy henceforth must be formed around it, and with that around its concept of public ecosystemic governance. And to make that work will require collaboration, collective commitment, institutional partnership, and some serious strategy making. No longer should cultural workers, artists, arts organisations be defined as individual competitors in a marketplace of public resources but as participants in a new public infrastructure. The building is large enough to be risky, and large enough to command attention — it could create an 'ecosystem evolution trajectory' through the city, redefining the city's urban development planning; and then this will have an impact on the spatial understanding of retail or shopping, and so on.

There is one further observation to convey on the Gateway facility: it began with the usual property management search for 'anchor tenants' and investors, along the way identifying a dimension of the cultural economy few of us consider — the art storage market. The British Council and Arts Council England are both contracted in storing their extensive collections, with significant potential for future exhibition or curating projects.

To return to my above mention of research management — that the Strategy research was 'managed' in a productive way. While this was only partially intentional, the management of research itself can create distinctive forces for change — for collaboration, for the public presentation of research and advocacy, for visioning and modeling of new ideas based on new data, of placing a cultural project (the City of Culture mega-event) in a policy context (not just the celebratory, one-off, financially or economically-motivated context). This 'positioning' of the City of Culture was compounded by the fact that the independent team appointed to deliver the City of Culture event, worked with a Strategy framework already established. And consequently, the mega-event did not eclipse the Strategy as a priority for a year, but was made to serve the interests of the Strategy. In fact, the flush of resources and funds that arrived with a mega-event, was instrumental for the Strategy research team to position themselves so as to expand their work and influence. This allows me to consider the role of research as 'knowledge production' – as more than 'evidence' or data for policy aims or research 'outputs' — and more than just the fact that it becomes possible to identify the interconnected value of all the knowledge producing activities in a place or area. The Strategy-making process, as noted above, was defined and managed in a particular way, and impacted the intellectual and governance landscape on the basis level of topical conversation, the experiential level of 'sensing' the 'buzz' in the city, the sense of a future or just a sense of potential.

A collaborative Strategy can become a production framework for all cultural activity in a city without the assertion of bureaucratic management. This governance by

'discourse' is not necessarily by hegemony (as an imposed ideology or fixed cultural plan), but can articulate a range of ideas and goals defined through a process of public research and so operationalise a form of cultural democracy in how it applies its methods, arranged and presented its data, and articulated the outcomes. As a 'Monitoring and Evaluation team' within the City of Culture framework, the researchers were able to initiate a multi-register programme of knowledge-production activity, which included academic-funded research, publishing short commissioned studies, a spectrum of city art projects, local events, and public engagement around other City of Culture initiatives. The 'Inclusive Leadership' training programme was one activity whose value intersected with the research enterprise [Cf. the websites referenced below].

One significant contribution of the Strategy research to the intellectual life of the city was the otherwise dull subject of 'methodology' — it normalised methodology and made it a creative undertaking, where the organisation of active knowledge construction began to look like something every artist, organisation and community should take seriously. And with an investment in methodology is where cultural commissioning itself becomes more intelligent, strategic and direct; ideas themselves become more critical and constructive. One innovation was the pioneering of cultural data management approaches for the city. This included the establishment of The Reel Store, the UK's first permanent immersive digital art gallery, initiated with exhibitions on data and its use. 'Digital Coventry' is project that continues as a web platform for all forms of digitised film, video and photography on the city. (It is a curation-based project, but also forms a living archive of the holdings of ordinary residents on their experience, personal and social life, cultural recording and any visual data that can form part of this extraordinary visual composite of city life). A commissioning project called The Coventry Challenge Project, invited a wide range of participants, organised into research teams within a university building. They were given access to city managed 'big data', and briefed for developing proposals on creative ways of using this big data for transformative impacts on the city's wellbeing and urban landscape.

One of the most impressive research outputs has been The Cultural Place Profiler. This is an interactive data portal, for use by any person (not just bureaucratic access, policy work or those with digital administrative skills). As its website states, it is a data research dashboard, with indicator tool, a comparator (between locales; other cities), and a corellator (relations to other data sources). Apart from its obvious city policy research and advocacy use, it enables cultural organisations to plan and deliver place-based projects and intended outcomes using its cultural but also non-cultural data. It can empower social agency in being used for 'hyperlocal' penetration, generating empirical data for social communities or associations in policy advocacy and lobbying, arts and cultural organisations in audience contextual analysis, planning around social and generational change, and making more strategic decisions for arts organisation progamming, events design, or just arts funding applications.

The initiatives in the exploration of cultural data management expanded the partnership and membership of the initial research team, using the computer science and other expertise within the universities. The outcomes provoked national attention and influence (the national Arts Council's new data portal project is one example), but also involved the reconfiguration of a significant national framework for public service provision: the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA).

The JSNA is a national framework for the local delivery of 'statutory' (or legally necessary) public services. This is largely for health, care and well-being-based services, and where multiple partners will be involved (as the almost always are with the National Health Service and its wide network of partners and supply chain operators). The research for The Cultural Place Profiler involved the construction of a 'Joint Cultural Needs Assessment' (JCNA) framework, effectively forming a critical extension of the national JSNA. Serves to give local communities nationally recognised data in order to make their own needs assessments, it is hard not to see this as a symbolic gesture of intervention — the power of local research to intervene critically in a national policy framework. It also empowers local organisations in devising a stronger political understanding of their own needs, and using data in the formulation of alternate, self-managed, or public proposals, or for partnering with arts organisations, positioning local delivery mechanisms for cultural services – and directly in response to place-based needs.

I now work towards the conclusion of this paper by way of the bigger picture of regional policy development: since the early days of the Coventry Cultural Strategy from 2016, national political devolution saw the emergence of the 'Combined Authority' of the West Midlands (where Coventry is one of seven cities). This, interestingly, has not evolved as a federal bureaucracy, but a strategic body empowering a regional of local authorities. Among its initiatives (inspired in part by Coventry's cultural policy development) was a Cultural Leadership Board (and a short lived Cultural Officer's group). This Board was an advisory board, which (unlike the 'Officer's Group') had a role in the Mayoral governance of the region, and engaged in visioning, knowledge-sharing, deliberation, evaluation and advocacy, enabling the Mayor's cultural office to set out a serious research commissioning strategy. The research commissioning centered on methodology and place-based knowledge: because of this, it generated some challenging research, which is still recent and yet to be fully digested by the cultural sector. It looked at audiences and the available data, how it is collated, and the sector responds to established policy expectations, and other reflexive questions on how cultural knowledge may be significant within policymaking. It also looked at the question of economic and social value, particularly in terms of national policy demands on culture and what that means in terms of the region. It also formulated the means of advocacy, for equipping the sector in asserting itself and its interest on the basis of knowledge. This generated an immediate need to define 'regional' cultural policy in relation to local cultural policy – avoiding both the federal domination of local cultural autonomy, and national policy imposition – where culture is so often just a 'translation' of national economic or social policy into culture.

Importantly, the multi-facetted research avoided focusing on one category called 'culture', but worked pragmatically with four categories of 'economy', 'place', 'people', 'arts'. A principal research output from this was a digital platform, an interactive mapping instrument, operating with live data on demography and social activity, called the 'West Midlands Cultural Infrastructure Map'. Like Coventry's JCNA, it is not a bureaucratic survey mechanism but a 'user-based infrastructure' for (so indicated on their website) for cultural sector organisations, creatives, producers, directors and community workers, to conduct granular research on the cultural geography of a place. It is a tool for strategic project design or simply for local authority officers in directing projects, or refining the allocation of resources. Most importantly, the 'mapping' does not charter culture just as a landscape of institutions and organisations but in terms of social space and how people use the spaces of culture — spaces that may be social

spaces, but the activity is identified as cultural. Identifying 2,350 spaces for a population of 3 million, it features interactive layering such as the 'Active Lives Data' (2015 – 2017) with not only indicators of cultural participation but the geo-social data on status and capital. As in Coventry, as part of a broader research project, the Map was done with an approach to research management, i.e. a knowledge capacity-building approach to research team development. (The team was initially a collaboration between two cultural consultancies for management, a management consultancy for strategy-building, a tech company for data analysis, and urban development consultancy for web design – local councils (municipalities), public agencies for development, and arts organisations, were also either involved or invited.

Part 3: *Conclusion*

By way of Conclusion, I have two points and then a clarification:
1: The Strategy research, and then the UK City of Culture-framed research and its projects, indicated a role for knowledge in the city that was more than the sum total of the research content itself (data, evaluations, outputs and so on). Research is management, collaborations and partnerships, agendas and a lexicon of theoretical terms, methodologies and evolving theories, capabilities, diagnostics and new paradigms, and so on. In the last eight years, we now have something approaching a 'Knowledge Infrastructure': we now need to analyse and tabulate what that means. Its immediate impact is, as noted above, cultural knowledge is now recognised at the level of policy, and the means by which cultural knowledge is defined and communicated, has intersected with other policy fields. We need now to assert local policy making capabilities in partnership-based and participatory research-capacity building, discourse and ideology critique as well.
2: With a knowledge infrastructure – or even just a lot of research – the lack of governance (or people and policies that use the research) becomes apparent. Governance is not just management or administration, it is politics — it requires representing the region's interests both 'upwards' (policy advocacy to authority above, regional and national), and 'downwards', toward the social everyday, civic and community level of 'local knowledge'. This will not just open further deliberation and the practical know-how that facilitates application, it will prevent an overlap of interests, knowledge duplication, and a competition between locales (the unfair fight for limited resources that has been normal under neoliberal national policy frameworks).

To clarify this paper's rationale — in setting out aims and parameters for a theoretical methodology in knowledge-production for cultural policy (which is the de facto subject of this paper) — do we understand the role of knowledge within policymaking, and the formation of the cognitive substrate of policy formation? The constitution and role of knowledge is not to be assumed, and not in a so-called 'knowledge economy' if that is still a principal reference point on economic development.

Of course, each artistic genre, field or area of culture will have their own methodologies — for analysis, interpretation, evaluation, and so on. But, what about cultural policy itself (i.e. the place-based macro-economic policymaking)? This requires more than a definition of culture, some aims for urban development, and a strategy that aligns culture with the official developmental aims of a 'place'. It will require a theoretical framework that sets out a means of conceptual development in our understanding of policy knowledge, say, an agenda for cultural policy research. While policy knowledge can be ideological or based on a specific discourse (one of the

many forms of neoliberalism, for example), a diplomatic opening is to agree with all parties a 'benchmark' concept or first stage. This might be 'cultural democracy', for example, which is innocuous, appealing, unifying, endlessly mutable, and with no immediate commitment to measurable outcomes (which most city politicians might prefer). It is worth starting with a fundamental term that can command a consensus, something internal to European public policies for culture since the 1950s is such a term.

Cultural Democracy is often differentiated from 'cultural democratisation', but today their historical features are often bundled together. The latter (in the 1970s, mostly) involved an active dismantling of canonical historical narratives, institutional authority, and the national (or imperial) symbolic order of value; it also involved an integration of popular, folk or socially-based cultural production, i.e. was socially anti-elitist. Cultural Democracy was an older and more enduring attempt to preserve culture through access and education, even strengthening institutional and historical culture through a pluralist recognition of culture's diversity and a commitment to cultivating in a population the basic capabilities and knowledge required to understand and experience culture. This was more in line with UNESCO's emergence, and here, I will improvise a UNESCO-type approach, which combines the component commitments of 'democracy' with human rights and 'human development'. While these are three big policy commitments that can be combined in many ways, Cultural Democracy is a good means of positioning them on a policy continuum: 'culture', as the recent UNESCO Mondiacult Declaration of 2022 'is a Public Good'. In other words, culture is a means of forming a democratic public sphere (i.e. not just a creative economy, or socially-therapeutic supplement to other policy fields).

An original rationale of a Cultural Democracy approach for local cultural policies was to side-step the older 'autonomy' of art and its role through industrial modernity in forming more and more rarified and educated social sub-groups — and rather, to see culture as forming the basic capabilities required for a broader-based democratic citizenship (and a relevance to the forms of 'global citizenship' being cultivated by UNESCO, such as Interculturalism, and Human Development). If democracy, essentially, seeks to cultivate self-determination (social and political), then Cultural Democracy facilitates this through 'culture' itself — a public culture of common knowledge and practice. Cultural capabilities, and not just skills or 'abilities' to do things, are the knowledge-based means to facilitate freedom (the power to create choices, affect change, construct social relations and with this the material conditions for public life, which is the common good). A 'knowledge-based means' therefore is epistemic in structure — and the context for this is not so much the democratic 'system' itself but the individually-oriented socio-legal disocurse that defines the material conditions of such capabilities. This socio-legal space is human rights — formed to articulate within the broad expanse of culture, a human fulfillment, dignity and individual aspiration. Cultural Rights (human rights to culture) is not equivalent to, but is indeed indicative of, human capabilities within a cultural sphere. It can provide an opportunity for examining the epistemic structure of capability formation —citizen participation in a way that at develops their own freedoms (the productive opportunities that devise choices and allows 'valuing' or the identification of what is valuable to a person's human development). Such a project of 'cultural epistemology' could be conducted through researching place-based knowledge production (research, critical analysis, literature and reflection, information and data) identifying a cultural rights comprehension of cultural capabilities as effective for cultural self-determination.

Of course, while 'cultural citizenship' is a term with a nice ring to it but for most cities is often largely redundant along with their participative democracy. Conceptually, its importance lies principally in its sense of 'agency' — where culture aims for a political agency that can intervene in other spheres of life or a city or place. For 'cultural citizenship' assumes that culture is a productive infrastructure that admits participatory involvement, and the cultural infrastructure is a material component of the socio-economic infrastructure of our place, city, region or country (i.e. culture is part of the public realm of the polity we live in). Of course, this kind of 'cultural citizenship' is aspirational (may not fully exist). As an agenda, therefore, Cultural Democracy will need to begin as a theoretical methodology (even if just a crude schema on what it is and how we can act on that basis). The Coventry cultural ecosystem governance model, however, promises the material conditions for some measure of change. Culture, historically, has devised a facility for constructing micro-societies, social movements, civic and social association, and local development not dependent on systemic change.

The immediate research work we need to undertake, then, is knowledge-based, so working backwards on the above logic, we need knowledge on the following:
1: The current meaning and formation of 'cultural citizenship' (definition, discourse, ideology, policies etc.) — as the socio-political agency of culture within a cultural infrastructure (a cultural field as part of the public domain of a political economy). In reality, there may be no 'infrastructure' to speak of, in which case this will investigate the institutional or economic formation of culture within that part of society (place-based contexts and their socio-economic formation through policy, organisational fields, the social populace).
2: A cultural epistemology of the way cultural capabilities are or can be formed according to Cultural Rights frameworks (of human rights law): the 'epistemology' indicates that capabilities within culture are specific to culture and so their cognitive dimension needs explaining.
3: The cultural political economy within which this takes place — the material conditions of the state apparatus and its economic imaginary of culture as democracy (and the positionality of culture within the political economy of state, however weak, contradictory or fraught that state is, within the global economy, international political order, and so forth).

The purpose of this paper, therefore, was to indicate how a region and a locale has effectively opened a door to a new vista in cultural policy research (which is an iteration on an old challenge in cultural democracy): how knowledge production [university research-based policymaking is one way] facilitates the cognitive mapping of the socio-political landscape that cultural citizens need to traverse so to contribute to an agency for culture that empowers local self-determination.

Appendix:

(i): *Further Research*
This paper was interconnected with a national research project, 'The Future of Local Cultural Policy Making by Culture Commons and Partners'. The results of this project will be published in the Autumn 2024. In this project, as this paper, the choice of Coventry and the West Midlands was motivated by the recent (and arguably innovative) policy research resulting, in part, from collaboration between local authorities and the universities. In the above research project, I attempt to demonstrate that the concept of a 'knowledge infrastructure' in this context is more empirical than theoretic, in that while the sociology

of knowledge and other field would furnish us with a more exacting model of this, on a basic observational level we can assert that the West Midlands exhibits some characteristics relevant to a more devolved local cultural decision making: Its knowledge infrastructure exhibits the following:
(i): Collaborative arrangements on policy research between the universities and local authorities.
(ii): Research team-building and the production and dissemination of methodologically innovative models of strategy and evaluation.
(iii): Mapping, survey and multi-scalar data research facilities, allowing for big and granular data research, along with relevant frameworks of application.
(iv): A wide spectrum organisational field of arts and culture, with a span of both value and capability, local, national and international — with artistic involvement in research and knowledge-based production.
(v): The professional facility for designing and managing cultural events at local, national or international scale, along with communications and marketing capabilities.
(iv): Partnership, networks and knowledge-sharing capabilities.

(ii): *defining 'culture'*
While cultural policy research is replete with terms like 'cultural sector', 'cultural economy', 'creative and cultural industries', 'cultural ecosystem' or 'cultural ecology', there is a lack of theoretical basis to these terms – and a lack of theory interconnected with methodology development. The significance of West Midlands policy research is that its methodology encompasses infrastructure mapping: defining culture in terms of infrastructure will include,
(i): local history, heritage, identity
(ii): positive historical change and social communities
(iii): the arts
(iv): socially-engaged cultural agencies and projects
(v): festivals, exhibitions, events
(vi): the city as cultural actor
(vii): Cathedrals; CofE churches
(viii): Non-CofE churches; unused buildings registered for 'worship'; faith communities; religious charities; belief-based development organisations.
(ix): tourism and visitor economy
(x): museums, galleries and archives
(xi): ethnicity and origins-based associations or interest-groups
Including (though not exclusively so…)
(xii): Education institutions – schools, colleges, universities.
(xiii): creative industries; technology and innovation-based business enterprise.

(iii): *References to Organisations, Places and Projects*

WMCA Cultural Leadership Board:	https://www.wmca.org.uk/what-we-do/culture-and-digital/culture/advisory-groups-and-west-midlands-combined-authority/cultural-leadership-board/
WMCA's Infrastructure Map	https://www.wmca.org.uk/what-we-do/culture-and-digital/culture/west-midlands-cultural-sector-research-project/west-midlands-cultural-infrastructure-map/
The West Midlands Place Profiler Dashboard	https://www.culturecentral.co.uk/west-midlands-place-profiler
Council of Europe's 'Handbook for Local Authorities' series (vol 1-3)	https://www.coe.int/en/web/tbilisi/congress
The 'European Charter of Local Self-Government' (1985)	https://www.ccre.org/img/uploads/piecesjointe/filename/charter_localselfgovernment_en.pdf
The Second 'Strategy Refresh' (2022)	https://culturechangecoventry.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2022/03/COV-Cultural-Strategy-Engagement-Final-2022.pdf
Cultural Strategy 'Baseline' study city culture narrative	https://culturechangecoventry.com/baseline/

Culture Change Coventry	https://culturechangecoventry.com/
Coventry's Future Cultural Governance fulcrum	https://coventry21evaluation.info/future-insights/planning-for-coventrys-future/coventrys-future-cultural-governance/
University of Warwick 'Warwick's Culture — a new Cultural Strategy'	https://warwick.ac.uk/about/regional/culture/warwicks_culture/#:~:text=Our%20new%20Cultural%20Strategy%20%2D%20Warwick's,civic%20and%20regional%20cultural%20partners.
Coventry University and the City Centre Cultural Gateway	https://www.coventry.ac.uk/news/2023/coventry-university-to-play-key-role-in-new-cultural-initiatives-for-the-city/
The WMCA investment portfolio	https://www.wmca.org.uk/documents/housing-regeneration/investment-prospectus-2023/west-midlands-investment-prospectus-2023/2023-investment-prospectus/coventry-city-centre-cultural-gateway/
Coventry Culture Works Governance Model	https://edemocracy.coventry.gov.uk/documents/s58960/04%20Coventry%20Cultural%20Strategy%20-%20Next%20Steps%20and%20Learning%20from%20City%20of%20Culture.pdf
Research methods	https://coventry21evaluation.info/about-us/ahrc-place-based-knowledge-exchange-project/
Research events	https://coventry21evaluation.info/past-events/evaluation-events/city-of-culture-data-webinar/
Coventry City of Culture Trust's 'Coventry Model'	https://coventry21evaluation.info/city-of-culture-trust-programme/#:~:text=The%20Coventry%20City%20of%20Culture%20Trust's%20strategic%20objectives%20for%20the,vibrancy%20of%20the%20cultural%20sector
Creative communication initiatives	https://coventry21evaluation.info/strategy-reports/animated-reflections-on-evaluating-the-uk-city-of-culture/
Coventry Cultural Place Profiler (2018)	https://coventry.culturalplaceprofiler.co.uk
Joint Cultural Needs Assessment model (2020)	https://usercontent.one/wp/coventry.culturalplaceprofiler.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/JCNA-NeedsAssessGuide-final-draft.pdf
Evaluation model (2022)	https://coventry21evaluation.info/future-insights/insights/cities-of-culture-a-model-of-evaluation/
Coventry's Cultural Strategy	https://www.coventry.gov.uk/arts-1/coventry-cultural-strategy
Coventry Citywide Intelligence Hub JSNA criteria	https://www.coventry.gov.uk/jsna
Coventry Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)	https://www.coventry.gov.uk/facts-coventry/joint-strategic-needs-assessment-jsna
WMA cultural sector survey and case study	https://www.wmca.org.uk/media/fwue1xwn/wmca-cluster-analysis-report.pdf
WMCA Audiences study	https://www.wmca.org.uk/what-we-do/culture-and-digital/culture/west-midlands-cultural-sector-research-project/
WMCA Social and Cultural Value study	https://www.wmca.org.uk/media/o5mfd0dj/economic-report-web.pdf

Coventry Citywide Intelligence Hub	https://www.coventry.gov.uk/facts-coventry/citywide-intelligence-hub
Coventry Cultural Strategy (empirical research)	https://culturechangecoventry.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2021/11/Cov-Culture-2.pdf
Coventry Monitoring and Evaluation Team	https://coventry21evaluation.info/about-us/our-team/ https://coventry21evaluation.info/about-us/
Coventry City of Culture, research and evaluation	https://coventry21evaluation.info/strategy-reports/final-evaluation-report/
Birmingham Observatory	https://birmingham-city-observatory.datopian.com/about
Digital Coventry	https://www.coventry.gov.uk/digital-coventry
Coventry City of Culture data, evaluation and research	https://coventry21evaluation.info/research-database/?keyword_tag[]=cultural-data
The 'Coventry Cultural Challenge' event	https://coventry21evaluation.info/past-events/coventry-cultural-challenge/
Event 'Walking though Coventry Data' (December 2022)	https://coventry21evaluation.info/past-events/evaluation-events/walking-through-coventry-data/
'What Data Tells Us About Coventry'	https://coventry21evaluation.info/future-insights/planning-for-coventrys-future/
Transforming Leadership Programme' Evaluation report	https://coventry21evaluation.info/research-evaluation/assorted-studies/city-of-culture-transforming-leadership-programme/
Future Trends Series	https://coventry21evaluation.info/research-evaluation/future-trends-papers/
Talking Birds 'Coventry's Citizens' Assembly on Arts, Culture & Creativity'	https://coventry21evaluation.info/future-insights/planning-for-coventrys-future/coventrys-citizens-assembly-on-arts-culture-creativity/
The Citizen's Assembly project	https://talkingbirds.co.uk/2020/01/01/recommendations/

(iv): *Categories of Cultural Organisation in the City of Coventry*

City institutions — historic institutions representing the heritage, civic culture, public culture and cultural assets of the place	Herbert Museum and Art Gallery	www.theherbert.org
City Public Agencies – organisations, boards or associations with devolved responsibilities	Culture Coventry Trust [part of CV Life]	https://cvlife.co.uk/
Nationally funded organisations (e.g. Arts Council NPO)	The Tin Music and Arts	https://thetinmusicandarts.org.uk/
City-branded organisations — i.e. whose identity is embedded in the history of the city	Belgrade Theatre	https://www.belgrade.co.uk/
Event-based organisations with a national profile	Coventry Art Biennial	https://www.coventrybiennial.com/
Artist-run or arts production organisations with a *general* national profile	Talking Birds	https://talkingbirds.co.uk/
Artist-run or arts production organisations with a *specific* national profile (i.e. for innovative; avant-garde; challenging; notorious)	Theatre Absolut	https://theatreabsolute.co.uk/
Landmark cultural institutions	--	--
Nationally significant heritage locations (non-	Guildhall	https://www.stmarysguil

ecclesiastical)		dhall.co.uk/
Nationally significant monuments, memorials or public art	Future Monument (Jochen Gerz, 2002)	https://jochengerz.eu/works/the-future-monument
Nationally significant architecture	Coventry Cathedral	https://www.coventrycathedral.org.uk/
Nationally significant education institutions	Coventry University Warwick University	www.coventry.ac.uk www.warwick.ac.uk
Nationally significant or research or innovation organisations	Coventry University Technology Park	https://www.coventry.ac.uk/business/facilities/technology-park/
Touring organisations/ production companies	Imagineer	https://imagineer-productions.co.uk/
Local and place-based arts venue with a regional profile	Albany Theatre	https://www.albanytheatre.co.uk/
Local and place-based production organisations with a national profile	--	--
Local festivals	The Earlsdon Festival	https://www.facebook.com/earlsdonfest/?locale=en_GB
City festivals	Coventry Godiva Festival (in the city memorial park)	https://www.godivafestival.com/
Diversity/ethnic or multicultural festivals	The Positive Images Festival	https://positiveimagesfestival.co.uk/
Local youth-oriented place-based production organisation with a national profile	Highly Sprung Performance	https://highlysprungperformance.co.uk/
Youth or children arts training organizations	Coventry Music Hub	https://www.coventrymusichub.co.uk/
Local/Regional arts centres	Warwick Arts Centre	https://www.warwickartscentre.co.uk/
Local Community/ Local Arts	Weavers' House	https://theweavershouse.org/
Socially-engaged Arts	EGO arts	https://egoarts.co.uk/
National media agencies	BBC Coventry and Warwickshire	https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/england/coventry_and_warwickshire
Regional development agencies	Invest Coventry and Warwickshire	https://www.investcw.co.uk/sector/creative-industries/
Outstanding Creative locations	The privately owned, Fargo Village	https://www.fargovillage.co.uk/
Creative Industries zones/villages/quarters	Electric Wharf (mixed use industrial development)	https://complexdevelopmentprojects.co.uk/project/electric-wharf/
International City liaison or cultural relations	Rising Peace Forum Coventry Peace Trail	https://www.risingforum.org/ https://www.coventrycathedral.org.uk/visit/see-and-do/peace-trail
City-wide cultural association or public fora	Coventry Culture Works 'Culture Open Forum' (cultural sector conference).	None yet