

Two heads are better than one: what art galleries and museums can learn from the joint leadership model in theatre

Executive Summary

Claire Antrobus

2009/10 NESTA Innovation Fellow on the Clore Leadership Programme

Context

Art galleries and museums in England are currently facing their biggest challenge in a generation. The past decade saw significant growth through new institutions such as Turner Contemporary, The Hepworth Wakefield, Baltic, Nottingham Contemporary, MIMA as well as major buildings projects for existing organisations at Towner, Whitechapel, South London Gallery and Firstsite. Many of these developments have been integral to wider regeneration initiatives, supported strongly by local authorities and regional development agencies. Public revenue funding for the visual arts at central and local government level has grown during this period. Similarly the public profile of the visual arts, and the status of the UK internationally as a centre of visual arts, has increased dramatically, as evidenced by the success of Tate Modern (the most visited art museum in the world) and Frieze Art Fair.

And yet this success story may be built on sand: outside the capital most art galleries and museums are heavily reliant on public subsidy for revenue funding and have not yet developed a range of reliable or sizeable income streams through fundraising or trading. With public funding of galleries now set to fall sharply at local, regional and national levels it is as yet hard to see where alternative income will be found.

More worrying still is the failure of increased public investment in arts facilities and activities to translate into a larger, more diverse and more engaged audience base for the contemporary visual arts nationally. Attendance levels for galleries and art museums as a whole have plateaued during this period of growth so that the average level of subsidy per visitor to an Arts Council-funded gallery has increased by 28%.¹ There are also systemic problems with workforce development and diversity in the sector leading to 'a crisis of leadership'.²

Recent research³ reveals a sector which is over-extended and under-capitalised – in other words lacking the resilience and capacity to respond to a rapidly changing operating context where major shifts in funding, audience behaviour and technology are disrupting business models across the arts and wider society. All artforms are facing these challenges, but in the visual arts we have the added 'problem' of free entry. Just as the newspaper industry struggles to find a new business model in an era of free online content, we too have an existing audience base which is accustomed to free access to our core product.

Purpose and approach of this research

'People have been allowed to carry on as 'king-curators' devising their programmes in isolation – touring used to be much more common than it is today. We can't tolerate any longer people who just want to do their own thing and just want to look to their international counterparts for their kudos. Their organisations will sink. The financial basis on which they operate will be so different – so they'll need to find new sources of income and collaborate more to make best use of resources.'

So leaders of art galleries and museums face undeniably significant challenges in the coming decade. This research sets out to ask whether new leadership models would be helpful, given this context. It looks at the joint leadership approach in theatre which developed around thirty years ago largely in response to a more complex and uncertain financial model. The report considers theatre's joint model, characterised by a double-headed structure of Artistic Director and Executive Director and a more collaborative style of leadership, and asks whether it offers any benefits beyond the single Director approach preferred in the visual arts.

Theatre has its own culture and challenges, and the changes we need in the visual arts will not be found through uncritically importing models from other sectors. But by understanding better how theatre is responding to similar pressures and comparing the two sectors we can shed light onto some of the deeply embedded assumptions we hold, which may stand in the way of discovering new strategies that will enable our organisations to thrive in tough times.

The research was undertaken through a series of semi-structured interviews with those involved in leading galleries, art museums and theatres, and a review of management and leadership literature. Thirty-four interviews were completed to capture the full range of leadership models in both sectors. Many in the theatre sector had experienced different permutations of the two main models - single and joint leadership - at different stages in their careers. Others were interviewed for their experience as Trustees or in recruitment of leaders.

Interviewees are listed in Appendix 1 but are cited in this research on a non-attributed basis. It was never my intention to seek out both parties in joint leadership structures in an attempt to study the detail of specific partnerships. Therefore these interviews represent only the views and experience of those directly involved in executive leadership models.

The full report is structured in six parts:

Section one offers a summary of the evidence relating to the kinds of leadership visual arts organisations will need to thrive.

Section two provides an analysis of current leadership models and approaches.

Section three explores the role and position of senior managers in the visual arts including a description of the role of the Executive Director and the benefits it offers organisations.

Section four discusses the merits and drawbacks of joint leadership models.

Section five looks beyond structures to explore the conditions of success.

Section six concludes with six key recommendations for those responsible for leadership in the visual arts.

The report aims to do three things:

1. For Boards and visual arts leaders, the report presents the case for reconsidering our leadership models (structures and approaches) in the visual arts.
2. For Boards and those seeking to recruit and develop leaders in the visual arts, the report offers:
 - practical advice about the range of leadership options and the context each model suits best;
 - findings relating to the competencies and structures required for joint leadership models, and collaborative leaders more widely, to be effective (section five);
 - An outline description of the roles and requirements for EDs (section three).
3. Finally, for all those working in the visual arts, I hope this report stimulates further discussion about our wider values in the non-profit sector and the critical need for a step-change in our approach to audiences, enterprise, management capacity and continuing professional development.

The full report is available from www.claireantrobust.com/publications

Key findings

What's driving change?

'I cannot understand what benefit it is to the organisation to put all your ability to really function at a senior level into the hands of one person, because that one person can only achieve what they can physically do in any 12 or 24 hour day and it is so much more effective to have a group of empowered individuals working together towards a common goal.'

Collaboration between organisations is recognised by leaders in private, public and non-profit sectors as an important business tool: particularly in contexts which are complex and uncertain, where cost effectiveness, the increasing specialisation of companies and the need for innovation are high.

The arts and cultural sector is one such context where collaboration is rapidly becoming essential. We are facing major challenges, some specific to the sector and some more general, which result from application of new technologies, the need to reduce carbon emissions and conserve energy, changing audience expectations and falling public funding.

The main benefits of collaboration and collaborative leadership are that it generates new ideas and innovation through harnessing the creative power that different perspectives and skills can produce in combination. Collaborative leaders are also able to motivate colleagues and peers through developing a shared vision that encourages 'discretionary effort'. At a time when we have reduced resources, making the most of our staff, skills, and insight alongside other assets will become increasingly important, and collaborative leadership is the key tool that can help us achieve that goal.

In the visual arts sector we need new income generating strategies which look beyond fundraising from high net worth individuals and securing corporate sponsorship deals, which in any case tend only to be suited to larger metropolitan organisations. Enterprise (including smart ways to generate income from our visitors whilst retaining free access) is essential, as is re-thinking how we encourage mass micro-philanthropy, on the lines of crowd-funding or more traditional membership models.

We also need a fundamental shift in how we engage our audiences – both to deliver our mission but equally to justify our public funding and achieve greater trading income. Raising the profile of our organisations with stakeholders locally and regionally, as well as nationally and internationally will underpin our ability to do this.

Despite recent initiatives such as Turning Point and Plus Tate, collaboration between visual arts organisations – and between the collections-based museums and exhibitions galleries in particular – is under-developed. There is however enormous potential for greater inter-organisational collaboration to maximise resources and benefit from the respective strengths of each part of the sector.

We need to develop our workforce, attract more interns and volunteers, and Board members who can support the realisation of these more enterprising and user-centred strategies to doing business. Collaboration between organisations and within organisations is going to be critical to achieving these changes rapidly and effectively.

We need a new leadership culture not structure

To respond to the external challenges- and our problems with workforce diversity and capability - we first need to challenge some of our out-moded assumptions within the visual arts sector. These include:

- A lack of focus on the audience and satisfying their needs not least because the financial model, and funding practice (for all its rhetoric about extending audiences), does not currently require this.
- A related tendency to see the artistic programme (and peer approval) as the only measure of success for galleries, and the conflation of the individual curator's taste with a wider vision for the organisation.
- A distrust and lack of respect or understanding for management and managers.

Investing in management capacity is an uphill struggle against a wider policy backdrop that sees any activity that is not 'front-line' as an 'overhead' that should be pared to the bone. Understanding how investing in and developing assets to create long-term resilience, and the role of managers in this, is one of the biggest challenges facing our arts and cultural organizations.⁴

Should curators still run galleries?

'The traditional route to senior roles in the visual arts has been curatorial and so that's the skills-base people start with and value [...] So I think there's a sense within the visual arts that as long as you're a good curator that's the most important thing - that's going to get you profile and that will lead to a senior position.'

The vast majority of art galleries and museums in the UK are run by people who began their careers as curators and this has been the traditional career path for gallery directors since exhibition galleries first emerged after the Second World War.⁵ But running an art gallery or museum in 2011 is far more challenging than it was in the 1970s and 1980s. Those seeking to lead galleries and museums today can no longer expect to learn all the fundraising, business, managerial and strategic skills they need in today's environment while 'on the job'. Nor - I would argue - can curators single-handedly expect to master all these diverse skills alongside their core expertise of continually developing their knowledge of artistic practice.

Over the past 10-15 years we have begun to see the emergence of Deputy Director and more recently Executive Director roles in the visual arts, often during periods of major growth (such as capital developments) or in response to major change. Executive and Deputy Directors are not the same: Executives tend to report directly to the Board, and play a strategic role, which includes responsibilities for organisation-wide decisions such as business planning and programming; Deputies tend to be more operational and have limited authority.

Career paths for visual arts managers are fragmented. We lose many managers who have developed a working knowledge of the sector to other non-profit and arts organisations for a variety of reasons. These include lack of recognition, poor pay and conditions and lack of career progression

opportunities. Validating management as a valuable career route, to attract and retain skilled staff, is critical to the future health of this sector – as is improving the understanding of the benefits of management. The two are interdependent.

‘The art part is valued more than the business part –people don’t feel valued.’

For cultural reasons, many visual arts organisations prefer to recruit single leaders (and curators specifically) although interviewees felt that there is a problem with supply of suitably experienced candidates. Research into the university sector shows that for knowledge-rich organisations (such as art galleries) having leaders who understand the core business is important for standards and internal and external credibility. It also has a demonstrable impact on business performance.

Art galleries and museums should be led by those with a deep understanding of our core mission. But the core business of arts organisations is not just the art product – it is equally the way we engage people with the art and yet we very rarely appoint learning or marketing experts to executive leadership roles in visual arts. We might take it for granted that curators have this knowledge of ‘the core business’, but they do not necessarily have expert knowledge (or a vision) about how people engage with art. Curators should lead art galleries and museums, but so should other visual arts professionals with expertise in audience engagement, such as learning and marketing staff. And if we want to develop a wider and stronger pool of future leaders in the visual arts then we need to value management and leadership and encourage curators to develop their competencies in these areas, alongside their curatorial expertise.

From Administrators to ‘organisational producers’

Executive Directors are usually extroverts, defined as ‘Resource Investigators’ in terms of Belbin’s team roles; put simply they are outward-facing, risk-taking, entrepreneurial people who make things happen, not the traditional accountant or administrator stereotype. Providing the structure and the resources required to achieve the mission is the core business of an ED. Therefore recasting the ED role as ‘organisational producer’ – responsible for the frameworks and resources to realise the vision - may be helpful in improving the perception, profile and understanding of these important roles.

Visual arts organisations that have invested in EDs have seen significant benefits including more ambitious programming, increased co-production and touring partnerships, increased earned and fundraised income and higher public profile. Improved stakeholder relationships, increased organisational stability and greater innovation are further key benefits of joint leadership models.

Context is king

There is no-one-size-fits-all leadership model that is right for a gallery or an art museum: leadership choices will depend on the organisational needs (the type and scale of organisation as well as its stage of development) and the strengths and weaknesses of the potential candidates available.

However, the research suggests strongly that two heads can be better than one, particularly for many mid-scale and larger galleries, especially outside London where the need to embed organisations in their local and regional contexts is particularly high, or in circumstances of major growth (including capital developments) or change. Some people, particularly those moving into executive leadership for the first time, or those who would prefer to work part-time (or even just forty hours a week) because of caring responsibilities, might definitely prefer joint structures. Belbin also suggests that executive teams of two can be extremely powerful and effective:

'a team of two, capable of multiple-role relationships with each other, can operate very efficiently in working arrangements, far surpassing a much larger team in what can be achieved'.⁶

Joint leadership is not a sticking plaster that can be used to prop up Artistic Directors who don't want to lead organisations, and is very unlikely to be successful if applied on that basis, not least as the best EDs will not be attracted to work alongside these candidates. It works best when ED and AD offer over-lapping experience and skills, and are 'fiendishly interested' in one another's patches (to quote one ED). That means having EDs who are passionate about, and understand the artform, who see their role as making extraordinary art experiences happen, and Artistic Directors who respect how an organisation – and the people within it - works best and understand that great management enables great art to thrive.

A professional marriage

The language of personal relationships often dominates discussions about joint leadership. Several interviewees referred to these partnerships as 'professional marriage'. Some AD/ED pairings in theatre are long-term commitments which endure beyond one organisation with ED/AD pairings applying for roles together. 'Personal chemistry' is often cited as a reason why some pairings work (or fail), and less than ideal situations are described as 'forced marriages'.

Regardless of how a pairing comes together, interviewees and the wider literature concur that, as with romantic love, it takes time – and effort – to build an effective relationship and stressed the importance of partners sharing common values. Just as sometimes 'opposites attract', difference of approach and experience was also apparent and found to be highly productive in professional relationships.

It is this difference which is considered the greatest asset of collaborative working – the grit in the oyster which makes the pearl. And yet it is also this difference which can lead to conflict within partnerships, ultimately poor performance or even breakdown of the relationship. For collaborative leaders, awareness of their own preferred way of interacting with others, combined with the ability to adapt their style for different situations, ('emotional intelligence') emerges as a key competency.

Beyond their own working relationships, collaborative leaders are adept at managing the inherent tensions within non-profit arts organisations between the different agendas of mission and money, artistic innovation and audience experience. The skill of collaborative leaders is to create an environment, a framework and an organisational culture, in which difference can support

and result in a synthesis of ideas, rather than a battle between opposing camps – characterised as ‘creatives versus suits’.

Joint leaders have to be collaborative leaders, but in the arts and cultural sector what can be overlooked is that single Directors also need to be just as (if not more) collaborative as joint leaders.

AD and ED are inter-dependent roles – it is not a transactional relationship where the role is split into two distinct parts so that it can be done separately. Therefore joint leaders need to share responsibility for the key objectives (programme, budget etc). Performance management and accountability structures also need to encourage collaboration not competition.

While many working in the arts may aspire to collaboration: relatively few achieve it. As MMM highlight in their report on collaborative working, participants often know what is required in theory and have good intentions but lack the competencies required.⁷ Collaboration is demanding and the necessary values to achieve success also often run counter to prevailing attitudes and ways of doing things within our organisations. Recognising the systems and behaviours that underpin collaboration and having in place measures that reflect *how* leaders (and organisations) work and not just *what* they achieve is imperative if Boards are to be able to support and challenge executive leaders.

What needs to change

‘Too often they [the Boards] want someone who is a charismatic leader in the Director role whereas in my opinion often what they need is someone who’s a great manager and who has a talented team whom they enable to deliver.’

Theatre offers of a model of leadership from which I believe we can learn in visual arts. It is more collaborative and respects the need for organisational as well as artistic leadership. There are many parallels between leadership in theatre and visual arts – but also some key differences. Within theatre, EDs play a key role in programming, and the audience is recognised as being fundamental to strategy – both in terms of the mission but also the simple economics of the box office.

Theatre EDs work within the theatre sector throughout their careers which means that those running theatres have a deep understanding of their artform and the business of theatre. Often there is significant overlap of experience and skills between ED and AD, although their roles are distinct.

Many EDs have been CEOs themselves, often in venues which are not producing-theatres (such as art centres). They are committed to their Artistic Directors – and particular about who they will work with – and they feel that theatres should be led by artists, not administrators. In turn, theatre ADs value organisational leaders and have visions for their organisations which extend far beyond the artistic programme to include their relationship with audiences, place and the wide range of people they recognise contribute to making successful theatre.

Fundamentally, leadership in the visual arts needs to change to become more collaborative – both in terms of how we work within and beyond our

walls. Management capacity also needs to be urgently addressed because of the unprecedented external challenges we are facing.

Joint leadership structures are one way to address this situation, but there are also other options – and in the long term a more strategic approach professional development of curators specifically, but visual arts professionals more widely, has to be the priority. Ironically, for a sector where many employees have two or even three university degrees, professional learning seems to stop when we enter the workplace. All of us concerned with visual arts leadership need to value ongoing professional development, to develop recognised standards and invest in people to a level far beyond current practice.

In the short-term increasing management capacity is crucial, although again this does not have to be limited to the adoption of a joint leadership model. Many interviewees acknowledged the under-utilised capacity within our organisations, and potentially through volunteers, which could be unlocked with a small amount of training and peer-peer mentoring.

A little investment, underpinned by a far bigger change towards more collaborative leadership, could unlock the skills and resources needed by this sector to become far more entrepreneurial and audience-focussed. Two heads are better than one: but why stop at two? Joint leadership models, and collaborative leadership more widely, capitalises on the new ideas that spring from bringing together different experiences and perspectives. Small teams, whether teams of two or larger management groups working to a single Director, are the most effective units for running organisations. But to thrive into the next decade we will need to engage all staff, volunteers, supporters, and audiences: collaborative leaders know how to harness and engage this far wider range of contributors.

Summary of recommendations

1. Boards, funders and visual arts leaders need to revisit our mission and values in the non-profit visual arts sector

We may need new leadership structures, but more important is a new leadership culture which I suggest is based on the following values:

- Genuine respect for artists *and* audiences. Belief that arts organisations exist to create art experiences for audiences and have responsibility to support and develop innovative artistic practice.
- Belief that all staff are creative and have mission-critical roles: not just the artistic team.
- Pride in developing ‘talent’ and facilitating the work of others rather than believing that you alone can achieve success.
- A vision for the arts that extends beyond the art world and sees a role for arts organisations in the life of the community.
- An understanding of the distinct role different arts organisations play in a wider ecology – i.e. looking to smaller organisations to profile emerging artists and using the resources of a larger space to develop audiences and to provide curatorially rigorous appraisals of an artist’s career, to offer fresh insights.

2. Boards need to select executive leaders who can work collaboratively and who possess a strategic vision for the organisation

- Boards need to look for collaborative competencies in all leaders – whether as joint leaders or single Directors.
- Key attributes required in leaders in the visual arts include an entrepreneurial approach to resourcing the organisation and a strong vision for the kind of relationship they want with their audiences and their context.
- When looking to recruit a new leader an organisation should be open to a range of possible models including the single Director and the joint Artistic and Executive Director models.

3. Boards need to be more active in supporting and holding executive leaders to account

- Collaborative leadership is a tall order and we should therefore expect our leaders to need to continue to develop their skills throughout their careers, including after appointment.
- Performance management of executive leaders should assess how effective they are in achieving collaboration. *How* people achieve results, not just *what* they do, matters. For example, a brilliant programme is important, but not at the expense of external relationships, declining audience figures, or a high turnover of staff who declare they can’t work with a ‘difficult’ colleague.

- In a joint leadership model both the AD and the ED, and in a single Director model the whole SMT, need to be jointly responsible for delivering a high quality programme, generating the necessary income and meeting the audience engagement targets they jointly agree with the Board.

4. Boards, funders, visual arts professionals and our professional bodies and networks (including VAGA, Turning Point and PlusTate) need to take professional development far more seriously in future

- The amount of time invested in developing people needs to change dramatically. It will also take some money, but this need not be a major barrier as many low-cost and free options exist. It is primarily a change in culture that is required.
- Developing professional standards for contemporary and modern art curators would encourage curators to value professional development and to recognise the wider competencies they need to acquire. This will improve both organisational performance and individual professional development and mobility.

5. Management, and managers, needs to be better understood in the visual arts

- To create extraordinary art experiences we need to make the most of our resources – financial and human. In mid-scale and larger galleries that can be done by employing dedicated strategic managers, but this is not the only option.
- There are many other over-qualified, under-utilised people in the visual arts sector who could develop the entrepreneurial skills we badly need – given some encouragement. But this requires a shift in the culture of the visual arts so that roles beyond the curator are valued properly.
- All staff, whether technicians, marketing officers, learning professionals or curators need to feel they are equally valued by the organisation; that they ‘own’ the programme; that they contribute directly to the mission. A good collaborative leader can deliver this shared vision.

Full report available to download from www.claireantrobus.com/publications

Appendix 1: List of interviewees

Alex Beard, Deputy Director, Tate
Vivienne Bennett, Director National Visual Arts Strategy, Arts Council England
Claire Byers, Deputy Director, Baltic
Martin Clark, Artistic Director, Tate St Ives
Caroline Collier, Director Tate National
Hilary Gresty, Director, Visual Arts and Galleries Association (VAGA)
Christoph Grunenberg, Director, Tate Liverpool
Judith Harry, Deputy Director, Ikon Gallery
Vikki Heywood, Executive Director, Royal Shakespeare Company
Donald Hyslop, Head of Regeneration & Community Partnerships, Tate
Julie Lomax, Director of Visual Arts, Arts Council England London
Baroness Genista McIntosh, former Executive Director National Theatre
Andrea Nixon, Executive Director, Tate Liverpool
Emma Morris, Director, Photoworks
Mark Osterfield, Executive Director, Tate St Ives
Helen Pearson, Director of Development and Alumni Relations, University of Gloucester and formerly Deputy Director Arnolfini
Victoria Pomeroy, Director, Turner Contemporary
Sarah Preece, Executive Director, Battersea Arts Centre
Susan Royce, independent consultant
Sir Nicholas Serota, Director, Tate
Loveday Shewell, Chair Arnolfini and former Administrator Whitechapel Gallery
Roxana Silbert, Associate Director, Royal Shakespeare Company
Laura Sillars, Director, Site Gallery
Paul Smith, Executive Director, Liverpool Biennial
Stephen Snoddy, Director, New Art Gallery Walsall
Nick Starr, Executive Director, National Theatre
Alex Stewart, recruitment consultant, Saxton Bampfylde Ltd
Sir John Tusa, former Managing Director Barbican and Chair of several Boards
Alastair Upton, CEO, the Bluecoat
Jonathan Watkins, Director, Ikon Gallery
Erica Whyman, Chief Executive, Northern Stage
Tom Wilcox, former Managing Director, Whitechapel Gallery
Godfrey Worsdale, Director, Baltic
Sheena Wrigley, General Director and Joint CEO, West Yorkshire Playhouse

Appendix 2: Leadership structures in art galleries and museums: the options

Pros	Cons	Contexts	Implications
<p>Director or CEO</p> <p>Very effective if suitable person can be found.</p> <p>May be easier to unite the whole organisation, avoiding a tendency to fall into 'suits and creatives' mindset.</p> <p>Simplest model to recruit and manage for Boards.</p>	<p>Director or CEO</p> <p>Difficult for one person to bring the breadth of vision, skills and experience required.</p> <p>Can be isolated, lacking critical friends.</p> <p>Organisation can become over-dependent on one individual and fail to capitalise on talent and effort of wider team.</p> <p>Demanding nature of role deters some applicants for professional and/or personal reasons.</p> <p>Perceived lack of artistic identity or leadership if Director not a curator by training.</p>	<p>Director or CEO</p> <p>Particularly effective in a crisis or turnaround situation when the ability to make decisions quickly is required.</p> <p>Organisations which need to establish a strong profile (e.g. start-ups, after crises) may also benefit from this model.</p> <p>Scale is another important consideration: single Directors models are ideal for smaller, less complex organisations.</p> <p>Suits highly specialised ACOs for reasons of external (and internal) credibility.</p>	<p>Director or CEO</p> <p>Need to recruit <i>collaborative</i> leaders with both the breadth of ambition/ vision and a full understanding of the business.</p> <p>External 'critical friend' support from Chair, a coach or mentor or informal peer relationships useful.</p> <p>Delegation crucial, as is development and empowerment of a range of 'deputies' to share responsibilities internally and externally and for succession.</p> <p>Needs sufficient expertise to hold artistic lead and audience lead to account if not an expert in one of those areas themselves.</p>
<p>Director-Deputy Director</p> <p>Can supplement missing areas of expertise and share workload with single Director.</p> <p>Often recruited from outside visual arts sector, bringing new perspectives as well as skills.</p>	<p>Director-Deputy Director</p> <p>More commonly an operational rather than strategic role.</p> <p>Areas led by DD perceived to be less important.</p> <p>Lack of status and authority deters some candidates.</p>	<p>Director-Deputy Director</p> <p>Not recommended as unclear what benefits this model has over AD-ED; can be ineffective and it can be more difficult to recruit into and retain good candidates.</p>	<p>Director-Deputy Director</p> <p>Career progression for existing DDs needs to be addressed by employers. Recommend moving towards ED model.</p>

Pros	Cons	Contexts	Implications
<p>Executive Director/ Artistic Director</p> <p>Inherently collaborative model – therefore more innovative and resilient.</p> <p>In-built critical friends.</p> <p>Enables more time to be devoted to artistic leadership and business development.</p> <p>Business continuity – if one person leaves organisation not destabilised.</p> <p>Doubles range of skills, knowledge and reach of the leadership.</p> <p>Job-share potential could give employers and employees more flexibility.</p>	<p>Executive Director/ Artistic Director</p> <p>Potentially more expensive (although only marginally more expensive than Deputy Director and role should generate additional income and improve performance).</p> <p>Poorly defined roles and mis-matched pairings could be disruptive.</p> <p>Shorthand of AD=art and ED=business has to be avoided or this divides organisation into ‘creatives and suits’.</p> <p>Not all leaders want to (or can) share power.</p>	<p>Executive Director/ Artistic Director</p> <p>Provides additional capacity during periods of major change or uncertainty – such as major capital projects, periods of growth or merger.</p> <p>Particularly effective for leaders in their first executive role who can learn together in a supportive environment.</p> <p>Should never be used as a structural ‘solution’ for an AD who doesn’t want the full responsibility of leading the organisation.</p>	<p>Executive Director/ Artistic Director</p> <p>Both AD and ED need to want to work collaboratively and respect and understand their counterparts’ role and expertise.</p> <p>ED and AD need shared values and to be able to work together in terms of their styles.</p> <p>Recruitment into (and succession planning for) these roles needs to take account of closeness of AD-ED relationship.</p> <p>Structures (including reporting and JDs) need to reflect and foster joint responsibility with distinct roles – not separate areas of responsibility.</p>
<p>Outsourced</p> <p>Offers experience of various organisations.</p> <p>Time-limited injection of skills/capacity.</p>	<p>Outsourced</p> <p>Relatively expensive.</p> <p>Doesn’t necessarily build capacity of the organisation – can be a sticking plaster.</p>	<p>Outsourced</p> <p>Works well for clearly defined projects (such as a merger, building project).</p> <p>Not suited to all aspects of ED role – e.g. external relations, developing staff and brand.</p>	<p>Outsourced</p> <p>Rather than appointing consultants on fixed-term, task-focussed contracts, better results. More effective learning capture and value for money could be achieved through short-term or part-time ED appointments.</p>

Notes

¹ Sara Selwood, 2008. *Towards developing a strategy for contemporary visual arts collections in the English regions*, Arts Council England, London, pp.32-33 and Table 1. Selwood calculates subsidy per attendance rising from £3.40 per visit in 2004/05 to £4.35 per visit in 2006/7 among ACE funded galleries.

² Arts Council England, 2006. *Turning Point: a strategy for the contemporary visual arts*. London: Arts Council England, p.25.

³ For a summary of the evidence around capitalisation of the arts and cultural sector see section 3.1 of Margaret Bolton, Clare Cooper, Claire Antrobus, Joe Ludlow & Holly Tebbutt, 2011. *Capital Matters: how to build financial resilience in the UK's arts and cultural sector*, London: Mission, Models and Money. In terms of the visual arts, Susan Royce concludes 'Most visual arts organisations are under-capitalised', in Susan Royce, 2010. *Business models in the visual arts*. Draft published report. Arts Council England: London, p.2.

⁴ Bolton et al., 2011, op. cit.

⁵ With the exception of the Whitechapel Gallery, which was founded in 1903, most of the exhibition galleries that now form the backbone of the contemporary arts infrastructure emerged since the 1960s. For more information of the development of the gallery infrastructure in England see Claire Glossop, 2003. 'A revolution in the gallery: From the Arts Council to the artist', in *Sculpture in 20th century Britain*, vol.1, ed. Penelope Curtis, Leeds: Henry Moore Institute.

⁶ Meredith R. Belbin, 2010. *Team roles at work*, second edition. London: Elsevier, p.63.

⁷ 'They frequently avoid discussing difficult subjects because they want to avoid conflict. They know that trust is important but they often lack reliable strategies for building it', Clare Cooper, 2010. *Fuelling 'The Necessary Revolution': supporting best practice in collaborative working amongst creative practitioners and organisations - a guide for public and private funders*. London: MMM, p.23.