King's College LONDON

Activist-in-Residence Programmes in Higher Education

CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON CHALLENGES AND POSSIBILITIES IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

A working paper
May 2022

Nayana Dhavan, Sebastian Matzner & Ed Stevens

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

ABSTRACT

Activist-in-residence schemes in Higher Education Institutions represent a paradox: what space exists for activists in institutions, which are often seen as (re-)creating and perpetuating hegemonic structures and/or thought of as the epistemic sources and reinforcers of the very ideas which activists aim to disrupt? In this working paper, we examine the motivations and theoretical considerations that drive the establishment of such residencies and discuss the tensions and possibilities that arise from this inherent paradox. Based on an analysis of existing AIR schemes and current theoretical framings of AIRs, we propose a practical framework for developing and assessing activist-in-residence programmes. We then offer reflections on a pioneering activist-in-residence scheme at King's College London's, piloted through Queer@King's, an interdisciplinary research centre specialising in gender and sexuality from 2019–21. Drawing on this case study, this paper seeks to reflect on the expectations, practicalities, challenges, and outcomes of operating such schemes.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AIR	Activist-in-Residence
HEI	Higher Education Institution
KCL	King' College London
LGBTQ+	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer plus
LSE	London School of Economics
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
UCLA	University of California, Los Angeles
UCSC	University of California, Santa Cruz

PART ONE. Understanding the tensions and opportunities in AIRs: a brief review of theory and existing programmes

Chapter 1. Introduction

Activist-in-residence schemes (hereafter AIR)[1] in Higher Education Institutions (hereafter HEIs) represent a paradox: what space exists for activists in institutions, which are often seen as (re-)creating and perpetuating hegemonic structures and/or thought of as the epistemic sources and reinforcers of the very ideas which activists aim to disrupt? In this working paper, we examine the motivations and theoretical considerations that drive the establishment of such residencies and discuss the tensions and possibilities that arise from this inherent paradox. Based on an analysis of existing AIR schemes and current theoretical framings of AIRs, we propose a practical framework for developing and assessing activist-in-residence programmes. We then offer reflections on a pioneering activist-in-residence scheme at King's College London's, piloted through Queer@King's, an interdisciplinary research centre specialising in gender and sexuality from 2019–21. Drawing on this case study, this paper seeks to reflect on the expectations, practicalities, challenges, and outcomes of operating such schemes.

Activist residencies are run on university campuses and at policy or non-governmental organisations where work centres on social justice causes. Compared to artist residencies, which have a longer tradition, activist residencies are fewer and less established. However, the purpose of both is to give a space and a platform to individuals and groups whose systems of knowledge acquisition and production are different from those of host organisations. Such residencies invite an expertise, epistemology, and worldview, which, in its difference, challenges not only the production of knowledge and culture of the host institution but also the modes of organisational functioning and conceptualisations of success as conventionally valorised. Our focus here is on activist residencies, however, given the limited number of empirical examples of past and present activist residencies, we also consider artist residencies in HEIs where these focus on a social good and are set up with a view to incorporate comparable concepts, motivations, and processes as activist residencies. By drawing on a variety of schemes in Europe and the US, we aim to develop a better understanding of the purpose, structure, and modes of engagement of such schemes as well as to offer some theoretical considerations.

---

[1] In this paper, 'scheme', 'programme' and 'residency' are used interchangeably to refer to Activist-in-Residence (AIR) programmes.

In this context, it is necessary to engage with the fundamental debate on whether and how activism fits into HEIs and how (and which) opportunities and tensions arise from this configuration for activists, academics, and institutions. Understanding how theoretical expectations, practical constraints and challenges interact in the attempt to create social impact is salient for evaluating the journey from inception, implementation and process to the outcomes and impact of AIR programmes. In this paper, we explore the expressed purposes and currently used structures of existing residency schemes and examine proposed and actual engagement between activists and HEIs through AIRs. Publicly accessible documentation and evaluation of these schemes were found to be limited: there is scarce narrative evidence on the nature of these collaborations, successes and failures, or on the tensions and opportunities that arise, from both the activist and the institutional perspectives. Thus, we adapt tools used in other residencies and draw on some of the theoretical concepts from process evaluation to propose a framework for reviewing what the AIR offers to those involved.[2]

Chapter 2. Activist Residencies in Higher Education: Rationale, Motivations, Tensions

2.1 The University and Social Good

Studying the motivations behind AIRs requires an understanding of why universities may wish to engage with activism. In this section, we discuss academia and activism as epistemic sources and engaged scholarship as a way to invite into universities the knowledge and expertise of activists for mutually beneficial work towards the broader social good. We extend this discussion to highlight some of the possible challenges in a collaboration between universities and activists, which then become relevant for schemes like AIRs.

Universities, as sites of learning and knowledge production, have a role in addressing complex contemporary social issues through critical debate, investigation, and teaching (Boyer, 2016; Cuthill et al., 2014; Holmwood, 2011). However, as both scholars and activists have recognised, the social status of HEIs as experts in knowledge generation creates a research/knowledge authority monopoly to the exclusion of other forms of discourse, research, and expertise (Biesta, 2007; Stehr et al., 2009). Moreover, historically, those who produce knowledge at universities are not representative of diversity in society; universities have, therefore, been recognised as creating or sustaining the power of elites, and even as (re)producing or

maintaining discriminatory power structures (Castells, 2001; Holmwood, 2011). In this way, while tasked with critically examining the roots of social injustice, HEIs can themselves become sites of epistemic or cognitive injustice if they 'other' the knowledges, epistemologies, experiences, and ways of generating knowledge of marginalised peoples (Fricker, 2007; Hall et al., 2013; Martin, 2016; People's Knowledge Editorial Collective, 2016). By examining the world exclusively from a narrow viewpoint of privileged elites, the work and knowledge thus produced not only reinforces inequity but becomes limited in its ability to address the social issues of individuals and groups whose voices are absent or under-represented in academia (Bhambra et al., 2018; Haraway, 1988).

2.2 Activist Residencies as a Form of Engaged Scholarship

'Scholarship of engagement' seeks to tackle such exclusionary dynamics in order to enable universities to better fulfil their role of critiquing society and resolving complex social problems (Boyer, 2016). The concept of 'engaged scholarship' emerged as a democratic mandate for HEIs and is defined as 'a collaborative form of inquiry in which academics and practitioners leverage their different perspectives and competencies to co-produce knowledge about a complex problem or phenomenon that exists under conditions of uncertainty found in the world' (Van de Ven, 2007). This approach goes beyond the concepts of 'outreach' and 'service', which emphasise the role of the university as 'giver' (engaged in a transfer of power and/or knowledge), and moves instead towards the more equitable idea of 'engagement' (Glass and Fitzgerald, 2010). The concept has been foundational for numerous ways in which universities seek to engage with communities to benefit both university actors (students, researchers, faculty, and staff) and partner communities as well as to help universities achieve (one of) their larger mission objectives: to respond to the complex political economic and social issues of their time and geographical context (Peterson, 2009).

Engaged scholarship can include varied ways of conducting research with communities (Cuthill, 2012), such as Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) (Minkler and Wallerstein, 2003), co-production (Banks et al., 2018) and participatory action research (Kindon et al., 2007). Scholarship on these practices and models demonstrates how they create spaces for reflexivity about the involved researchers' own positionality and identity, indicating that the evolution of identity in the process of research itself helps all participants involved in the collaboration to contribute to social change (Stevens, 2020). Following in this tradition, AIRs bring together the expertise and resources of activists and academics around a common social cause, while stimulating heightened reflexivity concerning ways of being and doing. In this way, AIRs offer another way to enact engaged scholarship as well as responding to the critiques of universities as detached from society at large.

2.3 Tensions and Challenges

In recent years, universities have also been subject to a neoliberal shift which reorients their role from knowledge-democratic to knowledge-economic ends, that is, towards the production of measurable economically-beneficial effects with a real-world impact (Bourke, 2013; Burawoy and Holmwood, 2011). Excellence frameworks which track such outputs—like the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) in the UK—constitute institutionalised structures created to recognise socio-economic impact (UKRI, 2022). On a broader level, this creates a pressure for academics to achieve, maintain, and demonstrate links of their work to social impact and/or to other measurable or demonstrable ways of contributing to this neoliberal notion of a university (Chubb, 2017). Some scholars note that the academy may, as a result, favour certain ways of working which lead to recognisable outputs as pegged to professional success.

Within such neoliberalised settings, working with activists may be perceived by academics as a risky endeavour (Chubb, 2017; Reiter, 2014). While engaging with communities, such as through a residency, may be a potential method for more inclusive knowledge production, it also risks conscripting such communities into the workings of regimes that are often themselves the target of their activism. Burawoy highlights how this shift in the configuration of the university has led to the emergence of instrumental engagements with communities, which emphasise outcomes for policy and policymakers and serve as measures of professional success for academics, rather than functioning as a critical, reflexive knowledge-building exercise aimed at contributing to a public good (Burawoy and Holmwood, 2011). The 'participation' of communities then becomes a co-optation to serve neoliberal purposes (Leal, 2007), namely, the extraction and accrual of value through the creation of a specific form of research outputs within an academic-institutional marketplace. Moreover, when activists agree to take on a role in HEIs, they enter the established procedures and priorities of academia. Beyond the risk of instrumentalisation lies the additional question whether being hosted by an HEI automatically turns activists into 'tempered radicals', forced to modulate their activism to an acceptable level in order to function within the higher education environment and gain/retain access to its resources (Meyerson and Scully, 1995).

Even if engagement with activists and communities is undertaken as a genuine attempt to contribute to social justice and to develop more inclusive processes, a further issue is the process by which activists enter universities. The question of who is selected and deemed a 'viable and productive resident' within an established institution calls for reflection on the restrictive effects of the relevant decision-guiding perspectives of both activists and academics/institutions for the forms of activism that eventually are 'in residence'. Some scholars doubt whether activists can ever be housed in institutions if their purpose is to disrupt power structures (McGuirk and O'Neill, 2012). The mere fact (and symbolic gesture) of issuing of an

'invitation' (pointedly in the competitive context an open call) directly relates to the core issue of the relative distribution of power, as Leal explains:

> *Genuine empowerment is about poor people seizing and constructing popular power through their own praxis. It is not handed down from the powerful to the powerless, as institutional development has conveniently chosen to interpret the concept. Those who give power condition it, for, as Paulo Freire (1970) best put it himself: 'Freedom is acquired by conquest, not by gift'. (Leal, 2007, p. 545)*

Understanding the power dynamics when an HEI provides both space and resources to activists is thus a critical part of assessing how universities value activists-in-residence and whether and how activists are able to negotiate their own sense of identity in these collaborations (Gitlin and Russell, 1994; Stevens, 2020). Moreover, ways of working, generating knowledge, and the meaning of space and collaboration may all vary in the highly institutionalised structures of an HEI as compared with those of activist contexts (Cameron, 2007; Kindon et al., 2007). Bringing together markedly different modes of operating is a relational activity which can in itself lead to conflict (Barge and Shockley-Zalabak, 2008; Van de Ven, 2007).

A way of addressing some of these concerns about AIRs lies in creating processes that help establish meaningful collaborations, including the mindful building of fair partnerships and the respectful and inclusive discussion and negotiation of expectations and plans (Hall et al., 2013; Minkler and Wallerstein, 2003). Further, engaged scholarship between academics and communities requires consistent, sustained engagement throughout the entire process (from inception through to evaluation) and must benefit the community (directly or indirectly) as the ultimate determinative factor in assessing its success (Stanton, 2008). Processes that confront and address these tensions must be built into the programme, which means creating time and space for reflection and communication during the residency and ensuring that they are inclusive (Gitlin and Russell, 1994; Ladwig and Gore, 1994). Equally, openness to discussing conflict and failure in engaged scholarship, embedded in a process of creating a metaknowledge about the experience, can prove helpful both for current participants (as reflective practitioners) and for others (who might consider exploring this model of activist-academia collaboration) (Gitlin and Russell, 1994; Reiter and Oslender, 2014; Rooke, 2016).

2.4 Conclusion – Priorities in Assessing AIRs

In summary, AIRs promise to be one way to address some of the critiques of contemporary HEIs: in tackling issues of exclusivity and underrepresentation, and in (potentially) providing an in-house critique of universities as institutions that position themselves as a conscience of societies yet simultaneously may contribute to

(or may at least be complicit in) certain social inequities. In creating these programmes, it is furthermore of critical importance to be mindful of the risks of instrumentalisation and/or of enclosing the activist work in conventional academic formats (which, from the start, cap their disruptive and catalytic potential). What may seem like a valuable offering from the university/academic side—a space to step back and reflect critically on one's assumptions and conclusions—may not be or seem of equal value and importance to those immediately engaged in a current struggle. While there is potential here for the joint interrogation of and reflection on the mutual shaping of theory and practice in activist and academic work, it is important to account for the fact that the default positions of the collaborators—with activists oriented towards action and academics towards reflection—are likely to present a tension in motivation, approach, and outcome expectations that themselves require addressing and negotiating.

Addressing these challenges and tensions requires the establishment of processes and spaces to confront these issues from the outset. This can be done by evaluating what space is made available to the activist, what conditions and expectations exist on all sides (institutional, academic, activist) and how the collaboration can be (made to be) meaningful. Drawing on Freire's seminal work (Freire, 1970), we would argue that the essential purpose of an AIR is to put into action the combined knowledge created in universities and in the work of activists, while creating a transformative space for both activists and academics that ignites critical consciousness as to their respective involvement in oppression, systemic positions, praxis and/or operating assumptions.

In the next section, we offer a short review of a selection of HEI residencies to unearth patterns in their goals and built-in expectations as evidenced in currently existing programmes.

Chapter 3. Activist-in-Residence: Review of Existing Programmes

There is a long tradition of artist residencies at Western HEIs aiming to 'provide artists and other creative professionals with time, space and resources to work, individually or collectively, on areas of their practice that reward heightened reflection or focus.' (Open Method of Coordination (OMC) Working Group of EU Member States Experts on Artists' Residencies, 2014) This 'heightened reflection and focus' could be viewed as an advantage for activists as well. However, there are significant differences in the placement of activists and artists in universities: artists in residence are often given an institutional placement in places which are already part of the 'art world' (such as a university museum, collection, or gallery). Equally, selecting and recognising new or noteworthy artists is often part of the existing work of such institutions and shapes the place of these institutions in the larger social and cultural landscape. This is in contrast to the invitation of activists into higher education institutions: the presence of activists in academia usually comes with the paradox of relocating disruptive activist energies—via a competitive selection mechanism—into a setting that is part of the establishment against which these energies are directed.

Against this backdrop, we review in this section existing activist-in-residence schemes to analyse the motivations and potential impacts of these programmes. Due to the paucity of literature on activists-in-residence, we also include social-justice driven artist residencies to provide an understanding of how these schemes are framed and how they play out for the actors involved in an HEI setting.

AIRs have been established in the US and Europe in the last few decades and a number have been housed in HEIs as well as institutions whose work is linked with development or social change. Our analysis below includes six residencies in the UK and ten in the US whose calls for applications, scheme descriptions, and linked institutional websites and blogs are publicly accessible. We conducted a thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998) of the goals and aims, format and type of engagement as well as any discussion of potential or actual effects, outputs, or impacts. The emerging patterns and themes are presented below. An initial finding is the paucity of public documentation about these schemes. In presenting our findings, we acknowledge that the absence of a theme or issue in a programme document does not indicate that it is not important, merely that we could not find documentation of it. We do believe, however, that examining the framing of the programme and respective roles as well as what is mentioned (and what not) can draw attention to articulated and unarticulated institutional expectations and priorities and, consequently, provides some insight into how universities view the role of AIR. It is hoped that, in the future, publicly accessible reflections on the actual experiences in running AIRs—such as offered in the reflections on the Queer@King's pilot scheme

within and appended to this paper (see SM's reflection piece in Appendix B)—will generate, over time, more grounded evidence for further work and critical reflection on this format. Appendix A offers a brief description of the activist and artist residencies reviewed here. In reviewing these residencies, we first outline some general characteristics of schemes. We then discuss themes that emerged from the point of view of actors (benefits to activists, academics and universities), the broader implications for knowledge and movement-building, and any discussion of potential or actual effects. For ease of reference, we may use in what follows the term 'activist' even when the person selected is an artist participating in a social change/justice-oriented programme.

HEI residencies focused on social issues vary in their structure greatly: from a few months to a year in length, and occasionally longer. Some cover living expenses or accommodation and a stipend, whereas others offer stipends or grants towards projects, and are thus not (necessarily) 'residencies' in the sense of a sustained on-site presence. The topics of residencies cover a breadth of issues: women and gender (LSE, 2020), LGBTQ and sexuality (Univ. of Brighton, 2020a), urban studies (UCL, 2020a), environmental studies (Univ. of Sussex, 2020), postcolonial studies (Goldsmiths, 2020a), human rights (Columbia Law School, 2020). However, even within these topics, the residencies allow for and encourage interdisciplinary work; for instance, the AIR at LSE is focused on the work of the Centre on Women, Peace and Security. Calling it a gender programme is therefore reductive (LSE, 2020). Another recent example of an interdisciplinary approach is the University of York's 'arctivist' programme which awarded grants to online collaborations between activists and artists that addressed social challenges in the COVID-19 pandemic (University of York, 2020). While the work itself may be interdisciplinary, programme descriptions occasionally note that the topic of the residency must 'align with the mission of the [institution]' (UCSC, n.d.) or point out that one criterion for selection is 'the fit with the ethos and aims of the [institution]' (Univ. of Brighton, 2020a). Given that institutions housing these residencies aim to critique and expand knowledge about pressing social issues, such phrasings may not indicate a need for conformity, however, they highlight the importance of examining the activist's experience of the culture of the host institution. Relatedly, alongside the criteria listed in published calls for residency applications, these tend not to discuss how the review panel is constructed and how the selection takes place, which underlines the previously flagged concerns surrounding representation in universities.

Descriptions of programmes reveal a pattern in their focus on elaborating the benefit to activists, while leaving the benefit to the institution understated. This might reflect a power dynamic in which the activist is being 'invited' into an institution and thus the explanation of the programmes is geared towards making them attractive to the activist (on this theme of 'inviting activism', see section 2 above). The breadth of these benefits includes the time and space to do or enrich the activist's work or thinking as well as the advantages of an academic environment and

resources to support their work. The offer of campus resources is fairly constant (a typical example mentions 'desk space, venues/rooms, media equipment, art practice spaces, lectures, libraries, journals, a web page with long-term hosting, administrative support, and academic staff' (Univ. of Brighton, 2020a); however a question remains regarding the extent to which these resources are useful, desired, and used by activists, or whether other (kinds of) resources from the HEI, if they emerged as (more) useful to the activist's work, could later be negotiated as part of the residency. Also unclear is access to 'academic staff': expectations of what academic staff can and cannot offer (given the institutional constraints and demands they operate under) may be considerably less clear to those outside of HEIs than those within.

Many host institutions focus on kick-starting, developing, and/or promoting the activist's own work (Barnard College, 2018; Goldsmiths, 2020a; LSE, 2020; Smith College, 2020). Expectations regarding the work to be undertaken in residence typically remain open and flexible but may involve a 'tailored plan of engagement' (LSE, 2020). While artist residencies might use the term 'original work' (Goldsmiths, 2020a) to pinpoint an intended/expected 'output', more scholarly-oriented schemes aim to assist activists in translating their work to academic formats and offer mentorship to do so (Columbia Law School, 2020).

AIRs are frequently framed as a space for reflection (LSE, 2020; UCLA, 2020), recognising that 'activist work is unrecognized, tiring, and demanding' (UCSC, n.d.). It is important to note that several residencies market the residency as a way to 'deepen' (Barnard College, 2018), 'advance', or 'develop' (Univ. of Brighton, 2020a) the activist's ways of thinking. While it is fair to say that these residencies are creating, by their establishment, a space for activists, the (self-)portrayal of HEI-based residences as privileged sites for changing the activist's ways of thinking runs the risk of re-casting universities in their established role of knowledge providers, rather than recognising or providing a platform for the activist's existing expertise and epistemological perspectives and contributions. HEIs as sites for critical enquiry and reflection removed from immediate pressures and use-value calculations remains a core value and ideal of many, if not most, academics but not necessarily of activists. The assumptions and intentions behind this benefit offered to the activist merit greater reflection and open negotiation as part of the residency process, rather than being viewed as a self-evident, shared foundation. This is an aspect of the power dynamic which deserves exploration in AIR implementation.

In addition to the activist's own work, the potential to collaborate with faculty and students is often mentioned; for instance, in order to bridge the 'university-community divide' (UCSC, n.d.). This advantage of collaborative work with the university community tends to focus on students rather than faculty or non-academic staff. The modes of engagement typically include 'workshops, class visits, community meetings or field research opportunities' (UCSC, n.d.) and opportunities

for producing work for blogs, papers and videos, and in the case of artists, works that speak to the social issue (Goldsmiths, 2020a; UCL, 2018). In some cases the activist takes on teacher-like roles as faculty in giving seminars (Colby College, 2020), or in formatively assessing the practice (rather than summatively assessing the academic work) of students (Goldsmiths, 2020b).

Residencies are also spaces for activists to do the work of movement-building by bringing people together, drawing attention to 'public scholarship or service projects' and developing communities and networks around these issues (The Political Hat, 2016; UCLA, 2020). The activist-academic engagement here is centred on the act of seeking to expand the audiences for artists and activists as well as exploring how '[art] can create new audiences for academic research, promoting creative inquiry into [social problems]' (UCL, 2020b). Some schemes make special reference to reaching the university community with the activist's work (Goldsmiths, 2020a).

Another dimension of AIRs lies in recognising the activist's expertise (Smith, 2016) in fostering a spirit of social activism and in helping students connect with real-world social issues alongside developing the skills to be an activist (EWU, 2020; UCLA, 2020; Univ. of Oklahoma, 2020). Activist expertise and knowledge production is generally conceived as removed from academic expertise and knowledge production; it seems rare for the activist to be invited to 'advise on ongoing projects... [or] develop new research agendas' (Columbia Law School, 2020) or to more widely 'contribute to the University's intellectual and political culture' (Univ. of Brighton, 2020a). Some schemes articulate a relatively generic hope that activists will introduce new ways of thinking into academia (Goldsmiths, 2020a; UCLA, 2020) or will lend their expertise in a way that 'harnesses disruptive ideas, open debate and progressive thinking to redress inequalities and social injustices of the twenty-first century' (Univ. of Brighton, 2020b). While these expectations are formulated, the foreseen benefits to faculty are rarely described concretely or documented, and expectations regarding a contribution to research products or processes, or of residencies as spaces for triggering intra-institutional change, are rarely articulated.

Given the findings of this review, it is important to reflect on how different actors conceive the contribution of AIR and activists. What do faculty stand to gain from these schemes? How comfortable are activists with joining neoliberalised institutions? How do activists translate, modify, critique and share academic knowledge with non-academic audiences? These key issues are discussed in the next section on creating systems for the evaluation of and reflection on AIRs.

PART TWO: Reflecting on and evaluating AIRs: a novel framework and its application to a pilot programme

Chapter 4. Reflecting on and Evaluating AIRs

In reviewing models of activist residencies, several themes have been traced concerning the stated or implied goals and expectations and, to a lesser extent, the forms and results of these programmes. In general, publicly accessible post-residency evaluation and reflection is limited and most available information about schemes consists in calls for proposals and brief mentions of residents' work, for instance in occasional posts in blogs or reports (as seen in section 3). Using the limited empirical evidence available and in light of lit review presented across sections 2 and 3, we now present a range of " themes" and associated questions that we recommend that anyone establishing AIR might consider.

4.1 Reflecting on the Potential and Challenges of AIRs

4.1.1 Motivations and Theories of Change for creating / participating in the AIR

A key criticism facing academics who seek to engage communities is the possible charge of instrumentalisation. It is important to recognise that multiple and divergent motivations for establishing and participating in an AIR—including, for instance, the need for funding (on the part of activists) and academic recognition (on the part of academics/academic institutions)—may well co-exist with meaningful collaboration. However, to mitigate (or at least confront) the risks of instrumentalisation, mutually beneficial processes need to be created from the outset. Initial steps of the programme should include discussions between the activist and the institutional host about the value of the residency to the university and for the activist. It is important to have 'a clear and authentic intention of why you want to bring artists and the community together and what impact you hope to have.' (Alliance of artists communities, n.d.) We believe these initial conversations help build on common aims but also critically, bring to the fore differences and power dynamics which are a source for reflection and a source of rich learning for all involved:

♦ What brings the HEI host and activist together in the AIR? What do both actors see as the benefits of the scheme for themselves, each other and their communities?

- How are the actors' understanding of the AIR the same or different: how do actors conceive the scheme, define activism, think of the role of the activist in the university and the role of the university?

- What would meaningful collaboration mean for both actors?

4.1.2 Theories of Change

As the review of programmes has shown, fit with the ethos or work of the institution (and often more specifically of a particular institute or department) forms part of the selection process. Several guides emphasise this idea of fit between activist and institution (Alliance of artists communities, n.d.; TransArtists, n.d.). However, while it can be assumed that the activist and host identify the same on closely related social issues and have a shared desire to work towards addressing them, a first fundamental discussion should centre on the theories of change that underpin each party's efforts, as each may hold different implicit views on what constitutes change, how change is brought about, and what constitutes successful change. Questions that merit discussion at the outset here include:

- What are the theories (of change) that underlie the programme (what needs to be changed, e.g. in society, at the university and, theoretically, how can this be achieved?) How do the host and activist see their own and the other's role in addressing the social issue? How can the residency be leveraged to this end?

- What are the institution and the activist doing towards this change? Do these current practices intersect, and do they need to? What is gained (and what is lost) by joining forces?

An initial conversation about questions of this kind can mobilise a joint social vision and enable participants to (1) discuss how different creative, conceptual, and organisational mechanisms can work towards the same goal; (2) evaluate the value of the AIR for stakeholders within a wider—but shared—theory of change for the specific social problem; and (3) set concrete expectations in terms of both the objectives and practicalities (roles, responsibilities, needs) of the collaboration.

It is important to highlight that a lack of consensus in this (or other) conversations should not be considered a failure or a problem; rather, this is an exercise in critical reflection (even if expressed through discomfort and dissonance) and for an AIR to live up to its envisaged potential of challenging existing ways of thinking and doing, a central prerequisite is a willingness to embrace the need for openness to dissent. An upfront discussion of expectations and values will also be a factor in establishing a shared understanding of what both parties see as the success or failure of the programme (TransArtists, n.d.).

4.1.3 Planning with Openness and Flexibility

A recurrent theme in the review of residencies was a programmatic openness, evident in a lack of description or prescription of expected outputs/outcomes of a residency. This is echoed in guides on creating artist residencies which emphasise flexibility as a way of countering difficulties that may arise: initial ideas may change and work may take on different directions and require new partnerships (Alliance of artists communities, n.d.; Dutch Culture, n.d.; King's Culture, 2020; Pittsburgh Arts Council, n.d.). This emphasis on openness is also an acknowledgement that the activist (and their communities) may have a way of working that is so fundamentally different from that of academia that any prescription could undermine the association. Rather than trying to (pre)determine a plan or product, this approach requires planned time for discussions about possible engagements, not only at the start but throughout the residency, because it is through these discussions that tensions may emerge and be resolved.

- What possible engagements does the activist want to undertake within the HEI or with actors from the HEI?

- Are there avenues for exploration (rather than specific events or outcomes) that would help further the cause underlying the residency ex. research agendas, feedback on projects etc? How can these engagements and explorations be facilitated?

- How can the understanding of which kinds of engagements worked (or did not) be built into planning future engagements or agendas?

4.1.4 Potential Engagements: creating space for the activist's expertise

Building on the theme of flexible planning, two specific areas of engagements must be highlighted (1) creating space for the activists' expertise (2) engaging actors beyond host and activist — i.e. activist's communities, students, research collectives, departments, and non-academic staff. How can the activist's expertise be shared, with whom and to what end? This is a joint exercise in expectation-setting and requires outlining the time and resources needed, even for a fluid plan (Open Method of Coordination (OMC) Working Group of EU Member States Experts on Artists' Residencies, 2014). However, given the limited time and resources, prioritisation of what is to be achieved should draw on the results of earlier conversations on theories of change and should correlate with the results of discussing the mutual benefits of the programme. This also creates space to find different forms of engagement, which may vary from raising awareness (e.g. presentations, visual displays), exposure (student learning and service, hosting each other's communities), working collaboratively or advising on research, coproducing

new lines of enquiry or agendas, and finding ways to translate knowledge into usable, accessible forms for communities and activists. One guide to residencies emphasises the role of different modes of engagement:

> *Success depends on the project contributing to the strategic aims of faculties and should not be considered only as add-on programmes of activity. Increasing engagement can provide longer-term benefits and impact for the artists and institution and so it is important to reflect on how to involve students, staff and the wider public with the residency. (King's Culture, 2020)*

Thus, the AIR offers an opportunity to learn from the activists' particular ways of working, doing and knowledge-building and deliberating on the questions below create opportunities for different kinds of learning in the HEI:

- How can the activist's expertise and knowledge be shared in the institution? What potential engagements can be envisioned?

- What kind of resources and networks within the institution can be made available for the activist for meaningful collaboration and contribution during their residency?

4.1.5 Fit and Institutional Change: Ongoing Reflection on Power within the Process

A recurrent theme in the review of residencies was a programmatic A further insight yielded by the review was the finding that, while residencies mention collaborations or research, any mention of institutional change is relatively rare. This can also be conceptually linked to the concept of 'tempered radicals' (Meyerson and Scully, 1995), in that any challenge to the system may be systemically moderated and that too much disruption might be avoided for fear of being detrimental to (the present standing or future of) the programme itself (and/or those institutionally responsible for it). While challenging any part of the university may or may not emerge as a perceived need or priority in the initial conversations, it is important to allow for the possibility that this may emerge as an unanticipated or emergent process. Careful thinking is required as to how to negotiate the desire to invite and cultivate disruption, on the one hand, with the risks of such disruption on professionals' working lives.

Making space for discussion and being open to change, challenge, and conflict are central ways to address the unequal power dynamics of inviting an activist into the institution. In general, provision should be made for:

Communication:

♦ **How can opportunities for communication between activist and host be created?**

♦ **How can the existing power dynamics be taken into account when planning and having these discussions?**

This must be planned, regularly maintained, and should include initial conversations about roles as well as ongoing discussions to further the work of the residency and for reflection on issues arising within it (Office of Public Art, 2014).

Documentation:

♦ **What systems can be created to documentation engagement and conversations for further reflection?**

♦ **What kind of formats and ways of sharing documentation are most accessible to those involved?**

Creating such documentation is necessary to trigger reflection and to feed meta-learning into evaluation. This can take many forms (visual, audio, prose, notes, etc) and serves as a way of focusing not just on outcomes but on the process of engagement (King's Culture, 2020; Office of Public Art, 2014).

Feedback:

♦ **What are the ways in which feedback will be collected in different kinds of events between the host, activist, and other members of the HEI to allow for reflection and evaluation?**

♦ **What kind of systems can be created to discuss the feedback so that changes can be incorporated during the residency?**

Feedback must be requested throughout all the AIR processes, wherever possible by activity participants and those supporting the work of the residency and collated as a database (however formal or informal). Gathering such feedback makes it possible to explore avenues of working together better and changing paths as needed. This feedback and reflection can vary in format and may even be incorporated into the activist's work and built back into the programme (King's Culture, 2020).

4.1.6 Ongoing Reflection on Power within the Process

Making space for discussion and being open to change, challenge, and conflict are central ways to address the unequal power dynamics of inviting an activist into the institution. In general, there need to be systems for:

1. **Communication** between activist and host. This must be planned, regularly maintained, and would include initial conversations about roles as well as ongoing discussions to further the work of the residency and for reflection on issues arising within it. (Office of Public Art, 2014)

2. Consistent **documentation** of both engagement and conversations. Creating such documentation is a necessary means for triggering reflection and for feeding meta-learning into the evaluation of the programme. This can take many forms (visual, audio, prose, notes, etc) and serves as a way of focusing not just on outcomes but on the process of engagement. (King's Culture, 2020; Office of Public Art, 2014)

3. **Feedback** in all the above processes from activity participants and from those supporting the work of the residency. Gathering such feedback makes it possible to explore avenues of working together better and changing paths as needed. This feedback and reflection can vary in format and may even be incorporated into the activist's work and built back into the programme (King's Culture, 2020)

4.2 Process Evaluation

Based on the analysis of the previous sections, it is clear that the act of mindfully focusing on the process of engagement during the residency has the potential to deliberately address power dynamics and defuse tensions while also helping to build a meaningful (rather than instrumental) collaboration. Further, focusing on the engagement can serve as a springboard for reflection on established institutional dynamics and ways of doing and thinking, thereby offering an opportunity to crystallise experiences into starting points for institutional change. We therefore draw on key concepts in process evaluation to offer a suitable framework to organise the tensions, themes and procedures discussed in preceding sections. Largely used in the health and development sector, process evaluations are defined as:

> *a study which aims to understand the functioning of an intervention, by examining implementation, mechanisms of impact, and contextual factors. Process evaluation is complementary to, but not a substitute for, high-quality outcomes evaluation. (Moore et al., 2015)*

Focusing on the process separates the 'how' from the 'what' (outputs, outcomes, or impact) AIRs can be conceived as a a way of engagement, the outcome of which is often borne of the process itself. A principle reason for conducting process evaluations is the **complexity** of 'intervention', which expresses itself in (at least) the following ways (Craig et al., 2008; Keshavarz et al., 2010; Moore et al., 2015):

1) the variety of programme components and how they interlink and the skill sets needed to deliver these components: AIRs may have multiple engagements (conversations, collaborations, teaching and workshops) with multiple actors (students, faculty, communities) in addition to the work of the activist, all of which may come together to give unexpected results;

2) the way in which the intervention links with the context and how the context itself feeds into the programme: in this case, the activist-in-residence is, almost by definition framed as an attempt to change the institutional status quo, i.e. a source of productive tension;

3) the degree of flexibility in the programme and permitted variability in outcomes: while AIRs are established with a larger purpose, the emphasis on flexibility is a way to ensure that the activist and host have the space to create the critical discussions and processes most suited to HEIs.

4.2.1 Proposing a reflexive process evaluation framework for AIRs

In this piece, we propose that AIRs benefit from a modified process evaluation: *reflexive process evaluation*. We propose that conducting such an evaluation is necessary to reflect on the programme and on unintended consequences and pathways that arise as a result of the the collaboration and to assess its value for engaged scholarship (Better Evaluation, 2013). As a framework, we place the reflections from the previous sections into the broad structure of process evaluation and provide our own guiding questions for incorporation which could be incorporated into the process of implementation. Process evaluation mainly focuses on three main components: implementation, mechanism, and context (as described in the table below). To provide a complete and more robust framework for AIRs, we have added to these three process components two additional stages for review: the initial stage of reflecting on the motivations for the programme and an ongoing and culminating step of reflecting on outcomes.

It is important to note that we draw on parts of process evaluation and adapt for the particular cases of AIR. Thus, parts of process evaluation are not readily or helpfully translate into the context of AIRs. For instance, AIRs are schemes or programmes rather than 'interventions' which typically have a fixed, projected outcome. Regardless, these programmes are created with a purpose and, as in the case of complex interventions, the theoretical basis of purposive engagement must be present in the establishment of the programme as well as reviewed in the process of implementation. In the case of AIRs, as in some kinds of complex interventions which aim to effect change in communities and organisations, processes and systems are put in place to engender change rather than a specific outcome. Thus, in what follows, we draw on those parts of the theory of process evaluation that can helpfully be applied to AIRs (see Table 1).

Table 1: Framework for Reflexive Process Evaluations of AIRs (based on (Moore et al., 2015))

Aspects of Reflexive Process Evaluation	Questions for discussion	When and how to operationalise
A.Reflecting on motivations		
Guiding question: What are the theories (of change) that underlie the programme (what needs to be changed, e.g. in society, at the university and, theoretically, how can this be achieved?)	Theory of change • What are the institution and the activist doing towards this change? Do these current practices intersect, and do they need to? What is gained (and what is lost) by joining forces? • How do the host and activist see their own and the other's role in addressing the social issue? How can the residency be leveraged to this end? The AIR • On a fundamental level, how do actors conceive the scheme, define activism, think of the role of the activist in the university and the role of the university? • What is the goal of the scheme for the different actors involved and which are most important? Is consensus required`? • What is the potential value of this programme for different actors: students, activist, activist's communities, faculty, university staff, other collaborators?	**Initial discussion** between activist and institutional host; and **(Initial and ongoing) reflection** on how the theory of change, priorities, and goals evolve (e.g. at beginning, mid-term and end, or at agreed intervals)
B. Process evaluation component 1: Implementation		
Guiding question:	• What are possible relationships and engagements between actors that could emerge in the programme to benefit the	Listing and prioritising **possible engagements;**

What are 'the structures and resources in place' (or need to be put in place) 'to achieve successful implementation'? (Moore et al. 2015)	larger goal? How should the host facilitate conversations with different university actors to better understand possible engagements with the activist and how can the activists facilitate conversations with other community members? • Are there avenues for exploration (rather than specific events or outcomes) that would help further the cause underlying the residency ex. research agendas, feedback on projects etc? How can these engagements and explorations be facilitated? • How can the activist's expertise and knowledge be shared in the institution? What potential engagements can be envisioned? • What kind of resources and networks within the institution can be made available for the activist for meaningful collaboration and contribution during their residency?	revisiting the list of possible engagements at different points in the residency **Discussions with various actors** (students, relevant staff/student groups, researchers and departments) about value and potential engagements (driven by theory and priorities) **Documentation** of engagements
C. Process evaluation component 2: Mechanisms		
Guiding question: How do the engagements under the aegis of the residency 'trigger change' (intended or unintended)? (Moore et al. 2015)	• What would meaningful collaboration mean for both actors? • How do various actors respond to and interact with the engagements? • What factors (or people) mediate this process? [for context and environment see next] • What are unanticipated pathways and consequences of engagements in the AIR? • How can the understanding of which kinds of engagements worked (or did not) be built into planning future engagements or agendas?	**Feedback** from actors on engagements **Documentation** of unexpected consequences and unintended or surprising effects Separate and combined **reflection** (activist and host) on change and response for each actor or engagement

D. Process evaluation component 3: Context		
Guiding question: How do external factors affect the functioning of the programme?	• Which/how do contextual factors shape the actors' theories of change in the concrete university setting? In the community? • Which contextual factors affect and/or may be affected by the implementation, programme mechanisms, and outcomes? • What are the causal mechanisms present within the context which act to sustain the status quo or enhance effects?	**Initial discussion** between activist and host to understand each other's contexts and the possible tensions- the context of the university and its processes and the culture of the activist organisation are particularly salient here **Joint reflection** on what affected different engagements and what could be done differently in the future **Reflection** on the presence of the activist in the university – by activist and institutional host
E. Reflection on processes and outcomes		
Guiding question: What did this engagement produce or achieve, both, in the institution and in the community/ society? How did power dynamics in this situation affect potential and actual engagements?	**Communication** • How can opportunities for communication between activist and host be created to reflect on past, present and future engagements? • How can the existing power dynamics be taken into account when planning and having these discussions? **Documentation** • What systems can be created to documentation engagement and conversations for further reflection?	**Documentation** of engagements, collaborations and events; **Products and outcomes** of the collaboration: papers, activities in the community, student participation **Potential ideas and plans for the future**

	• What kind of formats and ways of sharing documentation are most accessible to those involved? **Feedback** • What are the ways in which feedback will be collected in different kinds of events between the host, activist, and other members of the HEI to allow for reflection and evaluation? • What kind of systems can be created to discuss the feedback so that changes can be incorporated during the residency?	

4.3 Application of the Framework: Queer@King's AIR 2019-21

4.3.1 Background, Methods and Limitations

This reflexive process evaluation framework was developed during the pilot activist-in-residence programme which ran at Queer@King's, the Centre for Research and Teaching in Gender & Sexuality Studies at King's College London from 2019-21. It was applied largely at the end of residency to (1) reflect on the pilot and its effects and (2) test the reflection and assessment framework we propose here. Since the framework draws on the idea of process evaluation in health and development (Moore et al., 2015), its application to an AIR seeks to trial it as a means to refine this existing framework and to turn it into a usable tool for others interested in activist-academic engagement.

The data from this pilot case consists of information provided by key actors from the host research centre and a representative of the activist organisation. We relied on documentation and reflection of events as well as conversations between the authors between 2019-2021 as SM and ES were heavily involved in leading and implementing the residency. What follows therefore draws from the extensive reflection written up by SM (Appendix B) and the exit interview with an AIR representative. In light of our own post-residency reflections, we would advise others to reflect on, document and seek feedback from participants (such as students, faculty, collaborators) not only after but throughout the residency, so as to collect relevant data as the residency unfolds.

The exit interview and analysis of case materials were conducted by ND, who was not involved directly in planning and implementation. In terms of positionality, ND is (like SM and ES) affiliated with King's and thus represents the more academic and university perspective; but this bias may be tempered by the research ND conducted for the residency which illuminated many of the issues and tensions in academic-activist collaborations. Further, since ND administered the exit interview with the AIR representative, it is possible that there are issues or nuances that the representative may not have felt comfortable discussing with ND due to her affiliation. However, ND's involvement with the academic side of the residency, allowed her to bring a 'participating observer' perspective to bear on the project, increasing her awareness of aspects which may have been missed by external consultant. The pros and cons of internal versus external evaluation are discussed extensively in process evaluation (Moore et al., 2015) and institutions will want to think deeply about who should conduct data collection and analysis in their evaluations.

4.3.1.1 Ethics

This case was considered a service evaluation and therefore did not require ethics approval from the College. However, standard ethical procedures were followed including the informed consent process with the discussion of risks and benefits, explanation of how personal data would be handled, documentation of consent and opportunity to do member-checks.

4.3.2 Themes from the Framework

We discuss the five themes from the framework (table 1) across this section: (A) Concept of scheme and underlying motivations, (B) Implementation, (C) Mechanisms, (D) Context and (E) Outputs/Outcomes. By design, this pilot (and, we would conjecture, other activist residencies) left room for joint further development of the scheme, thus we consider **planning and flexibility** and the linked processes of **reflection** (section 4.1 and box 1) to cut across these themes, as does 'context' (as proposed in the original framework).

A.   Reflecting on Motivations

In the discussion of how process evaluation was modified for AIRs (section 4.2), the application of this framework for AIRs is based on the understanding that AIRs are not specific interventions but rather complex schemes in which flexibility is built in deliberately to respond to tensions in academic-activist collaboration. In evaluating this case study, it is essential to note that this was from the start conceived as a pilot project, built to understand how an AIR scheme might affect the work of the host research centre and whether and how an affiliation with the university might affect both activists and the communities they seek to serve. In addition, the pilot looked to explore whether engagement between the two parties and their communities could mobilise meaningful contributions to a larger cause (in this case LGBTQ+ issues in the Greater London area). The application itself set out the objectives and parameters of the residency as follows:

> We invite applications from individuals, groups, communities, and organisations – both newly/recently founded and more established – who have **limited or no access to funding and resources** for the realisation of their ideas for community projects and activist work.

> We especially encourage applications for projects that:

> - stand little chance of finding financial support through other means.
> - **experiment** with new or unusual approaches to activist work;
> - **benefit causes and groups** that may otherwise struggle to receive attention or are **under-served/under-represented** in mainstream LGBTQ+ activism;

- make the most of the resources, support, context, and infrastructure that we as a university-based queer centre can offer **to amplify their work**." (See Appendix B)

The discussion of the pilot in this section, especially regarding outputs and outcomes (section E), is guided by these objectives as well as those articulated by the AIR representative. The focus on the Greater London area obviously limited the kinds of organisations that would apply but also configured the residency as offering a platform to organisations whose work and causes are not as well served in mainstream LGBTQ+ discussions.

The pilot project was further shaped by dynamics flagged in Section 2 as to the debate on whether activists can be hosted by universities. Individual responses to the application process pushed back against the idea of a university hosting activists (for more detailed discussion on this, see Appendix B). This again limited the pool of applicants to those whose notions of activism were already aligned in principle with the idea of working with(in) a university and its framework (see the concept of 'fit' as discussed in Section 4.1). This alignment is clearly reflected in the exit interview response of the activist organisation's representative: '*It [their activist organisation] was a very new organisation, we thought we would partner with LGBT organisations, more LGBTQ+ charities, but the first opportunity for partnership was coming from [this university] … we were over the moon to receive funding and [this] partnership*".

Selection

Beyond the criteria for selecting the AIR, the process of selection and the composition of the panel for selection was recognised as challenging (see Section 3; see also (TransArtists, n.d.)). The concerns here were about (a) the relative diversity in the panel (regarding gender, ethnicity and sexuality) and (b) how a panel made up exclusively of academics could select an activist group, given the tendency to select those most like us. Might such a panel default to collaborators that promised some affinity with more academic interests, concerns, or approaches? Selection was made by an existing Steering Group whose composition had been a matter of discussion in its own right within the institution before the AIR. SM reflects further on selection issues in Appendix B but note his suggestion that selection panels would do well to include professional services, students and activists in the selection process.

Discussing Fundamental Concepts

Based on our background research on activist and other residencies in HEIs, we anticipated that there would be challenges and tensions. We found that none of the academics involved questioned the label 'activist' for the chosen organisation. However, the 'activist' label was not as clear-cut as a self-description for the AIR representative who explained that the organisation did not engage in work that

many others (notably non-academics) would readily consider activist work, such as campaigning. Rather, he considered that:

> *Creating awareness and amplifying the voices of LGBTQ+ people is a way of activism. Addressing the lack of inclusion is not just talking about the struggles of our community but also giving visibility to our stories of empowerment and changing the narrative and perception of disabled people, especially in the media. Our aspiration is to equalise the experience of all members of the LGBT community. And we want to promote sex positivity around different bodies and celebrate that. Providing education, working with venues and social spaces to create events and host activities that are inclusive and accessible and that can cater for the different disabilities; and we provide resources for the better understanding and better consideration of the community that falls at the intersection of LGBTQ+ and disability.*

Another interesting point that emerges from both parties' post-residency reflections was that whilst Queer@King's referred to this period of collaboration as a 'residency', the AIR representative frequently referred to this scheme as a 'partnership'. This was significant because, while a residency is time-limited, the AIR representative saw the partnership as ongoing, a positive outcome in as much as it constitutes a lasting legacy for the project.

B.   Implementation

In many ways, the first step towards implementing the pilot was developing and running the application process. The application form was designed to be clear and short to reduce the burden on applicants, asking for only one page with responses to a few questions (250 – 500 word answers) and offering the option to include a creative piece (writing, illustration, audio, video etc) to mitigate a bias towards traditional academic formats. This approach was successful in the eyes of the AIR representative who expressed delight with both the application and the timeline: *'I remember thinking "wow! an application for funding that's one pager!"… the turnaround time was very quick, [they would] get back by the end of the summer… this is all very refreshing!'*

A key reflection by SM on implementation was the amount of staff and resources required to organise a residency and support the activist. Resources ranged from setting up and maintaining websites, working with different parts of the university system and having the required staff hours to run the residency. Another critical insight about (human) resourcing was SM's suggestion of the need for an 'honest broker' who acts as a contact person for the activist and connects them with potential collaborators across the university, directing them to available resources (Appendix B). SM describes the kind of authority and role that this person should have:

> *Such a contact person needs institutional memory and orientation to spot promising connections across the university… and they need to be in an institutional position to make introductions and support early-stage, exploratory conversations that sound out interest in and feasibility of activist ideas in dialogue with potential collaboration partners. (see Appendix B for the full piece by SM)*

The need discerned here regarding the efforts required in purposefully establishing which contacts and resources will be of value to the activist also came up in the AIR representative's post-residency reflections. In thinking about potential collaborations and being directed to different people he explained: *'SM had already come up with a few links of his colleagues and who to speak to. Maybe I haven't used all of them; I sort of selected one or two, but the information was there, and then you choose whatever best you think you need; but it was always very positive to have this resource there.'*

Additional resources that were considered helpful by the AIR were the use of College spaces and a College email address. The AIR representative explained that as a new organisation their regular meetings were held in coffee shops, and to be able to use College rooms in a central London location was positive: '*I think there was a lot of excitement about those smaller admin things that would've definitely helped us.*'

C. Mechanism

Communication, reflection, planning and openness emerged as key in enabling successful engagements during the residency. For instance, both SM and the AIR representative noted that communication was irregular and sometimes replies were delayed. However, the post-residency reflections indicated, firstly, that both took the "blame" for these delays, and, secondly, that the irregularity of communication was not seen as a problem that fundamentally undermined the collaboration. As the AIR representative said, meetings happened whenever needed and the hosts were always available to provide feedback and guidance. This theme of 'being there' and feeling supported by the hosts was of great importance for the AIR. Here, he reflects on the how events were planned:

> *In the pipeline there was always a celebratory get together, to get to know each other, the full team—not necessarily just business or plans, that is always there. We were very happy that [the host] wanted to connect to have that connection at a human level. At the end of the day we are a charity that is based on community, we serve our community, we are not a corporate company, [not a] revenue generating [company], so it was really important to us, and it was great to know it was equally as important for [the host].*

In addition to appreciating this support, a significant part of the residency for the host was a planned and built-in flexibility, as reflected in the application guidelines

('We set no limits to your creativity for the kind of project and/or number of event/s you may want to pursue during your residency.'), In this case, the activist organisation applied for the residency with a particular landmark programme in mind and, when accepted, they utilised the residency funds to organise the event and make it more accessible and inclusive. However, after initial meetings allowed the AIR to get to know the host partners and develop a sense of the resources and support available to them at the institution, the AIR explored several opportunities and new ideas that emerged. Eventually, the AIR ended up being part of many different events over the course of the residency, far more than originally planned.

D.   Context

In reviewing this pilot, we focused on two impactful contextual factors - the COVID-19 pandemic and the context and culture of the host HEI.

The pandemic occurred a few months into the residency. While a few in-person events had been held, when the lockdown began in March 2020, all plans were put on hold. The uncertainty meant not just postponing plans but casting doubt over whether they would ever take place, which greatly affected the excitement with which the activist organisation was approaching this partnership. Eventually, the AIR representative explained that the shift to digital events was partly to create solidarity during the pandemic:

> *[Moving our events online] was something very new to us, so we went in very cautiously, because we didn't know what the outcome would be or what to expect. We felt it's important to keeping a dialogue going during the pandemic, a dialogue about disability inclusion and the difficulties that the disabled community faces. Also it is important, in these conversations to highlight not just the challenges that our community goes through but also celebrate the stories of empowerment as well. We don't always want to be seen as a vulnerable community that needs support, we want to break that stereotype and demonstrate our resilience. And, in this moment [beginning of the pandemic] everyone was experiencing a feeling of isolation, even those who haven't had a problem with exclusion* before. *We wanted to talk about the idea of disability exclusion, because maybe it was something a lot more people could identify with, or at least empathise **with this feeling of being left out or being alone.***

The AIR representative recognised that the lockdown was not something anyone could have planned for but, having lived and worked through the pandemic, he would now always have a digital contingency plan. Many of the chief advantages of the residency – for example, access to many university resources was not possible when campus was closed. In addition to not being able to use rooms, the activists were limited in the organic connections and meetings that would arise from being physically present. However, the AIR representative particularly appreciated the

effort made by the host to make connections happen even in the pandemic and considered virtual formats useful also for future AIRs.

We have previously discussed the possible tensions that come with an AIR set up within an HEI. In this case, the activist organisation had a positive view of working with the College at the outset. As explained in section 2 and 3 there remains a structural cap to the flexibility offered in an HEI AIR, because ultimately all processes, such as planning and budgeting, have to happen through university processes and therefore on the university's terms. In addition, there are aspects to HEI life, such as the predictable busy times of the calendar—what SM refers to as a 'heatmap calendar' (see Appendix B)—that need to be accommodated. While academics intuitively or purposefully plan around this, future AIR hosts are well advised to explain to AIRs predictable times when students and/or staff are not available. This should go hand-in-hand with the activists informing the host of the times when collaborative work is for them particularly desirable and/or impracticable.

E.   *Reflection on Processes and Outcomes*

The intention of the pilot was to experiment with the presence of an activist at a HEI and whether this form of engagement may yield any positive effects to further the cause. As discussed in section A, some of the aims were to: work with an organisation who did not have much funding and who wanted to experiment with new ideas or approaches; to give space and support, and to amplify the work of, underserved LGBTQ+ causes.

A variety of events took place under the aegis of the residency, described in detail in Appendix B. These brought together forms of creative expression, critical dialogue and other ways of raising awareness about disability and accessibility. For example, the Stratford Circus Arts Centre Takeover proved a novel way of bringing together the largest group of queer+ disabled performers in the UK—a proud achievement, as indicated by the AIR. This event was accompanied by reflections and conversations (in the form of online panels) that brought together the university community, the activist group and the community with and for whom both academic and activists sought to work. While the activist organisation has its own networks, the connection to people and organisations easily reached by the HEI opened new prospects of future partnerships, including: ideas on how to better incorporate research in advocating for the AIR's work; plans for continuing collaborations with various parts of the host HEI; and volunteering opportunities spanning both staff and students.

Along with the positive results of the AIR for the activist organisation, the AIR had a profound effect on the host research centre and its staff in how they approached and incorporated ideas of disability and accessibility on both personal and professional levels. The residency 'prompted centre members to far-reaching reflections on how their embodied experience, for instance in terms of chronic illness, is related to their

queerness and queer work in ways they had not contemplated prior to our collaboration with [the AIR organisation]' (Appendix B). In response to the activist group's own best practice in ensuring that events are run in an inclusive and accessible manner, it was decided early on to employ the services of a British Sign Language (BSL) interpreter with whom the AIR organisation routinely worked. Thereafter BSL interpreters were present at the research centre's events. The research centre's experience and growing expertise in accessible events was then written-up and circulated within the host HEI to disseminate best practice. This development represented an institutional shift and the AIR representative hoped that this element of institutional learning would have a legacy that might become part of future AIRs as well as a further avenue for continued partnership:

> *here's another thing that's proving positive in our partnership, [the research centre] is learning … I hope that [the College] will make plans and infrastructure more accessible for disabled people and that this [focus on accessibility] will be an expectation for future residencies. Equally, even though we are not going to remain AIR officially moving forward, any help and support we can give … we would like to continue to give, if needed.*

Part of the original aims of the AIR scheme was to give a platform to activists. While the host may not be best placed to reflect on the relative success of this aim, the AIR organisation representative's summary was positive: 'overall, for an organisation like ours which, at the time, was very new, to be given the opportunity by such a prestigious university was an indication that there was a need for an organisation like [ours] and that work that we are doing is relevant and timely.'

In conclusion, the pilot set out to assess whether an AIR scheme would yield productive and positive effects, either in the form of new ideas, collaborations, events or even institutional or community change. Reflecting on this two-year residency through a reflexive process framework, despite the difficulty of a global pandemic, both parties were satisfied that the AIR created opportunities and enabled collaborations, both during the tenure and also into the future, which represented value and growth for all involved. The AIR introduced ideas and ways of working that were beyond the original ambit of each partner. In this way, the residency extended the realm of the possible for both institutions.

References

Alliance of artists communities, n.d. Social Practice Artist Residencies 10 Tips for Residency Programs [Website]. Best Practice Guides. URL https://www.artistcommunities.org/sites/artistcommunities.org/files/shared/AAC_SocialPractice_tipsheet_ResidencyPrograms.pdf

Banks, S., Hart, A., Pahl, K., Ward, P., 2018. Co-producing Research: A community development approach. Policy Press, Bristol.

Barge, J.K., Shockley-Zalabak, P., 2008. Engaged Scholarship and the Creation of Useful Organizational Knowledge. Journal of Applied Communication Research 36, 251–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909880802172277

Barnard College, 2018. Announcing the 2018-2020 Social Justice Institute Cohort [Website]. Barnard Center for Research on Women. URL https://bcrw.barnard.edu/announcing-the-2018-2020-social-justice-institute-cohort/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Better Evaluation, 2013. Review evaluation (do meta-evaluation) [Website]. BetterEvaluation. URL https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/rainbow_framework/manage/review_evaluation_do_meta_evaluation (accessed 21.11.20).

Bhambra, G.K., Gebrial, D., Nişancıoğlu, K., 2018. Decolonising the University. Pluto Press, London.

Biesta, G., 2007. Towards the knowledge democracy? Knowledge production and the civic role of the university. Studies in Philosophy and Education 26, 467–479.

Bourke, A., 2013. Universities, civil society and the global agenda of community-engaged research. Globalisation, Societies and Education 11, 498–519. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2013.834182

Boyatzis, R.E., 1998. Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development. SAGE.

Boyer, E.L., 2016. The Scholarship of Engagement. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 20, 15–27.

Burawoy, M., Holmwood, J., 2011. Redefining the public university: Global and national contexts, in: A Manifesto for the Public University. Bloomsbury Academic, London, pp. 27–41.

Cameron, J., 2007. Linking participatory research to action: institutional challenges, in: Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods. Routledge, pp. 232–241.

Castells, M., 2001. Universities as dynamic systems of contradictory functions, in: Mueller, J., Cloete, Ni., Badat, S. (Eds.), Challenges of Globalisation : South African Debates with Manuel Castells. Maskew Miller Longman, Cape Town, pp. 206–223.

Chubb, J.A., 2017. Instrumentalism and Epistemic Responsibility: Researchers and the Impact Agenda in the UK and Australia (Dissertation). University of York.

Colby College, 2020. Fellowship information- Oak Institute for Human Rights [Website]. Oak Institute for Human Rights. URL http://www.colby.edu/oakinstitute/for-fellowship-applicants/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Columbia Law School, 2020. Human Rights Institute Practitioner-in-Residence Program [Website]. Columbia Law School. URL https://web.law.columbia.edu/human-rights-institute/HRI-Practitioner-in-Residence-Program (accessed 20.11.20).

Craig, P., Dieppe, P., Macintyre, S., Michie, S., Nazareth, I., Petticrew, M., Medical Research Council Guidance, 2008. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 337, a1655. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a1655

Cuthill, M., 2012. A "Civic Mission" for the University: Engaged Scholarship and Community-Based Participatory Research, in: McIlrath, L., Lyons, A., Munck, R. (Eds.), Higher Education and Civic Engagement: Comparative Perspectives. Palgrave Macmillan US, New York, pp. 81–99. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137074829_6

Cuthill, M., O'Shea, É., Wilson, B., Viljoen, P., 2014. Universities and the public good 56, 11.

EWU, 2020. Activist in Residence - Eastern Washington University. URL https://www.ewu.edu/css/gwss/activist-in-residence/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Freire, P., 1970. Pedagogy of the oppressed. Herder and Herder, New York.

Fricker, M., 2007. Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing, Epistem. Injustice. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gitlin, A., Russell, R., 1994. Alternative methodologies and the research context. Power and method: Political activism and educational research 181–202.

Glass, C.R., Fitzgerald, H.E., 2010. Engaged Scholarship: Historical Roots, Contemporary Challenges, in: Fitzgerald, H.E., Burack, C., Seifer, S.D. (Eds.), Handbook of Engaged Scholarship. Michigan State University Press, pp. 9–24.

Goldsmiths, 2020a. Artists-in-Residence [Website]. Goldsmiths, University of London. URL https://www.gold.ac.uk/postcolonial-studies/people/artists-in-residence/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Goldsmiths, 2020b. John Reardon [Website]. Goldsmiths, University of London. URL https://www.gold.ac.uk/politics-and-international-relations/staff/reardon/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Hall, B.L., Jackson, E.T., Tandon, R., Fontan, J.-M., Lall, N.L., 2013. Knowledge, democracy and action: Community-university research partnerships in global perspectives. Manchester University Press.

Haraway, D., 1988. Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. Feminist studies 14, 575–599.

Holmwood, J., 2011. The Idea of a Public University, in: Holmwood, J. (Ed.), A Manifesto for the Public University. Bloomsbury Academic, London. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781849666459

Keshavarz, N., Nutbeam, D., Rowling, L., Khavarpour, F., 2010. Schools as social complex adaptive systems: a new way to understand the challenges of introducing the health promoting schools concept. Social science & medicine (1982) 70, 1467–1474. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.01.034

Kindon, S., Pain, R., Kesby, M., 2007. Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place. Routledge.

King's Culture, 2020. King's Artists- Toolkit. King's College London, London.

Ladwig, J.G., Gore, J.M., 1994. Extending power and specifying method within the discourse of activist research. Power and method: Political activism and educational research 227–238.

Leal, P.A., 2007. Participation: the ascendancy of a buzzword in the neo-liberal era. Development in Practice 17, 539–548. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701469518

LSE, 2020. Activists in Residence Programme [Website]. London School of Economics and Political Science. URL https://www.lse.ac.uk/women-peace-security/people/activist-in-residence/home.aspx (accessed 20.11.20).

Martin, B., 2016. Methodology is Content: Indigenous Approaches to Research and Knowledge 14.

McGuirk, P., O'Neill, P., 2012. Critical Geographies with the State: The Problem of Social Vulnerability and the Politics of Engaged Research. Antipode 44, 1374–1394. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00976.x

Meyerson, D.E., Scully, M.A., 1995. Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change. Organization Science 6, 585–600.

Minkler, M., Wallerstein, N., 2003. Introduction to community-based participatory research, in: Minkler, M., Wallerstein, N. (Eds.), Community-Based Participatory Research for Health. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 3–26.

Moore, G.F., Audrey, S., Barker, M., Bond, L., Bonell, C., Hardeman, W., Moore, L., O'Cathain, A., Tinati, T., Wight, D., 2015. Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. bmj 350.

Office of Public Art, 2014. Artist in the Public Realm: Residency Resource Guide: A resource guide for creating residencies and fostering successful collaborations. Pittsburgh Arts Council, Pittsburgh, PA.

Open Method of Coordination (OMC) Working Group of EU Member States Experts on Artists' Residencies, 2014. Policy Handbook on Artists' Residencies. European Union.

People's Knowledge Editorial Collective, 2016. Introduction, in: People's Knowledge Editorial Collective (Ed.), People's Knowledge and Participatory Action Research: Escaping the White-Walled Labyrinth. Practical Action Publishing Ltd., Rugby, pp. 1–10.

Peterson, T.H., 2009. Engaged scholarship: reflections and research on the pedagogy of social change. Teaching in Higher Education 14, 541–552. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510903186741

Reiter, B., 2014. Of Academic Embeddedness: Communities of Choice and How to Make Sense of Activism and Research Abroad, in: Reiter, B., Oslender, U. (Eds.), Bridging Scholarship and Activism : Reflections from the Frontlines of Collaborative Research. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing.

Reiter, B., Oslender, U., 2014. Bridging Scholarship and Activism : Reflections from the Frontlines of Collaborative Research. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, MI, UNITED STATES.

Rooke, A., 2016. Collaborative Sociological Practice: the Case of Nine Urban Biotopes. International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society 29, 327–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-016-9225-7

Smith, 2016. Sharing Insights: Smith's Steinem Initiative Hosts Conversation for Women Organizers [Website]. Smith College. URL https://www.smith.edu/about-smith/news/gloria-wilma-school-2016 (accessed 20.11.20).

Smith College, 2020. Steinem initiative [Website]. Smith College. URL https://www.smith.edu/academics/jandon-center/steinem-initiative (accessed 20.11.20).

Stanton, T.K., 2008. New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities. Education, Citizenship and Social Justice 3, 19–42.

Stehr, N., Meja, V., Merton, R. (Eds.), 2009. The Sociology of Knowledge: Contemporary Perspectives in the Sociology of Knowledge and Science, Second. ed. Transaction Publishers.

Stevens, E., 2020. New ways of 'being' and 'doing' in Community-Based Participatory Research: Transforming professional identities and society through pedagogic rights (PhD Dissertation). University of Bath, Bath.

The Political Hat, 2016. Social Justice Institute. URL http://politicalhat.com/2016/12/16/social-justice-institute/ (accessed 21.11.20).

TransArtists, n.d. AiR checklist #1 Profile [Website]. DutchCulture | TransArtists. URL transartists.org/en/air-checklist-1-profile (accessed 23.11.20).

UCL, 2020a. People- Urban Laboratory (Artists-in-residence and Creative Fellows) [Website]. UCL Urban Laboratory. URL https://www.ucl.ac.uk/urban-lab/people (accessed 20.11.20).

UCL, 2020b. The City Dionysia - Narrating Wasteland in Urban Life [Website]. UCL Urban Laboratory. URL https://www.ucl.ac.uk/urban-lab/research/research-projects/city-dionysia-narrating-wasteland-urban-life (accessed 21.11.20).

UCL, 2018. Artist in Residence | UCL Culture Blog (Museum of Zoology) [Website]. UCL Culture Blog. URL https://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/museums/tag/artist-in-residence/ (accessed 20.11.20).

UCLA, 2020. Activist-in-Residence [Website]. UCLA Luskin Institute on Inequality and Democracy. URL https://challengeinequality.luskin.ucla.edu/activist-in-residence/ (accessed 20.11.20).

UCSC, n.d. Activist in Residence [Website]. UCSC Research Center for the Americas. URL https://rca.ucsc.edu/directors-initiatives/activist-in-residence/index.html (accessed 20.11.20).

UKRI, 2022. Knowledge exchange framework - Research England [Website]. UKRI Knowledge exchange framework. URL https://re.ukri.org/knowledge-exchange/knowledge-exchange-framework/ (accessed 8.11.21).

Univ. of Brighton, 2020a. Activist in Residence [Call for applications] [Website]. Centre for Transforming Sexuality and Gender. URL http://blogs.brighton.ac.uk/ctsg/test-activist-in-residence/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Univ. of Brighton, 2020b. Activists-in-Residence to work on issues of gender and sexuality [Website]. Centre for Transforming Sexuality and Gender. URL http://blogs.brighton.ac.uk/ctsg/2020/07/29/activists-in-residence-to-work-on-issues-of-gender-and-sexuality/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Univ. of Oklahoma, 2020. Activist-in-Residence [Website]. Center for Social Justice. URL https://www.ou.edu/cas/csj/programs/activist-in-residence (accessed 20.11.20).

Univ. of Sussex, 2020. Academia and Activism network-Centre for World Environmental History [Website]. University of Sussex. URL http://www.sussex.ac.uk/cweh/research/academia_and_activism (accessed 20.11.20).

University of York, 2020. Arctivists - Centre for Applied Human Rights: [Website]. Centre for Applied Human Rights. URL https://www.york.ac.uk/cahr/research/themes/covid-19/arctivists/ (accessed 20.11.20).

Van de Ven, A.H., 2007. Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Appendix A Table 2: Activist and (socially-oriented) artist residencies in HEIs

Residencies in HEIs					
Name of University	**Centre/ Department**	**Type of programme**	**City**	**Country**	**Website**
LSE- Centre for Women, Peace and Security	Centre for Women, Peace and Security	Activist-in-Residence	London	UK	http://www.lse.ac.uk/women-peace-security/people/activist-in-residence
Goldsmith's	Centre for Postcolonial Studies, Department of Politics	Artist-in-residence	London	UK	https://centrepostcolonialstudies.org/visiting-researchers-2/artists-in-residence/
University of Sussex	Centre of World Environment History	Artist-in-residence	Brighton	UK	http://www.sussex.ac.uk/cweh/research/academia_and_activism
University College London	Urban Laboratory- Grant museum of Zoology	Artists-in-residence and Creative Fellows Artist in Residence	London	UK	https://www.ucl.ac.uk/urban-lab/people https://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/museums/tag/artist-in-residence/
University of Brighton	Centre for transforming sexuality and gender	Activist-in-residence	Brighton	UK	http://blogs.brighton.ac.uk/ctsg/2020/07/29/activists-in-residence-to-work-on-issues-of-gender-and-sexuality/ Call: http://blogs.brighton.ac.uk/ctsg/test-activist-in-residence/
University of York	Art + Activism against repression during the COVID-19 crisis	'arctivist'-collaboration of artist and activist	York	UK	https://www.york.ac.uk/cahr/research/themes/covid-19/arctivists/ Call: https://www.york.ac.uk/cahr/news/2020/callforarctivists/

Residencies in HEIs

Name of University	Centre/ Department	Type of programme	City	Country	Website
Barnard College	Barnard Centre for Research on Women	Activist Fellows Programme	New York	USA	https://bcrw.barnard.edu/bcrw-launches-the-social-justice-institute/ https://bcrw.barnard.edu/announcing-the-2018-2020-social-justice-institute-cohort/
University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC)	Research Center for the Americas	Activist-in-Residence	Santa Cruz, California	USA	https://rca.ucsc.edu/directors-initiatives/activist-in-residence/index.html
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)	UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs- Institute on Inequality and Democracy AND UCLA Asian American Studies Center	Activist-in-Residence	Los Angeles, California	USA	https://challengeinequality.luskin.ucla.edu/activist-in-residence/ https://challengeinequality.luskin.ucla.edu/research-and-activism/#the-ucla-activist-in-residence-program
Smith College	Steinem Initiative	Activist-in-Residence	Northampton, Massachusetts	USA	https://www.smith.edu/academics/jandon-center/steinem-initiative
Eastern Washington University (EWU)	Women's and Gender Studies Program and the Women's and Gender Education Center	Activist-in-Residence	Cheney, Washington	USA	https://www.ewu.edu/css/womens-and-gender-studies/activist-in-residence/
University of Oklahoma (Univ. of Oklahoma)	Center for Social Justice, Department of Women and Gender Studies	Activist-in-Residence Program	Norman, Oklahoma	USA	http://www.ou.edu/cas/csj/programs/activist-in-residence
University of Cincinnati (Univ. of Cinn)	LGBTQ Center	Activist-in-Residence	Cinncinati, Ohio	USA	https://www.uc.edu/campus-life/lgbtq/signature-programs.html
Columbia Law School	Human Rights Institute,	Practitioner- in-residence	New York, New York	USA	https://www.law.columbia.edu/human-rights-institute/HRI-Practitioner-in-Residence-Program
Hollins College	Frances Niederer	Artist-in-residence	Roanoke, Virginia	USA	https://www.hollins.edu/academics/majors-minors/studio-art-major/frances-niederer-artist-in-residence/

Appendix B: *The Queer@King's Activist-in-Residence Scheme*: Reflections on a Pilot Project by Sebastian Matzner

What is offered below is a narrative account of the practical experience of running a (first) activist-in-residence scheme, retracing it through its different stages and commenting, with the benefit of hindsight, on what worked, what did not, and what could be improved or done differently. It does not offer a systematic analytical treatment (for this, please see 'Activist-in-Residence Programmes in Higher Education: Critical Reflections on Challenges and Possibilities in Theory and Practice') but seeks to communicate lived experience for the sharing of reflective practice. Readers interested in a case study of an activist-in-residence scheme from inception to evaluation may wish to read the entire account; readers with a more practical and focused interest in 'lessons learned' may wish to glean these by skipping to the sections highlighted in grey.

The Making Of…

'If you were awarded £1,000 for the most innovative research centre strategy, what would you do with these funds?' This sentence stood at the start of the Queer@King's Activist-in-Residence scheme, which ran in the academic year 2019/20 and was then extended (in order to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic) for another academic year. As Director of Queer@King's, the Centre for Research and Teaching in Gender & Sexuality Studies at King's College London, it fell to me to write the research centre strategy and, much as I would like to present a more thoughtful and deliberate genealogy of this pilot project, the truth is, it was made up on the hoof: forging closer and mutually beneficial links with LGBTQ+ groups, activists, and community organisers in the Greater London area had seemed to me an important task for our centre for some time and an activist-oriented scheme, modelled on established artist-in-residence schemes, was the first thing that came to my mind. Only after securing the funds did the project start to take more concrete forms, with much improvising and experimenting continuing all the way through. This reflective report seeks to take a step back, to revisit and reconsider the decisions made, the strategies adopted, the challenges encountered, and the gains made. Together with an evaluative exit interview with our pilot activists-in-residence, it complements the working paper 'Activist-in-Residence Programmes in Higher Education: Critical Reflections on Challenges and Possibilities in Theory and Practice' by way of offering insights into the practical realities of running such a scheme. While there is increasing literature on the principles underpinning this sort of undertaking, and while a slow increase of schemes of this kind can be observed,

very little empirical evidence about such schemes in the form of concrete case studies is readily available to potential organisers who might wish to draw on such material to prepare and calibrate their own plans in the light of the experiences of others. It is hoped that the following reflective report, along with the activist's reflections in the evaluative exit interview, can make a start in addressing this lack of available information on practical experiences and that organisers of comparable schemes might likewise make their experiences and reflections available to provide the necessary material for the development of evidence-based best practice in this format of socially engaged research and knowledge exchange.

What Do We Want? Who Do We Want? Where Do We Begin?

Conceptualising and advertising the scheme went hand-in-hand. Given the limitations of the official university website system—both in terms of the inflexibility of the content management system and the restrictiveness of access rights (with all the concomitant loss of time to develop, amend, and publish content)—it was quickly clear that an independent website for presenting and promoting the scheme was needed. Setting up a WordPress page with the official institutional logos but also functioning as a recognizably separate platform retrospectively appears to have been the right choice, presenting, as it does, the entire scheme with a degree of autonomy in relation to the host institution (in both visual/presentational terms and in terms of content and direct access). Having direct access to the outward-facing presentation of the scheme allows for immediate correction and recalibration, as and where necessary, and innovative and experimental formats in particular require such fleetness of foot, since thinking and practice are likely evolve in real-time. At the same time, the creation of https://kclqueeractivists.wordpress.com was time-consuming and arguably the first moment in the scheme where it became clear just how much resource (in addition to the allocated £1,000), especially in terms of staff time, would be needed.

Developing the web presence and articulating the scheme's intentions, scope, purpose, and selection criteria for public advertising was done in close liaison between academic and professional services staff, that is, between myself as Director of Queer@King's and Dr Ed Stevens as Manager of the Arts & Humanities Research Institute at King's (the umbrella body within and through which individual research centres are run and supported).

The website defined the aims and target partners for this scheme as follows:

> *With this initiative, we want to strengthen our ties with local LGBTQ+ activists from the Greater London area.*
>
> *We invite applications from individuals, groups, communities, and organisations – both newly/recently founded and more established – who have*

limited or no access to funding and resources for the realisation of their ideas for community projects and activist work.

We especially encourage applications for projects that stand little chance of finding financial support through other means.

We are looking for projects that will:

- *experiment with new or unusual approaches to activist work;*
- *benefit causes and groups that may otherwise struggle to receive attention or are under-served/under-represented in mainstream LGBTQ+ activism;*
- *make the most of the resources, support, context, and infrastructure that we as a university-based queer centre can offer to amplify their work.*

We set no limits to your creativity for the kind of project and/or number of event/s you may want to pursue during your residency. We do ask that you think carefully and realistically about how to spend the activist budget to achieve maximum impact.

The award of the residency will be conditional upon the nominated activist/s-in-residence's commitment to attending the 'Happy New Year Queer!' start-of-term social on 3rd October 2019, to setting the topic/theme and act as a member of the jury for the LGBT History Month 2020 Undergraduate Student Creative Project Competition, and to showcasing their activist work at an LGBT History Month event in February 2020. If you foresee that you cannot commit to any or all of these three, we would ask that you refrain from applying to this scheme.

The public-facing focus of the scheme as we envisioned it was thus on amplification: to give greater visibility and resource to small-scale, local activist initiatives with innovative ideas or concentration on special causes for whom securing funding or access to basic resources might prove particularly challenging. With the above description, we sought to strike a balance between encouraging a wide field of applications while also signalling the need to understand what this particular scheme in its particular institutional context can and cannot offer (i.e. no independent financial grants but funding for collaborative work). The built-in timetable for three events across the academic year sought to signal to applicants from the start the kind of involvement with the university community and some of its major sub-groups that we were hoping for: with the research centre and its membership, with students, and with the university and its local public at large. Conversely, it also sought to signal to the hosting institution (i.e. the funder) a core of value-adding contributions that could be counted on.

In retrospect, it becomes apparent that the presentation here is fairly one-directional: it presents the university as having something to offer to the activists—without any explicit discussion of what the activists are seen as bringing to the university and the research centre (other than filling in a pre-sketched events programme). In hindsight, the dimensions of truly bidirectional knowledge exchange and of stimulus for institutional change through questioning and disruption were absent from the presentation of the scheme (even if, in the event, they did occur; see more below). Moreover, the phrasing betrays a tension between the wish for surprises and openness to unexpected ideas and unconventional approaches, on the one hand, and the institutional expectation for the allocated resources to be put to good, effective, thoughtful use. Without wanting to stymy creativity, and while anticipating that the concrete shape of the residency programme would emerge in dialogue and in process, seeking at least an indication of an awareness for issues of feasibility and institutional expectations seemed important, and applications largely responded well to this.

In order to facilitate the calibration of specific projects, initiatives, and ideas for the residency, some clarifications were added regarding the dates of the residency (co-extensive with an academic year, i.e. 1st October until 31st July) and the support and opportunities available.

> *During their residency, the activist/s-in-residence will be able to:*
>
> - *book rooms and venues at all central London campuses of King's College London to host workshops, meetings, performances, or other events;*
> - *draw on administrative support from Queer@King's and the Arts & Humanities Research Institute to help with the planning and logistics of event organisation;*
> - *publicise their events and work through King's social media, web presence, and publicity channels;*
> - *use the King's libraries and IT stations;*
> - *collaborate with students and researchers at King's;*
> - *decide the theme/topic of the LGBT History Month 2020 Undergraduate Creative Project Competition and be a member of the jury;*
> - *showcase their activist work to a wider public audience at an LGBT History Month event in February 2020;*
> - *access a £1,000 activism budget*.*
>
> *[*The award of the residency does not constitute an employment relationship and the activism budget cannot be used to hire staff (though it may be used for one-off fee payments to individuals, subject to case-by-case discussion and approval). Funds from the activism budget can be used to purchase consumables and materials but unused or reusable purchased items will*

remain property of the College. Support from Queer@King's and the Arts & Humanities Research Institute will be available to advise the activist/s-in-residence on matters of budget and expenditure.]

All of the points listed were, in the event, made use of during the residency. As envisioned, details of financial arrangements and practicalities of how to use funds did require considerable discussion and creativity on part of professional services. Unexpectedly, so did the innocuous phrase 'collaborate with students and researchers at King's': the institutional barriers to such collaboration are considerably higher than expected, especially for those unfamiliar with the regulations and process of universities within their wider institutional context. The possibility to engage in and contribute to ongoing curricular teaching, for instance, is much less straightforward than imagined by those not familiar with regulatory requirements such as those set by the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). Likewise, 'collaboration with researchers' suggested that it might be possible to commission research and/or to participate in it, which, again, clashes with the realities of the cost, timeframes, and resourcing of research projects as typically conducted at universities (both in the run-up time and available staff time for such projects). A more explicit articulation of the envisioned knowledge exchange, mutual questioning and inspiration as well as kickstarting of potential joint projects would arguably have been desirable and helpful. A residency is better cast—from the outset—as a period for exploring and understanding the working modes and interests of the parties involved and for facilitating personal encounters with individuals and groups engaged in cognate or synergetic topics and activities, which can then become the starting point for future collaboration (in both research and teaching as well as other public-facing activities); a collaboration that begins in, but extends beyond the actual residency—rather than thinking of the residency period as one within which all such activity ought to be completed.

It's A Match!

Applications were invited via a one-page application form (see Figure 1 below), which asked applicants to indicate a project title and to

> *Tell us a bit about yourself/your group: What do you bring to being an activist-in-residence? Which part of London is the focus of your activist interest? Why does our activist-in-residence scheme appeal to you? (max. 250 words)*

and to

> *Tell us about your ideas for a residency project: Who is it aimed at? Where will your work take place? What will you try to achieve? How will you go about achieving it? Please include an overview of how you might spend the £1,000*

activist budget and what projects/events/outputs you would create (max. 500 words)

In addition, applicants were invited to

also submit along with the completed application form a creative illustration of your ideas for the residency in the form of one A4 page of creative writing or visual art (poetry, photography, artwork, collage) or a video or audio recording of up to 1:30 minutes length. (Please note that this is optional and no requirement; the application form is enough for your proposal to receive full consideration).

In the end, we received 13 (remarkably diverse) applications—but eliciting them proved more difficult than anticipated. Relying only on social media promotion and mailing lists for advertising the scheme quickly proved insufficient as this did not generate as many applications as anticipated. Waiting for people to come forward when invited clearly only worked half-way; to really reach the target group earmarked in the description, it emerged as necessary to proactively contact groups, individuals, and initiatives that seemed to be a good fit. Given the newness of this kind of scheme and the (understandable) uncertainty on part of applicants about its purpose, potential benefit, and indeed their eligibility and fit, searching out and contacting relevant local groupings became an important but, once again, labour-intensive part of the scheme. Given that part of the institutional aims of the scheme was to foster greater links with LGBTQ+ activists in the Greater London area, building up a directory of such activists/projects/initiatives doubled as both a tool to make our advertising of the scheme more targeted and purposive and as a future-oriented step in surveying and establishing contact with potential future partners (not just for present or future iterations of the scheme but as collaborators more generally). The scheme was thus connected to more mid-term aims here that go further, notably the plan to establish a London Advisory Board made up of activists/community groups as critical friends of the research centre and/or to hold activist/academic roundtables for continued/further exploration of collaborative work. Embedding the scheme into these wider institutional aims relativises the start-up costs of such a proactive approach (in labour/resourcing terms) and also contributes to generating with the directory a tangible legacy (an institutional/funder concern) and yields a widening of the participatory/beneficiary remit beyond the one successful applicant.

The process also elicited some decidedly negative responses. While overall clearly in the minority, some such negative responses expressed a general rejection of any attempt to connect queer activism to institutional structures, viewing them as an inhibiting factor and potential drain on already limited resources available for activist action as well as suspect of seeking to domesticate and/or capitalise on the activist work of others. Others articulated a more particular rejection of working with a

certain type of or indeed specifically with the hosting institution, based on a perception of it as playing an important role in maintaining the social order with all its inequalities. In the case of King's, this involved its status as a Russell Group university (and that grouping's status in relation to the stratification of British society); the university's disciplinary profile, notably its Department of War Studies with its government and army links; and, in particular, the university's institutional behaviour and public perception in relation to student activism and freedom of speech. On the latter point, the collaboration of King's security with the Metropolitan Police to pre-emptively de-activate campus access functions of student ID cards for students known to be engaged in activist work ahead of the royal visit to its Bush House opening event in March 2019 (https://www.kcl.ac.uk/news/statements/bush-house-security-report.pdf) was cited as material evidence for why activist collaboration with King's was seen as impossible, with the institution considered to be presenting a risk rather than an opportunity to activists. While the negative responses received made for hard reading, especially in the context of the increasing difficulty and effort involved in any attempt to secure institutional funding for non-profit-generating purposes at universities, in hindsight, and from an institutional perspective, these responses, too, have considerable value: much like the proverbial canary in the coalmine or a litmus test, they tell a story—and render manifest qualities and perceptions of an institution that fundamentally affect the conditions of possibility of collaboration with activists and community groups, but are often not adequately visible and accounted for as inhibiting factors for socially engaged research.

Once the applications had been received, the selection panel assessed the applications on individual merit and against the published expectations as selection criteria; a model of general best practice that lends itself to implementation in schemes of this nature, too. The selection panel was made up of members of the Queer@King's Steering Group, and thus reflective of its diversity in terms of gender, ethnicity, and sexuality (and thereby, in turn, reflecting contemporary academia at large and thus stronger on diversity in some of these and weaker in others). While diversity within the Steering Group has been for some time a (still unresolved) point of dissatisfaction and discussion within the Centre itself (and could here only be addressed by paying special attention to the criterion of diversity and representation as part of the selection process), what emerged with hindsight as an equally important point of diversity in the selection process was diversity of stakeholders. In the event, the selection panel was a group of academics deciding on which activist to select. As indicated in the phrasing of the webpage, some consideration of the fit between the activist project plans and the institutional context were expected as part of the applications and, after appraising the core idea of each application in its own right, concerns of feasibility did play a considerable role in the panel's deliberations. However, these deliberations were to some extent speculative and not as well informed as they could have been had a representative of professional services/activists/students been party to the selection panel. In effect, the selecting

academics sought to adopt in their deliberations in turn the perspectives of administrators, students, and activists, alongside their own. A better strategy would have been to bring these stakeholders themselves to the table and to actively involve them from the start. A selection panel made up of academics and students and administrators and activists (e.g. via an established advisory board or through other existing links) would have allowed each party to articulate their preferences, hopes, and concerns directly and without second-guessing, while also providing a safeguard against the strong (and, in terms of institutional dynamics, understandable) pull towards applications and projects which may seem an easier and safer (more feasible, more realistic, more complementary) option—which, however, also often renders them least or less disruptive.

Here We Go! Where Are We Going Again? And When?

The technical affiliation of the activists was done via the structure of visiting researcher appointments, which gave the activists access to the university's physical and digital infrastructure, and their introduction took place, as planned, at the beginning of year social 'Happy New ~~Year~~ *Queer*'. From that point on and, it has to be said, without following a conscious overall strategy, the collaboration evolved organically—which is to say: partly messily, partly purposefully, and partly serendipitously.

The pre-published and pre-agreed structure of involvement in, contribution to, and running of three events across the academic year offered a helpful structure to start with. Subsequent catch-up and planning meetings took place at irregular intervals and came to usually involve one or two representatives of the activist group, myself as Centre Director/academic and Dr Ed Stevens as Institute Manager/professional service support. This trialogue proved constructive and effective in sharing and developing ideas and calibrating them early in the development stage against institutional, practical, and logistical considerations of feasibility. In retrospect, holding these meetings at regular intervals and already firmly scheduled into everyone's diaries well in advance (rather than organising them ad hoc and infrequently) would have been a good strategy to support more sustained and steady engagement and project development. Again, the issue of available institutional resource (academic and professional services staff time) combined with the issue of the peculiarity of the academic year presented challenges here. The academic year has many 'heat points' in which certain tasks, such as marking or starting a new teaching term, take over and put almost every other activity on hold, as well as some 'low density points' where academic staff and students are less present on campus and generally less reachable for collaboration or events, such as Reading Weeks or breaks. For activist partners, these timelines and the relative distribution of availabilities over the course of an academic year are invisible and even for most academic staff they are more a matter of an intuitive sense rather than of readily conveyable calendrical knowledge (as expressed in the familiar academic kneejerk

avoidance/rejection of commitments at certain periods). This soft institutional knowledge is a fundamental enabling and inhibiting factor for basic planning purposes that should not be underestimated, and questions of timing and timelines were a recurrent feature in planning discussions. To counter the challenges of the academic calendar as an unknown and/or inhibiting factor, a pre-prepared 'heatmap calendar' for when best to engage with academics and students might well prove a useful tool to make available to activists at the start of their residency.

Questions around finance (how the allocated can funds be used and how costs can be reimbursed) and questions around how universities and research more generally function (e.g. how commissioning research works, what the timescales are, what stages are involved, its costs in terms of resource and personnel) were further recurrent points of discussion. To an extent, this seems inevitable: a genuinely original and/or disruptive activist residency is likely to entail, for instance, costing issues that do not arise in academic business-as-usual and an institutional/administrative willingness to exercise flexibility and creativity here is necessary to avoid activists running against walls of infeasibility due to accountancy issues at every turn. Our ability to co-fund ParaPride's Stratford Circus Arts Centre Takeover, followed up with a panel discussion event at King's to reflect on the event and thus bring activist practice, activist/academic reflection, and further public engagement into a mutually beneficial exchange with the aim of enhancing praxis, is a good example for an activity where funding arrangements presented challenges but which, once fully integrated into the wider residency programme, yielded much insight and facilitated continued transformative discussion.

With the iconic Stratford Circus Arts Centre Takeover, ParaPride's first official fundraising event as a registered charity, co-funded by Queer@King's, ParaPride made history during LGBT History Month 2020 by bringing to the stage the largest showcase of disabled and queer talent ever seen in the UK, changing the fabric of social opportunity for disabled and queer people, nationally. Ticket sales from this event went towards inclusive activities produced by ParaPride throughout 2020. It set the tone for a series of co-organised events that explored the theme of disability and queerness. After the aforementioned Undergraduate Student Creative Competition—for which ParaPride set the theme 'Dis-Labelled: Inclusion in Society'—the programme of events had to be switched to an online format due to the Covid-19 outbreak. The result was a series of 3 events in May 2020, called *ParaPride Digitals: Our Stories*. These events explored in more depth the intersectionality of being LGBTQ+ and diverse/disabled and involved panellists (including Queer@King's members) who contributed to ParaPride's work and success. Stories of empowerment and growth were shared alongside discussions of activism and reflections on the importance of supporting more marginalised LGBTQ+ communities. Each episode focused on a different category/topic: physical disabilities/diversities; sensory diversities/impairments; and mental health. The same approach was used for *Pride Inside* where Queer@King's provided hands-

on support, promoting the events, and joining celebrations of ParaPride as they hosted a July packed with online gigs, comedy shows, panel discussions, and arts-based events. Likewise, in LGBT History 2021 when we hosted an online fireside chat with activists and academics under the theme 'What Times! What Bodies! Queerness, Bodily Difference, and History'.

A further unexpected and unplanned opportunity emerged through the preparation of 'At Home in Cultural London', a new creative and innovative extracurricular flagship programme developed for the period of largely online teaching and learning to retain the London factor of studying at King's. Offered to all undergraduate students across the university, the programme provided an online extracurricular experience designed to connect them to London, and King's, through arts and culture (for more details, see here: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/cultural/projects/at-home-in-cultural-london). From activism to health and wellbeing via digital and urban futures, this six-week participatory course comprised a range of ways to explore, reflect and create in cultural London, wherever students were in the world at the time. 'At Home in Cultural London' included bespoke video content from King's academics and London's artists and cultural organisations, live creative workshops and small group discussions to enable participants to connect with other students. Organisers of the programme contacted us with an invitation to contribute to the format, which presented a great opportunity to showcase ParaPride's work and concerns to a much wider student audience than is otherwise reached through targeted events that specifically focus on queer issues and are much more self-selecting in participant demographics. By being part of a wider, London-centred programme, ParaPride's activism was thus able to reach a considerably more diverse constituency as the programme featured a joint interview on our activist-academic collaboration which, together with material provided by ParaPride on their activist work (including video footage from the Stratford Circus Arts Centre Takeover event), gave all participating students a good sense of the issues and stakes in ParaPride's work. (The video is now also accessible on the Centre's YouTube channel here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JmkUuno2eqE&t=3s. For more background and visual material from our collaboration, please also see the write-up here: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/research/parapride-activist-in-residence-scheme).

The collaboration with 'At Home in Cultural London' was not planned by the activist-academic group at the heart of the residency but came about because we were approached by another part of the university aware of our work; an awareness born from existing links between the Arts & Humanities Research Institute and the King's Culture team responsible for the online programme. In this respect, it is a good example for the considerable importance of internal presence, communication, and sign-posting for the success of activist-in-residence schemes. This emerged as important in two ways:

The first relates to the constant need to consider who might be good institutional partners for the different ideas explored by the activists, which was another major recurrent discussion point. What activists-in-residence need in this respect is a contact person, an 'honest broker' of sorts, able to sign-post them to relevant collaborators within the university and, crucially, beyond the unit of their most immediate affiliation (in our case, Queer@King's as a research centre and the home departments of its most active members). Such a contact person needs both the institutional memory and orientation to spot promising connections across the university (i.e. all academic departments, faculties, centres as well as other potentially relevant clusters, for instance, those tasked with cultural engagement, enterprise, internationalisation, alumni relations, etc.), and they need to be in an institutional position to make introductions and support early-stage, exploratory conversations that sound out interest in and feasibility of activist ideas in dialogue with potential collaboration partners. A student helper recruited as a project assistant may, therefore, struggle with this task on both ends.

The second points to the inverse direction of travel: the need to enable stakeholders within the university to reach out to the activists with proposals and suggestions for collaboration. For this to happen, the scheme itself and the particular activist-in-residence need to be actively communicated across the institution, including in those parts which may not immediately seem natural partners for collaboration. Even serendipitous events are often not entirely void of causality and, accordingly, not entirely separate from purposeful action: the presence of the activists needs to be (made) known in order to potentially elicit (unanticipated) expressions of interest for collaboration from across the institution.

What Stuck – And What Got Stuck

A major overall effect of the activist residency was the externally driven re-focusing of the Centre and its members' perspective on themselves, their queer work in research, and institutional practice. There was a palpable shift in gear in our engagement with perspectives of queer disability from the start and sustained across the residency. This prompted centre members to far-reaching reflections on how their embodied experience, for instance in terms of chronic illness, is related to their queerness and queer work in ways they had not contemplated prior to our collaboration with ParaPride. The close-up presence of an activist group dedicated to a concrete cause and the sustained expectation for meaningful engagement had a catalysing effect on the Centre and its members, notably in the form of transformation at the individual level (especially in the recognition of hithero unrecognised intersectionalities), as well as communicating the activists' concerns into the wider institution. Beyond this kind of impact, further effects related to institutional change. From the moment of announcing the new activists-in-residence at the start of term social on, ensuring that all venues used were fully accessible became a *conditio sine qua non*. With the switch to an all-online event format, this

accessibility imperative extended to online events where we introduced live British Sign Language interpretation and recordings with captions as standard features for all events. Both in terms of venue selection and in terms of online event design, our Centre developed in this process into a champion for accessibility and inclusion and the best practice and experience established during the residency was circulated into the wider institution. It fed, for instance, into a concurrent inclusivity review undertaken by the Arts & Humanities Research Institute (the umbrella body of all research centres) and was written up in the form of a manual by the Centre administrator so that the best practice established here could be disseminated and adopted elsewhere in the university. These developments as well as the present paper's attempt to communicate and share reflections on innovation and best practice in order to drive change in the institution and the sector at large emerged as a significant to the scheme that we had not quite envisaged in this way at the outset.

This is not to say, however, that everything worked. Above all else, the time and effort to run such a scheme exceeded by far what had been anticipated and what had been budgeted and resourced for. For one thing, the resulting time-lag in response times due to other ongoing staff commitments that had to take precedence over the running of the scheme (which recurrently created delays that, cumulatively, took up of a chunk of time that could have been used to plan and realise further activist projects). Moreover, at one point we also became victims of our success: a jointly prepared UKRI bid for funding to realise a public engagement project in relation to queerness, disability, and the national census was successful and promised to increase the available activists' funds tenfold—but the grant could not, in the end, be accepted because of insufficient institutional resources to realise what the bid was promising due to lack of sheer people power (i.e. available staff/staff time to adequately support the project). This situation, which arose because the bid was prepared and submitted without permanent staff involvement and without going through the established research development processes, was especially disappointing for all involved because it demonstrated the potential in activist-academic collaboration to jointly attract funding that might otherwise not be available to either party. Efforts to ameliorate the limitations of available staff time and support that were put in place half-way through the scheme, namely the recruitment of a PGR student as a Project Assistant to provide dedicated support to the scheme, did not succeed. The level of institutional knowledge, connectedness, and standing, as well as experience in academic organisational processes required to make a palpable difference here simply exceed what can be reasonably expected from a doctoral researcher with limited experience and institutional knowledge (while, conversely, the mentoring required to enable such a Project Assistant to support the activists necessarily ends up placing yet another demand on academic and/or professional services staff engaged in the scheme).

Overall, the pilot activist-in-residence scheme at Queer@King's was a success in the eyes of all who were engaged with it—or, perhaps better: a successful experiment.

Only in the process did it become clear(er) what was needed to fully realise its potential, and the open-mindedness, good humour, and willingness to cope with frustrations and delays on part of our activists-in-residence were key in making this a successful experiment. Our profound gratitude goes to them for joining us on this pilot project. From an institutional perspective, this also demonstrates the value of small-scale seed funds that allow people to 'play' and to (co-)produce projects in a tentative and exploratory manner rather than having fully formed ideas at grant application stage. There is much to be gained from schemes like this but they do come with inherent tensions and problems, in both institutional-political and organisational-practical terms that will require more thought, reflection, creativity, and innovative solutions. It is hoped that this reflective report of the experiences made in this pilot scheme, together with the activists' own responses and reflections in their exit interview and with the broader reflections and analysis offered in the research paper 'Activist-in-Residence Programmes in Higher Education: Critical Reflections on Challenges and Possibilities in Theory and Practice', can help to inform and improve future activist-in-residence schemes.

Figure 1: Application Form

Application Form   *Queer@King's Activist/s-in-Residence 2019/20*

Your Name: _____
Your Email: _____
Your Mobile: _____

Residency Project Title: _____

Tell us a bit about yourself/your group: What do you bring to being an activist-in-residence? Which part of London is the focus of your activist interest? Why does our activist-in-residence scheme appeal to you? (max. 250 words):

Tell us about your ideas for a residency project: Who is it aimed at? Where will your work take place? What will you try to achieve? How will you go about achieving it? Please include an overview of how you might spend the £1,000 activist budget and what projects/events/outputs you would create (max. 500 words):

Please confirm that you are willing and able to commit to: attending the 'Happy New ~~Year~~ *Queer*' start-of-term event on 3rd October 2019; settting the topic/theme and act as a member of the jury for the LGBT History Month 2020 Undergraduate Student Creative Project Competition; showcasing yout activist work at an LGBT History Month event in February 2020:   **YES / NO [delete as appropriate]**

Get in touch:

Impact & Knowledge Exchange
Strand Campus
King's College London
London
WC2R 2LS

@kingsartshums

ah-impact@kcl.ac.uk

kcl.ac.uk/artshums/research/impact