



Paul Hamlyn Foundation
ArtWorks Development
Grants, Year 2 Evaluation

Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
1.1	Approaches to Better Supporting Artists.....	1
1.2	Influencing other parts of the system.....	2
1.3	Resource management	3
1.4	Remaining challenges	4
2	Introduction	6
3	Method and Approach	6
4	Object of Study.....	7
4.1	Application Process.....	7
4.2	Project Snapshots	8
5	Key Findings.....	12
5.1	Project Outputs.....	12
5.2	Project Activities – Resources and Timescales	14
5.3	Supporting artists better.....	16
5.4	Leadership and influence in the System	19
6	Meeting the Aims of ArtWorks	27
7	Conclusions	39
7.1	Key Findings	39
7.2	Questions for the future	42
8	Appendix A – Self-Evaluation Template.....	45
9	Appendix B – PHF Reporting Requirements.....	46
10	Appendix C – Evidence List.....	49

1 Executive Summary

Following the end of the ArtWorks initiative, Paul Hamlyn Foundation (PHF) has continued to fund a range of activity to explore how artists could be better supported in developing their practice in participatory settings. In 2013, as part of the initiative, PHF funded seven projects through small development grants; in 2015 PHF decided to fund a further group of six projects, all with activity taking place between July 2015 and March 2016 (and some with activity continuing beyond this time). Each of the projects has received between £3,200 and £3,500. In addition, Creative Scotland funded a project which had applied through the PHF funding process, at a similar amount.

The projects largely focus on one or two of three things: supporting new or enhancing existing networks; trialling models of continuing professional development (CPD) for artists working in participatory settings; and developing improved circumstances for collaboration and/or new work. Over the seven projects, two have established new networks of artists, and three sought to build on or extend the activities of existing networks (though all involved some artists who were 'new' to the network). Six projects undertook formal CPD programmes, ranging from self/co-facilitated networks involving peer support and exchange through to formal placements attached to 'live' projects. One project focused particularly on the ways in which artists/arts organisations and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) could collaborate to support training and research for and by artists, and several projects sought to explore how employers, funders and commissioners could be brought together with artists.

The key findings of the evaluation, looking across the different projects, are discussed below. This Executive Summary considers: the approaches used with and impact upon participating artists; how projects have sought to engage with actors in the system who are not artists; how the projects have managed their resources; and what questions and issues have emerged as a result of the Development Grants.

1.1 Approaches to Better Supporting Artists

As noted above, almost all the projects sought to test CPD models with artists.

- All the projects providing CPD opportunities to artists assumed or identified a gap in the current training provision for artists who want to or do work in participatory settings.
- Those projects working with artists in the earliest career stages focused on providing a positive experience of a real, 'live' project. Supported by more experienced practitioners, those artists who participated valued the access to a professional experience, the responsibilities which they adopted in support of the real project to be delivered and the connections with others in the sector.
- Those projects bringing together artists at different career stages reported some similar benefits to artists, particularly the value of peer support and exchange. Projects like this were also valued because they offered artists: space and a reason to come together, and take time out of day-to-day working; an opportunity to engage in debate and discussion, sometimes with an explicitly critical framework, about work which takes place in participatory settings; in several cases, an opportunity to turn theory into practice, through micro grants or pilot projects; and honoraria or

bursary payments, or other kinds of practical support (working space) which the project provided.

- The projects varied in their recruitment processes, in terms of either open or closed/competitive recruitment for those engaging in opportunities. On the whole, closed/competitive recruitment was seen as a way of validating the opportunity being offered, and giving it some status. Some projects had to consider carefully the ethical issues in negotiating how to engage and bring in individuals and organisations.
- All those Development Grants where either a 'live' project was the focus of the CPD opportunity, or where micro grants or pilot projects have been available, have demonstrated strong ideas about the ethos of different kinds of practice. Several projects have also sought to ensure that – whoever is leading the project, and involved – there remains space for debate and critical reflection about what the role of arts work in participatory settings is, and what the role of the artist is.
- Most regularly of all, artists have valued the status afforded to them by being treated as practising professionals, and by being supported to focus upon themselves and their own practice. The various approaches tested in this project are replicable, flexible to different environments, and benefit those artists who participate in them significantly.

1.2 Influencing other parts of the system

The projects have also engaged with different parts of the 'system' which currently supports and engages artists working in participatory settings, from working with higher and further education, to working with employers, commissioners and funders. Some projects also engaged directly with the public. Key findings include the following points:

- Those groups brought together with a geographical focus assumed that either the unique issues/characteristics of an area, or challenges of a type of area (e.g. rural/non-city environments) would provide a useful reason for artists and others to come together. Where micro-grants or pilot projects were involved, these were then opportunities to address those unique issues in some way. In several cases, existing relationships with local non-arts sector settings or existing funding programmes have provided a useful space in which artists could try some things out practically. However, not all projects were 'local' - one, focusing on non-city environments, brought together participants from Scotland, Wales and England.
- Whilst they are a major element of the training infrastructure for artists who may go on to work in participatory settings, HEIs remain quite challenging (though potentially rewarding) to work with for artists and arts organisations. More generally, there were reminders in several projects of the significant funding and other changes taking place in the education sector, and elsewhere, that impact upon the kinds of partnerships or involvement which can take place in projects like these Development Grants. As we have found in other ArtWorks activities, the presence of individual champions who understand the arts sector is often very important in making meaningful connections; often these individuals bridge different parts of the sector in their experience or roles.

- Despite this, many of the Development Grants demonstrate both healthy leadership from employers, commissioners and funders seeking to explore their responsibility in supporting artists, and useful and respectful partnerships with artists and arts organisations who have been responsible for designing and delivering CPD opportunities. In this way, this year's Development Grants have added a new dimension to work previously undertaken as part of the ArtWorks programme.
- On the whole, these partnerships or shared leadership have sought to recognise the expertise in practice which the artists and arts organisations offer, but have also brought in and shared expertise from the employer/commissioner/funder side. This balance has allowed projects to take place where the wider infrastructure is showing an interest, but artists are still able (at least in part) to determine what is important. The involvement of this wider infrastructure of employers/commissioners/funders has been important in some projects as a way of providing validation for developing ideas – it is a sign of the wider world taking those ideas seriously.
- Those Development Grants which focused on a 'live' project, or which have involved micro grants or pilot projects have connected participating artists with the public. There are still some projects with planned activities to take place with the public also.
- Only one project has, as yet, really sought to broker open conversations between commissioners and artists. One of the lessons from projects funded by the Development Grants is that it can take time for new groups of individuals to develop a shared approach or a collective voice, and that therefore engagement with external opportunities may come only after a group has developed real confidence in its identity and agenda.

1.3 Resource management

- With a relatively modest amount of funding, the projects have succeeded in testing a range of things, provided there is a relatively clear focus and a single group of 'beneficiaries' or participants. 'Live' participatory arts projects which are already funded and existing relationships/networks have all been important 'collateral' in giving the Development Grants a setting in which they can have a significant impact – the Grants on their own would not have covered the full cost of many of the opportunities created through them.
- Several of the projects have had to extend their timescales, often because they have taken longer to recruit participating artists and others than originally anticipated. Some projects discovered that certain approaches, like co-creation or co-facilitation, have been particularly time consuming; however, those projects would also argue for the value of being able to allow ideas and networks to emerge using these approaches.
- Whilst some still have activities to complete, others have already been able to take their learning forward. Some are exploring wider funding applications to replicate and extend models they have tested; others have opportunities to take research and development activity through further development and testing stages. The Development Grants have, in many cases, usefully provided a focus for existing agendas and partners to come together around the specific question of better support for artists in participatory settings.

1.4 Remaining challenges

As already noted, in response to 'gaps' identified in previous ArtWorks activity and particularly in the previous round of Development Grants, this year's projects have gone further in engaging with employers, commissioners and funders, and in building on different approaches to CPD opportunities for artists working in participatory settings. Some projects are still to complete significant activities, and several are exploring 'what happens next', through funding applications or ongoing discussions.

In order for the models and ideas tested and explored in these Development Grants, most will need to identify additional or alternative resources to take models further, replicate them or explore alternative approaches. Some are already seeking further funding in order to do so, others are exploring different approaches to sustainability.

Positively, several lead organisations identify an ongoing responsibility for themselves in supporting those artists who have been involved in these Development Grants, and in applying the learning more widely. Several projects have undertaken some form of reflection and/or dissemination event as part of the completion of their project.

Finally, it remains important that PHF, as the funder of the Development Grants, considers the value of the learning and models from these projects in the context of the wider ArtWorks activities and its own renewed strategic agenda. Funders like PHF, and the local funders and local authorities who have led Development Grants in this year, are potentially uniquely able to both advocate to their grantees for the value of better support for artists working in participatory settings, and to actually establish frameworks through which the projects they fund can be encouraged to include these kinds of support opportunities. These Development Grants suggest that a relatively small amount of additional funding, alongside core project funding, can enable arts work in participatory settings to better support the artists who are delivering (or who may in the future deliver) that work.

Introduction, Method and Object of Study

2 Introduction

This evaluation looks at the findings from six projects funded through development awards made by PHF and one project funded to a similar level by Creative Scotland, as part of ongoing activity following the ArtWorks initiative. DHA were involved in evaluating the main activities of the ArtWorks initiative, and the seven development grants made in 2013. DHA are currently involved in evaluating activities which have been funded by PHF following the initiative, and as such were also appointed to evaluate this second round of development awards.

This evaluation seeks, therefore, to consider the seven projects both as individual interventions and in the context of ArtWorks' aims and the wider activities which have already taken place or are taking place. In support of this, this report offers both a summative view of the findings from the seven projects, and some formative commentary on issues which projects raise or which could be taken forward by those interested in furthering support for artists who work in participatory settings.

This report contains an explanation of the evaluation method and approach, brief descriptions of the object of study (the seven projects), a discussion of the key findings from the projects grouped into different approaches/areas of focus and a consideration of how the projects connect with the original aims of ArtWorks and intersect with other, ongoing work in this area. In the conclusion and executive summary we have brought what we think are the key findings and areas of learning together. The report concludes with a section on next steps for the evaluation.

3 Method and Approach

In selecting an evaluation approach for the development awards, it was considered important that the relatively modest level of investment (a maximum of £3,500 per project) be recognised with a 'light-touch' response, and that projects be supported to establish their own propositions for success and ways of assessing whether they have been achieved. From the funder's perspective, PHF wanted to understand:

- Whether these projects are effective, both in their own terms and in the context of the broad aims of ArtWorks and other work funded under this banner
- How this type of investment works, and what the benefits and limits of it are
- What learning and opportunities emerge from this process which should be understood by those seeking to support artists who work in participatory settings.

Projects were asked to complete a simple logic model for their projects, providing a self-evaluation tool for identifying what they would need to know to determine whether their projects had progressed as expected. The self-evaluation template is included in Appendix A. The model asks the user to lay out the detailed elements of their proposition, and should prompt users to interrogate whether the choices they have made about the inputs and activities can reasonably be expected to result in the outputs and outcomes they are seeking.

The template was introduced at a workshop in June 2015, with a worked example of the template available as a guide as well as a version with prompting questions. All the projects began filling in the template at the workshop, and discussed it with those running other projects. Subsequently projects were asked to take the template away and complete it, and submit it by the end of August 2015. The evaluator responded with feedback and queries, and some projects amended the template at this stage.

The template then supported discussions with all of the projects, initially in mid-Autumn of 2016 and then when projects had completed and submitted case studies; projects updated their templates as they progressed through.

Guidelines were also shared for the reflective case studies which projects would be required to produce at the end of the project, building on the headings and questions outlined in the self-evaluation template. Support, where required, was provided in identifying approaches and methods to evidence gathering and in structuring and responding to the case study requirements. Some projects shared draft surveys and questionnaires with the evaluator, for feedback. Finally, where appropriate, projects also supplied documentary and other evidence in addition to their case study and logic model to the evaluator to support a better understanding of the projects. Beyond this, documents relating to the call for proposals and selection process have also been reviewed. Using the model devised for the wider ArtWorks evaluation, the seven projects discussed here are also mapped onto the wider ArtWorks outcomes.

This report is divided into a number of sections. Section 4 looks at the 'object of study' and offers a brief overview of the seven funded projects. Section 5 looks at the projects individually and as a group, using a number of analytical 'lenses': looking at the outputs from the projects against the original funding criteria; exploring how funding was matched and spent, and issues around timetables; examining how artists, as the primary 'beneficiaries' of the Development Grants were engaged with, and how choices were made about who was engaged with; and looking at how projects have located leadership, and sought to influence different parts of the 'system' which exists around arts work in participatory settings, from training providers to funders to the public. Section 6 looks at the Development Grants in the context of the wider aims of the ArtWorks programme, and consider how this year's Grants have contributed to those aims. Finally, Section 7 offers some overall conclusions.

4 Object of Study

The following section briefly describes the bidding process and the seven projects, outlining – for the purposes of this evaluation process and report – the object of study.

4.1 Application Process

Each of the projects discussed here applied through an open process to PHF for a maximum of £3,500 each. Applicants were asked to put forward proposals for researching particular questions and/or testing the feasibility of possible solutions to perceived issues which addressed one or more of the following three aims:

- networks bringing together artists, employers and training and development providers to achieve something new;
- continuing professional development provision supporting artists at different stages of their careers which builds on the models and learning approaches developed during ArtWorks;
- projects involving partnerships between different groups such as employers/commissioners, artists and training providers, that engage the employers in the provision of training and development opportunities.

These aims were selected specifically to explore areas which other ArtWorks activities, and particularly the previous round of Development Grants, had not explored. Specifically, both the Pathfinders funded

through the ArtWorks initiative and the Development Grants had focused primarily on engaging with artists; whilst some projects/activities had sought to engage with employers, commissioners and funders, on the whole this had been more difficult to do. This year's Development Grants sought to encourage the involvement of employers, commissioners and funders. In addition, applicants were being encouraged to look at some of the models and learning approaches developed in CPD programmes already under the ArtWorks banner, and seek to build upon them. So, the intention was that the Development Grants would particularly further the aims of ArtWorks in relation to engaging more widely with the 'system' which includes artists working in participatory settings and the wider range of actors in that process, and to push further some of the CPD methodologies already tested by ArtWorks.

Sixty-eight applications were received (with a total request for £227,710) in May 2015, and six projects were selected (funded to a total of £20,700). Projects were initially asked to complete all activity by the end of February 2016; for a variety of reasons (discussed further below) some projects extended beyond this period. A further project from the 68 applications was funded by Creative Scotland to a similar level as those funded by PHF.

4.2 Project Snapshots

4.2.1 Sheffield Network of Arts Providers (SNAP) Collaborative Development Programme

Sheffield Network of Arts Providers (SNAP) working with children and young people recruited participants for and ran a series of 'collaborative enquiry' days. Participants included artists in different art-forms and at different career stages, and employers and commissioners from the city also. All participants, with the exception of one, were based in and worked primarily in Sheffield. The days were facilitated, and participants were able to set the agenda to some extent, identifying what they wanted to enquire into and how. The project included an opportunity for 'real' work to come out of it: participants were invited to develop and work up ideas into proposals for micro-grants, four of which were funded separately by SNAP.

4.2.2 Geraldine Pilgrim Performance Company, WELL

The Geraldine Pilgrim Performance Company was commissioned by ACE Creative People and Places project, Creative Barking and Dagenham, to undertake a participatory project called WELL, a site-specific performance journey in an ex-pharmaceuticals factory in Dagenham. The Company has a history and ethos of working with emerging artists, and wanted to test an approach of recruiting students from both local FE colleges and London-based HEIs to treat them as emerging artists and give them an opportunity to work alongside a range of professional freelance practitioners who were already working on the project. These emerging artists were divided into groups, assigned a professional mentor, assessed for the skill and knowledge level and given tasks and responsibilities on the project. The aim was to provide these emerging artists with an opportunity to learn through delivering a real project, alongside more experienced peers.

4.2.3 FEAST, Moveable Feast

FEAST, which funds and commissions participatory projects involving artists and participants in Cornwall, worked in partnership with Rogue Theatre and Creative Skills to develop and offer placements for emerging artists. Three apprentices were recruited through an open and competitive process to work on a project being run by Rogue Theatre. Their placements were supported by one-to-one mentoring

within Rogue Theatre, a thorough introduction and engagement with the whole project, a reflection framework including daily written diaries and video diaries, external mentoring from FEAST and a negotiated role in the final production. Each apprentice also received a bursary. The partners ran a seminar day to share the findings of the project and to assess more widely the need for CPD support. The aim of the project was to explore how FEAST, as funder, could take a more proactive role in encouraging and facilitating CPD provision for participatory artists in Cornwall.

4.2.4 Torbay Culture Board, Developing and delivering high quality participatory arts practice in Torbay

Torbay Culture Board developed a CPD programme for artists working in participatory settings. Artists were recruited through an open process, with no limitations. A small honorarium was available for freelancers who were taking part. The programme was determined by those participating through discussions in sessions and via email, and facilitated by the group. Approaches used in the six sessions included participants demonstrating and talking about their own practice, developing creative responses, using techniques like open space and a buddying/mentoring approach, and getting together for an evening meal. The group developed a document about the arts and cultural offer for use within an NCVO Cultural Commissioning Locality Project, and (at the time of writing) have planned an event with commissioners. Longer-term plans include seeking to build on the network of artists which has emerged from the programme, and support members' future development.

4.2.5 West Lothian Council, Connecting Creative Practice

West Lothian Council collaborated with four other local authorities and worked with Hidden Giants, a producing company working with artists in participation and education, to build upon their experience as Creative Learning Networks in building relationships and understanding between artists and schools. The project developed a training programme, which seven artists from different art-forms and career stages took part in. The three training days led to the artists delivering pilot projects in six schools across the different local authorities. Both artists and the education partners were encouraged to think about how they could share a common language, and explore different roles for artists in school settings.

4.2.6 Creative Learning (Aberdeen City Council), Community Out of Bounds

The Creative Learning Team, Aberdeen City Council seeks to improve outcomes for individuals and communities in the city through the arts, culture and creativity. Creative Learning wished to set up a programme which would be artist-led and place an emphasis on artists learning from each other within the context of participatory and socially engaged arts practice. Working with artist Jonathan Baxter, the project ran a pair of events open to artists and arts, community and higher education organisations, and used these as a basis for developing a more in-depth programme. From a recruitment process, 11 artists were selected to be involved in a six-month programme, engaging weekly, and benefiting from some shared work place. They have done a range of things, including undertaking a study visit to Leeds, using reflective journals and sharing their practice with each other. There are some further open events to take place, and connections are being made with community centres in Aberdeen to encourage potential projects and opportunities.

4.2.7 The Stove Network, research and development of effective partnerships between Higher Education and rurally based participative arts organisations

The Stove Network are an artist-led collective of 200+ members based in Dumfries, with a focus on participative arts practice in rural/non-city settings. Using their grant, the Network explored a number of potential routes for partnerships and collaborations with Higher Education Institutions. The Stove Network explored some existing and new relationships with HEIs, looking at the potential for modules on MA courses and collaborative doctoral awards which could be delivered in partnership between HEIs and practitioners. They also looked at how conversations and connections between the sector and HEIs could be supported. Working with HEI and other partners, the Network developed a Summit (a two-day event) designed to facilitate a range of practitioners and academics coming together to explore possibilities for future collaboration and reflect on the nature of participative practice in a rural/non-city context. Following this, an artist has been commissioned to offer a response to the Summit and this is feeding into ongoing project development with HEI partners.

Key Findings

5 Key Findings

This section looks at the different approaches taken by the seven projects with their relatively modest award from PHF. It explores potential achievements of such funding and what the projects have been able to test and learn.

5.1 Project Outputs

The seven projects have all, to some extent, been research and development projects. Individual projects began at different points in the process of testing their propositions, and therefore have produced different outputs and assets which could be further explored or developed. Most of the 'outputs' from the projects fall into broad categories: new or enhanced networks, tested models for CPD and new relationships.

5.1.1 New or enhanced networks

Whilst the original funding call specified new networks, some projects have sought to enhance or build upon existing networks and contacts. SNAP, with their collaborative enquiry project, were seeking specifically to test some questions about what kinds of conditions would be required for new collaborations and projects to emerge from the existing SNAP network. Not all of those artists who participated had already had some experience of SNAP, and so the network itself also benefited from new faces. The group which participated in the project still has an online group – and so SNAP have ended up establishing a new network within a network, to some extent. In West Lothian, the project also built on some existing relationships (between different local authorities, between local authorities and schools, and between schools and artists) within the Creative Learning Networks; the project sought to extend and enhance the network.

In the case of The Stove Network, the project has been at least in part an exercise in exploring how the Network can find and develop new partnerships. However, the Summit event run by The Stove Network involved bringing together small groups ('teams') of partners from HEIs and the arts sector from different locations in Scotland, Wales and England. So, the project has tested both the ways in which The Stove Network itself can enhance its reach, as well as exchanging ideas with other small networks and potentially offering a model for the ways in which some other areas could take work forward.

The project in Aberdeen more specifically sought to set up a new network, using a 'peer-education' programme as a vehicle to do so. In this project, the network is essentially 'owned' by the artists, and one of the topics for sessions within the grant-funded programme has been how the network can be sustained. For those artists and staff from arts organisations who participated in the Torbay Culture Board project, the group who have emerged from the CPD programme have already undertaken some work in developing a collective voice; future plans for the project include developing the group specifically as a network.

5.1.2 Models for continuing professional development

A range of different approaches to continuing professional development opportunities has been taken, in terms of the beneficiaries targeted, the style of facilitation, where expertise is brought in or identified, specific methodologies, timescales, etc. Some of this is discussed in subsequent sections, but this section offers a brief overview of the different approaches. In total, 89 artists, staff from arts organisations and commissioners took part in development programmes or networks (as opposed to open, public events).

SNAP chose a collaborative enquiry model, supported by a facilitator and used input from a range of external sources including curating some reading from the existing ArtWorks publications. Following on from this, participants were given the opportunity to pitch for four micro-grants – themselves small research and development grants. Other projects similarly mixed closed sessions for a group of participants, often involving some kind of ‘theoretical’ or ‘philosophical’ element, with opportunities to reach out. West Lothian ran three ‘training’ sessions for participating artists, followed by a series of pilot projects matching artist with schools and responding to a brief from a classroom teacher. Torbay Culture Board’s project included six sessions and some ‘buddying’ activities; at the end, the group had produced and launched a document on the arts and culture offer as a contribution to a wider, existing project connecting the arts with non-sector commissioners. The programme of activities being undertaken in Aberdeen has included open events, smaller sessions with artists recruited to the network, a study visit, the establishment of shared work space; there are also plans for some work to take place in partnership with community centres (early discussions have taken place). Alongside plans for continued collaboration with HEIs to improve the kinds of HE opportunities available for artists who want to develop their practice in participatory settings, The Stove Network’s Summit has resulted in a paid commission for an artist to offer a response to the project.

The Geraldine Pilgrim Company offered an opportunity for emerging artists to work alongside experienced artists on a live participatory project, benefiting from a range of mentoring, skills development and a live project environment. Similarly, FEAST offered a number of placements for artists on a live project, supported by mentoring and a reflective framework.

Whilst some projects placed a specific focus upon practical skills and exploring the way in which commissioning and employment takes place, some projects also placed a strong emphasis on participants exploring the ethical and philosophical principles of participatory practice in the arts. In some cases, these two things were brought together in projects where there was a specific ambition to contribute to the conversation or debate about the purpose and value of arts in participatory settings. The project in Torbay sought specifically to debate notions of quality; the artists in the West Lothian project were supported to ask questions about what their role in the education system could be; Aberdeen’s ambitions include developing a ‘critically informed’ network, and has placed some emphasis on participants developing their knowledge of the history of arts practice in participatory settings.

5.1.3 Improved circumstances for collaboration/new work

Several of the projects explored how circumstances or conditions could be improved/developed to support collaboration or new work beyond participation in a network. One of the micro-grants from the SNAP project (titled the 'non-marketplace') looked at an alternative approach to introducing schools and artists to each other. The pilot projects as part of the West Lothian CPD programme sought to give both schools and artists an insight into the different ways in which artists could be used in school settings. The Stove Network has focused in all the aspects of its project on how to develop the circumstances for collaboration with HEIs, and through the Summit has tested a particular approach to curating conditions for networking, sharing ideas and, potentially, establishing collaborative projects. The network emerging out of the Torbay project plans to undertake a practical session with commissioners.

More generally, several of the projects, either at application or in their case studies, make both implicit and explicit arguments for the value of networks and CPD to a better skilled and more coherent workforce, and the idea that this should support artists in better securing and negotiating collaborations and new work.

5.2 Project Activities – Resources and Timescales

The following three sections discuss project activities in detail, but there are a few observations across the seven projects worth noting at this stage in relation to budgets, general resources, timescales and recruitment for projects.

In terms of the budgets for the different projects, overall reported budgets vary significantly. This is due partly to the inclusion of 'live' participatory projects in budget reporting; these projects were not funded by the PHF Development Grant, but they do provide the learning environment in which CPD opportunities have taken place, and will also have been significant in bringing together and covering the costs of those experienced artists delivering the projects. For example, in the Geraldine Pilgrim Company project the small additional fee taken from the Development Grant funding for experienced artists on the 'live' participatory project to mentor the emerging artists on the CPD programme, will have covered neither the presence of those artists in the first place, nor the amount of time which they dedicated to engaging with the emerging artists. Some projects included match funding from internal sources, mostly in kind although two projects also provided some cash match. The Stove Network are notable in having brought in a range of cash funding from various partners after the project had been re-scoped.

For the most part, budgets were spent on:

- fees to artists/arts organisations and facilitators who were running or supporting CPD programmes;
- three projects included honoraria payments/bursaries for those artists participating in CPD opportunities;
- the costs of running events (materials, venues, catering);
- some small contributions to the staff time of organisations leading the projects, particularly where staff are freelance or not permanently employed.

Partnerships are discussed in detail later in this report, but it is particularly important to note that most projects began with some partnerships in place, or were able to find partners and further contributions through existing networks. As such, the relatively small grants given by PHF have been made to go quite far. Several case studies note that projects took more staff time, or were more complex to manage than

originally intended – the cost of these resources was met primarily by lead organisations. This is worth noting, as the grants of between £3,200 - £3,500 by no means reflect full cost recovery; however it also suggests that the terms under which the grants are made and the aims outlined in the funding call are valued and important enough to lead organisations that they are prepared to extend their own resources to complete projects.

Several projects were not completed by the end of February 2016, and some (at the time of writing) still have activities to take place. Notably, several projects found it took longer than they had anticipated to go through the recruitment process to bring together participants to take part in a CPD opportunity. In a couple of cases, emerging networks of artists and practitioners have simply needed longer to develop as groups, and explore what they would like to do before engaging with external opportunities.

5.3 Supporting artists better

Projects were encouraged, at the bidding stage, to think primarily about how artists can be supported – indeed, the overall ArtWorks programme was termed a ‘workforce development’ programme. All of the projects have focused very strongly upon a direct intervention with practitioners; some projects focused on practitioners in particular locations; and some on practitioners at different career stages. In total 89 artists were involved in CPD opportunities; more were involved in open and sharing events, and in research and development activities like The Stove Network’s Summit. The following section looks at the ways in which projects focused on particular groups or areas.

5.3.1 Detailed Analysis

Discussed below are projects which explicitly sought to bring value to groups determined either by their geographical area of practice, or their career stage.

Area of focus	
Trainee/emerging practitioners	The Geraldine Pilgrim Company recruited its 39 participating artists with a requirement that they be either in higher or further education, or have recently finished in higher or further education. Participating artists came from a mixture of institutions, and were studying either a foundation degree, BTEC or undergraduate level.
	FEAST recruited 3 apprentices through a competitive application process, seeking ‘early career’ artists. All the apprentices had graduated within the last two years, and two had not yet undertaken any paid work in the sector.
Location	SNAP began their project with the aim of enhancing an existing city-specific network. In recruiting participants, they sought a balance of art-forms, career stages, and professions (artists and commissioners/employers). One of the techniques used in the enquiry was to map the relationships between artists, companies and commissioners in Sheffield. Only one participant was not primarily based in Sheffield.
	The Geraldine Pilgrim Company recruited through HE and FE organisations, including one local to the project itself: Barking and Dagenham College. The project itself was specific to the local area and engaging with the local community, having been funded through Creative People and Places for Barking and Dagenham.
	FEAST gained applicants from across the South West (and a pair from London), and ultimately recruited three apprentices based in Cornwall and Devon. Part of the original rationale for the project was to support artists based in the area in developing their practice.
	Torbay Culture Board focused on bringing together artists in Torbay, and the participating artists published their document on the arts and culture offer as the ‘Torbay Arts and Culture Network’. The planned ongoing focus on engaging with local commissioners reinforces this approach – artists who are involved are expected to be committed to practice in the area.
	West Lothian sought ways to build upon existing place-based networks through its training programme for artists. Both the theoretical and the practical elements of the programme used the area as a specific context, and brought in expertise and opportunities from the different local authority areas involved in the project.

	The Creative Learning Team at Aberdeen also situated their project specifically in Aberdeen, running public events to explore examples of arts and communities work in Aberdeen, establishing local shared work space and making contact with community centres in the area as potential partners for public-facing work by the network.
	The Stove Network is already geographically focused in South West Scotland (and particularly Dumfries). However, the project also brought together teams from other areas (Sutherland, Merthyr Tydfil, Northumberland), and involved The Stove Network developing potential partnerships with an HEI in North East England, so was not restricted to 'local' working - however, a common area of focus/challenge for the Summit was practice in 'non-city' areas, a different kind of geographical focus.

5.3.2 Overview

Career stage of practitioners

The table above refers to the two projects which focused on practitioners at a particular career stage. It is worth noting that most other projects specifically sought to involve practitioners at a range of different career stages, and also to involve practitioners from different art-forms. Whilst most projects recruited artists (either through an open or competitive process), and sought an immediate impact upon that group of artists, the project from The Stove Network is perhaps slightly different in that it was not primarily envisaged as a professional development opportunity for those involved, but a mechanism for bringing together artists and others to consider what could be done to create better professional development opportunities for artists.

For the two projects which did focus upon practitioners at a particular stage, both offered activities which were effectively learning placements on live, participatory projects. In both cases for those artists participating, exposure to work in a professional environment and exposure to other professionals, were the primary approaches/benefits of the projects. The Geraldine Pilgrim Company worked with a significant number (39) of artists, and the case study notes some challenges in terms of finding enough time for the professional artists already on the project to provide the supervision/mentoring required by the emerging artists. Worth noting is the value that one 'supervising' artist placed on giving the emerging artists a chance to engage with the social aspect of working in the sector, and an opportunity to ask questions about career progression informally. The project did not offer any payment (some of those initially recruited were unable to take part due to taking up paid work instead); but many who did take part worked more days than had been anticipated at the beginning of the project and sought additional responsibilities within the project.

FEAST gained a large number of applications (53) and eventually recruited one more apprentice than was originally anticipated. Offering an honorarium, the requirement for participants to reflect using a framework established in advance and the use of the title 'apprentice' were important in the perception of the value of the placements for those participating artists.

It is worth noting that the other projects which did not focus on practitioners at a particular stage all offered some similar approaches:

- A mixture of ‘theoretical’ or ‘closed’ discussion/debate/reflection space *and* the opportunity for practical activities involving beneficiaries and/or partners outside the group;
- A value placed on peer-engagement and support, including sharing and showing different types of practice;
- The importance of creating both a rationale and a space for individual practitioners to come together, and of enabling space in which practical things could be ‘tried out’ safely;
- Those projects which included honoraria or some kind of bursary/benefit in return for participation reported this as important to the value which artists placed on the opportunity, and to their ability to take part.

Geographical focus

For those projects organising or recruiting their participants around a geographical focus, a number of approaches are worth noting:

- Several projects involved sessions looking at practice from within the area of focus, or mapping different providers/the ecology of an area.
- Different techniques were used, from sessions with experienced practitioners or people from outside the sector coming in to speak to a group, through to creative responses such as physically ‘building’ solutions and ideas.
- Whilst not discussed in detail in the different cases, all the projects with a geographical focus suggest that there might be a unique set of local circumstances/nuances which participating artists will feel some connection towards. Some projects specifically report participating artists exchanging similar experiences (both good and poor), as well as uncovering shared expectations and ambitions.
- Building on this assumption, projects with micro-grants or pilot projects on offer at the end presume that bringing artists from the same location together would prompt them to identify local problems/opportunities which they might seek solutions to; several projects anticipated that these solutions might be arrived at collaboratively (having brought different artists and others together in the first place).
- Where projects were specifically seeking to set up a network which might go on after the end of the project, networks were seen as a way of supporting artists in a location to organise themselves, seek or develop the support they might need, and create a collective voice/approach which would make it easier to engage with non-arts sector partners.
- Both FEAST and The Stove Network conceived of their projects as dealing in part with specific challenges to do with the arts sector in rural environments, and the fragmentary nature of provision in those environments.
- Several projects were also seeking to take advantage of or add to existing place-focused policy or funding arrangements. Torbay Culture Board attached its training programme to an opportunity to input into an NCVO Locality Project, looking at how the arts sector might engage with non-arts commissioners. In West Lothian, the project sought to build on some existing partnerships between neighbouring local authorities, and the way in which local authorities support schools in their areas to engage with artists. FEAST discovered towards the end of their project that they could take the learning from their placements scheme into a funding bid for creative industries skills development for the Cornwall area.
- Across the projects, despite the common geographical focus, different approaches to recruitment included projects opting for either open recruitment (all comers could take part) or, more commonly, competitive recruitment processes. Some projects included elements (e.g.

events at the beginning or end of the project) which were more widely open, and then engaged in a more closed or competitive recruitment process for a portion of the project. Several projects report that for participating artists, having a ‘competitive’ process was an important part of the perceived value of the opportunity.

- Two of the projects which ran competitive processes reported significant numbers of applicants (FEAST, for example, had 53 applicants and awarded three places), suggesting that artists certainly perceive a need for the kinds of CPD opportunities which were on offer.
- Rather differently, The Stove Network had to create an invitation list for both the open and closed elements of the Summit – navigating what should be open to all, and where discussions would be more productive with smaller, selected groups proved challenging, not least ethically as any selection suggests some degree of exclusion also.
- Finally, it is worth noting that whilst shared geographical locations were important for some projects, The Stove Network discovered some limitations to the role of geographical proximity in providing an agenda for bringing potential partners together. Organisations local to The Stove Network were invited to take part in the Summit, but most attendees were either individual practitioners or representing national organisations or organisations from outside the area.

5.4 Leadership and influence in the System

As already noted, all the projects focused upon a direct intervention or engagement with individual practitioners. However, the projects were led variously by individuals, organisations and institutions, and with a range of different partners engaging. This section considers what the projects demonstrate about strategies and approaches for providing leadership in and influencing the ‘system’ in which workforce development for artists working in participatory settings operates. Where analysis and commentary relate to artists and practitioners, the focus is on leadership as the previous section has discussed the ways in which the different projects sought to intervene and influence this group.

5.4.1 Detailed Analysis

The System	
Higher and Further Education Providers	The Stove Network undertook a project which directly sought to influence and intervene in current training provision being offered to artists by HEIs. The project included a number of areas of exploration, including a possible MA Module, a practice-based PhD and the Summit event which brought together a range of interested parties (including academics and artists) as well as ‘teams’ of existing partnership or proto-partnerships between artists and HEIs. The MA Module, originally a greater focus of the funding application, became difficult to pursue during the timeframe due to a restructure at the HEI which had been the potential partner, and some issues around the availability/accessibility of funding which had been sought.
	It is worth noting that the Geraldine Pilgrim Company project undertook its recruitment through HE and FE institutions and courses, drawing together 39 participants from five different institutions.
	The Aberdeen Creative Learning Team project involved an artist, Jonathan Baxter, in facilitating the network of artists. Jonathan is also working with Gray’s School of Art on developing workshops for undergraduates on socially-engaged art, and the project hopes to build upon this relationship in developing support for artists in the future.

Employers, Commissioners and Funders	<p>One of the principles of the SNAP collaborative enquiry project was to explore how ‘commissioning habits’ could be affected by SNAP. Five commissioners/employers were involved in the collaborative enquiry, though it is worth noting that three non-arts commissioners had to pull out due to funding issues/availability. A focus of enquiry was to plot the ‘ecology’ of Sheffield, exploring the relationships between employers/commissioners and other parts of the ‘system’; all of the micro-grants made pursue questions about the circumstances and process of commissioning which arose in the earlier part of the project.</p> <p>FEAST is a funder and a commissioner, as well as applying for and receiving funding from both arts and non-arts funders. One of the questions which FEAST wanted to explore as part of their project was how FEAST as a commissioner could develop their understanding of what ‘effective training’ might be for artists who work in participatory settings, and to understand how as a funder they might bring about more CPD opportunities in the context of participatory projects being delivered.</p> <p>The Torbay Culture Board is situated within Torbay Development Agency, and has a strategic role supporting culture in the Torbay area. It is in receipt of one of the NCVO Cultural Commissioning Locality Projects, which is designed to support artists and commissions to develop their understanding of each other. The project supported by PHF has developed a network of artists who have already presented a document to the Locality Project, and there are plans to run a workshop with commissioners as part of Locality.</p> <p>The West Lothian Council project brought together a group of local authorities (regular employers, commissioners and funders of artists working in participatory settings) to support artists from their areas. It also brought in a number of schools (also employers/commissioners of artists working in participatory settings) to act as partners for pilot projects. The training programme itself brought in teachers and council staff to talk with the participating artists, to share their experience and expertise.</p> <p>The Creative Learning Team at Aberdeen City Council is a regular employer, commissioner and funder of artists working in participatory settings. In looking to support artists in reflecting on their practice and developing a network, it has sought to ‘improve’ the confidence and innovation of artists working in the Aberdeen area in participatory settings.</p> <p>The Stove Network was able to connect with funders through its Summit, as a variety of partners including Active Northumberland and Creative Scotland were involved in supporting and contributing to the Summit.</p>
Artists, practitioners and arts organisations	<p>FEAST collaborated with a local arts organisation, Rogue Theatre, to develop their placement opportunities for artists. Both the partners worked together to advertise and recruit the artists. A reflective framework was established, and guidance/mentoring was available to apprentices from both partners. Rogue Theatre supplied not only the ‘live’ project environment, but also the specific experience and expertise of practice in participatory settings. The ethos of Rogue Theatre as a company was important to the way in which the CPD opportunity was framed for participating artists.</p>

	<p>The Geraldine Pilgrim Company sought to provide emerging artists with an opportunity to learn from experienced peers, and in the context of a real participatory project with the community. The original application described an ethical and philosophical position, for arts organisations such as the Company to be responsible in passing on their knowledge and skills, and in giving experiences to the next generation.</p>
	<p>The Stove Network is an artist-led network, and the premise of their project was to understand how they could influence the higher education sector. As such, the project was clearly led by artists and the Network’s specific agenda. The Network was positioned as expert in participatory practice (particularly in non-city environments), as well as experienced and connected to the challenges facing emerging practitioners, particularly where their training experience may not extend to this kind of practice. However, the project experienced some challenges in trying to engage with HEIs, and trying to offer some leadership in developing potential collaborations.</p>
	<p>The West Lothian project involved an experienced practitioner and arts organisation (Paul Gorman from Hidden Giants) to lead and facilitate the training for the participating artists.</p>
Communities	<p>The FEAST project included a ‘live’ participatory project with the community in Cornwall. The apprentices undertaking placements with Rogue Theatre were directly involved in various aspects of the project, including elements which involved direct contact with participants.</p>
	<p>The West Lothian Project included a series of pilot projects in schools, with children and young people. The training programme sought to support the artists to try working in different ways (to the ways in which they might normally work) with the schools, so that both the artist and the school (and its teachers and pupils) might experience what participatory arts work could offer.</p>
	<p>The Geraldine Pilgrim Company project included a ‘live’ participatory project with the community in Barking and Dagenham, which the emerging artists participating in the training and mentoring were involved in contributing to.</p>
	<p>The Aberdeen Creative Learning Team project made contact with seven community centres in the area, and plans to connect these with artists from the Network to support the delivery of three public engagement projects.</p>
	<p>SNAP considered the role of communities (looking specifically at the role of children and young people) in commissioning both as part of the collaborative enquiry (in theory) and directly through one of the micro-grants. Two of the other micro-grants also involve work with children and young people.</p>

5.4.2 Overview

Higher and Further Education Providers

One project, The Stove Network, specifically sought to explore what relationships could be built with HEIs. Beginning from the practitioner perspective of identifying an absence of suitable training within HEIs for artists who might want to work in participatory settings, they positioned themselves as the experts in this kind of practice, able to collaborate with HEIs to bring this kind of expertise into the

provision of undergraduate and postgraduate training. Both the Geraldine Pilgrim Company project and the Aberdeen Creative Learning Team projects involve some indirect connection with HEIs, and both confirm the perception that there is the opportunity for HEIs and FE colleges to improve the ways in which students can learn about and understand work in participatory settings. The project also looked at ways in which artists and academics might collaborate to develop research opportunities. Key learning with regards to direct interventions with HEIs includes:

- Challenges relating to the ways in which HEIs can or wish to collaborate. Some of the possibilities which were originally pursued by The Stove Network failed because of changes in the HEI environment (restructuring) and because of lack of clarity around accessing potential funding.
- More generally, one of the reflections offered by The Stove Network's project is that HEIs are not necessarily very comfortable collaborating with external organisations on 'an equal footing' – and that, on the whole, the academic agenda is seen as the overriding focus.
- The more successful discussions were often supported by individual relationships between artists and academics which already existed. This is something which has been apparent elsewhere in projects funded under the ArtWorks banner.

Employers, Commissioners and Funders

In this year of Development Grants a significant number of projects have involved employers, commissioners and funders in exploring CPD opportunities for artists. Three projects (SNAP, FEAST and Torbay Culture Board) had an explicit aim in their original application for funding to explore how commissioning/funding artists might be influenced. FEAST were asking that question of themselves as a funder and commissioner, and questioning the role of a funder and commissioner in providing CPD opportunities to artists. SNAP were seeking, as a group of artists and arts organisations, to explore how more collaborative approaches with commissioners and employers could be developed (and using a CPD vehicle to have some of this conversation). Torbay sought to develop the capacity and cohesiveness of a group of artists first, before enabling them to address commissioners through an existing project which has been brokering discussions and activities between commissioners and providers in the Torbay area.

As local authorities, both West Lothian Council (and its partner local authorities) and Aberdeen City Council's Creative Learning Team sought to exercise their responsibility as funders/commissioners/employers by establishing CPD programmes for artists in the area. It is worth noting that in both cases an artist/arts organisation was employed/partnered with, in order to actually shape and deliver the programme – both local authorities have sought ways in which to provide support which does not amount to them as local authorities determining the skills or capacities which artists need, and how they should acquire them. The same is true for FEAST, who partnered with Rogue Theatre.

Key learning with regards to engaging with employers, funders and commissioners includes:

- On the whole, project are either led by employers/commissioners/funders seeking ways in which they can provide a framework/resources for supporting CPD for artists; or they involve artists/arts organisations seeking ways in which employers/commissioners/funders can be influenced.
- Those projects which were led by employers/funders/commissioners all involved artists or arts organisations as delivery partners in their CPD programmes for other artists, recognising where the expertise might lie; the exception is the project from the Geraldine Pilgrim Company, where

effectively as an employer of artists (from the arts sector) they were able to both explore their responsibility in passing skills and experiences on, and to offer the required expertise.

- Project were also able, in some instances, to recognise and give space for the expertise which non-arts employers/funders/commissioners have. The West Lothian project brought in teachers to speak with the participating artists, and share their experiences; FEAST established a mechanism for the apprentices to benefit from mentoring both from Rogue Theatre and from FEAST, if required, and the whole project shared a reflective framework between all parties.
- Some projects were able to bring employers/funders/commissioners and artists together in other ways. This was not without challenge: in the SNAP project, some non-arts commissioners dropped out due to time/funding issues; in the Torbay Culture Board project, it has taken some time before the network of artists felt ready to engage with commissioners; similarly, the network in Aberdeen is still forming and determining its aims and approaches, and has not yet been ready to engage with those Community Centres contacted by the Council.
- However, the SNAP project involved commissioners who are also artists – a useful reminder that the gaps between different parts of the sector are often bridged by individuals who have experience of different parts of the ecology.
- For some projects, the involvement of employers/funders/commissioners has been important in validating or giving status to a project or parts of the project. The involvement of a SNAP steering group member who was also Bridge organisation/ACE related in hearing pitches for micro-grants, for example.
- In some cases, there have also been useful opportunities coinciding with the Development Grant: the NCVO Cultural Commissioning Locality Project for Torbay, the potential EU funding for FEAST, or the ongoing Creative Learning Network activities for West Lothian, which have created a particular opportunity to connect CPD for artists with more direct contact to employers/commissioners/funders.
- Projects that were led by employers/commissioners/funders were as interested in ensuring that artists should debate and be critical about practice in participatory settings, as they were in supporting artists to be 'employable'. This will reflect the selection of projects for Development Grants, and the fact that most employers/commissioners/funders were not from 'outside' the sector.

Artists, practitioners and arts organisations

Section 5.3 has already discussed at length how artists participated and were selected. However, it is worth noting that those engaging as participants in CPD programmes were not the only artists, practitioners and arts organisations involved. In the analysis about employers/commissioners/funders above, we have already noted the way in which several organisations leading projects worked with artists or arts organisations in delivering those CPD opportunities: Rogue Theatre partnered with FEAST, Jonathan Baxter with Aberdeen City Council, and Hidden Giants with West Lothian Council. SNAP brought in an experienced facilitator, and (as already noted) the Geraldine Pilgrim Company was able itself to take a lead in offering opportunities for artists. Torbay opted for a largely self-facilitated model for those participating artists, which met the brief of ensuring that the project was led by those who needed it, but which was sometimes challenging to manage in other ways. In the case of The Stove Network, the existing artist-led network was the key instigator of the project, leading on making connections with HEIs, developing the format for the Summit, identifying teams and other people to invite; however their process also involved some complex shared leadership with other partners (HEIs and others) in seeking to 'co-create' the event.

Key learning with regards to engaging the other roles taken on by artists, practitioners and arts organisations includes:

- Models of shared leadership – in which another party lead the funding application, but involved an artist, practitioner or arts organisation in developing and offering the CPD opportunity – seem to have worked well for several projects. Case studies report complementary skills and experiences, highlighting the expertise in practice which the artist or arts organisation are able to offer. In some cases, useful learning experiences (e.g. about what is important in recruiting participants for CPD opportunities) between the partners are reported.
- These ‘shared leadership’ models also succeed in some projects in ensuring that the CPD opportunities are seen to have integrity for the participating artists, as they are rooted in the expertise and experience of the artist/practitioner/arts organisation.
- They are also important models in enabling CPD opportunities as being seen as sufficiently separate from the agendas or requirements of an employer/commissioner/funder to support artists in developing their own approaches. For a project like Aberdeen City Council, seeking to enable a group of artists to develop a network which they will own and determine the future of themselves, this separation may be very important for the future feasibility of the network.
- In several cases, the ethos and experience of the artist/practitioner/arts organisation has been quite specific, and important in shaping the kind of experience participating artists have had. The type of ‘live project’ experiences offered by the Geraldine Pilgrim Company and Rogue Theatre will have been supported by an introduction to professional practices which are in some ways specific to this type of participatory arts work. In some cases, not just the type of participatory art, but the way in which the company operates will have been particularly important in shaping the CPD programmes offered.
- Those projects which involve artists taking a lead or developing their leadership have two different approaches. The Stove Network and SNAP are both existing networks, looking for ways in which other partners and practitioners can be involved in specific conversations. Both Torbay Culture Board and Aberdeen City Council sought to establish new networks. It is worth noting that these latter two projects have both needed to extend the timetable required for enabling the networks to engage with potential external parties – building a collective voice takes time.
- Finally, where artists have been taking a lead but also collaborating or sharing leadership across many practitioners (and, in some cases, other partners) the process of developing programmes has been quite challenging. The Stove Network, in co-creating their Summit, were able to make significant connections and bring an interesting group together; but the burden of managing this multi-way conversation was significant. The Torbay Culture Board project opted to support the artists in their emerging network to self/co-facilitate sessions; again, this seems to have been significant for the group in feeling that the process has had integrity, but has been practically challenging to support, and has at times revealed some challenging dynamics in terms of balancing input from across the participating artists.

Communities

As noted in the table above, a few of the projects directly involved artists engaging with communities. Possibly only one of the SNAP micro-grants has really sought to involve the community in discussions about how arts work in participatory settings might be commissioned or developed. Those other projects involving members of the public did so either by basing their CPD opportunity for artists around

a 'live' arts participatory project with the public, or by supporting pilot arts participatory projects involving public engagement as part of a wider CPD programme.

As noted above, the ethos and approach of some of the arts organisations involved in offering these 'live' projects seems to have been important in the kind of experience the artists on the CPD programme had; it's worth noting that both projects were immersive and/or site-specific, with at least some grounding in theatre. Whether this is important in understanding what kinds of projects are able to offer meaningful opportunities to emerging artists, is a question which might be worth further explanation, but which can't be answered by this evaluation.

The two projects which have already established micro-grants/pilot projects (SNAP and West Lothian Council) are able to demonstrate some potentially exciting projects and collaborations emerging as a result of the training/facilitated/discussion processes which they had already run. The ways in which these projects develop would be worth looking at by PHF as a funder, particularly if it is considering in the future how small grants for research and development can provide different kinds of opportunities.

Meeting the Aims of ArtWorks

6 Meeting the Aims of ArtWorks

The following section maps the activity of the seven projects onto the ‘intervention model’ designed for the interim evaluation of the wider ArtWorks initiative. The model was developed through testing with the ArtWorks Pathfinders, and brings together PHF’s identified Aim and Outcomes for the ArtWorks initiative. The objectives, core research questions and other articulations of the initiative have been used to plot a series of objectives and mechanisms, in sequential order building towards the final outcomes. This approach attempts to understand the process by which ArtWorks is attempting to effect change, and to show the assumptions about causal relationships in this process.

The model suggests an ‘ideal’ concept of how ArtWorks as an intervention might function, and shows linear progression routes through to the six stated outcomes which ArtWorks is seeking to achieve. In reality, activity often effects change in less clean or direct ways. Individual projects were not asked to bid for funding in order to meet all the outcomes, rather to select those which were the most relevant to the proposition which they had. Nor have they made proposals which necessarily follow a strictly linear process. Rather their activity reflects the spheres in which they can expect to have influence, and the particular opportunities and challenges of their institutional and partnership circumstances.

	→	→	→	→	Outcomes Artists are more confident and articulate about their work in participatory settings
	Involve artists in sharing evidence and discussion towards developing a better understanding of what supports quality and value, including what skills/knowledge/understanding are required in different circumstances	Use developing/piloting activity to develop artists skills and understand progression routes and access to information	Design and embed opportunities for training and CPD for artists at all stages of their career, reflecting on learning from developing/pilot activity	Involve artists in sharing the learning from ArtWorks, and making the case for future development	
Outputs	Through their CPD models, SNAP, The Geraldine Pilgrim Company, FEAST, Torbay Culture Board, West Lothian Council and Aberdeen City Council have engaged artists in discussions about their practice, and learning and skills sharing processes.	These CPD models have been tested as part of the projects, and reflection sought from participating artists to understand how well those models work.	Projects are now considering how they might embed, share or transfer the models and learning further.	The feedback from the artists is reflected in the case studies, which are published and can be disseminated.	
	The Stove Network co-created an event at which artists and practitioners contributed to a series of discussions and developing ideas for potential collaboration.	The feedback from the Summit, the materials generated and the forthcoming response from the Artist Commission provides a record and reflection of what has emerged from those discussions.	Some opportunities to further design and embed opportunities for training and CPD for artists are now being pursued by The Stove Network and relevant partners.	The case study is published and can be disseminated.	

Outputs	<p>Use pilot activity to support evidence towards developing a better understanding of quality and value for participants, and of participatory work taking place in different circumstances</p> <p>Use artists with developed skills to deliver enhanced quality in piloting activity</p> <p>Explore and reflect upon skills, knowledge and understanding required in different circumstances, and feed this into design of opportunities for training and CPD</p> <p>Disseminate the learning about skills, knowledge and understanding in different circumstances to artists, employers and funders, to make a case for the importance of training and CPD to quality experiences</p>				Participants are benefitting from enhanced quality experiences of engaging in arts-led activity
	<p>Potentially some of the pilot projects taking place as part of the SNAP, West Lothian and Aberdeen projects will explore the experiences of participants in terms of their understanding of quality.</p>	<p>In all these projects, the artists involved in pilot/micro activities will have had the 'benefit' of a training course/facilitated sessions/network development in advance.</p>	<p>All of these projects provide some useful potential learning for future CPD opportunities; when the pilot/micro projects are completed, it will be important for all parties to reflect upon what they might do again/do differently in the future.</p>	<p>All of these projects have a longer-term opportunity, once pilot/micro projects are complete, to make the case for the value of CPD in supporting quality experiences for participants.</p>	

Outputs	<p>Map existing evidence about quality and value, and support discussion across artists, employers and participants about it</p> <p>Support testing of better understanding through developing/piloting activity, and capturing the learning from this</p> <p>Apply this understanding to the design and embedding of opportunities for training and CPD for artists at all stages of their career</p> <p>Disseminate the learning about quality and value to artists, employers and funders, and make a case for the importance of training and CPD to quality experiences</p>				<p>Artists, employers and participants share a better understanding of what constitutes quality and value in the work</p>
	<p>Those CPD opportunities supporting discussion and debate between a cohort (SNAP, Torbay Culture Board, West Lothian and Aberdeen) have all used different approaches to support artists to consider, discuss and reflect upon their practice. Some projects involved employers/commissioners in doing so.</p>	<p>The projects involving micro-grants/pilot projects are providing opportunities for the learning which comes from debate and discussion to filter into practice. This also potentially apply to different ways in which artists/networks might approach commissioners in the future.</p>	<p>Some of these projects have not yet completed their 'testing' or pilot activities. There is a job for all projects to consider how the CPD opportunity they have developed might be used again, and what learning has emerged from pilot/micro grants. In several cases, there are still planned activities to take place.</p>	<p>The feedback from the artists is reflected in the case studies, which are published and can be disseminated. Projects like the West Lothian project have also supported sharing and reflection sessions between participating artists.</p>	
	<p>The reflective framework around the FEAST project provides a way in which different partners and the participants in the CPD opportunity shared ideas and understandings of the quality and value.</p>	<p>The written and video diaries from the FEAST project provide a useful way in which the artists were able to share their reflections on issues like quality and value in a project (as well as their own role as apprentices).</p>	<p>FEAST and Rogue Theatre should consider the learning from this reflective fieldwork in the design of any future CPD opportunities.</p>	<p>The feedback from the artists is reflected in the case study, which are published and can be disseminated. FEAST also ran a sharing event following the end of the project, and helping to put the particular CPD opportunity in context by involving speakers from outside the project.</p>	

Outputs	Identifying existing models of good practice which contribute to a better understanding of quality and value; map existing training, its gaps, scope and quality	Use developing/piloting activity to test new approaches/models of training and delivery	Expand/develop new models of training delivering, and design and embed opportunities for training and CPD for artists at all stages of their career	Disseminate the learning about models of good practice with artists, employers and funders, and make a case for those which are replicable/expandable	Clear models of good practice are shared, disseminated and replicable
	Several projects refer to existing models or approaches they are already experienced with in designing their CPD opportunities. The SNAP project specifically used some materials from ArtWorks for discussion in their sessions.	SNAP, Geraldine Pilgrim Company, FEAST, Torbay Culture Board, West Lothian Council and Aberdeen City Council have all tested CPD models with artists/trainee practitioners, and elicited feedback on those experiences.	The projects are now considering how they might embed, share or transfer the models and learning further. Some projects still have activities planned, others are exploring how activities might be sustained.	The models are all outlined in the case studies, which are published and can be disseminated.	
		The Stove Network sought to set up circumstances in which development of new CPD opportunities could take place. There are some useful potential projects to be taken forwards by various partners.			

Outputs	Mapping and consulting/engaging with the existing infrastructure, to understand common approaches/activity and existing understanding of quality and value	Use developing/piloting activity to test and develop the support infrastructure, and identify gaps or issues	Use and develop the infrastructure in the design and embedding of opportunities for training and CPD for artists at all stages of their career	Disseminate the learning and identify issues which still require resolution, to make the case for further infrastructural development (if required)	A more effective infrastructure for the training and development of artists at all stages of their careers has been developed across the UK
	As part of the SNAP project, artists and commissioners worked together to map the current 'ecology' of arts provision in the city.	Both the collaborative enquiry and some of the micro-grants which are part of the SNAP project pursue some questions about infrastructure, and particularly the way commissioners commission and employers employ.	There are opportunities for SNAP, through the existing network, to take forward the learning from these projects.	The case study is published and available for dissemination.	
	The Stove Network, through its Summit and the co-creation process, has brought together various teams working across the infrastructure.	The Summit provided an opportunity for teams to consider what gaps or issues they might want to address. The Stove Network itself has opportunities to pursue.	There are opportunities for The Stove Network to pursue, in collaboration with HEIs.	The case study is published and available for dissemination.	
		Other projects offering CPD opportunities (The Geraldine Pilgrim Company, FEAST, Torbay Culture Board, West Lothian Council and Aberdeen City Council) have all tested 'pilot' or new activities, seeking to address perceived gaps.	Several of these projects are now considering whether networks are sustainable, or what kinds of CPD opportunities might be built in in the future, and who will be responsible for them.	The case studies are published and available for dissemination.	

	Map and assess existing partnership working/common areas of activity/interest/understanding	Solicit and support partnership working through projects, including new/different kinds of partnerships	Solicit and support partnership working through engagement between PHF/pathfinders and other partners	Share the learning from the partnership process(es) and added value, encouraging continuation/new partnerships	There is more partnership working across funding agencies, public bodies and policy makers
Outputs	The Stove Network have explored the feasibility of greater partnership between HEIs and arts organisations undertaking work in participatory settings.	The Stove Network is proposing to go forward and test these partnerships further.		The case study includes some reflection on the different requirements of partners from HEIs and arts organisations.	
	FEAST, West Lothian Council and Aberdeen City Council have lead partnerships, involving artists and arts organisations, to develop support programmes for artists.	In all cases, the funder is the lead partner, but the artist or arts organisation has been key in developing the CPD programme.		The case studies includes some reflection on the roles of the different partners.	
	The SNAP project involved participants in the collaborative enquiry in mapping the ecology of arts provision in the city.	The SNAP project micro-grants provide an opportunity to explore different kinds of collaboration.		The case study includes some reflection on the ways in which different parts of the sector might work together, or be influenced.	
	Torbay Culture Board have supported a network of artists in developing an early statement regarding arts provision which can be used with commissioners.	The NCVO Cultural Commissioning Locality Project provides a potential opportunity for further partnership working with commissioners to be explored.		The case study includes some reflection on the opportunities which may become available.	

Key points from the analysis above are grouped below according to the aim which different activities sought to meet.

- *Artists are more confident and articulate about their work in participatory settings*

As discussed earlier in this report, all the projects sought to work with artists/practitioners in some way; most undertook an explicit CPD programme aimed at artists, looking for ways in which to support them in developing their practice. As such, the projects built upon an original mission for ArtWorks – to place the artist at the heart of developing their own practice –and have added to the previous round of Development Grants and Pathfinders in offering a range of approaches and models.

Several programmes placed an emphasis on: developing a critical view, or encouraging debate about arts practice in participatory settings, and the role of artists in those settings (particularly West Lothian and Aberdeen); exploring the role of the artist in the context of commissioners/employers; encouraging individual artists or collaborations to pursue opportunities or challenges which they have themselves identified as important; and supporting artists to ‘organise’ or develop a ‘collective voice’. Indeed, for Aberdeen City Council – seeking to support artists, but through a mechanism which is seeking to empower an emerging network to set its own agenda – the case study also suggests something of a challenge to ArtWorks and some of the practice which takes place in the city.

In the wider context of Artworks, it is worth noting that many of these approaches are coherent with other CPD opportunities which have been developed through ArtWorks. Several Pathfinders/previous Development Grants have placed a similar emphasis on peer support, using both formal mentoring and more informal approaches. Other kinds of fora have enabled artists to discuss and demonstrate their practice, and to find space for critical debate (one of the Pathfinders ran a programme called ‘Critical Conversations’). The importance of enabling or giving space for a ‘critical’ reflection on artists working in participatory settings is implicit in many of these projects: the suggestion is that a confident sector is one which can articulate and enact its politics also. The balance of ‘theoretical’ or ‘reflective’ space with practical opportunities was a feature of Action Learning Groups in one of the Pathfinders.

On the whole, what this suggests is that there are a range of CPD approaches which artists feel broadly comfortable with, and which are relatively manageable in resource terms (none of the individual CPD programmes have been particularly expensive). In many cases, the primary drive has been to create a loose framework to support artists and their peers in coming together, addressing the need and desire from artists to be able to share their practice, and engage and learn from others.

- *Participants are benefitting from enhanced quality experiences of engaging in arts-led activity*

Several projects involved an ‘applied’ element to CPD opportunities, with training either taking place as part of a main ‘live’ project, or the opportunity to develop pilot/micro projects as a result of an earlier phase within a closed group. As with much of the previous activity which has taken place as part of ArtWorks, there was relatively little public involvement other than as potential beneficiaries/participants in resulting projects. Primarily, projects sought to bring

benefit to artists first (and, by implication, secondarily to participants as a result of better supporting artists).

As with other ArtWorks Development Grants and Pathfinder activities, none of the CPD opportunities have been set up in a way that would enable one to 'measure' the resulting impact upon participants; many of the approaches to CPD would suggest that an artists might be able to 'enhance' their delivery to participants slowly, over time – rather than as an immediate impact of the training. This aim, for ArtWorks, has always been challenging to achieve, and harder to prove.

It is much more complex (both practically and ethically) to involve the public than to involve artists in CPD opportunities, or in broader discussions about the circumstances under which arts work in participatory settings is developed and commissioned. This reflects the structures which largely manage how arts work currently takes place, but it is worth noting that elsewhere (particularly in policy areas such as health) there is work going on which is exploring how the public can be involved in things like commissioning. This is a bigger issue than ArtWorks – which is, primarily, a workforce development programme. It will be useful to understand how networks like SNAP can take forward the learning from their micro-grants and potentially explore further how the public, and specific communities, can take a role in shaping arts work in participatory settings.

- *Artists, employers and participants share a better understanding of what constitutes quality and value in the work*

A significant number of projects were either led by employers/commissioners, or sought to involve them in discussions about how and why arts practice takes place in participatory settings. There are some potential models for bringing artists and employers/commissioners together in the future also; at the time of writing, several projects still have planned activities to undertake in this area.

This is one of the areas in which this year's Development Grants have enhanced previous ArtWorks activity substantially. The involvement of local authorities, settings such as schools, broker organisations and other funders in leading and contributing to CPD opportunities, networks and wider discussions has gone beyond much of the activity already undertaken as part of the ArtWorks programme.

- *Clear models of good practice are shared, disseminated and replicable*

Each of the projects offers either a CPD model, a model for developing a network and/or a way of curating and structuring discussions between artists/practitioners and partners from outside the immediate practice. As noted already, several use techniques we have seen in other ArtWorks projects (e.g. mentoring, reflective frameworks and approaches, curated discussions, creative responses, etc.), adding to the body of models in this area. The balance of 'theoretical' and 'practical' activities offered within CPD opportunities is worth noting, and suggests significant 'return' for the relatively small investment offered by the Development Grants. Where this has taken place, other funding or existing relationships have been important in enabling this range of activity to be included. There are also some useful models of practice in

participatory settings, and of potential approaches to improving the commissioning environment, emerging from pilot and micro projects funded within Development Grants.

The Development Grants in this year have re-tested or enhanced some models already seen elsewhere in ArtWorks (e.g. Peer Networks in the Scotland Pathfinder and peer mentoring in the North East Pathfinder), and tried out some brand new approaches. Models are shared and there has been both local dissemination by Development Grants, and the opportunity for wider dissemination through the ArtWorks programme itself. What is currently less clear is what possibilities there are for replicating those models, either for those organisations involved in this year's Development Grants or more widely in the sector. Development Grantees are, in many cases, still exploring further opportunities for repeating programmes or approaches to sustaining activity. There is the potential for a wider conversation, at least amongst the wider pool of ArtWorks grantees, about how these models might be shared and used in the future.

- *A more effective infrastructure for the training and development of artists at all stages of their careers has been developed across the UK*

These Development Grants are fairly modest, and so whilst projects in many cases have succeeded in beginning discussions regarding improving the 'infrastructure' for supporting artists who want to develop their practice in participatory settings, the development of an 'effective infrastructure' is still work in progress.

Some of the issues experienced by Development Grantees in their projects in seeking to influence or contribute to a more effective infrastructure (e.g. the challenges of seeking to influence training providers like HEIs, the question of how training models will be sustained, etc) are similar to those seen in previous Development Grant-ed projects, and in other ArtWorks activities. As such, this year's Development Grants make a useful contribution in this area, but it would not be sensible to expect them to 'solve' the challenges. Approaches like The Stove Network's Summit go some way to exploring how dialogue between artists/arts organisations and parts of the infrastructure might be supported and encouraged.

- *There is more partnership working across funding agencies, public bodies and policy makers*

Very positively, several of these Development Grants have involved employers/commissioners/funders seeking to exercise their responsibility in supporting artists. More generally, it is worth noting however that partnerships have tended to be fruitful where:

- Individual champions or advocates are already in place within organisations or parts of the infrastructure, enabling personal relationships to cut through potential institutional challenges;
- Where, for example, local authorities are involved, it has been the department or staff already closest to the arts sector taking the lead.

Neither of these points detract from the value of partnership working reported across the different projects, but it is worth noting that there will be harder-to-access employers/commissioners/funders who have not really been involved in these projects. Nonetheless, it is particularly important to note the collateral that organisations leading these Development Grants were able to bring to enhance the value of the initial PHF grant, through building on

existing partnerships and networks, concurrent funding opportunities or projects which were already taking place.

In the context of the wider ArtWorks initiative, the involvement of local authorities and other 'local' funding agencies in this year's Development Grants has been a particular addition to the types of partners and partnerships already tested across different ArtWorks activities.

This section has discussed the six aims originally established by ArtWorks, and the ways in which different Development Grants have sought to meet them. Overall, it is worth noting that – in seeking to work towards the six aims – the Development Grants follow a similar pattern to other ArtWorks activity, with significant particularly contributions to the aims to support artists directly and develop models of support. However, the Grants in this year have also added substantially to previous ArtWorks activity in seeking to engage with employers, commissioners and funders, and in bringing together partnerships involving a wider range of actors in the system.

Conclusions

7 Conclusions

7.1 Key Findings

The project outputs discussed here include evidence of need and ‘gaps’ in provision, solutions tested in principle and in practice, as well as some new relationships and partnerships. Organisations and individuals who have led projects report changes in their knowledge and understanding, in some cases prompting them to consider what they might change themselves about existing activities they run or the way in which they respond to artists or other groups.

Across the different projects, key findings are discussed below.

7.1.1 Approaches to Better Supporting Artists

Across the different CPD approaches tested in the Development Grants, key findings are as follows:

- Projects varied in the ways in which they sought to recruit artists and other to participate in their activities; different recruitment approaches have been successful and useful. Whilst competitive or selective recruitment can add value in the perceptions of the applicant, it is also worth noting that selection (by definition) means that somebody is being excluded. For some activities, this has been harder to navigate than others.
- All the projects have placed some value on balancing both ‘theoretical’ experiences with ‘practical’ experiences – different projects have done so with different emphasis. In some cases, there has been a significant emphasis in supporting not just practitioners, but the development and innovation in the practice itself through ongoing discussion, sharing, debate and critical engagement. One project (Aberdeen) has suggested in its case study that this potentially offers a challenge to ArtWorks as an ongoing set of aims and activities – it is worth noting that all the projects funded in this year have had (largely implicitly) to negotiate carefully between seeking specific outputs in practical environments, and providing space for wider and more exploratory discussions and activities.
- Artists who participated in different projects report feeling the benefit of/placing value on:
 - Being given time and space to consider their own practice;
 - Appreciating the validation which being selected for a programme, or being given a specific status (e.g. apprentice) in a project/organisational environment, offers;
 - Having access to peers and artists more experienced than themselves, to share and understand different approaches and/or learn about how the practice and professional environments work;
 - Developing their own articulation of their practice.
- Amongst the different projects, reflective and creative methods have been used successfully in a variety of ways. It is worth noting, however, the variety of facilitation approaches and the ways in which these frame the CPD opportunities which have been made available, and particularly the ownership of those opportunities. For those projects (Aberdeen and Torbay) which have particularly sought to empower artists to go forward and develop their own shared agendas, it will take some time before those networks can be independently sustainable.

Overall, projects have made choices to suit particular aims or environments. Certain choices can add 'kudos' and perceived 'value' to an opportunity: selective/competitive recruitment, giving a formal status to an artist or a group of artists, providing bursaries/honoraria and being given opportunities to test ideas out in 'real' environments. Most regularly, however, artists have valued the status afforded to them by being treated as practising professionals, and by being supported to focus upon themselves and their own practice. The various approaches tested in this project are replicable, flexible to different environments, and benefit those artists who participate in them significantly.

7.1.2 Influencing other parts of the system

Across the different approaches to influencing other parts of the 'system' (i.e. not artists), key findings are as follows:

- Engaging with certain parts of the 'system' can still be quite challenging. HEIs, for example, are often not very permeable, and engagement seems to operate best where a 'champion' who already knows how to work with the arts sector is already in place. Partners such as HEIs, and employers/commissioners are also under their own funding pressures, and there appears to be relatively little 'slack' in the system to support engagement in projects which are exploratory, or outside normal activities. As with previous projects funded under the ArtWorks aims, individuals who bridge different parts of the 'system' have been important in some projects. Where relationships have already existed between individuals between different parts of the system, partnerships have been easier to pursue.
- However, where employers, commissioners and funders have been involved, it is an important step in recognising that there can be shared responsibility in supporting artists who are being asked to deliver complex work and outcomes to do so as well as is possible. Some projects have begun to explore how artists and employers, commissioners and funders can share discussions about how work is developed, and how the circumstances for commissioning might be improved to support better work, and better outcomes. Many of these discussions are in their early stages; it will be interesting, for example, to see how existing networks like SNAP, the Creative Learning Networks and The Stove Network can take these conversations forward.

All of the projects have contributed in taking ArtWorks further than previous activities have in engaging different kinds of partners and actors who can influence and support artists working in participatory settings. It remains the case that arts and culture is often a small part of what larger organisations like HEIs or local authorities are involved; individual champions are often still key. However, projects in this year have also tested or are testing ways in which to structure discussions and ideas exchange between artists and some of these partners and actors. In the current climate, it is unlikely that engaging across a complex 'system' will get easier, so pursuing these models for engagement – but realistically recognising the value of individual connections – should be important for those wanting to make further progress in this area.

7.1.3 How far does the funding go?

With a relatively modest amount of funding, the projects have succeeded in testing a range of things. In terms of understanding the possibilities and limits of the grant as it was made to the projects, the key findings are as follows:

- A grant of this size (£3,200 - £3,500) is enough to allow organisations to test a short-term CPD opportunity with a single 'cohort', providing the focus of the opportunity is discussion, debate, sharing practice and learning from other speakers. Where practical opportunities are involved, usually a 'live' project or some other funding/partnerships available to support those practical opportunities must also be in place, as the grant does not cover this.
- All of the projects have benefited from significant 'collateral' which lead organisations already had in place: existing relationships/networks and reach, existing projects already funded, and so forth. However, it is worth noting that the specific aims of the different Development Grants were not otherwise being met or sought already – so, these projects have benefited from a complementary context, but have also undertaken activity which would not have happened otherwise.
- The timescales for the Development Grants in this have been longer than the timescales offered for the previous round of Development Grants; however, several projects in this year still have work to undertake. In one instance this reflected a re-scoping, and the need to adjust the timetable. In others, recruitment processes took longer than expected, or emerging networks were not yet ready to undertake work with partners outside the network. It may be worth considering whether launching projects in the summer creates some issues, with holiday and other commitments over the summer period potentially slowing projects down. However, it may also simply be the case that projects have been ambitious, and underestimated the necessary timescales. It is to the credit of PHF as funder that projects have been allowed the space to progress as best suits the project, rather than to meet the original deadline.
- Finally, whilst some projects still have activities to complete, others have already been able to take their learning forward. FEAST have found their CPD programme has been a useful test and experience to support a bid for skills development funding to the Arts Council and European funds, for example. The Stove Network already have significant partnership working as a foundation for future development of training and research opportunities for artists. The Development Grants have, in many cases, usefully provided a focus for existing agendas and partners to come together around the specific question of better support for artists in participatory settings.

Overall, the investment offered by PHF (and by Creative Scotland, in the case of West Lothian Council's project) has delivered a significant 'return'. Crucially, all the projects link in to existing activities or agendas being pursued by lead organisations; and they have all built upon existing or prompted new partnerships and networks. This has enabled projects to deliver activities beyond the scope of £3,500; and to undertake activity which is not isolated from existing programmes and activities, but which adds to it. Potentially, there are models here for funders in the future: PHF and other funders could consider how CPD opportunities might be encouraged with arts work in participatory settings which they fund. Local authorities could consider how they provide a platform for artists to come together and develop their skills and voice. Larger programmes like Creative People and Places could look at projects like the

Geraldine Pilgrim Company project, and seek ways to build the capacity of emerging artists alongside activity which is being delivered with and for communities.

7.2 Questions for the future

When evaluating the first round of Development Grants two years ago, I suggested that there were two remaining issues which several of the projects still needed to 'solve' when considering how they could apply or take forward what they had learnt in their projects: the question of where resource might come from to support repeated CPD opportunities or take developing projects further; and the related question of who was able or prepared to be responsible for repeating CPD opportunities, developing projects, etc. As already noted, in response to 'gaps' identified in previous ArtWorks activity and particularly in the previous round of Development Grants, this year's projects have gone further in engaging with employers, commissioners and funders, and in building on different approaches to CPD opportunities for artists working in participatory settings.

These questions remain valid for this year's projects.

7.2.1 Resources

This report has already noted the ways in which different projects were able to bring to bear additional funding, staff time as match and so forth. In discussing the budget, it was also noted that several reported putting in more time than they originally anticipated, in order to ensure that the project went to plan. If some CPD models were to be used again, it is not necessarily the case that organisations and individuals would be in a position to 'fill the gap'. On the other hand, lead organisations and partners have put in significant developmental time on CPD models; potentially, this might allow some models to be used again without this developmental time being required in the same ways.

Some projects have succeeded in tying ongoing activities into new funding streams (the FEAST ACE/EU funding bids, for example); others could reasonably claim to have a forum and framework for ongoing engagement with those artists and others who have participated (e.g. SNAP, the West Lothian Creative Learning Networks, The Stove Network). Models like the one used by the Geraldine Pilgrim Company will remain within the knowledge of the company itself. Others have identified the need to continue to look for ways to be sustainable (e.g. Torbay Culture Board emerging network, and the network in Aberdeen). For several projects, as activities from the original projects are still to be completed, there is still time for projects to consider what might be taken forward. At present, however, it is worth noting that none of the lead organisations yet have specific plans to run similar CPD processes again.

7.2.2 Responsibility

In this year, several projects have involved employers/commissioners/funders in exploring how they can better support artists. In this respect, it has gone beyond some of the approaches seen in the previous round of ArtWorks Development Grants, and some of the activities undertaken by Pathfinders in the ArtWorks initiative. It is encouraging to see different parts of the system look for ways in which they can enable those delivering work with the public. As noted already in this report, those lead organisations who are employers/commissioners/funders have tended to partner with artists/arts organisations, and to create structures which seek to allow the content of CPD opportunities to be determined by practitioners (rather than administrators, or academics), i.e. by those who are experienced in arts work in participatory settings.

In taking the learning and models forward, different projects suggest a range of approaches – some are intended to be led or determined by groups of self-organising artists (e.g. The Stove Network, the emerging network in Aberdeen), and others remain up to the employer/commissioner/funding partner to take forward. Several projects have already usefully sought to disseminate their learning amongst their own networks, and those who have not yet done so (or are not yet completed) should seek to do so.

Finally, it remains important that PHF, as the funder of the Development Grants, considers the value of the learning and models from these projects in the context of the wider ArtWorks activities and its own renewed strategic agenda. Funders like PHF, and the local funders and local authorities who have led Development Grants in this year, are potentially uniquely able to both advocate to their grantees for the value of better support for artists working in participatory settings, and to actually establish frameworks through which the projects they fund can be encouraged to include these kinds of support opportunities. These Development Grants suggest that a relatively small amount of additional funding, alongside core project funding, can enable arts work in participatory settings to better support the artists who are delivering (or who may in the future deliver) that work.

Appendices

8 Appendix A – Self-Evaluation Template

The following self-evaluation template, with prompting questions, was used by all the projects at the outset, and updated where required as projects progressed.

Aims	Context	Inputs (Resources)	Mechanisms	Participants	Outputs	Outcomes	Contribution to ArtWorks' Aims/Call to Action
What we want to achieve	What are the external factors that affect us? What are the starting points for our activity? What do we already know? What is already taking place?	What resources are we putting in? Why have we chosen them? Who are we working with? How will we know if we have chosen the right approach and resources for this project?	What activities or processes are we undertaking? How will we know what the 'take-up' will be? How will we know if it is the right/appropriate activity/process to achieve our aim?	Who will the participants be? How will you know if you have reached the participants which you wanted to? How many participants are there? What do you know about their participant habits before your project? What was the participants' experience of the project?	What outputs do we expect? How will we know if they have happened? Did anything happen that we didn't expect?	What outcomes do we expect? How will we know if they have happened? Did anything happen that we didn't expect?	What is the impact of our work on the outcomes ArtWorks is seeking to achieve?

9 Appendix B – PHF Reporting Requirements

Paul Hamlyn
Foundation



Reporting Requirements for ArtWorks Development Grants

You are asked to report in writing to the Foundation on the progress and outcomes of the work we are funding. We encourage you to be as open as possible in your reporting. We recognise that not everything always goes to plan and that you and we can learn a lot from such experiences.

The Foundation will use your reports to:

- assess the overall impact of the Foundation's funding and the extent to which it is achieving the aims of its grant-making programme
- understand what you have learned from doing the work, so that useful knowledge can be shared with other grantees or other organisations with similar interests

As a condition of funding, grantees are required to provide us with final report materials shortly after completion of the project.

Your final report materials needs to consist of:

- a case study for publication by ArtWorks (for wider publication)
- a final income and expenditure statement (for internal monitoring use only)
- optional supplementary materials to your case study that includes any additional information and reflections on you and your project that sit outside your wider disseminated case study (for internal monitoring use only)

As part of the overall evaluation of the ArtWorks Development Grants DHA will support each grantee to undertake their own self-evaluation. Details of what is expected of grantees and the support available from DHA is outlined in the ArtWorks Development Grants Self Evaluation Guidelines, circulated at the ArtWorks Evaluation Workshop on 25 June 2015.

Please note that any significant changes to your project – such as to the anticipated outcomes, outputs or to the original expenditure budget – must be cleared with the Foundation.

TIMESCALE:

As all ArtWorks Development Fund grantees are part of a larger evaluation lead by DHA and your final report will feed into their full evaluation report. As such you are required to submit final report by **28 March 2016**.

CASE STUDY TEMPLATE

We intend to publish each case study, alongside the Evaluation of the ArtWorks Development Fund report, and as such need each case study to follow an agreed template.

In producing your case study, **please use the headings in italics** when you are writing up your project. The other questions here are included as prompts, to help you structure your reflection and material.

TITLE (your project title)

Our project aims

- What did you aim to achieve?
- What did you set out to test? What was your research proposition?
- What did you intend to get out of the project? Where did you start from – what was the context/motivation for the project?
- What did you look to build on from ArtWorks?

What we did

- What did you do?
- What were the inputs/resources for the project?
- What were the activities and processes which you used?

What the project achieved

- What happened and what did you learn?
- What were the main outputs of the project?
- What were the outcomes of the project?
- Did anything happen which you didn't expect?
- What was the impact of the project on the organisations involved?

Lessons learned

- What are the main things you have learned? What worked and what didn't work? What would you do differently in future?
- What could the impacts of your work be on your organisation or in a wider context?
- Are there opportunities for other partners/providers to take up your learning?
- What were your key lessons/ success factors that could support others in taking your ideas forward and scaling it up?
- Are there opportunities for other partners/providers to take up your learning?

What is happening next

- What plans do you, or your partners, have next?
- Will this work continue or develop? If so, how will it be funded and sustained in the future, or embedded in your activities?
- What would be the barriers to you, or others, taking the learning forward?

More Information:

- Contact name and details to be provided for public case study
- Links (if relevant)

The case study should be no more than 2000 words in total.

Please include one print quality image, with credits, to be included in a published version of your case study.

Submission of the case study, a breakdown of income and expenditure for the work we have funded against your project budget and any project reports or evaluations commissioned will meet the PHF grant requirements.

10 Appendix C – Evidence List

Project	Evidence Provided
SNAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Grant Bid • Case Study and Appendix outlining the micro-grants • Budget/Costs • Evaluation Template in Draft and Updated • Outlines/programmes for the Collaborative Enquiry Sessions • Materials used in the Collaborative Enquiry Sessions
Geraldine Pilgrim Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Grant Bid • Case Study • Budget/Costs • Evaluation Template in Draft and Updated • Timeline/Project Plan • Draft survey for participating artists
FEAST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Grant Bid • Case Study • Budget/Costs • Evaluation Template in Draft and Updated • Advertisement for placement opportunities • Data on placement applicants • Questions for reflective framework • Activities list for placements • Written reflective diaries from apprentices • Video diary/blog from apprentices • Programme for Sharing Seminar and notes from 'Tablecloth' session • Video 'trailer' for Rogue Theatre production
Torbay Development Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Grant Bid • Case Study • Budget/Costs • Evaluation Template in Draft and Updated • Video/PowerPoint documentation of the network activities, including pictures, sound and words to describe the processes, and comments from evaluation activities
West Lothian Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Grant Bid • Case Study • Evaluation Template in Draft and Updated
Creative Learning Team, Aberdeen City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Grant Bid • Case Study • Budget/Costs • Evaluation Template in Draft and Updated • Recruitment call for artists • Reading list for participating artists • Consultation questionnaire for community centres • Itinerary for research trip to Leeds

Project	Evidence Provided
The Stove Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development Grant Bid• Case Study – extended version and short version• Budget/Costs• Evaluation Template in Draft and Updated• Original project brief• Practice-based PhD proposal• Draft programme for Summit, Outline and Detailed programme for Summit days• List of invitees and attendees for the Summit• Feedback/responses to the Summit• Brief for the Artist Commission• Successful Expression of Interest for the Artist Commission

Report written and researched by

Tamsin Cox, Head of Policy and Research

Design by

David Casey, Designer

Contact us

Birmingham
t. +44 (0) 7850 329808

e. tamsin@dhacommunications.co.uk
www.dhacommunications.co.uk
@DHAComms
@tamsinecox



© dha
May 2016

