

dha & the Institute for Cultural Practices, University of Manchester

Paul Hamlyn Foundation ArtWorks Evaluation Final Report

March 2015



The University
of Manchester



Developing
Practice in
Participatory
Settings



In 2014 DHA undertook a survey of artists, building on research and consultation material from the ArtWorks pathfinders. Almost 1,000 artists responded to the survey, and answered questions about their artistic practice, their income, what kinds of settings they work in, what kinds of professional development they have experienced, and what kinds of support they would like in the future.

The results of the survey, and set of follow-on interviews, are published separately from this report. A series of infographics using data from the survey are used in this report to illustrate the views of the primary stakeholders for ArtWorks: artists who work in participatory settings. The infographics look at the proportion of people who report positive agreement with statements, or identify priority activities/income areas or experiences of particular things. The full results are available in the separate report, 'ArtWorks Evaluation. Survey of Artists' (2014) by dha.

The following illustration from the survey looks at attitudes towards professional development.




Contents

1	Executive Summary.....	2
1.1	Introduction	2
1.2	Outputs and Outcomes.....	4
1.3	Size and Scale of ArtWorks	6
1.4	Activity Clusters.....	6
1.5	Processes and Structures	8
1.6	What has ArtWorks achieved?.....	11
2	Introduction and Object of Study	15
2.1	The Object of Study.....	15
2.2	Abbreviations	18
3	Method Statement.....	20
3.1	Evaluation Questions	20
3.2	Intervention Model	21
3.3	Evaluation Methodology and Process	23
4	Context and Background.....	28
4.1	Context.....	28
4.2	Governance, Staffing and Funding.....	30
4.3	What is ArtWorks for?	32
5	Outputs and Outcomes.....	35
5.1	Outputs and Outcomes against the Framework.....	35
5.2	Overview	47
6	Size and Scale	51
7	Activity Clusters.....	57
7.8	Overview of Activity Clusters	69
8	Processes and Structures	72
8.1	Enquiry-based Approach.....	72
8.2	Partners, inputs and sites of intervention/influence.....	74
8.3	The Role of PHF and the Structure of ArtWorks	89
9	What has ArtWorks achieved?.....	96
9.1	What happens next.....	100
10	Conclusions	106
11	Appendix A – Bibliography	111

Executive Summary

The following illustration from the survey of artists looks at artists' attitudes towards professional development in the future.



1 Executive Summary

1.1 Introduction

This summary provides an overview of the Final Evaluation Report for the Paul Hamlyn Foundation's (PHF) Special Initiative, ArtWorks. The Evaluation has been undertaken by DHA and the Institute for Cultural Practices, University of Manchester.

1.1.1 ArtWorks

ArtWorks is a Special Initiative of the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, a funding model that the Foundation has used for a number of specific areas in which it wishes to intervene. PHF commissioned a consultant, Susanne Burns, to undertake some initial research and consultation to explore what was required or could be done to support needs that artists working in participatory settings might have. They subsequently ran a funding call from which five Pathfinder partnership projects were selected to be funded for three years from Spring 2011 (subsequently some activity was extended to Autumn 2014).

The initiative has a Steering Group, a Project Director (an external consultant) and co-ordination and administrative support. PHF has funded the project at £1.47million, and other funding partners (Creativity, Culture and Education, the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the Cultural Leadership Programme) have together put in a further £570k. Each of the five Pathfinders received funding of between just under £180k and £300k, providing a range of cash and in-kind match themselves.

The stated aim for ArtWorks is as follows:

'Overall aim

To support the initial training and continuous professional development of artists working in participatory settings in order to enhance the quality of people's engagement in arts-led activity and the arts, and create a more professional and confident sector whose work is validated and valued and is seen as important.' (From the PHF *Call for Submissions from Pathfinder Partnerships 2010*).

The five Pathfinders cover different geographical areas: ArtWorks Cymru (led by Welsh National Opera) in Wales, ArtWorks London (led by Barbican Guildhall) in London, ArtWorks Navigator (led by Foundation for Community Dance with a consortium) is national, ArtWorks North East (led by the University of Sunderland) in the North East of England, and ArtWorks Scotland (led by Creative Scotland) in Scotland. Each Pathfinder bid with a range of partners, including arts organisations, organisations focused on participatory arts practice and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

The Pathfinders were asked to utilise an enquiry-based approach to contribute to the aims and objectives. They all undertook mapping, consultation and research as a first stage, most engaging with artists to find out what they needed, and in some cases consulting with employers and commissioners, HEIs and FE providers, and participants over specific areas of enquiry. They then went on to test models of professional development, ranging from accredited short courses to on-the-job models for reflection, from student work placements to peer networks, and from contributing to National Occupational Standards through to development of a code of practice for artists.

ArtWorks has, at times, been a challenging project to articulate because of its complexity. Across the three years of the Evaluation, however, descriptions that Pathfinders, Steering Group and staff give of the purpose of ArtWorks have become more tightly focused on the idea that ArtWorks is an intervention in the workforce (rather than a broader intervention in the whole area of art in participatory settings). Those interviewed as part of the Evaluation also went on to anticipate the potential benefits to the general public who participate in arts activities, placing this intervention in a wider context. Important to interviewees have been issues like: how participatory practice might be conceptualised; validating the practice, or giving it status; raising the profile/voice of the work and of artists; and bringing different bits of 'the system' (the sector) together to consider how practice works/should develop. Several also discussed: skills development; sharing knowledge between artists and other practitioners; raising the standards of artists' practice; and 'professionalising' the practice.

1.1.2 Evaluating ArtWorks

The Evaluation Team was appointed part-way through the first year of the Pathfinder activity, and has subsequently worked to use both a formative and summative approach over the period of the Initiative. Key research questions at different levels were established in the first instance, and the Evaluation Team then developed a range of approaches to mapping and analysing ArtWorks as an initiative. These are:

1. An 'intervention model' that takes the aims, objectives and outcomes sought for ArtWorks and developed an 'ideal' proposition for how the outcomes might be achieved. The Pathfinders activity was then mapped against this proposition, to see where individual Pathfinders and the critical mass of activity might have an impact on those outcomes.
2. An assessment of the size and scale of ArtWorks, looking at outputs according to a broad typology, and at the types of people that activities had succeeded in engaging with.
3. Conceptual clustering of activities across the different Pathfinders, to bring together and analyse the different approaches taken for activities with similar aims or intentions. This process has been useful in revealing where there is a critical mass of activity/outputs across the Initiative, and where there are gaps.
4. Modelling the partnership approaches that the Pathfinders have taken, to understand what different kinds of partners have been involved, and how.

The evaluation approach has drawn on a range of data, including: reporting by the Pathfinders as part of monitoring and funding processes; written outputs from the Pathfinders, including internal material (e.g. action plans) and published material (e.g. reports); written outputs from the governance and management structure employed by PHF, again looking at both internal (e.g. Steering Group papers) and published material (e.g. the Working Papers); meetings with the Pathfinders and governance and management staff; and a series of semi-structured interviews.

In addition, the Evaluation Team has undertaken a literature review, which was published with the Interim Report and has been subsequently updated and republished. The findings from the literature review are briefly reflected upon in the Evaluation report. The Evaluation Team also undertook a survey with artists, and a series of semi-structured interviews, testing some of the findings that had emerged across the different consultation and research activities run by the Pathfinders. The survey findings provide a useful basis against which to understand some of the activity undertaken by ArtWorks, and

more generally confirms and adds to the findings from individual consultations and research processes. The findings from the survey and interviews have both been published separately.

1.2 Outputs and Outcomes

As noted above, the Evaluation mapped Pathfinders' activities against six outcomes set out for the project, using an 'intervention model' (a version of a logic model) against which to understand how individual Pathfinders and the whole initiative was making progress against its aims. Individual Pathfinders were not expected necessarily to achieve all six outcomes (some focused their activity in specific areas), and it is also worth noting that the outcomes were originally established on the basis that the Initiative would have a significant second phase of funding. As such, it is reasonable to assume that the Pathfinders would make progress towards the outcomes, but that they would be unlikely to achieve them completely. The commentary here summarises these findings.

Outcome 1 - Artists are more confident and articulate about their work in participatory settings

All of the Pathfinders set up dedicated consultation processes with artists. Consultation covered a wide range of topics, from career paths to enquiries into quality. Following this, several Pathfinders involved artists in designing and testing support models, including: leading and contributing to CPD processes for other artists, or developing bespoke approaches for themselves; artist-led networks developing their own support processes; and consultation/testing with artists to develop tools like a Code of Practice. Networks and platforms/events have provided artists with space to articulate their practice, and raise the profile of it. Feedback suggests broadly that artists have felt better supported as a result of these interventions.

Outcome 2 – Participants are benefitting from enhanced quality experiences of engaging in arts-led activity

Understanding the possible effects on participants of 'better supported' artists is a complex issue, and none of the Pathfinders specifically undertook activity to find this out; this would have been difficult to both design and implement. As noted above, however, some artists are better supported as a result of ArtWorks and so the potential benefits may carry through to participants. Some work was undertaken that explores the nature of participants' experiences by proxy, i.e. through consultations with artists about their practice and through reviews of existing work. Two Pathfinders included projects taking place in participatory settings as sites of intervention/influence for their Pathfinders, several Pathfinders drew on ongoing experiences of participants in projects already taking place, and one undertook direct research with participants. One Pathfinder supported a project in which participants were involved in developing and testing continuous professional development approaches for artists working with older people, and has come the closest to providing a consideration of specific practice from the perspective of *all* stakeholders.

Outcome 3 – Artists, employers and participants share a better understanding of what constitutes quality and value in the work

Questions of quality – what it is, and how to articulate it and promote it – have been key areas of enquiry for some Pathfinders. ArtWorks Scotland developed an extended enquiry into quality, producing and testing a set of 'quality factors' with artists and with other partners, including employers and commissioners, and carrying this learning forward to be included in funding criteria. Others included it

more generally in their initial consultations with groups, and two Pathfinders ran a small project looking at participants' views of quality, which was quite challenging methodologically. Some projects have succeeded in bringing together perspectives from a range of stakeholders, including events and consultations that have specifically sought to bring artists and employers/commissioners together. An ongoing challenge with quality has been the question of whether there needs to be (or can be) a coherent 'answer' to this 'problem' of quality, but the awareness of it has been important.

Outcome 4 – Clear models of good practice are shared, disseminated and replicated

The original outcome did not specify what the 'models of good practice' were to be models of, so whilst models of professional development seem to be key here, other kinds of 'models' (existing models of practice in participatory settings, models of funding/resourcing support) are also considered here. Several Pathfinders undertook some mapping and auditing of existing models of support for artists working in participatory settings, one undertook work mapping of arts activity in participatory settings as a practice, and two Pathfinders produced bibliographies.

Beyond this mapping, Pathfinders developed and tested a range of support models, including mentoring, networks, short courses, practice R&D models, conversations, action learning groups and other approaches. There are several examples of Pathfinders building on the mapping and on existing models that individual partners were familiar with: in some cases, models were used for different purposes, or extended and tested in different ways. In one case, ArtWorks Scotland worked to build on the external specialist knowledge of the Scottish Mentoring Network to develop support in this area. There is also some 'newness' that has emerged, either new approaches to the process of developing models, or new models in their own right (like the Barbican Guildhall BA programme). There is still some work for ArtWorks to do to disseminate models (there are ongoing communications work and events planned to help support this) and to consider where/how models might be further tested or embedded. In some cases, models are now part of the ongoing activity of organisations, but in some cases there is still work to do in terms of considering what will happen with these models.

Outcome 5 – A more effective infrastructure for the training and development of artists at all stages of their careers has been developed across the UK

At this stage, Pathfinders are able to evidence significant interventions into various parts of the 'system', from initial and further training in HEIs through to nationally recognised standards and qualifications. There are some commitments to pursuing particular models (discussed above) in the first instance, but the potential wider impact cannot be judged at present until these models have had a period of time in operation beyond this 'pilot' activity. The degree of impact may depend significantly on the positioning some of these models and tools with key partners (including funding and policy-making agencies) and upon strong dissemination to and take-up by artists. It is also important to note that ArtWorks has been seeking to instigate change at a time when policy agendas are crowded, resources limited, and the Initiative itself has sometimes been challenging to articulate and, therefore, to advocate for.

Outcome 6 – There is more partnership working across funding agencies, public bodies and policy makers

Approaches to partnership working vary significantly across the different Pathfinders. Given the breadth of different parts of the 'system' and the ambition stated within this outcome of engagement across major agencies, it is perhaps more suitable to think of collaborative working in its broadest sense. On this basis, we could argue that the input from ArtWorks Navigator into consultation processes run by

Arts Council England, Creative and Cultural Skills and others on quality framework, qualifications and standards is a clear contribution towards collaborative working between major agencies and the wider sector. There are also some strong examples of partners within Pathfinders working with each other in ways which are new to them; in several cases, this has been about recognising expertise and experience outside the Pathfinder lead, and trusting other partners to lead areas of activity themselves. Despite very positive engagement from Creative Scotland (leading a Pathfinder) and Arts Council Wales (funding follow-on activity for ArtWorks Cymru), there have been ongoing challenges in engaging with Arts Council England and its policy agenda.

1.3 Size and Scale of ArtWorks

It has been quite challenging to develop a set of metrics that Pathfinders could report upon which would capture the variety and volume of activity that they have undertaken. However, it is possible to give some brief indications of the size and scale of some of the activities which have been undertaken. Most of the figures here refer to activity in the second and third years of the intervention.

Pathfinders have run a range of activities to build contacts and communities, raise the profile of ArtWorks and specifically to support artists and practitioners in networking and sharing practice. More than 300 events were reported in these two years, with artists being involved in delivery and taking part, as well as other participants. Pathfinders have used a number of existing routes for digital engagement, with online communities and content being produced. Significant numbers of face-to-face, digital and 'phone consultations have also been undertaken. Four Pathfinders undertook formal structured training, delivering over 300 sessions with artists and other participants. Some Pathfinders also used arts activity in arts and participatory settings as a 'test bed' for activities, with more than 200 sessions being included. The data suggested that engaging with a wide range of stakeholder has been important to some Pathfinders in establishing influence throughout their activities, including attending events/conferences run by other partners.

For some activities, Pathfinders were able to collect some data about who participated. Across a range of activities, the data shows that artists from all career stages – from students to established artists – have been involved in activity. Artists of all artforms have also been involved in activities, and the spread of artforms broadly reflects the artforms reported by respondents to the major survey that was undertaken with artists. There is also good evidence of engagement with HEIs and FE providers, employers/commissioners and teachers. As such, the communities and networks which Pathfinders have built/accessed now reach significantly beyond artists.

1.4 Activity Clusters

As noted above, the Evaluation developed a conceptual 'clustering' of activities across the different Pathfinders, to identify areas of critical mass or gaps across the Initiative. These clusters were used in part to help determine the evidence to be used for the Working Papers that PHF has published from ArtWorks. The commentary here summarises the findings.

Mapping training and development provision

Pathfinders and PHF supported assessments and mapping of some existing training and development provision, which provide a useful snapshot of the general spread and areas of focus in current provision, particularly two national studies on England and Scotland. Separately, work undertaken by ArtWorks

North East on academics' perceptions of this kind of practice provides some useful depth about some of the personal connections, motivations and barriers involved in individuals' engagement (or not) through course design with practice in this area.

Artists – consultations/research

The most significant cluster of consultation and research produced through ArtWorks has been with artists. Some focused on particular types of support, others on particular methods for consultation; some were artform specific, and others cross artform. This is a substantial body of work, with some rich qualitative data, but the respondent/participant sizes in many of these exercises are relatively small. Some approaches have been hybrid models, using CPD models to 'double' as consultation processes. Building on this cluster, the Evaluation team undertook a survey and a follow-up set of interviews with artists in the final year of the programme.

Employers and commissioners and members of the public/participants – consultations/research

On the whole, whilst there are examples of useful 'conversations', this area of work is significantly less developed than consultation has been with artists. Where engagement with employers and commissioners has been most successful has tended to be where consultation or engagement processes have had a specific focus (e.g. a particular area of the practice). This area has been made challenging by the diversity of organisational types working in this area. Engagement with members of the public/participants by ArtWorks has been very limited. Challenges with determining questions that might be suitable across different kinds of participant groups, as well as different kinds of projects with different objectives, were significant in the design of this research. One project did engage the public as 'experts' in an area of practice that focused on older people, and provides a model which may be useful with some other groups.

Exploring the practice of arts in participatory settings

A range of activity has taken place across the Pathfinders that has been about either mapping knowledge and understanding of the practice of arts in participatory settings, or about providing a platform/opportunity for different experts (including many artists) to share their experiences and views on the practice. All of the Pathfinders have used events as a way of engaging with artists, and providing space for artists and others to talk about practice. Some events have used specific methodologies, e.g. the Critical Conversations in the North East, or the use of Pecha Kucha in Scotland. Some projects have produced materials for future learners from these events. Two projects used arts activity that was taking place in participatory settings as an opportunity for development and intervention.

Artists – testing/piloting professional development approaches

The range of models for professional development tested and developed in the second two years of ArtWorks has been substantial. One model of support which was also a consultation process was completed in the first year (i.e. Peer-Assisted Learning in the North East); other models (e.g. Peer to Peer Networks and Connecting Conversations) have been carried on, and have become more completely focused on artist development and support, rather than consultation/data production. Some approaches have been tested in a range of ways (e.g. the Lab model used by ArtWorks London), others are new models that have been piloted through ArtWorks for the first time (e.g. ArtWorks North East

short courses). Some have looked at development in a broad sense; others are focused on particular kinds of practice, settings or artforms.

Policy-making, guidance, qualifications and standards

A range of work has emerged around creating guidance and infrastructures that can be widely applied/used across the sector. Navigator has focused activity in this area, developing a Code of Practice for artists, exploring a CPD credits system, and contributing to the development and application of National Occupational Standards. Supporting this is work around a range of nationally-recognised qualifications. ArtWorks North East have sought to influence HE policy through the Quality Assurance Agency benchmark review. As already noted, ArtWorks Scotland pursued significant work on quality, which has translated into funding criteria.

1.5 Processes and Structures

Here we reflect on the processes and structures that helped to shape Pathfinders' approaches to this initiative. This section looks briefly at reflections upon the enquiry-based approach, and then summarises the partnership models which the Evaluation team developed.

1.5.1 Enquiry-based Approach

In interviews with Pathfinders, the Steering Group and staff respondents mentioned either 'lines of enquiry' or 'action research' unprompted in their interviews, though it was not (on the whole) part of interviewees initial descriptions of the initiative; where interviewees indicated this approach in describing the initiative, they tended simply to refer to 'research' in a general sense. A few respondents suggested that the approach had not necessarily been universally applied or communicated by PHF as a funder. Some Pathfinders reported finding the process challenging, certainly in terms of creating clarity about the relationship between individual Pathfinders and the whole Initiative. Pathfinders were not always clear whether research should have prompted changes in their individual programmes.

Other challenges reported by Pathfinders included the issue of actually analysing and applying the learning that emerged from research, particularly where other partners in a Pathfinder might prefer different approaches or solutions. Sometimes it was also difficult for Pathfinders to tell where they were making progress on difficult issues, like definitions and quality, though some agreed that not all these challenges were solvable within the project. Gaining reliable feedback and evidence on the value of individual activities was challenging for some, but there is evidence of Pathfinders doing this well and with integrity. The ownership of some of the research, given the significant input from independent contractors and freelancers, has also needed to reflect the breadth of contributors and knowledge producers in the sector.

Despite these challenges, most interviewees were positive about an approach that had encouraged the Pathfinders to find things out before they proposed interventions or solutions. For some, there was a significant sense of integrity attached to this process, and several talked about the 'ethos' of this kind of work. The sense that an enquiry-based approach supported a more honest dialogue was reported by some Pathfinders.

1.5.2 Partnerships and sites of intervention/influence

Different partnership models have been employed by the different partners, in three broad groups: formal partnerships, with a Steering Group (ArtWorks Cymru and ArtWorks North East); a consortium model (ArtWorks Navigator); more informal partnerships, with partners being engaged for specific projects rather than in the overall design and direction (ArtWorks London and ArtWorks Scotland). Support from external consultants has been key for some Pathfinders (e.g. ArtWorks Cymru had support for facilitation of Steering Group meetings and evaluation; ArtWorks London and ArtWorks Scotland worked with a dedicated Pathfinder evaluator); there has also been work with freelancers to support elements of research and communications in different projects, as well as use of consultancy agencies for specific pieces of research/scoping. Three Pathfinders (North East, London and Scotland) employed dedicated part-time project managers, and all the Pathfinders allocated some staff time to leading Pathfinder activities, and engaging with partners. In some cases, there were specific efforts made to ensure a geographical spread to the influence and intervention which the projects constituted; in other cases (e.g. ArtWorks London) there was a fairly local focus, but also the possibility of establishing models for a particular type of training provider (a conservatoire) that might be taken notice of internationally.

1.5.3 Decision-making and roles for partners

In practical terms, some Pathfinders had formal collective decision-making groups, with partners meeting regularly to review and plan activity, and make choices about the use of resources. Sometimes partners reflected different understandings of the project from each other, and commitments (e.g. putting staff time into activities) was a challenge for some partners. Within these models, some Pathfinders have been led more than others by an individual organisation, and this has also been reflected in different ways of using partners.

Some partners offered a site of intervention for research/testing (e.g. ArtWorks Cymru Action Learning Groups with arts projects taking place in participatory settings). Engagement from partners in leading specific bits of work (including organisations and individual artists) has been a process used by most of the Pathfinders, recognising the value of individual expertise or opportunity to influence (e.g. ArtWorks North East commissioning some partners to lead on individual areas of enquiry). Some Pathfinders who were interviewed cited developing confidence in working with partners, and in supporting partners to go and lead their own areas as a benefit of the process.

In the case of ArtWorks Navigator, which is a slightly different kind of Pathfinder from the others in terms of both the partnership and the activity, the 'offer' that they bring to the table is their members/those they represent, and the responsibility that they have in serving those members. As such this Pathfinder sought to extend its influence through the sites of intervention open to individual partners, e.g. consultations which partners may be invited to be part of.

Partners in all the Pathfinders have also been important as routes to accessing artists, and other stakeholders in the sector, providing participants for consultation processes or routes to particular groups. Through partnerships and the wider groups who have been engaged through consultations, pilots, events and networks, each of the Pathfinders has done some work to develop and connect a community of practice in this area.

As might be expected, those partners leading activities tended to feel closer to the process and knew more about what was taking place, and had more clarity about what their role was; those at more of a

distance were more likely to feel frustrated. Several Pathfinders report challenges in bringing different groups together, and navigating different agendas. Most interviewees, however, reflected upon the value of both the focus that ArtWorks brings to an area which they feel is important, and the opportunity to get together with peers and actors from elsewhere in the sector or 'system', to learn and exchange ideas. Overall, the sense of an ongoing dialogue and discussion was important to many, particularly for those who did not feel that this was something they could access within their day-to-day environments.

1.5.4 Institutional contexts

For some Pathfinders, the institutional context in which the lead partner was operating was significant in determining both their own activity and how they were able to engage with other partners. Creative Scotland (the national funding and development agency for the arts, film and creative industries in Scotland) in leading ArtWorks Scotland, is perhaps one of the most significant examples of a Pathfinder having to negotiate a different approach within an institutional context, putting significant time into work with partners on potential applications for pilot projects, going beyond the normal role of a funder, and working with those partners to train them in engaging with the evaluation framework set for that particular Pathfinder. Barbican Guildhall's leadership of ArtWorks London has also been strongly informed by the institutional context within which they have operated with the merging of the two institutions (bringing HE training provision and arts practice taking place in participatory settings together into one organisation) and significant work taking place to extend existing models. The short courses piloted by ArtWorks North East are a specific attempt to develop a solution that sits outside a single, institutional context, and which brings in useful things (accreditation, expert teaching, etc.) from a range of different contexts.

1.5.5 Role of PHF

Pathfinders have significantly appreciated the way in which PHF has sought to champion change in an area, and the roles of the Project Director and Project Co-ordinator, though there were challenges for the staff undertaking these roles and particularly for the positioning of an external consultant as Project Director. The lack of a trustee from PHF on the steering group was cited by more than one interviewee from within the Staff/Steering Group as a challenge, in terms of communicating the initiative and its value within the organisation. On the whole, Pathfinders tended to be unsure of what the specific role of the Steering Group was, and how they were to be involved or communicated with.

Perhaps most telling is the sense from Pathfinders that they have not always been clear how much ownership PHF wishes to have of the project. In many ways, this reflects a project that encounters issues of ownership (and appropriate leadership) in almost everything that it does. This partly relates to the structure and governance of the project, and clarity about different roles; but also to a wider set of issues about the variety of organisations involved in arts practice in participatory settings, the role of freelance and employed artists, and complex relationships between different, diverse parts of the system within which practice takes place. As such, a process of ongoing negotiation around these issues is probably the only realistic response from all parties. The extent to which the initiative has succeeded in making the most of the available Steering Group may only emerge in the next few months, as tangible outputs and recommendations from the Pathfinders are now being disseminated and advocated for. Several interviewed Steering Group members refer to challenges in understanding the Pathfinders and

their activities at various points in time; it seems likely that the enquiry-based approach has also contributed to this issue.

The processes overlaid by PHF onto the Pathfinders included a range of monitoring and reporting, and regular meetings. Most Pathfinders felt it was useful to meet together regularly and hear from the other Pathfinders about what they were doing, and that sense of being part of a collective endeavour. Some reported challenges in understanding each other's programmes, and how the process of shared development might take place. Another issue, for some, has been the balance of partners in the room and the question of whether Pathfinders are able to make collective decisions.

All interviewees who discussed Pathfinders working together in detail felt that it had taken some considerable time for it to be clear how this might happen. Despite these challenges, Pathfinders were also clear about appreciating the input and engagement from other Pathfinders through the meetings. On the whole, interviewees tended to agree that by the end of the final Pathfinder meeting, they were beginning to feel part of collective processes.

1.6 What has ArtWorks achieved?

Looking across the range of findings in this report, the following achievements can be recognised:

1. New partnerships and relationships - individuals and organisations have worked together who would not, otherwise, have done so. Some Pathfinders can demonstrate significant individual learning about working with partners in different ways. Beyond this, new networks and connections have emerged within and beyond Pathfinders. Engagement across 'the system' has been deliberately sought and enhanced by the initiative.
2. A body of consultation and research about artists, the practice that they undertake in participatory settings and what they need to support it, has been produced and brought together. This had added, in the broadest sense, to the critical mass of interest and knowledge in this area.
3. The Pathfinders and their partners are all better informed about the needs and requirements for support for artists who work in participatory settings, and feel more equipped to champion, lead and design support in this area. Being better informed includes better understanding each other's definitions of participatory arts, and the different approaches of different artforms and other types of practice.
4. The solutions and models which have been proposed have been tested, both at the conception stage through consultation and research, and at the application stage through feedback. Whilst there is more work to do in several areas to further test, refine and establish ongoing models and the resources to support them, this process has been valuable for both Pathfinders and those artists (and others) participating in pilot activity. Some of these models clearly have some potential for long-term application and/or transferability. This testing process has, in some cases, been useful for individual organisations who have used the process as a way of examining their own activities.
5. Artists have directly benefited from some of the activities that have taken place through ArtWorks (contributing to outcome 1 in supporting a more professional and confident sector,

and potentially to outcome 2 where artists may be able to take some of those experiences directly into their practice with participants). In some cases, this might have included contributing their views and being asked to articulate their practice – sometimes with a significant platform to access their peers and others in ‘the system’. Others have engaged with pilot processes, either through design, co-design or participation, and have provided feedback about the benefits and challenges of individual solutions. More generally, there is evidence that artists have appreciated the focus that ArtWorks has given this area of practice, and the need to better support it. In some cases, artists have been able to lead on developing further their community of practice; in other ways, many have contributed to emerging communities and networks (this could be viewed as contributing to outcome 5, as communities and networks could be seen as parts of the infrastructure which supports artists). The ongoing demand for these networks has emerged directly through some Pathfinders.

6. ArtWorks has succeeded in engaging two of the four national arts funding and development agencies in a significant way, accessing the funding and policy-making infrastructure (contributing to outcome 6). Two HEIs have led on activity development, and several others (and FE colleges) have run smaller projects and sought to extend their provision in this area. A number of arts organisations have contributed or lead on model design. It is specifically worth noting the focus on ‘small wins’ and ‘quick wins’ from some of the Pathfinder interviews: where changes to the infrastructure have taken place, this is largely manifested through specific interventions in specific sites, within major institutions. In doing so, ArtWorks has found ways in which to respond to the variety of need and practice that consultation processes revealed/confirmed.
7. Finally, as one interviewee put it, one of the significant indicators of achievement for ArtWorks is that the different Pathfinders want to continue pursuing activities in support of the objectives set out by ArtWorks at the beginning. Individual organisations as well as networks have stepped up to take different areas forward.

1.6.1 What next?

In the Interim Report we asked whether and how ArtWorks could seek to be more than the sum of its parts. This question remains an important one looking at the proposed legacy/ongoing activity for the different Pathfinders.


Understandably, there is a desire from PHF and others (including Creative Scotland, as a Pathfinder lead organisation) to ensure that funders are not dictating or leading any future processes at the cost of proper involvement with the sector. There are, however, resourcing and other limitations that will affect the way in which different parts of ‘the system’ – including artists and arts organisations – can step forward and engage with or take a lead on different areas. The Final Report from the initiative, and the series of proposed events for Spring 2015, provide an opportunity for ArtWorks to begin to outline what it is asking, encouraging and supporting different bits of ‘the system’ to do.

ArtWorks Navigator has proposed the development of an Alliance, which would seek to take the issue of workforce development of artists who work in participatory settings forward, and there is still work to be undertaken to understand how this structure can bring together different stakeholders, and how it will relate to any other legacy activities taking place. Other Pathfinders have proposed specific programmes of activity for continuation. For good reason, ArtWorks has not emerged with a single

solution or approach. However, the models, solutions and propositions tested through the programme risk losing traction and take-up where they are not positioned more widely, or wider support is not sought. Beyond the 'ask' that might be made of different parts of the 'system' this Spring, the test of ArtWorks as a system-wide intervention will emerge through the ways in which commitments are made by those partners either outside the ArtWorks structure, or no longer in receipt of ongoing support

Introduction

The following illustration of from the artists' survey shows the importance of different kinds of activities to the income of artists.



Base: 1,083
Source: DHA

2 Introduction and Object of Study

DHA and the Institute of Cultural Practices at the University of Manchester were appointed to undertake the evaluation of ArtWorks in December 2011, part way into the first year of the Pathfinders' activities. In January 2013 an Interim Report and Literature Review were published as the first outputs of the evaluation. This report, the Final Report from the evaluation process, has built upon a range of mapping and analytical approaches which were developed for the Interim Report (following the first year of the evaluation team being in place. It applies a theory of the way in which this intervention might bring about change, and places the ArtWorks activities and interventions against this theory. As several of the Pathfinders already have detailed plans in place for future activities, this evaluation also looks at these plans in the context of this proposition for change.

ArtWorks is a complex initiative and, as with the Interim Report, we have borne in mind the requirement to engage in not only a summative, but also a formative evaluation. Given the indications of future plans, some of the practical mapping outlined in this report may continue to be useful to Pathfinders, Paul Hamlyn Foundation and other stakeholders in assessing and reflecting upon ongoing activities which are seeking the same outcomes as ArtWorks has.

It is just noting briefly that a different evaluation team had initially been contracted before the Pathfinders were selected. Subsequent to the Pathfinders beginning their activity, this contract was terminated, leading to the later appointment of this evaluation team some nine months after the Pathfinders had begun their activity.

This report contains a method statement and analyses of the initiative over three (plus) years of activity. In our conclusion and executive summary we have brought what we think are the key findings and areas of learning together.

2.1 The Object of Study

The background and development of ArtWorks was explored in detail in the Interim Report, but the following short section provides a brief description of the development of ArtWorks, and the Pathfinders and their activities. This range of activities has been the object of study for the Evaluation.

ArtWorks is a Special Initiative of the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, a funding model which the Foundation has used for a number of specific areas in which it wishes to intervene. PHF commissioned a consultant, Susanne Burns, to undertake some initial research and consultation to explore what was required or could be done to support needs which artists working in participatory settings might have. Subsequently it was agreed that the Initiative would seek to fund some activity, with the following key principles:

- Using an enquiry-based approach
- Sharing activity across Pathfinders or clusters
- That other funders should be approached to be involved
- That PHF should place a central role in not only funding the initiative, but also in continuing to lead the research and extend the influence of the project.

The Initiative is governed via a Steering Group, comprising independent members appoint for their expertise, and including a member who is also on the Arts Programme Committee of PHF. The Steering Group reports to the Arts Programme Committee, and through this Committee to the Board of Trustees. The Initiative has a Project Director, an external consultant (Susanne Burns, who undertook the initial

research and consultation phase), a Project Co-ordinator (appointed part-way through the project) and some administrative support from within PHF.

PHF committed £1.47million to the Initiative, with partnership funding coming from: the Arts and Humanities Research Council (£50k to support research and evaluation); Arts Council England, through the Cultural Leadership Programme (£20k); and Creativity, Culture and Education (£500k). A call for submissions for Pathfinders was put out in Autumn 2010; eight bids were shortlisted and submitted full applications in response to feedback. Five Pathfinders were selected, and have been funded with between just under £180k to £300k; each Pathfinder is supplying some match, ranging from staff time and activity to cash match.

The stated aim for ArtWorks is as follows:

‘Overall aim

To support the initial training and continuous professional development of artists working in participatory settings in order to enhance the quality of people’s engagement in arts-led activity and the arts, and create a more professional and confident sector whose work is validated and valued and is seen as important.’ (From the PHF *Call for Submissions from Pathfinder Partnerships 2010*).

The Initiative also set out key objectives (including partnership working, developing an understanding of quality and sharing evidence) and six outcomes which it was seeking. It is worth noting that the Initiative was originally expected to have a second substantial phase which has not been taken forward; this is discussed further in this evaluation. Pathfinders were funded to undertake work over three years, beginning in Spring 2011; this timescale was later slightly extended, and so most Pathfinders were undertaking some activities into Autumn 2014. At this stage, most also had areas of activity which were ongoing or embedded.

The following are brief descriptions of each of the Pathfinders; this report goes on to look at the activities and partnerships of each of the Pathfinders in more detail.

ArtWorks Cymru

ArtWorks Cymru is a Pathfinder based in and focusing upon Wales. It is led by the Welsh National Opera, and involved a range of partners including other producing arts organisations with participatory programmes (e.g. Sherman Cymru and National Dance Company Wales) as well as organisations whose focus is on community and participatory practice (e.g. Community Music Wales and Community Dance Wales), and input from Higher Education Institutions. The Pathfinder undertook a range of mapping, consultation and research, including surveys, interviews and case studies. They piloted a model of professional development, developed an online network and a range of online materials, and ran events.

ArtWorks London

ArtWorks London is a Pathfinder focused on London, and led by the Barbican Guildhall. A range of organisations and individuals have been involved in contributing to the project, including HEIs (e.g. Trinity Laban and Royal Holloway), arts organisations (e.g. Entelechy and ICA), umbrella/strategic organisations (e.g. A New Direction) and individuals (e.g. Ned Glasier). The Pathfinder undertook

consultation and research processes at the beginning, and then has trialled range of professional development approaches (some of which were supported by specific additional consultation). It has had a Collaborative Doctoral Award (shared with Royal Holloway), developed a database of artists and run a number of events.

ArtWorks Navigator

ArtWorks Navigator is a Pathfinder with national reach, and involves five partners who are membership/representative and networking organisations for artists working in different artforms (Foundation for Community Dance, Engage, a-n, ArtQuest, National Association of Writers in Education and SoundSense). The Pathfinder undertook some mapping, including producing a bibliography of resources, and some consultation/research processes. Within this Pathfinder, much of the work has focused on influencing developments taking place within the professional structure of the sector, feeding into consultations on the development of standards and qualifications, as well as developing tools for supporting artists wanting to develop their practice.

ArtWorks North East

ArtWorks North East is a Pathfinder based in the North East of England, led by the University of Sunderland with a range of partners including producing arts organisations with participatory programmes (e.g. BALTIC, Tyneside Cinema and Sage Gateshead) and organisations focused on community and participatory arts (e.g. Helix Arts and Equal Arts). The Pathfinder undertook research and consultation processes, and trialled a range of professional development activities and events, as well as developing online materials and a website for learning resources.

ArtWorks Scotland

ArtWorks Scotland is a Pathfinder based in a focusing upon Scotland, led by Creative Scotland with a range of organisations and individuals who were involved in supporting the bid, providing advice and informing the work, and who received funding to undertake pilot activity. Amongst these were HEIs, arts organisations, organisations focused on other activities (e.g. the Scottish Mentoring Network) and groups of artists. The Pathfinder undertook research and consultation, and supported a range of projects testing different approaches to professional development, as well as developing funding guidance, running an online network and a series of events.

2.2 Abbreviations

For clarity, the following table lists common abbreviations used in this report.

Full Name	Abbreviation
Paul Hamlyn Foundation	PHF
ArtWorks Cymru	Cymru
ArtWorks London	London
ArtWorks Navigator	Navigator
ArtWorks North East	North East
ArtWorks Scotland	Scotland
Arts and Humanities Research Council	AHRC
Creative and Cultural Skills Council	CCS
Higher Education Academy	HEA
Collaborative Doctoral Award	CDA
Arts Council England	ACE
Arts Council Wales	ACW
Higher Education	HE
Further Education	FE
Higher Education Institutions	HEIs

Method Statement

The following illustration from the artists' survey looks at the importance of different activities to an artists' practice.



3 Method Statement

Before looking at the findings from the second and third years of evaluation activity, it is worth revisiting the core questions for the evaluation. This has set out the principles for the methodology which we have used both in the first year for the Interim Report, and subsequently for this Final Report, and the 'intervention model' which provides the conceptualisation of ArtWorks as a framework against which we have built our understanding of what the initiative is achieving.

3.1 Evaluation Questions

Our evaluation questions remain those first proposed in our tender, and shared with the Pathfinders in December 2011, and the Steering Group in February 2012. It is important to note that the role of the Evaluation Team has been to understand what has taken place, and how this has happened. In this sense, the Evaluation Team is not working towards the same enquiry questions as the Pathfinders, but rather interrogating how the Pathfinders (and PHF) have gone about answering those questions.

The questions are broadly arranged into three levels: macro-level questions, dealing with the broad change which the intervention seeks to make, and the outcomes; mid-level questions, dealing with the practical building blocks of the intervention; and micro-level questions, looking at the activity of individual pathfinders and the granularity of individual activities.

Level	Evaluation questions
Macro	<i>What will this intervention change:</i> - <i>for PHF's practice</i> - <i>for the partners' practice</i> - <i>for wider practice</i> - <i>for future policy/planning</i>
Mid	<i>What is the size and scale of this intervention?</i>
	<i>What were the specific aims, and have they been fulfilled?</i>
	<i>What were the intentions, and did anything need to change?</i>
	<i>How did PHF and its partners go about achieving this, and did it work?</i>
Micro	<i>What is the learning from individual partnerships?</i>
	<i>Is it different, for different artforms?</i>
	<i>Is it different, for different practice settings?</i>
	<i>What kinds of support do organisations/partnerships need in the future to take this forward?</i>

3.2 Intervention Model

The following pages show the intervention model which was first shared with the Steering Group in February 2012. It has been tested and used for exercises at National Pathfinder meetings in April 2012 and October 2012. Findings against the Intervention Model from the Interim Report were shared with Pathfinders in January 2013. It has also been shared individually with some of the Pathfinders, where they felt that it provided a useful process for modelling their own activity.

Some things are worth noting when considering the application of this model as an evaluation framework:

- The model is based primarily on the six outcomes identified at the outset by PHF. The model suggests an 'ideal' concept of how this intervention might work.
- It shows a linear progression route through to the six outcomes. In reality, activity often effects change in less clean or direct ways. As the intervention progresses, we have been able to get a sense of the circularity or indirect and cumulative effects of certain kinds of activity.
- The five Pathfinders did not individually bid – and are not funded – to undertake activity which meets all six outcomes. 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.

The challenge, from an evaluation perspective, is to understand both the Pathfinder and PHF activity both in relation to individual intentions, and in relation to the overall aims which PHF has identified for the initiative.

3.2.1 Overview

The following grid 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 seeking to effect change, and to show the assumptions about causal relationships in this process.

Objectives & Mechanisms					Outcomes
Aim					
	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	Artists are more confident and articulate about their work in participatory settings
	Use pilot activity to support evidence towards developing a better understanding of quality and value, and of participatory work taking place in different circumstances	Use artists with developed skills to deliver enhanced quality in piloting activity	Explore and reflect upon skills, knowledge and understanding required in different circumstances, and feed this into design of opportunities for training and CPD	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	Participants are benefitting from enhanced quality experiences of engaging in arts-led activity
	Map existing evidence about quality and value, and support discussion across artists, employers and participants about it	Support testing of better understanding through developing/piloting activity, and capturing the learning from this	Apply this understanding to the design and embedding of opportunities for training and CPD for artists at all stages of their career	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	Artists, employers and participants share a better understanding of what constitutes quality and value in the work
	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
	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
	Map and assess existing partnership working/common areas of activity/interest/ understanding	Solicit and support partnership working through pathfinders, 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

3.3 Evaluation Methodology and Process

3.3.1 Evaluation activity

Building on the methods used in the first year of evaluation, and on the findings from the Interim Report, four key strands of activity have been ongoing:

1. Primary data collection and analysis
 - Interviews with Pathfinders (undertaken in years 2 and 3 of the programme), key PHF personnel and Steering Group members
 - Update sessions on project progress (undertaken in years 2 and 3 of the programme)
 - Attendance at National Pathfinder Meetings (throughout the programme)
2. Secondary data analysis
 - Updating requirements for monitoring data
 - Analysis of quantitative and qualitative data from quarterly monitoring
 - Analysis of phase/stage reports and grant release materials
 - Analysis of Pathfinder project documentation and outputs
 - Analysis of PHF project documentation and outputs
3. Responsive activity
 - Engaging with Pathfinders where requested, providing a 'sounding board' through working sessions
 - Supporting Pathfinders with responses to outputs, feedback on documentation and models/methodologies where appropriate
4. Literature review
 - Reviewing and organising a range of policy, evaluation and academic literature to provide a useful contextual basis for assessing this intervention.

In addition to these activities, in the final year an additional strand of activity was added. The Interim Report identified the 'primary beneficiaries' of ArtWorks as artists themselves, and the mapping of activity clusters from the first year revealed a broad range of consultations and piloted activities with artists. Whilst the range of work undertaken by the Pathfinders is extensive, methods and sizes of participation groups varied significantly. The findings from these consultation and pilots confirm the need for ArtWorks – as discussed at length in the Interim Report – but there are limitations on the existing data sets in terms of their capacity to provide a granular understanding of that need.

Having assessed these limitations, the Evaluation Team undertook a large-scale survey of artists, and followed-up with a series of in-depth interviews. The questions built upon findings and issues raised through the Pathfinders' consultations and pilots. The survey allowed these findings and issues to be tested with a wider sample of artists, enabling a better understanding of the relationships between key characteristics (such as artform) and the different experiences and responses of artists.

For this evaluation process, the findings from both the survey and the interviews provide some broad proxy measures which are useful for confirming the need for support, and the range and types of support which artists might need; and, by extension, the potential efficacy and value of activities undertaken by the Pathfinders.

For the interviews which were undertaken with staff members from PHF, project staff and ArtWorks Steering Group Members; and with members of the core teams and partners from across the five Pathfinders. 56 interviews were undertaken in total, as follows:

Interviews	Year 2	Year 3
Pathfinder - Core Team	12	12
Pathfinder – Partner/Associate	10	15
PHF - Staff/Steering Group	N/a	7
Total	22	34

Where data from the interviews is used throughout this report, interviewees are identified only as being part of one of three groups:

1. A core team member of a Pathfinder (Core Team, Pathfinder)
2. A partner member of a Pathfinder, or an individual associated with a particular Pathfinder (Partner/Associate, Pathfinder)
3. A member of the PHF staff, project staff or Steering Group for ArtWorks (Staff or Steering Group, PHF).

Interviews with PHF and the project staff and steering group members were undertaken in Autumn/Winter 2014. Interviews with Pathfinders (both core team and partners) were undertaken in two waves: in Summer 2013, and in Autumn/Winter 2014. Some interviews were ‘repeated’ – i.e. the same interviewee was interviewed in each wave, usually because they were a core team member of a Pathfinder.

The interviews serve a dual function: to enable the Evaluation Team to test some ideas and propositions, and to maintain familiarity with different aspects of the programme; and to explore the degree to which there are shared or different perceptions of the purpose of this initiative. The majority of quotations used are from the third year of interviews (unless otherwise specified), but general commentary reflects both second and third year of interviews.

3.3.2 Years Two and Three Focus

The Final Evaluation Report look at the activities which have taken place across ArtWorks, and maps and analyses them in a number of different ways, to understand how the activities and plans of the Pathfinders and PHF relate to a model of change specific to the outcomes which ArtWorks is seeking. As noted in the Interim Report, change does not always take place in a linear way; different Pathfinders are also designed to do different things, and are able to exert influence over different parts of ‘the system’. These sections therefore analyse ArtWorks through four different models:

1. Matching the activity of the Pathfinders against the intervention model, through mapping these activities and outputs against the six outcomes.

2. Aggregating a range of quantitative data supplied by the Pathfinders on a quarterly basis, to understand something about the size and reach of the initiative.
3. A mapping of the key activity clusters and outputs across the Pathfinders, by area of focus, to support an understanding of the collective assets produced across the initiative.
4. Modelling of the individual Pathfinder partnerships including the inputs and sites of intervention and influence, to understand better those specific circumstances which provide both opportunity and limit to the scope of each project.


The first two of these constitute an overview of the initiative. Models 3 and 4 both concern themselves with understanding how the Pathfinders are going about their process of enquiry, and what can be understood about what has been achieved through ArtWorks, and how.

With the exception of the quantitative data, the modelling brings together data from all three or more years of Pathfinder activity. Where appropriate, some reference is also made to central activity undertaken by PHF.

3.3.3 'The System'

The idea of seeking to develop change across 'the system' which affects and determines how artists are supported in their practice in participatory settings, has been a key part of the way in which ArtWorks was conceptualised, and the Pathfinders were constructed and funded. For evaluation purposes, the notion of a 'system' is useful as a way of understanding that different partners and individuals may play different roles in the process, have access to different places in which they can change things (sites of intervention and/or sites of influence), because of the different activities and responsibilities which they undertake and have.

As part of a presentation to a conference in 2014, the Evaluation Team talked about ArtWorks in the context of attempting to influence and change 'the System'. At the time, we offered the following conceptualisation of 'the System':




‘The System’ was conceptualised as having the following ‘parts’:

- Artists at the centre, as the object of support, and navigating the system. Artists are also sources of knowledge about the practice.
- Training providers – FE, HEIs, arts organisations, other providers – providing training opportunities. Some of these training providers are also knowledge producers about the practice, and involved in developing understanding and critical dialogue about it.
- Employers/commissioners working with artists to deliver practice taking place in participatory settings – arts organisations, local authorities, direct commissioners from other settings. Some of these may also be training providers. Some also produce knowledge about the practice.
- Sector development and representative organisations – membership bodies for individuals and organisations, networks, Sector Skills Councils (CCS), and so forth. Some of whom may also be training providers; some of whom may work with artists to deliver practice in participatory settings; some of whom also produce knowledge about the practice.
- Funders and policy-makers. Some of whom may fund/commission artists directly; some of whom may provide training programmes; some of them may also overlap with sector development and representative organisations. They also have a fundamental responsibility to beneficiaries, and a political interest in settings.

This conceptualisation is imperfect, but provides a basis for references to ‘the system’ throughout this Evaluation Report.

Current Context

The following illustration from the artists' survey shows the proportion of artists earning different amounts from their artistic practice.



4 Context and Background

In the Interim Report we included a section which attempted to set a baseline, or acknowledge the context in which ArtWorks as a project had begun its activities. In terms of understanding the finding of this Final Report, it seems equally valuable to acknowledge the wider context within which ArtWorks activities are currently operating. Therefore, this section looks at a brief overview of changes in the policy context for ArtWorks.

4.1 Context

4.1.1 Policy Context

It is not the purpose of this section to review all key policy changes for the period in which ArtWorks was initiated and has operated. The first stage research undertaken by Susanne Burns offers an assessment of policy context which was current at the time of publications (February 2009) and clearly lays out the range of government interventions, agendas and concerns which impacted upon work undertaken by artists in participatory settings. What is important to note (as we did in the Interim Report) are the areas in which significant change has or is taking place, since the inception of this initiative. The following assessment is not a detailed or comprehensive one, but simply notes some of the key elements in a range of developments. The purpose, in doing so, is to try to place and understand ArtWorks within a current context.

Education

In the interim report we noted the new National Plan for Music Education in England (November 2011) and the roll-out of the Music Education Hubs model, which have been funded (in the first instance) for the period 2012-2015, and now have a funding allocation for 2015-2016; the development of a Level 4 Certificate for Music Educators is now completed also. In Harmony projects are still running in a number of locations, with a funding period of 2012-2015 at present.

The Henley Review of Cultural Education alongside the Arts Council's work on quality in work with children and young people, have been amongst the prompts for a Level 3 qualification in work with children and young people. In Wales, the Welsh Government commissioned an independent report into 'Arts in Education in the Schools of Wales' by Professor Dai Smith, published in Autumn 2013; the policy responses to this report include a national action plan (launched in March 2015) for 'Creative learning through the arts' which runs from 2015-2020.

More broadly in England, the new National Curriculum framework came into force in September 2014; in terms of references and engagement with the arts, there were wins (drama gets included) and losses (dance is referenced only in limited ways; film and digital arts are not included). The Cultural Learning Alliance, Bridge organisations and others have been working across the sector to advise and advocate to schools and others about ways in which arts can be included and supported in schools. In Scotland, the 'Curriculum for Excellence' has been implemented in schools since 2010, which breaks down learning into four 'capacities'. One of the eight curriculum areas is 'expressive arts'.

Further and Higher Education

Higher Education Institutions across the UK went through the first Research Excellence Framework Assessment in 2014, which now includes an increased focus upon 'impact' measures which, in theory, seem to offer significant opportunities for more collaboration between academics and HEIs on the one hand, and policy-makers, funders and the arts and cultural sector itself on the other. The emphasis on funding STEM subjects at University has gained significant press and lobbying interest across the cultural sector. More generally, the 'employability' agenda and impact of DLHE statistics could be significant in the future.

At localised levels, some courses which have been stalwarts of learning for artists who want to work in participatory settings have been closed (e.g. the MA in Community and Participatory Arts at Goldsmiths); this is a reminder of the relative fragility of specialist MA courses within larger institutions. It is also worth remembering that across the different UK nations, different approaches to student funding and finance remain an issue; for students from Wales, tuition fees are capped and the government supplies the rest as a grant, even where the student leaves Wales, for example.

FE colleges are particularly vulnerable in changes to funding for education for post-16 year olds, with adult education funding having been significantly cut, and rate reductions for the 16-18 budget targeting 18-year-olds in the first year. The impact upon choices which FE colleges make about which courses to run has been significant.

Arts and cultural investment

As was noted in the Interim report, across the UK arts councils have made significant changes to their investment portfolios, not only in terms of who gets funded, but also in the structure of that funding. Arts Council Wales moved to a new portfolio in April 2011, and organisations bid again for funding from 2014-2016 under this process; the Council also undertakes an investment review again in 2015. Arts Council England moved to a new process in April 2012, and the second round of applications was undertaken in 2014. Arts Council England finds itself now with new responsibilities across a wider sector which now includes museums and libraries (though not archives), and the Music Education Hubs (as discussed above). Heading into the General Election in 2015, Arts Council England will have a new Chief Executive, and may well face renewed discussions about its role and relationship with DCMS. Creative Scotland revised its own revenue funding programme from April 2013, and a second round of applications for 2015-2018 was undertaken in 2014; it also has relatively new leadership. From ArtWorks' perspective, working across three different policy contexts and seeking to engage these arts development and funding agencies has required different approaches; these are discussed further elsewhere in this report.

Local Authorities

It is worth noting that whilst local authorities have been working through the impacts of significant reductions in funding since the 2010 election, many of the most significant cuts have been scheduled for the 2015/16 financial year. Some legislative changes (e.g. Localism Act), as well as administrative practices involving privatising council services, mean that the structure of provision is changing significantly in some areas. Potentially there is more significant impact to come in the arts from local authorities funding cuts. These issues can vary substantially between different types of local authorities,

politically, in terms of their geographic type (e.g. urban or rural) and according to their national context (e.g. England, Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland).

Health and other settings

Significant structural changes in health, with new commissioning partnerships, mean that the way in which the arts may be funded in health settings has changed. Arts Council England has funded some work to support arts organisations to engage with health commissioning, and there are examples of individual organisations getting to grips with these changes. Similarly, criminal justice settings are also changing (particularly with the influx of private providers and contracting). It is worth noting that, whilst some practitioners and organisations may continue to do useful work, more generally there are challenges in developing sector-wide engagement, or broader discussions around standards and quality, where the structure of provision varies significantly.

The 'market'

Looking across this range of policy contexts, what is clear is that it is a complex and changing 'market' for arts practice in participatory settings, something which the report on interviews with artists (DHA, 2015) explored in some depth with artists reporting continuous upheaval in relationships with employers and commissioners. ArtWorks has not sought to directly engage with the question of growing or developing the market, but several interviewees did discuss this as a critical issue for the way in which practice develops and can develop in the future.

4.2 Governance, Staffing and Funding

The governance, staffing and funding structure for ArtWorks was outlined in the Interim Report. The following brief review is supplied for both context, and to update (where appropriate), on the material included in the Interim Report.

It is worth noting at this stage that ArtWorks is a 'special initiative', a type of funding which PHF has used as a way of engaging with a number of key issues in the arts and other areas over the last few years. Originally it was anticipated that ArtWorks would be funded in two substantial stages, with the second phase potentially receiving as much or slightly more funding than the first. The first phase, therefore, constituted the investment in the five Pathfinders for a little over three years each, as well as the associated programme of events, e-distribution, centrally commissioned research and publications undertaken by the ArtWorks team at PHF. Subsequently, however, PHF has reviewed and changed its funding approaches and is no longer pursuing the 'special initiative' model. The ongoing activity anticipated from ArtWorks is, therefore, a range of 'follow-on' activities with some small-scale funding from PHF, and the possibility of two projects which have applied through PHF open grants programme to take specific elements piloted or developed through ArtWorks forward.

Governance and Staffing

PHF has continued to run ArtWorks with a model which applies across most of its special initiatives, in which a Steering Group, comprising a range of independent members appointed for their expertise and a member or members who link the group to the relevant Programme Committee and/or Board of Trustees. In the case of ArtWorks, an advisory member of the Arts Programme Committee chairs the Steering Group. The current membership includes engagement from a range of funders, as well as senior individuals from the arts and cultural sector (including an artist) and higher education sector. The

Steering Group reports to the Arts Programme Committee, and through this Committee to the Board of Trustees.

The staffing model has been added to since the Interim Report, with the appointment of a Project Co-ordinator specifically for ArtWorks in order to provide some more significant administrative and project management support, and to release more of the Project Director's time for engaging strategically with the Pathfinders and planning outward-facing activities. The Project Director is an external consultant (a model used with other special initiatives). As we noted in the Interim Report, this model supplies ArtWorks with a clear champion for the work, but seeks to separate this champion to some extent from PHF's role as a funder. Such an approach suggests that PHF is keen to provide both leadership and direction in its special initiative, in an active way throughout the course of the initiative. Elsewhere in this report we discuss some of the challenges with this particular role.

Funding

A total budget of £1.47million was sought, and agreed by PHF's Trustees. At the same period additional partnership funding had been sought from a range of sources. The Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) committed £50k to support the research elements and the evaluation of the project. Arts Council England, through the Cultural Leadership Programme (CLP), committed £20k, and Creativity, Culture and Education (CCE) committed £500k. In total, these three provide a total of just under 30% of the overall funding pot.

Within this overall funding pot, £1,173,836 was committed to Pathfinder activity, and to support any development activities between stage 1 and 2 of the bidding process. Direct project costs, including a substantial development and commissioning fund, make up a further £380k, supporting activity across the initiative including communications and events. Support costs are at just over £330k, and the total evaluation budget at just over £150k. The addition of the CCE funding moved the overall number of Pathfinders who could be funded in this first phase from three or four to five.

Individual Pathfinders vary significantly in the direct funding they receive from the programme, and the way in which they match that funding, giving overall investment envelopes which are significantly different.

Creative Scotland received the largest amount of funding (£300k) from PHF, and provided the most significant match funding, reporting an overall project budget of £666,840, with £300k of cash and in kind match from Creative Scotland. The Barbican Guildhall received £266,130 from PHF, and provided match of £350,526 through their funded programme and research and development activities in the Creative Learning department. The University of Sunderland received £247,016 from PHF, and bid with an overall project cost of £630,309, accounting for the match through time dedicated from staff at the University (c. £105k) and across the different Pathfinder partners (c. £142k). Navigator received £181,500 from PHF, which was matched with £202,050 from staff time across the partners and some existing, relevant programme delivery, for a total budget of £432,000. Welsh National Opera received £179,010, matched by £176,977 from staff time and programming for a total budget of £357,710.

The significant size of both Creative Scotland and the Barbican Guildhall, in drawing on direct cash/activity match is reflected to some extent in the volume of outputs from both across the Pathfinder programme.

4.3 What is ArtWorks for?

In the first year of the Evaluation we asked interviewees to talk about what they felt the purpose(s) of ArtWorks was, and what they thought it was and should be trying to achieve. Some respondents expressed this at a 'meta' level, connecting any intervention with the ultimate benefit of better experiences and outcomes for participants. Others were less specific, seeing it as an intervention into arts practice in participatory settings, but with no particular view about the site of benefit. Several respondents discussed the timeliness of the initiative, in terms of the development of the practice, though some also raised some complex questions about the ownership of the initiative and whether solutions would be imposed or encouraged on the sector. Most respondents saw ArtWorks as trying to work across different parts of 'the system', and many sought to be realistic about the extent to which they felt change could be instigated.

When we asked a similar question in years 2 and 3 interviews, respondents largely talked about the activity they were doing (in the case of Pathfinders, particularly). However, some also discussed the overall purpose of ArtWorks. On the whole, as the initiative has progressed, descriptions have become more tightly focused on the idea that ArtWorks is an intervention in workforce development (rather than a broader intervention in the whole area of art in participatory settings), which (it is anticipated) then goes on to benefit the participant:

'the connection with the life-long learning continuum or the quality of an artist's work has an immediate impact on the participants and therefore the quality of work of art is much louder and clearer.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'Deconstructing the key area about giving artists and practitioners working in that area of social engaged practice – just trying to make them more effective and also working with the people who engage artists from that context, to support them and to think about why they would engage artists.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

When Pathfinder Partners/Associates were interviewed, some did focus on different things, such as: how participatory practice might be conceptualised; validating the practice, or giving it status; raising the profile/voice of the work and of artists; and bringing different bits of 'the system' together to consider how practice works/should develop. Several, however, did also discuss: skills development; sharing knowledge between artists and other practitioners; raising the standards of artists' practice; and 'professionalising' the practice.

Some interviewees also reflected on who the beneficiaries or owners of the initiative would be.

'... what was delightful for me was that sometimes, artists, by the nature of being artists can be lonely characters and sometimes the artist's role tends to be unsupported or that there isn't anyone looking out for them. So for me it was delightful that the initiative was seeking to close the gap and help artists in participatory settings.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

The focus on engaging with artists and groups of artists was common to the majority of responses, even where interviewees discussed other groups (e.g. participants, training providers or others). When different interviewees discussed the purpose of the project, some also focused upon the types of activities which were planned or being undertaken. A few saw the project primarily as a research project – finding things out – and others focused on activities which were being tried out.

A few respondents discussed the scale of ambition which ArtWorks has outlined, and some raised interesting questions about whether the objectives could be achieved, and what kinds of solutions could be expected. Some respondents focused on the challenges of bringing a wide range of people together, and how feasible it would be to seek solutions from a relatively complex initiative structure. One interviewee went further, and reflected upon the inception of the project as follows:

‘I think [ArtWorks] was looking for the silver bullet you know – you would find this thing and it would answer these questions – that’s what I think it was aiming to do. To try and have a definitive single portal for practice that would do that.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

The question of single, coherent solutions also came up in later discussions with interviewees about outcomes and next steps; these responses are discussed further later in this report. Finally, a few respondents referred specifically to the current policy and investment context within which arts practice in participatory settings is currently taking place:


‘I think also, as a by-product, that in a very difficult climate where things were being cut and this kind of work is lower down the agenda than it used to be, I think it has kept this very important area of work on the agenda.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

Outputs and Outcomes

The following illustration from the artists' survey shows the different settings where artists report undertaking most of their work.

Settings for community, participatory and socially-engaged work

Thinking about the different settings in which you undertake community, participatory or socially-engage work, please select the setting in which you undertake the most work.



Base: 999

Source: DHA

5 Outputs and Outcomes

5.1 Outputs and Outcomes against the Framework

This section presents the first of the four models of analysis. The following pages show the current and planned outputs from the five Pathfinders against the six outcomes identified by PHF for the ArtWorks initiative. This model should be considered alongside the following commentary below.

This commentary looks at each outcome area and then offers some general observations across the programme.

Outcome 1 - Artists are more confident and articulate about their work in participatory settings

The initial research and consultation phase of ArtWorks made it clear that there was a desire to foreground the artist and the artist's practice in the enquiry model. This has been understood across the Pathfinders, and subsequently this has been a significant facet of each of the Pathfinders enquiries. All of the Pathfinders have set up dedicated consultation models with artists, though the research approach varies significantly (discussed in the commentary on activity clusters). Consultation has covered a wide range of topics, from career paths to enquiries into quality.

Following these consultations, several Pathfinders have involved artists in designing and testing support models. Navigator has engaged artists with the development of the Code of Practice and CPD credits system. In the case of London, Labs have been led and participated in by different artists. The Fellowship is a bespoke model for the artist who has currently piloted it completely. The Trinity Laban and Entelechy pilots, and the Open School East have all involved artists in both the development of the CPD and in receiving and giving feedback on the CPD experience. In the case of Open School East, specific mentoring support has been given to those practitioners leading the development of the School; within the model, artists are also encouraged to design their own support programmes.

In the case of Scotland, artists have led significantly on the development of the Peer to Peer Networks – they are, effectively, owned by their members. Individually, some of these networks almost stand alone as small ArtWorks action research projects in their own right. There is also evidence of practitioners being involved in designing and supporting the HE/FE pilots, for example. The North East has involved artists in the delivery of short courses, as well as in participating and feeding back on them. Cymru engaged artists in their Action Learning groups.

Across the Pathfinders, there have also been a range of networks and platforms/events which have involved artists. A real emphasis on reflective approaches through events has been a particular focus of a number of these opportunities, and it is worth noting the particular role which such opportunities can play in:

- Framing the practice as serious and, potentially, locating it within a critical discourse with practitioner peers
- Raising the profile of the practice itself
- Validating the practice through this framing and profile.

Perhaps equally important in these models is not only the opportunity for artists to engage with other artists, but also for other individuals in the 'system' – e.g. project managers, policy-makers and others – to be seen to be recognising and respecting these articulations of practice.

More generally, the range of feedback gained across different models and approaches suggests broadly that artists have felt better supported as a result of the range of different interventions which have taken place. The process of consulting artists, exploring their needs and involving them in developing responses is itself felt to be valuable in several examples. Scotland has been notable for the quality and focus of feedback gained following conferences and through the pilot projects and Peer to Peer networks, in terms of relating the benefits back to the intended outcomes. Other Pathfinders and individual projects have also collected thorough feedback (for example, the North East has detailed reflections and future actions/amendments for the Short Courses; London gained a range of feedback on the Lab models).

Outcome 2 – Participants are benefitting from enhanced quality experiences of engaging in arts-led activity

In the context of a three-year (plus) intervention, understanding the possible effects on participants of 'better supported' artists is a complex issue. None of the individual Pathfinders had designed an intervention which sought to compare practice undertaken by less well supported artists with those who are better supported. What can be confirmed, at this stage, is that ArtWorks undertook a range of activity (much of it piloted) which supported and developed artists to a greater or lesser extent. Those artists are working, practising artists – and so we can assume that some participants will have benefited to some extent from any 'improvement' in practice which artists may have achieved as a result of that support and development.

In terms of the direct involvement of participants, some work has been undertaken which explores the nature of participants' experiences by proxy, i.e. through consultations with artists about their practice and through reviews of existing work. As noted in the Interim Evaluation Report, this sometimes reflects the sphere of operation for some Pathfinders; for example, most of the Navigator partners work directly with artists, but fewer of them undertake any work directly with participants.

Both ArtWorks London and ArtWorks Cymru have included projects taking place in participatory settings as sites of intervention/influence for their Pathfinders. ArtWorks Cymru included an explicit element of research with participants as part of their activities, and subsequently undertook a consultation/testing of a reflective learning model through Action Learning Groups attached to specific projects. The case studies for the projects (on the whole) focus more on the outcomes of the projects and the choices of the artists and other staff, rather than on the Action Learning process itself. ArtWorks London has consistently referred to a range of projects (and the evaluations from those projects) taking place within the Creative Learning department, and as such as regular engagement with a breadth of participants.

An interesting model which takes the role of the participant one step further has been the involvement of older people in the Trinity Laban project, which has developed and tested CPD approaches for artists working with older people. Whilst this is not a model transferable to all potential participant groups, it has come the closest to providing a consideration of specific practice from the perspective of *all* stakeholders.

It remains the case, therefore, that ArtWorks has not demonstrated that better supported artists result in better practice; however, as noted above, better supported artists feel that their practice is/could be better. Whether it would have been feasible to test this within the scope of ArtWorks is questionable: creating some kind of laboratory conditions for comparing the improved practice of an artist who has

received support, against an artist who has not received support, would probably have been difficult to design in research terms. Furthermore, this assumes that a single support intervention might be enough to make a difference – this seems unlikely, particularly where short courses or relatively small interventions are involved. Finally, there would always have been an issue with confirming the ‘improvement’ of the artist from the participants’ perspective. Projects like the Trinity Laban project (as noted above) have come closest to involving participants in discussions about what might make better practice.

Outcome 3 – Artists, employers and participants share a better understanding of what constitutes quality and value in the work

Questions of quality – what it is, and how to articulate it and promote it – have been key areas of enquiry for some of the Pathfinders. Within the context of the overall ArtWorks Cymru Pathfinder, the partners worked together to produce a model of quality which is included in the evaluation (Jackson, 2014a), which has emerged particularly out of reflecting upon the projects selected for Action Learning Groups. ArtWorks Scotland specifically sought to consult with artists on the question of quality, and developed and tested a series of ‘quality factors’ with both artists, and latterly with other partners including employers and commissioners.

Beyond these focused enquiries, consultations with other groups have concerned themselves with issues of quality. This has not always been straightforward. Cymru and London tried out an approach with participants involving a survey which looked at, amongst other things, how participants might understand quality. The research was not wholly successful, partly due to the survey approach not being suitable for some groups of participants, but also because the survey design sought very directly to ask participants to make judgements about issues which were framed in a way which might not necessarily be relevant to participants.

As already noted, some projects have succeeded in bringing together perspectives from a real range of stakeholders; approaches like Connecting Conversations (London), Critical Conversations (North East) and the visual arts Artists Lab (Navigator) have provided spaces for dialogue between artists and other groups, including project managers and staff who direct and design programmes involving arts in participatory settings. It remains the case, though, that the majority of work in this area has focused on artists and their understanding of quality.

An ongoing challenge with quality has been the question of whether there needs to be a coherent ‘answer’ to this problem (an issue raised in the Interim Report, but worth repeating here). Pathfinders have not always found it easy to determine where the question of quality sits: should they solve it, or are discussions of quality about informing models for improved support. Creative Scotland’s work on quality factors and subsequent Quality Guidance is the first attempt to really codify the learning in this area, and the way in which this continues to develop and is applied is perhaps the clearest test case of whether ArtWorks has contributed significantly in this area.

Outcome 4 – Clear models of good practice are shared, disseminated and replicated

Several Pathfinders began with undertaking some formal or informal mapping and auditing of existing models for supporting artists who work in participatory settings, with several using their own programmes of activity as a starting point (e.g. Navigator). Formal assessments of existing training provision through the Consilium research for England (commissioned by PHF) and Scotland

(commissioned by ArtWorks Scotland) has been supplemented by an assessment of Wales (undertaken by ArtWorks Cymru). The North East began with an assessment of the state of participatory practice, which has gained some profile as a standalone piece of work. Two Pathfinders (Navigator and London) produced bibliographies too. PHF centrally commissioned a review of international practice.

More generally, it is worth noting that there are several examples of Pathfinders beginning development of support through use of existing models. The North East used a Peer Mentoring methodology already familiar to one partner as a consultation exercise; subsequently the Short Courses seek to bring together training experiences and standards from HEIs and from less formal environments together to build a model. Navigator has largely sought to extend its reach through ArtWorks, rather than do radically new or different activity; for example, through the application of the NOS to a wider artform group. Scotland worked with Scottish Mentoring Network to develop mentoring pilots and a thematic network, building on existing knowledge and experiences (though with individual pilots finding their own approaches to applying this). London has built upon existing Labs models and qualifications (the MMus) as a route to developing new programmes, or informing broader approaches.

Pathfinders have also used models which are new to them or, arguably, undertaken work in a way which is relatively new to the development of practice in this sector. Some of the 'newness' potentially relates to the ways in which models have been developed (e.g. the Symposium element of the Trinity Laban project, with the involvement of participants); in other cases, solutions are doing something which other existing models don't do. The principle for the new Barbican Guildhall BA is to provide a course not currently provided in the HE market.

In terms of the dissemination and continuation of models, there are a number of clear outputs and issues in this area:

- Some models (e.g. the London Labs, the Scotland HE/FE placements, the North East careers event) have an ongoing commitment from the site of influence/hosting organisation, and are relatively limited in terms of the resource implications for continuation;
- Some models are committed to, and will continue/evolve as they are tested and applied (e.g. the Code of Practice from Navigator, and the BA from London);
- Some models specifically require further resources for wider testing (e.g. the Fellowship for London);
- Some models may continue only where individual opportunities occur for continuation (e.g. the Short Courses in the North East, the take up of mentoring activities in Scotland), though the knowledge, learning and tools from the Pathfinders models are available and have been disseminated;
- Other models have no specific plans for continuation (e.g. the Action Learning groups for Cymru).

One of the key findings from ArtWorks is the range of models which are suitable and do work for artists. In part, of course, this reflects the variety of needs which different artists have. As such, this is not a failure of the programme; however, it raises some issues about the legacy of the programme. Should models continue to be promoted only by individual partners/Pathfinders, as the 'market' determines which should succeed, or are there models which need to be positioned and promoted to the exclusion of other models (or potential others)? Or, alternatively, is there a bigger issue about whether models will simply stop being used and tested if no-one is underwriting the costs of engaging with them?

These are some of the issues which legacy projects from ArtWorks and the Fellowship and ArtWorks Alliance proposals will need to consider in the future.

Outcome 5 – A more effective infrastructure for the training and development of artists at all stages of their careers has been developed across the UK

At this stage, Pathfinders are able to evidence significant interventions into various parts of the ‘system’. For example, through the Barbican Guildhall there will be new degrees; through the University of Sunderland a combined model of short courses and learning materials; through Scotland a range of placements in HE/FE environments. The degree to which this, for example, constitutes a more effective training and development infrastructure could be considered through the following questions:

- What commitment is there to take these interventions forward?
- Who will these interventions effect in the first instance?
- What is the likelihood of them having an impact upon other providers, or more widely?

At present, there are some commitments to pursuing particular models (discussed in the commentary on Outcome 4); in the first instance, these interventions will largely effect particular cohorts of students/artists. The potential wider impact cannot be judged at present but (for example) take-up and usage of the Scotland placement guidance could be an indicator of wider impact.

Beyond this sited models, there are some other interventions which specifically seek to intervene across larger parts of the system. The Navigator work on qualifications and standards, including the Code of Practice and CPD credits system, is potentially significant for the ways in which artists develop their practice, and for the ways in which employers, commissioners, funders and policy-makers understand the practice and practitioners, and engage with practitioners. The degree of impact may depend significantly on the positioning of these tools with key partners (including funding and policy-making agencies) and upon strong dissemination and take-up to and by artists.

Creative Scotland’s work on quality, and more generally its ongoing commitment as a funding body, is also an important test case given the potential reach as a funding body. There are positive signs in the use of the Quality Guidance in recent funding decision-making processes, and more generally in the engagement with ArtWorks findings and outputs in the conceptualisation of activity within the funding body and the development of new strategic approaches. Cymru has an opportunity to learn from this and explore similar possibilities through their legacy project, particularly given the significant involvement from Arts Council Wales.

More broadly, it is important to note that ArtWorks has been seeking to instigate change at a time when policy agendas are crowded, and resources are limited. The difficulty of engaging Arts Council England directly in ArtWorks has been a challenge throughout the project, and there is still work to do to identify whether there is any ongoing strategic impact which ArtWorks can achieve through Arts Council England. At times, ArtWorks has struggled to produce an articulation of what it is doing which provides sufficient clarity for other potential stakeholders. This relates, to some extent, to the ‘action research’ nature of the work; however, for all the legacy and ongoing projects, sharpening the focus and articulation of objectives will be key if other significant parts of the ‘system’ are to be brought on board.

Outcome 6 – There is more partnership working across funding agencies, public bodies and policy makers


Approaches to partnership working vary significantly across the different Pathfinders, and are discussed in more detail in section 5.4 of this report. Whilst there are a range of examples of partnership working, given the breadth of different parts of the ‘system’ and the ambition stated within this outcome of engagement across major agencies, it is perhaps more suitable to think of collaborative working in its broadest sense. On this basis, we could argue that the input from Navigator into consultation processes run by Arts Council England, Creative and Cultural Skills and others on quality framework, qualifications and standards is a clear contribution towards collaborative working between major agencies and the wider sector.

Pathfinders have, in some cases, mapped activity as a basis for working across different partners and parts of the system. There are individual examples of different kinds of relationships emerging: the evaluation report for ArtWorks London (Jackson, 2014b) notes that the Trinity Laban project (part of ArtWorks London) represents a good example of a project in which Trinity Laban, as the partner, was trusted to take a lead on designing and running their own project. In a different way, ArtWorks Scotland has involved Creative Scotland in funding projects in a different way, setting broad parameters and providing funding support for individual pilots to explore things in their own ways.

Commentary on Outcome 5 has already discussed more broadly the engagement with different funding bodies, and those issues apply when we consider how funding bodies and policy-making agencies have engaged with ArtWorks. There remains an ongoing issue about the relationship between ArtWorks and the policy agenda at Arts Council England; this should be a key area of focus in the dissemination of learning from the three years of the Pathfinders, and for any legacy and ongoing activity.

The following tables map out the Pathfinders’ activity against the intervention model.

Intervention Model showing Pathfinder activity



Outputs	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	Use artists with developed skills to deliver enhanced quality in piloting activity	Explore and reflect upon skills, knowledge and understanding required in different circumstances, and feed this into design of opportunities for training and CPD	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	Participants are benefitting from enhanced quality experiences of engaging in arts-led activity
	Navigator: existing ongoing activity taking place across the partners; development of NOS for wider disciplinary groups; building on existing knowledge through the Bibliography.	Navigator: Not being pursued in this Pathfinder directly	Navigator: Possible opportunities to influence HE/FE providers, or through membership-delivered CPD activities.	Navigator: Possible route for dissemination of findings from other Pathfinders	
	London: Indirectly through Labs models; range of arts activities in participatory settings to draw learning from; ICA project; Fellowship reflection; building on existing knowledge through the Bibliography. Older People project specifically included participants.	London: Several artists who experienced various CPD are working with Barbican Guildhall in the future, but no specific 'testing' of enhanced impact from improved skills.	London: Young Arts Academy (building on Unleashed); development of MMus to be cross-art form; development of new BA; extension of Fellowship; Older People project and Entelechy.	London: through Trinity Laban, Entelechy and Open School East, beginning to engage partners outside Barbican Guildhall. The development of the Fellowship will be key in involving more partners.	
	Scotland: Indirectly through Peer Networks; quality factors research.	Scotland: Indirectly through Peer Networks, though no specific 'testing' of enhanced impact. HE/FE pilots demonstrate students' undertaking worthwhile projects with new skills.	Scotland: Indirectly through consultation work and Peer Networks; and annual conference/event; explored in part through placements and Creative Learning Networks also.	Scotland: Peer Networks; annual conference/event; placement guidance; mentoring guidance and network; Quality Guidance from Creative Scotland; plans for online engagement.	
	North East: Indirectly through Peer-Assisted Learning project; through Critical Conversations and Focus Groups; and through Audit of Participatory Arts Practice	North East: Cultural Spring engagement with Short Courses will support this; Creative Ageing Network may also support this.	North East: Short Course design reflects this; Learning Materials also; Creative Ageing Network and PALS reflect learning too.	North East: Conference provided opportunity for dissemination; further partnership plans look positive, including themed lunches.	
	Cymru: Directly through Participants Research and Action Learning Projects.	Cymru: the Action Learning Projects are testing a model of reflection in an applied setting, but no 'before and after' assessment was involved for the artists.	Cymru: Significant opportunity still to think about the future use of the Action Learning model.	Cymru: final Conference provided a platform for sharing learning.	

Outputs	Map existing evidence about quality and value, and support discussion across artists, employers and participants about it	Support testing of better understanding through developing/piloting activity, and capturing the learning from this	Apply this understanding to the design and embedding of opportunities for training and CPD for artists at all stages of their career	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	Artists, employers and participants share a better understanding of what constitutes quality and value in the work
	Navigator: Bibliography; Artists Labs; assessment of NOS and other accreditation options; mapping of existing codes of practice. NB. significant emphasis on artists' experiences.	Navigator: application of NOS to wider disciplinary group. NB significant emphasis on artists, though NOS/other qualifications and standards work may help to widen engagement with employers.	Navigator: development of Code of Practice and feasibility on CPD credits; work on NOS and qualifications. Ongoing discussions re. CPD offer. NB significant emphasis on artists.	Navigator: dissemination through membership and events, as well as ongoing work with employers and funders. NB significant emphasis on artists.	
	London: Bibliography; Connecting Conversations; Trinity Laban Symposium; Entelechy Learning Group. NB significant emphasis on artists and producers, less so employers. Some small involvement from participants.	London: Labs model; cross-arts CPD; Trinity Laban and Entelechy pilots; ICA pilot; Open School East; NB significant emphasis on artists and producers.	London: long-term application of Labs models; development of BA and MMus; ongoing discussions for Trinity Laban on CPD re working with Older People; Fellowship extension; Young Arts Academy; Open School East.	London: through Trinity Laban, Entelechy and Open School East, beginning to engage partners outside Barbican Guildhall. The development of the Fellowship will be key in involving more partners. The potential success of the BA will also be important positioning.	
	Scotland: Skillset study; work on quality factors. NB significant emphasis on artists and training providers	Scotland: Peer Networks as a model of CPD; HE/FE pilots, mentoring pilots and Creative Learning Networks. NB current emphasis has been on artists and training providers	Scotland: range of CPD guidance in place; ongoing role of Peer Networks; development of quality factors into Guidance, and application of guidance.	Scotland: Peer networks; annual conference/event; further application of the Quality Guidance will be particularly significant in this area.	
	North East: Audit of participatory arts practice; Critical Conversations; Focus Groups. NB Significant emphasis on artists, artforms and settings	North East: testing of short courses and learning materials framework, and continuation of Critical Conversations.	North East: long-term solution for course design and resources framework. Advocacy to QAA on inclusion in degree courses.	North East: Extension of short courses testing and careers project are positive; future role perhaps in advocating more through QAA/other HE routes.	
	Cymru: Participants Research, Artists Consultations/Case Studies. NB. NB attempt to engage with all stakeholders for quality, though employers/commissioners research is limited.	Cymru: Action Learning Groups tests a model of reflection.	Cymru: Possible opportunities for Action Learning model as a long-term CPD model for artists.	Cymru: Significant opportunity to think about the future use of the Action Learning model; end of project Conference; ongoing opportunities with a widened network for the legacy phase.	

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	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
	Navigator: Use of NOS; snapshot of existing training; Codes of Practice review; Bibliography.	Navigator: Application of NOS to wider disciplinary group; range of other qualifications contributed to; development of Code of Practice; feasibility on CPD credits system.	Navigator: application of Code of Practice and CPD credits (to happen); plans for future CPD development. Potential portal.	Navigator: Significant dissemination through partners and members thus far; ArtWorks Alliance will be a key route if funded for the future.	
	London: Bibliography; Lab models; Entelechy Learning Review; Trinity Laban Symposium; AND consultations; Connecting Conversations.	London: Lab models testing; Entelechy and Trinity Laban CPD pilots; Connecting Conversations continuation; Open School East; Fellowship; ICA pilot.	London: long-term application of Labs models; development of BA and MMus; ongoing discussions for Trinity Laban on CPD re working with Older People; Fellowship extension; Young Arts Academy; Open School East.	London: range of partners now involved; development of Fellowship is crucial; as is take-up of BA and new MA, when brought on.	
	Scotland: Skillset research, events and annual conference, work with Scottish Mentoring Network, placements event.	Scotland: HE/FE Placements; mentoring pilots; Creative Learning Network pilots.	Scotland: Development of mentoring guidance and thematic network; development of placements guidance.	Scotland: Opportunities through annual conference and events. Long-term use of Quality guidance and possible online community will be important.	
	North East: Audit of participatory arts practice	North East: development of short courses and learning materials framework; continuation of Critical Conversations; Careers Event and materials.	North East: Careers Event to be repeated; short courses being used again; ongoing question re. learning materials/website; Creative Ageing Network and PALS development both later pilots.	North East: Long-term use of course design and learning materials framework currently not determined; ongoing range of events and Network/PALS projects.	
	Cymru: Training Audit	Cymru: Action Learning Projects.	Cymru: Possible long-term application of Action Learning model.	Cymru: End of project conference. Involvement from Arts Council Wales and wider group of partners for legacy activity is particularly positive in taking the learning forwards.	

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
	Navigator: mapping codes of practice; work on NOS and qualifications; snapshot of existing CPD.	Navigator: development of Code of Practice and feasibility on CPD credits; support for development of new qualifications and standards.	Navigator: potential application of Code of Practice and CPD credit system; potential collaborative CPD offer.	Navigator: dissemination of existing activities through membership routes; significant opportunity with ArtWorks Alliance to go further.	
	London: Connecting Conversations; Lab feedback; AND consultations.	London: Labs model; cross-arts CPD; Trinity Laban and Entelechy pilots; ICA pilot; Open School East.	London: development of BA and MMus; Fellowship extension; Young Arts Academy; Open School East.	London: range of partners now involved; development of Fellowship is crucial; as is take-up of BA and new MA, when brought on.	
	Scotland: Skillset research	Scotland: range of pilot projects with different parts of the infrastructure (training providers, arts organisations, artists).	Scotland: mentoring guidance and network in place; placement guidance in plans, and individual plans to continue; future plans to produce guidance on Creative Learning networks; future of Peer to Peer Networks.	Scotland: Opportunities through annual conference and events. Long-term use of Quality guidance Useful questions for Scotland about how they ensure the take-up of guidance in the longer-term.	
	North East: Audit of participatory arts practice	North East: development of short courses and learning materials framework; continuation of Critical Conversations; Careers Event and materials.	North East: Careers Event to be repeated; short courses being used again; ongoing question re. learning materials/website; Creative Ageing Network and PALS development both later pilots, which could offer interesting training/development solutions.	North East: Long-term use of course design and learning materials framework currently not determined; ongoing range of events and Network/PALS projects.	
	Cymru: Training Audit; mapping of Codes of Practice.	Cymru: Action Learning Model; some HE/FE discussions.	Cymru: will need to emerge from the renewed/extended partnership, and engagement with Arts Council Wales.	Cymru: Conference; and through the new, extended partnership and ACW engagement.	

Outputs	Map and assess existing partnership working/common areas of activity/interest/understanding	Solicit and support partnership working through pathfinders, 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
	Navigator: Snapshot of training; ongoing sharing of activities.	Navigator: range of influence exerted through existing strengths.	Navigator: development of ArtWorks Alliance proposition. Input into other Pathfinders events. Used other Pathfinders for consultation.	Navigator: development of ArtWorks Alliance proposition.	
	London: Connecting Conversations	London: AHRC-funded CDA with Royal Holloway; work with Open School East, Entelechy, Trinity Laban and ICA offers a range of approaches.	London: Will depend how some of these partnership projects develop in the future. Engaged with other Pathfinders through events and Fellowship development.	London: No specific plans, but work generally towards an ongoing community of practice.	
	Scotland: Skillset research	Scotland: development of funding partnerships with range of HE/FE providers, arts organisations and learning settings. New approaches for Creative Scotland as a funder.	Scotland: engagement with other Pathfinders through events and quality factors; future of local partnerships unclear.	Scotland: Events and annual conference; significant opportunities to disseminate to and influence the sector in the future, and to continue to 'fund differently'.	
	North East: Audit of participatory arts practice; Focus Groups; Critical Conversations.	North East: Short Courses included different kinds of delivery; more recently the themed lunches and later pilots are exploring different approaches.	North East: May depend on long-term solution for course design and resources framework; worked with other Pathfinders on QAA, and engagement in other events.	North East: Final conference gave a significant route for dissemination; ongoing development of later pilots also significant.	
	Cymru: Training Audit	Cymru: engagement of partners through consultation/research, Action Learning Groups and final event.	Cymru: positive expansion of partnership and involvement from ACW going forwards; engaged with other Pathfinders events, and lead on bringing together learning models.	Cymru: final Conference provided a platform for sharing learning; future depends on the wider partnership and Arts Council Wales building on learning from the first three years.	

5.2 Overview

Looking at progress towards the different outcomes, there are a number of things which are worth noting:

- It is worth stating again the original proposal for ArtWorks anticipated a second phase of major activity; following PHF's revised approaches to funding, this plan was no longer in place. However, the proposed outcomes for ArtWorks were not revised as a result of this shortened horizon. As such, it is reasonable to assume that the Pathfinders would make progress towards the outcomes, but that it was not feasible to assume that any of them would be achieved in any complete or final way.
- Whilst Pathfinders have built upon work from the first year, engaging both participants and employers/commissioners, it remains the case that the most significant body of knowledge within ArtWorks comes from artists. The strength of engagement with artists reflects the original intentions for ArtWorks to involve artists in the process of considering and developing better support, and so is itself a successful contribution towards those original intentions. However, the challenges of engaging with other groups mean that there is still, potentially, work to do to involve a range of stakeholders.
- Within this range of stakeholders, Pathfinder partners have undertaken some work relating to commissioners from particular sectors (e.g. the North East's Creative Ageing Network project, Trinity Laban with Older People, and early discussions between Navigator and Skills for Care). These are positive examples of how non-cultural commissioners can be engaged. There is still, however, work which may be required in this area to ensure that the range of settings within which artists operate is reflected in some of the models and solutions which Pathfinders have pursued.
- It would be valuable going forwards for any legacy projects and ongoing activity to consider if or where evidence might be considered about the effects of better support for artists. There are no current plans for longitudinal evaluation of individuals who have received support from the ArtWorks programme. Nor has there been any testing of 'before' and 'after' delivery by artists, to understand whether better support makes for better practice, and subsequently better experiences for participants. To some extent, this benefit may always need to be validated by artists, rather than by participants.

Projects in this area are often still too short to enable any intervention in artist support to be felt and captured. In addition, the problem which Cymru and London faced in designing their participant research is a significant one. How reasonable is it to expect participants to judge 'quality' in terms understood by practitioners and administrators, and how sensible is it to require comparison (either between different practitioners, or between the same practitioners at different stages). There is no easy solution to this, but potentially there is still a need to make the case for investment in artists' development. This case ultimately, for most funders, relies on the principle of better outcomes for the investment offered.

As noted in the Interim Evaluation Report, the actual and potential future beneficiaries of ArtWorks could be conceived of in two stages:

Activity	First-stage beneficiary	Second-stage beneficiary
Arts activity taking place in participatory settings	Artists, some employers	Participant, wider employers and commissioners group
Partnerships and infrastructure development	Pathfinder partnerships, and immediate areas of influence	Wider infrastructure for support, and for delivery of arts activity in participatory settings

Section 5.4. looks at these sites of influence in greater detail, but it is perhaps valuable at this stage to offer a brief comment on the idea of ‘systemic change’ which ArtWorks has sought to effect. Pathfinders have made specific and conscious efforts to engage with different parts of ‘system’, including:

- Artists/practitioners – those delivering work in participatory settings directly.
- Participants – those ‘receiving’ work in participatory settings.
- Arts organisations, as employers, commissioners, training providers, co-designers and co-deliverers of this work.
- Umbrella/member organisations, as representatives of artists/practitioners, and as employers, commissioners, training providers, co-designers and co-deliverers of this work.
- Other employers and commissioners.
- Higher Education Institutions and FE colleges, as training providers and (to some extent) as sources of expertise about the practice itself.
- Policy-makers and funders.

The different roles of individuals and organisations are discussed further in section 5.4, but it is worth here discussing a few key things about the way in which a ‘system’ has been intervened in:

- As such, the system here is extremely broad and diverse, from major agencies and organisations to significant numbers of individual practitioners.
- It also includes several parts of institutions: departments within arts organisations and HEIs.
- More than this: it is often held together by individuals, rather than bigger units. For example, relevant HEI courses, and run and championed by a single member of staff with external teaching support; many organisations specialising in work in this area have extremely small staff numbers.
- Artists and practitioners are not, however, only on the outside of organisations and institutions. Some run organisations of their own; others are staff members (at least part time) in organisations; HEIs have practitioners or ex-practitioners on staff.
- Different parts of the system bring different criteria and language to the table; accommodating this can be difficult. As the Evaluation Survey and other consultations show, whilst there are similarities between artists’ needs in different artforms, there are also differences.

Given this range of challenges and opportunities, ArtWorks can be said to have intervened at several places within the system; but ‘systemic change’ will be the test of take-up and engagement outside the Pathfinders themselves. There remain significant challenges in articulating and disseminating the learning from ArtWorks, and in formulating a proposition for ‘systemic change’ – identifying what it is

that ArtWorks partners want other actors in the system to do. The range of models and solutions from ArtWorks, whilst an appropriate response to consultation with artists, provides a very practical issue in making recommendations to the sector.


Over the last couple of years the ArtWorks team in PHF has been working, supported by some external communications and copy-writing consultancy, to develop a range of external communications from ArtWorks, including e-bulletins and, more recently, regular 'briefings' which have served to 'launch' published outputs from ArtWorks, raised specific issues and addressed particular communities. This ongoing process of attempting to extrapolate key messages and requests for the wider sector, and articulate them, has been a key challenge for ArtWorks for several of the reasons noted above. As part of this ongoing process, a series of final events is planned in Spring 2015, with supporting publications, as a way of consolidating both the final learning and seeking to extend the influence of the programme over a wider group of potential stakeholders in 'the system'.

Size and Scale

The following illustration from the artists' survey looks at artists experiences of multiple settings.

Experience in different settings

Thinking about your practice community, participatory or socially-engaged settings, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?



Base: 999
Source: DHA

Strongly agree Tend to agree

6 Size and Scale

The Pathfinders supply a range of quantitative data on a quarterly basis. The format of these reports was revised twice in the early part of the second year of the Pathfinders' activities, following a process of discussion/workshopping with the Evaluation Team and the Pathfinders. Developing reliable metrics has been a challenge, partly because the projects were driven primarily by an action research process, rather than an agreed set of outputs; in counting outputs, therefore, we needed to understand what we thought this information could tell us. In addition, potential 'double-counting' of people participating (particularly artists) reflects the way in which several Pathfinders ran multiple discreet activities within their programme. Working with the Evaluation team, Pathfinders have been able in some cases to remove issues of duplication, or to differentiate more clearly where activity is strictly funded by ArtWorks or (potentially) part of existing, wider programmes.

This data has been most useful in general terms to indicate the range and reach of activities which Pathfinders are undertaking. The full range of quantitative data is therefore not presented here, but rather used selectively to illustrate commentary on different areas of activity.

Activity for which data was collected widely and fairly comprehensively across Pathfinders includes:

- Activity which focus on networking or open events
- Consultation activities
- Professional development and training activities
- Commissioned artwork and arts activity taking place in participatory settings
- Activities undertaken by the core team and partners – meetings, attendance at conferences or other kinds of events, research time
- Some general information about participants external to the Pathfinders, including artists' career stage and artform, and a broad indication of other kinds of participants.

Networking, Events and Online Communities

Pathfinders have run a range of activities to build contacts and communities, raise the profile of ArtWorks and specifically to support artists and practitioners in networking and sharing practice. 84 network events/sessions and 224 seminars/conferences/symposia are reported across the second and third years of Pathfinder activities. ArtWorks Scotland's Peer to Peer Networks are reflected in these figures; activity by these networks could also be understood as 'informal professional development', given the ways in which this project provided the opportunity for artists to benefit from peer support.

This significant number of events (seminars, symposiums, conferences) reported across the Pathfinders reflects a real emphasis on widening out discussions which took place within individual partnerships in the first year. It also appears to reflect a real sense of need: the importance of opportunities for artists and other stakeholders involved in this kind of practice to get together came through strongly in the survey and interviews undertaken as part of the evaluation, and in the attendance at ArtWorks-wide events. Pathfinders report significant numbers of artists being involved in the delivery of events (283), as well as taking part (1,092); more than 2,000 other participants (e.g. HE/FE staff, employers/commissioners, etc.) in events were also reported.

Separately, the PHF team for ArtWorks has calculated 74 public events run across the Pathfinders and the PHF ArtWorks team, including a two-day conference and a full-day seminar a year on from the conference. These events brought estimated attendance of just less than 2,500.

Beyond face to face engagement, ArtWorks Pathfinders have used a number of existing routes for digital engagement; some have also sought to develop online communities. ArtWorks Scotland runs a LinkedIn group; ArtWorks Cymru have been particularly active on both Facebook and Twitter. The size of engagement across these groups is not currently huge, but given the competition through social media, they suggest that the focus of respective ArtWorks groupings has provided something useful and particular for participants. In terms of digital outputs, it is also worth noting the Vimeo content produced by ArtWorks Cymru. ArtWorks Navigator partners also reported using e-bulletins and existing websites to reach artists with ArtWorks related content. In addition, ArtWorks North East produced a new online resource (website) with curated content and potential teaching/learning pathways as part of their Pathfinder outputs.

Consultation activities

As with the first year of ArtWorks activities, a significant range of formal consultation processes have been undertaken across the Pathfinders, with 102 face-to-face sessions, 9 digital consultations and 68 'phone consultations being reported. Included in this second and third year of the Pathfinder are the Artists Labs (consultation sessions/focus groups) run by ArtWorks Navigator, for example. Some activities built on previous models (e.g. ArtWorks London Connecting Conversations), which have become strands of ongoing activity in their own right, rather than one-off consultations. Work undertaken for the ArtWorks Scotland Pathfinder by an external contractor (Consilium) accounts for the 'phone interviews undertaken.

Professional development and training activities

Four of the Pathfinders report undertaking formal structured training with artists (and often with other kinds of participants) in some form or another in this second and third year (309 sessions are reported, with 678 artists and 861 other participants) ArtWorks Scotland also undertook work to produce mentoring guidelines, which is not reflected through the data. Technically, several other activity categories which are not included in this section include activities which support the professional development of artists and others; it has been one of the facets of ArtWorks 'solutions' which are practice focused that, on the whole, they could be framed or understood in a number of ways. For example, the Action Learning model utilised by ArtWorks Cymru could be understood as a part of good project management around a specific piece of practice; or a model for informal professional development. These issues are discussed further in Section 7, which clusters together the different types of activities which Pathfinders have undertaken.

Arts practice

Only one of the Pathfinders (London) is currently including arts activity in arts settings within their programme, reflecting the way in which that Pathfinder has sought to use existing programmes as a 'test bed' for its Pathfinder activities. London were joined by two other Pathfinders in including arts activity in participatory settings as a route for testing approaches in these two years. These approaches place emphasis on linking professional development to practice, something emphasised as important by respondents to the Evaluation Survey and Interviews. Overall, more than 200 sessions of participatory

arts activity were reported by Pathfinders, with 178 artists being involved in delivery, 135 taking part and more than 1,000 other kinds of participants, including members of the public.

Activities undertaken by the core teams and partners

Across the Pathfinders, meetings with a range of different stakeholders, including Partners in the Pathfinder were recorded. More generally, the data reported here demonstrates the ways in which discussions with different stakeholders have been important to some Pathfinders in establishing influence throughout their activities. It is also worth noting that some Pathfinders reported attending and presenting at conferences and other events run by sector organisations outside the Pathfinders. These activities served both to raise the profile of ArtWorks, or of specific issues within ArtWorks, and to share some of the learning, models and thinking emerging from the initiative.

In the context of the 'systemic change' which ArtWorks has been seeking to instigate, these approaches to engaging with different actors in the process of developing artists for work in participatory settings are an important indicator of the mechanics of trying to intervene in the 'system'.

Artists and other participants


A range of information has also been collected by the Pathfinders relating to participants in various activities. Where possible, Pathfinders have collected information about the career stage and artform of artists who have been involved. Pathfinders have also been collecting information about the 'type' of other participant, to build a picture of the volume of people engaging from the HE/FE sector, from employers and other commissioners, and from elsewhere.

The following graphs show the reported results for artists, both career stage and artform. For comparison, Year 1 figures are included, as are the responses to the same questions from the Evaluation Survey sample. In addition, a version of years 2 and 3 figures are included for artform spread which have been adjusted to remove artists reported as having been involved in a particular activity. This adjustment reflects the fact that a single digital activity disseminating information included very large numbers of visual artists being counted, which overall significantly affects the balance of artforms shown across all activities. Given the relatively limited nature of this involvement, removing this activity gives a potentially more accurate picture of engagement with different artforms across the different types of activities. All reported figures for the period September 2012-September 2014 are included in the 'Years 2 & 3' findings; the adjusted figures then remove a particular slice of reported dissemination, and are likely to give a more balance picture of artists participating in consultations, networking, attending events, training, and practice-based professional development opportunities.

The comparison with the Evaluation Survey provides another point of comparison, though it is worth noting that the Survey gained a response largely due to dissemination through the Pathfinders themselves (and therefore it would not be surprising if the Survey data reflected the participants in activities).

To put the figures above into some context, the following two graphs provide a comparison of the proportion of artists at different career stages and in different artforms across the different sets of data.

Figure 1: Proportion of artists at different career stages, by data/period source




Source: DHA

The significant emphasis on emerging artists in ArtWorks activities is likely to reflect the role of two higher education providers in two different Pathfinders; both the University of Sunderland (ArtWorks North East) and Guildhall (ArtWorks London) engaged with students as part of their activities. However, the data also demonstrates engagement with artists' different career stages, contributing to ArtWorks stated aim of exploring support for artists at all the different stages of their careers.

Figure 2: Proportion of artists within different artforms, by data/period source

(N.B. labels not included for proportions below 1.0%)



Source: DHA

As already noted above, the significant majority demonstrated by the visual arts practitioners in the year 1 and years 2 and 3 data are prompted by broad dissemination of material across membership and registration organisations. The adjustment offered for years 2 and 3 shows an artform split closer to that of respondents to the Evaluation Survey, and seems likely to offer a reasonable indication of the artform spread of artists who have engaged in a range of activities. Again, whilst the data is necessarily an

indication rather than a precise measurement, it confirms involvement across all the major artform areas by Pathfinders (another objective for ArtWorks).

Finally, Pathfinders were also asked – where possible – to indicate what they could about involvement with different kinds of stakeholders. The following table suggests that in years 2 and 3 Pathfinders have increased their engagement substantially with HEIs and FE providers, employers/commissioners and teachers particularly. As such, the communities and networks which Pathfinders have built/accessed now reach significantly beyond artists.

Across different activities – predominantly those which involve arts activity in arts settings or in participatory settings – Pathfinders also reported more than 2,000 ‘participants’, i.e. members of the public who engaged with the work of artists. Because of the various approaches taken within ArtWorks, it is not possible or sensible to assume an immediate impact from ArtWorks interventions on the experiences of those participants; however, what is demonstrable is the very direct relationship between some approaches to professional development and applied practice itself.

Other partners engaged in activity	Year 1	Years 2 & 3
HEIs and FE providers	211	976
Employers/Commissioners	127	632
Teachers	4	351
Policy Makers/Funders	85	91
Other	227	791


Across all the Pathfinders in years 2 and 3(plus) of their activity, a total of 643 ‘engagements’ with artists involved in *delivering* activity are reported (as opposed to receiving or attending activities); and 2,854 engagements with other partners have been reported. We use the term ‘engagements’ here to reflect the fact that the same individual artist or other partner may have been involved several times, and that in some cases they have been counted for each involvement (rather than uniquely). Where possible, some Pathfinders were able to remove counting individuals more than once, where the same activity engaged small numbers who were known to the Pathfinder or their partner. As such, therefore, individuals are most likely to have been ‘counted twice’ where they were involved in different activities with the same Pathfinder.

Activity Clusters

The following illustration from the artists' survey looks at artists' experiences of working with employers and commissioners.

Artists' experiences of employers and commissioners

Thinking about your practice in community, participatory or socially-engaged settings, and the circumstances in which this work is undertaken, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?



Base: 925
Source: DHA

Strongly agree Tend to agree

7 Activity Clusters

The following section looks at the activities which are described in the previous section, and maps key activity clusters and outputs across the Pathfinders. The Evaluation team has undertaken this ‘clustering’ as a way of understanding how Pathfinders have sought to achieve outcomes, and what commonalities or differences in approach there have been where activities have a similar purpose or function. In addition, this conceptual clustering allows us to begin to understand whether activity across Pathfinders might be linked or have a collective impact or contribution.

The clustering goes beyond the types of engagements outlined in the ‘size and scale’ mapping, in looking not just at the common types of activity, but (to some degree) at the purposes of the activities more closely. As such, the numbers presented in Section 6 do not directly map across to the ‘clusters’ presented in this section, where we are able to recognise that some activities had more than one purpose, and therefore may appear in more than one cluster.

It is not the role of this evaluation to extrapolate the learning from existing research reports; PHF has commissioned a series of ‘Working Papers’ which bring together learning from the different clusters as identified in the Evaluation Interim Report; where appropriate, commentary references these Working Papers. However, this section does comment briefly upon differences in approaches and methods, apparent successes and challenges, and future opportunities and limitations.

The commentary below discusses each cluster. On the following pages are visualisations of these clusters, identifying each item within the cluster.

Mapping training and development provision

Several Pathfinders undertook assessments or mapping processes to understand what kinds of training and development provision currently exist. Audits of formal courses in England, Scotland and Wales have all been undertaken, and supplemented by some more partial audits of informal provision. Necessarily, informal provision is difficult to comprehensively assess – the range of potential providers is significant, and there is no single place for comprehensive listings. Whilst the audits of formal courses are useful benchmarks, it is also worth noting that, inevitably, provision within HEIs and other institutional environments also changes. As such, the audits provide a useful snapshot of the general spread and areas of focus in current provision.

Separately, the work undertaken by ArtWorks North East on academics’ perceptions of this kind of practice provides some useful depth about some of the personal connections, motivations and barriers involved in individuals’ engagement (or not) through course design with practice in this area. Added within the second and third years of the Pathfinder’s activity have been some networking/consultation sessions with HE and FE providers (by London and Cymru).

The majority of this cluster is reflected upon within Working Paper 5, including the findings from these mappings (Schwarz, 2013b).

Artists – consultations/research

The most significant cluster of consultation and research produced through the ArtWorks report has been with artists. All the Pathfinders undertook some kind of consultation or research with artists,

whether specifically focused at a particular area of possible support (e.g. the Skillset Research by ArtWorks Scotland), or using a particular methodology to look at a range of topics (e.g. the Connecting Conversations model for ArtWorks London). Some approaches have focused upon artforms (e.g. Navigator Artists Labs and the North East Focus Groups), whilst others have specifically sought to be cross-artform. None of the consultation processes appear to have specifically worked with artists at only one career stage; most seem to have explicitly sought to connect/involve artists at different career stages.

Whilst this represents a significant body of work, the respondent/participant sizes in many of these methodologies are relatively small: they are usually under 100, and often focus on much smaller numbers (e.g. 8-10 in focus groups/roundtables). As such, the results of the work represent some significant richness in terms of the depth of exploration and production of qualitative data. These small groups also reflect the ways in which some consultation methods have simultaneously sought to trial reflective learning models (e.g. Connecting Conversations by London; Peer-Assisted Learning in the North East; and Scotland's Peer to Peer Networks); arguably, the Action Learning Groups run by Cymru could have been seen as a similar hybrid model, though the emphasis on gaining 'data' from artists is not apparent in the same way, and so that project is not included here. A number of projects, including Cymru and Scotland (for the work on quality factors, for example) have utilised online surveys, producing some quantitative data.

Building on this cluster, the Evaluation team undertook a survey and a follow-up set of interviews with artists in the final year of the programme. The survey tests out some of the issues arising from the consultations with a significantly larger sample, and provides some comparisons between different types of artists, including by artform and career stage.

More generally, it is worth noting that the principle of research/consultation has underpinned individual projects within Pathfinders. For example, both the Entelechy and Trinity Laban-led projects for ArtWorks London have involved some consultation and engagement with artists, before trialling CPD methodologies.

Working Paper 4 (Taylor, 2013b) reflects upon the findings from the consultations which were undertaken by the middle of the project, and brings together some of the learning.

Employers and commissioners – consultations

In years 2 and 3 Pathfinders have also looked at ways in which to engage with Employers and Commissioners. On the whole, whilst there are examples of useful 'conversations', this area of work is significantly less developed than consultation has been with artists. On the whole, where engagement has been most successful has tended to be where consultation or engagement processes have had a specific focus (e.g. the involvement of arts organisations in the Age Gap Symposium). Cymru gained very low numbers of responses for the two surveys which they sought to undertake with 'creating organisations' and with 'buying organisations', for example.

In the longer-term, this is an area where those looking to continue work towards the ArtWorks objectives will need to consider how to better engage a wider group in this area. Consultation is made challenging by the range of organisations (both those within the cultural sector and outside it) and the range of different ways in which organisations might formulate their responsibility in supporting artists.

It could be argued that the involvement of significant numbers of arts organisations within Pathfinders, including two Pathfinders being led by significant employers and commissioners of artists, provides a strong basis for the work already reflecting the motivations and concerns of that part of the 'system'. More generally, it is worth noting that the boundaries between different parts of the 'system' are often not absolute. Artists also work in organisations, commissioning and employing other artists. More widely, some projects (e.g. Trinity Laban's symposium) has sought to create a context-specific community of practice which includes artists, those who employ them and host projects and participants all together.

Working Paper 9 reflects upon the findings from some of the work undertaken in this area (Sellers, 2014).

Members of the public/participants – consultations/research/input

As noted in the Interim Report for the Evaluation, engagement with members of the public/participants by ArtWorks has been very limited. The research undertaken by Cymru in the first year was supplemented by some additional work undertaken across Cymru and London, though issues with the methodology (partly with the survey and the appropriateness of use with particular participant groups) and, more generally, with the conception of the work, means that the findings from this research are limited. Challenges with determining questions which might be suitable across different kinds of participant groups, as well as different kinds of projects with different objectives, were significant in the design of this research.

It has been difficult for Pathfinders to determine how participants might provide responses about the skills which artists need, or what might make a project better. The process of involving older people in the Age Gap Symposium and Training Day may provide one potential future approach (though this would not necessary be suitable for all potential types of participant group), and is perhaps the most honest about the role which participants' feedback can play.

Working Paper 6 (Salamon, 2013a) reflects most of the findings in this area.

Exploring the practice of arts in participatory settings

A range of activity has taken place across the Pathfinders which has been about either mapping knowledge and understanding of the practice of arts in participatory settings, or about providing a platform/opportunity for different experts (including many artists) to share their experiences and views on the practice. Formal written audits, bibliographies and reviews are a substantial part of the Year 1 output in this area. The Collaborative Doctoral Award in London provides a space for some original, academic reflections, and the learning materials in the North East bring together both curated and specially-produced materials (particularly building upon some of the events and other engagement which that Pathfinder has had with artists).

All of the Pathfinders have used events as a way of engaging with artists, and providing space for artists and others to talk about practice. Some events have used specific methodologies, e.g. the Critical Conversations in the North East, or the use of Pecha Kucha in Scotland. In some cases, for example particularly with the Critical Conversations, these have also acted as a way of providing a critical framework with which to explore and interrogate the practice and, ultimately, to validate it through reflection. Navigator did not run ArtWorks-specific events, but instead has used its significant reach

through existing partners' events and other relevant events to include presentations and sessions relevant to ArtWorks. These approaches have also been ways of disseminating both the findings from and plans for ArtWorks activities.

Finally, two projects explored practice in participatory settings in a very direct way. The Action Learning Projects in Cymru (and the subsequent case studies) focus particularly on what can be understood about the projects around which the Action Learning Groups are formed. As such, the Groups are something of a light-touch intervention in those projects, and the resulting feedback in the case studies is presented as an account of the practice in that instance. The ICA Project with London was an intervention to explore how an exhibition in a gallery setting could be enhanced through participatory activity. This is a clear and direct intervention, bringing participatory practice into a new site.

Working Paper 2 (Schwarz, 2013a) brings together some of the findings in this area.

Artists – testing/piloting professional development approaches

The range of models for professional development tested and developed in the second two years of ArtWorks has been substantial. One model of support which was also a consultation process was completed in the first year (i.e. Peer-Assisted Learning in the North East); other models (e.g. Peer to Peer Networks and Connecting Conversations) have been carried on, and have become more completely focused on artist development and support, rather than consultation/data production.

Some approaches have been tested in a range of ways. The Lab approach used by London is not newly developed for ArtWorks, but the seven labs have sought to test and apply the model in different ways. The Action Learning projects from Cymru used the same reflective methodology for five different projects. Scotland has supported pilots looking at mentoring, placements as part of HE/FE courses and creative learning networks, with a range of different partners and contexts being brought to bear.

Other methodologies have been tested or developed with a more single focus. The Short Courses in the North East have had a single testing round with a number of different artists, and will be further tested through the relationship with Cultural Spring. The Fellowship model (London) has, at present, run with one partnership of an organisation and an artist. Some initial testing of the feasibility of extending it has been undertaken through a workshop. Entelechy's CPD was tested with a workshop of artists.

Looking across the different approaches, ArtWorks models span a range of approaches, from formal, accredited training, though to open-ended models of reflection. With the exception of the London Pathfinder, the majority of models are 'owned' by an HEI/FE college, or exist as a methodology which groups or individuals must commit to. As such, there are a number of models which, feedback for individual projects suggest, are valuable, but which have no default mechanism for carrying on. This issue may be significant for legacy projects.

There is a mixture of models which target specific groups (either artform, career stage or both) and models which are cross-artform and career stage. The Creative Learning Networks specifically bring non-artists into the development opportunities, as has the Trinity Laban project with older people.

Working Paper 3 (Taylor, 2013a) brings together some of the findings in this area.

Policy-making, guidance, qualifications and standards

A range of work has emerged around creating guidance and infrastructures which can be widely applied/used across the sector. Both Cymru and Navigator undertook some work looking at codes of conduct and mapping commonalities. Navigator went on to develop a Code of Practice for artists and to explore issues around codes for employers. Supporting this is work around standards, developing the existing National Occupational Standards in Dance Leadership for application for practitioners in all artforms. In a similar way, Navigator has also engaged with national partners in contribution to the development of a range of nationally-recognised qualifications. In addition, Navigator has been exploring a credits system for CPD which artists can use to validate their development, and which recognises the range of CPD activity which might be undertaken. Separately, the North East advocated for the acknowledgement of participatory arts practice in performing arts degrees through the QAA benchmark review.

Creative Scotland have been exploring what kinds of guidance can be developed by a funding body to support artists and others to develop the practice, and understand what can/should be expected of the practice and of different partners in it. The Foundation Report on Quality Guidance consolidates the Pathfinder's work on quality factors, and provides the basis for exploring how that knowledge can be applied. Creative Scotland have explored this application through recent funding processes, and there is potentially more work to come in this area, such that Creative Scotland has separately funded the Report and is committed to further development. More widely, partners from Navigator have particularly engaged in a range of discussions and consultations about quality frameworks in England.

This is an area in which several other agendas (e.g. the National Music Education Plan or changes in HE funding) significantly affect the routes for influence and the types of discussions which can be had. Potentially, it could be the area where most artists find it hardest to engage with (rather than with specific CPD opportunities), and which opens up significant questions about the relationships between artists and various regulatory, developmental and funding bodies.


Working Paper 7 (Salamon, 2013b) and Working Paper 8 (Schwarz, 2014) reflect some of the findings in this area.

On the following pages are the conceptual diagrams supporting the analysis on these different clusters of activity across the Pathfinders.

In reading the diagrams, please note that:

- Items in blue are from the first year of ArtWorks;
- Those in red are from the second and third years of activity (either beginning after the first year, or carrying on from the first year).


7.1 Mapping training and development provision



The research from ArtWorks North East provides a different way in to understanding the context in which training providers engage with artists.


7.2 Artists – Consultations/Research

A range of techniques for formal consultation were used, including online surveys (Cymru and Scotland), focus groups and group face-to-face consultations, and individual interviews.




7.3 Employers and Commissioners - Consultations

The second two years of ArtWorks have shown an increase in engagement with those who work with artists (including employers and commissioners). On the whole, whilst this body of work is useful, it is not as extensive as the consultation undertaken with artists.



7.4 Members of the Public/Participants – consultations/research/input

The involvement of participants in contributing directly to ArtWorks has been limited, though several sites of intervention either involved actual projects as routes for reflection (e.g. the Action Learning Projects), or engaged with artists who are regularly practising in this area.



7.5 Exploring the practice of Arts in Participatory Settings



7.6 Artists – Testing/Piloting professional development approaches



7.7 Policy-making, guidance, qualifications and standards



7.8 Overview of Activity Clusters

In the Interim Report we looked across the different clusters of work which were emerging, and summarised a number of key points. At the time, it was clear that Pathfinders were genuinely engaging in a process of enquiry about what kinds of support artists needed, and what kinds of models might be best for providing that support. For some Pathfinders, this particular process required the development and application of new skills, either commissioning work from research partners or developing and undertaking research methodologies themselves. Pathfinders were, on the whole, committed in principle to honouring the research findings by using them; this was particularly the case where Pathfinders were consulting with artists who were part of existing relationships with Pathfinders, where there might be an immediate opportunity to apply any learning.

We also noted, in the Interim Report, that Pathfinders were covering some fairly similar ground with consultations, and with small sample sizes, but without particular reference or understanding of each other's work. The volume of outputs from smaller research projects across the Pathfinders was felt to be daunting for individual partners to get to grips with, and potentially limiting to the process of testing any individual findings against the broader context of similar areas of enquiry elsewhere in the initiative. We also noted, at that time, some of the challenges individual research projects had experienced in gaining appropriate sample sizes and responses from particular groups.

On the whole, some of these issues have remained a significant challenge. Overall, for example, the initiative has improved engagement with employers and commissioners, but not in significant numbers. Some projects and Pathfinders have succeeded in prosecuting a very applied course with their research: the work on quality factors for Scotland emerged from general, facilitated open-ended work, through a survey with artists and a subsequent survey testing with employers and commissioners, and finally has been contextually tested against other work on quality and developed into early stage guidance for application at the policy-making level. Whilst the samples against which the factors were tested are relatively small, the current status of the Guidance is flexible enough to provide ongoing testing and support. This is a good example of an interactive approach to moving from consultation to testing and piloting activities; other Pathfinders and projects have navigated this in different ways. On the whole, negotiating this transition (understanding what to take forward and how) is one of the key challenges of an enquiry-based approach.

Other piloted activities have collected feedback in an organised and structured way: the pilot projects in Scotland, the short courses in the North East and the Lab models in London are all good examples. ArtWorks Cymru has, perhaps, connected up the elements of its project less clearly than other Pathfinders, and potentially realising the value of its findings and considering the ongoing application of the Action Learning model should be key considerations for the legacy programme. For Navigator, the iterative nature of the process has been one of constant testing; however, the proposed Arts Alliance will potentially be a major, new intervention, and will require some careful consideration of how partners will know whether it has been successful or not. It is also worth noting that some models would benefit from further testing, not only to understand the extent of their value and application, but also to help articulate if and how they might be different from other support models currently available. The Fellowship, for example, has clearly been a very beneficial model for both the participating artist and the Barbican Guildhall, but it has only been tested with a single partnership.

More generally, it is worth noting that – despite reviews of different research and activity clusters being commissioned – the timing of these being available largely missed the opportunity for Pathfinders to

review their activity based upon any shared or refined findings. Some criticism for the Working Papers came from a few interviewees, largely concerning the way in which the papers only review material from ArtWorks. As such, the framing of the material in the papers is sometimes quite challenging for the reader, in terms of understanding how they might fit with other existing knowledge. Individually, research projects have had their own rationale within a Pathfinder. When removed from this and grouped together with other projects, the results can look quite partial and without reference to other knowledge and evidence from sources external to ArtWorks. On the whole, challenges like this reflect the ambition of ArtWorks to tackle significant and complex issues: situating the learning within the context of wider knowledge might have been valuable, but both limited budgets and the need for prioritisation has been required at various stages. The role of the Working Papers is explicitly to share the particular contribution to learning from ArtWorks, a key task in seeking to explain to those outside Pathfinders and individual pilot projects what the special initiative has been doing.

The most significant learning from this process might be about the challenges posed by five individual processes of 'localised' design, around the same broad topics and areas of enquiry. Most of the research confirms that artists need a range of support (not a single, standardised programme), and that there is room for providers and support agencies to offer some variety. However, it is probably not the case that each Pathfinder required consultation with artists from their specific geographical area in order to find this out. It seems clear that some value might have been added by:

- Co-ordinating some research elements, to remove duplication of effort and output, improve research design and sample sizes.
- Sharing the process of analysing and interpreting findings, providing a wider opportunity for testing amongst Pathfinders and applying the learning.
- Aligning some moments across the different Pathfinders' programmes, to allow for revision of programmes, shared input into design of models and solutions.

Whilst more co-ordination may have been useful, it is worth noting the value which individual Pathfinders and partners have gained from undertaking their own research processes, and the commitment to application which this has prompted in many cases. In addition, it would have potentially only been possible with a different funding and commissioning process from the beginning, which required or structured a process in which Pathfinders would share both research questions and fieldwork from the beginning. More generally, it seems unlikely that additional co-ordination would have significantly altered the overall structure of models and solutions offered here, particularly as it has become clearer over the duration of the project that a 'single solution' would not be appropriate.

Processes and Structures

The following illustration from the artists' survey looks at some of artists' experiences of employment and commissioning practices in relation to arts practice in participatory settings.



8 Processes and Structures

Having reviewed the range of activity which the Pathfinders are undertaking, it is important to reflect upon the processes and structures which are helping to shape their approaches to this initiative. This section looks at reflections upon the enquiry-based approach, and then models the partnerships and types of interventions which appear to be emerging from the Pathfinders. It concludes by reflecting upon the role of PHF in these processes and structures.

8.1 Enquiry-based Approach

In the first year, interviewees reported some apprehension about the idea of an enquiry-based approach, and in some cases were unsure exactly what it would entail throughout the course of the initiative. Already at this stage respondents were reporting both challenges engaging with a wide range of partners and complex research questions, and a positive sense of being given some time and space to think about some difficult things. In the context of these findings from the Interim Report, it is worth noting that some of these questions may relate to issues with the original evaluation contract, in which the first evaluation team were involved in processes to support the Pathfinders setting research questions and enquiry-based approaches.

In more recent interviews, some respondents mentioned either ‘lines of enquiry’ or ‘action research’ unprompted in their interviews, though it was not (on the whole) part of interviewees initial descriptions of the initiative; where interviewees indicated this approach in describing the initiative, they tended simply to refer to ‘research’ in a general sense.

We asked interviewees to talk about their experiences of an ‘enquiry-based or action research’ approach. A few respondents suggested that the approach had not necessarily been universally applied or communicated by PHF as a funder, and that despite discussions about supporting Pathfinders to ‘try things out’, there were expectations that particular kinds of activities or outcomes would occur:

‘... it’s meant to be an R&D action research project, open ended around innovation but at the same time there is an expectation to turn your widgets into gadgets.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

‘I remember at the very first Pathfinder [Meeting] – “you have to produce results, we are not a talking shop and you have to deliver and I’ll be very cross if we don’t deliver” – and that frightened me for a bit.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

Beyond this, several respondents discussed the process and some of the challenges involved. One Pathfinder reported feeling that the framing of research questions probably had not been clear to different Pathfinder partners (as noted above, this may reflect some of the challenges with the original evaluation contract). Another raised a more general question about the enquiry process where there was an expectation that participants would benefit, but no mechanism within the design of any of the activity proposed by Pathfinders to assess this (an issue noted in this report in relation to the logic model which provide the overall Evaluation Framework). One interviewee suggested that the enquiry-based approach had particularly caused some confusion about how Pathfinders were supposed to relate to each other, where they had similar lines of enquiry, and a couple of interviewees raised the question of whether some of the initial research should have been undertaken across Pathfinders, rather than individually, and whether this might have made for better piloting and solutions in the longer term. Pathfinders were not always clear whether research should have prompted changes in their individual

programmes, an issue which is discussed further in the section which looks at the role of PHF and the relationships between the Pathfinders.

In addition to these issues of clarity, respondents raised a number of other challenges relating to the process. A couple of respondents discussed the way in which the process meant that Pathfinders were, inevitably, focused upon their own activities and did not necessarily have anything to share more widely in the early stages:

‘I thought we would pull a wider sector with us more quickly than we have and I’m not sure why we have been unable to achieve that. I think it was possibly because the work that the Pathfinders was doing wasn’t public in the early phases in the first 18 months – a lot of the work was quiet and research and closed’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

Other challenges reported by Pathfinders included the issue of actually analysing and applying the learning which emerged from research, particularly where other partners in a Pathfinder might prefer different approaches or solutions. More generally, the question of whether Pathfinders were making progress, or not, was challenging for some respondents. Issues around definitions, clarifications and other specific elements were – one interviewee suggested – something that Pathfinders had to learn to live with:

‘I didn’t really know what [the enquiry-based approach] was and because it seemed to be changing ... I think we have all dealt very well with that, so to quote [Pathfinder Lead] ‘we have got more comfortable with ambiguity’ and I think that’s a really good thing.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

More generally, looking across the wealth of feedback and evaluative work on individual projects, there is significant data available about the efficacy of individual pilots and models. However, inevitably much of this comes from self-reporting by those partners and organisations who owned individual projects/pilots. Because of this, here are challenges with such data. One Pathfinder respondent reflected on the natural inclination of others running pilots within their Pathfinder to want to report ‘the good news story’ of the project, rather than necessarily offer a ‘deep analysis of their learning’.

Another reflected upon the use of freelance support for research, and the challenge of continuing the lines of enquiry throughout the project. The involvement of expert individuals has enabled those individuals, in some cases, to bring very particular views to the table which raised some interesting questions about ownership of different elements of the ‘enquiry’.

Despite these challenges, most interviewees were positive about an approach which had encouraged the Pathfinders to find things out before they proposed interventions or solutions. For some, there was a significant sense of integrity attached to this process, and several talked about the ‘ethos’ of this kind of work. One interviewee, an external consultant, particularly praised the seriousness with which a Pathfinder Core Team had engaged with and responded to the research; the same interviewee did, however, also suggest that in some cases this might have led to ‘over-thinking’ the problem. The sense that an enquiry-based approach supported a more honest dialogue was reported by some interviewees:

‘[it has been useful to be] absorbing and understanding the ethos of learning, rather than the kind of, the tendency for a funder to fund and then the tendency for the project manager or whoever organisation to report back on success and not really feel comfortable to have an open

dialogue about difficulties or failure, or challenges, or you know. That's been brought up a lot in ArtWorks, you know. We, we like having this platform to talk about the gritty stuff ... And with our program ... we have basically said, we want you to try and do something that's sustainable, so if you, if you have to take a more difficult route to do that, um, then we'd rather you did that, rather than sticking with what's easy.' (Pathfinder – Core Team).

'I think it is more intimate – what's good about it is that you seem to have had a freedom to get into the detail of it.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group).

More generally, interviewees reported feeling that the process did support them in considering different options and developing their plans as the initiative progressed:

'Well I think if there's anything that hasn't happened it hasn't happened because it's almost reformed itself into something else.' (Pathfinder – Core Team).

Overall, there was a sense from several interviewees of having to have some faith in the process, and recognising that there would be different stages in the process. One interviewee summed this up:

'I think it is about holding ones nerve because it takes time for things to emerge – it takes time for the learning to be organised in the way that makes it visible - so I think it's more about that sense – you go from one mood to another and the mood we are in at the moment is outward facing and is about examination, but we have got there quite steadily. ' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

8.2 Partners, inputs and sites of intervention/influence

The following analysis builds upon the models and commentary which were included in the Interim Report. The models have been added to, not only to reflect subsequent Pathfinder activity, but also to try and give a sense of the relationships between:

- The formal structures adopted by different Pathfinders
- The roles different partners take, and inputs and sites of intervention/influence they bring with them
- How these inputs and sites of intervention/influence are understood as 'adding up' to developing communities of practice.

This analysis goes some way to unpicking the ways in which different Pathfinders have tackled issues of intervening in 'the system' which affects and instigates artists working in participatory settings. The commentary below should be read in conjunction with the relevant model for each Pathfinder (which are laid out in the following pages).

ArtWorks Cymru

ArtWorks Cymru operated with a formal partnership who supported the bid to be a Pathfinder, and subsequently operated as a steering group of eight organisations, meeting regularly, developing the programme of work and (ultimately) making decisions upon the direction of the Pathfinder. This structure was supported by an external consultant (Annabel Jackson) who facilitated these meetings and supported the conceptual development and decision-making process, as well as producing a final Pathfinder evaluation (including a range of case studies of projects used in the Action Learning Groups).

Welsh National Opera were the leading partner, hosting and being responsible for the funds. The WNO's Youth and Community Director, Rhian Hutchings, took the role as Project Lead. Other project-specific staff were employed on a freelance basis, with responsibilities for specific projects/activities (research and digital material). As such, the structure could suggest a collaborative model of delivery. Steering group members did all input into the conceptual development of the project, design of research/consultation, accessing artists and others for research/consultation and the subsequent development of events. The significant 'intervention' of Action Learning Groups (a consultation/exploratory model attached to a set of participatory projects, which could also be understood as a reflective learning model) took place across five projects attached to five steering group organisations.

Other partners across the steering have supported the Project Lead in a range of ways, but have not included taking a lead on individual elements; as such, the Project Lead appears to have been the driving force for Pathfinder activity and direction. More recently, Arts Council Wales has become involved in discussions, and provided some funding for events. The proposed role for Arts Council Wales in taking a lead in the legacy project for ArtWorks Cymru suggests a useful strategic policy alliance has been fostered. It also, perhaps, reflects upon the way in which the Pathfinder has been reliant on a single partner to lead/drive activity – the majority of other partners are small organisations, or individuals within larger institutions with other commitments.

More widely, ArtWorks Cymru has sought to engage with artists, organisations, employers and commissioners through a range of consultation/research activities, through events and specific activities (such as the Action Learning Groups), through online networks (Facebook and Twitter) and through disseminating learning from the Pathfinder. The emphasis in the legacy proposal from ArtWorks Cymru is, in part, about continuing to build and engage with this community. The range of different partners who have stepped forward to be involved in this next phase is significant; however, it seems likely that there is a something of a challenge going forwards in balancing the role of Arts Council Wales and engagement from the sector.

ArtWorks London

ArtWorks London bid to be a Pathfinder with a number of named and anticipated partners, but has not operated formally as a partnership with a steering group, collective decision-making processes and so forth. At the end of the first year the team at Barbican Guildhall, who have lead the Pathfinder, undertook some significant revision of their plans to reflect issues raised by the ArtWorks Project Director about the ways in which the Pathfinder was balancing engagement with Barbican Guildhall as a site of intervention and engagement with other partners and sites of intervention outside the lead organisation. Where other Pathfinders have specified a geographical focus (Wales, Scotland and the North East) with the aim of spanning that physical area, it seems unlikely that such an approach would have ever been feasible for ArtWorks London given the range and concentration of organisations, practitioners and other stakeholders. As such, the Pathfinder brings together partners who are London-based and focused, but is not 'London-wide'. In terms of legacy, Barbican Guildhall's position and a major arts organisation and HEIs may also enable an impact nationally and internationally, as a conservatoire amongst other conservatoires, and as a producing organisation seeking to widen the impact of its artistic product.

As with other Pathfinders, for some activities (e.g. Connecting Conversations) partners have proved useful in providing artists and others to engage in those activities; as such, this approach does provide input from partners and a site of intervention within those partners. A greater focus in the second and third years of the Pathfinder has served to provide greater clarity about the relationship between ongoing Barbican Guildhall activity (particularly activity within the Creative Learning department) and Artworks activities, and to enable a range of partners to be involved in specific roles, and specific projects/activities.

Activities such as Open School East, work by Entelechy on approaches to continuous professional development for artists with a disability, a project on participation in a gallery setting with ICA and work on development for artists working with older people lead by Trinity Laban/OPAN, all provide models of the Barbican Guildhall providing space for partners to lead/co-own and design/co-design their own projects. In each case, the partner also began with identifying/authenticating the area of need for the project, and taking some ongoing responsibility for ensuring the site of intervention (those artists or groups engaging in activities). Potentially, the Fellowship could be understood in the same way: the design was shared by Barbican Guildhall and the piloting artist (Ned Glasier), and the responsibility for reflecting on and disseminating the model has also been shared. In the case of the Fellowship, the ongoing site of intervention, in theory, benefits both Ned's regular work in Islington, and the Barbican Guildhall through their use of Ned in (potentially) teaching on the BA, leading Labs, and so forth.

This kind of mutual benefit unpins the ArtWorks London 'model' for a community of practice for whom there is a 'Golden Thread' of development opportunities, largely focused upon a suite of interventions which use the Barbican Guildhall as their base (either geographically, or intellectually). These include the Young Arts Academy, the new BA, the development of the MMus to a cross-arts MA, the use of the Labs model with different groups and ongoing Connecting Conversations as a reflection model. One of things Barbican Guildhall will need to continue to negotiate and interrogate in its legacy activities will be the relationship between solutions/methods 'owned' by Barbican Guildhall and activities led by other partners (e.g. the Trinity Laban-led work with older people), in terms of the concept of a 'Golden Thread'.

ArtWorks Navigator

ArtWorks Navigator is a different kind of Pathfinder from the others, both in terms of the structure of the intervention and in terms of the type of intervention which has been developed. The Navigator partners worked together on a shared bid, and each sits round the table as a kind of 'consortium' partner, with an ongoing process of partnership meetings, shared design and decision-making taking place.

Within this flat structure there are a number of things which are, however, worth noting about individual partners roles:

- Fundamentally, the 'offer' which Navigator partners bring to the table are their members/those they represent, and the responsibility which they have in serving those members. As such, partners are both experts on the practitioners they represent, and obliged to take a lead in ensuring that those practitioners are supported.
- Those organisations who are partners in ArtWorks Navigator have significant experience (both organisationally, and as individual staff members) in workforce development; several partners are also organisations who focus on working with artists who work in participatory settings,

bringing another level of specific experience. Several partners have decades of experience of policy-making and practice development in these areas.

- The partners vary both in size, and in their remit: some serve large numbers of artists, others have a closer focus. The range of services they deliver varies, as does any other activity they undertake (e.g. FCD's role in leading Big Dance). With them, they bring their own networks and stakeholders in terms of policy-makers, employers/commissioners and so forth. Part of the principle of the Navigator approach has been to try and exercise these remits and relationships more significantly at an individual level, and to the benefit of the wider consortium/ArtWorks objectives.

These factors have, to a large extent, determined the division of labour within ArtWorks Navigator. For the Artists Lab, each artform partner/grouping designed and led a lab. In most other cases, partners have stepped forward to lead on areas of activity, or brought in relevant connections as and when there appears to be both the willingness and existing strengths/experiences.

In terms of understanding the 'site of intervention/influence' for ArtWorks Navigator, Pathfinder activities have (on the whole) concentrated on ways in which Navigator can support better understanding between employers/commissioners/policy-makers and practitioners. Work on qualifications and codes of conduct, for example, has involved several Navigator partners operating as advocates and consultees for policy-makers seeking to prosecute and formalise quality agendas. Work on an employer's Code of Practice brings in a direct relationship with those organisations who sit between funders and artists. In the longer-term, ArtWorks Navigator has the clearest responsibility of all Pathfinders to ensure that the artists' workforce feels better supported.

In terms of ongoing activities, one of the key challenges for the proposed ArtWorks Alliance will be to explore who else needs to engage to ensure:

- That artists who are not members of the Navigator partners can be reflected, where appropriate;
- That other existing initiatives to develop workforces are acknowledged and balanced against whatever activities the Alliance pursues;
- That the Alliance can potentially increase and develop the leverage it has with funders, policy-makers, employers and commissioners.

ArtWorks North East

The ArtWorks North East Pathfinder is one of two led by a Higher Education Institution (the other being Barbican Guildhall in leading the Artworks London Pathfinder). The bid and subsequent delivery structure has included a formal group of partners which has met regularly throughout the course of the project, and some collective decision-making has taken place. The process for collective decision-making developed into a series of sub-groups leading on different areas, the only Pathfinder to utilise this approach.

Beyond these formal structures, partners have engaged in a range of different ways. Some activities have clearly been part of a shared design and delivery, including the Critical Conversations and the final conference, across all or most partners. Partners, as with other Pathfinders, have been an important route to accessing artists and other consultees for research and piloting activities. They have also identified and framed platforms for significant artist practitioners to share their work, lead discussions and reflect upon the practice. There is (as is the case with other Pathfinders) an important element of

expert curation which has taken place in developing events and other activities; in this way, ArtWorks has been providing platforms and validation for artists and their practice.

Partners have also engaged more substantially in delivering individual projects or activities. Some of this has been undertaken through a consultant/funded project model, and in these cases the Pathfinder has published findings/outputs in a way which clearly recognises the intellectual ownership of and input into individual projects (for example, the Audit of Participatory Practice undertaken by Toby Lowe from Helix; Dave Camlin's work on the Peer-Assisted Learning, and subsequently on the PALS scheme; and the University of Sunderland's work on a careers event and leaflet).

More complex has been the question of ownership around two shared projects: the short courses and the online resource which brings together learning material with course pathways. It was always intended that these major outputs would be 'open access', and potentially provide resources which others could appropriate/make use of. (This is, for example, unlike the Barbican Guildhall where there is very clear organisational ownership of several models/interventions, even where delivery expertise might be drawn from a range of partners). The short courses proved a challenge to the collective decision-making process in the North East, and tested the degree to which partners were prepared to input into the project beyond activities which included allocated funding to recompense partners/cover costs.

Despite these challenges, ArtWorks North East has succeeded in supporting a range of interventions based on both the expertise/sites of intervention available to individual partners and the wider developing community of practice. There is ongoing work to see where and how the short course model may develop, the role of the themed lunches and Critical Conversations and other events, and the potential for the online learning resources. Relationships with the Cultural Spring, and increased engagement from some partners in recent months suggest that there are opportunities to develop all these possibilities further.

ArtWorks Scotland

ArtWorks Scotland is the only Pathfinder to be led by a funding agency. Creative Scotland developed their Pathfinder bid with a range of partners, and continued to engage some of those partners through a formal structure, particularly in the first year. An 'Umbrella Group' and a 'Research Advisory Group' operated as consultation groups for particular elements of activity. Internally, Creative Scotland had allocated a member of staff to be the Project Lead, and brought in freelance consultants to undertake Project Management and Research roles. Like ArtWorks Cymru and Artworks London, ArtWorks Scotland also worked with an external consultant to evaluation the whole Pathfinder programme. In addition, they are the only Pathfinder to have commissioned an external agency (rather than a partner) to undertake a significant element of research and consultation (Consilium mapped formal training available in HEIs and FE contexts, and consulted with artists, training providers and employers/commissioners).


ArtWorks Scotland has developed and spread the sites of intervention and ownership of different elements of the programme as the Pathfinder developed. The Peer to Peer Networks were in place early in the project, and have effectively been funded by Creative Scotland with significant flexibility to develop their own programmes of activity. Individual networks are artist-led, and have determined their own areas of enquiry and priorities; they have also contributed significantly as consultees for work commissioned by Creative Scotland on artists' training needs, and on quality factors. In the case of the

networks, the participating artists are themselves the direct site of intervention, and some have looked to extend their influence (using the organisation of a network to engage with different stakeholders). The pilot projects mostly took place in the last year of the Pathfinder's activity, with Creative Scotland running small open funding processes (though there is also evidence of solicitation of bids, where appropriate to fill gaps).

Whilst it could be said that Creative Scotland has behaved like a funder throughout the project, it has departed from its normal funding processes and approaches significantly in an effort to ensure that individual pilots could explore, develop and bring learning back to the wider project. As such, the majority of 'outputs' (e.g. courses, placements, mentoring models, knowledge exchange relationships, network activities) are owned by those partners who have undertaken the projects, rather than Creative Scotland. Creative Scotland has also sought to work with existing structures where appropriate (e.g. with the Scottish Mentoring Network) or with partners who can host outputs which have wider application (e.g. the placement guidance online resource, which is being held by the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland). In doing so, the sites of intervention within the lifetime of the project are multiple (though, in each case, relatively small numbers); where projects are able to sustain or repeat activity (for example, if some of the HE/FE partners continue to offer/develop placements) the potential for a wider site of intervention (e.g. future cohorts of students) is significant.


Creative Scotland has also undertaken work to bring together/connect participants in these different projects and those who have not been involved. It is still considering whether or how to convert some of the Pathfinder's early work with online groups and networks. The conferences and events have been positively received, and developed in their content. Finally, Creative Scotland has also sought to seriously explore the implications for policy-making, informing not only funding guidance and decision-making processes, but also the strategic conceptualisation of a large area of the funding body's responsibilities. As Creative Scotland develops its legacy activity, there is clearly still an appetite and role for the lead partner to continue to provide support to a range of other partners. It is likely that the questions of ownership and responsibility will continue to be negotiated as individual projects or elements of activity emerge.

The modelling on the following pages offers a visualisation of the relationships discussed in this commentary.




ArtWorks Cymru


Partners, inputs and sites of intervention/ influence




ArtWorks Navigator

Inputs and sites of intervention /influence





ArtWorks North East
Inputs and sites of intervention/
influence



ArtWorks Scotland

Partners, inputs and sites of intervention/influence

8.2.1 Partnership Experiences

In the Interim Report three broad reflections about partnership came from the Pathfinders and other interviewees: that it was taking time to build relationships and partnerships; that some lead partners were finding it useful to take time to 'go away and figure things out' before they engaged more fully with a range of partners; and that different kinds of partnerships and relationships were emerging, with different roles for individual contributors.

In more recent interviews, interviewees who were connected to the Pathfinders (either in the Core Team, or as Associates/Partners) were asked what their experiences of the partnerships in ArtWorks were. There were a number of general points which came up across several interviewees. The Pathfinders were a positive way of bringing together different people or organisations who would not normally meet or work together on collective activity. This included, in some instances, opportunities to bring together individuals within organisations leading on similar areas (e.g. education or outreach), but who did not normally engage with each other as peers. For some interviewees, the emphasis on engaging with particular types of organisations – e.g. membership bodies, HEIs or funders – was an important benefit, and something which they weren't sure they would have done otherwise.

Some Pathfinders had formal collective decision-making groups, with partners meeting regularly to review and plan activity, and make choices about the use of resources, etc. This did not necessarily equate to partners beginning with the same understanding of the project, or of respective roles and responsibilities. In some cases, this extended to some challenges in determining how project resources would be used to account or compensate for the time which partners spent on different elements of Pathfinder activities. Balancing commitment from Partners of different sizes, with different levels of resources, was also something of a challenge for some Pathfinders.

In practice, different Pathfinders had periods in which those partners were perhaps less engaged than this structure suggests:

'... that's been actually really hard work and it's had a big impact on the project, in trying to get them to engage with the project.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

In some cases, Pathfinders report that initial bid commitments were sometimes not supported by partners when it came to delivery (in the case of partnership-wide commitments, rather than individual commitments. Pathfinders succeeded in finding ways round such issues by pursuing some projects with a small group of partners, or allowing a single partner with an area of interest/expertise or relevant current activity to take that area on:

'I think we've let the partners develop, kind of bespoke approaches for themselves, in line with the outcomes that we were trying to achieve.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'[partners running projects] report that they felt like the way we'd worked with them was really good as well. They said they felt like they were trusted and respected to carve out their own paths while working alongside the ArtWorks program as a whole.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'I think we have become more confident in how we work in partnership with other organisations that have a different skill set to our own and more confident in how to support those organisations to deliver CPD which fits both our agenda and also theirs. This is about a much

more configured way of selecting partners – there is definitely something around that and how you prolong and sustain partnerships beyond the phase of that funded period.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

This pragmatic approach to partnership – focusing on areas where others can do something which the lead organisation cannot, or where together something can be achieved which individually cannot – is emphasised particularly within the evaluation of ArtWorks London (Jackson, 2014b). One Pathfinder reflected upon the way in which different models had been tried out, and considered that a formal steering group would not have been beneficial in the earlier stages of the project. They did think, however, that there might be a more formalised partnership to emerge in the future. Where Pathfinder partnership models did not include shared responsibility or authority across different partners, this did not mean that the experience of the model was not positive:

‘[Project Lead] was driving it all the way through and without [them] it wouldn’t have happened, but [the partnership] always felt like it was a good equal space.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

In a different Pathfinder model where collective decision-making was important, there was significant emphasis on needing to create the right conditions for different partners to come together:

‘... we have to make sure we change the rhythm and texture of [meetings] in order to keep people awake and on their toes. The point is they are very safe and flexible spaces – sometimes we have quite difficult discussions – because we don’t always agree about everything all of the time – there is a base line, an ethical set of values we all subscribe to in terms of how we would approach strategy and I think what I like about that grouping is that it has allowed us to do that. So we are not conflict phobic.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

For those interviewees who are more distant from the ongoing activities of the Pathfinders, some report a degree of frustration with the volume of output from ArtWorks, and the difficulty of getting to grips with it all. Almost all talk about the value of both the focus which ArtWorks brings to an area which they feel is important, and the opportunity to get together with peers and actors from elsewhere in the sector or ‘system’, to learn and exchange ideas. Overall, the sense of an ongoing dialogue and discussion was important to many, particularly for those who did not feel that this was something they could access within their day-to-day environments.

Several interviewees who had not been involved on a day-to-day basis commented in general terms about some of the challenges Pathfinders had faced in bringing people together. Some respondents raised useful issues about perceptions: for example, that a university can seem like a large and resource-rich environment from the outside, but actually responsibility for a project may sit entirely with an individual, and for a portion of their time only. Another interviewee talked about the difficulties in trying to co-ordinate activity within and across Pathfinders when there are significant differences between partners, not only in terms of institutional context but actually in terms of different agendas and motivations.

Individually, Pathfinder Associates and Partners reported getting a lot out of engaging with various activities. Individual agendas and ideas have been taken forward and supported, and in some cases interviewees were particularly keen to point out that the relationship had provided a different grounding for engaging with Pathfinder lead partners than had previously been the case. In other instances, partners reported frustration with not being able to bring to bear their own expertise or

agendas in a way which they might have wished to. More generally, some frustration about a lack of clarity in the case of some Pathfinders has made being a partner (particularly an arms-length partner) difficult; this was an issue which perhaps was particularly compounded by the approach which ArtWorks has used, which in some cases gave rise to the sense that progress was not being made, and the same discussions were being had over again. One interviewee reflected upon a dynamic within a Pathfinder in which one partner was a particularly strong driver, and pointed out that the other partners were complicit in this by being happy to let responsibility for activity sit with this partner.

8.2.2 Institutional Contexts

Several Pathfinders have been undertaking work in a way which is different to the normal activity which takes place in their institutional contexts. In some cases, there is relatively little evidence from interviews or elsewhere that this caused any particular disruption or required negotiation, or that this new way of doing things has had any longer-term impact. In these cases, it is perhaps the case that the intervention activity was small enough, or taking place in a discrete enough way, so as not to require significant interaction with the wider institutional context.

Creative Scotland's work leading on the ArtWorks Scotland Pathfinder is perhaps one of the most significant examples of a Pathfinder having to negotiate a different approach within an institutional context. They put significant time into work with partners on potential applications for pilot projects, going beyond the normal role of a funder, and working with those partners to train them in engaging with the evaluation framework set for that particular Pathfinder. The impact back onto the institutional context – from developing the quality factors externally with the Peer to Peer networks, further testing them and then directly commissioning (rather than through ArtWorks) work on quality guidance which built upon those factors, is a powerful example of an ArtWorks intervention which has provoked further investment from lead partner.

Subsequently, Creative Scotland is using that guidance to inform investment practices and strategic discussions, providing one of the strongest examples of policy impact for ArtWorks. Potentially, Arts Council Wales in their commitment to future engagement with the legacy which emerges from ArtWorks Cymru, is well-placed to explore similar opportunities in Wales.

Barbican Guildhall's leadership of ArtWorks London has been strongly informed by the institutional context within which they have operated: to the extent that the project was re-scoped after the first year at the request of PHF, to try and ensure some broader engagement with partners external to the lead organisation. Nonetheless, the cross-arts environment of the Barbican, and the desire to translate work from the main programme for participants and to ensure that participatory work is properly recognised sets a very particular foundation for the way in which support in this area has been developed by the Barbican Guildhall. In addition, the merging of the two institutions – at the time at which the Pathfinder was being established – provides some very strong institutional challenges and drivers which have affected the work within this Pathfinder. The extension of existing models – the Labs, weekend CPD models, the MMus, Unleashed – has been core to this Pathfinder.

Across the other Pathfinders, different approaches are in evidence. The short courses piloted by ArtWorks North East are a specific attempt to develop a solution which sits outside a single, institutional context, and which brings in useful things (accreditation, expert teaching, etc.) from a range of different contexts. ArtWorks Cymru used existing projects upon which to test the Action Learning Groups, but have at this stage not progressed beyond standalone interventions. Whether their research base and

model can be used to intervene more substantially within the institutional contexts of the new partnership which has come together to undertake legacy work is a key challenge in the next stage. Arguably, the 'institutional context' for Navigator partners involves significantly influencing external stakeholders and circumstances for the benefit of their members and constituents. As such, ArtWorks has (as Navigator always argued it would) been an extension of their existing responsibilities and activities. The proposed ArtWorks Alliance, however, may more significantly impact back upon the ways in which they continue those responsibilities and activities.

8.2.3 Types of engagement in ArtWorks

Looking across the modelling of different Pathfinders and the responses from interviewees, a range of types of engagement with ArtWorks have emerged:

- Project Leads, who are all individuals embedded within institutions, and have responsibilities both to PHF and their own institutions. They have tended to have responsibilities across the Pathfinder.
- Project Managers, who have mostly been fixed-term contract appointments. These have provided some dedicated resources for Pathfinders; in some cases, they have also played an important role in separating the project from the institutional context of the Project Lead. They have tended to have responsibilities across the Pathfinder.
- Other core team members, which includes a range of freelance appointments for research and other support, and the collaborative doctoral award student in ArtWorks London. On the whole, these individuals have engaged in specific activities as part of ArtWorks; some of them, however, have also contributed to broader discussions (such as the quarterly meetings of all Pathfinders).
- Consultants and other expert resources, who are contracted to undertake specific pieces of work. Arguably, there could be some overlap between this group and some of the 'Other core team members'. However, on the whole, consultants have only engaged in the specific role which they are contracted to engage in. As such, for example, they have not been part of some of the broader discussions across Pathfinders. Despite this, it is worth noting the significant input and influence which some consultants in these roles will have had. For example, Annabel Jackson's work with both Cymru and London was both evaluative and developmental; the same is true to some extent with Graham Reekie's involvement with Scotland.
- Pathfinder Partners, who are individuals within their own institutional contexts who have committed to engaging with ArtWorks through their Pathfinder. In practice, this group breaks down into a range of different kinds of engagement:
 - Participation in collective decision-making and design.
 - Taking a lead on specific projects or areas of activity (which may have been designed and proposed by the partner also; or which may build upon or use existing models and knowledge owned by that partner).
 - Co-leading/designing a specific project or area of activity.
 - Contributing to consultations/discussions through personal involvement, or providing access to communities of practitioners.
 - Responding to funding calls by developing a proposal which involves an intervention in their own institutional context (where there is one), and subsequently delivering that proposal; in these cases, partners tend to 'own' the design of their project.

- Project Partners, who have engaged with ArtWorks through a relationship with a specific project, but who may not have been involved in ‘pitching’ that project to the Pathfinder, and accounting for the findings/results back to the Pathfinder.
- Other contributors and participants, who have engaged in consultations, responded to research calls, taken part in professional develop pilots, presented case studies and reflected upon their practice in events and other fora, and engaged in online networks. The degree of engagement will have varied significantly across this group.
- The ‘background’ of Pathfinders’ own institutional relationships, networks and constituents, including artists, students and other organisations. In some cases, this has been an important part of the mandate for intervention (e.g. the membership of artists across Navigator organisations). These relationships have sometimes been the pool to which Pathfinders have gone to seek contributors and participants, and different kinds of partners. They have also, in some cases, been in receipt of disseminated material from ArtWorks.

8.3 The Role of PHF and the Structure of ArtWorks

Within the section on context, the governance and staffing structure for the ArtWorks initiative is discussed. As with the Interim Report, it is possible to understand the role of PHF and the governance and staffing structure as operating on a number of levels:

- As a funder, which requires fundees to account for the ways in which they receive and use funds, and has obligations to Trustees to account for the appropriate spending of its funds,
- As an instigator of this project, and an advocate for the project and more widely for the value and importance of arts practice in participatory settings
- As a policy-advocate, attempting to create change across the system and to affect the future supply (and perhaps demand) for arts practice in participatory settings.

As with interviews from the first year, in more recent interviews Pathfinders, Partners/Associates and other Steering Group members understand this range of roles, and there is significant appreciation for the way in which PHF has sought to champion change in an area:

‘PHF has got us much further along the road than anybody else has got us over the years.’
(Pathfinder – Core Team).

By extension, there is also significant appreciation for the role which the Project Director and Project Co-ordinator have played, and their expertise in navigating a range of different requirements and roles. In the Interim Report we noted some of the particular challenges which the appointment of an external consultant to the role of Project Director might create, and one interviewee specifically referred to this:

‘The contracting out of the project direction was something quite complex to an independent consultant that wasn’t networked back into the organisation – was very difficult and a very difficult position personally but it meant the initiative was very lonely ‘cause she was sitting outside of PHF itself.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

The additional resource of a Project Co-ordinator (building on an earlier role undertaken by a Grants Officer within PHF) has, to some extent, sought to anchor the project within PHF more significantly. Other issues raised through the interviews include the issue of the role of the Steering Group, and the clarity of relationships between the Steering Group (with expertise in their own right and, in theory, a

role of authority within the ArtWorks structure) and the Pathfinders (as funded organisations); and between the Steering Group and other governance structures within PHF. One interviewee noted that:

‘we have suffered a bit because we haven’t had a Trustee engaged with us.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group).

The absence of a trustee from PHF on the steering group was cited by more than one interviewee from within the Staff/Steering Group as a challenge, in terms of communicating the initiative and its value within the organisation. In terms of engagement with the Pathfinders by the Steering Group, one interviewee felt that:

‘the Pathfinders, are obviously gelling well together for the most part, and are forming a powerful constituency and the Steering Group is full of very good people and they are also a powerful constituency but those two constituencies that haven’t really engaged along the process.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

On the whole, Pathfinders tended to be unsure of what the specific role of the Steering Group was, and how they were to be involved or communicated with. It is probably unrealistic to assume that a meaningful process of full engagement and transparency across the various levels of ArtWorks activities and governance could have been attained; already (as discussed below in more detail) the overlaying of a structure to bring Pathfinders together was quite a significant additional commitment, beyond individual Pathfinder programmes.

However, it is worth noting that the structure, as it stands, placed substantial pressure on individuals – particularly the Project Director – to both cover the ground and mediate between different requirements, authorities and responsibilities. As such, the model is quite fragile, and potentially asks for too many different roles to be played by one individual. The appointment of a Project Co-ordinator has gone some way to spreading the burden, but more generally this structural challenge raises some complicated questions about the ways in which funded projects, which are funded to develop a knowledge base and respond to it, should engage with funders’ expectations; and how a Steering Group should navigate those outputs and expectations.

Perhaps most telling is the sense from Pathfinders that they have not always been clear how much ownership PHF wishes to have of the project. In many ways, this reflects a project which encounters issues of ownership (and appropriate leadership) in almost everything which it does: as such, a process of ongoing negotiation around these issues is probably the only realistic response from all parties. The extent to which the initiative has succeeded in making the most of the available Steering Group may only emerge in the next few months, as tangible outputs and recommendations from the Pathfinders are now being disseminated and advocated for.

More generally, the question of whether the initiative would continue into a second phase as had been originally planned (within the context of PHF’s investment streams) has created some concern about the way in which PHF views and understands the project. Views from some interviewees with PHF Staff/Steering Group attributed this issue to changes in PHF’s strategic approaches to funding which relate less to the Foundation’s commitment to the aims of the initiative, and more directly to the form of funding (which the Foundation is ceasing in all areas). Whilst this could have been the end of activities under the broad objectives of ArtWorks, the programme of legacy funding and open grants which

Pathfinders have pitched for, means that an ongoing cluster of activities seems likely to go ahead. There is still, however, a question of what kind of overarching role PHF might continue to want to play.

Several interviewed Steering Group members refer – as Partners and Associates do – to challenges in understanding the Pathfinders and their activities at various points in time. Again, as with the Partners/Associates, it seems likely that the enquiry-based approach has also contributed to this issue:

‘So what we haven’t got to the bottom of that – making it clear to Steering Groups and others that maybe we should do this special initiative in clear phases and with a clear pointer – saying OK this was the development phase and this is what we’ve learned and now we are going to try to focus in on implementation.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

The following two sub-sections look at specific aspects of the structure which PHF overlaid across the five Pathfinders.

8.3.1 Monitoring processes

For some Pathfinders, the overlaying of a range of different reporting mechanisms was quite a challenge. PHF agreed with the Pathfinders a process of both quarterly monitoring reporting and staged reporting to support the drawing down of grants, which some respondents felt caused some duplication; our understanding is that, to some extent, Pathfinders had requested some of the additional level of ‘monitoring’ as it was felt that the resulting information might be valuable in demonstrating the value of the programme. More generally, for some, the involvement then of evaluation processes in addition added to the administrative burden.

Three Pathfinders worked individually with an evaluator, and all engaged with the overall evaluation. Where Pathfinders activities involved funding other partners to undertake work, the process of reporting could involve several stages and relationships. Sometimes Pathfinders felt that there was an absence of clarity about what different framework and reporting mechanisms were for.

More generally, the overlaying of this process was felt (for some) to cut across the way in which work was actually taking place:

‘there is a very tight ArtWorks management mesh thrown on top of a much looser consortium who work in a more free-flowing organic way – we found that really difficult and think we found their insistence on there being one project impossible to deal with. It is not how we work. It has been jointly led and other people lead on different things at different points of time. (Pathfinder – Core Team)

From an evaluation perspective, the process of regular updates was useful; however, the specific adherence to quarterly monitoring, including the return of quantitative data, has proved complex for Pathfinders to provide and not perhaps as useful in evaluation terms as might have been anticipated. Some of the issues with the quantitative data are discussed in the section which reviews the findings from that data. It is particularly true to say with the case of Navigator, whose outputs and activities were largely about extending and focusing existing influence, that the attempt to build quantitative data across different Pathfinders resulted for a while in the perception that the Navigator partnership was not understood or valued in the same way as other Pathfinders with significantly higher activity outputs.

Broadly speaking, it would be true to say that data supplied less regularly, but more comprehensively, might have been more useful from an evaluation perspective. This constitutes some learning for the Evaluation Team, as well as being useful feedback for PHF and others in future funding.

8.3.2 Meetings and Collective Programme Development

Most Pathfinders felt it was useful to meet together regularly and hear from the other Pathfinders about what they were doing. The importance to some Pathfinders and individuals of being brought together was about feeling a part of a collective endeavour:

‘... we were all trying to find our feet. And we were all wondering if we were the right people to do this, because we all seemed to be coming from different places. But I think we found a kind of way to sort of cohere and make sense to each other ... the most amazing reach across the UK, were in that room. And, I suppose, you know, again, that, it would be really great not to lose that.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

One Pathfinder talked about the challenges of understanding how different Pathfinders might fit together, particularly given the different positions which Pathfinder organisations already have in relation to practice in participatory settings; one of their key questions was whether to wait and see whether other Pathfinders would take the lead in certain areas, or whether it would be their job to do so. The absence of clarity, and the challenge of understanding each other’s programmes, was an issue raised by most Pathfinder interviewees who had attended the quarterly Pathfinder meetings:

‘... there was a lack of clarity in some areas at the beginning. But I mean, I remember some early meetings, where there was like, huge confusion, about for example, how to, how to relate one pathfinder to another, or where links could be found, you know, to be specific about. I mean, I remember some of those being, just like, and it may have been at that point people weren’t ready to do that.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

‘... it was difficult to relay that back to everybody and I really don’t think people individually had time to read everything or really get on board with the whole national picture, it was too big, and we were probably too remote from it most of the time.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

‘... there was so much business to sort out here we didn’t really have the time to reflect on how that would fit into a bigger picture.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

The time commitment required to attend two-day Pathfinder meetings on a quarterly basis was an issue raised by several interviewees, and was felt to have limited the involvement from partners who were not core team members in some cases.

Less clear to most interviewees was the process of shared development, and how activity PHF were leading fitted in with what they were doing, including discussions about websites and branding. Some interviewees raised some questions about the clarity of purpose for some Pathfinder meetings, particularly given the time commitment required. Another issue, for some, has been the balance of partners in the room and the question of whether Pathfinders are able to make collective decisions. For some, it was unclear what elements of PHF activity Pathfinders could have a direct ‘say’ in, and how they were supposed to influence each other’s work. Interviewees from different groups reflected upon this in different ways:

'I think we had an idea ... naively that [engagement across the Pathfinders] would happen but until it started happening and it took longer than we thought – we didn't know whether or not there was some traction there.' ((PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

'I am only now realising that that what would have happened if (a) we had the permission to mix it up between Pathfinders earlier on and (b) we would be in a position to understand what was going on much earlier.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'There must have been things over that period of time that the Pathfinders themselves should have been organising and horse trading between themselves and doing different things. All of us in the early days were saying we working on this but it is not ready for even Pathfinder consumption yet and when it became ready for Pathfinder consumption there was nothing anybody could do about it.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'I don't feel there has been enough cohesion to raise the status of the sector.' (Pathfinder – Partner/Associate)

All interviewees who discussed Pathfinders working together in detail felt that it had taken some considerable time for it to be clear how this might happen. Some interviewees felt more strongly than others that this was a failing; for some, like the discussion around centralised research and consultation, there is a sense that activity was duplicated across Pathfinders, and that a strategic overview was late in coming for all parties, given the time it took to gain an understanding of each other's activities. Others were more relaxed in feeling that it had taken some time for all Pathfinders to develop clarity over their individual propositions. Generally speaking, though, Pathfinder interviewees expressed some frustration with what was felt to be an absence of clarity about authority, responsibility and decision-making.

As with the earlier discussion concerning the roles of the Steering Group and PHF as a funder, ArtWorks has sometimes lacked a clear proposition for the ways in which change which would go beyond individual pilots or interventions would take place. It has been very good at bringing different partners to the table, engineering meetings or events, but has had to work hard to set an agenda for discussion which is both open and focused. The two events run by the central ArtWorks team, the Changing the Conversation Conference in April 2013 and the Reprising the Conversation event a year later in 2014 both succeeded in bringing together people who might not otherwise have an opportunity to meet to discuss issues; on the flip-side, inevitably such events have to make a selection about the ways in which those discussions are framed and prompted (as well as who is able to be in those discussions, and who is not. As with other areas of challenge, this probably relates in part to the enquiry-based model, and some of the subsequent challenges which it poses in terms of articulating progress and direction.

It also seems to relate to the way in which grant-making has taken place; individual Pathfinders were encouraged to lay out their own proposals, and signed a funding agreement to undertake them. The expectation to learn from, or engage with others was not included explicitly – or to the extent which happened or which might have been useful – in those initial agreements. With the benefit of hindsight, it seems possible that a cross-initiative timetable – allowing shared 'pauses' for reflection and possible activity revision – might have been beneficial from the beginning of the project, rather than being overlaid as time went on. As it stands, relatively little activity was altered or amended because of the findings from or plans of other Pathfinders: potentially, this is something of a missed opportunity.

Despite these challenges, Pathfinders were also clear about appreciating the input and engagement from other Pathfinders through the meetings:

'I appreciate the quarterly meetings and being face to face with all the Pathfinders. I think that was really important to get an idea of where each of the Pathfinders were at, to tune in and I think the times as well, when we weren't in meetings but were socialising, was a nice time to catch up because you get the more informal catch up time there. I quite find its those coffee break 'catch-ups' that actually bear more fruit - and strike up the connections more than round the table ones but that's just my personal preference.' (Pathfinder – Core Team).

'I think that's it's been a fantastic opportunity to work with all the other people nationally, I think that I'm full of admiration for them, working in their day jobs and in the project. I think when we've met together I feel as if we were only scratching the surface, it was like stand up and tell people about this and stand up and tell people about that and it took until really recently till I actually knew what they were doing.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'On a ground level basis just to be made to get together, in some senses, to share what you are doing, articulate it, justify it and not just through report writing but speaking round the table – exploring ideas and possibilities together and just interrogating each other's work – you know as well as anyone the time it took for us to get out from our own cells – it has happened quite naturally and really helpful and made it more impactful as well.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'I've found that very refreshing, to be having kind of one foot in [Pathfinder lead organisation], and um, one foot connected to this other approach. And I think that's the approach that I've drawn back into the programme actually.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)


On the whole, interviewees tended to agree that by the end of the final Pathfinder meeting, they were beginning to feel part of collective processes. Should the planned legacy activities and projects for which Pathfinders are applying through the open grants process at PHF be successful, this suggests a useful foundation of shared working for all the Pathfinders to move forward with some ongoing reference to each other.

What has ArtWorks achieved?

The following illustration from the artists' survey looks at artists' experiences of how practice in participatory settings is valued.

Valuing the practice

Thinking about your practice in community, participatory or socially-engaged settings, and the way it is perceived by others, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?



Base: 925
Source: DHA

Strongly agree Tend to agree

9 What has ArtWorks achieved?

For the context of this section, it is worth restating the intended outcomes for ArtWorks:

- Outcome 1: A more professional and confident sector whose work and value is perceived as important and whose voice is stronger
- Outcome 2: Participants are benefitting from enhanced quality experiences of engaging in arts-led activity
- Outcome 3: Artists, employers and participants share a better understanding of what constitutes quality and value in the work
- Outcome 4: Clear models of good practice are shared, disseminated and replicable
- Outcome 5: A more effective infrastructure for the training and development of artists at all stages of their careers has been developed across the UK
- Outcome 6: There is more partnership working across funding agencies, public bodies and policy makers

Looking across the range of findings in this report, the following achievements can be recognised:

8. New partnerships and relationships (contributing to outcome 6 in part, and potentially to outcome 1) – individuals and organisations have worked together who would not, otherwise, have done so. Some Pathfinders can demonstrate significant individual learning about working with partners in different ways. Beyond this, new networks and connections have emerged within and beyond Pathfinders. Engagement across ‘the system’ has been deliberately sought and enhanced by the initiative.

‘... I do think there’s something really special in a kind of almost intangible way, um, when you get a group of people in a room ... And it’s that sort of energy, and engagement.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

9. A body of consultation and research about artists, the practice which they undertake in participatory settings, and what they need to support it has been produced and brought together (contributing in some cases specifically to outcome 3, as well as to outcome 1 and outcome 4). This had added, in the broadest sense, to the critical mass of interest and knowledge in this area.

‘Three years of UK wide research is really good. It is a really strong base to start from – it seems weird to be going three years and saying ‘we are just starting’ but it doesn’t feel like that – it feels like we have done our homework and now we off our starting blocks. That’s the gift Paul Hamlyn has given us.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

‘... some of the learning recommendations that are emerging, and some of the reports we are publishing, feel a useful contribution to a national debate or a national state of play.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

10. The Pathfinders and their partners are all better informed about the needs and requirements for support for artists who work in participatory settings, and feel more equipped to champion, lead and design support in this area (contributing to outcomes 1 and 3 in terms of knowledge; and to outcomes 4 and 5 in terms of developing responses to this knowledge). Being better informed

includes better understanding each other's definitions of participatory arts, and the different approaches of different artforms and other types of practice.

'... there is some resistance to professionalisation or at least the term. They were wary about it.' (Pathfinder – Core Team).

11. The solutions and models which have been proposed have been tested, both at the conception stage through consultation and research, and at the application stage through feedback (contributing to outcome 4, and potentially to outcome 5 where models are being taken forwards). Whilst there is more work to do in several areas to further test, refine and establish ongoing resourcing models, this process has been valuable for both Pathfinders and those artists (and others) participating in pilot activity. Some of these models clearly have some potential for long-term application and/or transferability. This testing process has, in some cases, been useful for individual organisations who have used the process as a way of examining their own activities.

'[the models have been] conceptualised, tested and flexed over the last two years plus and so those models are just a bit more rigorous.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'There has definitely been something about focusing our strategy, formulating our thinking in a more clearer and coherent way as a department and really getting it into the core of what we are about.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

12. Artists have directly benefited from some of the activities which have taken place through ArtWorks (contributing to outcome 1 in supporting a more professional and confident sector, and potentially to outcome 2 where artists may be able to take some of those experiences directly into their practice with participants). In some cases, this might have included contributing their views and being asked to articulate their practice – sometimes with a significant platform to access their peers and others in 'the system'. Others have engaged with pilot processes, either through design, co-design or participation, and have provided feedback about the benefits and challenges of individual solutions. More generally, there is evidence that artists have appreciated the focus which ArtWorks has given this area of practice, and the need to better support it. In some cases, artists have been able to lead on developing further their community of practice; in other ways, many have contributed to emerging communities and networks (this could be viewed as contributing to outcome 5, as communities and networks could be seen as parts of the infrastructure which supports artists). The ongoing demand for these networks has emerged directly through some Pathfinders.

'I think we can certainly report that there's a perception that a community of practice is developing.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'the impact on individuals, has in some cases been really profound, in terms of the journeys that they've made.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

13. ArtWorks has succeeded in engaging two of the four national arts funding and development agencies in a significant way, accessing the funding and policy-making infrastructure (contributing to outcome 6). Two HEIs have led on activity development, and several others (and FE colleges) have run smaller projects and sought to extend their provision in this area. A

number of arts organisations have contributed or lead on model design. It is particularly worth noting the focus on ‘small wins’ and ‘quick wins’ from some of the Pathfinder interviews: where changes to the infrastructure have taken place, this is largely manifested through specific interventions in specific sites, within major institutions (contributing to outcome 5). In doing so, ArtWorks has found ways in which to respond to the variety of need and practice which consultation processes revealed/confirmed.

‘I think it is much more mature and grown up and recognising there is no such a thing as a silver bullet and I think that’s so much better – although it has travelled over ground that has been covered before and when I speak to other people they have the sense ‘we’ve done this, we’ve done that’ but actually I do think, particularly in the last year, with the changing conversations, it has joined people together and has ignited through projects and some thinking that was really positive and generous.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

14. Finally, as one interviewee put it, one of the significant indicators of achievement for ArtWorks is that the different Pathfinders want to continue pursuing activities in support of the objectives set out by ArtWorks at the beginning. Individual organisations as well as networks have stepped forward to take different areas forward (contributing generally to outcome 1 with a more confident sector; and outcome 5, if we understand that the infrastructure for artists includes a range of support structures and solutions).

‘The positive outcome of that decision by Paul Hamlyn Foundation not to continue with the special initiative to me has been the way I’ve seen individuals within the sector pick this up and say ‘we are not going to drop it – we are not going to let this go the way other things have gone in the past’.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

More generally, in terms of whether things happened the way in which Pathfinders had expected them to at the beginning, some report examples of activities happening in a less ‘linear’ fashion than they had anticipated. This was not always felt to be a problem, but perhaps to more accurately reflect what Pathfinders had learnt about trying to embed solutions or create change, particularly where Pathfinders are ultimately seeking long-term development in this area. In some cases, this also reflected opportunities that occurred for extending the influence of ArtWorks, which had not originally been anticipated.

‘my real joy about it is that it started off as very frustrating, difficult to navigate, hard to get your head round it – a painful project in a way and now it seems that it has become something with a momentum which is really going and we all believe in what is happening now – believing those messages that are being disseminated and how they are being disseminated most importantly.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

‘... we’ve been able to organise our thinking and our ambitions in such a way that we have a firm plan for the future. That is the most significant outcome ... It’s about having had that space and time to then assimilate that into an ordered thought which means we can move forward in a way that’s appropriate for us and think is appropriate for other people.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

As part of the interviews, respondents were also asked to think about the things which they felt had been difficult or unexpected throughout the process. Issues raised in the interviews, or in documentation from the Pathfinders, include:

- The failure of the initiative to engage with Arts Council England at the strategic level, particularly for those Pathfinders where partners regularly engage with other areas of Arts Council policy.
- The time it took for Pathfinders (in some cases) to get to grips with what findings from research meant, in terms of designing solutions or pilots.
- Difficulties in filling gaps with different research groups— employers and commissioners, FE colleges, Welsh artists, some groups of artists (artform specific) and participants.
- Building on this, the inability of any of the projects to test the central hypothesis for ArtWorks, i.e. whether artists who are better supported deliver better experiences for participants.
- The logistics of piloting models/producing solutions, particularly where the model/solution did not sit within existing structures.
- Existing competition in CPD delivery.
- Dealing with the volume of outputs from different ArtWorks Pathfinders.
- Understanding what the quality of the consultation/research is, and needs to be, to underpin robust propositions/testing.
- Consciousness by some Pathfinders of being inward-looking for an extended period of time.

Several respondents talked about the importance of sharing what ArtWorks has been doing more widely:

‘I think that because we haven’t embedded it with a wider constituency, and the change of Director [at PHF], our task of making the impact within the sector more widespread, is slightly harder.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

The key issue here seems to be the judgement of the extent to which ArtWorks has succeeded in ensuring lasting solutions which are widely accepted across the sector. As already noted, a second phase of ArtWorks was originally planned which presumably would have been focused on taking forward models and solutions from the first phase to embed them more widely across the sector.

Commentary on stakeholder engagement often focused on the need to engage specific stakeholders, as already noted above:

‘... the big one for us is about how do we get Arts Council England to take this seriously. That’s been a dismal failure, cos they only take stuff seriously that they do seriously, and that conversation we had about how do you map content of stakeholder group – so that’s partly where we had the interesting session about growing the market.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

On the other side of several of these challenges, some respondents did report unexpected positive outcomes from the project; these tended particularly to focus on the willingness of some potential partners and parts of ‘the system’ to engage generously with the initiative, for example:

‘one of the developed or surprised outcomes in [Pathfinder] is the willingness of some of the HE institutions to work in partnership. It has been easier than expected because there is a shared passion to make things work and a degree of trust – and again we have seen that in pockets around

the [UK] as well. I thought the other really good example was Lancaster where it was unprecedented the number of HEs who turned up to that conference.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

9.1 What happens next

Interviewees in the final year were asked to think about what they thought should or needed to happen next (if anything) in order for the objectives which ArtWorks set itself to achieve; as such, they were also asked if the original objectives of ArtWorks were still relevant. All respondents indicated to a greater or a less degree that there was still work to be done, and that the original task which the initiative set itself was still important.

Some focused on the value of disseminating and sharing the learning from ArtWorks (both any research findings and any tested/piloted models of support) and, in some cases, had particular audiences in mind:

I think there’s a huge dissemination job to do into the HE sector, whether that’s done through the professional organisations like SCUD I don’t know, I think there’s that massive piece of work to do. (Pathfinder – Core Team).

Several interviewees mentioned the monthly briefings (a relatively recent element of the communications activity undertaken by PHF to support ArtWorks) as positive routes for dissemination. Others felt that engaging with more people needed to go beyond just sharing learning. Several Pathfinders discussed the need to ‘extend the reach’ of existing partnerships and activity:

‘And I think it’s something that in the legacy activity ... we really should be pushing that actually, we need to extend the reach. Just not be, just totally absorbed with steering group members and sort of close friends, sort of close friend activities.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

There are already some useful indicators of Pathfinders extending their reach. The partnership group within Cymru has grown from seven to 26, upon the development of the legacy activity. Year on year increases in attendance and duration of the ArtWorks Scotland conference appear to indicate a need. Models such as the short courses being picked up by Creative People and Places programmes in the North East already indicate some positive transference and application of learning. It is worth noting, however, that some interviewees were very keen that not only should some kind of partnership persist, but that continuing the ‘ethos’ of shared processes which had already taken place was also important.

Some Pathfinders talked about ongoing issues with ensuring that the development of the practice can have a wide ownership from different groups, and the question of how to balance input from individual, small organisations and larger organisations/agencies. For some Pathfinder leads, the next stages of activity include complex work in attempting to transfer ownership to a wider group, whilst trying to also ensure that responsibility and support remains in place. Creative Scotland, for example, have explicitly stated that (in the long-term) solutions, models and profile should be passed across to ‘the sector’. A key element of Scotland’s legacy activity will be to determine what can be carried on through ‘the sector’, and where larger agencies may still need to take some responsibility, or provide resources, where small groups cannot.

In many ways, this issue is an extension of the question of what happens to models where there is no ongoing commitment from Pathfinders to deliver or extend the model. A model may be written up and available for dissemination, but some respondents were concerned with understanding *how* ‘extending the reach’ can happen:

‘Having got to that point it’s now how we ensure the right mechanisms and networks are in place to ensure these things become part of the sectors DNA rather than something that is just there about writing reports which is why what might or might not have happened.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

‘I think we need to have quite clear messages and examples of recommendations about what the simplifying the large body of research and conversations and stuff that we have into something that is more clear about what people can do to help, what stakeholders can do, to help embed the good practice or learning.’ (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

One interviewee framed some of the challenges with ownership in the context of different roles and positions artists wish to take, both for themselves and in representing the practice and its purposes:

‘There’s those [artists] who want to be on the inside, working within the system, to see how it benefits them. And then those who quite justifiably want to be on the outside, because they see it as art’s role to you know, to question and provoke, to a certain extent, and you’re always going to have both, you know, both elements.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

Several interviewees reflected on similar questions about the roles which artists had played in leading and engaging with some of the work. Some felt that this work had not been shared strongly enough, and that a wider community of artists should know about the focus which ArtWorks had placed on thinking about support for artists in this area. Others discussed the question of what to do with artists who had been engaged through consultation and testing processes, but for whom there was not a commitment to ongoing activity:

‘we met a lot of the artists and it was trying to keep them involved and bring them back but it felt it didn’t really happen – they got them for the research and then disappeared and I think it would be quite difficult for them to roll something out on a grand big scale.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team).

‘I think that community of practise will need a sort of central focus to continue. It’s not going to really exist if, uh, there isn’t somebody leading it, and developing it and moving it.’ (Pathfinder – Core Team)

More generally, some interviewees expressed some concern about the ways in which ArtWorks would need to continue grappling with issues of articulation and defining its constituents in an area of practice which is varied, fragmentary and fluid. Some framed this in the context of an ongoing challenge to establish artistic practice in participatory settings as equally valuable to artistic practice in traditional arts settings:

‘I’m still very interested in this whole thing of the need to talk specifically about “artists who work in participatory settings” as opposed to [just using the term] “artists” and we have a mix of artists who just do that and don’t need it to be defined – in many ways that remains but at the same time I think it has been extremely important to be talking about ...“participatory artists” in order to get things to where they are now. Projecting into the future if we are really embedding this field of practice [as] par for the course of being an artist in the future, always accepting that there will always be those who say “FY mate, I’m on my own” and that’s fine - it’s just turning it

inside out a bit the artist who struggles on his or her own in a studio is not the central definition of what being an artist in society is about ...' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

Several interviewees talked about the need to engage better, more or in different ways with a wider group of employers and commissioners. A few interviewees also reflected on challenges in changing HE practices, and the difficulties of influencing big institutions and systems. Another key group of potential stakeholders with whom, it was felt, more progress needed to be made was funders. A couple of interviewees discussed the internal task for PHF to share the learning from ArtWorks internally, and to interrogate what that might mean for existing funding practices. There is a sense within PHF that the general strategic direction of new funding programmes has reflected learning from ArtWorks, but it is not clear yet that this has carried through to specific grant-making practices:

'It will be a real shame if we have done all this work and then it just got put in a cupboard and when people were looking at grants, because grants are going to go more into this territory, it would be really sad if the things we have learnt do not influence the grant making.' (PHF - Staff/Steering Group)

Other interviewees discussed the approaches other funders might be persuaded to take:

'there should be a mechanism that gets into the system and gets into Arts Council funding or that we try to say you have a responsibility as an organisation to train, look after, develop artists who work with, as you would with anyone else in your industry – it comes as a whole – you should be doing that for artists ongoing. But it also sets out a different relationship with those artists which suggest more than half an hour of saying goodbye which I think is much better practice.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

Several interviewees talked more broadly about how propositions and solutions would continue to emerge, and the question of how to balance any coherent single proposition with multiple and varied solutions. One interview describes the absence of a 'core offer':

'I think the thing that ArtWorks didn't quite manage to do, my perception, is get the critical mass of practitioners with it in terms of distribute models to the ones we are going to adopt – this is what we are going to do – this is a compromise and this is what we are going to do.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

Others were more convinced that the absence of a coherent framework or offer was inevitable:

'My sense was this would happen, to try to imagine you could find a single solution to such a wide and varied set of issues and ideas – it just wasn't going to happen.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

For some, the acknowledgement that there is not a single offer does not just result from practical challenges, but also from needing to maintain some integrity in preserving difference within any attempts to be coherent:

'What the landscape is in terms of provision for artists in their training and development – the landscape of all the language that is used and the various nuances and connotations of participatory socially engaged practice - there is greater clarity around that. We are also clear

there is no 'one size fits all' but that doesn't make it impossible or negate the efforts of ArtWorks to try to pull this all together in terms of a more cohesive sector in terms of how it can engage its needs and provisions.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

Interviewees varied in the extent to which they felt that future activity funded as ArtWorks legacy, or through open grant applications, might need to seek a coherent approach across different strands. For some there is still work to undertake before partners can be clear about whether there is a general offer to be shared more widely. More generally, some interviewees had different views about whether the likely resources which could be available for future activities would be sufficient to support change in the future.

'I do worry where [Pathfinders] will be when they don't have that money coming in – I don't think the battle has been won. One of the things that has been a really positive thing has been the level of conversations across sector, particularly the FE/HE sector with the arts, and it has made me realise even more how few conversations there are and how separate our worlds are.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

'a little bit of money can make people quite adventurous rather than worrying about opinions being formed and being exhibited and I think that sparks hope' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

A few interviewees also very particularly raised questions about the context for arts practice in participatory settings, and the current activities of employers and commissioners. Some felt that any legacy activity would need to think about what could be done to develop the market for this kind of work.

As noted in the commentary on what ArtWorks has achieved, some interviewees were keen to stress the value of 'small wins' or 'quick wins'. In the context of a project with very significant overarching ambitions, this is perhaps the emerging proposition for change: that continued, small-scale stimulus and supporting a range of networks enables a number of champions from within different parts of the 'system' to emerge and lead their own intervention. Whether these small wins need to be underpinned by other kinds of coherence – through policy-making, guidance, national platforms, shared standards and structures or funding practices – in order to be more than the sum of their parts is the key challenge for the legacy activity proposed by different Pathfinders and PHF. Potentially, partners will need to consider whether some of the gaps or challenges laid out in this report are still considered important to address. For example, is there value in seeking to 'prove' the impact of better supported artists on participants, or is feedback from artists and practitioners sufficient in making this case?

One interviewee expressed some of these wider challenges in terms of partners needing to develop their leadership of the issues:

'The big issues are: leadership, and I don't just mean in terms of an organisation taking a grant - I actually mean influence and gravitas and clout. It's not one person – it has to be dispersed but it has to be people who can take others with them. That's a tough challenge.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

An ongoing issue for several interviewees is the role which PHF might choose to play in the future, and where it might still retain some leadership (or provide support). More widely, the importance of

maintaining the existing reach (through online networks, databases, events and other activities) which Pathfinders have built is a crucial part of these considerations of who takes what forwards.

Despite the range of challenges which interviewees discussed, two things came through very strongly from all respondents: that there is a sense of responsibility to continue to work towards better support for artists who work in participatory settings, and that this should be achieved through sharing discussions across different parts of 'the system':

'the conversation has to continue.' (PHF – Staff/Steering Group)

'we have started to have a much more joined up conversation about it all – which is really valuable and maybe we have started asking the right questions.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

'Did I say how wonderful ArtWorks has been? We all want to continue.' (Pathfinder – Core Team)

Conclusions

The following illustration from the artists' survey looks at what artists think about how reflection fits into their practice and its development.

The role of reflection in practice

Thinking about your practice in community, participatory or socially-engaged settings, and how you develop and improve your practice, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Where the term 'reflect' is used here, it could mean different opportunities to reflect, from time and space within a working day, or space for reflection as part of formal training and development processes.


I would like to have more opportunity to engage and reflect with my peers on what 'good practice' is



I would like to have the opportunity to engage more in formal reflection processes (e.g. end of project meeting, formal mentoring)



I prefer to reflect on my practice in informal settings (e.g. pub, over coffee)




I would like to have the opportunity to reflect on a project with the employer/commissioner



I don't always get the opportunity to reflect on a project with the employer/commissioner



Having the opportunity to reflect personally on my practice is crucial to improvement



Base: 925
Source: DHA

Strongly agree Tend to agree

10 Conclusions

This Final Report reflects findings from across the three years (plus) of the ArtWorks initiative. Based on an initial phase of research, five Pathfinders have been commissioned to undertake an individual and collective enquiry process, each operating within their individual sphere of influence and opportunity. All of the Pathfinders have been involved in considering 'next phases' of activity, beyond the end of the current funding agreement. This report looks primarily at what has happened in the phase in which they were funded as Pathfinders, but also considers (where appropriate) some of the future plans which Pathfinders have made, and any general issues or ongoing challenges.

It remains the case that partners involved in ArtWorks feel significantly committed to pursuing the objectives of the initiative, and are prepared to act as champions for models and propositions, as well as believing that further work is required. The range of partners across 'the system' is substantial, though it is also worth noting that many organisations and individuals will have been involved in individual projects, rather than connecting to the overall programme. Pathfinders, individually and institutionally, have (for the most part) enjoyed the process of being involved, and approached the prospect of intervening in existing practices with real determination and integrity.

This conclusion discusses a range of findings, and highlights some areas for consideration in the future.

10.1 Findings

Knowledge

In the Interim Report we noted the way in which consultation processes seemed to confirm that artists would benefit from improved support in developing their careers in arts practice in participatory settings. Upon completion of a range of consultation and research processes, the Pathfinders have built a knowledge base in a range of areas.

Most substantial of these has been the engagement with artists and their practice. Across a range of different approaches, Pathfinders have explored:

- Who artists are, and what motivates them
- What they want and what they need, in order to develop their practice
- What they are prepared to do, in order to develop their practice
- What they think is important in the practice, in order to achieve worthwhile outcomes.

Beyond artists, significant and systematic work has been undertaken mapping formal training provision from major, institutional providers. More informal mapping, which gives a sense of the current informal provision, has also been undertaken. Between these mappings and responses from artists, Pathfinders have been able to identify some gaps in provision, and undertake work which responds to these gaps.

ArtWorks has also encompassed a range of work exploring what affects the quality of arts practice taking place in participatory settings. In some cases, this work has not had a direct output or outlet in terms of responding activity. However, the work by ArtWorks Scotland builds upon findings from consultation and research carefully, and provides a useful statement and basis for ongoing development and discussion. It is worth noting that this area of enquiry has been challenging for Pathfinders, both conceptually and practically.

Finally, ArtWorks has undertaken some small work exploring the role of employers and commissioners. This has been limited by both practical challenges and, on the whole, a relative absence of focus upon the practical conditions under which arts practice in participatory settings takes place. Whilst the context of commissioning and employing has been acknowledged across the Pathfinders, engagement in this area has largely focused on input by employers/commissioners who were partners in Pathfinders.

Models, Solutions and Propositions

ArtWorks has tried and tested a number of different approaches to better support artists to develop their arts practice in participatory settings. These include:

- formal training courses, which can be accredited;
- interventions into formal training courses, some of which may be accredited;
- structured reflective learning models and methodologies, some of which may be closely aligned to 'live' practice or practice development models;
- mentoring approaches and peer networks, supporting artists to self-organise and design their own support;
- training which has focused on particular practice settings or practice methodologies;
- other knowledge exchange approaches, including events and online networks;
- curation and dissemination of materials about arts practice in participatory settings, as learning materials and to support career choices;
- input into new professional qualifications for artists practising in participatory settings;
- input into new professional standards for artists practising in participatory settings;
- development of new professional codes for artists practising in participatory settings;
- emerging guidance on ensuring quality outcomes for arts practice in participatory settings.

Some of these models have commitments to ongoing testing and application; others are still in development, or were used as consultation/research routes, and are yet to be considered further. A key test of long-term success for ArtWorks will be the degree to which different models, solutions and propositions can ensure take-up from artists and other stakeholders, where appropriate. For example, the positioning of the new NOS and code of practice for artists requires work with both artists and employers/commissioners; and, at another level, with policy-makers and funders.

It is also worth noting that the majority of models require some ongoing resources and support to ensure any continuation. Where there are opportunities to change institutional practice (for example, with the application of the learning on quality in Scotland) impact can be gained without significant additional funds. However, where ongoing development for artists is concerned, there will usually be a requirement for time, money or some other cost to be covered. Models like the CPD credits approach from Navigator may help to acknowledge and formalise a wider range of learning, but fundamentally there are still some difficult conversations to be had by different partners about who is prepared to take responsibility for investing in the workforce in this area.

An emerging community of practice?

As noted above, several of the activities which Pathfinders have undertaken have provided opportunities for artists (and others involved in the practice) to share their knowledge and experience. Despite the significant variation in experiences and types of practice, on the whole there is evidence that this focus has been valued significantly by participants in events and networks. The research

undertaken by the Evaluation Team with artists confirmed what many of the consultation findings had stated: that many individual artists and others involved in practice can feel relatively isolated (even where they work within or with significant institutions and organisations), even where communities of practice do exist already.

Practitioners have emerged from a range of contexts throughout the ArtWorks programme: from HEIs and FE colleges, working for arts organisations, running their own organisations, and building careers across a range of settings and types of practice. Whilst the diversity of the practice probably limits, in the longer term, any total and completely coherent networking of these practitioners, many value:

- the opportunity to come together;
- the opportunity to hear about, observe and learn from each other's practice;
- the validation which this focus on the practice and range of platforms for it brings.

Better supported artists

Through ArtWorks, some artists who currently practice in participatory settings have been better supported. The most significant single intervention has probably been the Fellowship pilot, between a single artist and Barbican Guildhall. At the other end of the scale are artists who have contributed to a survey, and online network or attended an event. In between are artists who have engaged with pilots and provided feedback; and artists who have led on the design and delivery of elements of pilots, or whole pilot areas of activity. As such, the involvement from artists has been significant, though the structure of the Pathfinders as viewed in terms of formal partners does not necessarily always reflect this input.

A key challenge for any legacy activity will be the way in which the networks and contact lists which Pathfinders have can be used to ensure that artists continue to be supported, and that artists are enabled to share their experiences of that support and their views on how it could be developed in the future.

Processes and challenges

The enquiry-based approach in ArtWorks has created some significant challenges, including issues about the robustness of individual elements of the research and practical issues with interpretation and application. More generally, individual Pathfinders have had to learn quickly about the challenges of designing research which actually gets the answers to the questions which they feel they need to ask. Arguably, some shared, early research might have been valuable in addressing some of these issues. Beyond individual elements of the research, there remains something of a challenge in continuing to:

- disseminate the findings
- encourage others to build upon them, rather than repeat the exercise
- apply those findings to meaningful action.

At times, Pathfinders have grappled with questions of how to engage with partners across a complex 'system', in order – in the long-term – to seek some kind of 'systemic change'. From a practical perspective, however, Pathfinders can demonstrate some engagement and attempts at interventions across most of the major sites in the 'system'. There are gaps: there is significant work to be done understanding how commissioners and employers from the non-cultural sectors might further influence workforce development in this area. Pathfinders have had to be pragmatic, as they have been with their own partnerships and structures. Small wins and quick wins have provided useful in-roads into new

areas. Some of the more cross-system propositions – the code of practice, NOS and quality guidance – are still to be thoroughly tested in their application.

There have been significant challenges in managing the structure and organisation of the initiative, and the processes for decision-making at different levels. It has not always been clear how learning from the Pathfinders would inform PHF and the Steering Group, or how those with different authority and responsibility for the project would feed back into proposed interventions. Beyond this issues of ‘internal’ organisation, more widely there are some challenges about the ongoing ownership of the aims and outputs of ArtWorks. Wider ownership is sought across all of the proposed legacy activities by Pathfinders, and there is evidence of wider engagement in some areas (e.g. the expanded Cymru partnership). However, there is work to do to identify what is being asked of different stakeholders, and to ensure positioning with key partners such as Arts Council England.

Overall, it remains the case that ArtWorks was not going to be able to ‘achieve’ its goals within the time and budget limitations available to the Pathfinders. If those goals are still held to be important, it is therefore important that the legacy activities (replacing, as they do, the original proposed second phase of the initiative) are still framed and focused by those goals. As such, this evaluation seeks to look at the progress which has been made towards them. Grappling with the size of ambition has sometimes been challenging for Pathfinders, particularly given the relationship between workforce development and other significant issues like the ways in which the value of arts practice in participatory settings are understood. This dynamic tension has been constant through the Pathfinders’ activities, and is likely to continue; it has also been an important part of the overall initiative allowing Pathfinders time and space to deal with difficult issues, and imagine alternative approaches. However, it is worth noting that – in order to make progress – ArtWorks has needed from time to time to set out its stall, and be clear about what it *is* doing, and what it is *not* doing.

What next?

In the Interim Report we asked whether and how ArtWorks could seek to be more than the sum of its parts. This question remains an important one looking at the proposed legacy/ongoing activity for the different Pathfinders.

Understandably, there is a desire from PHF and others (including Creative Scotland, as a Pathfinder lead organisation) to ensure that funders are not dictating or leading any future processes at the cost of proper involvement with the sector. There are, however, resourcing and other limitations which will affect the way in which different parts of ‘the system’ – including artists and arts organisations – can step forward and engage with or take a lead on different areas. The Final Report from the initiative, and the series of proposed events for Spring 2015, provide an opportunity for ArtWorks to begin to outline what it is asking, encouraging and supporting different bits of ‘the system’ to do.

In the context of the Navigator proposition to develop an Alliance, there is still work to be undertaken to understand how this structure can bring together different stakeholders, and how it will relate to any other legacy activities taking place. For good reason, ArtWorks has not emerged with a single solution or approach. However, the models, solutions and propositions tested through the programme risk losing traction and take-up where they are not positioned more widely, or wider support is not sought. Beyond the ‘ask’ which might be made of different parts of the ‘system’ this Spring, the test of ArtWorks as a system-wide intervention will emerge through the ways in which commitments are made by those partners either outside the ArtWorks structure, or no longer in receipt of ongoing support.

Appendix A


The following illustration from the artists' survey looks at the experiences and views which artists have of standards and codes of practice for their professional practice.

Standards and Codes of Practice

Different groups of practitioners use codes of practice, or nationally-recognised standards in their practice.

For example, some dancers use the National Occupational Standards (NOS) for Dance Leadership.

Thinking about your familiarity and use of different codes of practice and standards which exist in relation to practice in community, participatory or socially engaged settings, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?



11 Appendix A – Bibliography

- DHA. 2014. *ArtWorks Evaluation. Survey of Artists.*
- DHA. 2015. *ArtWorks Evaluation. Interviews with Artists.*
- Jackson, A. 2014a. *ArtWorks Cymru. Evaluation Report.*
- Jackson, A. 2014b. *ArtWorks London: Evaluation Report.*
- Schwarz, M. 2013a. *ArtWorks: Arts Practice in Participatory Settings. Working Paper 2.*
- Schwarz, M. 2013b. *ArtWorks: Training and Development Providers and Opportunities. Working Paper 5.*
- Schwarz, M. 2014. *ArtWorks: Quality – because we all want to do better. Working Paper 8.*
- Salamon, E. 2013a. *ArtWorks: Understanding Participants' Views. Working Paper 6.*
- Salamon, E. 2013b. *ArtWorks: Qualifications, Codes of Practice and Standards. Working Paper 7.*
- Sellers, E. 2014. *ArtWorks: Understanding demand – building effective relationships between employers and artists. Working Paper 9.*
- Taylor, B. 2013a. *ArtWorks: Testing Professional Development Methodologies. Working Paper 3.*
- Taylor, B. 2013b. *ArtWorks: Artist Consultations. Working Paper 4.*

The following illustration from the artists' survey shows the barriers which artists cited to them engaging with opportunities for developing their practice.

Barriers to engaging with development opportunities

Thinking about things which might prevent you from further developing your practice in community, participatory or socially-engaged settings, please select the most significant barriers which you have encountered.



The financial cost of paying for courses/development opportunities



The time cost of not undertaking paid work in order to take up courses/development opportunities

*Base: 890
Source: DHA*

Report written by

Tamsin Cox, DHA

Dr Abigail Gilmore and Lottie Clarke, Institute for Cultural Practices, University of Manchester

Illustrations by David Casey, DHA

Contact us

Tamsin Cox, Head of Policy and Research

Birmingham

Unit 313, Custard Factory

Gibb Street, Birmingham, B9 4AA

e. tamsin@dhacommunications.co.uk

www.dhacommunications.co.uk

@TamsinECox

@DHAComms



The University
of Manchester

