

WESTON  
JERWOOD  
**CREATIVE  
BURSARIES**

**2014-16  
EVALUATION  
REPORT**

## CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b>	03
<b>1: Introduction</b>	06
<b>2: Programme Context</b>	07
<b>3: Aims, Objectives and Measures of Success</b>	10
<b>4: Programme Design and Management</b>	13
Programme Design	13
Hosts and Placements	13
Eligibility Criteria	14
Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme	14
Management	15
<b>5: Evaluation Methodology</b>	17
<b>6: Findings against Objectives</b>	18
a] Evaluate the effectiveness of the programme, particularly any new elements of the programme design and eligibility criteria	18
b] Provide positive benefit to a minimum of 40 participants during their job placements	24
c] Improve participants' chances of finding permanent employment in the arts thereafter	27
d] Provide positive benefit to 40 high quality host arts organisations	29
e] Build public awareness of the programme and the issues it addresses – within the arts industry and related sectors (arts, creative industries, education, social justice)	32
<b>7: Recommendations</b>	35
Programme Design	35
Recruitment of hosts and participants	37
Placements and running the programme	39
<b>8: Summary</b>	42
Key findings	42
Key combined outcomes	42
Next steps	43
<b>Appendices</b>	44
Further reading, list of placements and key programme documents	

### Terminology

*Host Organisations:* Arts organisations who successfully applied to create and host a placement as part of the programme

*Participants:* Recent graduates who had been on full maintenance grants throughout university and who undertook the placements with host organisations (previously referred to as bursary recipients)

*Placements:* Roles created by host organisations for participants.

# WESTON JERWOOD **CREATIVE BURSARIES**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

*By Kate Danielson*

*Programme Director,*

*Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2014-16*

*August 2017*

### **Programme Outline**

The Creative Bursaries programme is a talent development initiative which since 2010, through its two editions, has helped create 84 roles in 75 arts organisations nationally for graduates from low-income backgrounds. Providing these bursaries goes some way to making entry into the arts a level playing field and ensuring those with talent, if not financial backing, are given the opportunity to succeed. In the process, the programme aims to embed diverse recruitment practices amongst the host organisations, share best practice across the sector about how to recruit as widely as possible to support inclusion at entry level, and have an impact on the diversity and vibrancy of our future arts workforce.

This evaluation focusses on the second edition, the Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2014-16 which ran from March 2015 to October 2016. 40 recent graduates undertook placements lasting between six and 12 months with 40 leading arts organisations across the UK. Hosts were selected for their ability to offer the most inspiring placement in a wide range of jobs in the arts and the best possible start for the graduates. Alongside their placement, participants were supported by mentoring and structured networking opportunities through the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme.

The programme was designed and managed by Jerwood Charitable Foundation with the support of Garfield Weston Foundation, Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation and J Paul Getty Jr Charitable Trust.

This report looks at the experiences of the participants and host organisations and the impact of the programme on their development. It highlights the particular successes of the programme's design and its benefits to those involved, and makes recommendations for its future development to have the widest impact on participants, hosts and the wider sector.

### Programme Aims

The aims of the programme are to support a new generation of talented artists and cultural workers into the arts, in the process increasing the long term diversity of that workforce, and to encourage best practice in recruitment amongst hosts, again, to achieve long term change.

*To do this, the programme was designed to:*

- Create well-supported, developmental job roles in the arts for talented entry-level graduates from low income backgrounds, opening up access for those who may otherwise struggle to find a way in.
- Create additional resource and capacity where it is most needed in leading arts organisations.
- Effect short and long term change in the way organisations think about how they recruit, creating a legacy of fairer access to the arts sector and more open recruitment practices.
- Effect both short term and long term job creation in the arts.

### Key Findings

*Highlights of the Programme's design*

- 94% (75) of hosts and participants involved in the programme were satisfied or very satisfied with their involvement and 100% (80) felt the programme should continue.
- 93% (37) of the placements completed to full term.
- 33% (13) of participants self-identified as non-white.
- 60% (24) of participants had their contracted extended or made permanent by their hosts.
- 78% (31) of participants were still known to be undertaking paid work in the arts/creative industries, as of August 2017.

### Benefit to Hosts

- 95% (38) of hosts were very or quite satisfied with the recruitment criteria.
- 98% (39) of hosts would consider targeting future job opportunities towards low income applicants in future.
- 98% (39) of hosts felt their participant had made a substantial contribution to their organisation.

### Benefit to Participants

- 92% (37) of the participants felt taking part in the programme had increased their **commitment** to working in the arts.
- 95% (38) of participants felt that the programme had improved their **understanding** of recruitment processes in the arts sector in general, and therefore increased their chances of securing work in the future.
- 80% (32) of participants felt the training sessions provided through the programme (via the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme) were useful or very useful.
- 72% (29) of participants felt their mentoring sessions had been either useful or very useful.
- 90% plan to stay in touch with the networks formed through the programme.

### Key Combined Outcomes

Looking across this evaluation and the evaluation of the pilot edition, the [DCMS Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2010-12](#), it is clear that the combined statistics and the qualitative research result in a compelling case for the programme has a positive influence in the arts sector. The programme continues to succeed in the following areas, as originally defined in the pilot evaluation:

- Opening up fairer access to entry level jobs.
- Diversifying the arts workforce for the better.
- Widening the talent pool for employers.
- Encouraging organisational best practice in recruitment to achieve long term change and seeding behavioural change in participating organisations.
- Encouraging successful transition from university to work in the arts for those without existing networks and unpaid work experience.
- Supporting early career professional development.
- Retaining that talent in the arts and ensuring participants move on to the next stage in their careers:
  - ⇒ Of the alumni of the pilot scheme, we know that 84% (37 out of 44) are still working in the arts and of this edition, 78% (31) we currently know are employed in the arts.
  - ⇒ Participants moved on to new jobs including Programme Administrator, Quays Culture, Salford; Offsite & Education Assistant (Curatorial Trainee), Chisenhale Gallery, London; Events Officer – Patrons, Royal Academy, London; Concerts Administrator, CBSO, Birmingham; Events and Projects Officer, Creative People and Places Marketplace Project, Ely; Studio Administrator at Bow Arts, London; CRM (Customer Relationship Management) at Universal Music, London.
- Developing diverse cultural leaders of the future:
  - ⇒ Alumni are following pathways into future leadership; Aaron Wright (participant 2010-2012) secured the first leadership role of the cohort in 2016, as [Artistic Director of Birmingham's Fierce Festival](#), a great achievement against international competition and just five years into his career at the age of 28.
  - ⇒ Other leadership and management roles which participants in the first edition have secured include Circus Producer at The Roundhouse; Producer at Sheffield International Documentary Festival; Arts Officer for the Orkney Islands; General Manager of National Theatre Productions; Communications Manager at Mahogany Opera Group then Classical Music Programme Manager at the British Council; and Communications Manager at British Council's Shakespeare Lives programme. Others are developing successful freelance careers in the arts.
- Creating new jobs in the arts:
  - ⇒ New work opportunities created for 84 young graduates from low income backgrounds in 75 arts organisations across the UK.
  - ⇒ 60% of placements were extended and 32% of roles made permanent, or led to longer term employment relationships, across both editions.
- Increasing ethnic diversity of participants compared to pilot edition:
  - ⇒ Tightening the means-tested criteria between editions one and two and changing our briefing to hosts increased the number of individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds who participated, from 9% to 33% of the cohort – up 366%.

## 1: INTRODUCTION

The Creative Bursaries programme is a singular project which has increased diversity and skills in the arts by creating jobs and training for talented young people from low income backgrounds; those who could otherwise not afford to work for free in order to gain the experience the arts currently require in order to progress and succeed.

The arts have long been seen as the [preserve of the white middle-classes](#)<sup>1</sup>. This ongoing programme is opening up access for those with the potential but without the finances and support network to find their way in. Since 2010, the Creative Bursaries programme has funded paid entry level roles for [84 talented recent graduates](#) from low income backgrounds in 75 outstanding arts organisations across the UK.

The project is designed and run by Jerwood Charitable Foundation to support the potential arts leaders of the future. By giving these young people the best possible start to their careers, the programme contributes to a thriving and diverse arts sector. These are the people who are proving themselves as the leaders of the arts organisations of the future, and who will have the power to ingrain long term change in recruitment practices, diversity and skills development across the sector. Participating hosts are also creating long-term change in how their organisations think about recruiting as widely as possible.

A successful pilot edition, the [DCMS Jerwood Creative Bursaries](#), was developed by Jerwood Foundation and Jerwood Charitable Foundation (JCF) from 2010-2012. This was funded by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and Arts Council England (ACE). Following this, JCF secured the support of Garfield Weston Foundation, Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation and JP Getty Jr Charitable Trust to establish the

second edition, the [Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries](#), which ran from 2014-2016.

The Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2014-16 programme was completed in October 2016 and is the subject of this evaluation.

The evaluation completed in July 2012 for the DCMS Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2010-12 can be viewed [here](#).

In September 2017 we launch the third edition of the programme, the Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2017-2019. The programme is designed and managed by Jerwood Charitable Foundation in partnership with the British Council. It has been made possible through the combined support of Arts Council England's Ambition for Excellence Fund, Garfield Weston Foundation, Jerwood Charitable Foundation, CHK Charities Limited and PRS Foundation.

*“The programme has highlighted the need for organisations to be more proactive in making sure diversity in the workplace is central to their core aims and objectives. The programme provides a model of best practice for how to create greater access to jobs in the arts for a more diverse community.” (Host)*

**Report by Kate Danielson, Programme Director  
and Shonagh Manson, Director,  
Jerwood Charitable Foundation  
September 2017**

<sup>1</sup> [theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/nov/23/middle-class-people-dominate-arts-survey-finds](http://theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/nov/23/middle-class-people-dominate-arts-survey-finds) October 2015

## 2: PROGRAMME CONTEXT

In 2010 Jerwood Foundation and Jerwood Charitable Foundation were invited by DCMS to create a programme which would open up access to arts professions for those who could not afford to work for free in the problematic and prevalent unpaid internship culture of the arts<sup>1</sup>. Whilst the practice of offering unpaid internships as the main entry route into the arts has, since 2010, become largely unacceptable, it does still proliferate and anecdotally it has for the most part resulted in a contraction of entry-level opportunities rather than the creation of new paid roles. It is still the case that some of the most talented recent graduates, particularly those without the financial resources to sustain themselves without a regular salary, are being lost to the arts sector.

Meanwhile, progress on improving fair access and diversity in the arts sector has at best stood still and potentially has worsened<sup>2</sup>. Research and media coverage<sup>3</sup> during the lifetime of the programme reveals that the arts continue to be at risk of becoming an exclusively middle-class enclave. Whilst diversity has to date been more often defined in terms of ethnicity, gender and disability, socio-economic status is increasingly highlighted as a key hindrance to career advancement and social mobility. In 2010 when the Creative Bursaries pilot was launched, it was the only national arts programme focussing on socio-economic diversity, and this is still the case today.

*“I feel [the programme] has helped foreground socio-economic circumstances in the context of diversity and helped acknowledge the extent to which they run through all of the ‘protected characteristics.’” (Host)*

In targeting socio-economic diversity the programme is also supporting ethnic diversity, with 33% of the current cohort coming from non-white, culturally diverse backgrounds. This compares favourably with Arts Council England (ACE)'s analysis of its National Portfolio Organisations which showed in 2014/5 ethnic minorities made up 13.7% of the sample workforce<sup>4</sup>.

We very much welcome the DCMS commitment, to increasing access to culture for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds, expressed in its 2016 [Culture White Paper ‘Our Culture’](#), to increasing access to culture for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. As the White Paper recognises, the key to ensuring this access is to foster a diversity of leadership and representation within artists and arts organisations themselves – to make sure that young people have meaningful, plentiful and visible role models. There is a visible lack of diversity at leadership level, where several funding and development interventions operate (e.g. ACE's Change Makers, Clore Leadership Programme), but strategic intervention at entry level, the area which this programme inhabits, is missing.

*“When there are more diverse heads of companies - perhaps a generation away - then diversity will be embedded in an organisation's DNA.” (Host)*

<sup>1</sup> This was the Government's formal response to the [Fair Access to the Professions Report 2009](#) action regarding unpaid internships.

<sup>2</sup> [theguardian.com/inequality/commentis-free/2017/jul/05/cool-britannia-inequality-tony-blair-arts-industry?utm\\_source=dlvr.it&utm\\_medium=twitter](http://theguardian.com/inequality/commentis-free/2017/jul/05/cool-britannia-inequality-tony-blair-arts-industry?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter); [artscouncil.org.uk/publication/equality-diversity-and-creative-case-2015-16](http://artscouncil.org.uk/publication/equality-diversity-and-creative-case-2015-16)

<sup>3</sup> *No, I won't get work experience for Tarquin* by Deborah Ross [thetimes.co.uk/tto/life/article4265953.ece](http://thetimes.co.uk/tto/life/article4265953.ece) Nov 13 2014; *The Loneliness of the Working-Class Actor* by Carole Cadwalladr. [theguardian.com/film/2016/may/08/working-class-actors-disappearing-britain-class-privilege-access-posh](http://theguardian.com/film/2016/may/08/working-class-actors-disappearing-britain-class-privilege-access-posh) May 8th 2016.

<sup>4</sup> [artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Equality\\_Diversity\\_and\\_the\\_Creative\\_Case\\_A\\_data\\_report\\_2012-2015.pdf](http://artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Equality_Diversity_and_the_Creative_Case_A_data_report_2012-2015.pdf)

As ACE's Chair, Sir Peter Bazalgette described the lack of diversity as the 'single biggest challenge facing the creative industries', labelling the past 50 years of culture as 'absolutely lamentable' in terms of diversity. A number of major reports and surveys conducted recently by leading arts and academic bodies all agree that this lack of diversity is damaging the arts sector as well as discriminating against individuals and leading to the creative sector becoming a closed shop. These include Create London and Goldsmiths University's Panic survey<sup>5</sup>, Creative Industries Federation's Creative Diversity Report<sup>6</sup> and the Warwick Commission Report.<sup>7</sup>

There is a continued need to create opportunities in the arts sector for young people from less affluent backgrounds which would take them from primary school all the way through to more advanced development interventions such as the Clore Leadership Programme. This ladder of development would ensure talented but disadvantaged young people are brought into and retained in the arts. We welcome ACE's recent commitment to creating a 25 year Creative Talent Plan which will begin to address just this<sup>8</sup>, and to which we hope this continuing programme can make a significant contribution. In addition, the work done by universities' Widening Participation departments to attract more diverse young people and retain them through to graduation currently stops short of supporting them into

work opportunities beyond formal education, and this is crucially undermining the effective social mobility of those from particular backgrounds, as recognised by Universities UK's social mobility report in 2016<sup>9</sup>. We will seek opportunities to contribute to Universities UK's goals to address these issues as we move forward with the third edition of this programme.

*"I am really proud to be from a working class family and think it's a huge credit to the organisers that you recognise the value of underrepresented voices, and are actively working to give us platforms, support and opportunities for development."* (Participant)

5 [createlondon.org/create-announces-the-findings-of-the-panic-survey/](http://createlondon.org/create-announces-the-findings-of-the-panic-survey/)  
6 [creativeindustriesfederation.com/news/creative-diversity-report-launch](http://creativeindustriesfederation.com/news/creative-diversity-report-launch)  
7 [2.warwick.ac.uk/research/warwickcommission/futureculture/finalreport/](http://2.warwick.ac.uk/research/warwickcommission/futureculture/finalreport/)

8 [artscouncil.org.uk/blog/making-more-our-nations-talent](http://artscouncil.org.uk/blog/making-more-our-nations-talent)  
9 [universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/working-in-partnership-enabling-social-mobility-in-higher-education.aspx](http://universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/working-in-partnership-enabling-social-mobility-in-higher-education.aspx)



Kully Thiarai, Artistic Director, National Theatre Wales, speaking at the Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2014-16 closing event.  
Image Hydar Dewachi

### 3: AIMS, OBJECTIVES AND MEASURES OF SUCCESS

The aims of the programme are to support a new generation of talented artists and cultural workers into the arts, in the process increasing the long term diversity of that workforce, and to encourage best practice in recruitment amongst hosts, again, to achieve long-term change in behaviour and results.

To do this, the programme was designed to:

- ➔ Create well-supported, developmental job roles in the arts for talented entry-level graduates from low income backgrounds, opening up access for those who may otherwise struggle to find a way in.
- ➔ Create additional resource and capacity where it is most needed in leading arts organisations.
- ➔ Effect short and long-term change in the way organisations think about how they recruit, creating a legacy of fairer access to the arts sector and more open recruitment practices.
- ➔ Effect both short term and long term job creation in the arts.

Our evaluation objectives were:

- a] Programme:** Evaluate the effectiveness of the programme, particularly any new elements of the programme design and eligibility criteria.
- b] Participants during placements:** Provide positive benefit to a minimum of 40 participants.
- c] Participants following placements:** Create positive benefit to participants.
- d] Hosts:** Provide positive benefit to 40 high quality host arts organisations.
- e] Sector:** Build public awareness of the programme and the issues it addresses – within the arts industry and related sectors (arts, creative industries, education, social justice).

We broke down our measures of success for each of these five objectives as follows:

For the **programme**:

- i]** Hosts and participants are satisfied with their engagement with the programme overall.
- ii]** Minimum of 40 placement applications are secured from host organisations.
- iii]** The criteria (revised from the 2010-12 pilot edition) are workable for hosts and participants and all placements were provided to eligible graduates.
- iv]** A spread of ethnically diverse candidates apply for placements and are recruited, exceeding current arts industry diversity figures of 13.7% (ACE figures<sup>1</sup>) and general working age population diversity figures of 12% (Diversity UK figures<sup>2</sup>).
- v]** Placements reflect skills gaps in the sector.
- vi]** 90% (36) of placements complete to full term.
- vii]** Programme completed on time and on budget.

<sup>1</sup> [artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Equality\\_Diversity\\_and\\_the\\_Creative\\_Case\\_A\\_data\\_report\\_2012-2015.pdf](http://artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Equality_Diversity_and_the_Creative_Case_A_data_report_2012-2015.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [diversityuk.org/diversity-in-the-uk/](http://diversityuk.org/diversity-in-the-uk/)

For **participants during their placements:**

- i] Participants report increased aspirations, skills and commitment to the arts and confidence about a future career in the arts
- ii] Participants develop a better understanding of recruitment processes in the sector
- iii] Participants report that the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme added value to their placement
- iv] Successful mentoring relationships are provided
- v] Extended professional networks are developed - including between peers and smaller geographic cohorts of participants

For **participants following their placements:**

- i] Participants secure a job or freelance role in the arts on completion
- ii] 50% (20) of participants have their contracts extended or made permanent by their host
- iii] Successful job progression achieved by participants over 5 years

For **host organisations:**

- i] Participants make a tangible contribution to the organisation and hosts consider there is a legacy from the programme
- ii] Hosts would consider targeting less affluent applicants again; hosts have found new ways of recruiting more widely and will continue to use these new methods
- iii] Hosts have made valuable new relationships, e.g. with peer organisations, HEIs

For the arts **sector:**

- i] A positive reputation is created and articles in the press/online achieved
- ii] Host organisations and participants act as ambassadors for the programme and are active participants in influencing employment practices in the arts and in raising the issue of diversity in the arts.

Section 6 on page 18, **Findings Against**

**Objectives**, goes through each of these in detail.



Weston Jerwood Creative Bursary participants.  
Image: Outroslide Photography

## 4: PROGRAMME DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT

### **Programme Design**

- The programme was UK-wide and included hosts and participants in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales.
- The programme part-funded 40 entry-level job placements across the full range of art forms and was open for hosts to propose roles across a full range of job types in the sector: from directors, performers and musicians to producers, backstage and arts management roles. Placements were real jobs in which participants learnt whilst working and fulfilled an important, productive role within the host organisation.
- Eligible participants had to have been in receipt of a full maintenance grant (or equivalent, eg Young Student's Bursary in Scotland) for each year of their university studies.
- Eligible participants must have graduated from their first degree since 2013 (within two years at the time) with a minimum 2:2 degree.
- 85% (34) of placements were 12 months' long, both full- and part-time, with 15% (6) between six and 11 months' long, both full- and part-time.
- Recruitment and on-going management of each placement was the responsibility of the host.
- Participants received a salary of £15,500 pa pro rata nationally and £18,000 for those in London, commensurate with Living Wage. Host organisations received a grant from the programme covering 75% of the salary costs of the placement, with hosts contributing the remaining 25% and salary on-costs.
- The Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme was created to run alongside the placements and provided a fully funded programme of extended professional development, training, an independent mentor for each participant and structured networking.

- All 40 placements ran on a rolling basis between May 2015 and September 2016.
- The programme was made possible by a consortium of private trusts and foundations, with no public funding for this edition.

### **Hosts and Placements**

Host organisations were invited to apply; there was not an open call out to seek organisations. This was designed to manage success rates and reduce the work burden on organisations applying; to reduce the administrative burden on the programme; and to bring in organisations to hit the criteria and spread represented below.

Hosts were invited according to two main criteria; that they were amongst those producing the highest quality artistic work; and that they were seen to be running their organisations and looking after their staff in an exemplary developmental fashion, ensuring the best offer for participants. Organisations applied with the outline of a new placement they would host. Invitations were sent to hosts in December 2014 and successful hosts were announced in March 2015.

Both host organisations and the roles they offered were chosen to represent:

- A broad spectrum of art forms.
- The diversity of types of job role/practice in the arts.
- A spread across geographic locations.
- The different size and funding status of organisations in the arts.

Roles were intended to support the needs of the host as well as providing the best opportunity for participants, ensuring that the placements were the best possible experience for both hosts and participants. Placements that enabled vital additional capacity at key moments were considered a priority. All roles selected were new to the organisation, created specifically in response to our invitation, although this was not a criterion for application.

**Eligibility Criteria**

Maintenance Grants were identified by DCMS at the outset of the original pilot edition 2010-12 as a fair and manageable method of means-testing the financial status of recent graduates. In the Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries (WJCB) 2014-16, it proved once again to be the most specific, light-touch and objective way of assessing means-tested need, following extensive research which did not unearth alternatives, undertaken during the pilot edition.

Assessed by the Student Loans Company each year and based on levels of parental income, students are provided with a document for every year of study confirming the level of grant funding they receive. Students in England with a family income under £25,000 pa receive a full maintenance grant. In the other countries in the UK this threshold is still lower; in 2016 in Wales this figure is £18,000 pa, in Scotland £17,000 pa and in Northern Ireland £19,000 pa.

As the focus of the programme was on recent graduates, the year of graduation was set as within the past 2 years (2013 – 15) and the grade requirement was a minimum 2:2 or above. These criteria were intended to target those at a key point following graduation and to reduce the number of applicants, making it more manageable for the hosts to manage their own recruitment. In a change from the pilot edition 2010-12, in which only graduates from a recognised art subject were eligible, for the 2014-16 edition we expanded the programme so that graduates from any subject were eligible to apply.

**Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation****Training Programme**

Supported by the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation in the 2014-16 edition, the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme was a significant development within the overall programme following the pilot edition. The programme increased the professional development training that participants received outside their host organisations. We designed and held four national training events, hosted by host organisations around the country. This included a two-day visit to Manchester International Festival; a one-day fundraising workshop in London at Somerset House and Donmar Warehouse; a two-day event as part of Glasgow International, hosted by Glasgow's Citizens Theatre, Cryptic and The Common Guild, focussing on project management skills; and a one-day workshop in Birmingham at Eastside Projects on career planning.

The programme also provided funding for each participant to have an independent mentor outside their host organisation, to help focus attention on their future careers.

We sent regular e-newsletters to participants with news about other training opportunities (e.g. Activate's Outdoor Arts Event Production course which Activate offered at a discounted rate to participants) and added the group to the Jerwood Visual Arts private view invitation list. We set up a closed Facebook group which has been an important place for them to exchange news, jobs opportunities etc. This has 35 members and is still in active use by participants at the publication date of this report in September 2017.

**Management**

The programme was run by Programme Director, Kate Danielson, in conjunction with Director of JCF, Shonagh Manson. Jointly, they managed the programme as follows:

- ➔ Refined the structure of the programme, following the evaluation of the pilot.
- ➔ Invited, assessed and selected the host organisations, and assisted them in creating and promoting the right opportunities.
- ➔ Approved the final selection of participants for each placement according to the financial and academic criteria, and monitored mentor selection.
- ➔ Advised and supported both hosts and participants on an on-going basis.
- ➔ Designed and delivered the professional development and networking opportunities for participants through the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme.
- ➔ Raised the profile of the programme within the sector and involved hosts and participants as ambassadors, with support from the programme's press representatives, Four Colman Getty.
- ➔ Developed and managed the programme's communications strategy.
- ➔ Successfully fundraised for the third edition of the programme.
- ➔ Conducted ongoing evaluation of the programme and compiled this final report.

The programme's Director Kate Danielson worked on a freelance basis and was supported by freelance administrators Oliver Fuke (Jan–Sept 2015) and India Windsor-Clive (Oct 2015–Dec 2016).



Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries participant.  
Image: Outroslice Photography

## 5: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Information was collected in the following ways:

### SurveyMonkey questionnaires

Questionnaire for all placement applicants	1216
Hosts' entry survey	42*
Participants' entry survey	42*
Hosts' exit survey	40
Participants' exit survey	40
What does it cost to enter the arts? Survey	196

\*2 participants had to pull out and were replaced.

### Written material

Programme Director's entry telephone interview with hosts	42
Programme Director's entry telephone interview with participants	42
Programme Director's exit telephone interview with hosts	40
Programme Director's exit telephone interview with participants	40
Manchester training event feedback forms	21
London training event feedback forms	33

### Other sources

The following material is published on the programme's website:

- [Two films commissioned to document the launch of the programme and the first training event at Manchester International Festival](#)
- [Blogs written by participants](#)
- [Press coverage](#)
- [Photographs and other media](#)

## 6: FINDINGS AGAINST OBJECTIVES

This section follows the programme's five evaluation objectives as outlined on page 10, Section 3: **Aims, Objectives and Measures of Success**.

### **a) Evaluate the effectiveness of the programme, particularly any new elements of the programme design and eligibility criteria**

#### **i) Hosts and participants are satisfied with their engagement with the programme overall**

##### **FINDING:**

*94% (75) of hosts and participants involved in the programme were satisfied or very satisfied with their involvement and 100% (80) felt the programme should continue*

One host reported being partially satisfied as they felt their participant was more of a burden than a help to the organisation and another felt the eligibility criteria were too restrictive.

Three participants were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Two felt there had been a lack of structured support for their role within their host organisation, and another didn't feel the training events related to their role.

#### **ii) Minimum of 40 placement applications secured from host organisations**

##### **FINDING:**

*105 arts organisations were invited to apply to host a placement and 85 applied for 40 places; resulting in a 47% success rate*

Some invited hosts did not reply and others felt it wasn't the right time for them, e.g. if they were in the midst of a change of leadership. Clear guidance for host organisations applying was developed and shared, indicating selection criteria (please see Recruitment Briefing for Host Organisations in the Appendices on page 47).

We selected applications based on the quality of the offer for the placement participant against the criteria, and then worked to create a mix of opportunities for participants across the country and across art form. We had many more good applications than we could support, and were able to create geographical cohorts. At least three-quarters of the 85 applications received were of a high standard and could have been supported were the funding available.

The programme achieved a mix across geographic locations as follows:

- 27% (11) in London
- 2.5% (1) in the South East of England
- 8% (3) in the South West of England
- 12% (5) in the East of England
- 15% (6) in the North England
- 10% (4) in the Midlands, England
- 10% (4) in Scotland
- 10% (4) in Wales
- 5% (2) in Northern Ireland

The spread across art form included craft and circus for the first time:

- 20% (8) in the visual arts
- 20% (8) in theatre
- 22% (9) in cross arts
- 15% (6) in music (including opera, jazz, orchestral and experimental)
- 10% (4) in dance
- 5% (2) in literature
- 5% (2) in circus
- 2% (1) in craft

In response to feedback from the pilot edition 2010-12, we ensured there were a higher number of 12 month full-time placements compared to part-time and/or shorter (six – 11 month) placements. In the 2014-16 edition, 75% (30) placements were 12 month full-time roles and 25% (10) part-time and/or roles of six – 11 month duration.

**iii] The criteria (revised from the pilot edition 2010-12) are workable for hosts and participants and all placements are provided to eligible graduates**

Eligibility criteria for participants were adjusted for this second edition as follows:

- ➔ All graduates were eligible, not just those graduating from arts subjects.
- ➔ Academic criterion was broadened from 2:1 to 2:2 to increase the pool of eligible candidates.
- ➔ Financial criterion was tightened; all graduates had to have been in receipt of a Full Maintenance Grant throughout the duration of their degree, not just a Partial Maintenance Grant each year as was the criterion in the pilot edition 2010-12.

Our aim was to ensure that participants were those most in need – hence the tightening of financial eligibility. We relaxed the academic criterion to reach a wider potential pool of candidates. Throughout the programme, we were working in a vacuum of knowledge about the actual size of our pool of eligible candidates as we could not find out data about the total number of students across the UK who were on a full maintenance grant throughout their university years.

**FINDING:**

**95% (38) of hosts were quite satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied with the recruitment criteria**

Two hosts felt the criteria were not at all workable for them; they felt the maintenance grant requirements were too strict or placed too great a strain on their small staff to assess.

Many hosts were concerned with the low number of eligible applicants the criteria produced and also about the amount of work involved in understanding and reviewing the candidates' financial documents. Whilst the majority were very happy with their selected participant, they reported that in many cases they didn't have a

good second choice. Overall the feeling was that although they all understood very clearly the need for the criteria, they found it onerous to implement in practice. It wouldn't stop them from taking part again in the future or recommending the programme to other hosts but it is something to draw to the attention of future hosts before they start recruiting. Hosts with small teams and those with complex HR processes (e.g. those who are part of a university) found it challenging.

*“On the positive side, I understood the importance of ensuring the position was given to someone who wouldn't have been able to support themselves on an unpaid internship. Therefore it made sense to limit it to people who had received the full maintenance grant. I think given the current climate for graduates, this was the right thing to do.” (Host)*

**FINDING:**

**88% (37) of hosts were quite satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied with the number of placement applications received, which varied widely between two and 47**

More work would need to be undertaken to analyse the reasons for the wide range in number of placement applications received. However factors such as location of the role/host, sector, profile of organisation, type of role/job titles and recruitment methods all played an important part.

High-profile organisations in metropolitan areas attracted the most (45 for Somerset House, London; 29 for Manchester International Festival; 44 for The MAC, Belfast; 32 for the Lowry, Salford) but some other London roles attracted far fewer (four to six for Aurora Orchestra, Jacksons' Lane and Arvon). The highest number was for OTO Projects (47) which is a small, experimental music venue in London but with a loyal following and strong digital presence. Literature roles attracted low numbers as did those in the East of England (Writers Centre Norwich 6, Pacitti Company 2, DanceEast 3, both in Ipswich), which was commensurate with our experiences under the pilot edition 2010-12 too.

It is worth noting that the top end (47) is likely the upper level hosts can cope with given the amount of checking of eligibility documents involved.

**FINDING:**

***There was a 39% decrease in the number of eligible applicants between the pilot edition 2010-12 and the 2014-16 edition***

There was an average of 22 applicants per placement in the pilot edition 2010-12 (967 applicants for 44 placements) compared to an average of 14 in the 2014-16 edition (567 applicants for 40 placements). As a median figure, there were 18 applicants per placement in the pilot edition 2010-12 and nine in 2014-16 edition.

In response, some hosts had to adjust their recruitment, as follows:

- ➔ Recruiting a graduate dancer proved challenging for one host and they had to re-advertise. They had a small pool of eligible candidates to draw from in dance schools and in the second round they worked harder to explain the criteria to the HEIs they worked with.
- ➔ One host withdrew from the programme as they had no eligible applicants and could not re-advertise because of the tight timing proposed for the role. Their location in rural Scotland was likely to have been a factor, as was the nature and timing of the role offered and their approach to recruitment.
- ➔ Another host reframed the job offer to suit the skills of their preferred candidate as they didn't receive eligible applicants with the experience required in their initial job description.
- ➔ A few hosts extended their deadline to throw the net wider.

There were differences in the range of understanding from hosts about how much work was involved in going beyond their normal recruitment practice.

Welsh hosts attracted more applicants (median 15) than Scottish hosts (median 9). There were only two Northern Irish hosts and one of these, The MAC, used a graduate recruitment programme to recruit on their behalf which increased their figures (44 applications). This programme is now closed; it was run by Parity Professionals, operating in Northern Ireland only with Government funding from the Department for Employment and Learning (DEL).

On the positive side, many hosts commented that whilst the number of applicants was low, they noted a higher standard than normal entry level candidates.

*“Not the usual suspects....Hugely above average in terms of quality.” (Host)*

They also appreciated having fewer applicants to process whilst still having enough to shortlist from:

*“Given the criteria, we were surprised that pretty much all of the applicants were of a high quality. The percentage rate of application number to interview number was very high.” (Host)*

Many hosts reported getting more applicants from outside their local area than they would normally expect for an entry level role. This could be because the programme is gaining in profile and it is possible that having most of the recruitment for this edition happen in a four to six month window, and the central promotion of job roles by the programme as well as by individual organisations, also helped. Some hosts concluded that they should target beyond their local area for entry level roles in future.

**FINDING:**

**100% (42) of participants were either quite satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied with the recruitment criteria and process**

The 12% (5) who were quite happy felt the criteria unfairly precluded some people who would really benefit:

*“I had been feeling completely overwhelmed with my situation at home and just couldn't see how I could start out in the arts industry without some kind of financial support. It felt like someone had finally recognised that. I have heard some criticism of it: specifically that it cuts out people who didn't receive a full maintenance grant but are still in difficult situations financially. I do think if there is a way to include those people or make the criteria a little less rigid then it would better take into account the variety of situations that young people are in at the moment.” (Participant)*

Only one participant didn't strictly meet the eligibility criteria, having not received a grant for one of their years at university. The host organisation presented a clear case for why they should still be considered eligible within the spirit of the programme and the parameters of the particular organisation's workforce, and the application was approved.

**iv] A spread of ethnically diverse candidates apply for placements and are recruited, exceeding current arts industry diversity figures of 13.7% (ACE figures<sup>1</sup>) and general working age population diversity figures of 12% (Diversity UK figures<sup>2</sup>)**

**FINDING:**

**33% (13) of participants self-identified as being from an ethnic minority**

This compares to 15% of the 567 overall applicants to the 2014-16 edition and 9% (4) of successful participants who self-identified as being from non-white ethnic backgrounds in the pilot edition 2010-12. We would need to do more research to work out why hosts achieved this increased level of diversity in 2014-16. It may have been because they were inspired by the values and aims of the programme to recruit from a more diverse talent pool but as we did not ask this question specifically this is conjecture.

There is some evidence from other studies<sup>3</sup> to support a correlation between socio-economic status and ethnic diversity. Therefore tightening the financial eligibility criteria may have contributed to these higher than average BAME figures.

<sup>1</sup> [artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Equality\\_Diversity\\_and\\_the\\_Creative\\_Case\\_A\\_data\\_report\\_2012-2015.pdf](http://artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Equality_Diversity_and_the_Creative_Case_A_data_report_2012-2015.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [diversityuk.org/diversity-in-the-uk/](http://diversityuk.org/diversity-in-the-uk/)

<sup>3</sup> *Every child: equality and diversity in arts and culture with, by and for children and young people*, published by ACE Dec 2016: [artscouncil.org.uk/funded-activities/diversity-and-equality](http://artscouncil.org.uk/funded-activities/diversity-and-equality). *Poverty and ethnicity: A review of evidence*, published by Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011: [jrf.org.uk/report/poverty-and-ethnicity-review-evidence](http://jrf.org.uk/report/poverty-and-ethnicity-review-evidence)

## v] Placements reflect skills gaps in the sector

Although not a criterion within the host organisation recruitment process, we found that both host applications and the successful placements awarded did broadly map skills gaps identified in the arts.

Within the 40 placements, there were 9 roles (22%) with Digital in their title, from Digital Artist in Residence at Clean Break Theatre in London to Digital User Researcher at Cryptic in Glasgow. Each role brought vital new skills and resource into their host organisation, either to exploit their archives digitally to generate income (OTO Projects), to put their back catalogue online (Pacitti Company) or to set up new digital systems or websites for future use (Cryptic and Eastside Projects). There were 6 roles in fundraising and 3 in technical theatre.

Other examples of how hosts responded, and outcomes achieved, were:

- ➔ Donmar Warehouse in London created the new role of Resident Design Assistant, to run alongside their well-established Resident Assistant Director programme. This new role will now be offered annually and with the same eligibility criteria<sup>4</sup>, a legacy of the programme.
- ➔ g39 in Cardiff created a new role of Gallery Technical Assistant to test out the impact of replacing seasonal freelance support with a year-round post.

*“This is the first time we have had the capacity to employ a gallery technician. As such the recipient has made a substantial contribution to our activity. Our output in our current premises requires a substantial*

*amount of staff with technical expertise to install professionally. This was previously achieved mainly through freelancers, but with a contracted member of staff within this team it resulted in better managed exhibition installs.” (Host)*

- ➔ Manchester International Festival teamed up with other leading cultural venues in the city (HOME, Royal Exchange Theatre and Royal Northern College of Music) to offer a new Trainee Production Manager role shared across all four venues. This was in response to a shortage of training opportunities in the city to develop trained technical staff to support the number of new venues opening.
- ➔ Opera North’s new Higher Education Coordinator role (Leeds) was the first of its kind in the UK, linking an arts organisation with universities. Following completion, Alice Parsons was offered a permanent position and promotion to Higher Education Manager.
- ➔ NoFit State in Cardiff offered a new role of Development and International Relations Assistant to build up skills in international fundraising within the circus sector.

## vi] 90% (36) of all placements complete to full term

### FINDING:

#### 93% (37) of placements completed to full term

1 placement finished 2 months early due to a disciplinary issue and 2 placements had to be re-filled due to health and family issues. Both hosts re-advertised and filled again in good time, with revised job roles and titles and went on to host very successful placements second time round.

<sup>4</sup> [donmarwarehouse.com/about/vacancies/](http://donmarwarehouse.com/about/vacancies/)

Most placements started later than originally proposed by hosts. We did not stipulate start dates and unless there was a strong need internally (e.g. to coincide with festival dates), it seems that hosts had mainly underestimated the time it would take them to start and complete recruitment. The first participant started in May 2015 and the first to leave was the six month placement at Fierce Festival, in December 2015. The majority finished in July or August 2016 with the end date for all placements being extended from August 2016 to September 2016. The majority of placements were in place at the same time during the period from July 2015 to July 2016. This was important so that training events could be accessed by as many as possible, but those undertaking six-month placements did miss out on a few events – we covered their travel costs to take part if they had already left their placement but some could not take time off from their new jobs.

**vii] Programme completed on time and is on budget**

The budget was £576,825 and the actual spend was £574,233, 0.45% under budget. The end of the programme was extended by a month from September to October 2016 to allow for two hosts; one that took longer to advertise than anticipated and the other that needed to re-advertise.

Placement salary costs varied from budget once all confirmed placements were approved as some offered varying part-time roles (0.6 or 0.8FTE for example), whilst others offered placements of varying lengths between six and 12 months, and therefore costs of placement varied.

Administration costs varied due to the volume of successful fundraising work undertaken for the third edition of the programme, and extending the programme for an additional month.

**b] Provide positive benefit to a minimum of 40 participants during their job placements**

**i] Participants report increased aspirations, skills and commitment to the arts and confidence about a future career in the arts**

**FINDING:**

80% (32) of participants felt that their placement had provided them with the skills and knowledge to be confident about finding employment in the sector in future

*“12 months ago I wasn’t sure I was going to be able to work in the arts sector at all - I felt like I didn’t have enough experience or confidence and didn’t really know how to get started. My host has given me so many opportunities and an amazing level of support, my confidence has improved hugely and I feel like I have real experience to draw on now for everything I do in the future.” (Participant)*

Participants were clear about which elements of their placement they felt would help them to gain their next role and progress in the arts and they rated the following as important or very important:

- 95% (38): hands on job experience
- 85% (34): knowledge of the sector, as well as the professional networks they had gained
- 70% (28): knowledge of their host organisation, as well as training through the programme
- 50% (20): their mentor

Whilst many early workforce or welfare-to-work schemes need to focus on the basics of getting new recruits to turn up on time and getting used to working in an office, the majority of this cohort was given responsibility by their hosts from the outset. There were a few cases where this was an issue with participants and where hosts could have benefited from additional support from the programme, for example through access to a potential coaching fund. Hosts commented that whilst their participant needed additional support to find the right communication skills at times, they had aspirations to make their mark in their organisations.

**FINDING:**

*Taking part in the programme increased participants’ commitment to the arts for 92% (37) of the cohort*

**ii] Participants develop a better understanding of recruitment processes in the sector**

**FINDING:**

95% (38) of participants felt that the programme had improved their understanding of recruitment processes in the arts sector in general, and therefore increased their chances of securing work going forward

*“I thought the recruitment process was a learning experience in and of itself. I found out so much about how to apply for arts jobs and how to present myself at interview.” (Participant)*

**iii] Participants report that the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme added value their placement**

**FINDING:**

80% (32) of participants felt the training sessions provided through the programme (via the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme) were useful or very useful

**FINDING:**

90% (36) of hosts felt their participant had benefited from the training provided by the programme

*“The extra support of the mentor and the training really professionalises the programme, and makes it clear that the participant is not merely being used to fill extra capacity, but that it is a mutually beneficial programme of structured learning by doing. The programme is well structured to give the participant the confidence and skills to succeed professionally, and is a vital injection of talent and diversity into the arts sector.” (Host)*

The training programme was designed to offer professional development opportunities that were of value and relevance to the broad range of roles included in the programme. The four national events were also designed to allow as much

time as possible for the participants to get to know one another and form a cohort; something which we knew from the pilot edition 2010-12 would be important to them not only during their placements but in the future. This was reflected in much of the positive feedback:

*“Absolutely brilliant, really can’t stress how valuable this event was. Having not yet met any of my fellow participants, this was so useful to compare experiences and particularly in the context of socio-economic backgrounds and how our experiences of working in the arts compare. I’m the only junior member of staff at my organisation and it’s great to cross pollinate ideas and learning.”* (Participant)

*“If anything the networking is the most vital part of these training days, for me at least. I feel I have definitely made contacts who I would feel very comfortable calling for advice or even collaboration!”* (Participant)

There was a feeling from several participants that training sessions could be more proactive in addressing the specific issues and challenges which this particular cohort may face and that those leading the training should have reflected their backgrounds better:

*“I’d love to see you celebrate more the fact that we are all graduates from low-income backgrounds... Perhaps for future programmes it would be nice to address this directly in some kind of workshop or session. Often when we discuss inclusivity, diversity etc. class becomes the elephant in the room, it would be so great to start a positive conversation about this, and how difference makes the arts better.”* (Participant)

*“I do feel that the training events could have been for any group of graduates working within the arts, but they did seem to forget/ignore the fact that everyone was there due to being from lower income backgrounds... I also was quite disappointed in the lack of diversity of the guest speakers, I think pretty much everybody was white? I do think much more effort should be made to ensure that there is greater diversity, as it is so important to hear a range of voices.”* (Participant)

#### **iv] Successful mentoring relationships are provided**

##### **FINDING:**

**72% (29) of participants felt their mentoring sessions had been either useful or very useful**

This compared with 60% (25) who thought they would be useful at the start.

##### **FINDING:**

**78% (31) of hosts felt their participants had benefited from their mentoring experience, with 22% (9) unsure**

Hosts and participants were given general guidance by the Programme Director about how we felt the mentoring relationship should work – roughly three sessions spread throughout the year and with the focus on participants’ career planning. They were free to choose their own mentor, with their hosts, and mentor contact details were supplied to the Programme Director once selected. We generally advised that a mentor should not be too senior, and be someone they could relate to. There was a variation in the impact these relationships had on participants, with some feeling really supported and others not quite understanding the point of mentoring. Those that didn’t really work out were often where the hosts had chosen their mentor for the participant without consulting them.

Studying the feedback, it is worth considering in future starting the mentoring later in their placements, once participants have had time to reflect on the best choice of mentor. This could enable them to have the right support as they get closer to looking for their next job after the placement, and know more what questions they want to ask and what path they want to pursue. It could make sense to have the final mentoring session after their placement has ended.

*“Together we have decided to meet a few times after the placement has ended which I think will work out really well, as I have felt like I have had lots of ‘mentors’ around me this year.”* (Participant)

Although 32% (13) didn't know if they would stay in touch with their mentor after their placement, 60% (24) said they would and there were clearly some important relationships established.

*"I was really lucky to have my mentor (despite geographical distance) and think that was a highlight of the programme for me; her openness and ongoing offer of help is something I really appreciate."* (Participant)

#### **v] Extended professional networks are developed – including between peers and smaller geographic cohorts of participants**

##### **FINDING:**

**87% (35) of participants found the networking opportunities provided by the programme were useful or very useful**

Networking included both with their peers in the cohort, and with other industry professionals and leaders. Participants had opportunities to network at the four ALWF Training Programme events, at the opening and closing receptions and online through the closed Facebook page for the programme. The training events brought them together with cultural leaders such as Sir Peter Bazalgette (then Chair, ACE), Josie Rourke (Artistic Director, Donmar Warehouse, London), Jonathan Reekie (Director, Somerset House, London) and Dave Moutrey (CEO, HOME, Manchester).

*"Really impressed with the bursary programme's ability to pull people from arts organisations/ Peter Bazalgette etc to talk to us/have small group sessions. Everyone always really friendly/engaged/actually keen to help in whatever way they could. This is what I'll take the most from the programme, in that I feel everybody that we've come across during the training events would probably be really open to being emailed/contacted by Weston Jerwood Creative Bursary participants."* (Participant)

In the pilot edition 2010-12, there was a feeling from participants outside of London that they were excluded from a 'tighter' London-based

cohort, which was likely exacerbated because there were more placements in London (43% (18) compared to 27% (11) in this edition). In a change to the 2014-16 edition, we selected hosts and placements specifically so as to create geographical cohorts to ensure all participants had ongoing access to a smaller local peer group. We also ensured the training programme was spread across the country, with only one event in London. As a result, no-one reported feeling that there was a London bias.

##### **FINDING:**

**90% (36) plan to stay in touch with the networks formed through the programme**

Some participants took longer than others to feel they had got to know the cohort or to understand the potential benefits of a network. In future, we should look at doing more team building exercises at the first training event, including Pecha Kucha sessions, so that participants get an early insight into what the others are doing, and build more informal networking time into the training events.

*"Peer support between bursary holders is also an advantage to creating a generational network of like-minded people going through the same experience and this could have a positive outcome for the arts sector in the future."* (Host)

The closed Facebook page was a useful way for them to build on friendships made in person and was still being used by many of the group after the close of the programme.

There were some examples of local and sector cohorts which were developed by the participants and their hosts. This happened in Glasgow amongst the three placements as a result of their joint planning of the Glasgow International training event in May 2016.

Two job swaps were arranged by the participants once they got to know each other; one between Streetwise Opera and Somerset House, both London organisations, and one between the participants at Hepworth Wakefield and Turner Contemporary in Margate.

**c) Improve participants' chances of finding permanent employment in the arts thereafter**

**i) Placements secure a job or freelance role in the arts on completion**

**FINDING:**

*As of August 2017, 78% (31) of participants were still undertaking paid work in the arts/creative industries*

This includes those who were still working with their hosts on extended or permanent contracts, and those successfully undertaking freelance work in the arts.

**Table 1:** Employment figures for participants as of August 2017

Number in new jobs in the arts	12
Number remaining with their host on long-term or permanent contract	10
Number undertaking an MA	1
Number working freelance in the arts	9
Number looking for work (unemployed or freelancing not out of choice)	5
Don't know	3
100%	40

We will stay in touch with participants informally, through email contact, Facebook and LinkedIn, and will also approach the whole cohort formally to participate in longitudinal evaluation about their progression during the 2017-19 edition of the programme.

New jobs included:

- ➔ Bethany Walsh (The Lowry): Programme Administrator, Quays Culture, Salford
- ➔ Rachael Baskeyfield (Situations): Offsite & Education Assistant (Curatorial Trainee), Chisenhale Gallery, London
- ➔ Ellwyn Male (g39): Creative and Digital Arts Technician, Aylesbury College, Buckinghamshire

- ➔ Verity Casey (Sadler's Wells): Events Officer – Patrons, Royal Academy, London
- ➔ Maddi Belsey Day (Town Hall/Symphony Hall): Concerts Administrator, CBSO, Birmingham
- ➔ Danil Boparai (Eastside Projects): Social media/editorial assistant, Dezeen, online architectural/design magazine, London
- ➔ Nastasha Boyce (Cambridge Junction): Events and Projects Officer, Creative People and Places Marketplace Project, Ely
- ➔ Olivia Barratt (Somerset House): Studio Administrator at Bow Arts, London
- ➔ Conn McKermott (The MAC): marketing for retail, Belfast
- ➔ Somshun Khan (Arvon): Digital marketing executive at Microsoft and practicing as an artist, London
- ➔ Lydtsy Coates (The MAC Belfast): CRM (Customer Relationship Management) at Universal Music, London
- ➔ James Barringer (WNO): Internship (paid) at Youth Sport Trust, Loughborough

As with alumni of the pilot edition 2010-12, some are establishing themselves in freelance careers. For example, Rosie Elnile (Resident Design Assistant, Donmar Warehouse), is freelancing in Donmar's Associate Designer Tom Scutt's studio. She is a Jerwood Young Designer at the Gate Theatre, where her designs for *The Convert* (January/February 2017) attracted positive press attention. She was also credited as co-Designer on Donmar's Autumn 2016 production of *Elegy*.

Toni Lewis (Associate Producer, Fierce Festival) is freelancing with Forced Entertainment, is a Freelance Creative Producer for artist Demi Nandhra, was selected as a SPILL New Producer by Pacitti Company and received a bursary to work as a Producer on Bristol Old Vic's Producers programme.

Tayah Preece (Trainee Production Manager, Manchester International Festival) is developing a freelance career in Manchester as a Technical Stage Manager and events producer. She is

a Creative Fellow (production management focussed) on Akram Khan's *Giselle*, produced by English National Ballet and Manchester International Festival and a Trainee Production Manager for the Royal Northern College of Music's *Così Fan Tutte*, amongst other credits.

Brodie Sim (Programme Assistant, The Common Guild) is combining freelancing with the Creative Learning team for Edinburgh International Festival with exhibiting at Generator Projects Dundee in April 2017 and also continuing in her role as Programme Assistant for her host.

**i] 50% (20) of participants have their contracts extended or made permanent by their host**

**FINDING:**

**60% (24) of participants had their contracted extended or made permanent by their hosts**

Roles were extended for a range of time, with 12 still working with their hosts either in their original role or as a freelancer at the conclusion of this report. Three roles were made permanent at the end of their placements (Freya Gallagher was promoted to the new post of Operations Assistant at Writers' Centre Norwich; Nastasha Boyce's role of Assistant Producer: Outreach at Cambridge Junction was made permanent and Alice Parsons's role of HE Coordinator at Opera North).

Jack Thomson, Graduate Dancer at Phoenix Dance Company in Leeds, had his contract extended with the company for 2 months and was singled out in a press review: *'Jack Thomson is not only an excellent dancer but has considerable stage authority for such a young artist. He performs the opening solo [...] and makes a damn fine job of it'* (Dance Europe April 2016). He then decided to leave the company to pursue a freelance career in dance and film and as of February 2017 was making a film with Random Acts.

*"Weston Jerwood paid a 'living wage' so I could gain experience but not be out of pocket. That's great – nobody else does that. The diverse experience I've gained from the four fab Manchester organisations has made me more employable and taught me valuable freelancing skills, such as project and time management. As an aspiring production manager, it's opened up my experience to a wide range of events – but perhaps the biggest impact is that RNCM went on to contract me as a freelance Assistant Production Manager for a year, allowing me to further develop my skills and experience."*  
(Participant)

**ii] Successful job progression achieved by participants over 5 years**

**FINDING:**

**80% (32) felt their placement has provided them with the skills and knowledge to be confident about finding employment in the arts sector in the future**

They reported that they have a clearer idea of what job roles there are out there, how skills can be transferable, an understanding of how they fit job descriptions, what training is available and a better idea of what employers are looking for.

We will follow their progress over the next five years through formal evaluation during future editions and by inviting them to be involved in those editions (as informal or formal mentors and via other networking opportunities), and via email contact, Facebook and LinkedIn.

**d] Provide positive benefit to 40 high quality host arts organisations**

**i] Placements make a tangible contribution to the organisation and hosts consider there was a legacy from the programme**

**FINDING:**

**98% (39) of hosts felt their participant had made a substantial contribution to their organisation**

Hosts were asked to identify what the most important benefits to them were of participating in the programme:

- ➔ Introducing a new job role to their organisation and in many cases trialling roles that didn't currently exist in the sector (73% (29) of hosts said this was very important):
  - ⇒ Donmar Warehouse tested a new Resident Assistant Designer post to complement their established Assistant Resident Director position, and concluded they would continue to offer it as an ongoing opportunity.
  - ⇒ g39 created a new Gallery Technician role, and have talked to Creative and Cultural Skills about creating apprenticeship training out of this.
  - ⇒ NoFit State created a Development and International Relations Assistant, to build up a skill which many European circus companies have but is not found in the UK.
  - ⇒ Opera North introduced a Higher Education Coordinator – believed to be the first of its kind in an arts organisation in the UK.
  - ⇒ Arvon recruited a Digital Communications Officer, addressing a lack of digital skills in literature.
  - ⇒ Clean Break brought on board a Digital Artist, allowed them to implement their digital strategy through a creative role.
- ⇒ Craftspace tested a new role for them of Creative Producer at a critical time when the organisation was making a dynamic shift to interdisciplinary programming, and as a result co-produced their first play.
- ⇒ Sadler's Wells piloted a new role of Development Assistant, Individual Giving to prove the case for it to become permanent and it is now a new post as Development Coordinator.
- ⇒ Manchester International Festival trialled a new way of working with three other cultural venues in the city (Royal Exchange Theatre, HOME and RNCM) to offer a unique training role for a Trainee Production Manager.
- ➔ Increasing their capacity in the short term: 78% (31) of hosts said this was very important - in the long-term, this dropped to 21% (9). For many, this resulted in new systems being implemented and new skills being embedded which once set up could be maintained by existing members of staff. Digital skills featured highly in the list of benefits to hosts:
  - ⇒ Situations increased their online following by over 200%.
  - ⇒ WNO's participant kick started a step change in their digital communications.
  - ⇒ Salome Wagaine, Digital User Research, Cryptic delivered a 33 page digital report for Cryptic as the main outcome of her 9 month placement.
  - ⇒ Arvon now have a digital strategy for the first time.
  - ⇒ At Activate, Samantha Gillingham set up their first Youth Board and introduced Instagram to the organisation.
  - ⇒ Eastside Projects were able to launch two new websites during the year Danil Boparai, their Digital Assistant, was in post.
  - ⇒ Pacitti Company were able to focus on 25 years' worth of archives which had been under-utilised.

*“We now have digitised assets of previous works and research materials that were previously in other formats. We have increased knowledge around areas such as live streaming, and online potential that we didn't know about before” (Host)*

- ➔ Gaining new perspectives from their participant was a benefit that 52% (21) of hosts reported was a very important factor in the successful outcome of the programme for their organisation. Also their participants helped them to communicate with different audiences, especially younger and BAME audiences:

*“Her perspectives as a younger person and as a British Asian Muslim has been a refreshing change to the atmosphere in our office and has led to us thinking in a more tangible way about how we communicate to younger and BAME audiences” (Host)*

There were a variety of reasons why nearly all hosts felt their placements had created a legacy beyond the life of the programme. For the most part, hosts had really embraced the ethos of the programme and thought well beyond the idea of their participant as just an extra pair of hands. In addition, by allowing hosts to create a new role to their own specification, without setting parameters on the type of role, there is more chance they would be of benefit to their organisation and in some cases to the sector. Many hosts actively considered from the outset how to embed their new role in the organisation for the longer term.

Hosts also thought strategically during recruitment about who most needed the opportunity rather than choosing the one who could best hit the ground running. A number of hosts felt the placements worked so well particularly because they were flexible with the job descriptions and allowed participants to develop the roles into areas of particular interests or where they had additional strengths. This was the case at Contact in Manchester.

Junior Akinola was hired with the broad title of Projects Coordinator; with his skills as a film maker, he became the Coordinator and film maker for Contact's major HLF project, *Making Contact*, creating an archive of personal stories to celebrate the venue's 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary.

*“We have been able to offer the recipient additional work as a freelance film maker. The recipient took on the responsibility to manage two of our existing projects. He made a significant contribution in coordinating a new heritage lottery funded project [Making Contact]. He built a strong relationship with Manchester City Council and was our staff lead for Manchester's bid to become the European Youth Capital. He will be working on this project freelance once his contract ends with Contact.” (Host)*

**ii] Hosts would consider targeting applicants from low-income backgrounds again; hosts have found new ways of recruiting more widely and will continue to use these new methods**

#### **FINDING:**

**98% (39) of hosts would consider targeting future job opportunities towards low income applicants in future**

*“Diversification of our arts industry is imperative - new voices, new ideas, new approaches are key to healthy and creative practice” (Host)*

*“Being involved in the programme has been an important reminder of just how hard it is for people to find entry points in the arts especially if they are unable to fund themselves to do unpaid internships. This obviously results in a narrowing of the pool of people that end up working in the arts and this is not good for anyone involved” (Host)*

Some organisations which are situated in areas of high deprivation (Turner Contemporary in Margate and Hepworth Wakefield) are already committed to being accessible to those in their local communities. But for many hosts, however

committed they are in theory, they reported that they still feel they need the incentive or support of a programme such as this to achieve it:

*“...It is of vital importance to reflect the city outside the walls of [our organisation]. The talent is out there but reaching out to find it is always depressingly difficult. The bursary provided the necessary spur to action. It required a lot of effort to ensure that we targeted our opportunity as widely as possible and at the moment I think we still require the spur of ring-fenced funding to initiate the level of effort needed.”* (Host)

All hosts reported recruiting more widely than for equivalent roles. They all advertised via HEIs, some specifically in their region, some in their art forms; some to tutors directly and others directly to Careers Services. They focussed on graduate career websites, some went via Job Centres and engaged heavily in social media to get the word out. We had provided them with a recommended list of sites which most hosts used.

*“We were more proactive in reaching out to people who may be eligible, rather than waiting for them to come to us.”*

Hosts also reported using different methods in their application forms and in interviews.

*“We created a redesigned application form to reflect the fact that candidates may not have directly relevant work experience. We also ran a familiarisation session, introducing candidates to the organisation and providing them insight to the different departments here and range of people employed here who shared their individual experiences of working in the arts.”* (Host)

Approximately 75% (30) of the hosts had taken part in some type of access scheme previously. 20% (8) were previous hosts in the pilot edition 2010-12, the DCMS Jerwood Creative Bursaries programme; others had taken part in the Creative Employment Programme, Future Jobs

Fund, Creative Access, Hynt (Welsh Access scheme) and Youth Employment Scheme, and some offered other paid internships and apprenticeships.

The changes hosts reported making to their recruitment included shortlisting according to different criteria, advertising in new places, closer links with HEs and a determination to work these changes into their recruitment policies in future.

*“We have developed a new list of targeted places to advertise as a result of this programme and these now form part of our regular recruitment plan.”* (Host)

*“We are increasingly ensuring our recruitment opportunities are circulated in the most deprived Cambridge Wards”* (Host)

Cambridge Junction also now benchmarks their entry-level salaries at the Living Wage, an improvement which was a direct result of being part of the programme.

Whilst there was some long-term change achieved, impact in this area should be a far greater focus for the programme going forward. In future editions, it is recommended to bring hosts together at the start and end of the programme to discuss new approaches to recruitment and long term sustainability and change.

*“I hope there will be the opportunity at the celebration for some shared learning and hearing the outcomes of other organisations. Midway contact point review/sharing learning for hosts would also be invaluable and enable us to think creatively about how to sustain roles longer-term. This is going to be a challenge for us.”* (Host)

In future it is worth assessing how important it is to have the CEO/Senior Management Team and /or Board involved from the start. At one host where there was an issue at the start with the participant feeling unsupported because of

staff changes this was resolved once the CEO was brought into the discussion. At other hosts, interviews for the placements were with the Artistic Directors and Executive Directors and it would be good in future to track success of placements which had the involvement of senior managers from the outset.

**iii] Hosts have made valuable new relationships, e.g. with peer organisations, HEIs**

Hosts made new relationships with HEIs through recruitment, met fellow hosts and participants at the launch and closing receptions and in a few cases were brought closer to other organisations through the work of their participants. Amy Stevenson brought her host, Hepworth Wakefield, into contact with Phoenix Dance for the first time, through programming a dance collaboration to celebrate the gallery's fifth anniversary, with fellow participant, Jack Thomson, Graduate Dancer at Phoenix Dance. As a result, Jack has recently been commissioned by Hepworth to create a bespoke choreographed response to their exhibition, *Disobedient Bodies*, combining his skills in fashion and dance together. The Glasgow host organisations (Cryptic, Citizens Theatre and The Common Guild) collaborated for the first time in designing and running the Glasgow training event. For Activate, it provided an opportunity to establish a new relationship with Jerwood Charitable Foundation and they have since received project funding.

Hosts requested more networking opportunities with one another and with the cohort of participants in future. The design of the next edition will take this into consideration and seek more opportunities for both host and participant networking.

**e] Build public awareness of the programme and the issues it addresses – within the arts industry and related sectors (arts, creative industries, education, social justice)**

**i] A positive reputation is created and articles in the press/online achieved**

Having had no external support for press in the pilot edition 2010-12 (outside of the DCMS press team), for this second edition we appointed Four Colman Getty, with the aim of raising the profile of the programme and campaigning for the issues, and to support our fundraising campaign for the 2017-19 edition.

Press work during the first two editions has established the programme's profile in the arts sector. For the 2014-16 edition we achieved press in: *The Stage*, *Arts Professional*, *AI (Arts Industry Magazine)*, *Broadway World* and on the Creative and Cultural Skills (CCSkills) website. The Programme Director and JCF Director Shonagh Manson were invited to speak at CCSkills' March 2016 National Conference: Putting Skills to Work and Shonagh also spoke at their March 2017 Conference: Diversity and Fair Access. The programme was included as a case study in DCMS' *Culture White Paper 'Our Culture'*; referred to as exemplary in ACE's commissioned report *Analysis of Theatre in England*; and cited in Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation's diversity report *Centre Stage*.

Links to this press can be found on our website [here](#), along with the three press releases which we sent out during the programme.

Taking part in the CCSkills' conferences resulted in our introduction to the Cultural Skills team at the British Council, from which we have

now formed a major confirmed partnership for the 2017-19 edition of the programme. Kate Danielson was also shortlisted for the Creative Choices Award 2017 for support for young people by CCSkills.

In addition:

- ➔ All 40 job adverts featured the programme's logo and information.
- ➔ A number of hosts included interviews with or blogs by their placements on their websites (e.g. [Kettle's Yard](#), Cambridge) or in their brochures (e.g. [Manchester International Festival's Little Blue Book](#), p 30-1).
- ➔ The programme was given a particular focus in [Jerwood's 2015 Annual Reports](#) and in [2016](#).

The programme's pages on the [JCF website](#) were the sixth most visited pages for the website overall between June 2015 to June 2016 with over 4,000 visitors during this period.

The Twitter hashtag #creativebursaries was used throughout the programme.

**ii] Host organisations and participants act as ambassadors for the programme and are active in influencing employment practices in the arts and raising the issue of diversity in the arts**

**FINDING:**

**92% (37) of hosts said they had been proactive in promoting the programme and its aims in a number of ways:**

- ➔ Many acknowledged the programme on their website, featuring case studies of, and blogs by, their participants and in newsletters and in online communities.
- ➔ The programme was talked about with stakeholders and peers at networking events, such as local What Next? meetings and tabled at a Culture Forum North meeting.

- ➔ Participation by hosts played an important part in their reporting to trusts and foundations and in funding applications to show their commitment to excellence and diversity, and may have acted as a potential lever for further funding.

As a requirement, all participants acknowledged the programme in their email signatures (eg 'This role has been made possible by the Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries'), including the logo in some cases.

Hosts have been vocal in articulating the impact the programme has had. For example, Manchester International Festival, who were hosts in both editions, said:

*"Involvement with the Creative Bursaries (since its inception in 2010) has enabled the Festival to significantly expand its talent development networks across Manchester and the North West and to explore how we cultivate the next generation of cultural leaders. We have been encouraged and supported to forge relationships with partners across the city, trialling collaborative ways of working that have since fed into thinking for the Factory [the new venue due to open in 2019].*

*The legacy of this programme is extraordinary – addressing socio-economic barriers and creating real access routes into the workplace for skilled graduates from low-income backgrounds – and we have certainly benefitted from an increased profile amongst up-and-coming talent locally and nationally. There is also an enhanced awareness amongst local education partners that we have these entry-level positions which they can signpost graduates to who are looking to kick-start their career in the arts."*



Aaron Wright, Bursary Alumna and Artistic Director of Fierce Festival, speaking at the Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2014-16 closing event.  
Image Hydar Dewachi

## 7: RECOMMENDATIONS

This section summarises the recommendations from this evaluation and shows how these have shaped our plans for the 2017-19 edition of the programme.

### PROGRAMME DESIGN

RECOMMENDATIONS from 2010-12 pilot evaluation	2014-16 OUTCOME	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2017-19
Review academic criteria: high grades and arts subject not a good indicator of potential.	Reduced to 2:2 from 2:1 and all degrees (not just arts degrees) eligible.	Remove need for specific grade – all degrees remain eligible.
Consider adapting the model to suit practising artist roles.	3 (7.5%) artist roles (dancer, designer, digital artist in residence) supported. Similar to 2010-12 (2.5 roles – director, musician and dancer (0.5)). We adjusted the language to ensure particular roles didn't sound too much like "jobs".	Continue to allow organisations to lead on which type of role they need, with some strategic balancing of selection of hosts to meet skills gaps.  Research eligibility from other courses for artistic study: e.g. could the DaDA (Dance and Drama Award) ensure eligibility for this programme?
12 month placements were preferred by the majority of both hosts and participants. If funding allows, ensure in future that all hosts have the opportunity to apply for 12 month placements.	85% (34) of placements @ 12 months, compared to 66% (28) of 2010-12.	All (100%) placements @ 12 months, some PT.
Consider offering London weighting.	Done.	Continue.
Plans for future development to include costings without the organisational grant to hosts, and models including contributions to salaries from hosts.	2014-16 edition included 25% contribution from hosts and no organisational grant, which proved feasible; 85 out of the 105 hosts (81%) who were invited applied. Only one reported not doing so for financial reasons.	Continue with 75% contribution by programme, 25% contribution by hosts and no further organisational grant. Evaluate feasibility of making this 50%/50%.
The programme highlighted the perceived lack of support given to graduates as they move from higher education into the workplace. More research should be done in future to explore collaboration with Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE).	No change.	Find ways to collaborate with Higher Education through e.g. Universities UK, Culture Forum North to build relationships with Careers Services & Widening Participation (WP) departments. Join the dots in support for WP students/graduates.
		Pay participants the Living Wage as set by the <a href="#">Living Wage Foundation</a> <sup>1</sup> .
		Add budget for discretionary coaching/support fund for participants who may have additional settling in difficulties.
		Consider funding pot for participants to apply to run their own projects during the programme - increasing their project management, fundraising, budget management training and cohort building.
		Review impact of policy changes to Maintenance Grants & Loans for future editions.
		Coordinate start and end times of placements to enable core training programme to involve all participants.

**RECRUITMENT OF HOSTS AND PARTICIPANTS**

RECOMMENDATIONS from 2010-12 pilot evaluation	2014-16 OUTCOME	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2017-19
Clarify financial eligibility criteria to hosts and applicants – provide examples and explain loans vs grants.	Provided step by step written and verbal guidance – anecdotal evidence suggests less support was required by hosts from Director than in pilot. Added FAQs to website.	Provide more guidance for hosts in assessing eligibility up front: Hold hosts' induction workshop at outset. Attendance for hosts a requirement of the grant.
Provide additional recruitment support for hosts and encourage more sharing of learning between them directly – including more contact with HEIs.	Full recruitment advice document provided. Encouraged sharing of learning but not taken up for the most part. All hosts advertised via HEIs but 1-2-1, not collectively.	Explore how hosts might throw their net even wider: discuss eg sharing recruitment. Investigate how to share this learning more widely and how to bring in learning of past hosts. Explore at hosts induction workshop.
Hosts to assess financial eligibility documents <u>before</u> interview rather than at point of job offer.	Recommended and carried out in most cases – less wasted time in interviewing ineligible applicants.	Provide further clarity at hosts' induction workshop.
Successful hosts must have in place clearest possible job descriptions from the outset to prevent any lack of clarity. Placements must be designed to both challenge and support participants.	Gave advice to some hosts on this issue. There was, however, some success associated with JDs being flexible, so adaptable to suit strengths of participants.	Discuss at hosts' induction workshop.
		In past editions, achieved a 1 in 2 success rate in invited hosts vs awarded placements. Keep this as low if possible. Assess % success rates when inviting hosts.
		Add questions in hosts' application to help us identify hosts who can deliver our key outcomes, e.g. how will they support participants into next role, their diversity rating and how involved are their Board/SMT.
		Further research to look at how to increase number of applicants. Why did some hosts get many more applicants than others: where, how and when they advertised/recruited, job title, sector, geographical location, whether they have been part of diversity programmes in past?

**PLACEMENTS AND RUNNING THE PROGRAMME**

RECOMMENDATIONS from 2010-12 pilot evaluation	2014-16 OUTCOME	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2017-19
Explore exchanges between placements – with hosts and participants playing a more active role in this.	This was encouraged and two good examples happened (Hepworth/Turner; Streetwise/Somerset House).	Discuss at hosts' induction workshop, with case studies. Also discuss with participants at first training day.
More focus on local networking and encouraging art form and role-specific cohorts. More active involvement of hosts in creating links within the programme.	Actively created geographical cohorts when selecting hosts and avoided top heavy London cohort. Glasgow training event a good example of how this local cohort developed. Others less successful – individuals influence the success of this.	Discuss at hosts' induction workshop and first training session for participants - include team building exercises and informal networking time to encourage cohort bonding amongst participants. Include hosts wherever possible in networking opportunities.
Consider creating more networking opportunities for hosts.	No change.	Add hosts' induction workshop at start and 2nd workshop event for hosts at the end.
It took some participants longer than others to appreciate the value of having a mentor. The programme could do more to manage the expectations of participants and mentors.	Provided mentor guidelines/advice. Still some confusion but better results.	Discuss at hosts' workshop and first training event for participants. Consider appointing mentors later and focus on transition into next steps, after end of role. Ensure participants are involved in mentor choice (not just chosen by hosts). Consider programme being more involved, e.g. creating a mentoring pool, linking with our alumni, Clore Leadership Programme etc.
		Ensure speakers in training events reflect diversity of participants and topics address their specific issues and challenges e.g. different backgrounds.
		Do more to encourage that new recruitment practices are embedded in participating host organisations – focus of workshop for hosts on conclusion.
		Collect stats and feedback from hosts about whether participating in the programme was used as a lever for successful fundraising.
		Measure involvement of hosts' SMT and/or Board in the application/in the interview process and/or supportive of diversifying their workforce as a way of tracking the success of placements.



Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries participants.  
Image: Claudia Legge

## 8: SUMMARY

This section summarises the key findings of the programme and the combined outcomes of the programme, including our findings from the 2010-12 pilot edition. We finish with a summary of the next steps.

### Key Findings

#### Highlights of the Programme's design

- 94% (75) of hosts and participants involved in the programme were satisfied or very satisfied with their involvement and 100% (80) felt the programme should continue.
- 93% (37) of the placements completed to full term.
- 33% of participants self-identified as non-white.
- 60% (24) of participants had their contracted extended or made permanent by their hosts.
- 78% (31) of participants were still known to be undertaking paid work in the arts/creative industries, as of August 2017.

#### Benefit to Hosts

- 95% (38) of hosts were very or quite satisfied with the recruitment criteria.
- 98% (39) of hosts would consider targeting future job opportunities towards low income applicants in future.
- 98% (39) of hosts felt their participant had made a substantial contribution to their organisation.

#### Benefit to Participants

- 92% (37) of the participants felt taking part in the programme had increased their **commitment** to working in the arts.
- 95% (38) of participants felt that the programme had improved their **understanding** of recruitment processes in the arts sector in general, and therefore increased their chances of securing work going forward.
- 80% (32) of participants felt the training sessions provided through the programme (via the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation Training Programme) were useful or very useful.

- 72% (29) of participants felt their mentoring sessions had been either useful or very useful.
- 90% of participants plan to stay in touch with the networks formed through the programme.

### Key Combined Outcomes

Looking across this evaluation and the evaluation of the pilot programme, the [DCMS Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2010-12](#), it is clear that the combined statistics and the qualitative research result in a compelling case for the programme as a positive influence in the arts sector. The programme continues to succeed in the following areas, as originally defined in the pilot evaluation:

- a]** Opening up fairer access to entry level jobs.
- b]** Diversifying the arts workforce for the better.
- c]** Widening the talent pool for employers.
- d]** Encouraging organisational best practice in recruitment to achieve long term change and seeding behavioural change in participating organisations.
- e]** Encouraging successful transition from university to work in the arts for those without existing networks and unpaid work experience.
- f]** Supporting early career professional development.
- g]** Retaining that talent in the arts and ensuring participants move on to the next stage in their careers:
  - Of the alumni of the pilot scheme, we know that 84% (37 out of 44) are still working in the arts and of this edition, 78% (31) we currently know are employed in the arts.
  - Participants moved on to new jobs including Programme Administrator, Quays Culture, Salford; Offsite & Education Assistant (Curatorial Trainee), Chisenhale Gallery, London; Events Officer – Patrons, Royal Academy, London; Concerts Administrator, CBSO, Birmingham; Events and Projects Officer, Creative People and Places Marketplace Project, Ely; Studio Administrator at Bow Arts, London; CRM (Customer Relationship Management) at Universal Music, London.

#### h] Developing diverse cultural leaders of the future:

- Alumni are following pathways into future leadership; Aaron Wright (participant 2010-2012) secured the first leadership role of the cohort in 2016, as [Artistic Director of Birmingham's Fierce Festival](#), a great achievement against international competition and just five years into his career at the age of 28.
- Other leadership and management roles which participants in the first edition have secured include Circus Producer at The Roundhouse; Producer at Sheffield International Documentary Festival; Arts Officer for the Orkney Islands; General Manager of National Theatre Productions; Communications Manager at Mahogany Opera Group then Classical Music Programme Manager at the British Council; and Communications Manager at British Council's Shakespeare Lives programme. Others are developing successful freelance careers in the arts.

#### i] Creating new jobs in the arts:

- New work opportunities created for 84 young graduates from low income backgrounds in 75 arts organisations across the UK.
- 60% of placements were extended and 32% of roles made permanent, or led to longer term employment relationships, across both editions.

#### j] Increasing ethnic diversity of participants compared to pilot edition:

- Tightening the means-tested criteria between editions one and two and changing our briefing to hosts increased the number of individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds who participated, from 9% to 33% of the cohort – up 366%.

#### **Next steps**

Fundraising for the third edition was on-going throughout 2016-17 to ensure the programme could continue to deliver benefits to a further cohort of recent graduates and participating host organisations but also achieve longer-term impact across the arts and related sectors. Issues of social mobility, diversity and fair access are more important than ever and gaining momentum after a lamentably slow start. With a growing profile for the programme and a formula which could provide useful learning for others working in these areas, we are applying the findings of this evaluation to the third edition of the programme which will see a significant uplift in activity and ambition.

Between 2017 and 2019 the programme will create 40 new, paid, entry-level roles in the arts for recent graduates at 40 leading arts organisations nationally. Working with new delivery partners including the British Council, the Weston Jerwood Creative Bursaries 2017-2019 will create an expanded development programme for participants, including a new international strand, offering 12 international placements for selected participants and host organisations, and an international training trip for all 40 participants. Support from Arts Council England's Ambition for Excellence funding will increase the sustainability of the programme and extend the impact for the sector through intensive evaluation and sharing of what is learnt.

## APPENDICES

### **Further reading**

- Creative Industries Federation: [Social Mobility & the Skills Gap](#)
- All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Social Mobility: [The Class Ceiling: Increasing access to leading professions](#)
- DCMS: [Case Studies for the Culture White Paper](#)
- Universities UK: Working in Partnership: [Enabling Social Mobility in Higher Education - Final Report of the Social Mobility Group](#)
- Social Mobility Commission: [State of the Nation 2016: Social Mobility in Great Britain](#)
- Arts Professional's Pulse Report: [Diversity in the Arts Workforce – What needs to change?](#)
- Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation's Diversity Report in British theatre: [Centre Stage: The Pipeline of BAME Talent](#)
- Panic! Survey: What happened to social mobility in the arts? (by Guardian, Goldsmiths)
- BIS: [Fulfilling our potential: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice consultation](#)
- GPS Culture: [A Policy for the Arts and Culture in England - The Next Steps?](#)
- The Bridge Group: [Graduate Outcomes and Social Mobility](#)
- ACE, by EW: [Every Child: Equality & Diversity in Arts & Culture with, by and for children and young people](#)

**List of placements**

Organisation	Recipient	Title Of Placement	Location	Length	FT/PT	Website
Activate Performing Arts	Samantha Gillingham	Projects and Promotions Assistant	Dorset	12 months	FT	activateperformingarts.org.uk
Arvon	Somshun Khan	Digital Communications Officer	London	12 months	FT	arvon.org
Aurora Orchestra	Steph McVey	Orchestra Assistant	London	12 months	0.6 FTE	auroraorchestra.com
Cambridge Junction	Nastasha Boyce	Assistant Producer: Outreach	Cambridge	12 months	FT	junction.co.uk
Citizens Theatre	Siobhan Hermitage	Trainee Assistant Stage Manager	Glasgow	12 months	FT	citiz.co.uk
Clean Break	Tasha McDonnell	Digital Artist in Residence	London	12 months	0.6 FTE	cleanbreak.org.uk
Contact	Junior Akinola	Projects Coordinator	Manchester	12 months	FT	contactmcr.com
Craftspace	Hannaa Hamdache	Creative Producer Placement	Birmingham	6 months	FT	craftspace.co.uk
Cryptic	Salome Wagaine	Digital User Researcher	Glasgow	9 months	FT	cryptic.org.uk
Dance Umbrella	Olitta O'Garro	Festival Assistant	London	6 months	FT	danceumbrella.co.uk
DanceEast	Daniel Teixeira	Creative Team Assistant (Producing)	Ipswich	12 months	FT	danceeast.co.uk
Donmar Warehouse	Rosie Elnile	Resident Design Assistant	London	12 months	FT	donmarwarehouse.com
Eastside Projects	Danil Boparai	Digital Assistant	Blrmingham	12 months	0.8 FTE	eastsideprojects.org, extraspecialpeople.org
Fierce Festival	Toni (Antonia) Lewis	Associate Producer	Birmingham	6 months	FT	wearefierce.org
g39	Ellwyn Male	Gallery Technical officer	Cardiff	12 months	0.8 FTE	g39.org
Hepworth Wakefield	Amy Stevenson	Curatorial Assistant	Wakefield	12 months	FT	hepworthwakefield.org
Hofesh Shechter	Emily Gatehouse	Projects Administrator	London	6 months	FT	
Jacksons Lane	John Cantlow	Technical Fellow	London	12 months	FT	jacksonslane.org.uk
Kettle's Yard	Kyle Percy	Curatorial Research Assistant	Cambridge	12 months	FT	kettlesyard.co.uk
Manchester International Festival	Tayah Preece	Trainee Production Manager	Manchester	12 months	FT	mif.co.uk
National Theatre Wales	Brady Bowes	Digital Communications Assistant	Cardiff	12 months	FT	nationaltheatrewales.org
NoFit State Circus	Sascha Goslin	Development and International Relations Assistant	Cardiff	12 months	FT	nofitstate.com
Opera North	Alice Parsons	Opera North Higher Education Co-ordinator	Leeds	12 months	FT	operanorth.co.uk
OTO Projects	Abby Thomas	Digital Archivist	London	12 months	FT	cafeoto.co.uk
Pacitti Company	Jason Haye	Digital Assistant	Ipswich	12 months	FT	pacitticompany.com, spillfestival.com
Phoenix Dance Theatre	Jack Thomson	Graduate Dancer	Leeds	12 months	FT	phoenixdancetheatre.co.uk
Prime Cut	Conn McKermott	Arts Development Manager	Belfast	11 months	FT	primecutproductions.co.uk
Sadler's Wells	Verity Casey	Development Assistant, Individual Giving	London	12 months	FT	sadlerswells.com/
Situations	Rachael Baskeyfield	Digital reporter	Bristol	12 months	FT	situations.org.uk
Somerset House	Olivia Barratt	Somerset House Studios Assistant	London	12 months	FT	somersethouse.org.uk
Stanley Picker Gallery	Joe Sanchez	Digital Projects Assistant	London	6 months	FT	stanleypickergallery.org
Streetwise Opera	Charlie Bindels	Project Assistant	London	12 months	FT	streetwiseopera.org
The Common Guild	Brodie Sim	Programme Assistant (Events and Engagement)	Glasgow	12 months	0.6 FTE	thecommonguild.org.uk
The Lowry	Bethany Walsh	Development Assistant	Salford	12 months	FT	thelowry.com
The MAC	Lyndsy Coates	Audience Development Assistant	Belfast	12 months	FT	themaclive.com
Town Hall Symphony Hall Birmingham	Madeleine Belsey-Day	Jazzlines Creative Assistant	Birmingham	12 months	FT	thsh.co.uk
Turner Contemporary	Victoria Evans	Programme Assistant	Margate	12 months	FT	turnercontemporary.org
Watershed	Holly Muse	Rife Guide Coordinator	Bristol	12 months	FT	watershed.co.uk
Welsh National Opera	James Barringer	Fundraising and Communications Assistant	Cardiff	12 months	FT	wno.org.uk
Writers' Centre Norwich	Freya Gallagher-Jones	Business Development Assistant	Norwich	12 months	FT	writerscentrenorwich.org.uk

## **RECRUITMENT BRIEFING FOR HOST ORGANISATIONS**

This briefing is divided into three sections and provides guidance on how to recruit according to the specific eligibility criteria of this programme.

This is based on our experience and lessons learnt in the former pilot scheme, the DCMS Jerwood Creative Bursaries.

We know that each host will have their own valuable advice about successful recruitment methods and where to advertise; our evaluation of the pilot scheme identified that more sharing of this learning between hosts should be supported. We will upload Sections 2 and 3 of this document to Google Docs and invite hosts to edit it. We would encourage all hosts to add any of their own advice for where to advertise or best practice recruitment guidance that they think could benefit other host organisations.

### **1: Rules of eligibility criteria for recipients**

Successful recipients must:

- ➔ have received a **full maintenance grant** during the full period of their course and be able to verify it with the necessary paperwork
- ➔ have graduated **since summer 2013**, from a first degree (ie a BA or an NVQ 6, or MA if from a Scottish university) in the UK
- ➔ have achieved a **2:2 degree or above**
- ➔ be full-time **resident in the UK**

It will be clear from these specific criteria that this isn't an open recruitment and you are likely to need to move beyond your normal recruitment methods. In other words, you are targeting a smaller pool of *recent* graduates (so they will probably not have a great deal of experience of job hunting) and specifically graduates from lower-income families who quite likely have not had the option to undertake prolonged periods of unpaid work experience, if any at all. They also may not know about the "usual" arts jobs sites.

The FAQ document which will be hosted on our webpage is designed mainly for candidates but should answer any additional questions you may have about the criteria. We will send you a link to this once the programme's webpages go live and it is attached as a separate document for now.

### **a) Evidence of eligible financial criteria**

Successful recipients must:

- ➔ have received a **full maintenance grant** during the full period of their course and be able to verify it with the necessary paperwork

You will need to get documents from all applicants to prove that they were in receipt of the relevant grant funding for each of their university years.

- ➔ All candidates should provide a Student Finance Breakdown letter for EACH OF THEIR UNIVERSITY YEARS. **Please see attached a sample of the relevant document on page 7.** This version was provided by Student Loans Company and provides the basic information – but you will see many variations on this theme. England, Wales and Northern Ireland use different versions of this one and the Student Awards Agency Scotland has their own version.
- ➔ You should ask candidates to attach this evidence **to their application**. This is very important and will save you time later on. Graduates are sometimes confused themselves about what level of grant or loan they received so will unintentionally misrepresent their level of financial support. The Student Finance Breakdown letter will detail this.

#### What to look for in the documents

**A LOAN is not eligible as evidence of financial need – they must have received a GRANT.**

You are looking for the words "Grant" (or "Bursary" in Scotland) – ie evidence of financial support which is **non-repayable**. This is granted on the basis of familial income. Loans are available to all and have to be paid back, and are not eligible evidence for the purposes of this programme.

On most documents, you will find a box entitled "Maintenance Grant" and will need to check the amount using the table below to ensure it was a **Full** Maintenance Grant (as opposed to a Partial Maintenance Grant – which is not eligible evidence).

Apart from **Maintenance Grants**, the other grants or bursaries which are also eligible are:

- **Welsh Government Learning Grant** (used to be called Assembly Learning Grant): the equivalent of a Maintenance Grant for Welsh students.
- **Young Student's Bursary or Independent Student's Bursary**: the equivalent of a Maintenance Grant for Scottish students.
- **Special Support Grants**: replaces the Maintenance Grant for students who can claim income-related benefits. Students can get either type of grant but not both together, and the value is the same.

This table outlines the amount you are looking for – there are likely to be some slight differences (up to £200) as the exact amount of grant each student is eligible for depends on the year they entered Higher Education (HE). Eligible candidates are likely to have entered HE from 2009/10 onwards.

Grant	Nation	Funding Body	2009/10 £	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £
<b>Maintenance Grant / Special Support Grant</b>	England	Student Loan Company (SLC)/ Student Finance England (SFE)	2,906	2,906	2,906	2,984	3,080
<b>Maintenance Grant / Special Support Grant</b>	NI	SLC/ Student Finance NI	3,406	3,475	3,475	3,475	3,475
<b>Welsh Government Learning Grant (previously Assembly Learning Grant) / Special Support Grant</b>	Wales	SLC / Student Finance Wales	2,906	5,161	5,780	5,161	5,161
<b>Young Student's Bursary / Independent Student's Bursary</b>	Scotland	Student Awards Agency Scotland (SAAS)	2,640	2,640	2,640	2,640	1,750

**b) Evidence of academic criteria**

Successful recipients must:

- ➔ have graduated **since summer 2013**, from a first degree (ie a BA or an NVQ 6, or MA if from a Scottish university) in the UK
- ➔ have achieved a **2:2 degree or above**
- ➔ be full-time **resident in the UK**

Eligible candidates must provide proof of having graduated not earlier than summer 2013 from a first degree and with at least a 2:2 grade. There are no criteria about the subject they studied but they must only have studied to BA level. MA students, ie those who have gone on to study for a second degree, are not eligible for this programme. The exception is those who studied at one of the older Scottish Universities where the 4 year MA is the equivalent of the English BA.

Only full-time residents in the UK will have received a Full Maintenance Grant so for the purposes of our criteria, you do not need additional proof of residency.

**2: Where to Advertise**

To help you ensure your recruitment is as accessible as possible to the target demographic, we have listed websites and documents which we hope you will find useful. These are ideas only and it is not a requirement of the programme that hosts use them.

Whilst you are likely to be familiar with many of them, our aim is to encourage you to go beyond where you might normally advertise.

Do also update the Google Docs spreadsheet with other sites you are familiar with which may be useful for other hosts. We will send you an invitation to edit this once it is created. We are encouraging all hosts to add information to this document – as well as information about the most effective use of social media to publicise the jobs on this programme, including tips for paid social media posting. The hashtag #artsjobs on Twitter is also particularly effective. Most of these are national sites - each host will also have regional- and sector-specific examples.

**FREE SITES**

- ➔ Arts Councils:
  - ⇒ Arts Council England's Arts Jobs: [artsjobs.org.uk/artsjobshome/](http://artsjobs.org.uk/artsjobshome/)
  - ⇒ Creative Scotland: [opportunities.creativescotland.com/](http://opportunities.creativescotland.com/)
  - ⇒ Arts Council of Wales: [artswales.org.uk/arts-in-wales/arts-directory-search](http://artswales.org.uk/arts-in-wales/arts-directory-search)
  - ⇒ Arts Council of Northern Ireland: [artscouncil-ni.org/news/job-opportunities](http://artscouncil-ni.org/news/job-opportunities)
- ➔ Job Centres / Universal Jobmatch: [gov.uk/advertise-job](http://gov.uk/advertise-job)
- ➔ Artsadmin E-digest: [artsadmin.co.uk/resources/e-digest](http://artsadmin.co.uk/resources/e-digest)
- ➔ Ideastap (closing June 2015): [ideastap.com/Opportunities/Jobs/arts-jobs](http://ideastap.com/Opportunities/Jobs/arts-jobs)
- ➔ Creative and Cultural Skills / Creative Choices: [ccskills.org.uk/careers/jobs](http://ccskills.org.uk/careers/jobs)
- ➔ Skillset: [happ.hiive.co.uk/](http://happ.hiive.co.uk/)
- ➔ Artsphere: [artsphere.co.uk/jobs/](http://artsphere.co.uk/jobs/)
- ➔ Axisweb: [axisweb.org/about-opportunities/](http://axisweb.org/about-opportunities/)
- ➔ BIS: [graduatetalentpool.bis.gov.uk](http://graduatetalentpool.bis.gov.uk)

- Creative Society: [thisisitnetwork.co.uk/opportunities/jobs/](http://thisisitnetwork.co.uk/opportunities/jobs/)
- Local university careers services, eg:
  - ⇒ University of the Arts, London (UAL)'s Creative Careers: [arts.ac.uk/student-jobs-and-careers/employers-and-partners/post-a-job/](http://arts.ac.uk/student-jobs-and-careers/employers-and-partners/post-a-job/). They have a wider reach beyond their own graduates.
  - ⇒ University of Leicester Museum Studies: [le.ac.uk/departments/museumstudies/JobDesk](http://le.ac.uk/departments/museumstudies/JobDesk)
  - ⇒ Oxford University: [careers.ox.ac.uk/searching-for-work/where-to-look-for-work/job-internship-vacancies/](http://careers.ox.ac.uk/searching-for-work/where-to-look-for-work/job-internship-vacancies/)

#### PAID

- Graduate Prospects is the commercial arm of HECSU (Higher Education Careers Services Unit): [prospects.ac.uk](http://prospects.ac.uk)
- Arts Hub: [artshub.co.uk/uk/advertise-a-job/](http://artshub.co.uk/uk/advertise-a-job/)
- National Graduate Recruitment: [gradjobs.co.uk/](http://gradjobs.co.uk/)
- Association of Graduate Recruiters: [agr.org.uk/Jobs](http://agr.org.uk/Jobs)
- [the-dots.co.uk](http://the-dots.co.uk) (only £20 for an internship)
- Milkround: [recruiters.milkround.com](http://recruiters.milkround.com)
- Employability – opportunities for disabled and dyslexic students and graduates: [employ-ability.org.uk](http://employ-ability.org.uk)
- Goodmoves: [goodmoves.org.uk/Search/CMS/recruiting](http://goodmoves.org.uk/Search/CMS/recruiting)
- Diversity Job Site (which includes Ethnic Jobsite, Disability Jobsite, Diversity Jobsite, Disability Network, overlooked Talent and Asian Jobsite): [diversityjobsite.co.uk/recruiters.php](http://diversityjobsite.co.uk/recruiters.php)
- Skills Development Scotland: [ourskillsforce.co.uk/](http://ourskillsforce.co.uk/)
- Yorkshire graduates: [yorkshiregraduates.co.uk/employers/?ts=1649072](http://yorkshiregraduates.co.uk/employers/?ts=1649072)
- GradSouthWest: [gradsouthwest.com/recruiters\\_home.htm](http://gradsouthwest.com/recruiters_home.htm)

#### 3: Best practice guidance

There are numerous websites offering best practice guidance – here is a selection we are aware of which offer useful information about creating the right environment for entry-level placements and ideas of where to recruit.

- ACE/CCS: *Internships in the Arts* [artscouncil.org.uk/publication\\_archive/internships-arts/](http://artscouncil.org.uk/publication_archive/internships-arts/)
- CCSkills: [ccskills.org.uk/supporters/employer-advice/article/a-best-practice-guide-to-apprenticeships-internships-and-volunteering](http://ccskills.org.uk/supporters/employer-advice/article/a-best-practice-guide-to-apprenticeships-internships-and-volunteering)
- CCSkills recommend ACAS's *A Guide for Employers* April 2014, produced by CIPD: [acas.org.uk/media/pdf/h/5/Managing-future-talent.pdf](http://acas.org.uk/media/pdf/h/5/Managing-future-talent.pdf)
- *Creative Skillset: Guidelines for Employers offering work placements in the Creative Industries*. Provides definitions of terminology and case studies. [creativeskillset.org/assets/0000/6234/Guidelines\\_for\\_employers\\_offering\\_work\\_placements\\_in\\_the\\_Creative\\_Industries.pdf](http://creativeskillset.org/assets/0000/6234/Guidelines_for_employers_offering_work_placements_in_the_Creative_Industries.pdf)
- *Graduate Talent Pool: Work Experience: an Employers' Guide*. Detailed plans for induction and sample formats for on-going assessments of employees. [graduatetalentpool.bis.gov.uk/cms/ShowPage/Home\\_page/Offering\\_internships/plieffdlc](http://graduatetalentpool.bis.gov.uk/cms/ShowPage/Home_page/Offering_internships/plieffdlc).
- *University of the Arts London (UAL): Guidelines* mainly from an intern's point of view. [arts.ac.uk/student-jobs-and-careers/find-jobs-and-internships/student-and-graduate-internships/internships-advice/](http://arts.ac.uk/student-jobs-and-careers/find-jobs-and-internships/student-and-graduate-internships/internships-advice/)
- *UAL & ACE: Resources for interns and the organisations hosting them, to help realise high-quality internships*. [artquest.org.uk/articles/view/how\\_to\\_have\\_a\\_fair\\_internship](http://artquest.org.uk/articles/view/how_to_have_a_fair_internship)
- *Government Services and Information: Employment rights and pay for Interns*. [gov.uk/employment-rights-for-interns](http://gov.uk/employment-rights-for-interns)
- *Museums Association: museumsassociation.org/careers/16042012-internships*
- RNIB – Advice about recruiting blind/partially sighted person: [rnib.org.uk/services-we-offer-advice-professionals-employing-blind-or-partially-sighted-person](http://rnib.org.uk/services-we-offer-advice-professionals-employing-blind-or-partially-sighted-person)

**APPENDIX A**  
**SAMPLE STUDENT FINANCE BREAKDOWN LETTER**

2010/11

5 October 2009

Customer Reference Number: 01234567890

Dear Mr Bloggs

**Student Finance for Academic Year 2010/11**

<b>The amount</b> to be paid to your university or college:	<b>£3290.00</b>
---	-----------------

<b>The amount</b> to be paid to you:	<b>£6403.00</b>
--------------------------------------	-----------------

This letter details how your student finance total is made up and when to expect payments. We have also included a list of Frequently Asked Questions to help answer any questions you might have about student finance and a University or College Payment Advice.

**Next steps**

You don't have to do anything.

Yours sincerely

**2010/11****Your Student Finance Breakdown****5 October 2009**

Name:	Joseph Bloggs
Customer Reference Number:	01234567890
UCAS Personal ID:	1234567890
University or College:	THE UNIVERSITY OF WIGAN
Course:	SCIENCE
Course year:	First

You will need to pay back the Tuition Fee Loan and Maintenance Loan.

**Tuition Fees**

Tuition Fee amount:	£3290.00
Tuition Fee Loan available to you:	£3290.00
<b>Tuition Fee Loan to be paid to your university or college:</b>	<b>£3290.00</b>

The amount we will pay directly to your university or college:

**£3290.00****Maintenance Loan**

Loan not based on household income:	£3564.00
Plus loan based on household income:	£1386.00
Minus loan replaced with grant*:	£1453.00
Equals loan available to you:	£3497.00
<b>Loan to be paid to you:</b>	<b>£3497.00</b>

The amount we will pay to you:

**£6403.00****Grants**

<b>Maintenance Grant:</b>	<b>£2906.00</b>
---------------------------	-----------------

\* This amount of your Maintenance Loan has been replaced with a Maintenance Grant. This means you have less student finance to repay. For more information go to [www.direct.gov.uk/studentfinance](http://www.direct.gov.uk/studentfinance).

You have been assessed as eligible for Disabled Students' Allowances (DSAs). If you have not yet received any confirmation of your DSAs entitlement, we will contact you shortly.