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# Executive Summary

## Introduction

This report provides an evaluation of the Visual Artist and Craft Maker Awards (VACMA).

## Background

There are currently 13 programmes covering 15 Local Authorities (Highland also covers Moray and South of Scotland covers the Scottish Borders and Dumfries & Galloway). The Programmes offers grants of between £500 and £1,500 to support visual artists and craft makers in their creative and professional development and is resourced by a combination of funding from Creative Scotland and cash and in-kind contributions from the local delivery partner (Creative Scotland’s contribution varies from 50-66% of total funding for the programme).

Table A.1: VACMA Programme Geographic Coverage

|  |
| --- |
| Local Authority Areas |
| * Aberdeen
* Aberdeenshire
* Dumfries & Galloway
* Dundee
* East Lothian
* Edinburgh
* Fife
* Glasgow
 | * Highland
* Moray
* Na h-Eileanan Siar
* Orkney Islands
* Scottish Borders
* Shetland Islands
* South Ayrshire
 |

## Study Objectives

The objectives of the study were to evaluate VACMA in terms of:

* Operation and Delivery of the Programme;
* Creative and Professional Development;
* Area Development and Place;
* National Cultural Policy; and
* Potential Future Models and Priorities.

## Study Method

The study comprised:

* Desk-based review – performance and strategic fit;
* Consultations – Creative Scotland, Partners and Former Partners; and
* Surveys – Beneficiaries (ie individual recipients of funding) and Panel Members (ie those making up the decision making panels in participating local authority area)

## Conclusions and Recommendations

#### Strategic Fit

There are a number of common themes across strategic aims within Creative Scotland’s 10-Year Strategy, Arts Strategy, Creative Industries Strategy and Visual Arts Sector Review that the VACMA Programme is contributing towards. This includes: excellence and experimentation, working with local partners to support individual artists and local communities, supporting the development of talent and skills, supporting the presentation and distribution of work, helping artists access international markets, and helping create sustainable businesses and improving the financial position of artists.

## Operation and Delivery of the Programme

#### Applications and Awards

The number of applications has fluctuated around the 400 level, with a grant award rate of approximately a third. There is a wide variation in the number of applications across the different local authority areas with the most popular area – Glasgow – receiving c.150 and some areas receiving less than 10. The average grant award level has been in the £800-900 range.

There are more applications from visual artists (average 70%) compared to craft makers (30%), which is broadly in line with Creative Scotland applications and the size of the respective sectors in Scotland. The most common type of support requested in applications was development of new work and skills development. The most common age group for applications was 25-44 (59%) and the years in practice was less than 5 (40%).

One suggested area for improvement was advice and guidance on what makes a successful application. A possible way to help address this may be to provide application examples with annotations. This could be a central source so as not to duplicate effort.

#### Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

Almost three-quarters (73%) of applicants were female but other research suggests that is reflective of the wider visual artist market. A total of 8% of all applicants in 2016-17 classed themselves as disabled but 16% of successful applicants were. So the relative success rate for disabled applicants was better than non-disabled in that year.

The scheme also plays an important role in extending the geographic reach of Creative Scotland funding, by providing specific funding by local authority area – including many areas which do not attract large numbers of applications to central Creative Scotland funds.

Improved EDI monitoring was introduced in 2016-17 allowing for a greater level of demographic detail for this year and going forward.

#### Continued Need

All of the stakeholders felt that there was a continued need for the VACMA scheme. This view is supported by the role the scheme is playing in supporting strategic aims and the benefits that it is generating. Those where there was a question mark over its future delivery was due to external factors (i.e. budget cuts) rather than any issue with the scheme itself.

#### Application Process

The stakeholders felt that the straightforward application process is a key strength of VACMA and this is borne out by the beneficiaries and Panel Members high rating of the application process, with at least 85% of beneficiaries and at least 90% of Panel Members rating aspects of the process as excellent/very good/good.

Figure A.1: Rating of Application Process (% excellent/very good/good)



#### Promotion

The level of promotion of the scheme was considered an area for improvement as was the consistency of promotion across the different areas. The process of introducing greater consistency has already begun and will continue into the future. This will help raise the profile of the scheme, allow for a more cost-effective process in promoting the scheme and easier sharing of information through more informal channels.

Another suggested improvement was introducing ways to promote the work of successful applicants as this would be beneficial to both the individual artists and the scheme itself. This could be tied into existing activities e.g. existing festivals, exhibitions, local authority buildings, etc.

#### Artist Forum

At present the stakeholders meet on an annual basis but there is no forum for artists to meet. However, various artists groups and networks do exist, so rather than setting up another it would be more appropriate to use these existing networks to allow people to engage with each other. This could include presentations by stakeholders and/or successful applicants to help promote the scheme.

#### Recent Graduates/Emerging Practices

There is a feeling amongst stakeholders that there are less applications and successful awards from recent graduates/emerging practices. Refinement of the monitoring data for time since graduation, where applicable, and years in practice would allow more in-depth analysis of this area.

#### Monitoring

There have been recent improvements in the monitoring data that is collected, particularly around equality, diversity and inclusion. This will allow for the monitoring of trends going forward and a more detailed understanding of the types of people that are applying and those that are successful.

#### Funding

Over the last three years the level of grant funding awarded has fluctuated but the level in 2016-17 is very similar to that of 2014-15. Funding on an annual basis is a challenge for many areas as they don’t know from year to year whether the funding will be available. Whilst a three year funding cycle would provide greater security and allow for future planning this may not be easy to achieve.

#### Progression

The VACMA scheme was originally designed to be a ‘stepping stone’ onto bigger things. It may be that more than one successful application to VACMA is not unreasonable as it may take this to allow the artist/practice to move forward. However, when this becomes more than two successful applications then there is probably a need to review what progress that artist/practice is actually making.

## Creative and Professional Development

#### Beneficiaries

The majority of beneficiaries (96%) felt that their involvement with VACMA had been very beneficial/beneficial to their arts/craft maker’s practice. It has benefitted them in a number of ways, the most common of which are set out in **Table A.2**.

Table A.2: Benefits from VACMA

|  |
| --- |
| Most Commonly Cited Benefits to their Work/Practice (a lot/some) |
| * Generated new ideas (97%)
* Feel more inspired (93%)
* Increased skills/developed techniques (93%)
* Increased self-confidence (91%)
* Better understanding of techniques/materials (87%)
* Identified new ways of working (87%)
* Improved the quality of their work (86%)
* Feel more valued (83%)
 |

These benefits provide a combination of capacity building within the individuals themselves (through feeling more inspired, self-confident and valued) and their work/practices (through new ideas, skills and understanding of techniques/materials, new ways of working and improved quality).

The support from VACMA has also provided over two thirds (68%) with new opportunities to display/promote their work with the most common being through an exhibition/gallery (30%) and arts festival (15%). A total of 70% reported an increase in their income as a result of VACMA (a lot/some/a little).

#### Panel Members

A total of 81% of Panel Members felt that their involvement in VACMA had been very beneficial/beneficial to their professional development. They experienced a number of benefits from undertaking the role with the most common given in **Table A.3**.

Table A.3: Benefits from being a Panel Member

|  |
| --- |
| Most Commonly Cited Benefits (a lot/some) |
| * Allowed them to keep up to date with developments in the local arts/crafts community (93%)
* Allowed them to give something back to the local arts/craft community (85%)
* Felt more inspired (62%)
* Increased their contacts (61%)
* Increased their self-confidence (61%)
 |

Also, just over two fifths (42%) of Panel Members had received funding from VACMA in the past and all of them felt that this had been very beneficial/beneficial to their arts/craft makers practice.

#### Mentoring Support

Approximately one in 10 had also received mentoring support. Ways that the mentoring support had helped them included: helping them set clear goals (23%), a source of advice/support (15%) and developing more productive processes (8%). They have, therefore, benefitted from this more intensive form of support. However, the fact that mentoring support allows for more resource intensive work with the beneficiary, means that it is only available in certain local authority areas and to a limited number of people.

## Area Development and Place

The VACMA scheme has created a strong feeling that there is support for the visual arts and craft sector from Creative Scotland and the Local Authority, and that the sector is valued – **Figure A.2**. It is also considered important in raising the profile of the visual arts and craft sector. This chimes with some of the key aims of the stakeholders of VACMA.

Figure A.2: Place Development (Strongly Agree/Agree)



Raising awareness of the arts community is more mixed with a much higher proportion of Panel Members feeling this was the case. There are also much lower proportions feeling that VACMA has created a greater sense of community.

This is understandable as the Panel Members review all applications giving them a much greater awareness of the local arts community. Also applicants/beneficiaries may not be aware of each other. These areas could partly be addressed through some of the points made earlier about promoting/showcasing successful applicants work and linking in with existing arts networks to raise the profile of VACMA and those that have participated in it.

The VACMA scheme has also brought a range of other benefits to local areas including talent retention, greater collaboration, increased skills base and provision of a greater range of arts and crafts thus increased public engagement with the arts.

Also it has provided Partners with a greater awareness of who is working in their area and they have engaged with some of the artists (both successful and unsuccessful applicants to VACMA) on other projects/activities outside the VACMA scheme.

## Potential Future Models

#### Existing Schemes

None of the areas are looking at changing the format and/or scale of their scheme but two areas did find it challenging to secure funding for the current year. Maintaining the current position is a focus for many of the areas. This is often due to external factors such as wider budgetary pressures.

In some areas budgetary control has moved between departments in the Local Authority or to Trusts that operate services on behalf of the Local Authority. For these areas it has been necessary to seek continued funding though this new decision making process.

The fact that funding is often only allocated on a one year basis, wider external budgetary pressures and changes in budgetary control are potential risks to future funding in some areas.

#### Living Costs

A small number of the stakeholders and beneficiaries suggested that the living costs of artists is something that the scheme should cover.

However, the scheme acts as a means to an end i.e. helping artists to undertake activities that will lead to new opportunities, increased income and greater sustainability rather than providing them with an income whilst they undertake their work.

#### Level of Grant Awards

Amongst beneficiaries (66%) and Panel Members (60%) the balance is in favour of keeping the grants at the existing amounts (£500-£1,500). This combined with the level of benefits that artists are experiencing with the current levels suggests that the grant levels should be maintained as is. Partners should have the discretion to award amounts below the lower limit where they feel the award would still be sufficient to make a difference to that artist/practice.

#### Geographic Coverage

Existing coverage is only 15 of the 32 local authority areas in Scotland. Whilst other research suggests that these 15 areas account for a large proportion of the visual arts community in Scotland, there is a significant proportion that is not covered by the current programme.

VACMA has developed organically from the bottom up rather than as a national scheme from the top down. It is a partnership approach, requiring the input of a local partner e.g. Local Authority, Trust or arts organisation in order to operate in a particular area. This can be challenging, not least in the current environment of public sector cuts. Also in some areas they may not have arts staff to administer the scheme and feedback from previous Partners suggest that some feel that the number applying would be too low to make it worth implementing.

A possible way around this may be for schemes to be run across local authorities as currently happens with Highland (covering Moray) and Scottish Borders (covering Dumfries & Galloway). This would involve the new area providing a contribution towards the administration of the scheme and funding for grants. A concern for these new areas may be that they just end up supporting grant awards in the area that is administering the scheme on their behalf. However, they could ring fence their funding to go to applicants from their area.

#### Other Art Forms

Whilst the majority of respondents felt that VACMA could be expanded or similar schemes developed to include other art forms, this would be dependent on being able to access additional resources (to administer the scheme and for the grant awards) and creation of new panels relevant to each particular art form. This would be very challenging in the current environment of budget cuts and the fact that many are looking at this point to simply maintain funding for the existing VACMA scheme.

## Concluding Statement

There is a strong rationale for the continuation of the VACMA Programme based on the contribution it is making to strategic objectives and benefits it is bringing to individual artists and craft makers, panel members and local areas. The straightforward application process is working well in practice. Whilst this report makes some recommendations on future operation and delivery these are refinements to the existing programme rather than wholesale changes. The other recommendations relate to further promotion of the scheme and its achievements, and potentially encouraging some other areas to take part.

# Introduction

This report provides an evaluation of the Visual Artist and Craft Maker Awards (VACMA).

## Background

There are currently 13 programmes covering 15 Local Authorities (Highland also covers Moray and South of Scotland covers the Scottish Borders and Dumfries & Galloway). The Programmes offers grants of between £500 and £1,500 to support visual artists and craft makers in their creative and professional development.

## Study Objectives

The objectives of the study were:

* Operation and Delivery of the Programme – how well the programme has been delivered and where improvements could be made in the future;
* Creative and Professional Development – to what extent has it helped to support creative and professional development. What the experience of Panel Members has been;
* Area Development and Place – the extent to which it has contributed to a sense of place and engagement with the wider local arts community. How it has helped support and develop the local arts community and how it fits and relates to local cultural strategies and other of forms of support available locally.
* National Cultural Policy – how it contributes to national cultural policy aims; and
* Potential Future Models and Priorities – in terms of geographic reach and/or alternative models.

## Report Structure

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

* Chapter 2: The VACMA Programme and Strategic Fit;
* Chapter 3: Stakeholder Consultations;
* Chapter 4: Survey of Beneficiaries;
* Chapter 5: Panel Member Survey; and
* Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations.

# VACMA Programme and Strategic Fit

## Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the VACMA programme and performance over the last three years. It also considers the strategic fit and contribution to key cultural strategies.

## VACMA

The VACMA programme offers grants, and in some cases mentoring, support to visual artists and craft makers. The programme currently has 13 schemes operating in 15 local authority areas (Highland also covers Moray and the South of Scotland scheme covers the Scottish Borders and Dumfries & Galloway). Each scheme is managed locally with decisions on awards made by local panels.

Table 2.1: VACMA Programme Geographic Coverage

|  |
| --- |
| Local Authority Areas |
| * Aberdeen
* Aberdeenshire
* Dumfries & Galloway
* Dundee
* East Lothian
* Edinburgh
* Fife
* Glasgow
 | * Highland
* Moray
* Na h-Eileanan Siar
* Orkney Islands
* Scottish Borders
* Shetland Islands
* South Ayrshire
 |

The scheme is joint funded by local Partners (referred to as ‘Partners’ throughout the remainder of this report) making both a cash and in-kind contribution to the funding and management of the scheme[[1]](#footnote-1). Creative Scotland’s contribution varies from 50-66% of the total funding available.

The Programme offers grants of between £500 and £1,500 to support visual artists and craft makers in their creative and professional development.

Grant awards are made to practitioners at all stages of their career who have demonstrated a commitment to their work and in developing their practice through new work, new skills or new opportunities.

The fund was initiated during the Scottish Arts Council (SAC) as a ‘stepping stone’ towards funding from SAC. However, the funding structures have changed and it now operates as support at a local level with a broader remit discussed throughout the report.

## Strategic Fit

We have reviewed a number of key strategic documents, including:

* Unlocking Potential Embracing Ambition: A Shared Plan for the Arts, Screen and Creative Industries 2014-2024;
* Creative Scotland: Arts Strategy 2016-17;
* Creative Industries: A Strategy for Creative Scotland 2016-17; and
* Creative Scotland Visual Arts Sector Review.

There are a number of common themes across the strategic aims in these documents that the VACMA Programme is contributing towards:

* Excellence and experimentation, in particular supporting the development of high quality work and opportunities to innovate:

The main aim of VACMA is to provide support that allows artists to develop their work and improve its quality. VACMA allows time and opportunities to experiment with new techniques, materials and markets. This is particularly relevant as the Visual Arts Sector Review identified that within the sector “capacities, both human and financial, are extremely stretched”. In this situation, without support, it can be very difficult to find the time or resource to explore new ideas and opportunities.

* Working with local partners to support individual artists and local communities:

At the time of the evaluation, VACMA is a partnership programme between Creative Scotland and 15 different local authority areas, and is an important source of support in developing the creative communities within these local areas. This partnership approach is important in focusing combined resources on a set of common aims and providing both a national and local perspective.

* Supporting the development of talent and skills:

VACMA provides support that can be used to directly access training and new skills. The focus of this type of support is on gaining skills that have a practical application and will develop and enhance their work. Again, where artists are stretched, VACMA is important in providing support to allow artists to access these new skills. CS’s Diversity in the Arts Survey demonstrates specific challenges for rurally based artists and VACMA is an important source of support in helping to reach and develop the skills of these artists.

* Supporting the presentation, touring and distribution of work and public engagement:

VACMA provides support that allows artists to showcase their work in new and different contexts. This helps the artists to promote their work to a wider audience, improve their contacts and increase their ability to secure future work and income.

* Helping artists access international markets:

The VACMA Programme has supported a number of artists that have an international focus to their work. So whilst the support is provided on a local basis the reach of the work it supports can extend far beyond this.

* Helping create sustainable businesses and improving the financial position of artists:

The Visual Arts Sector Review highlights that stretched capacities have “the potential to impact negatively on levels of motivation and confidence in the sector, and raises concerns about future sustainability and growth”. VACMA has an important role to play in increasing the motivation and confidence of artists and allowing them to develop their work in such as a way as to increase their future income and sustainability.

A key theme of the Visual Arts Sector Review was the low earnings of artists and the challenges of sustaining a career. This was also reflected in the Diversity in the Arts Survey. While the scale of the VACMA awards does not provide sustainable income support it is valued as an important funding source to support artists to maintain their practice.

## Applications and Awards

This section provides analysis of the applications and successful awards for the three years 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17.

#### Number

The number of applications and successful awards over the last three years is given in **Table 2.2[[2]](#footnote-2).**

Table 2.2: VACMA Programme Applications and Awards 2014/15-2016/17

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Applications | Successful | % Successful |
| 2014-15 | 376 | 121 | 32% |
| 2015-16 | 413 | 144 | 35% |
| 2016-17 | 397 | 120 | 30% |
| **Total** | **1,186** | **385** | **32%** |

Note: Excludes Shetland Islands (all three years) and Highland & Moray (2015-16) - data not provided. Scheme not operational in Highland & Moray and Na h-Eileanan Siar (2014-15), and South Ayrshire (2014-15, 2015-16).

The number of applications increased in 2015-16 but then declined slightly in 2016-17, although it was still around the 400 level. The percentage of successful applications has ranged between 30-35% with an average of 32%.

#### Geographic Coverage

The VACMA Programme has developed ‘bottom up’ (organically through partnerships with individual local authorities) rather than ‘top down’ (a national programme). The programme is open to all local authority areas in Scotland and a total of 15 out of the 32 currently participate in it.

While a recent visual arts survey by SCAN[[3]](#footnote-3) indicates that the highest concentration of artists are living in areas covered by the scheme, the lack of full geographic coverage means the scheme is not available to everyone in Scotland.

The number of applications varies significantly across the different areas – **Figure 2.3.**

Table 2.3: Applications by Local Authority area

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Applications | Successful |
|  | **2014-15** | **2015-16** | **2016-17** | **2014-15** | **2015-16** | **2016-17** |
| Aberdeen | 9 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 5 | 8 |
| Aberdeenshire | 12 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
| Dundee | 29 | 41 | 22 | 10 | 25 | 12 |
| East Lothian | 13 | 17 | 19 | 7 | 8 | 4 |
| Edinburgh | 61 | 51 | 44 | 15 | 18 | 18 |
| Fife | 36 | 43 | 30 | 23 | 27 | 10 |
| Glasgow | 149 | 189 | 145 | 27 | 30 | 22 |
| Highland & Moray | - | - | 48 | - | - | 15 |
| Orkney | 23 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 5 |
| South of Scotland | 44 | 31 | 34 | 17 | 14 | 14 |
| South Ayrshire | - | - | 8 | - | - | 2 |
| Na h-Eileanan Siar | - | 18 | 17 | - | 10 | 9 |
| **Total** | **376** | **413** | **397** | **121** | **144** | **120** |

Note: Excludes Shetland Islands (all three years) and Highland & Moray (2015-16) - data not provided. Scheme not operational in Highland & Moray and Na h-Eileanan Siar (2014-15), and South Ayrshire (2014-15, 2015-16).

There have also been considerable fluctuations from year to year within certain local authority areas.

The percentage share of applications in 2016-17 is given in **Figure 2.1.**

Figure 2.1: Applications by Local Authority area (2016-17)



In 2016-17, Glasgow had the largest number of applications accounting for more than a third (36.3%) but that does compare with an estimation of 30% of the Visual Arts Sector being located in Glasgow[[4]](#footnote-4). The next largest were Highlands & Moray (12%) and Edinburgh (11%), which compares to between 4-5% of the Visual Arts Sector estimated to be in each of these areas.

The success rates also vary considerably – **Figure 2.2** – ranging from 15% in Glasgow to almost 55% in Dundee. The low success rate in Glasgow reflects the large number of applications that it receives. In 2016-17 Glasgow received 145 applications and made 22 grant awards (which was the highest of all the areas). That compares with Dundee that received 22 applications and made 12 awards. Also the success rates are not simply a function of the number of applications received but are also dependent on the quality of the applications. So some areas may have a low level of applications and low success rate where there are not enough applications of sufficient quality.

Figure 2.2: Success Rates (2016-17)



There is no doubt that the success rates in some areas are constrained by the amount of funding that they have available i.e. they have more applications of quality than they have the funds to support (this came through in the consultation process – set out later in Chapter 3).

#### Value

The project costs (ie the total budget for the project that an individual applicant is developing) and the grant awards for successful applications are given in **Table 2.4**.

Table 2.4: Total Project Costs and Grant Awards (All Successful Applications)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Project Cost | Amount Requested | Grant Award |
| 2014-15 | £174,968 | £118,916 | £103,675 |
| 2015-16 | £210,818 | £151,315 | £116,534 |
| 2016-17 | £304,030 | £139,498 | £103,646 |

Note: Excludes Shetland Islands (all three years) and Highland & Moray (2015-16) - data not provided. Scheme not operational in Highland & Moray and Na h-Eileanan Siar (2014-15), and South Ayrshire (2014-15, 2015-16).

The total project costs have risen by 74% between 2014-15 and 2016-17 but the amount requested and awarded declined in 2016-17 compared with 2015-16.

The average project cost and grant award for successful applications are given in **Table 2.5**.

Table 2.5: Total Project Costs and Grant Awards (average per project)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Average Project Cost | Average Amount Requested | Average Grant Award | % of Request |
| 2014-15 | £1,535 | £983 | £857 | 87% |
| 2015-16 | £1,550 | £1,051 | £809 | 77% |
| 2016-17 | £2,621 | £1,162 | £864 | 74% |

Note: Excludes Shetland Islands (all three years) and Highland & Moray (2015-16) - data not provided. Scheme not operational in Highland & Moray and Na h-Eileanan Siar (2014-15), and South Ayrshire (2014-15, 2015-16).

The average size of the projects increased significantly in 2016-17, although the amount requested has only increased marginally in comparison. The average level of grant award has fluctuated within the £800-900 range over the three year period, with the percentage of the requested received declining over the period.

In 2016-17 the average grant award by local authority ranged from £733 to £1,145 with the overall weighted average being £864.

#### Artists Days

Artists are asked as part of their application how many days they will be spending on the project that is being supported through VACMA[[5]](#footnote-5). In 2016-17, the number of days was 3,386 (an average of 36 per artist). Caution should be applied when using these figures, as there was considerable variation in the answers suggesting that there was variation in interpretation. However, the large number of days committed to projects does highlight the important enabling role of the grants.

#### Type of Project

The applications from visual artists (70%) is more than double those from craft makers (30%). The success rate across the two different art forms is given in **Figure 2.3.**

Figure 2.3: Visual Arts and Craft Makers (three-year average)



Whilst craft makers had a much lower proportion of total applications their success rate was a little higher than the visual artists.

#### Gender

A much higher proportion of applications were from females (73%) compared to males (27%). However, other research suggests that this is probably reflective of the wider sector as the SCAN survey (referred to previously) reported a gender split of 70% female and 30% male. Also the Visual Arts Sector Review highlighted a higher proportion of females studying visual art.

In terms of success rates with their applications, not only do females account for a much higher proportion of applications (73%), they also have a higher success rate in their applications and account for 78% of successful applicants.

For 2016-17 additional data was captured on the type of projects which the awards supported, age group, years in practice and disability.

#### Project Purpose

The project purpose is given in **Figure 2.4.**

Figure 2.4: Project Purpose (2016-17)



The most common area for applications in 2016-17 was Development of New Work (46%) followed by Skills Development (18%) – **Figure 2.4**. The proportion of successful applications accounted for by Development of New Work (44%) was similar to its share of the applications, whilst for Skills Development (26%) it was higher. The relative success rate for Skills Development was higher than for Development of New Work but the latter still accounted for the largest share of successful applications.

In 2016-17, 36% of applications and 35% of successful awards had an international dimension to their work. The success rate reflected the proportion of applications received.

#### Age Groups

The 25-44 age group (59%) had the highest proportion of applications in 2016-17 and the highest proportion of successful applications (50%) – **Figure 2.5.**

Figure 2.5: Age (2016-17)



The highest proportion of applications (40%) were from people that had been developing their practice for less than 5 years – **Figure 2.6**. This group also accounted for 40% of successful applicants. Successful applicants were very similar in profile to total applications across all of the years in practice categories.

The high percentages of applicants in the younger age groups and in less than 5 years in practice suggests the awards are a source of support for early career artists. However, the categories are too broad for this data to be conclusive.

Figure 2.6: Year in Practice (2016-17)



#### Disability

Across all the applicants in 2016-17, 8% classed themselves as disabled. Of successful applicants, 16% classed themselves as disabled. So the relative success rate for disabled applicants was better than non-disabled in that year.

# Stakeholder Consultations

## Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the consultations with the key stakeholders which included Creative Scotland and Partners that administer the schemes in the local authority areas that participate in the VACMA programme, as well as consultations with two local authorities that had previously participated in the VACMA Programme (a list of consultees is given in **Appendix A**).

## Strategic Fit and Rationale

CS representatives felt that VACMA fits and contributes to a number of key aims of Creative Scotland’s Strategy including promoting excellence, access, place, leadership and connectivity. Also amongst the Partners there was a feeling that VACMA has a strong fit and contribution to their local strategies. This was particularly the case regarding arts and creative industries strategies but also extended to aims under wider economic and community strategies. Some of the key strategic aims that VACMA is helping support includes skills development, capacity building, engagement, emerging talent, talent retention, sustainability and innovation. It allows the Partners to engage with individual artists and help to support the artistic community within their area.

## Key Objectives and Achievement to Date

There are a number of key objectives that the Partners felt the VACMA scheme was achieving.

#### Helping Develop Talent/Artists’ Practices

A key aim of VACMA was seen as helping artists to develop their talent and practices. Several mentioned the programme as acting like a ‘stepping stone’ in their development and allowing the artists to experiment and innovate.

#### Supporting the Local Arts Community

The local focus was identified as an important dimension in VACMA.

Many felt that the programme has helped in supporting the local arts communities and capacity building thus, in turn, creating stronger local arts networks. This has then created stronger relationships at a local level.

Its role in retaining talent within the local area was also a key factor for a number of areas by helping support emerging talent and allowing progression.

#### Profile of the Sector

The profile of the sector has been enhanced by giving artists greater exposure and through there being a greater awareness of who is operating within the local arts sector. VACMA is also helping to raise awareness of the role that visual arts and crafts play within the creative industries sector and wider local economies.

A comparison between the key strategic themes (set out earlier in Section 2.3) and the views of stakeholders on what is being achieved is given in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1: Strategic Objectives and Achievements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strategic Objectives | Stakeholder Views on Achievements |
| * Excellence, experimentation, innovation, high quality work
 | * Allows artists the opportunities to experiment/innovate
 |
| * Supporting local artists/communities
 | * Capacity building, stronger local arts networks, retaining talent, increased awareness of those working locally
 |
| * Development of talent/skills
 | * Allows artists the time and resources to develop their talent, skills and practices
 |
| * Presentation/distribution of work & public engagement
 | * Greater exposure, raising awareness of role of visual arts and crafts
 |
| * Accessing international markets
 | * Increased exposure for those with an international focus
 |
| * Sustainable businesses/improving financial position
 | * Acts as ‘stepping stone’, supporting emerging talent and allowing progression
 |

## Continued Need

All interviewees felt that there was a continued need for VACMA. A number of aspects were mentioned in demonstrating its continued need, including:

* receiving more quality applications than they can support;
* whilst the grants are modest they make a big difference to those supported;
* its supports a range of artists that would not be able to access funding elsewhere;
* it allows more devolved support in local areas;
* the number of applications they are receiving; and
* the type of support is not available elsewhere.

## Strengths and Weaknesses

Respondents were asked for their views on the strengths and weaknesses of the scheme. These are summarised below by theme.

#### Programme Delivery

VACMA was seen as a programme that encourages excellence and diversity of practice by providing support to a range of different artists. There is very little funding of this type available. VACMA was considered a good example of a partnership approach and its flexibility means that it can fit with local needs e.g. they can support projects that are linking into other activities taking place locally.

Having artists on the panels means that there is a strong element of specialist knowledge and they are an important resource in allowing the programme to operate. However, an associated weakness identified by some was that depending on who is sitting on the panel this may determine the applications that get supported. Although this is mitigated by the changing nature of the panels and independent support provided by CS. Also Panel Members in areas of high demand have a large workload appraising applications due to the number that they receive.

Although it is not offered in all Local Authority areas it is considered by many to be a ‘national’ scheme. Others identified the lack of provision in many areas in Scotland as a weakness. In particular, some areas commented that they receive applications/enquiries from surrounding areas that they are not able to support e.g. Glasgow and Highland.

The flexibility of carrying funding over into the next year was also highlighted.

Budget cuts have brought into doubt the future viability of the scheme in certain areas and increased workloads for some others. Many are having to secure the budgets on an annual basis, including Creative Scotland, which means it is very difficult to plan for the future.

The fact that the scheme was limited to visual artist and craft makers was seen as a strength by many as it provided a specific focus, whereas some felt that not supporting other art forms was a weakness.

#### Promotion

The level of promotion of the scheme was noted as a weakness in some areas, as was the consistency of promotion across the different schemes. The level of promotion links to another experience which is fluctuations in demand (with some citing the rural nature of their areas as a factor in this).

There are potentially other people out there that could apply but restricted budgets makes it difficult to target/promote the scheme to them.

#### Applications

In the delivery of the programme a key strength cited was the straightforward application process (although some noted that there were still artists that struggled with it). Providing advice and feedback was also a strength as it helped artists with future applications. However, this was also an area of weakness for some as they did not have the resource to do this or could only do it on an ad-hoc basis. The quality of some applications was also noted as being poor. Reference was made to the previous support provided by the Cultural Enterprise Office in improving the quality of applications for funding, but there was now a gap in this provision.

Several areas reported receiving a lot of applications that were not relevant to the scheme but it was unclear whether this was due to the guidance or whether artists are just trying anywhere to find funding.

There was also a feeling amongst some that the type of applications vary between visual artists (who may feel free to experiment more) and craft makers (where they may feel the need to be more commercial).

Several commented that going through the application process (successful or otherwise) helps individuals reflect on where they are and gives them a better understanding of the requirements when applying for funding.

Also some people felt that not being able to support artists living costs through the scheme was a weakness.

#### Benefits to Individuals and the Local Area

Partners also identified the benefits that the programme brings to individuals and the local areas as key strengths. These are discussed in greater detail later in this section.

However, a point to note here is that whilst the scheme was originally designed to be a ‘stepping stone’ for the artists, some Partners are not seeing this as they have a number of returning applicants.

## Suggested Improvements

There were suggested improvements around a number of areas.

#### Promotion

Many felt there is a need to promote the scheme more, both at a local and national level. The quality and consistency of the branding could also be improved. This, in turn, should increase the number and quality of the applications for those areas that are currently receiving low numbers.

There has recently been a move to have the same application deadlines and this has been achieved for all of the areas.

It was felt that this made it more of a ‘national’ scheme and allows for a more consistent and cost effective marketing approach.

There could be much greater promotion of who has been successful and the sort of projects that they undertook both locally and nationally, as promoting the work will be beneficial both for the individual artists and the scheme itself.

#### Artist Forum

At present while those operating the scheme meet on an annual basis there is no forum for artists to meet. Such a forum would allow for knowledge exchange, increased networking and collaboration.

#### Recent Graduates/Emerging Practices

The feeling is that there are less applications and successful awards from recent graduates/emerging practices. There has previously been some discussion about developing bespoke support for this group, possibly an emerging practice bursary.

There may be a possibility of supporting collectives (as some people choose to work in this way), particularly if recent graduates formed this type of approach.

#### Applications and Monitoring

There has been recent work in making the application process more consistent across the different areas and this has been welcomed by the Partners, but there is a need to go further.

There have been recent improvements in the monitoring data particularly around equality, diversity and inclusion but some commented that there is a need to develop this further.

The time input field in the application delivers stark variation in responses – so some suggested that there is a need to be careful about how this is interpreted.

#### Funding and Coverage

There is a need for greater security of funding to allow for future planning. Currently it is often on an annual basis and would be better if it covered three years. However, both Creative Scotland and other funding Partners acknowledged there would be logistical challenges in the delivery of this.

Some also noted that it would be helpful if Creative Scotland could confirm its funding earlier in the year so that planning could start sooner.

Also some think that the scheme should be expanded to include other local authority areas as there is demand from other places that cannot currently be satisfied.

## Benefits

Those surveyed were asked what benefits the VACMA scheme brought to their organisations, individual beneficiaries and the wider local area.

#### Organisations

The organisations believe that it demonstrates commitment to supporting the local arts sector and contributes to a number of different aims that they have in relation to strategic approaches to cultural policy and the creative industries. It provides a strong partnership approach between Creative Scotland and Partners across a range of common aims. It has also created stronger relationships between partners and with the local arts community, with the annual forum for Partners particularly useful in this respect.

Several Partners mentioned that VACMA complements the other work that they are undertaking in supporting the creative industries.

#### Individuals

It helps individual artists to develop their work and practice, and progress towards greater sustainability.

Benefits include: increased self-confidence, improved skills, endorsement of work (which raises self-esteem and the ability to secure future funds/work), increased profile and the opportunity to develop their work. It helps to support artists that can then go onto other larger projects in the future.

The delivery process also leads to the upskilling of the Panel Members who are also arts professionals. The Panel Members include a mix of individuals that work in both the visual art and craft maker sectors.

#### Local Area

The scheme was seen by some to strengthen the economic impact of the sector and the creative skills base. Benefits cited included retention of talent, greater collaboration, raising the profile of the arts and reputation of local areas.

It has provided Partners with a greater understanding of who is working in their local area. Partners have engaged with artists (both successful and unsuccessful applicants to VACMA) on other projects/activities outside the VACMA scheme.

It also makes a greater range of arts and crafts available to local communities, thus increasing engagement with the sector.

## Mentoring

Of the 13 schemes, five currently provide a mentoring scheme. For a further four – one offered it in previous years (but is not this year due to capacity constraints), one is currently seeking funding to reintroduce it, one has provided additional workshops in the past and one no longer does due to reorganisation.

In terms of how successful the mentoring support is, one of the areas is only in their first year so could not comment on this. The others felt that mentoring allowed for a greater level of support to the artist in helping to develop their practice and resolve problems. They have had some very positive feedback from those that have taken part. However, the numbers taking part in mentoring are small in comparison to those receiving grant awards as it is a more resource intensive activity.

## Future Plans

#### VACMA

None of the areas had any plans to change the format and/or scale of the scheme but there were two areas that found it challenging to secure the budget for this year.

A further three raised the issue of cuts in local authority budgets and concerns for funding the VACMA scheme in the future.

The scheme does not cover all of Scotland and some stakeholders mentioned the fact that they receive enquires/applications from outwith their areas that they cannot support. They suggested that the scheme should be extended to cover the other areas in Scotland.

#### Expansion of VACMA or Schemes for Other Art Forms

The majority of respondents felt that VACMA could be expanded to include other art forms or similar schemes developed. However, the key issues raised in relation to this were the need for additional:

* resource to administer such schemes;
* funding for the grant awards (from both Creative Scotland and the relevant local authority); and
* new Panels relevant to the particular art form.

These issues were considered very challenging in the current environment of budget cuts.

## Previously Participating Areas

We contacted five areas that had previously taken part in the VACMA scheme but only two took part in the consultation process.

A key factor for both areas was that when they previously took part in the scheme they were only supporting very small numbers. So it did not seem worth the resources to administer the scheme. One also felt that those in their area needed more grassroots support, as many applicants did not meet the standards to allow them to be supported through the VACMA scheme.

Neither area had plans to reintroduce the VACMA scheme but they were also unsure about what the scheme currently offers and therefore whether things would have changed sufficiently for it to be worth their while to consider reintroducing it.

# Survey of Beneficiaries

## Introduction

This chapter provides analysis of the Beneficiary Survey. The survey was conducted online with each Partner sending an email to beneficiaries from the last three years (a total of 385). A total of 116 responded to the survey (a response rate of 30%).

## Profile

The profile of respondents is broadly similar to the profile of applicants, outlined earlier in Section 2.4, allowing the data to be treated as a broadly representative sample of the recipients. Details of the profile are given below.

The gender of respondents was 73% female and 25% male - **Table 4.1**.

Table 4.1: Gender of respondent beneficiaries

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Male | 28 | 25% |
| Female | 83 | 73% |
| Non-Binary | 2 | 2% |
| **Total** | **113** | **100%** |

Table 4.2 outlines the age range of respondents, with the same proportions in the 30-39, 40-49 and 50-59 age groups.

Table 4.2: Age of respondent beneficiaries

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Under 25 | 6 | 5% |
| 25-29 | 13 | 11% |
| 30-39 | 28 | 24% |
| 40-49 | 28 | 24% |
| 50-59 | 28 | 24% |
| 60+ | 12 | 10% |
| **Total** | **115** | **100%** |

Over four-fifths of respondents (82%) indicated that they were involved in visual art, and 32% in crafts - Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Type of practice involved in

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Visual art | 78 | 68% |
| Craft | 21 | 18% |
| Both | 15 | 13% |
| **Total** | **114** | **100%** |

Almost two-thirds of respondents (64%) reported that they work 22 or more hours per week as an artist/craft maker - Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Hours spent per week working as an artist/craft maker

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Less than 7 hours | 4 | 3% |
| 7-14 hours | 16 | 14% |
| 15-21 hours | 22 | 19% |
| 22-28 hours | 26 | 23% |
| 29-35 hours | 13 | 11% |
| 35+ hours | 34 | 30% |
| **Total** | **115** | **100%** |

The majority of respondents (85%) had earned less than £10,000 in the past year as an artist/craft maker - Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Amount earned in previous year as an artist/craft maker

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Less than 5k | 63 | 55% |
| £5-10k | 34 | 30% |
| £10-20k | 14 | 12% |
| £20-30k | 3 | 3% |
| £30-40k | 1 | 1% |
| **Total** | **115** | **100%** |

When asked how they would describe the furthest reach of their work, 59% said it was international whilst only 5% said it was local - Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1: Reach of respondents work
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Over half of respondents (57%) indicated that they had been developing their practice outside of education for less than 10 years - Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Time spent developing practice

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Less than 5 years | 32 | 27% |
| 5-10 years | 34 | 30% |
| 10-20 years | 24 | 21% |
| 20+ years | 25 | 22% |
| **Total** | **115** | **100%** |

Over half of the respondents (56%) reported that they had been living in their local authority area for over 10 years - Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Time spent in Local Authority

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Less than 2 years | 5 | 4% |
| 2-5 years | 19 | 17% |
| 5-10 years | 27 | 23% |
| 10-20 years | 32 | 28% |
| 20+ years | 32 | 28% |
| **Total** | **115** | **100%** |

When respondents received their awards is given in Figure 4.2.

Figure 4.2: Date respondents received their reward


N=99.

## Grant Award

Respondents were asked to indicate the primary focus of the activity they undertook with funding from VACMA. The most commonly identified foci were: development of new work (43%) and skills development (28%) – Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Primary focus of VACMA funded activity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Development of New Work | 49 | 43% |
| Skills Development | 32 | 28% |
| Equipment | 12 | 10% |
| Residency | 9 | 8% |
| Research | 7 | 6% |
| Presentation | 6 | 5% |
| Promotion | 1 | <1% |
| **Total** | **116** | **100%** |

They were then asked if there were any secondary foci for their VACMA funded activity, with the most commonly identified being: development of new work (46%), research (32%) and skills development (26%) - Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Secondary foci of VACMA funded activity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Development of New Work | 51 | 46% |
| Research | 36 | 32% |
| Skills Development | 29 | 26% |
| Presentation | 15 | 14% |
| Equipment | 13 | 12% |
| Residency | 9 | 8% |
| Mentoring | 7 | 6% |
| Promotion | 5 | 5% |

N=111. N.B. Multiple responses possible.

When asked if they had made any previous applications to VACMA, 47% indicated that they had. Table 4.10 shows those that made previous applications. The most common number of previous applications made was one (62%), with an average of 1.6.

Table 4.10: Previous applications made to VACMA (only those who have previously applied)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Application(s) | Number of applicants | % |
| 1 | 34 | 62% |
| 2 | 12 | 22% |
| 3 | 6 | 11% |
| 4 | 3 | 5% |
| **Total** | **55** | **100%** |

Just over two-thirds (69%) of previous applicants were successful.

Table 4.11: Number of previous successful applications (applicants who had applied more than once, n=38)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Application(s) | Number of applicants | % |
| 1 | 29 | 76% |
| 2 | 4 | 11% |
| 3 | 5 | 13% |
| **Total** | **38** | **100%** |

For successful previous applicants, the most common number of successful applications was one (76%) - Table 4.11.

## Application Process

Respondents were asked to rate various aspects of the VACMA application process from excellent to poor – Table 4.12 provides a breakdown of results.

Table 4.12: Respondents ratings of the application process

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Simplicity of the process | 39% | 42% | 12% | 7% | 0% |
| Written guidance and information | 39% | 40% | 15% | 5% | 2% |
| Advice and support from staff | 51% | 28% | 14% | 3% | 3% |
| Transparency of the process | 34% | 37% | 19% | 8% | 3% |
| Efficiency of service | 45% | 36% | 11% | 5% | 3% |
| Feedback on your application following decision | 42% | 33% | 12% | 7% | 6% |

N=116, except advice and support from staff, where N=115.

The application process was highly thought of with at least 85% of respondents rating each aspect as excellent/very good/good. Those with the highest proportions of excellent/very good were:

* simplicity of the process (81%).
* efficiency of the service (81%);
* written guidance and information they receive (79%); and
* advice and support from staff (78%).

Respondents were asked if they had any other comments about the VACMA application process, with the most common being:

* it was simple/straightforward (12%);
* they received good support/communication/feedback from VACMA administrative staff (6%); and
* writing the application made it clear to them what their aims were (3%).

Other comments made about the application process included:

* it is not always clear what projects can be supported (2%);
* applicants are notified quickly after a decision has been made (2%); and
* there are cashflow issues as beneficiaries must pay first before they can claim their funding (2%).

## The VACMA Programme

Two-thirds of respondents (66%) indicated that they felt the amounts available through VACMA (£500-£1,500) should not be changed - Figure 4.3.

Figure 4.3: The grant awards are between £500 and £1,500. Do you think that there should be any change to these amounts?
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Some of the reasons provided by those who felt that they should not be changed included:

* this funding gives reasonable/sufficient amounts (26%);
* with limited funds more people can benefit from smaller grants (15%);
* this range makes VACMA a popular option for those with smaller projects (6%);
* the current range gives ‘kick-start’ funding for emerging artists (3%); and
* those seeking higher amounts of funding are catered for through Creative Scotland Open Funds (3%).

Reasons provided for changing the amounts included:

* more ambitious projects could be supported (8%);
* more money could help artists to develop their work further (3%);
* more public money for the arts would be good (3%); and
* a lower funding limit could see more artists with lower budget projects being supported (3%).

Respondents were asked if there were any improvements that could be made to the VACMA scheme, the most common were as follows:

* more training/support opportunities so they understand what is required for a successful application (19%);
* more funding for the VACMA scheme (5%);
* an increase in the grant awards (3%);
* an exhibition of successful projects (3%);
* a networking group of successful applicants (3%); and
* the VACMA application process should be better publicised (3%).

Other improvements which were suggested by 2% of respondents in each case were: interview people, a clearer and simpler application process, more feedback for both successful and unsuccessful applicants, a mentoring scheme within all Local Authorities, a separate fund which focuses on international development, contributions should be made to artists living costs, more support and advice should be provided to both prospective and successful beneficiaries.

## Benefits

Respondents were then asked to what extent their involvement in VACMA had resulted in improvements in their arts/craft work – Table 4.13 provides a breakdown of results.

Table 4.13: Benefits from being a beneficiary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | A Lot | Some | A Little | None |
| Generated new ideas | 112 | 79% | 18% | 1% | 3% |
| Feel more inspired | 111 | 69% | 24% | 5% | 2% |
| Increased my skills/developed new techniques | 110 | 62% | 31% | 5% | 3% |
| Better understanding of a particular technique/materials | 111 | 61% | 26% | 6% | 6% |
| Identified new ways of working | 111 | 60% | 27% | 10% | 3% |
| Improved the quality of my work | 110 | 58% | 28% | 11% | 4% |
| Increased self-confidence | 111 | 56% | 35% | 5% | 4% |
| Feel more valued | 111 | 55% | 28% | 10% | 7% |
| Able to work in new medium | 111 | 46% | 23% | 10% | 21% |
| Allowed me to use more efficient approaches/processes | 110 | 37% | 35% | 19% | 8% |
| Allowed me to spend more time on my arts/craft practice | 110 | 34% | 29% | 20% | 17% |
| Increased contacts | 113 | 31% | 35% | 23% | 11% |
| Led to greater collaboration with others | 110 | 28% | 26% | 26% | 19% |
| Helped increased my income from my practice | 110 | 18% | 22% | 30% | 30% |

Figure 4.4, shows the combined ratings of a lot or some for each improvement.

Figure 4.4: Combined beneficiary ratings



Benefits identified by the highest proportion of respondents (i.e. rated a lot or some extent) were as follows:

* helped to generate new ideas (97%);
* made them feel more inspired (93%);
* increased their skills/helped them to develop new techniques (93%);
* increased self-confidence (91%);
* gave them a better understanding of a particular technique/material (87%);
* identified new ways of working (87%);
* improved the quality of their work (86%); and
* feel more valued (83%).

Just over two-thirds of respondents (68%) reported that their VACMA award had led to new opportunities in displaying and/or promoting their work. These opportunities included:

* at an exhibition/gallery (30%);
* at an arts festival (15%);
* made new business contacts, which lead to further work opportunities (5%);
* allowed them to produce new large scale work (4%);
* led on to linked projects (3%); and
* media article helped to boost their profile (3%).

The majority of respondents (96%) felt that their involvement with VACMA had been very beneficial/beneficial to their arts/craft makers practice. No respondents indicated that they felt their involvement had had no impact on their practice - Figure 4.5.

Figure 4.5: Overall benefit of involvement in VACMA
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When asked how many days they had spent on their VACMA funded project, 28% spent less than 20 days and 24% 25-50 days - Figure 4.6.

Figure 4.6: Number of days spent of VACMA funded project


N=101.

#### Mentoring

A total of 11% had received mentoring support in addition to their grant award, however it should be noted that the majority of Local Authority areas do not provide mentoring support.

Some respondents provided comments about how the mentoring support had helped them develop their arts/craft makers practice, such as:

* it helped them to set out clear objectives/goals for their work (23%);
* their mentor was a great source of advice/support for all aspects of their work (15%); and
* their mentor helped them develop more productive working process (8%).

One beneficiary reported that the mentoring support they had received had not helped them in any way, and instead felt that their mentor was indifferent about their progress which, in turn, negatively affected their confidence.

## Place Development

Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed with some statements about the VACMA Scheme – Table 4.14 provides a breakdown of the results.

Table 4.14: Place Development

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither/Nor | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Has created a greater sense of community amongst local artists/craft makers | 114 | 10% | 23% | 57% | 10% | <1% |
| Made me more aware of the arts community in my local area | 116 | 9% | 27% | 56% | 7% | 2% |
| Makes me feel that the arts and crafts sector is valued in my local area | 116 | 32% | 53% | 10% | 3% | 1% |
| Improves the profile of the visual arts/craft sector in my local area | 115 | 23% | 52% | 18% | 5% | 1% |
| Makes me feel that the visual arts/craft sector in my local area is valued by Creative Scotland and the Local Authority | 115 | 40% | 50% | 5% | 4% | 1% |

The majority of respondents strongly agreed/agreed that VACMA:

* makes them feel that the visual arts/craft sector in their local area is valued by Creative Scotland and their Local Authority (90% total; urban 86%, rural 92%);
* makes them feel that the arts and crafts sector is valued in their local area (85% total, urban 86%, rural 85%); and
* improves the profile of the visual arts/crafts sector in their local area (75% total, urban 68%, rural 80%).

The level of agreement was lower for the following statements about VACMA:

* they are now more aware of the arts community in their local area (36% total, urban 23%, rural 39%); and
* has created a greater sense of community amongst local artists/craft makers (36% total, urban 23%, rural 43%).

This would suggest that the scheme’s strengths are in the impact on value and profile of the sector but is less successful in terms of contributing to the creation or development of an arts community. It also suggests that the VACMA scheme has a greater role in place development terms in the rural areas compared to urban.

## Other Applications

Since receiving their VACMA award, 14% of respondents indicated that they had applied to Creative Scotland’s Open Project Fund - Figure 4.7.

Figure 4.7: Applied to the Open Project Fund



N=116.

The most common number of applications made was one, with an average of 1.5 - Table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Applications made to Open Project Fund

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Application(s) | Number of Applicants | % |
| 1 | 11 | 68% |
| 2 | 2 | 13% |
| 3 | 2 | 13% |
| 4 | 1 | 6% |
| **Total** | **16** | **100%** |

Almost two-fifths (38%) of applicants were successful (that compares with an overall Open Project Fund success rate of between 31-33%[[6]](#footnote-6)). A total of 5% of all respondents had had a successful application to Creative Scotland’s Open Fund.

## Other Comments

A total of 21% of respondents chose to leave final comments, with the most common being:

* they are grateful for VACMA/feel it makes a difference for the artists who receive funding (8%);
* VACMA has given them confidence/helped them feel their work is of value (8%);
* funding has helped them to develop both their work/future careers (3%); and
* they hope that VACMA continues (2%).

# Panel Member Survey

## Introduction

This chapter provides analysis of the Panel Member Survey. The Panel Members are a mix of visual artists, craft makers and employees of the local Partners. They appraise the applications and select the successful ones. The survey was conducted online with each Partner sending an email to those that had been Panel Members over the last three years. A total of 26 completed the survey.

## Profile

When asked which area they were involved with, just over two-thirds were involved with visual art (69%) and 62% with craft - see Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Panel Member’s involvement in the VACMA scheme

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Visual Art | 9 | 35% |
| Craft | 7 | 27% |
| Both | 9 | 35% |
| Neither | 1 | 4% |
| **Total** | **26** | **100%** |

There were similar proportions that had been involved for less than 2 years and 2-5 years but a much smaller proportion that had been involved over 5 years - Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Panel members VACMA participation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | % |
| Less than 2 years | 11 | 42% |
| 2-5 years | 12 | 46% |
| Over 5 years | 3 | 12% |
| **Total** | **26** | **100%** |

## Application Process

Panel Members were asked to rate various aspects of the VACMA application process from excellent to poor – Table 5.3 provides a breakdown of results.

Table 5.3: Panel Member ratings of the application process

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Simplicity of the process | 12% | 38% | 42% | 8% | 0% |
| Written guidance and information | 12% | 50% | 35% | 3% | 0% |
| Advice and support from staff | 42% | 50% | 8% | 0% | 0% |
| Transparency of the process | 19% | 50% | 23% | 8% | 0% |
| Efficiency of service | 20% | 52% | 20% | 8% | 0% |
| Feedback provided on applications following decision | 15% | 69% | 15% | <1% | <1% |

N=26, except for efficiency of service, where N=25.

All of the aspects were rated excellent/very good/good by at least 90% of Panel Members. The aspects rated the highest (i.e. excellent/very good) were:

* advice and support from staff (92%);
* feedback provided following decisions (84%);
* the efficiency of the service (72%); and
* transparency of the process (69%).

Panel Members were asked if they had any other comments about the VACMA application process, with the most common being:

* applicants should be made aware of the factors which make for a successful application (12%);
* it would be useful to know if application feedback is communicated back to applicants, as this is currently unclear (8%); and
* it should be noted that Panel Members take the assessment process very seriously (8%).

## The VACMA Programme

Three fifths of Panel Members felt that the amounts available (£500-£1,500) should not be changed - Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1: Changes to grant award amounts



N=25.

Some of the reasons provided by those who felt that they should not be changed included:

* the funding is used to kick-start projects/artists seeking larger grants can seek other sources of funding (35%);
* the current range of funding means that more people can benefit from smaller grants (15%);
* the artists who received these grants still find them useful and are able to receive the funding quicker (4%); and
* if the grants were increased it may make it harder to meet the match-funding requirements (4%).

For Panel Members who felt grant awards should be changed reasons included:

* beneficiaries with larger projects could be better supported (15%);
* the upper limit of £1,500 was adequate when the scheme started but now it has grown in popularity and so should be increased (8%); and
* the grant could be extended to better fit a typical artist's daily rate of pay (4%).

Panel Members were asked for any suggested improvements to VACMA, the most common were as follows:

* more training/support opportunities so they understand what is required for a successful application (27%);
* a showcase for VACMA beneficiaries work (e.g. press release, annual exhibition) (12%); and
* better promotion of the VACMA scheme across the country (8%).

## Benefits

Panel Members were then asked to what extent their involvement in VACMA had brought benefits to their practice – Table 5.4 provides a breakdown of results.

Table 5.4: Benefits from being a Panel Member

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A Lot | Some | A Little | None |
| Allowed you to give something back to the local arts/craft community | 58% | 27% | 15% | 0% |
| Allowed you to keep up to date with developments in the arts/craft community in your local area | 35% | 58% | 8% | 0%  |
| Feel more valued | 27% | 31% | 38% | 4% |
| Increased contacts | 23% | 38% | 31% | 8% |
| Increased self-confidence | 19% | 42% | 23% | 15% |
| Feel more inspired | 4% | 58% | 38% | 0% |
| Led to collaboration with others | 4% | 28% | 24% | 44% |
| Helped develop your own work | 4% | 19% | 54% | 23% |
| Generated new ideas | 0% | 46% | 46% | 8% |

N=26 except led to collaboration, where N=25.

The most commonly identified benefits from being involved with VACMA (i.e. a lot or some), were as follows:

* allowed them to keep up to date with developments in the arts/craft community in their local area (93%);
* allowed them to give something back to the local arts/craft community (85%);
* they felt more inspired (62%);
* helped increase their contacts (61%); and
* increased their self-confidence (61%).

Overall, the majority of Panel Members indicated that their involvement with VACMA had been very beneficial or beneficial to their professional development (81%) - Figure 5.2.

Figure 5.2: Overall benefit of being a Panel Member
N=26.

## Place Development

Panel Members were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed with some statements relating to VACMA - Table 5.5 provides a breakdown of the results.

Table 5.5: Place Development

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither/Nor | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Has created a greater sense of community amongst local artists/craft makers | 8% | 35% | 54% | 4% | 0% |
| Made me more aware of the arts community in my local area | 12% | 62% | 27% | 0% | 0% |
| Makes me feel that the arts and crafts sector is valued in my local area | 42% | 54% | 4% | 0% | 0% |
| Improves the profile of the visual arts/craft sector in my local area | 31% | 50% | 12% | 8% | 0% |
| Makes me feel that the visual arts/craft sector in my local area is valued by Creative Scotland and the Local Authority | 42% | 54% | 4% | 0% | 0% |

N=26.

The majority of Panel Members strongly agreed/agreed that VACMA:

* makes them feel that the visual arts/craft sector in their local area is valued by Creative Scotland and their Local Authority (96%);
* makes them feel that the arts and crafts sector is valued in their local area (96%);
* improves the profile of the visual arts/crafts sector in their local area (81%); and

The only statement that less than half of Panel Members agreed with was that VACMA had:

* created a greater sense of community amongst local artists/craft makers (43%) but 74% stated that it made them more aware of the arts community in their local area.

Comparing to the responses of applicants it is clear that the panel experience has a greater impact on creating and raising awareness of the arts community than the applicants’ experience.

## VACMA Applications

Just over two-fifths of Panel Members (42%) reported that they had received funding from VACMA in the past.

Of those who had, all reported that the activity they undertook with VACMA funding was either very beneficial (82%) or beneficial (18%) to their arts/craft makers practice - Figure 5.3.

Figure 5.3: Overall benefit from VACMA involvement
N=11.

### Other Comments

A total of 35% of Panel Members chose to make additional comments, with the most popular including that:

* they hope that the scheme continues (19%);
* they feel it is a worthwhile and valuable scheme (11%);
* it boosts the confidence of its beneficiaries (4%); and
* VACMA could consider allowing a percentage of the grant award to be used by beneficiaries to cover living costs (4%).

# Conclusions and Recommendations

## Introduction

This chapter provides a set of conclusions on the findings from the study and recommendations for the future development of the VACMA Programme.

## Strategic Fit

There are a number of common themes across strategic aims within Creative Scotland’s 10-Year Strategy, Arts Strategy, Creative Industries Strategy and Visual Arts Sector Review that the VACMA Programme is contributing towards, including:

* Excellence and experimentation, in particular supporting the development of high quality work and opportunities to innovate;
* Working with local partners to support individual artists and local communities;
* Supporting the development of talent and skills;
* Supporting the presentation, touring and distribution of work and public engagement;
* Helping artists access international markets; and
* Helping create sustainable businesses and improving the financial position of artists.

## Operation and Delivery of the Programme

#### Applications and Awards

The number of applications has fluctuated around the 400 level, with a grant award rate of approximately a third. There is a wide variation in the number of applications across the different local authority areas with the most popular area – Glasgow – receiving c.150 and some areas receiving less than 10. The average grant award level has been in the £800-900 range.

There are more applications from visual artists (average 70%) compared to craft makers (30%), which is broadly in line with Creative Scotland applications and the size of the respective sectors in Scotland.

The most common type of support requested in applications was development of new work and skills development. The most common age group for applications was 25-44 (59%) and the years in practice was less than 5 (40%).

One area for improvement suggested by both successful beneficiaries and panel members was advice and guidance on what makes a successful application. The Partners already provide advice and support to varying degrees but they are often stretched in this regard. However, a possible way to help address this may be to provide application examplars with annotations explaining why. This would focus not on that particular project but rather the way in which they conveyed it in their application (this could also include examples of good quality images). This could be a central source so as not to duplicate effort.

#### Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

Almost three-quarters (73%) of applicants were female but other research suggests that is reflective of the wider visual artist market.

A total of 8% of all applicants in 2016-17 classed themselves as disabled but 16% of successful applicants were. So the relative success rate for disabled applicants was better than non-disabled in that year. However, this is only data for one year.

The scheme also plays an important role in extending the geographic reach of Creative Scotland funding, by providing specific funding by local authority area – including many areas which do not attract large numbers of applications to central Creative Scotland funds.

Data on EDI has only recently been implemented, so is limited at this time but there are plans to develop this further in the future.

#### Continued Need

All of the stakeholders felt that there was a continued need for the VACMA scheme.

This view is supported by the role the scheme is playing in supporting strategic aims (set out above) and the benefits that it is generating (discussed later in this chapter). Those areas where there was a question mark over its future delivery this was due to external factors (i.e. budget cuts) rather than any issue with the scheme itself.

#### Application Process

The stakeholders felt that the straightforward application process is a key strength of VACMA and this is borne out by the beneficiaries and Panel Members rating of the application process (with at least 85% of beneficiaries and at least 90% of Panel Members rating each aspect as excellent/very good/good).

Figure 6.1: Rating of Application Process (% excellent/very good/good)



#### Promotion

Promotion of the scheme was considered an area for improvement as was the consistency of promotion across the different areas. This links to another issue around the fluctuations in demand in some areas. There have recently been moves to provide greater consistency across the different areas e.g. moving to the same date for applications in all areas, greater commonality in the application forms, etc. This is an important process which should continue and ideally move to a position where there is consistency across the application forms, guidelines, deadline dates and branding.

This will help raise the profile of the scheme, allow for a more cost-effective process in promoting the scheme and easier sharing of information through more informal channels.

Another suggested improvement was introducing ways to promote the work of successful applicants. This would be beneficial to both the individual artists and the scheme itself. Of course this will have resource implications but it may be possible to tie it into existing activities e.g. existing festivals, exhibitions, local authority buildings, etc.

#### Artist Forum

At present the stakeholders meet on an annual basis but there is no forum for artists to meet.

However, various artists groups and networks do exist, so rather than setting up another it would be more appropriate to use these existing networks to allow people to engage with each other. Especially as the artists are spread throughout Scotland. Stakeholders and/or successful applicants could potentially give a presentation on VACMA at these respective groups. This would help promote the scheme and give artists an idea of the type of projects that have been supported.

#### Recent Graduates/Emerging Practices

There is a feeling amongst stakeholders that there are less applications and successful awards from recent graduates/emerging practices. It is difficult to tell from the data if this is the case. Years in practice is measured as less than 5 years and this group accounts for 40% of applications. It is not possible to tell how many of them are emerging i.e. less than three years but it is interesting to note that such a significant proportion were relatively new in their practice i.e. less than 5 years. It is also not possible to tell how many were recent graduates.

Refinement of the monitoring data for time since graduation, where applicable, and years in practice would allow more in-depth analysis of this area.

#### Monitoring

There have been recent improvements in the monitoring data that is collected, particularly around equality, diversity and inclusion.

This will allow for the monitoring of trends going forward and a more detailed understanding of the types of people that are applying and those that are successful.

#### Funding

Over the last three years the level of grant funding awarded has fluctuated but it has not declined overall during the period. It increased in 2015-16, returning in 2016-17 to a similar level as that in 2014-15. So at this point funding is being maintained, however, two areas did find it challenging to secure the funding for the current year. Funding on an annual basis is a challenge for many areas as they don’t know from year to year whether the funding will be available.

Whilst a three year funding cycle would provide greater security and allow for future planning this may not be easy to achieve.

#### Progression

The VACMA scheme was originally designed to be a ‘stepping stone’ onto bigger things. Some Partners did express concern that this may not be the case for some artists. Indeed, the survey would tend to support this view with some artists having a number of previous successful applications to VACMA. It may be that more than one successful application to VACMA is not unreasonable as it may take this to allow the artist/practice to move forward. However, when this becomes more than two successful applications then there is probably a need to review what progress that artist/practice is actually making.

## Creative and Professional Development

#### Beneficiaries

The majority of beneficiaries (96%) felt that their involvement with VACMA had been very beneficial/beneficial to their arts/craft maker’s practice. It has benefitted them in a number of ways, the most common of which are set out in **Table 6.1**.

Table 6.1: Benefits from VACMA

|  |
| --- |
| Most Commonly Cited Benefits to their Work/Practice (a lot/some) |
| * Generated new ideas (97%)
* Feel more inspired (93%)
* Increased skills/developed techniques (93%)
* Increased self-confidence (91%)
* Better understanding of techniques/materials (87%)
* Identified new ways of working (87%)
* Improved the quality of their work (86%)
* Feel more valued (83%)
 |

These benefits provide a combination of capacity building within the individuals themselves (through feeling more inspired, self-confident and valued) and their work/practices (through new ideas, skills and understanding of techniques/materials, new ways of working and improved quality).

The support from VACMA has also provided over two thirds (68%) with new opportunities to display/promote their work with the most common being through an exhibition/gallery (30%) and arts festival (15%). A total of 70% reported an increase in their income as a result of VACMA (a lot/some/a little).

#### Panel Members

A total of 81% of Panel Members felt that their involvement in VACMA had been very beneficial/beneficial to their professional development. They experienced a number of benefits from undertaking the role with the most common given in **Table 6.2**.

Table 6.2: Benefits from being a Panel Member

|  |
| --- |
| Most Commonly Cited Benefits (a lot/some) |
| * Allowed them to keep up to date with developments in the local arts/crafts community (93%)
* Allowed them to give something back to the local arts/craft community (85%)
* Felt more inspired (62%)
* Increased their contacts (61%)
* Increased their self-confidence (61%)
 |

Also, just over two fifths (42%) of Panel Members had received funding from VACMA in the past and all of them felt that this had been very beneficial/beneficial to their arts/craft makers practice.

#### Mentoring Support

Approximately one in ten had also received mentoring support. Ways that the mentoring support had helped them included: helping them set clear goals (23%), a source of advice/support (15%) and developing more productive processes (8%). They have, therefore, benefitted from this more intensive form of support. However, the fact that mentoring support allows for more resource intensive work with the beneficiary, means that it is only available in certain local authority areas and to a limited number of people.

## Area Development and Place

The VACMA scheme has created a strong feeling that there is support for the visual arts craft sector from Creative Scotland and the Local Authority, and that the sector is valued – **Figure 6.2**. It is also considered important in raising the profile of the visual arts and craft sector. This chimes with some of the key aims of the stakeholders of VACMA.

Figure 6.2: Place Development (Strongly Agree/Agree)



Raising awareness of the arts community is more mixed with a much higher proportion of Panel Members feeling this was the case. There are also much lower proportions feeling that VACMA has created a greater sense of community.

This is understandable as the Panel Members are reviewing all of the applications so this gives them a much greater awareness of the local arts community. Also applicants/beneficiaries may not be aware of each other. These areas could partly be addressed through some of the points made earlier about promoting/showcasing successful applicants work and linking in with existing arts networks to raise the profile of VACMA and those that have participated in it.

The VACMA scheme has also brought a range of other benefits to local areas including talent retention, greater collaboration, increased skills base and provision of a greater range of arts and crafts thus increased public engagement with the arts.

Also it has provided Partners with a greater awareness of who is working in their area and they have engaged with some of the artists (both successful and unsuccessful applicants to VACMA) on other projects/activities outside the VACMA scheme.

## Potential Future Models

#### Existing Schemes

None of the areas are looking at changing the format and/or scale of their scheme but two areas did find it challenging to secure funding for the current year. Maintaining the current position is a focus for many of the areas. This is often due to external factors such as wider budgetary pressures.

In some areas budgetary control has moved between departments in the Local Authority or to Trusts that operate services on behalf of the Local Authority. For these areas it has been necessary to seek continued funding though this new decision making process.

The fact that funding is often only allocated on a one year basis, wider external budgetary pressures and changes in budgetary control are potential risks to future funding in some areas.

#### Living Costs

A small number of the stakeholders and beneficiaries suggested that the living costs of artists is something that the scheme should cover.

However, in considering this it is important to go back to the rationale for the scheme which is to allow people to develop their work/practice.

Therefore, the scheme acts as a means to an end i.e. helping artists to undertake activities that will lead to new opportunities, increased income and greater sustainability rather than providing them with an income whilst they undertake their work. In addition, the scale of the awards within the scheme would not allow for this.

#### Level of Grant Awards

Amongst beneficiaries (66%) and Panel Members (60%) the balance is in favour of keeping the grants at the existing amounts (£500-£1,500).

In terms of stakeholders many adopted the approach of supporting as many as they can within the funds available but still providing individuals with a meaningful amount that would make a difference to them/their practice. If more funds were available the likelihood is that many of the areas would support more artists at the same levels rather than increasing the individual amounts. These factors combined with the level of benefits that artists are experiencing based on the current levels suggests that the grant levels should be maintained as is.

An interesting point was raised about the lower limit in that some areas already provide grants below £500. This has tended to be down to around the £300 level.

Whilst some areas have suggested a lower limit and some are actually currently providing grants below the existing £500 limit, given our earlier comments on consistency it will be important to have a consensus view on this. Thus the existing limits should be maintained for applications but Partners should have the discretion to award amounts below this where they feel the award would still be sufficient to make a difference to that artist/practice.

#### Geographic Coverage

Existing coverage is only 15 of the 32 local authority areas in Scotland. Whilst other research suggests that these 15 areas account for a large proportion of the visual arts community in Scotland, there is a significant proportion that is not covered by the current programme.

Some of the Partners receive enquiries/applications from areas not currently covered and felt that the scheme should be extended to cover other parts of Scotland.

VACMA has developed organically from the bottom up rather than as a national scheme from the top down. It is a partnership approach, requiring the input of a local partner e.g. Local Authority, Trust or arts organisation in order to operate in a particular area. This can be challenging, not least in the current environment of public sector cuts.

Also in some areas they may not have arts staff to administer the scheme and feedback from previous Partners suggest that some feel that the number applying would be too low to make it worth implementing.

A possible way around this may be for schemes to be run across local authorities as currently happens with Highland (covering Moray) and Scottish Borders (covering Dumfries & Galloway). This would involve the new area providing a contribution towards the administration of the scheme and funding for grants.

A concern for these new areas may be that they just end up supporting grant awards in the area that is administering the scheme on their behalf. However, they could ring fence their funding to go to applicants from their area.

So it would be worth investigating the interest from both existing stakeholders and potential new partners in the development of jointly administering schemes to increase geographic coverage.

#### Other Art Forms

Whilst the majority of respondents felt that VACMA could be expanded or similar schemes developed to include other art forms, this would be dependent on being able to access additional resources (to administer the scheme and for the grant awards) and creation of new panels relevant to each particular art form. This would be very challenging in the current environment of budget cuts and the fact that many are looking at this point to simply maintain funding for the existing VACMA scheme.

## Concluding Statement

There is a strong rationale for the continuation of the VACMA Programme based on the contribution it is making to strategic objectives and benefits it is bringing to individual artists and craft makers, panel members and local areas. The straightforward application process is working well in practice.

Whilst this report makes some recommendations on future operation and delivery, these are refinements to the existing programme rather than wholesale changes. The other recommendations relate to further promotion of the scheme and its achievements, and potentially encouraging some other areas to take part.

Appendix A – List of Consultees

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Organisation | Contact |
| **Stakeholders** |
| Aberdeen City Council | Mark Bremner |
| Aberdeenshire Council | Alison Arrowsmith |
| Creative Arts Business Network | Mary Morrison |
| Creative Scotland | Amanda Catto, Gary Cameron, Stephen Palmer, Anne Petrie and Sarah Macintyre |
| Dumfries & Galloway Council | Rebecca Coggins |
| East Lothian Council | Lesley Smith |
| Edinburgh City Council | Jo Navarro |
| Fife Contemporary Art & Craft | Diana Sykes |
| Glasgow Life | Lesley Hepburn and Paula Auson |
| High Life Highland (also cover Moray for VACMA) | Kirsten Body |
| Leisure and Culture Dundee | Susan Keracher |
| Na h-Eileanan Siar | Elsie Mitchell |
| Orkney Islands Council | Antony Mottershead |
| Shetland Arts | Cara McDiarmid |
| South Ayrshire Council | Laura Kerr |
| **Previously Participated** |
| East Ayrshire Council | Phillipa MacInnes |
| West Lothian Council | Laura Tyrrell |

1. Moray being the exception. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Note: the figures in the remainder of this chapter exclude Shetland Islands for all three years and Highland & Moray for 2015-16 as they did not provide us with these figures. Also the scheme did not operate in 2014-15 in Highland & Moray and Na h-Eileanan Siar, and in 2014-15 and 2015-16 in South Ayrshire. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Scottish Contemporary Arts Network (2015) *What We Learned About Visual Arts in Scotland* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Scottish Contemporary Arts Network (2015) *What We Learned About Visual Arts in Scotland* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This indicator was introduced in 2016-17 and is due to continue. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Creative Scotland Annual Reviews 2014-15 and 2015-16. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)