



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

16th Meeting, 2019 (Session 5)

Thursday 30 May 2019

The Committee will meet at 9.00 am in the Robert Burns Room (CR1).

1. **Arts Funding:** The Committee will take evidence in a roundtable format from—
Professor Richard Demarco CBE;
Harry Josephine Giles;
David Leddy, Artistic Director, Fire Exit Theatre Company;
Rhona Matheson, Chief Executive, Starcatchers Theatre Company;
Ken Mathieson;
Raymond Vilakazi, Artistic Director, Neo Productions.
2. **Consideration of evidence heard (in private):** The Committee will consider evidence heard earlier in the meeting.

Stephen Herbert
Clerk to the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee
Room T3.40
The Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
Tel: 0131 348 5234
Email: stephen.herbert@parliament.scot

The papers for this meeting are as follows—

Agenda Item 1

Note by the Clerk

CTEEA/S5/19/16/1

PRIVATE PAPER

CTEEA/S5/19/16/2
(P)

Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee

16th Meeting, 2019 (Session 5) Thursday 30 May 2019

Arts Funding Inquiry

Note by the Clerk

Introduction

1. The Committee launched an inquiry into arts funding on 15 March 2019. It published a [call for evidence](#), which was open until 12 April 2019. The Committee received 67 written submissions which have been published on the Committee's [website](#). This is the first evidence session on the Committee's inquiry on arts funding and the purpose will be to consider in detail the issues raised in response to the call for evidence.

Evidence session

2. At this meeting, the Committee will take evidence in a roundtable format from a range of respondents to the Committee's call for evidence as follows—
 - Professor Richard Demarco CBE
 - Harry Josephine Giles
 - David Leddy, Artistic Director, Fire Exit Theatre Company
 - Rhona Matheson, Chief Executive, Starcatchers Theatre Company
 - Ken Mathieson
 - Raymond Vilakazi, Artistic Director, Neo Productions
3. All the witnesses for this meeting responded to the Committee's call for evidence and their submissions are provided in **Annexe A** below.
4. A summary of the written evidence received in response to the call for evidence has been prepared by the clerks and is provided in **Annexe B**.

Sigrid Robinson
Assistant Clerk
Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee
23 May 2019

CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**ARTS FUNDING INQUIRY****SUBMISSION FROM HARRY JOSEPHINE GILES**

I am a full-time writer and performer, who also works as Co-Director of the performing arts producer Anatomy Arts and as a Creative Writing teacher at the University of Stirling. The following is a personal perspective on arts funding, as someone with ten years of experience working as a freelance artist and managing arts organisations in various roles, outlining some of the problems with arts funding in plain language, and suggesting policy solutions that could open up the conversation:

SOME MAJOR PROBLEMS FOR ARTS FUNDING

1) **Most artists I know cannot make a living wage from their work.** The younger they are, the more likely they are to be indebted, precariously-employed, and private renters, unable to access the social and economic capital of previous generations. Whereas previous generations of artists were to some degree subsidised by unemployment and other benefits, these routes have been cut off to most. This has a knock-on effect on diversity, as racialised and other minoritised people are even less likely to access support for their work economically, and face other social barriers as well. The result is an arts scene dominated by middle- and upper-class white people, still, at all levels of production and management, but increasingly-so further up the hierarchy.

2) **This means in turn that marginalised voices are tokenized and put into their own boxes:** the queer artist is only able to get paid to make art about being queer, for example, or the organisation that does good accessibility work is shunted from the "Performance" panel to the "Diversity" panel (this happened to one of mine). Marginalised voices are more likely to have to rely on crowdfunding, self-exploitation, non-arts jobs and so on in order to make the work they want to make.

3) **Publicly-funded arts do not command mass public support.** We are luvvies. We are seen as an indulgence. Not enough people see the link between publicly-funded arts, community and education arts, and private sector arts (e.g. an actor in a West End musical may make most of their money in the public sector; a school poetry workshop is only possible thanks to a public support infrastructure). Some of the blame for this must lie in which arts are funded: arts enjoyed broadly by richer people, such as opera and ballet, get the most funding support, whereas arts enjoyed broadly by poorer people, such as hip-hop and videogames, get the least public support and are expected to survive in the commercial sector alone. The

result is that when public spending cuts come the arts are often the first to go and the worst punished.

4) Arts organisations are riven by multiple economic inequalities. The gap between the wage earned by the Artistic Director of a national theatre and that earned by an actor in that theatre is shameful. Those in administration and management have the most stable jobs and wages, while those actually making art have the least access to jobs and stability, with producers somewhere in the middle. That is, the arts model the inequalities of the wider employment sector, with executives consolidating their power, trickling up wages to the top, and exploiting the labour of those who actually make the commodity. This is also linked to and runs through the problems of points one and two, meaning that those marginalised by factors like disability and race are also hit by these inequalities.

5) There is no clear understanding of or approach to the gradients between “professional” and “amateur” arts. Far more people want to be involved in the arts than can currently find employment in the arts. Submitting your art to a wage-relation also destroys the pleasure of art for some. By necessity or choice, there is a large unpaid arts sector, from community drama groups to volunteer orchestras. This is a vital part of cultural life, but who has access to capital to support that culture is shaped by all the factors previously discussed: the more marginal your voice, the more likely your art will be seen as amateur and undeserving of support. It also creates a greyzone for all artists: as one moves from amateur to professional, because there is no formal apprenticeship (even arts qualifications usually do not lead to immediate employment), one takes on many free and underpaid gigs, and institutions are liable to exploit this to sell art and undercut wages. Support for “community” and “professional” arts is intertwined in fact but not in practice.

6) The ability to earn a living as an artist depends on a number of skills and capacities entirely unrelated to artistic ability, e.g. networking, application-writing, volunteering availability, interview technique, &c. These skills are also distributed along vectors of marginalisation, reinforcing social hierarchies. In particular, public funding is closed off to independent artists who cannot speak the language of funders and write a funding application; at present, support for them is mostly available through other freelance artists lending help. Meanwhile, full-time organisations often employ fundraising officers to help them access both public and private funds. The result, again, is that power and capital consolidate to themselves: it's easier to get money if you have money, and the cycle continues.

7) In Scotland, and most of all in Edinburgh, the festival model dominates the arts. In this model, employment for artists and art for audiences is made available only seasonally in order to concentrate a marketing push. In some cases, festivals market themselves as an opportunity artists must pay to be part of. As a result, the precarisation of the arts, and the ability of landlords and financiers to be parasitic on the labour of artists to the point of emptying it entirely of wages, is deepened, while the ability to create year-round arts institutions and community-embedded arts practice is weakened. Moreover, the arts become a special thing that happens in a specific place and time, rather than something threaded through life.

8) **We don't know what arts funding is for.** Is it to support art that cannot survive in the commercial market? To make the art that doesn't sell? Is it to ensure artists can make a living? Is it to diversify the cultural scene? To enable anyone from any background to access any artform, as artist or audience? Is it to strengthen the sustainability and economic potential of the Creative Industries? To invest for a greater return? Because these different and sometimes mutually-exclusive aims are muddled together, we have a muddled and directionless approach to arts funding.

SOME IDEAS WHICH ARE NOT SOLUTIONS BUT MIGHT HELP FIND SOME

1) Artists' unions to negotiate pay rates with funding bodies, and funding bodies to refuse funding to any organisation which does not meet those rates at every level.

2) Arts executive pay for funded organisations to be capped at a 3:1 ratio to that of the lowest-paid worker (including maintenance staff).

3) For every administrator or producer employed by a funded organisation, an artist must also be given a full-time job making art. Alternatively, funded bodies must dedicate at least 50% of their annual budget directly to artists.

4) Professional and community arts to be managed by the same public agency, with a ratio of funding to be determined following research (but 50:50 seems like a good one to aim for to me). That is, for every £1 spend employing someone within a professional arts organisation (i.e. one that employs artists), £1 is given in to a community arts organisation (i.e. one that provides free/supercheap access to creative activities).

5) Funding bodies to have explicit policies to favour workers' co-operatives, i.e. arts organisations which are owned and democratically-managed by their workers. At least, as an interim stage, funding bodies to support the development of workers' co-operatives through training, starting with their own staff.

6) Artists' unions to establish new closed shop venues and publishers, &c., or to negotiate with existing organisations to establish closed shops, where only union members can work and pay and benefits are fixed.

7) Funded organisations to meet robust diversity quotas for employees, artists and audiences or face defunding. Quotas should be in excess of demographic proportions.

8) Funding bodies to make at least a third of their funds small grants (£1-5k) directly available to artists, with ultra-low entry requirements and monitoring. The "failure" of many of these grants to be accepted and celebrated.

9) Governments to invest in rent-free housing available to artists on application with ultra-low entry requirements.

10) Government-backed arts apprenticeships established, whereby one works at subsidised wages for 1-3 years learning acting or marketing with a guaranteed job at the end of it.

11) Any funding officer in a publicly-funded organisation is seconded for 25% of their time to an organisation any freelance artist can access to help write their funding applications.

12) Arts organisations and non-governmental funders to have an explicit policy of campaigning for unemployment, disability and other social benefits, in recognition that these are a crucial form of arts subsidy.

CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**ARTS FUNDING INQUIRY****SUBMISSION FROM PROFESSOR RICHARD DEMARCO CBE****Prioritisation of Arts Funding**

1 – As I approach my 89th birthday, and in this year of the 500th anniversary of the death of Leonardo da Vinci, I have cause to reflect on the funding of the Arts, not only during my lifetime but also over the centuries. In particular, I consider that I am in a unique position to review the various models of funding (direct patronage, state support, commercialisation and the like) which have operated to support the arts over the years in the context of the results which been produced and the contribution which these results have made to the enhancement of the lives of the generations, past and present.

2 – By way of preliminary observation, for the purposes of this submission, I define the ‘arts’ as all the arts to include the visual arts, performance (theatre and dance), music, events, literature and indeed all activities which are by their nature the product of creative activity by an individual or groups of individuals. (I reserve my position on whether or not random output of machines – such as computer-generated ‘music’ - can be considered art.) Put another way, for me art is that which is the product of the human mind, irrespective of the medium which is used to express that product.

3 – Also by way of preliminary point, my fundamental position is that ‘Everyone is an artist’, as espoused by my friend and collaborator, Joseph Beuys whom I and many, many others regard as the leading avant-garde artist/teacher of the Twentieth Century.

There is therefore a fundamental error in seeking to divide the world into Artists and non-Artists. To do so is abhorrent to me as it fails to recognise the latent talents which every single human being has. It is irrelevant to consider that only those who choose to seek to make their living by using their artistic talents can be considered ‘artists’. My extensive experience dictates that some of the greatest art has been created by individuals and groups of individuals whose circumstances would not suggest the possibility of such creation- the prisoner, the refugee, the oppressed. Indeed, I question the artistic ‘worth’ of many of the products of the rampant commercialisation and consumerism which threatens to destroy creative endeavour.

4 – Another basic norm of mine is that, following the assertion that Everyone is an artist, education – in the widest sense – is a fundamental contributor to the realisation of artistic endeavour. The etymology of ‘education’ is to ‘lead from within’. And so, the latent talents which every individual has need to be brought out. From my experience over many, many years, I firmly believe that the secondary and tertiary education systems have done a sterling job is suffocating any talents that lie within. Art schools, universities and the like have managed to place an unacceptable stricture on individuals by conditioning their thinking and contrary to what many maintain, limiting freedom of expression.

Only in primary schools is there still, in some limited places, the unfettered opportunity to truly create. I return to this theme below.

5 – What would a sustainable model of funding look like?

There are two features which I believe need to be part of a sustainable model of funding.

5.1 - I consider that it is fundamental to the future for funding for the arts which is to come from the public purse for it to be removed from the vagaries of politics. It seems to me that as long as there is the possibility of control of funding remaining with those whose decisions and directions are determined by the political expediency of the moment, then it cannot be considered sustainable.

Art is not a commodity whose supply tap can be turned on and off at a whim and subject to funding. Many truly artistic endeavours have been many years in the formation; many artists require to be allowed to gain much experience in their particular medium before their true genius shines through and many artists, particularly those working collaboratively, require periods of time working with others for the combined talents to come together to produce a total which is far greater than the sum of the parts.

So longevity of funding timeframe is essential. Short timeframes of funding such as three years require a large proportion of the relevant time to be spent engaged in the dispiriting exercise of securing follow-on funding.

So, at a Scottish Government level, there needs to be agreed an arts funding settlement which goes beyond the life of the then current Government. (There is a comparable argument that such long term funding is also required for the health and primary and secondary education sectors, but that is a digression.)

I think there is a consensus across the party political spectrum that 'Art is a good thing' and should be supported. But when there are other and increasing demands on the political purse, it is easy for those responsible to raid the 'Arts' budget to meet demand elsewhere. This creates division, uncertainty and certainly a lack of sustainability.

So a longer term settlement agreed by all concerned is needed. That is my first feature of a sustainable model of funding.

The delivery mechanism, including who is accountable for its delivery, for that settlement also needs to be agreed cross-party to minimise uncertainty.

5.2 There must be tax incentives given to individuals and businesses to support the arts. I understand that such tax incentives are commonplace elsewhere, particularly in the USA.

I refer above to the rampant commercialisation of art which has occurred in recent years where art is seen as a 'good' investment. Whilst I deplore this as it obscures true artistic merit, it does indicate that there are very wealthy individuals and others who are prepared to 'invest' in the arts. The Art Fund has been a success in encouraging individuals to purchase artworks which otherwise might have been beyond their immediate financial capability.

These trends should be capitalised on by establishing tax incentives to invest in a prescribed list of charitable arts organisations whose objects are the promotion of the arts. Such incentives should be over and above the current gift aid provisions.

The prescribed organisations would include the National Galleries, organisations which hold or obtain the 'recognised Collection of National Significance' status, registered charities devoted to the promotion of education in the arts and so forth. A set of criteria would require to be developed for such organisations to qualify.

For private collections to qualify, these would require to be open to public inspection for the majority of the year and to make their items available on loan for minimum specified periods to National Galleries and the like for public display.

So, incentivising individuals and businesses to support the arts through a dedicated tax regime is my second feature of a sustainable model of funding.

6 - How should that funding be made available to artists?

I turn now to my view of how the majority of the available funding should be made available to artists. It addresses the concern as to what are artists to do to 'earn' a living to enable them to enjoy the basic securities of life (food, clothing, accommodation) which in turn create a climate in which their artistic talent can be productive. This is a considerable pressure on the present funding system.

6.1 My simple answer is for artists to be offered part time (half full time equivalent) employment through the education authorities to facilitate the teaching of art, particularly in primary schools. This would help nurture the talent of youngsters and at the same time allow the artist the guarantee of a basic salary which would allow them to develop time and space to devote to their art and also crucially, to obtain funding through patronage, sale of their works and other commercialisation routes. Such contracts of employment would require to be for a period of say five years. This funding would require to be ring-fenced and not subject to alteration by the local authorities responsible for its administration.

I would suggest that a considerable percentage, say up to 50%, should be allocated to this stream of funding.

How does this contribute to the sustainability of funding? Quite simply, it removes the pressure on the funding system of endless 'projects' being dreamed up and applied for, having to go through an application process, having to be monitored and evaluated with all the associated administrative work. Such elimination would reduce the administrative cost on the funding system.

6.2 In respect of the balance of available funding, my view is that a grants application system should continue to be operated with the following features:-

(1) A body truly independent of government should be charged with responsibility for funding packages which should be offered on a five year basis. The Board for this organisation should reflect a wide range of experience and skills and be appointed after public advertisement.

(2) It should be guided by advisory committees in the various disciplines composed of practising artists who are remunerated for their time involved.

(3) There should be no restrictions on the purpose for which funding is applied nor a requirement to adhere to themes or pre-set topics.

(4) The programme of funding awarded would be on a rolling basis over 5 years with 20% of the available funding being awarded in the first year, 20% in the second year and so on. The balance of available funding in each of the initial four years would be available to offer tapering-off grants to organisations to whom funding has already been offered.

I hope the forgoing comments are of value to the Committee in its deliberations. Should further explanation of my comments be required, I would be happy to provide these.

Professor Richard Demarco

CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**ARTS FUNDING INQUIRY****SUBMISSION FROM KEN MATHIESON****Introduction**

While my submission reflects how funding impacts the jazz scene and its musicians, who are almost without exception free-lance players, free-lancers across all the Arts must have similar experiences.

My CV

I've been active on the Scottish jazz scene and internationally for 60 years and in that time have had the good fortune to work with many of the greatest names in jazz in the 20th century. In 2004 I formed The Classic Jazz Orchestra for a single gig in the Edinburgh Jazz & Blues Festival and that proved so successful (at least in artistic terms) that the band continues to this day, counting the cream of Scottish jazz talent among its pool of players. In its 15 years of existence CJO has appeared all over the UK and has won awards and accolades world-wide for the quality of both its bespoke arrangements and its performances and recordings, as well as the versatility of its musicians.

Jazz in Scotland

For a century Scotland has produced many world-class jazz musicians, but in the last 40-50 years the Scottish jazz scene, like jazz everywhere, has contracted as it became marginalised from mainstream entertainment, due in part an ageing demographic, but mainly to the massive commercialisation of pop music. Jazz will always attract creative musicians with improvisation skills (perhaps more so than ever as classical music starts to embrace improvisation for the first time in some 200 years and colleges and conservatories are once again teaching it – if it can be taught), but the contraction of the scene means fewer playing opportunities in smaller bands in fewer, smaller venues for fees reduced to levels common in the 1980s. The outcome is that it is harder for professional musicians to earn a living playing jazz and, with fewer performance opportunities, it is harder for players to maintain high standards. Obviously this also makes it harder for Scotland to retain its brightest talent, which should be a priority of any self-respecting nation. The situation is no less difficult for promoters or indeed Arts specialists in the media as activity tails off.

My Experience of Funding of Jazz in Scotland

Given these issues and others explored at greater length below, it's existentially important that funding for jazz should be more specifically targeted than the current "all-Arts free-for-all" operated by Creative Scotland. Its structures and processes currently inhibit funding reaching the jazz sector. Since CJO was formed I've received funding awards from Creative Scotland and other sources, some for recording sessions and composition commissions and some for development of work opportunities in the jazz sector. For the latter, it seemed clear to me that without gigs

there is no jazz scene, so musicians and promoters have to work together for mutual benefit or we suffer further contraction.

The key aims were therefore to create work opportunities for musicians and to encourage venues like theatres and arts centres which had dropped jazz from their programming to reinstate it at reduced financial risk to the promoter. Subject to a successful funding award, the deal involved CJO giving the promoter a 33% discount on its usual performance fee, with the award covering the shortfall and all overheads e.g. travel, subsistence, accommodation, PR etc costs. This also meant that small grass roots venues, which are so important to national culture, were able to afford CJO and benefit from the increased resulting revenue. With 2 Open Funding awards this model was successful and resulted in a substantial increase in public performances, most of them to very full/capacity audiences, so the model clearly works and the additional gigs tightened the band's performances markedly. Key to this success was that most of the financial risk was borne by the promoter, with Creative Scotland only funding the fee discount and touring oncosts.

However, the following year a third application was rejected as "just more of the same", which overlooks the fact that many of the gigs lined up were in venues where we had never played before and that part of the project was to cover the costs of extra rehearsals to familiarise new players with the repertoire so that the three oldest players (all in their 70s) could bow out and ensure the band's continuation with new blood. The rejection resulted in a diary with 25 gigs being reduced to a mere 6 for the year, with significant loss of income for all the band's players. At a subsequent meeting with Creative Scotland staff, I was encouraged to re-apply and ensure that I covered all the points they raised at the meeting. When I pointed out that all these points had indeed been covered in the original application, it was met with embarrassed looks.

Issues Specific to Creative Scotland's Processes

Funding Cycles

I fully understand that funding of large national companies and projects is by its nature different from the funding of smaller projects and organisations. The completion of funding applications is onerous and time- and resource- consuming for all applicants, but the 3-year cycle of Regular Funding means that the admin burden of applying is relatively lighter for its applicants.

For smaller projects and organisations there is a disproportionate admin burden in applying for Open Project funding as it may require more than one application in a year to assist with ongoing activities plus any special project opportunities which might arise. This can have a massive adverse impact on smaller grass-roots ventures which collectively are the bedrock of our culture.

Application Completion and Appraisal Processes

As mentioned above, the form-filling alone is a very time-consuming process given a 35-page application form for Open Funding projects of under £15k and 37 pages if over £15k. On top of this is a requirement for numerous supporting documents (CVs, reviews, proof of bookings etc). The size of all the documentation required for my application in 2016-17 amounted to just under 6MB of (mainly) Word and Excel documents.

Once submitted, an Open Funding application goes through an initial screening process typically taking about a week. If it fails this test for any reason, there are further delays while information is re-worked and double-checked before re-submission. It then goes round the initial screening once more before going for appraisal. Depending on the amount of re-work, it is possible that 3 weeks can elapse from submission to the start of appraisal.

Appraisals for under £15k take 8 weeks and for over £15k 12 weeks. In addition it is recommended that a further 4 weeks are allowed between notification of success and the start of the project, so these projects can require 3 or 4 months respectively to pass successfully through appraisal (i.e. not counting the pre-submission compilation and initial screening cycles). If these cycles are included, the total elapsed time could easily come to 6 months or more, so it's hardly surprising that hardly anyone tries again after a rejection.

Where a project includes bookings for performances agreed in principle with a promoter, it is commonplace to find that the promoter has filled the slot by the time a decision emerges and can't accommodate a replacement date due to other bookings. This applies particularly where theatres are involved as they tend to work 6 to 9 months ahead in programming. Finding alternative promoters in a shortened timescale is never easy and my experience in such cases is that I have to fall back on promoters for whom CJO has worked in the past and who know they won't lose money on it, thus exposing me to the "just more of the same" criticism by Creative Scotland. Contrast this with my experience of applying to Renfrewshire Council for funding for a large composition and performance commission. The form was 8 pages long, took a couple of hours (including budget calculations) to complete, and the whole cycle from start to confirmation of its success took 2 months.

Creative Scotland Budgets

There are no separate budgets for different Arts forms let alone sub-genres within these forms (accountants call this "midden accounting as money gets shovelled in at one end and out at the other without any sense of direction), so effectively funding decisions are made on a "first come first served" basis. This tends to put minority interest genres (which sadly now include jazz) at a disadvantage. Surely it is not beyond the wit of Creative Scotland staff to evolve more detailed budget methods that ring-fence funds to enable threatened genres to recover?

Other

After meetings and other communications, I question whether Creative Scotland has any staff with a deep knowledge of jazz in general and Scottish jazz in particular.

Conclusions

My principal concern is that Creative Scotland should reconsider its processes to better support the non-corporate individuals in Scotland's Arts who plough a lonely furrow in pursuing precarious careers and furthering their skills. This applies to the artists and to the facilitators (promoters, galleries, theatres, clubs etc) who bring the Arts to the public. In the course of doing that, Creative Scotland should make it simpler to apply for funding (my experience is that artists are wonderfully creative people in their genres, but few are adept at admin and PR), and look at ways to shorten appraisal cycles so that artists don't have to put their careers on hold until they hear whether applications have succeeded or not. It would also support even-handed distribution of funding if CS could develop a more sophisticated approach to budgeting.

My fear for Scottish jazz is the continuing contraction of activity. No gigs = departure of the best players = no jazz scene. With young musicians emerging every year from jazz courses in music colleges, there are more and more people competing for fewer gigs and so the money goes down and quality counts for less. If we can find a way to reverse this trend I have confidence that there will always be creative musicians who want to exercise their talent in the most spontaneous musical idiom yet invented. The issue goes beyond direct funding and has to include encouraging audiences, which in turn in turn means involving promoters.

Ken Mathieson

12th April 2019

CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**ARTS FUNDING INQUIRY****SUBMISSION FROM STARCATCHERS**

Starcatchers is Scotland's National Arts and Early Years Organisation. We are currently in receipt of Regular Funding from Creative Scotland and have previously been funded through their project funds.

Starcatchers works with artists and cultural freelancers as a core part of our delivery – as a producer-led rather than artist-led organisation. We have evolved to realise the artistic visions of the artists with whom we work and through that create beautiful, exciting, inspiring performances, installations and arts experiences for Scotland's youngest children and the adults who care for them.

Having had a year of Regular Funding Starcatchers is now better placed to understand the positive impact that having consistent funding brings – whilst our award is significantly less than we had applied for, the confirmation of 3 years of funding has allowed us more flexibility with our plans, given more security for us as an organisation and allowed us to work with more artists than we had originally anticipated.

At the same time, our Regular Funding from Creative Scotland only makes up around 30% of our annual turnover and as such we are reliant on making applications to a large number of other bodies to provide us with the resource we need to deliver our programme of work.

We welcome the Committee's inquiry into funding for the arts in Scotland and the potential for a more flexible, innovative approach to arts funding to evolve.

Children's Theatre in Scotland:

Theatre and dance for children and young people is one of Scotland's success stories, but still does not receive the recognition, support and investment it deserves. Scottish theatre and dance for children and young people is in demand internationally and plays to packed houses internationally. In the last year, Starcatchers' production *Hup* was the first production for babies to be presented at the Lincoln Center, New York. This is only one example of a number of highly successful international tours of Scottish children's theatre in the last year alone, however, the sector still struggles to find an audience in Scotland. Our European neighbours recognise the vital importance of funding theatre and dance for young audiences – Denmark has over 70 full-time companies – but Scotland continues to lag behind, despite the fact that the work here is recognised as some of the best in the world.

- **What would a sustainable model of funding look like?**

Starcatchers would advocate for a refreshed model of arts funding in Scotland that has input from both national and local bodies including Scottish Government, Creative Scotland and local authorities.

The arts sector needs confidence from its funders – the commitment to longer-term funding models that allows artists and companies to take risks, experiment and develop inspirational new work for and with our audiences is essential.

Scotland needs a new approach to arts funding that recognises the contribution arts and culture make to our lives and supports the development, creation and dissemination of high-quality work to audiences and communities across the country. We need an approach that is not focused on bureaucracy and reporting but on nurturing our artistic community and the work being made.

We need a funding system that supports both individual artists and organisations. Organisations need to be able to access consistent support whether this is through project funds or through ‘regular funding’. Individual artists and cultural freelancers should not be competing for funding against organisations, particularly larger organisations who have resources.

- **How should that funding be made available to artists?**

- Funding for individual artists should be separate from funding for organisations
- Investment made available for R&D as well as creation/dissemination of product
- Recognition that individual artists do not have the same support structure as organisations and therefore adapting evaluation and reporting mechanisms accordingly
- There needs to be understanding that different art-forms have different needs and therefore it might be appropriate to ring-fence funding for particular activity rather than all art-forms competing for the same funding.

- **What are the major threats to sustainable funding of the arts in Scotland?**

The current three-year cycle of regular funding offered by Creative Scotland is not sustainable model and as was seen following the most recent round in 2018, had a major impact on the arts sector as a whole. Organisations are forced into a long application process that forces energy away from other activity or fundraising from other sources and when, after a significant period of waiting for outcomes this is unsuccessful this creates increased fragility for the infrastructure of our sector. This process had an impact on the organisations who were eventually successful in their bids but the ripples were felt by those who were unsuccessful who had to then apply

for other funding to support their work; by venues who were waiting to hear from organisations on the outcome of their funding so public programmes could be completed and by individual artists who work with almost every organisation involved in the process.

There are similar challenges with project funding – organisations and individuals commit significant time and resource, often unpaid to create funding applications which can be turned down for seemingly arbitrary reasons leaving applicants with few options for how to secure other resource to create their work.

Diminishing local authority funding for the arts in recent years is also a threat to sustainable funding. Whilst there is recognition that there is pressure on the public purse, arts provision is often seen to be the first to be cut by local authorities because it is deemed an ‘added extra’ rather than a vital offering for communities.

The introduction of Cultural Trusts in recent years has also had a significant impact on wider arts funding in Scotland. The devolved responsibility of managing these services from local authorities has meant that once well-established support from arts services for artists, organisations and the work they make has been eroded. The priority, particularly with programming theatre, is now whether or not the trust is making money rather than how well it is serving their communities.

- **What are the main challenges for artists and cultural freelancers in obtaining funding in Scotland?**

The challenges for individual artists and cultural freelancers around obtaining funding include:

- The time and resource needed to complete funding applications which takes them away from earning a living – the majority of individual artists have to find the time outside of paid work to write funding bids
- The complexity of funding application process – there is a skill to creating strong funding applications and providing the kind of information that funders are requesting. This is not always a strength of individual artists.
- Limited opportunities for them to access the amount of resource they need to make the work they want to make – small project pots, limited R&D funding, short-term residencies that are under-resourced.

- **What measures could the Scottish Government take to ensure a sustainable level of funding for the arts?**

- Ensure that the role of arts and culture in enriching our society is embedded locally and nationally.
- Ensure that local authorities are protecting cultural provision and investing in the artists and arts organisations working within their communities.
- Move away from over-reporting and bureaucratic approaches to arts funding and delivery – enable the arts sector to tell the positive stories that demonstrate the impact made.

- **How could Scotland be innovative in attracting greater funding for the arts?**
- **How should public money be made available to support artists and cultural freelancers in Scotland, including any relevant international examples of best practice?**

We need to find a more sustainable way to enable artists to make a living in their field. Provision of a stipend or wage when they are between work for example as happens in France would make a positive impact.

There are a number of organisations in Scotland, which act as 'hubs' for individual artists. Starcatchers produces work with artists making work for and with Early Years. In addition to producing the work and supporting the artistic process, we provide support in writing applications, contracting artists, performers and other cultural freelancers, marketing and financial management. Other producing hubs such as Red Bridge Arts are operating on models that provide artists with the support they need. There have also been other examples of producing hubs previously which had some success, yet the funding for these no longer exists and the positive impacts are lost.

- **What factors should be considered and how should decisions be made about which artists or cultural freelancers should obtain public funding in Scotland?**
- Increased use of peer review to inform decision making processes.
- Multi-stage applications so artistic concepts can be fully explored as well as management, finance etc

Any other comments:

It has been noted on some online forums we are members of, that freelance artists are concerned about being able to respond to this call for evidence. Whilst they recognise it is important to do, they are also commenting that completing this call for them is unpaid labour and that it feels quite daunting.

It was felt important to share this feedback with the committee in light of the questions being asked.

REF NO. CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19

CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ARTS FUNDING INQUIRY

SUBMISSION FROM DAVID LEDDY, FIRE EXIT THEATRE COMPANY

OVERVIEW

- **Peer review panels** should be used for funding decisions above £10k
- **Creative Scotland staff should only administrate the system.** They should not make funding decisions.
- **Ongoing qualitative assessment** must take place (as it did under Scottish Arts Council)
- **Artistic excellence** must be prioritised first, ahead of social engineering targets.
- **Creative Scotland staff should do secondments in arts organisations** and vice versa.
- **Prioritise organisations that create art and pay artists.**
- **Two-stage funding process** would save everyone time and money.

DETAIL

- **Peer review panels** should be used for funding decisions above £10k
 - Rolling panels of well-qualified peers should make the funding decisions, guided by CS staff to ensure that funding priorities are being served.
 - Panels should be large enough to ensure that bias and/or favouritism cannot unduly influence decision-making (eg. ten people)
 - Panels should include an equal balance of artists and administrators. Past panels have been dominated by administrators.
 - Panels should include people who are not currently funded to ensure the system does not become insular and closed.
 - Panel membership should be open to application as well as some members being invited to join (because highly qualified, useful people often don't apply)
 - Peer review could go through a two stage process such as:
 - 1 – A large group of 30 peers read applications and offer feedback using a simple pro-forma ratings system. This could be done digitally

REF NO. CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19

- without peers needing to travel to meetings. This could also be a way to include high-level professionals who do not have the time for day-long panel meetings.
- 2 – A different, smaller group of 10 peers meet and discuss the successful applications in full detail.
 - Academia has useful models of peer review to learn from.
- **Creative Scotland staff should only administrate the system.** They should not make funding decisions.
 - A funding body is unlikely to ever attract staff of high enough quality to make high-quality decisions. Instead, those staff should administrate and guide the process and the decisions themselves should be outsourced to better qualified people.
 - **Ongoing qualitative assessment** must take place (as it did under Scottish Arts Council)
 - The old SAC system of ongoing assessment worked well and should be reinstated.
 - Organisations should not receive funding unless 80% of their assessments in the last two years have been rated 'very good' or 'excellent'.
 - This could be done as part of a wider peer review process where all applicants and recipients are expected to review other organisations at least once a year in order to be eligible for funding.
 - **Artistic excellence** must be prioritised first, before other targets.
 - After Fire Exit's funding was withdrawn Creative Scotland's senior leadership told me "Creative Scotland is not very good at funding art and we'd like you to advise us on how we could do that better." This situation needs to change.
 - Reinstating a system where a high level of artistic excellence is the *first* priority. Currently it is simply treated as one target amongst many. The other targets are easier to quantify and thus organisations are effectively penalised if they prioritise artistic excellence over social engineering.

REF NO. CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19

- **Prioritise organisations that create art and pay artists.**
 - Too much focus is given currently to peripheral organisations that do not pay artists or create art.
 - Creative Scotland often fund organisations who do not pay union rates and this is highly problematic.
 - Every organisation should be required to calculate what percentage of their budget is spent of paying for artistic staff as well as artistic productions costs.

- **Creative Scotland staff should do secondments in arts organisations and vice versa.**
 - Many CS staff have little or no knowledge of the real pressures faced by an arts organisation. Often their professional experience of the sector (if they have any) was at a low level and a long time ago.
 - Secondments in organisations of differing sizes would help them to understand the realities of the organisations they deal with.

- **Two-stage funding processes would save everyone time and money.**
 - First application stage would be a short overview containing the proposal, organisation's history and an overview budget.
 - Peer review panels would advise applicants whether or not to move on to stage two. A possible option here is that applicants are not precluded from applying to stage two, but are warned that their application is unlikely to succeed.
 - Second application stage would require full details, budgets and so on.
 - Wellcome Trust has a useful model to look at here.

CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ARTS FUNDING INQUIRY

SUBMISSION FROM NEO PRODUCTIONS

What are the major threats to sustainable funding of the arts in Scotland?

1. Sufficient funding from the national government and local government levels to maintain activity. This includes maintenance of facilities for cultural activity at an affordable level such as performances and rehearsals. We have identified that at this point in time there is only around £500k of public funding directly targeted at supporting BME activity. Until this amount increases (along with a general rise in funding for the arts in Scotland) a lot of the issues that we talk about in this document will not change.
2. Reliance on lottery funding which is variable depending on people playing the game and dilution of the market through proliferation of lottery games.
3. Volunteer burnout through lack of funding support for the activities for the activities they organise/co-ordinate - especially when their volunteering supports organising the cultural activities in diverse ethnic communities. Also those working on a non-paid or low paid basis to develop the BME creative activity, that does and will, contribute to the diversity of culture in and from Scotland.

What are the main challenges for artists and cultural freelancers in obtaining funding in Scotland?

Challenges come in different ways and from different directions.

For example, Creative Scotland saying they can fund 100% of a project but then giving feedback on unsuccessful bids as lacking other cash support – contradiction between rhetoric and actuality.

Having the time and skills to create and submit funding applications especially when you are unfunded to do it and expected to do it on a voluntary basis. It has been shown that along with working class people, BME people are often disadvantaged in this manner in not having the resources to support them while they try and create a career in the arts. It is not easy (or fair) when you are competing against/being judged at the same level with established organisations that have paid fundraising teams to create their applications.

Established processes creating unintentional exclusions, for example, if you want to be considered by National Theatre of Scotland you have to submit a script to the Playwrights Studio but the Studio does not 'do' musicals so that cuts out that channel. And because music and theatre are one of the key ways African people approach performance, this ends up being a form of indirect discrimination as it denies a diversity of cultural perspectives and approaches in favour of a Westernised version of culture.

Also if you are working in the musical theatre genre there is no specific information readily available for musical theatre of this nature – rates for opera performances are the nearest to them but that genre is different in many ways. Maybe this is something we can help develop a better scale of pay levels as getting payscales right is important for the budgeting aspect of applications and has been an issue when applying for funding for us as an organisation.

Institutional Racial Bias: An example is the use of the term ‘ambition’ when feeding back especially on unsuccessful applications. Agencies may not realise how patronising the term ‘ambition’ can be read within the racial context of arts funding, as it often has the implication that BME people are not allowed to have the same ambitions as mainstream counterparts and are seen as ‘over-reaching’ themselves.

The unconscious use of ‘ambition’ often comes with an attitude that BME creativity must conform to white ‘standards’. We have met this attitude in the past when being told to align with a ‘white’ organisation to get ahead. This showed disrespect to the right of people to express their own creativity and the culture they come from. And when we did approach those organisations we did not get the support that particular funding agency seemed to think would be there. This is not surprising from the racist bias perspective, as well as a failure by the funding agency to understand that these organisations have a budget already established around a different artistic vision and approach to creative activity.

Another issue around the use of the term ‘ambition’ is when looking to apply to agencies such as Creative Scotland, we have then been given the feeling that we should apply for smaller amounts of project funding level as a maximum. This perception that BME organisations and individuals should limit their artistic and creative ambitions to shows that involve one man and his ‘djembe’ by the resources made available to them has to be challenged. How can we counter the deep-rooted discrimination and disadvantage that is recognised as common across Scotland if equal chances are not given for BME based activity to ask for the amount of funding required to achieve a greater level of quality?

Unfortunately the decision making process of Creative Scotland we experienced earlier last year appeared to continue the institutional bias. They failed to understand that black people’s approach to theatre/ performance does not necessarily conform to the Western modes and this is a significant reason that they do not come to the mainstream arts venues. It also means it can cost more to get BME actors/ singers/ performers involved as there is not ready pool working in the arts due to lack of funding!

The reasons given for turning our application down last year reinforced the barriers that have been documented for most BME practitioners including being disadvantaged by not having the financial stability or support to be able to take time out to develop work or do unpaid research. The evidence for this comes from a report: *Panic! Social Class, Taste and Inequalities in the Creative Industries* April 2018: University of Edinburgh and University of Sheffield with Arts Emergency/Create London, Barbican Centre, & CREATE
<https://www.barbican.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/2018-04/Panic-Paper-2018.pdf>

What measures could the Scottish Government take to ensure a sustainable level of funding for the arts?

A measure the Scottish Government could take is ensuring that all its agencies are actually fulfilling their legal obligations in the areas of Equalities as part of the general duty under the Equality Act 2010, to promote a fair and more equal society and show 'due regard' to:

- *eliminate unlawful discrimination*, harassment and victimisation, as well as other conduct prohibited by the Act
- *advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not*
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not."

and being alert to institutional racism that has been identified in recent reports.

We will say to its credit, our experience after our unsuccessful application last year is that Creative Scotland has now been working to make changes in its approach and putting some funding behind its current Diversity initiatives. Its reports '*Understanding Diversity in the Arts*' and '*Equality Matters*' have also highlighted numerous and complex barriers to access, progression and representation in the arts, screen and creative industries and that career progression is far from a level playing field. They noted recently that "Challenges are more acutely felt by women, people with parental responsibilities, disabled people and those from Black and minority ethnic backgrounds. Lack of connections, social structures and networks also featured highly as a barrier, with many mentioning the importance of informal networks in securing work or getting noticed."

When they analysed their Regularly Funded Organisation (RFO) programme (examined by the Scottish Parliament committee last year), Creative Scotland found a reduction in the number of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion-led organisations supported through the RFO programme and a reduction in a focus on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion programming. Also, there were no new applications from Equality, Diversity and Inclusion led organisations.

We agree with Creative Scotland's perspective that "equality, diversity and inclusion are crucial to the arts, screen and creative industries if they are to be sustained, refreshed, richer and more dynamic, and release the true potential of creative talent, regardless of people's background." Though, of course, with the current limitations in Creative Scotland's funding they cannot yet commit the amount of resources required to start 'levelling the playing field' but at least they are moving in the right direction. So long-term increased funding is required to help challenge and change the outdated attitudes that do not have a place in Scotland today in any public body.

We also think that a minimum of 1% of the overall Scottish budget be solely allocated to separate cultural budget supporting cultural activity extra to cultural activity being funded by other budget strands – financially backing up the idea of culture being at the heart of Scottish life.

We think that politicians particularly have failed to appreciate that the fragility of the arts and creativity life of Scotland because of other factors such as the amount of tourism driven by cultural activity that appears to not need much money because it 'successfully' operates without much input – such as the Edinburgh summer festivals or the voluntary contribution. But without increased investment to help sustain the current activity and lever in development of excellence in product and experiences, the arts ecology will not survive without more casualties. History shows that resting on one's laurels without nurturing what currently helps Scotland punch above its weight will result in 'system failure'. This is already showing in the number of small scale festivals, events and groups (often rural or specialism based) that are, or close to, failing through lack of what is very small amounts of funding required to keep going. An increase of investment of 1% of the Scottish budget (as a minimum) will be well worth it – especially in the long run.

How could Scotland be innovative in attracting greater funding for the arts?

There is a major artistic absence of a visible contribution to Scotland's culture by minority ethnic communities yet there is an interest in such work as the likes of 'The Lion King'. Presenting a greater diversity of cultural experiences will result in a greater diversity of people 'consuming' and participating. Unfortunately, creation of this type of work from Scottish based ethnic minority artists is very rare, especially as long as major barriers to participation in the arts and theatre for the ethnic minority communities continue to persist.

There could be better support for cultural companies/individuals that want to become profit making get started as there is the possibility of self-financing 'products' being created alongside subsidies for those areas not able to attract a commercial level of income.

How should public money be made available to support artists and cultural freelancers in Scotland, including any relevant international examples of best practice?

The idea of universal basic income is an attractive way for artists to be assured of some income whilst pursuing creative practice that could develop into a more sustainable career. It would also make it easier for a greater diversity of people able to consider cultural activity as a career too.

We would look to public money helping supporting the umbrella and development organisations that then support arts and crafts people to develop their activity into career supporting incomes/social enterprises – either partially or fully such as the Cultural Enterprise Office or SENScot.

What factors should be considered and how should decisions be made about which artists or cultural freelancers should obtain public funding in Scotland?

Factors to be considered come from the results of consultation were articulated in the report of the Scottish Government's Cultural Strategy Engagement Report¹ published last year which noted that there should be 'better diversity of artistic

'product' being created and offered' along with issues around 'the affordability of a career in the arts for those in lower socio-economic levels of society' (frequently where black people are) with the current funding system being described by some as 'favouring people with established networks and privileged backgrounds'; and the recent aforementioned '*Panic! Social Class, Taste and Inequalities in the Creative Industries* which found 'The cultural and creative sector "significantly excludes" those from working class backgrounds, which is in addition to barriers faced by women and people who identify as disabled or Black and minority ethnic (BME)'. A *Culture Strategy for Scotland – Engagement Report* (Full & Summary versions) March 2018: Scottish Government <https://beta.gov.scot/publications/culture-strategy-engagement-report/>

Research published in 2016 by the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Scotland, stated:

"Discrimination and disadvantage are still common across Scotland. We don't all have equal chances in life and some forms of discrimination are deep-rooted." The arts form a significant cultural part of life in Scotland and are not immune from the general findings of the commission.

Moreover, according to the Scottish Government's Race Equality Framework for Scotland 2016-2030, published in May 2016:

"The rich heritage and history of Scotland is celebrated, studied and debated constantly. In reality, minority ethnic communities and individuals have always been intertwined in that history. However, their stories are seldom shared and often poorly represented. The Scottish Government is committed to ensuring that minority ethnic histories are an integral part of Scotland's story. In terms of Black history, this includes acknowledgement of Scotland's involvement in the transatlantic slave trade. It also includes exploring how colonialism shaped Scotland both economically and socially, and how the impact of these global events can still be seen in the inequalities faced by minority ethnic communities today.

The whole of Scotland's society should know the broader story of Scotland's history and role in the world in order to create social and cultural equality, and to promote a strong, pluralistic national identity for Scotland. Community cultural projects such as storytelling, community radio, music festivals and local news stories provide opportunities for sharing a diversity of perspectives and facilitating new shared meanings. More broadly, it is important to encourage a sense of equal ownership for all communities in our national heritage and historic environment, including through greater recognition of the intangible cultural heritage of communities. The Scottish Government strongly believes that Scotland's history and heritage belongs to all Scotland's people.

When it comes to children & young people - the power of theatre and music to influence young minds is well recognised. Scottish youngsters are growing up in a constantly changing world with the country's racial demographic changing yearly through welcoming a diverse group of ethnicities who have chosen to make it their home. Figures from the 2011 census show that the minority ethnic population in Scotland doubled over the decade with the African communities showing six-fold

increase -

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Equality/Equalities/DataGrid/Ethnicity/EthPopMig> It is important that there is cultural activity that seeks to reflect this, educating young people on diverse cultures and stories, broadening their artistic horizons, as reflecting the diversity of the population.

More needs to be done to support projects created and led by members of the black and ethnic minority community. It is very rare for members of this community to get the opportunity to do large scale projects as traditionally what limited resources and funding there is available in Scotland does not generally reach them. Being able to see and take part in more BME work, black and ethnic minority audiences will benefit from exposure to an artistic product that is relevant to them and their experiences. They will feel included in society and feel pride in seeing their stories reflected on Scottish stages, in turn widening their horizons on what theatre can be and it can be for them.

We need to be mindful of the barriers around access for ethnic minorities are considerable especially within the arts which is often considered an 'extra' or 'superfluous' even though cultural activities are actually an essential part of their identities. These include but are not limited to the following:

- The work presented is alienating
- Prices are expensive
- Intimidating environments
- Social isolation

Another factor to take account of is how trends in criteria of public funding can be problematic. For example there is a trend towards funding based around geographic place at the moment. This makes sense if your funding is about building geographic communities, but cultural activity is also often based around communities of interest or in our case, people of particular backgrounds who are not limited to one area of a city or part of the country. This can create an unintended barrier to accessing funding when you are working across different areas particularly when you consider how one of the benefits of cultural activity is about helping see the connections between the different places and not be boxed in by a view within a few miles of your location. For example, we understand Awards for All is now appears to be making decisions based around place-based criteria. This creates a certain assumption about the type of group that might be applying and will potentially preclude a group that wants to work over more than one location to reach more of the people they are trying to reach as they are not based in the same local community.

Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee

Arts funding inquiry

Summary of written evidence

OVERVIEW

The Committee launched a call for evidence on its arts funding inquiry, which was open from 15 March 2019 until 12 April 2019. The call for evidence focused on two main areas of interest: what would a sustainable model of arts funding look like; and how public funding should be made available to artists. The Committee received 67 written submissions in response. This summary provides an overview of the main themes that emerged from the written evidence received.

PUBLIC FUNDING LANDSCAPE

National funding

A common theme in the written submissions was commentary on the decline of public funding for the arts in recent years,¹ particularly in the past decade.² The Federation of Scottish Theatre noted that currently overall funding for the arts in Scotland “is much less than 1% of the total budget”.³ Some respondents explained that even those artistic organisations that are successful in bidding for funding from Creative Scotland are feeling the pressure on public finances. The Scottish Contemporary Arts Network noted in this regard–

“Many visual arts organisations were awarded standstill funding deals in the most recent round of regular funding (RFO funding) from Creative Scotland. By the end of this period (2021) that means a real term drop in funding of around 15% since 2014. If this trend continues with the next round of RFO funding, there is real concern among our members that they will reach breaking point. Standstill will become collapse.”⁴

The Federation of Scottish Theatre also commented on the real terms funding being awarded by Creative Scotland, as follows–

“Whilst FST members recognise that this is less than the cuts to the budget as a whole and welcome the Scottish Government’s support for arts and culture,

¹ See for example: CTEEA/S5/19/AF/06; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/40; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/52; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/54; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/57; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/52; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/35.

³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11, p. 1.

⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61, p. 1.

Creative Scotland’s policy of allocating flat cash funding has compounded the reduction. More than two-thirds of our regularly-funded members received the same cash award from Creative Scotland for 2018-21 as they received for 2015-8, and for several this is the same cash amount as their grant in 2010 when Creative Scotland took over responsibility for funding. This is a real-terms cut of more than 25% in ten years and its impact on sustainability is palpable.”⁵

Some respondents commented that declining real terms public funding for the arts in recent years has led to a dependence by the sector on funding opportunities supported by Creative Scotland.⁶ The Ayr Gaiety Partnership noted in this regard–

“There are many organisations, and much cultural activity in Scotland, which is almost entirely dependent on public funding. So in practice the art that gets produced is determined directly by Creative Scotland (acting as a sort of National Artistic Director across all art forms). Once the funding for the particular artwork has completed, the only method in which the next artwork will be created is through further Creative Scotland funding. The results of the recent RFO decision process are testament to this – where organisations that did not secure funding have either closed, or in some cases have been sustained through substitution of their funding from one Creative Scotland funding stream (RFO) to another (OPF or Touring Fund).”⁷

The Committee also received evidence from the National Theatre of Scotland about how the direct funding it has received from the Scottish Government over recent years compares to wider funding landscape of artists and arts organisations, as follows–

“We applaud the Cabinet Secretary’s efforts to ensure that the reduction in income to the arts from National Lotteries was compensated for by the Scottish Government. Despite this the reality for many arts organisations and independent artists is that funding has been going backwards in real terms for some time. The National Theatre of Scotland is in the privileged position of enjoying both an extremely positive relationship with government and also strong levels of financial support. Even given this, funding for the company has reduced by 21% since 2012 in real terms when actual reduction and inflation are taken into account. This comes at a time when costs have continued to rise, affecting our ability to make the sort of cultural provision we believe the Scottish people deserve.”⁸

The Musicians’ Union suggested that the Scottish Government should aim to ensure that funding levels remain in line with inflation,⁹ while Neo Productions and the Traditional Music and Song Association of Scotland advocated for 1% of the Scottish

⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11, p. 1.

⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/60; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/51; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/24; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/35; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27.

⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27, p. 2.

⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25, p. 1.

⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14, p. 1.

Government's budget to be ringfenced for spending on culture in line with the recommendation of the Cultural Commission (2005).¹⁰

Lottery funding

The Committee's call for evidence also asked for views about what role National Lottery funding may play in creating a sustainable model of arts funding for the future.¹¹ Creative Scotland, which is one of the twelve distributors of National Lottery funding in the UK,¹² expressed concern about the sustainability of the National Lottery as a reliable source of funding for the sector in the following terms–

“The National Lottery has recently been under challenge from competition from other lotteries, particularly Society Lotteries. This has led to fluctuations and volatility in the income being generated and subsequently distributed. The recent impact on Creative Scotland has been a fall in income from The National Lottery of some £6million.

This is a significant issue. With approximately 86% of Creative Scotland's core unrestricted Grant-in-Aid funding allocated to the current Regularly Funded Organisations, the two remaining funding routes we offer (Open Project Funding and Targeted Funding) are largely only possible through The National Lottery.”¹³

The National Lottery responded to the Committee's call for evidence arguing that the UK Government's proposed reforms to society lottery regulations¹⁴ are ‘a major threat to sustainable funding of the arts in Scotland’.¹⁵ The People's Postcode Lottery also responded to the call for evidence arguing that “Society lottery reform is not about competing with the National Lottery. It is about increasing the outdated annual sales limit contained in the 2005 Gambling Act...”¹⁶

Creative Scotland's written submission argued that additional methods of funding support are required for a sustainable funding model–

“Given the increasing pressures on public funding, there is also a need to investigate new, additional, methods of funding support for arts and creativity such as crowdfunding, credit unions, social enterprise support and others. Creative Scotland is exploring the potential of these additional avenues and

¹⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65, p. 2.

¹¹ See commentary on this issue in the following submissions: CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/43; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/34; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64.

¹² The distributors include: Arts Council England; National Lottery Heritage Fund; UK Sport; SportScotland; Creative Scotland; Sport England; Arts Council Northern Ireland; Sport Northern Ireland; British Film Institute; Arts Council Wales; Sport Wales; the National Lottery Community Fund.

¹³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/59, p. 3.

¹⁴ UK Government, Consultation on Society Lottery Reform on options for amending sales and prize limits for large and small society lotteries, 29 June 2018 – 7 September 2018: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/consultation-on-society-lottery-reform>.

¹⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/37, p 1.

¹⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/21.

will promote good practice and opportunities which could further help artists and cultural freelancers in Scotland.”

Aberdeen City Council’s written submission expressed similar views, suggesting that the Scottish Government may wish to consider replacing the National Lottery as a source of funding for Creative Scotland with a new model based on other investment funds, such as through a Scottish National Investment Bank.¹⁷

Local authority funding

Many submissions also commented on the public funding and support available for the arts from local authorities.¹⁸ Glasgow Life, for example, cited findings from the Accounts Commission that suggest the outlook for local government spending will continue to be under pressure in the short term–

“According to the Accounts Commission, by 2025 local government needs to spend an additional 4% to 5% to meet social care needs alone and without service re-design or policy changes Scottish local authorities are forecast to be spending nearly 80% of their budgets on education and social work [Accounts Commission, Local Government in Scotland – Challenges and Performance, 2018].”¹⁹

Respondents identified local authority funding as being under particular threat because spending on culture is not a statutory requirement.²⁰ The Federation of Scottish Theatre explained in this regard that–

“Funding for ‘Other Culture and Heritage’ across the whole of Scotland in 2017-18 was £51M, less than 10% of the total Culture and Leisure budget and less than Creative Scotland’s Grant in Aid from Scottish Government”.²¹

Creative Scotland also commented on the non-statutory nature of local authority spending on culture and the impact this is having on spending and provision across the country, noting–

“It would also be helpful, given the contracting public purse, if there was greater clarity around local authorities’ obligations in relation to funding for the arts. Local authorities are currently required to make ‘adequate provision’, however it is unclear what is expected in practice. If this provision was statutory then it would provide a firmer foundation for collaboration between local authorities and their creative and cultural partners, including Creative Scotland.”²²

¹⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53.

¹⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/43; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/06; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/28; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/40; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64.

¹⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48, p. 1.

²⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/26; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/59; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/43; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

²¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11, p. 1.

²² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/59.

It was noted that pressures on arts spending in local authorities has led to some local authorities no longer employing staff with expertise in the arts to support the sector locally.²³ In this regard, Creetown Initiative Ltd commented–

“Another by-product of this reduced funding is that staff who are not qualified to support the arts are shoe-horned into arts posts as a result of council re-organisation (something which seems to happen on a weekly basis). So, you end up with the wrong people in the wrong jobs which weakens the depth of knowledge and support available.”²⁴

Culture Counts and the Traditional Music and Song Association of Scotland also noted that the creation of Arms-Length External Organisations (“ALEOs”) to deliver cultural and leisure services on behalf of local authorities has been an outcome of the pressure on local government finance.²⁵ It was noted that this has received some external scrutiny, such as the Barclay Review of Non-Domestic Rates,²⁶ which argued that the use of ALEOs by some local authorities amounts to “tax avoidance and should cease”.²⁷

Brexit

Another issue commented on by respondents is the impact that Brexit may have on the future of arts funding in Scotland and the sector generally.²⁸ The National Theatre of Scotland highlighted, for example, the impact Brexit may have on compounding existing issues about the amount and regional distribution of arts funding in Scotland–

“The reduction in and in some cases complete removal of local authority funding has been detrimental to arts organisations and individual artists and arts workers. We would contend that this has also been detrimental to local authorities who have lost the benefits that art brings to local communities. When coupled with the potential removal of access to European Commission funding and variable changes such as a reduction in National Lottery spending and the position of arts funding is increasingly precarious.”²⁹

The Traditional Music and Song Association of Scotland highlighted that the potential loss of access to European funding could result in a real-terms decrease in available funding because the amount currently invested in the UK is “proportionally greater in return than the proportion of the funding the UK contributes”.³⁰ Creative Scotland

²³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64.

²⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03.

²⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/60; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63. NB: A 2018 Audit Scotland Report found that 25 local authorities had formed leisure and/or culture ALEOs with a total turnover of £430 million, see: Audit Scotland, “[Council’s Use of Arms-Length Organisations](#)”, May 2018, p. 4.

²⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/60.

²⁷ Non-domestic tax rates review: Barclay report, 22 August 2017, para 4.116: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/report-barclay-review-non-domestic-rates/>.

²⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/59; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/62; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

²⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25.

³⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63, p. 2.

also commented on this issue, noting that the UK Shared Prosperity fund will be a relevant consideration in the future funding landscape—

“The proposed UK Shared Prosperity fund, or an equivalent programme, will be needed to support development of the creative sectors if significant investment is not to be lost. This will be particularly felt by rural areas of Scotland where EU funding has been critical.”

Museums Galleries Scotland also expressed its desire for Scotland to continue to benefit from the Shared Prosperity Fund once established, noting—

“Critically, this should – at least – equal the current funding stream as available to the UK from the existing EU Structural Funds, with consideration also given how allocations reach and benefit communities across the whole of Scotland. More broadly, we would welcome consideration of how access to funding could be made simpler for local initiatives that would not necessitate the resource and capacity of a larger lead body.”³¹

The Musician’s Union also noted that “many of Scotland’s orchestras rely on foreign Scottish-based artists” and that a recent survey in Scotland found that “more than a quarter of artists and arts workers are considering or planning leaving Scotland after Brexit”.³² The Musicians Union explained in this regard that it is campaigning for “an EU touring visa for musicians working in the EU post-Brexit”.³³

CHALLENGES FOR ARTISTS

The main challenges for artists that were identified in the written evidence include fair pay; competition for funding and bureaucracy in the application process; and diversity of artists. These issues are considered in turn below.

Fair pay

The lack of fair pay for artists was a recurring theme in the submissions received.³⁴ Craft social enterprise, Really Interesting Objects CIC, commented on the relative rates of cultural freelancers’ and artists’ pay over the past decade, noting—

“Financial pressures on funding means many cultural freelancers (who are often also artists) are working at a rate of pay which is lower than the rates paid ten years ago. This is evidenced in the recent Art Professional UK research on pay which also shows that pay and fee rates in Scotland are

³¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/62.

³² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14, p. 2. The survey cited in the submission was authored by the Federation for Scottish Theatre and the Scottish Contemporary Art Network.

³³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14, p. 2. The survey cited in the submission was authored by the Federation for Scottish Theatre and the Scottish Contemporary Art Network.

³⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/51; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/39; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/29; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

lower than the rest of the UK with a freelancer in Scotland averaging £11,481 a year compared to a UK average £16,000 a year.”³⁵

The Scottish Artists Union also expressed concern about fair pay in the sector, noting that “three out of four members consistently fail to be paid rates equivalent to the union’s published rates. At 76%, this is the highest figure in recent years”.³⁶

Catherine Wheels Theatre Company explained that the approach of some unions to set minimum recommended rates of pay³⁷ has not necessarily had the intended effect of raising wages for artists, when it observed–

“Companies and artists are keen not to be seen to ask for too much money because this might hinder their chances of being successful. One knock-on effect is that performers and artists employed through the funding grant are offered Equity minimum rates only as a normal practice. The result is that a performer that has been working for the past 10 years in shows, receiving the same rate of pay for those 10 years. Equity minimum rates are there to set standards for the minimum wage you can pay an actor. It is not normal in any other profession for the rate of pay not to increase due to experience over a 10 year period.”³⁸

It was also noted that the existing ‘rates of pay’ within the arts do not necessarily cover all artforms. Neo Productions commented, for example, that “if you are working in the musical theatre genre there is no specific information readily available for musical theatre of this nature – rates for opera performances are the nearest to them but that genre is different in many ways”.³⁹

Another issue highlighted in the submissions was the relative wages of different types of professionals within the arts. In this regard, some respondents commented that there is a perception that artists themselves are the least well-paid of professionals working in the arts. Writer and performer, Harry Josephine Giles, noted for example–

“Those in administration and management have the most stable jobs and wages, while those actually making art have the least access to jobs and stability, with producers somewhere in the middle.”⁴⁰

Another issue raised in the submissions was a lack of transparency in arts funding, which undermines fair pay for artists. It was noted in this regard that day rates are not always calculated using the actual hours worked or required,⁴¹ and that some

³⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/39; Arts Professional, “Arts Pay 2018: A summary of pay and earnings in the arts and cultural sector”: https://www.artsprofessional.co.uk/sites/artsprofessional.co.uk/files/artspay_2018_report.pdf.

³⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/29, p. 2.

³⁷ The example cited was Equity Union: <https://www.equity.org.uk/at-work/list-of-rates-and-agreements/>.

³⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36, p. 3.

³⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65, 1.

⁴⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04, p. 2. See also: CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18.

⁴¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22.

funding does not cover aspects of artistic production, such as producer fees.⁴² Other challenges posed to fair pay and funding, included the lack of maternity leave and childcare for freelancers, particularly for those from less privileged backgrounds;⁴³ as well as a lack of sick pay, holiday pay and travel expenses.⁴⁴ Specific examples provided included the Visual Artist and Craftmaker Awards, which “do not fund artists’ time”.⁴⁵

Some respondents argued that funders, such as Creative Scotland, should not fund organisations that do not pay union rates.⁴⁶ Another individual quoted in the Catherine Wheels Theatre Company’s submission noted that in their experience, actors in France are paid according to their age and experience. They considered that a similar model should be considered for Scotland, noting that “it wouldn’t have to be law, it could be introduced into Scotland as a charter to be followed by companies, an endeavour to move towards”.⁴⁷

Funding application bureaucracy and competition

The Committee is aware from the Regular Funding Inquiry it conducted last year that the demand for public arts funding currently outstrips supply.⁴⁸ Creative Scotland highlighted this issue in its written submission to the Committee’s Arts Funding Inquiry, noting–

“For example, in the 2018 round of Creative Scotland’s Regular Funding, 184 applications were received requesting £154m across the three years of the programme. In total we were able to award just under £102m to 121 organisations.

In Open Project Funding in 2018/19 we received 1,177 applications requesting £23.7m and were able to award £10.7m to 493 applicants. Of these, 201 awards (41%) were made to individual artists and practitioners and 292 (59%) to organisations, who in turn support many hundreds of artists through their projects.”⁴⁹

The Committee considered in detail concerns about the additional pressure that bureaucratic application forms and processes place on artists in its inquiry last year and this issue was also raised in response to the call for evidence for this inquiry.⁵⁰ The concerns expressed include the considerable unpaid time needed to complete

⁴² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08.

⁴³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18.

⁴⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22.

⁴⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53.

⁴⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14.

⁴⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36, p. 3.

⁴⁸ Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee letter to Creative Scotland, 14 June 2018: www.parliament.scot/S5_European/General%20Documents/CTEER_2018.06.14_Letter_to_Creative_Scotland.pdf.

⁴⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/59, p. 2.

⁵⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A2; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/45; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/30; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/13; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/15; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/16; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/24; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/59; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64.

applications;⁵¹ the disproportionate burden on smaller artistic companies;⁵² the disparity in available resources to apply for funding between artistic companies that employ paid staff versus volunteer-led organisations;⁵³ artists lacking the necessary skills to complete bureaucratic application forms;⁵⁴ and concerns about ‘network organisations’ competing against their members in the same funding streams.⁵⁵ Some respondents commented that these issues contribute to an uneven playing field in the competition for funding.⁵⁶

A number of possible solutions to reducing the bureaucracy of applications were suggested by respondents. One idea was to introduce an application process with distinct stages with a lighter-touch approach to early stages.⁵⁷ Another suggestion was to introduce micro grants with a lighter-touch application process.⁵⁸ Options for how a micro-funding model could be developed are discussed in more detail in the ‘innovation’ section below.

Diversity

The written evidence received raised a number of concerns about the extent to which the current arts funding environment supports opportunities for artists from a diverse range of backgrounds, including socio-economic profile of the sector,⁵⁹ as well as the protected characteristics of sex,⁶⁰ race⁶¹ and age⁶².

Katriona Holmes, an independent creative producer, noted that women working as cultural freelancers face unique challenges, including funding their own maternity leave beyond statutory rates of pay.⁶³ Ms Holmes’ submission also highlights the challenges faced by primary carers to maintain professional networks, compete for work and afford childcare.

Neo Productions’ submission comments on the barriers faced by artists from a black, Asian and minority ethnic background. Its concerns related to the extent to which there is funding available to promote artforms with a focus on ethnic diversity, noting that “We have identified that at this point in time there is only around £500k of public funding directly targeted at supporting BME activity.”⁶⁴ It also stated that an analysis of the most recent regular funding round found that there was a reduction in the

⁵¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/30; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/15; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17.

⁵² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/16; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65.

⁵³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

⁵⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/13; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/24.

⁵⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/38; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/38; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/02; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20.

⁵⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/06; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/15; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27.

⁵⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/23; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64.

⁵⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/45; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/38; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/35.

⁵⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/55; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/29.

⁶⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08, p. 1.

⁶¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48.

⁶² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/05, p. 1.

⁶³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08, p. 1.

⁶⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65, p. 1.

number of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion-led organisations and a reduced focus on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion programming.⁶⁵

Individual artist, Dr Alison Bell, commented on how older artists may be unintentionally discriminated against in funding priorities. In her view, there is an underlying assumption in current funding priorities that public funding should be based on the potential economic return of the funding investment. Dr Bell argues that this model favours young artists and that "...artists (60 years+) with a long creative practice applying for funding tend to be excluded".⁶⁶ Furthermore, she comments that "Indeed, there are almost no funding opportunities aimed specifically at older artists. (I don't mean those choosing to enter the arts after retirement, there have been funding opportunities for them recently)."⁶⁷

Who should be funded?

The issue of who should be funded raised many questions about the overall strategic purpose of public arts funding. Many written submissions reiterated the importance of focusing on the quality of the art being produced as the basis for any arts funding framework.⁶⁸ For some respondents, the quality of the work was defined as 'artistic excellence',⁶⁹ whilst for others it should be defined by wider issues, such as accessibility and connection to the local community.⁷⁰

The written evidence also considered how to define what makes an 'artist'; as well as what is the difference between an 'artist' and a 'creative freelancer' and how they should be supported and by which public agency.⁷¹

Harry Josephine Giles, a writer and performer, commented on the underlying strategic tensions of arts funding, when they noted—

"We don't know what arts funding is for. Is it to support art that cannot survive in the commercial market? To make the art that doesn't sell? Is it to ensure artists can make a living? Is it to diversify the cultural scene? To enable anyone from any background to access any artform, as artist or audience? Is it to strengthen the sustainability and economic potential of the Creative Industries? To invest for a greater return? Because these different and sometimes mutually-exclusive aims are muddled together, we have a muddled and directionless approach to arts funding."

A difference of views on this point emerged overall in the written evidence with some respondents arguing that there should be a clear approach to "the gradients

⁶⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65.

⁶⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/05, p. 1.

⁶⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/05, p. 1.

⁶⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/42; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/15; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19.

⁶⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/42; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/15; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19

⁷⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44.

⁷¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1.

between ‘professional’ and ‘amateur’ arts”,⁷² whilst others took the view that “everyone is an artist”.⁷³

National Cultural Infrastructure

In considering who should be funded, the written evidence also commented on the fabric of Scotland’s national cultural infrastructure and the role that direct Scottish Government funding plays in supporting this in a sustainable way. Many submissions supported a model of direct funding some organisations that are deemed to be of national significance to Scotland but suggested that the Scottish Government should review how the existing model is operating.⁷⁴

The written submissions identified a number of perceived ‘gaps’ in the type of institutions that currently receive direct funding. It was noted, for example, that a national youth performing arts company would be a welcome addition to the existing portfolio.⁷⁵ Another suggestion was to add organisations to the portfolio that focus on innovative or experimental, rather than simply classical, productions.⁷⁶ In this regard, it was also noted that some artistic mediums, such as musicals, do not generally feature in the programmes of national performing companies, which may unintentionally exclude the work of minority artistic producers for whom this artform holds particular cultural significance.⁷⁷

Another perceived gap in the existing infrastructure was a national strategy supported with funding to preserve and sustain cultural venues. This included venues that were identified as being of national significance, such as the Royal Lyceum and the Traverse Theatre,⁷⁸ as well as the provision of capital infrastructure across the country in the form of accessible and specialist cultural venues.⁷⁹ The Music Venue Trust suggested in this regard that the Scottish Government consider implementing a model to act as a National Trust for Venues to support sustainable investment in venues across Scotland.⁸⁰

Genres and artforms

The written submissions also expressed concern about the extent to which the existing provision of public arts funding supports different genres on an equal basis.⁸¹ Some respondents considered that each genre needs its own strategy supported by ring-fenced funding to ensure a diversity of arts is supported in Scotland in a sustainable way.⁸²

⁷² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04.

⁷³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12.

⁷⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/60; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/43; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/24; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/28.

⁷⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/28; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/60.

⁷⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48

⁷⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65.

⁷⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A2.

⁷⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/62; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.

⁸⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.

⁸¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/57; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/45; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/16; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/39.

⁸² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/57; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/16; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/39.

Artist, Arts Organisation, Network Organisation

The written evidence also considered how funding should be allocated between artists, arts organisations and network organisations. A divergence of views emerged on this issue. Some respondents argued that individuals who ‘create art’ and ‘pay artists’ should be prioritised for funding.⁸³ Other respondents made the case for a funding model that incorporates the full spectrum of artists through to network organisations,⁸⁴ noting that ‘a fair balance’ between the types of individuals and organisations that are funded ‘is not an easy one to achieve’.⁸⁵

Network organisations that responded to the call for evidence highlighted the services they provide to artists, including places to create and show work,⁸⁶ skills development,⁸⁷ as well as providing advocacy on behalf of artists for more funding.⁸⁸ A solution to this issue suggested by some respondents is to provide funding to network organisations in a way that is separate from the funding available to individual artists so as to avoid the perception that they are competing against each other.⁸⁹

How should funding be allocated?

Peer review

Some respondents expressed their support for the continued arrangement of arms-length funding of the arts.⁹⁰ A popular suggestion was to incorporate a peer review process into existing funding schemes.⁹¹ It was noted that peer review works well when the panel of reviewers is rotated.⁹²

Staged application processes

The Committee’s inquiry into the Regular Funding 2018-21 process recommended that Creative Scotland consider the introduction of a staged-application approach to funding. This suggestion was also raised by many respondents to this inquiry,⁹³ who argued that it would reduce the burden on applicants who are unsuccessful in their application at the early stages. It was noted that many trusts already use this approach to funding.⁹⁴

Fair pay

As noted in the ‘challenges’ section above, some respondents argued that funders, such as Creative Scotland, should not award funding to organisations that do not pay

⁸³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19.

⁸⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20.

⁸⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

⁸⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53

⁸⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/13

⁸⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/38

⁸⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61.

⁹⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12.

⁹¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/41.

⁹² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/41.

⁹³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/64; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/52; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36;

CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/23.

⁹⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36.

union rates to artists.⁹⁵ Other suggestions in the written evidence for encouraging fair pay include–

- a requirement for funded organisations to dedicate at least 50% of their annual budget directly to artists;⁹⁶
- funding bodies to adopt a policy of favouring certain types of arts organisations, such as workers’ co-operatives, i.e. arts organisations which are owned and democratically-managed by their workers;⁹⁷
- the introduction of diversity quotas for funded organisations.⁹⁸

Thematic funding

Some respondents expressed concern with the provision of funding on a short-term or thematic basis, e.g. public funding priorities being aligned with themed years.⁹⁹ For example, individual artist Mary Bourne, commented that this approach to funding makes “...it very difficult to sustain a direction of travel in your own work as an artist if you don’t have the good fortune to neatly fit one of these categories.”

What support do artists need?

Business and professional support

Many submissions commented on the need for artists to access business and professional support in order to attract funding and make their practice sustainable.¹⁰⁰ One individual suggested that a national agency should be established to support artists to transform their work onto a commercial stage in a strategic way (such as authors’ works being adapted for screen etc.).¹⁰¹ Another individual artist encouraged a cautious approach in this regard, noting that a balance needs to be struck between the amount of funding that goes towards developing business support resources versus supporting the intrinsic value of art.¹⁰²

Career support and opportunities

A theme emerging from the written evidence was the need for the funding available to be targeted in a way that supports artists at different stages of their careers. This could have added benefits for supporting a diverse profession, as noted by Festivals Edinburgh in its submission–

“To change this profile for the better, a sustained pipeline of support is important for talented people to develop and progress as well as to enter the culture sector. Focused and co-ordinated support opportunities to provide long-term pathways for individuals, albeit limited in number, may prove more effective in growing a diverse new generation of cultural leaders than a higher

⁹⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14.

⁹⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04.

⁹⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04.

⁹⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04.

⁹⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/06; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/54.

¹⁰⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A2; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/33; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/23.

¹⁰¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07.

¹⁰² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A2.

volume of interventions that do not systematically address gaps and transition points.”¹⁰³

Some respondents also commented that there appears to be a lack of support available for mid-career and established artists.¹⁰⁴ A number of different types of support for artists’ career development were highlighted in the written evidence, including–

- Sabbaticals, residencies,¹⁰⁵ and secondments,¹⁰⁶ including for artists within Creative Scotland¹⁰⁷
- Professional and technical skills development¹⁰⁸
- Mentoring programmes¹⁰⁹
- Networking opportunities¹¹⁰
- Apprenticeships¹¹¹

Micro-funding

A common suggestion in the written submissions was the provision of micro-funding,¹¹² and bursaries.¹¹³ Respondents noted that small amounts of funding would be particularly useful for obtaining equipment and artistic materials.¹¹⁴ It was noted that this model works well when the application process is competitive yet relatively simple.¹¹⁵ Examples cited include the “Awards for All” process run by the National Lottery Community Fund,¹¹⁶ and the micro-grants operated by the Eigg Box social enterprise.¹¹⁷

Other forms of support

Other ideas suggested for supporting artists included the provision of: rent-free housing;¹¹⁸ free working spaces and childcare.¹¹⁹

Geographic spread of public funding

Many responses to the inquiry commented on the concentration of national funding for the arts in Edinburgh and Glasgow.¹²⁰ The Ayr Gaiety Partnership noted, for

¹⁰³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50.

¹⁰⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A2

¹⁰⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/49; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/42

¹⁰⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07

¹⁰⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/57; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/19

¹⁰⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/33

¹⁰⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08.

¹¹⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08.

¹¹¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/45.

¹¹² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/45; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/38; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/35.

¹¹³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44.

¹¹⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44.

¹¹⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27.

¹¹⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27.

¹¹⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22.

¹¹⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/04.

¹¹⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08.

¹²⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/47; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/45; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/32; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/10; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/23; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27.

example, that “...most arts funding [is] concentrated on the Central Belt and many areas of Scotland [are] without any form of funded or significant artistic organisation”.¹²¹ An anonymous respondent also addressed this issue, commenting that “...we are seeing arts funding going to mainly central belt locations and causing a two tier of what is art happening within Scotland”.¹²²

To the extent that arts funding is available in rural and remote parts of Scotland, some respondents identified the challenges faced by artists in accessing financial support and professional opportunities. Kirstin Gow, a creative freelancer, explained the difficulties faced by artists in remote areas to access existing opportunities–

“It is not uncommon for me to come across opportunities funded for the Highlands and Islands which are pretty much inaccessible to me without a significant investment of time and money. Whilst I accept that my remote location means I do not have the same access to facilities and opportunities as others, the lack of awareness of the challenges faced by those of us working in remote areas by those working on projects purporting to support us is still often stark. As evidence I point to the example of a ‘creative hub’ set up in Inverness for the Highlands and Islands which one of the project team told me was free for me to use as an islander – ignoring the fact it would take a minimum of 2 ferries and a day’s travel each way, and a minimum of one overnight stay, just to access the ‘free’ facility for a few hours.”¹²³

Ms Gow also highlighted the importance of meaningful local input for projects that are funded on a collaborative basis to ensure these have maximum impact–

“In terms of geographical coverage it is also frustrating to find a project which is ‘parachuted in’ to your community and run by someone from outside the area without any liaison with those working locally. Public money for projects engaging with a community should only be available to artists who have shown that they have made proactive and reciprocated efforts to engage with the community and the creative sector in the areas they plan to enact the project.”¹²⁴

Some respondents suggested that geographic ring-fencing of national funding could be a means to address the spread of funding across Scotland.¹²⁵ Suggestions for how a ring-fencing mechanism could work included: prioritising national funding based on gaps in provision in local authority arts funding;¹²⁶ by head of population across the 32 local authorities;¹²⁷ or that specific funding should be made available for national projects versus regional projects to be administered at the national and local level respectively.¹²⁸ Other respondents considered that national funding could

¹²¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27.

¹²² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1.

¹²³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22.

¹²⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22. See also: CTEEA/S5/19/AF/27.

¹²⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46.

¹²⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/47.

¹²⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07.

¹²⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03.

be used as an incentive for regular funded organisations to relocate outside of Edinburgh or Glasgow.¹²⁹

Neo Productions cautioned against focusing exclusively on the geographic spread of arts funding. It noted that the cultural identity of individuals from a black, Asian or minority ethnic background is not limited by geography. As such, Neo Productions argued in relation to having too narrow a focus on geographic spread of arts funding that–

“This can create an unintended barrier to accessing funding when you are working across different areas particularly when you consider how one of the benefits of cultural activity is about helping see the connections between the different places and not be boxed in by a view within a few miles of your location.”¹³⁰

HOW COULD SCOTLAND BE INNOVATIVE in arts funding?

The Committee’s call for evidence invited respondents to contribute ideas about how Scotland could be innovative in its approach to arts funding. The respondents who commented on this aspect of the call for evidence were generally supportive of encouraging greater innovation. However, some respondents warned that ‘innovation is a risky world’,¹³¹ and suggested that innovation should be designed in a way that empowers local communities to imbed any new approaches,¹³² and are designed with data collection technologies and impact studies in mind.¹³³ The suggestions for innovative approaches are considered below.

Regular Funded Artists

At present, individual artists are not currently eligible to apply for Creative Scotland’s regular funding scheme, which is only open to organisations. Some respondents suggested that Scotland should create a new regular funding stream for individual artists.¹³⁴¹³⁵ The proposed benefits of this approach would be to create greater financial certainty for artists deemed worthy of direct funding, which in turn give them artistic freedom to create art.¹³⁶

Artists’ Basic Income

The Scottish Government has funded a feasibility study into a basic citizens’ income working with four local authorities: Fife Council, City of Edinburgh Council, Glasgow

¹²⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1.

¹³⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65, p. 5.

¹³¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/15.

¹³² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22.

¹³³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/54.

¹³⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A2; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46

¹³⁵ NB: Artists can apply for open project funding or targeted funding. Open project funding is open to artists, groups and creative organisations for projects for up to two years. Targeted funding is available to anyone who falls within the specific criteria of existing targeted funding programmes (such as the Youth Music Initiative).

¹³⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65.

City Council and North Ayrshire Council.¹³⁷ A number of submissions suggested that a basic citizens' income should be made available to artists.¹³⁸ A potential benefit of this approach that was highlighted in the written submissions included promoting greater diversity within the arts.¹³⁹ It was also noted that the system would require careful design to ensure that 'it doesn't become a closed shop' and to encourage artists to continue to develop 'onto other funding or business models'.¹⁴⁰

Taxation tools

Taxation was mentioned by many respondents as an innovative means to create more investment in the arts.¹⁴¹ Some respondents suggested that the creation of new taxation powers within the Scottish Government's devolved competence, such as a tourist tax, could be used to increase public funding for arts and culture provision.¹⁴² Other ideas focused on matters within the UK's Government's reserved competence, such as increasing taxes on foreign companies;¹⁴³ the introduction of an Irish artists' tax breaks model;¹⁴⁴ and changing the taxation regime applied to the National Lottery from the Lottery Duty regime to a Gross Profits Tax.¹⁴⁵ Suggestions for encouraging greater private investment, as well as any international examples, are considered in more detail below.

Private Investment

Many respondents commented on the possibility of using private investment from trusts, foundations and private companies, as an additional source of funding for the arts in Scotland.¹⁴⁶ Suggestions included the creation of a cultural fund 'which could draw on the diaspora for support which in turn would fund activity in Scotland';¹⁴⁷ community share programmes;¹⁴⁸ and incentives for businesses to invest locally.¹⁴⁹

Some respondents, such as the Traditional Music and Song Association of Scotland and the Musicians' Union encouraged caution in relying on private investment to play a part in a sustainable funding approach, noting that many trusts and foundations who are reliant on stock market investments have seen a decline in their available funds in recent years.¹⁵⁰ In this regard, the Musicians' Union cited examples from the United States where a number of orchestras and other arts organisations collapsed

¹³⁷ <https://basicincome.scot/whats-happening-scotland/>.

¹³⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/54; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/46; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/06; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/08; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/23; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/43.

¹³⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/65.

¹⁴⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53.

¹⁴¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/54; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/52; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/51; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/42; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/37; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/06; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/07; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/13; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/22; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/29; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/59.

¹⁴² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25.

¹⁴³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/52.

¹⁴⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/42. See here for more information:

https://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/money_and_tax/tax/income_tax/artists_exemption_from_income_tax.html.

¹⁴⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/37

¹⁴⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/43; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/23; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/06; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61.

¹⁴⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

¹⁴⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03.

¹⁴⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/03.

¹⁵⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

when invested donations and legacies lost value.¹⁵¹ It was also noted that many trusts and foundations only fund organisations, rather than individual artists,¹⁵² whilst other respondents underlined the importance of ethical assurance processes when relying on private investment for public purposes,¹⁵³ including the extent to which public arts projects result in civic/public spaces becoming privatised.¹⁵⁴ Respondents also noted that the market for private investment is also very competitive.¹⁵⁵

The Committee received examples of arts organisations that have been successful in diversifying their funding sources, including private investment, and the benefits of a diverse income stream. Festivals Edinburgh noted for example–

“the Edinburgh Festivals have reshaped operations in the face of core grant reductions totalling over 33% in real terms since 2010 and have become increasingly effective at raising income against the vital foundation of core grant. Growing earned income by over 35% in the five years to 2015 involved replacing all major financial services sponsors who withdrew during the UK recession, and securing new corporate and in particular individual donor support. In a constrained public funding environment, the festivals have a continuing commitment to use the strength of their brands to diversify financing models in these ways to attract more funding that can be reinvested in supporting creative work.”

Aberdeen City Council also noted that many cultural organisations in its area have sought to diversify their income, which has enabled them to demonstrate ‘remarkable resilience’ in the current funding landscape.¹⁵⁶ The Scottish Contemporary Arts Network suggested that making a map of existing private investment opportunities across Scotland would be welcome,¹⁵⁷ whilst others noted that competition for private funding is already high.¹⁵⁸

Collaborative/partnership funding approaches

Respondents, such as Glasgow Life, suggested greater support could be offered to the arts sector to ‘develop brokerage between the private and public partnerships’.¹⁵⁹ Whilst some considered that pursuing multiple funding streams was beneficial for artists generally in terms of their income security etc.,¹⁶⁰ it was also noted that it can have drawbacks for artistic freedom.¹⁶¹ One respondent noted in this regard ‘too many partners means the artist has to try and please all’.¹⁶² A solution offered to this

¹⁵¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/14.

¹⁵² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

¹⁵³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/18; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12.

¹⁵⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48.

¹⁵⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50.

¹⁵⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58.

¹⁵⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61.

¹⁵⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50.

¹⁵⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/23; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/34.

¹⁶⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/34.

¹⁶¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/41.

¹⁶² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/52.

issue was to introduce measures to encourage collaborative funders to use a joined-up partnership approach to funding.¹⁶³

Models for organising artists

The Traditional Music and Song Association of Scotland noted that artists should be supported to find innovative models to attract funding through different means of organising themselves.¹⁶⁴ It highlighted the benefits of artists organising themselves as a Community Interest Company or Social Enterprise “which allows them an element of control but also an organisational structure to access a greater range of funding”.¹⁶⁵ The Playwrights’ Studio also highlighted the social enterprise model as something which could enable artists to progress and attract funding.¹⁶⁶

Teaching and the Curriculum for Excellence

Respondents highlighted the benefits of arts education for young people in developing their creativity, wellbeing and critical thinking.¹⁶⁷ The Traditional Music and Song Association of Scotland suggested that the Scottish Government could explore more ways in which to draw on Scotland’s artists to support the arts curriculum in schools. It highlighted the Youth Music Initiative as a successful model to build upon. Other respondents suggested that artists could be offered employment through local authorities to teach arts education.¹⁶⁸

International examples

Table 1 below presents extracts from the written evidence highlighting examples of best practice from other countries or regions with commentary from the respondent about why the examples have been suggested. The respondents are identified in the footnotes provided. The views of respondents expressed below are provided for context only and do not represent the views of the Scottish Parliament.

Table 1: Extracts from written submissions highlighting international examples

Country/region	Respondents’ commentary
Australia	Australia Council for Arts artists fellowship programme ¹⁶⁹
	In Australia in 2014-15, the federal government decided to reallocate funding worth nearly £60m over four years - a third of the ongoing arts funding - away from the arms-length Australia Council for the Arts to create a directly run government programme. The arts sector protested and a subsequent Australian Senate inquiry published a report in December 2015.

¹⁶³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/13; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/20; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/34.

¹⁶⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

¹⁶⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

¹⁶⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/44.

¹⁶⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/43.

¹⁶⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/12.

¹⁶⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/51.

	<p>The report expressed strong support for the system maintaining arms-length non-political specialist expertise in arts funding through the Australia Council; and advised that the funding policy and framework should aim to support the whole cultural ecosystem including small and medium sized organisations and independent artists, having regard to the challenges of operating across urban and rural Australia. As a result of this controversy and policy changes following the 2016 elections, the frameworks of the previous period are no longer in place and the Australia Council has had its funding and its policy leadership in these areas reinstated.¹⁷⁰</p>
	<p>Australia Arts Council: This started an arm's length organization whose role is to broker relationships between small and midsized arts organisations and small private family foundations and trusts. Art Support Australia meets with donors, talks to them about the importance of supporting the arts, and identifies organisations that might fit with their values. It also mentors arts organisations to help them develop realistic funding strategies and prepare effective proposals.¹⁷¹</p>
Brazil	<p>In Brazil, the cultural foundations SESC and SESI were set up by philanthropic leaders of the commerce and industry sectors in 1946 to promote social welfare, cultural development and improving the lives of workers, their families and the communities they live in. Their revenues come from a 1.5 percent tax paid by every company according to the size of their payroll, and directed to the cultural foundations. Their funded programmes focus on citizen engagement through a wide range of interventions including connecting grassroots cultural movements in favelas and community centres to the practice of world-renowned invited artists.¹⁷²</p>
Catalonia	<p>[Cultural tourism] has been started in Catalonia a long time ago and was almost too successful in the case of Barcelona but has benefited other lesser known places and regions considerably. The original network that has started this development now calls itself an international network and has supported cultural regeneration in other countries. ...I attach a link to their main website and also a link to the website of a region in Catalonia where this approach has been very successful and it attracts lots of international tourists with their arts and crafts. This region is called Emporda.¹⁷³ http://www.creativetourismnetwork.org</p>

¹⁷⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58.

¹⁷¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48.

¹⁷² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58.

¹⁷³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/47.

	http://www.creativetourismnetwork.org/empordanet-the-catalonia/
Denmark	Our European neighbours recognise the vital importance of funding theatre and dance for young audiences – Denmark has over 70 full-time companies – but Scotland continues to lag behind, despite the fact that the work here is recognised as some of the best in the world. ¹⁷⁴
	In Denmark, the Government has established an infrastructure and trading subsidy budget which has developed 19 Grassroots Music Venues of exceptionally high quality. These venues receive ongoing subsidy to create local jobs, support for musician micro-businesses, and platforms for local emerging talent – at the full subsidy rate, each of these 19 venues commits to paying each performing musician 2000 Krone, a fee equating to £250 per band member per performance. ¹⁷⁵
England	Arts Council England’s Developing Your Creative Practice bursaries (£2,000-10,000) ¹⁷⁶
	The Birmingham Cultural Investment Enquiry (https://culturecentral.co.uk/features/birmingham-cultural-investment-enquiry-2016) completed in 2016, identified a plethora of new and innovative approaches to funding culture. Crucially, they found that a mix of models would be needed to deal with the growing funding challenges ahead and that open communication between national and local funders was important. They recommended framing a citywide cultural investment proposition, highlighting the overall value to the city of investment in the arts and helping to attract more funding. Birmingham recognised that they need to use Anchor institutions such as the business and higher education sectors to unlock further investment in culture across the city and that this would bring benefits to all. This model can have benefits for cities and Local Authorities across Scotland. There may also be individual elements identified within the Birmingham enquiry that National and Local Government feel could be explored further, such as use of BIDs or Social Investment Funds. ¹⁷⁷
England	The increasing interest in culture from across government and public policymakers should be accompanied by co-creation approaches and recognition of value through securing funding from wider budgets, building on models such as the Cultural Commissioning Programme in England. ¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/17.

¹⁷⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.

¹⁷⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11: <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/arts-council-development-funds/10-things-you-need-know-about-dyccp>

¹⁷⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53.

¹⁷⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50.

	<p>We need to look at the arts differently and I believe that England and the arts council have led the way in terms of looking at how we support the arts more.¹⁷⁹</p> <p>the Arts Council England requirement for data sharing means that England has rich audience data that is used by individual companies but can also be utilised by government to track impact and identify gaps. We welcome the decision to appoint the Audience Agency to fulfil this role for Scotland and hope that it leads to a similar level of information sharing between organisations.¹⁸⁰</p>
France	<p>The French ‘Intermittents du Spectacle’ system whereby artists who can prove that they regularly earn an income through their practise can claim state support in fallow periods is worthy of consideration in the light of low average wages of Scottish artists and freelance arts workers.¹⁸¹</p>
	<p>When working in France I learnt that actors are paid according to their age and experience. In effect the rate of pay is increased with age, read experience. Actors starting out get paid the basic wage, and actors with more years’ experience get paid according to which bracket their years of experience falls into. It wouldn't have to be law, it could be introduced into Scotland as a charter to be followed by companies, an endeavour to move towards.¹⁸²</p>
	<p>We could look to France where artists are supported annually as ‘intermittent du spectacle’ – whereby an arts industry worker between jobs receives a basic income which allows them to support themselves. While the envy of arts professionals across the world, it has its grey areas and isn’t perfect; however, it evidences a much higher value on the importance of the arts in society than we currently do here in Scotland. It allows mid-career artists to stay in the industry, rather than having to look elsewhere to find any financial security.¹⁸³</p>
	<p>Across the EU, governments have provided a variety of mechanisms to subsidise and underwrite investment in Grassroots Music Venues, resulting in an average subsidy of 42% of total turnover, as high as 70% in France.¹⁸⁴</p>
France	<p>In France, GMVs receive operational support from: Le ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Le ministère de la Ville, de la Jeunesse et des Sports, Le ministère de la Justice L’Union Européenne - Lifelong Learning Programme and La SACEM. Le CNV - Centre National de la chanson des Variétés et du jazz –</p>

¹⁷⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A1.

¹⁸⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25.

¹⁸¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25.

¹⁸² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36.

¹⁸³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36.

¹⁸⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.

	administers two schemes by which a levy is paid by all live music events and distributed to Grassroots Music Venues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. to promote risk taking with programming at grassroots level. 195 venues benefitted in 2015 b. to improve the infrastructure at Grassroots Music Venues. 59 venues benefitted in 2015.¹⁸⁵
Germany	Germany count funding and scholarship applications as job applications for benefit purposes, allowing professional artists to claim state benefits if they are on low-income. ¹⁸⁶
	The German Government announced a package of investments into Grassroots Music Venues to a value of €8.2million in November 2016 (Förderprogramme zur technischen Erneuerung der Aufführungstechnik von Musikclubs). ¹⁸⁷
Ireland	Initiatives that put visual art and artists at the centre of local and national infrastructure are to be welcomed. An oft-cited example is Ireland's Per Cent for Art scheme where 1% of the cost of any publicly funded capital, infrastructural and building development can be allocated to the commissioning of a work of art. Similar schemes are also active in Scotland, for example Aberdeenshire Council. ¹⁸⁸
	We are keen to see a budgeting approach which recognises the broader impact of culture on the health and wellbeing of our citizens. The Committee may be aware that Ireland has recently invested in an innovative agreement between Arts Council Ireland and the County and City Management Association, where the national body works in collaboration with local authorities to support the culture at local level. ¹⁸⁹
	Irish Aosdana model which provides an annual stipend to approved artists. ¹⁹⁰
Ireland	Arts Council of Ireland bursaries (various, ranges from €10,000 – €20,000 per bursary, depending on scheme) ¹⁹¹ .
Netherlands	We also believe it is illustrative to look at evidence from the Netherlands, where the two state national lotteries were forced to merge in order to try and compete with the Dutch People's Postcode Lottery. In spite of actions taken by the state-owned operators, the Dutch People's Postcode Lottery is now larger by sales than the merged state lottery, having displaced the national lottery as the dominant market player. ¹⁹²
	In the Netherlands, every middle-sized town or city (approx. 100.000 inhabitants) has a music venue for popular music genres. Fifty-one of these music venues receive funding from

¹⁸⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.¹⁸⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53.¹⁸⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.¹⁸⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/61.¹⁸⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/60.¹⁹⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53.¹⁹¹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11: <http://www.artscouncil.ie/available-funding/>.¹⁹² CTEEA/S5/19/AF/36.

	the Government following the advice of Muziek Centrum Nederland. ¹⁹³
New Zealand	Aotearoa New Zealand is currently in the process of including cultural well-being as a core component of their new Living Standards Framework. This rightly centres culture at the heart of the national conversation and ensures that government policy more broadly considers the arts. This can lead to greater integration between arts and healthcare or education provision, something that is happening in some ways in Scotland but could be enhanced. ¹⁹⁴
North America	American and Canadian fundraising models which are far less reliant on public funds but have incredibly strong cultural sectors. ¹⁹⁵
	Canada [and Singapore], which provide learning around this kind of ring-fenced funding which is linked to core national and cultural identity development and tourism. ¹⁹⁶
Norway	Norwegian model of artists scholarships ¹⁹⁷
	In Norway, The Musikkutstyrsordningen (Norwegian Musical Equipment Foundation) gives bi-annual grants to studios, venues, community groups, and rehearsal spaces for upgrading facilities and maintaining and purchasing equipment. It was established in 2009 and distributes circa 27.5 - 30 million kr per year (£2.5 - £2.8 million). Although it is a national subsidy/state funding scheme, it is governed by a General Assembly comprised of some of the key music trade bodies in Norway. ¹⁹⁸
Nordic	A separate agency or fund to support artists to travel outside of the country usually covering travel to the country as a minimum, sometimes other costs such as visas or accommodation and subsistence. This expands the opportunities for artists and freelancers to seek alternative ways of being funded for work through fees being paid by work in other countries. ¹⁹⁹
	Provide more long term paid opportunities to work in the education system as tutors, teachers and performers so schools can access more cultural and artistic activity either through regular visits or specialists on the staff team or both. ²⁰⁰
	There are international models which can serve as examples for Scotland, for instance from Norway ²⁰¹ and Sweden ²⁰² which provide access to employment benefits for freelance workers. ²⁰³

¹⁹³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.

¹⁹⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/25.

¹⁹⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/53.

¹⁹⁶ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/48.

¹⁹⁷ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/51.

¹⁹⁸ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/31.

¹⁹⁹ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

²⁰⁰ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/63.

²⁰¹ <https://skuda.no/english>.

²⁰² <http://teateralliansen.se/teateralliansen-in-english/>.

²⁰³ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/11.

Sweden	Long term funding that invests in artists to undertake a period of work not just a one-off project. See: Dancers/ Actors Alliance in Sweden. ²⁰⁴
	For example, Vasterbottensteatern, a company I have worked for in Skellefteå, a municipality of 70,000 in northern Sweden, is one of the smallest of Sweden's 16 regional repertory companies. It receives a public subsidy of around £2million per year. This is far more than our biggest rep, the Lyceum, serving a city of 500,000. I understand our National Theatre receives not much more than twice the amount of Vasterbottensteatern.
Switzerland	The Swiss Arts Council Pro Helvetia is responsible for supporting Swiss artists on both the domestic and international stages in a way which is coordinated and effective, including a small team of staff based in important markets around the world.
Quebec	The latest Quebec culture policy published in June 2018 committing the government to encourage cultural philanthropy through fiscal measures, and increase levels of government support to unprecedented levels for creation, production and sharing of high quality and innovative culture, may be worth consideration. Their cultural strategy also commits to practical measures for improving the lives and livelihoods of artists – including exploring means of adapting fiscal measures to their reality. Quebec has been a pioneer in adopting two statutes on the status of the artist and introducing assistance programs as well as tax or social protection measures for artists. ²⁰⁵
	Quebec, and Canada more broadly are examples of where government money is used to deliver objectives that are difficult for other funders, and to take a long-term approach. The Canada Council for the Arts provides a range of support, from small R&D funds to multi-year funding for the creation and international presentation of work of scale that will showcase the very best of the country.

²⁰⁴ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/A2.

²⁰⁵ CTEEA/S5/19/AF/50; CTEEA/S5/19/AF/58