



## EUROPE

THE ARTS  
CHILD POLICY  
CIVIL JUSTICE  
EDUCATION  
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT  
HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
NATIONAL SECURITY  
POPULATION AND AGING  
PUBLIC SAFETY  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
SUBSTANCE ABUSE  
TERRORISM AND  
HOMELAND SECURITY  
TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE  
WORKFORCE AND WORKPLACE

This PDF document was made available from [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org) as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

[Jump down to document](#) ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

### Support RAND

[Browse Books & Publications](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

### For More Information

Visit RAND at [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)

Explore [RAND Europe](#)

View [document details](#)

### Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Unauthorized posting of RAND PDFs to a non-RAND Web site is prohibited. RAND PDFs are protected under copyright law. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please see [RAND Permissions](#).

This product is part of the RAND Corporation technical report series. Reports may include research findings on a specific topic that is limited in scope; present discussions of the methodology employed in research; provide literature reviews, survey instruments, modeling exercises, guidelines for practitioners and research professionals, and supporting documentation; or deliver preliminary findings. All RAND reports undergo rigorous peer review to ensure that they meet high standards for research quality and objectivity.

R E P O R T

---



# Arts debate

## Perceptions and impact

Ruth Levitt, Julia F. Lowell

Prepared for Arts Council England

The research described in this report was commissioned by Arts Council England.

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

**RAND**® is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2008 Arts Council England

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from Arts Council England.

Published 2008 by the RAND Corporation  
1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138  
1200 South Hayes Street, Arlington, VA 22202-5050  
4570 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2665  
Westbrook Centre, Milton Road, Cambridge CB4 1YG, United Kingdom  
RAND URL: <http://www.rand.org>  
RAND Europe URL: <http://www.rand.org/randeuropa>  
To order RAND documents or to obtain additional information, contact  
Distribution Services: Telephone: (310) 451-7002;  
Fax: (310) 451-6915; Email: [order@rand.org](mailto:order@rand.org)

## Preface

---

RAND Europe was commissioned by Arts Council England to assist the Arts Council to evaluate perceptions of the process and impact thus far of the arts debate. The arts debate aimed to explore how people value the arts today and determine their priorities for public funding. The Arts Council ran the arts debate in England from early 2006 to late 2007. This short report is based on interviews that RAND Europe conducted with a small set of arts debate participants and Arts Council stakeholders in January 2008.

RAND Europe is an independent not-for-profit policy research organisation that aims to serve the public interest by improving policymaking and informing public debate. Its clients are European governments, institutions and firms with a need for rigorous, impartial, multidisciplinary analysis. This report has been peer-reviewed in accordance with RAND's quality assurance standards.

For more information, please contact:

Catherine Bunting  
Director, Research Strategy  
Arts Council England  
14 Great Peter Street  
London SW1P 3NQ  
UK  
Tel: +44-7973-6835  
Fax: +44-7973-6590  
[catherine.bunting@artscouncil.org.uk](mailto:catherine.bunting@artscouncil.org.uk)

Ruth Levitt  
RAND Europe  
Westbrook Centre  
Milton Road  
Cambridge CB4 1YG  
UK  
Tel: +44-1223-353329  
Fax: +44-1223-358845  
[levitt@rand.org](mailto:levitt@rand.org)



# Contents

---

Preface.....	iii
Summary.....	vii
<b>CHAPTER 1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2 Methods.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 The interviewees.....	5
2.2 The questions.....	6
2.3 The report.....	6
<b>CHAPTER 3 Themes and issues.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 Comments on the processes of the arts debate .....	7
3.1.1 Positive comments.....	7
3.1.2 Critical comments .....	8
3.2 Comments on opportunities arising from the arts debate.....	8
3.3 Other issues raised by interviewees.....	10
3.4 Conclusions.....	10
<b>Appendix A: Interviewees.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix B: Question to interviewees.....</b>	<b>15</b>



# Summary

---

In 2006 and 2007 Arts Council England ran a large inquiry that it called ‘the arts debate’. The arts debate included research and consultative processes aimed at finding out what people value most about the arts and what principles they think should guide publicly funded organisations. The Arts Council intends to use its own analysis of the findings of the arts debate to inform its mission, strategy, priorities and plans.

RAND Europe was commissioned by Arts Council England to assist the Arts Council to gather and summarise information about perceptions of the impact and processes of the arts debate thus far. The Council intends to use this information to test some of its early thinking on how to respond to the findings of the debate. This short report is based on interviews that RAND Europe conducted with eleven arts debate participants and Arts Council stakeholders in January 2008. This small sample of selected informants was not representative of the whole population of arts debate participants. The Arts Council was seeking qualitative feedback, independently reported, from a group of prominent individuals whom they regarded as thoughtful, knowledgeable, and belonging to key stakeholder groups. To encourage frankness and protect possibly sensitive information, it was agreed that the underlying data from the interviews would not be made available to the Council or the public, and that no individuals or organisations would be associated with particular points of view described in the report.

The interviewees were identified by the Arts Council. The questions for interviewees were prepared jointly by the Arts Council and RAND Europe. The interviewees included heads of several regularly funded arts organisations, a chief executive of an Arts Council England region, a member of the Arts Council’s national Council, a senior official from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), a local authority chief executive, a member of the arts debate advisory panel, and a senior specialist in cultural policy at a university. Interviewees contributed positive and critical comments about the arts debate processes; they also commented on opportunities arising from the arts debate and raised other issues.

## **Main messages**

The two main messages that emerged from the interviews were that:

- interviewees felt positive about the process of the arts debate. They would like to see some form of dialogue continue, involving the Arts Council, its direct constituents (individual artists and arts organisations) and, if possible,

representatives of the general public. They also generally approved the set of goals identified by the Council for itself, although they did not feel that the Council had been specific enough about how it would go about achieving those goals

- there was scepticism about whether the Council would change any of its processes or its decisions based on the findings of the debate. This scepticism was reinforced by what the interviewees perceived to be the very unfortunate timing of the recent funding allocation announcements, which lacked connection to ideas from the arts debate, and the publication of the McMaster review

Other key challenges for the Arts Council to consider, which some interviewees raised, include:

- the unresolved dichotomy between excellence and access, and the implications of placing greater focus on the quality of experience of those who use or consume the art
- the call to include artists in setting the agenda, but without becoming too swayed by their self-interest

### **Positive comments**

Interviewees generally spoke positively about the breadth and openness of the design and conduct of the arts debate. They made positive comments about:

- the availability of opportunities for them to express their views during the debate
- the arts debate team's responsiveness to comments about the processes
- the bravery of the Council in undertaking a potentially risky initiative (the arts debate might have revealed a lack of support for the arts or for the Arts Council)
- the professionalism of the organisation and facilitation of the events they attended
- the liveliness of the sessions and topicality of the discussions

### **Critical comments**

Interviewees tended to be concerned about:

- the Arts Council's poor handling of public relations and media communications, leading to a lack of visibility among arts organisations, individual artists, and the general public, and missed opportunities to reach out to stakeholders during and after the debate
- the Council's own internal commitment to the arts debate
- the lack of an explicit connection between the priorities for action that the Council identified as arising from the arts debate, and the Council's most recent funding decisions
- the debate's emphasis on the policies and responsibilities of the Arts Council as opposed to what people want from the arts and artists

## Opportunities

Several interviewees saw the arts debate as the possible beginning of a continuing engagement between the Council and individual artists, arts organisations, other arts funders, the government and the general public.

## Other issues arising from the Arts debate

Interviewees identified the following issues as arising from the arts debate:

- the arts debate illuminated the prospect of the Council becoming primarily a development agency for all the arts, rather than solely a funding body dealing with certain arts organisations. Some interviewees noted ways in which this would significantly change its relationships with the organisations it funds
- a number of interviewees wanted the Arts Council to engage artists more constructively in dialogue and negotiation in the future
- maximizing the quality of the experience of audience members may be a more appropriate focus for the Council than either promoting excellence or improving access. Interviewees observed that high quality experiences are what keep people coming back to the arts, and they produce the instrumental benefits (such as jobs and economic growth) that politicians seem to value most
- the timing of the publication of the findings from the arts debate and the announcement of the Arts Council's most recent decisions on funding arts organisations was very close. According to a number of interviewees, the effect of media coverage of the funding decisions was to overshadow the arts debate, and to reveal an apparent lack of connection between the messages from the arts debate and the basis for the funding decisions
- interviewees thought the arts debate has also been overshadowed by the publication of the McMaster review in January 2008. Some interviewees thought that, for those who have not been closely involved in the debate, the McMaster review would completely eclipse it. Some interviewees questioned why coordination of the timing for the McMaster review had not been handled better by DCMS and the Arts Council, since they saw some of McMaster's suggestions as contradicting the arts debate's findings. In particular, while the debate indicated an enhanced role for the public in decision making, McMaster appears to minimize that role.



Arts Council England works to get more art to more people in more places. It develops and promotes the arts across England, acting as an independent body at arm's length from government.

Between 2006 and 2008, it will invest £1.1 billion of public money from government and the National Lottery in support for the arts. The primary means in which this money is distributed are:

- Grants for the arts: an open access grants programme, funded by the lottery. This is available to individuals, arts organisations and other people who use the arts in their work. Grants are awarded for activities that benefit people in England or that help artists and arts organisations from England to carry out their work.
- Regular funding for organisations: funded by the grant in aid the Arts Council receives from government, this provides grants to nearly 900 arts organisations on a three-year basis.

Arts Council England also uses some of the money it receives from government on supporting, developing and assisting the arts sector and encouraging wider engagement with the arts.

Other sources of funding for the arts include: local authorities, box office earnings, private donations and business sponsorship, trusts and foundations and European Union funding.

Source: DCMS and Arts Council England

In 2006 and 2007 Arts Council England ran an inquiry into the public value of the arts, which it called 'the arts debate'. In summary, the main elements of the debate included:

- nine principles developed by the Arts Council to guide the debate
- a literature review on public value research and public engagement that was conducted by members of the Council's research staff
- an advisory panel of seven external experts, from the worlds of public engagement, public value research and the arts sector, who advised the Council on how to run the debate
- internal consultations: workshops involving a total of 50 of the Arts Council's staff
- general public consultation: 20 discussion groups and 10 workshops involving a total of 170 members of the general public
- arts community and stakeholders consultation: 79 interviews and group discussions with individual artists and arts managers and 30 stakeholder organisations

- public consultation: an online process, which generated 1,251 written responses
- deliberative research: four workshops and a one day forum, involving individual artists, arts organisations, professionals and the public
- an open space event: a two day event attended by 150 artists, arts professionals and members of the public

Reports on most of these elements have been published, as was a final report presenting the findings overall and the Arts Council's conclusions from the entire process (see the Arts Council's summary of the key findings in the box below). All of these documents plus further details of the debate are available at a website created for it by the Arts Council, <http://www.artsdebate.co.uk/>.

#### **Key findings from the Arts debate**

- The arts are seen as part of our fundamental capacity for life - enabling us to interpret, adapt and understand the world around us, helping us to express ourselves, communicate with others and broaden our collective horizons
- The arts enrich our experience of life - they bring colour, passion, beauty and intensity to our lives. They are a source of pleasure, entertainment and relaxation and a means of escape from the day to day
- The arts offer powerful applications in other contexts - contributing to health and well being, to education and learning, a sense of belonging and community and so to social cohesion and a healthy economy
- The report identifies important areas of consensus as well as points of difference. There is widespread support for the principle of public funding for the arts but only if it seeks to achieve certain key outcomes. People would like the Arts Council to:
  - support ground-breaking work that touches the lives of more people in exciting surprising ways
  - be bold, visionary, transparent, fair and properly accountable
  - continue to foster public debate about the role the arts play in our lives.

Source: <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/artsdebate/summaryandconclusions.php>

In the autumn of 2007, the Arts Council began to consider how to use the emerging findings of the arts debate to inform its own longer term strategic thinking and corporate planning activities. It decided to commission a short interim study, in order to find out a little more about external perceptions of the impact of the debate. For the interim study it decided to seek the views of a small number of participants and stakeholders.

The Arts Council was interested to know:

- (a) how the processes of the arts debate were experienced – did participants and stakeholders perceive the research and consultation processes of the arts debate to have been efficient, thorough, and fair?
- (b) views on how the Arts Council should now make the most of the opportunities the debate has created – specifically:
  - what are the opportunities for the Arts Council?
  - how do these relate to the framework of values that the Arts Council is developing?
  - what may the Arts Council have missed?

- what are the opportunities for others?

The views of selected participants and stakeholders were intended to help the Arts Council and the wider arts sector to:

- respond to the findings of the arts debate
- identify priority areas of work
- comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the ongoing processes used by the Arts Council to set strategy and engage its stakeholders in its work.

The Arts Council commissioned RAND Europe in mid-December 2007 to undertake this brief, interim study, for reporting in February 2008. Four facts are relevant to that timing:

- the Arts Council announced in December 2007 and January 2008 its decisions about allocations of funding to arts organisations for 2008-2010
- on 17 January 2008 the report of Sir Brian McMaster's review (*Supporting Excellence in the Arts; From Measurement to Judgement*), which had been commissioned by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport (James Purnell MP) in July 2007, was published on the website of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS); McMaster had been asked to consider:
  - how the system of public sector support for the arts can encourage excellence, risk-taking and innovation
  - how artistic excellence can encourage wider and deeper engagement with the arts by audiences
  - how to establish a non-bureaucratic method to judge the quality of the arts in the future
- James Purnell MP was appointed Secretary of State for Work and Pensions on 24 January 2008, and replaced at DCMS by Andy Burnham MP, formerly the Chief Secretary to the Treasury
- the new Chief Executive of the Arts Council, Alan Davey, formerly Director of Culture at the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, took up his post at the Arts Council in February 2008

Chapter 2 of this report describes the methods used for this interim study. Chapter 3 describes the themes and issues that interviewees raised. The interviewees and the questions put to them are listed in the appendices at the end of the report.



### 2.1 **The interviewees**

The Arts Council chose the scale and scope of this study of perceptions of the process and impact of the arts debate. The Arts Council set the number of interviews at twelve and identified a long list of sixteen individuals to be approached to take part in the study. They included heads of several arts organisations that the Arts Council regularly funds, a chief executive of an Arts Council England region, a member of the Arts Council's national Council, a senior official from DCMS, a member of parliament, a local authority chief executive, members of the arts debate advisory panel and a senior specialist in cultural policy at a university. Of the sixteen, twelve were men, four were women.

The Arts Council was clear that this small sample of selected informants was not representative of the whole population of arts debate participants, and thus would not be able to support statistically valid conclusions about the perceptions of that population. The Arts Council was, rather, seeking qualitative feedback, independently reported, from a group of prominent individuals who belonged to important stakeholder groups and whom they regarded as among their 'valued critical friends'. To encourage frankness and protect possibly sensitive information, it was agreed that RAND Europe would not make the underlying data from the interviews available to the Arts Council or the public, and that no individuals or organisations would be associated with particular points of view described in the study.

RAND Europe emailed each of the interviewees requesting an interview and attached a letter from Catherine Bunting, Director of Research Strategy at the Arts Council, explaining the purpose of the interim study and requesting them to agree to an interview. Of the sixteen individuals approached, three individuals declined, one could not be available in time; one provided a brief written response to the e-mailed interview questions. Ten interviews, four in person and six by telephone, could be arranged in the time available; seven of the interviewees were men and three were women (see Appendix A). The interviews took between 45 and 60 minutes each.

## 2.2 The questions

The scope of the questions was specified by the Arts Council and the questions were drafted with RAND Europe (see Appendix B). The questions were intended to investigate the interviewees' views on two broad subjects:

- how the processes of the arts debate were experienced by them, their peers or sector, other important stakeholders and the Arts Council itself
- how the Arts Council should now make the most of the opportunities the debate has created.

All the interviewees received their questions in advance by email. The interviewees were asked the same seven general questions, plus up to two further questions that were specific to their role as head of an arts organisation, etc.

## 2.3 The report

The sample of interviewees was very small, and not representative of the entire population of participants in the arts debate. Their comments have not been subjected to a formal quantitative analysis in this report. Rather, the comments have been analysed qualitatively, to draw out context-rich emergent themes and issues.

Interviewees were informed that this report would be published on the Arts Council's website. RAND Europe drafted the report, and the Arts Council approved the text.

There are four sections in this chapter. The first two follow the interviewees' comments on the two broad questions put to them:

- how the processes of the arts debate were experienced
- how the Arts Council should now make the most of the opportunities the debate has created.

The third section covers the other main issues raised by the interviewees. The fourth section summarises the main conclusions from this study.

### **3.1 Comments on the processes of the arts debate**

#### **3.1.1 Positive comments**

Interviewees spoke positively about several aspects of the arts debate processes. They mentioned the “broad, inclusive design”, and that the initiative was “timely”. Several interviewees thought there had been opportunities for a “wide range of people” to express their views. Some interviewees commented that the session(s) they had attended (they identified particular workshops, forums and the open space event) had been “professionally run” and “well facilitated”. Some interviewees found the sessions “interesting” or “engaging”. Some interviewees particularly commended the “spontaneity of the dialogue” between individual artists and public that they had encountered.

Some interviewees thought the Arts Council had been “brave” to undertake the arts debate, because it was “risky” opening up for discussion such fundamental questions about the value of the arts and the public funding of the arts. They explained the risk as “...you might get the wrong answer”, or the Arts Council might be told “...you don't have a mandate”, or that “...the arts debate would be ignored” and that the Arts Council would be criticised for being out of touch.

Some interviewees commented that “it was good” that some members of the Arts Council's staff and Committees had been observers at the session they participated in. Some interviewees noted that the Arts Council team organising the arts debate were “receptive to advice and suggestions” that they and other participants made about the process, and in some cases the team had introduced modifications to the process.

### 3.1.2 Critical comments

Interviewees were critical of a number of aspects of the arts debate processes. Many interviewees thought the arts debate had been “invisible to most people”; this could include their professional peers, and/or others in their sector, and also the general public. Several interviewees remarked particularly that the Arts Council had “not engaged artists adequately” in the arts debate.

The Arts Council’s communications about the arts debate attracted comments: some interviewees thought the Arts Council had “missed an opportunity” to communicate adequately with all its networks and stakeholders through the arts debate. Some interviewees thought the arts debate team had not communicated well with the participants in the arts debate during the programme of events, to “tell them where in the processes their input came” or “how the rest of the debate was going to work”. Some interviewees were disappointed that the arts debate team had not provided feedback to them, as individuals who had played a particular role in the debate, now that the debate’s programme of events was over. Some interviewees asked what feedback they would have from the arts debate team following this study.

Some interviewees doubted whether there was “buy in” by the Arts Council to the arts debate “much beyond the team of organisers”. Some interviewees thought that some Arts Council members and staff were “anxious” about what participants would say in the open sessions, and feared they would voice the “wrong” answers (namely that the arts were “not worth supporting”); they thought this anxiety was apparent in the way the arts debate has been designed and run by the Arts Council.

Some interviewees thought that the organisers had focused the arts debate too much on the role of the Arts Council itself. These interviewees thought the focus should have been more on “the role of the arts” or on “what the public want” from artists and the arts. One interviewee commented that: “... no organisations outside the arts sector” had been engaged, and that “...the Arts Council didn’t really open itself up.”

One participant thought the three-hour public consultation group sessions in the evening lasted too long and that there were more sessions than was necessary; the same interviewee criticised the quality of the group facilitation at a particular session.

## 3.2 Comments on opportunities arising from the arts debate

Several interviewees thought it very important that the Arts Council should see the arts debate as “the beginning of a process, not something it has now completed”. They urged the Arts Council to see “continuing engagement” as central to its relationships with individual artists, arts organisations, other arts funders, the government and the general public. This point was made emphatically by several interviewees. One said: “...roll it out more and more to reach more people than they have so far”. Another said the arts debate had demonstrated: “...a new operating principle: to facilitate the debate among artists, public, arts administrators and funders, about art. This is the way to rethink how the Arts Council works and what it is for - a permanent debate”. Some interviewees said the form that the continuing debate might take in the future did not have to be the same as this had been.

Several interviewees expressed concerns about how the Arts Council would engage with individual artists and arts organisations in the future. One said: “The Arts Council’s bidding process sets up a supplicant-benefactor relationship; this is the wrong relationship with artists. We need to share the agenda with artists, the relationship should be predicated on that.” Another said: “We must not have a polarised debate. We must not get trapped in artists’ own self interest in relation to producing their art. The Arts Council has got to engage artists in dialogue and negotiation, with no ulterior motive. The arts community must say if excellence and development matter and how they want to engage with these things. The Arts Council does not have the monopoly.”

Interviewees were asked to comment on a set of priorities that the Arts Council had identified for itself, arising from the arts debate (see Appendix B Question 5), namely:

- greater clarity of mission based on quality of artistic experience
- more purposeful decision-making based on achieving a balance of core outcomes (excellence, innovation, diversity, reach and engagement)
- greater fairness, transparency and accountability, with greater scope for taking risks
- improved relationships with partners, particularly funded organisations
- ongoing dialogue between the Arts Council, arts community, public and other stakeholders
- more powerful advocacy for the value of the arts in people’s lives today

Most interviewees “could agree” with most of those points, thinking the points were on the whole “reasonable” and that they “wouldn’t argue” with most of them. However, some interviewees also thought these priorities were “standard management things” the Arts Council had to do anyway: “... did you need the arts debate to find this out?” Another questioned: “... what do we mean by these words?” And another said: “... but how do you address them?”

Some interviewees challenged the inclusion of certain items in the above list of priorities. For example, the core outcomes named in the second bullet point prompted one interviewee to say: “Innovation is not necessary in every performance.” Regarding transparency, in the third bullet point, one interviewee said: “The danger is that it is not transparent. If we could all spend a year really developing a consensus about how to proceed that would be beneficial, but there is not the time. The next spending review is already underway.” Another said: “I disagree that fairness should be there - who knows what it means?”

Furthermore, the apparent lack of an explicit connection between the above list of priorities and the Arts Council’s most recent funding decisions puzzled several interviewees, and in their view revealed that the Arts Council had insufficient clarity about its own mission.

One interviewee, referring to the findings of the *Peer Review* of the Arts Council commissioned by DCMS and published in 2005 ([www.artscouncil.org.uk/documents/press/phpGk4rBz.pdf](http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/documents/press/phpGk4rBz.pdf)), commented: “My anxiety is that the *Peer Review* produced a similar list that did not lead to transformation in the Arts Council”.

### 3.3 Other issues raised by interviewees

Several interviewees favoured the Arts Council placing more emphasis on “its role as a development agency for the arts”, and on becoming “an advocate for all the arts, not just those it funds”. Some interviewees thought this emphasis would necessarily alter the Arts Council’s relationships to those organisations it funds regularly “who see it as a source of habitual funding”. One interviewee suggested: “Funding should be on five-year contracts, not permanent. Teams should have to re-tender for the franchise to run major arts organisations, so that you get different people coming in.” Another agreed: “There should be multiple models for success - franchising is one idea, so that teams have to change.” One interviewee added that: “The case for funding individual artists has not been argued well enough to a sceptical public. The Arts Council may feel it should stay away from this.”

Some interviewees noted that the “quality of the experience” of audiences had emerged as a significant theme from the arts debate. One said: “The traditional dilemma is between excellence and access in the arts. But beneath the surface of that is a notion that bridges these, namely ‘quality of experience’. ... If the quality of experience of those who use or consume the art is poor, it does not produce instrumental benefits. This anchors the Arts Council to the quality of the experience.”

Several interviewees commented on the close timing of the arts debate, the McMaster review and the Arts Council’s announcements of its most recent funding decisions to arts organisations. The press coverage of the latter had, in some interviewees’ perceptions, undone the reputational gains that may have accrued to the Arts Council from the arts debate. One said the arts debate had got “...lost in the furore over the debate about cuts. The Arts Council has got itself into a mess there, which is indicative of its ignorance of its constituency.” Another referred to “...the fire fighting about recent funding decisions. The PR problem is that the Arts Council’s ambitions arising from the arts debate are inconsistent with its recent decisions about cuts, which have not been transparent. The Arts Council thereby trips itself up.” Another said: “The cuts are seen as hostile – made by Philistines. There is a huge rebuilding job to do”.

The publication of the McMaster review and announcement of the Arts Council’s funding decisions clearly tended to undermine and reduce the impact of the arts debate for interviewees, and they thought there would have been an even more marked effect on those who had been less closely involved in the arts debate. Some interviewees questioned why coordination with McMaster had not been handled better by DCMS and the Arts Council. The McMaster review’s ideas about peer review informing the Arts Council’s funding decisions prompted comments from some interviewees; they saw this as contradicting the arts debate’s findings on a role for the public in decision making.

### 3.4 Conclusions

The two main messages that emerged from the interviews were that:

- interviewees felt positive about the process of the arts debate. They would like to see some form of dialogue continue, involving the Arts Council, its direct

constituents (individual artists and arts organisations) and, if possible, representatives of the general public. They also generally approved the set of goals identified by the Arts Council for itself, although they did not feel that the Arts Council had been specific enough about how it would go about achieving those goals

- there was scepticism about whether the Arts Council would change any of its processes or its decisions based on the findings of the debate. This scepticism was reinforced by what the interviewees perceived to be the very unfortunate timing of the recent funding allocation announcements, which lacked connection to ideas from the arts debate, and the publication of the McMaster review

Other key challenges for the Arts Council to consider, which some interviewees raised, include:

- the unresolved dichotomy between excellence and access, and the implications of placing greater focus on the quality of experience of those who use or consume the art
- the call to include artists in setting the agenda, but without becoming too swayed by individual artists' self-interest.



## Appendix A: Interviewees

---

Andrew Brewerton	Principal, Dartington College of Art, Chair Arts Council England South West, member National Council of Arts Council England
Philip Cullum	Acting Chief Executive, National Consumer Council
Mick Gallagher	Chief Executive, Boston Borough Council
Vikki Heywood	Executive Director, Royal Shakespeare Company
Paul Kirkman	Head of Arts, Department for Culture, Media and Sport
Michael Lynch	Chief Executive Officer, Southbank Centre
Dick Penny	Managing Director, Watershed Media Centre
Mark Robinson	Executive Director, Arts Council England North East
Anthony Sargent	General Director, The Sage Gateshead
Sara Selwood	Professor of Cultural Policy and Management, City University
Erica Whyman	Chief Executive, Northern Stage



## Appendix B: Question to interviewees

---

### The arts debate: your reflections, perceptions and expectations

Interviews, January 2008

#### Questions to all interviewees

1. How do you perceive the arts debate? In your view, how is the arts debate being perceived, by:
    - your sector/peers
    - other relevant stakeholders (who are they?)
    - the Arts Council itself?
  2. Has the arts debate made a difference so far? If so, to whom?
  3. How would you rate the quality of the process, e.g.
    - the adequacy of opportunities during the debate to offer your perspective
    - the adequacy of opportunities for other groups to offer their perspectives (do you think any important group(s) were left out?)
    - the adequacy of the Arts Council's communications about the arts debate
    - what worked well
    - what could have been done better?
  4. What are the most pressing issues emerging from the arts debate that you would like to see the Arts Council respond to?
  5. The Arts Council has identified a number of key areas where it believes it needs to change in response to the arts debate findings:
    - greater clarity of mission based on quality of artistic experience
    - more purposeful decision-making based on achieving a balance of core outcomes (excellence, innovation, diversity, reach and engagement)
    - greater fairness, transparency and accountability, with greater scope for taking risks
    - improved relationships with partners, particularly funded organisations
    - ongoing dialogue between the Arts Council, arts community, public and other stakeholders
    - more powerful advocate for the value of the arts in people's lives today
- Do you agree that these challenges should be the primary focus for the Arts Council going forward? How would you like to see the Arts Council address these challenges? What if anything is missing?

6. Do you think the Arts Council will indeed make these changes?
  - If yes, which ones, how and on what timescale?
  - If not, why not?
7. Does the arts debate present the wider arts sector with any new opportunities or challenges?

### **Other questions**

*(up to two further questions, from among those below, put to the relevant interviewee(s))*

8. How might the arts debate support and inform the Board's strategic leadership of the organisation, decision-making and governance?
9. How should the Board agree, lead and deliver any change programme resulting from the arts debate?
10. Can the National Council learn anything from the arts debate about its own role?
11. What (if any) influence is the arts debate having on the National Council's broader ambitions for the organisation?
12. What does the arts debate mean for the relationship between the Arts Council and DCMS and the 'arms-length principle'?
13. What are the implications for the relationship between the Arts Council and funded organisations?
14. How can the Arts Council work with the wider arts sector to respond collectively to the arts debate findings?
15. Does the arts debate present local government with any new opportunities or challenges??
16. What are the implications for the relationship between the Arts Council and local government-funded arts?
17. What are the Arts Council's ongoing public engagement challenges and opportunities?
18. How does the arts debate relate to the history of cultural policy in the UK?