



The Radcliffe Trust

Heritage and Crafts: working together to develop skills and sustain the sector

24 March 2011, Mary Ward House, 5/7 Tavistock Place, London WC1H 9SN

Summary notes of the sessions

9.50-10.00 Welcome

Jo Reilly, Head of Participation and Learning at the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) and Carole Milner, Adviser to the Radcliffe Trust (RT) Heritage & Crafts Programme, welcomed RT and HLF grantees for their respective grantee workshops. They explained the tight schedule and the main objective for the day, which was to identify the strong messages and action points that could be taken forward from the event. Introductory notes had been provided for each session so as to facilitate this process.

10.00-11.45 HLF grantee sharing workshop, including:

- a) **Sharing practice from Training Bursaries**
- b) **Workforce diversity**

Introductory notes: *Meeting as a cohort of ten project managers since 2005, our Training Bursary programme grantees have developed and shared a great deal of best practice linked to work-based heritage training. This session will bring them together with our Skills for the Future programme grantees to discuss practical issues around recruitment, trainee support and increasing workforce diversity.*

Carole Brown (ICON) presented on the importance of quality standards in training projects. She introduced the aims and scope of the £1.38m HLF funded Training Bursaries project:

- Tackling the shortage of people skilled to carry out work on major heritage projects
- Addressing the diversity of the sector – increasing the variety of routes for getting into heritage conservation
- UK-wide, covering the public and private sectors
- Interns placed with experienced practitioners as supervisors
- Targeted disciplines where little/no training is available
- At least half the intake come from non-traditional backgrounds
- Additional 10 placements from other funders levered in
- 70 placements of 12, 24 and 6 months over 6 years
- 51 completers to date; numbers into employment – 39; numbers into training – 10.

The need to demonstrate quality was at the heart of the Skills for the Future programme. Carole stressed the importance of creating a quality experience for *everyone* involved in the project: trainees; supervisors; host organisations; and HLF (and other funders). She stressed the importance of planning and evaluation, not only to measure the quality of the training and

development delivered but also the overall experience of the partners and hosts. One had to know whether all the project targets had been met, for example, increased diversity and sustainability for the trainees – future employment or training and progression of individuals.

To ensure quality, Carole stressed the importance of:

- Investing time in a robust recruitment process;
- Creating a reporting system between the trainee and the grantee;
- Engaging with the key personnel involved in the training delivery and offering them development and support;
- Creating an active network and organising sharing events;
- Building in evaluation from the beginning and constantly monitoring quality;
- Taking a whole-career view with the trainee and supporting them beyond the placement.

Phil Burton (Herefordshire Nature Trust) introduced the £1m LEMUR Training Bursaries project which offered:

- 'On the job' practical hands-on skills offering a fast track route into nature conservation and membership to a professional network;
- 54 diverse and structured training placements.

The project involved a wide range of hosts and partnership arrangements and contracts were signed. He stressed the need for continuous co-working to get the project right and, once again, the importance of recruitment, induction and monitoring through Individual Learning Plans and portfolio content, visits to hosts and exit interviews.

Network Opportunities were built into the project and the trainees were given the message that 'being a LEMUR' is being part of a bigger thing. They organised regular team-build events, central training events bringing dispersed trainees together, open days at host sites where the trainees were encouraged to meet the public and a 'graduation' ceremony.

Promotion and celebration were key. Press releases were linked to the project milestones and they achieved national press with BBC Wildlife, broad sheets and the newsletters of professional bodies and had involvement from TV personalities. Trainees were involved in providing content for:

- An interactive and informative web-site;
- A leaflet;
- A sector conference at Kew gardens; and
- A promotional film.

Caitlin Griffiths (Museum Association) shared the lessons of the MA's Diversify programme. People from ethnic minorities, people with disabilities and people from less affluent backgrounds are under-represented in the museum and gallery workforce. The Diversify scheme made museum careers more accessible to people from these groups. In 1998, working with a range of partners, the Diversify scheme began with the MA establishing a sustainable programme of positive-action bursaries and traineeships. Positive-action under the Race Relations Act 1976 allows for targeted training programmes or encouragement in certain circumstances. A comprehensive toolkit relating to the scheme is here: www.museumsassociation.org/download?id=98529

10.00 -11.45 Radcliffe Trust grantee workshop:

a) Support and funding needs (10-11am)

Introductory notes: RT grantees are often those who find it difficult to access funding elsewhere. They are those to whom even small amounts of flexibly-applied funding can make a real difference. What are the main challenges such organisations face? Looking to the future, what do funders such as the RT need to be thinking about if they want to provide the best forms of support?

26 RT grantees attended this workshop, together with four RT/TTP representatives. Grantees represented the whole spectrum of our activity.

i) Grantees expressed their appreciation for being invited to attend the event. Many were small, worked in isolation and had few resources when it came to making applications and following up. They felt it was reassuring and inspiring to share with other grantees and the RT.

ii) With respect to RT, they particularly appreciated:

- the simplicity of the application process – it was important to have a structure to follow e.g. headings, but this was preferable to a complicated application form;
- having friendly people they could talk to and who could provide help and advice (RT and TTP);
- flexibility when dealing with unexpected problems or changes;
- the willingness to take risks;
- the RT's independence;
- even small amounts of money that could make a big difference, particularly as these often provided leverage for other grants.

iii) Some of the difficulties expressed in terms of funding were as follows:

- Many organisations are small, have few resources and need support themselves, especially when developing new projects, which is risky for them.
- Individual bursaries remain very expensive because of the nature of the work being taught
- In those areas less likely to receive support from HLF (such as HE, ongoing programmes, what is perceived as core activity) support from independent trusts and foundations (ITFs) is crucial but competition for funds is consequently very high.
- Heritage crafts skills are falling between the cracks; the perception is that none of the public agencies (e.g. Arts Council, Crafts Council, HLF etc) support these and that their importance as living crafts is not always appreciated.
- Some funders were mentioned as having been particularly helpful in the past to small organisations, largely because of their approachability and flexibility.
- More work is needed with young people, not just at careers advice level but in schools and at a younger age.
- The elephant in the room was the problem around vocational training and the need to rehabilitate this. Young people interested in vocational training should not be patronised but inspired and supported at an early stage. The relationship between Master Craftsmen and apprentices needs to be maintained and the Masters also need support to be able to pass on their skills.
- In some areas there are no recognised qualifications and funding is needed to help plug the gaps and build the missing qualifications.
- Overall there needs to be a careful balance between support for skills development, support for projects providing the market for those skills, and educational and community-based projects.
- HLF is the biggest funder and plays a pivotal role. It has achieved an enormous amount but it was felt there was more that could be done by HLF to address the sorts of issues raised here. Hopefully these voices will be heard in the current consultation.

iv) It was recognised that it was not possible for RT to continue funding all the ongoing projects as well as to support new ones. Grantees understood the need for appropriate break points in year-on-year funding but asked that this should be made clear and should be planned; with proper notice so as to ensure that funding did not all disappear at the same time. There was a need for funders to work together on this.

v) It would be interesting to see if a more strategic approach to such questions, and to funding overall, could be adopted by independent funders.

b) Engaging young people (11 –11.45am)

Introductory notes: *Many RT grantees work with young people. Their work covers areas such as: raising awareness at school-level of career possibilities in the Heritage and Crafts (H&C) sector; inviting young people into the workplace to see the opportunities and challenges for themselves; engaging young people who are disaffected from school or not in education, training or employment (NEETS); providing volunteering, apprenticeship and training opportunities; providing the back-up to enable young people to launch into business for themselves.*

How important is it to raise awareness of the opportunities for young people in the H&C sector at an early stage and how best can this be done? What are the blocks to young people entering the sector? How useful have H&C projects proved in engaging the interest of otherwise disaffected young people? What are the greatest needs for support in working with young people?

Representatives from Ernest Cook Trust, Crafts Council, NADFAS and West Dean/Edward James Foundation joined us for this session. It was interesting to note that Ernest Cook also funded about half of the organisations present. This was a short workshop and it was acknowledged that it could only be the start of a conversation. We were aiming, nevertheless, to get at the strong messages to take forward.

- It was agreed it would be useful to ensure more careers guidance was provided regarding possibilities in the H&C sector. Several young NEETS had raised this as a lack in schools and colleges.
- However it was felt that the point at which careers-advice was given in schools was possibly already too late and that more needed to be done earlier, even in primary schools, to raise the profile of H&C as livelihoods, not just hobbies. It was acknowledged that the school curriculum was already crowded but the point should continue to be made.
- It was felt very strongly that more needed to be done to rehabilitate crafts and skills and to overturn the perception of vocational work as being 2nd-class. There is a need to re-constitute a "crafts culture" and to promote H&C as a growth industry. H&C taken together represent a significant economic grouping. The industry needs to be forward-looking, promoting living skills and livelihoods not dead skills preserved only in museums.
- More taster sessions are needed at an early stage.
- More support is needed in terms of advice, support and mentoring for start-up businesses (see Cockpit Arts and Craft Central initiatives).
- More research and evidence was needed to make the case for the opportunities provided in the H&C sector.

12.15-13.00 Plenary session: Qualifications and standards - making sense of the new progression routes

Presenter: David Tournay, Evolution Partnership; Chair: Jo Reilly, HLF

Panel: Jenny Godsalve, Creative and Cultural Skills; Kevin Patrick, Lantra; Jessie Buscombe, National Apprenticeships Service; Carol Brown, Icon; John Taylor, Livery Skills Council

Introductory notes: *To anyone of any age who is intent on pursuing a career in the heritage and crafts sector, the question of which qualifications, academic, vocational and/or professional, to aim for is a crucial one. The cost and time involved can be substantial and it is vital that qualifications at any level, and the standards they imply, have credibility and are widely recognised both inside and outside the sector. A number of government- and professional body-led initiatives exist. At the centre of these is the new Qualifications and Credit Framework – what opportunities does it offer the sector? Together, do the initiatives provide a consistent and coherent framework (and, if not, why not?) and how do we make sense of them?*

David Tournay described the new Qualifications and Credits Framework (QCF) and the opportunities it offered the sector to develop qualifications that were employer-led and fit for purpose. He explained the basic concepts of the QCF and that it was based on National Occupational Standards (NOS). He set QCF in the context of the whole range of qualifications

and standards currently prevalent in the H&C sector and produced a handout to explain the relationships between them. These qualifications each performed different roles with respect to: academic attainment; proof of performance; proof of vocational capability; licence to practice; quality assurance, etc. The QCF offered the sector the opportunity to create a blended model of qualifications, not what we currently had, which was a confusing raft of different qualifications. He demonstrated how a heritage organisation could take advantage of the QCF through a case study of The Pioneer Sailing Trust of which he is a Trustee. The Trust had developed its own Level 2 qualifications in timber selection and caulking to give their apprentices all they needed to augment a standard marine engineering qualification.

In many cases there are no colleges or training bodies providing qualifications, particularly at apprenticeship level (QCF levels 2 and 3) and employers could step in to provide these. Taken together, the H&C sector represents a significant grouping. Within it there are currently over 130 Awarding Bodies and six Sector Skills Councils (SSCs). Could not a consortium be established to provide a holistic overview, fill the identified gaps and work towards the blended model that was needed?

Felix Warnock, Chair of the Radcliffe Trust and Jenny Abramsky, Chair of HLF, welcomed participants to the afternoon plenary sessions.

14.10-15.10 Shaping HLF's future direction on heritage skills - an opportunity to contribute to an open debate about HLF's proposed new strategic framework

Presenter: Jenny Abramsky, Chair, HLF; Panel: Jo Reilly and Karen Brookfield, HLF and past recipients of the HLF Training Bursaries programme: Billy Reid (Historic Scotland), Claire Pearson (National Portrait Gallery), Leanne Tonkin (People's History Museum, Manchester), and Alison Chapman (Kew).

Introductory notes: Since 1994 HLF has provided £4.5 billion of support to the heritage sector. The Government's announcement of an increase in our share of Lottery good causes income to 20% by 2012-13, amounting to around £50 million extra money a year, was an extremely welcome boost for the UK's heritage. From 2013 to 2019, HLF will have an annual awards budget of around £300 million. We have recently launched our public consultation on the future of Lottery funding for heritage, including whether we ought to consider further targeted initiatives to promote heritage skills. In this session Jenny Abramsky will introduce the scope of this consultation and ask delegates to consider what our future priorities ought to be.

The session began with an introduction to the scope of the consultation and in particular the skills issues that HLF sought feedback on:

- Jenny discussed her pride in the Skills for the Future programme, launched in 2009, which built on the success of our Training Bursaries initiative and thanked the project managers for coming together to share their views - the work they were doing to develop trainee-centred programmes, to create entry routes into our sector for a wider range of people and to build up our sector's knowledge of the benefits of work-based training was very welcome.
- She spoke of her amazement at the sector's response to the Skills for the Future programme. With a short lead-in time it attracted many more high-quality applications than had originally expected and HLF Trustees were so impressed they eventually awarded £17m to the programme, over three times the original budget.
- But should we do it again was our question for today - in the consultation, and in this session, the audience was asked to think about:
 - whether this high level of demand continues
 - whether HLF should run a skills programme again, and if so, what skills it should focus on?
 - how we can demonstrate and evidence the need for more heritage training?

- what the likelihood is that our trainees will find jobs and be retained in the sector? Our Training Bursaries evaluation tells us that 89% of trainees so far have gone on to work or further training in the sector which was great news; were we likely to see similar high rates of employment as a result of Skills for the Future?

Some of the main points raised during the discussion were as follows:

- Training Bursaries were good schemes and met the needs of the sector; continued funding should be offered to keep them going. Knowledge learned over the past six years would soon be lost if they all end.
- Many organisations had not been successful in Skills for the Future. Could successful organisations mentor those who would like to apply again if the opportunity arises?
- Could HLF play a role in brokering relationships between heritage and training organisations?
- HLF should consider broadening its definition of skills to include a wider range of heritage craft skills. Traditional skills and skills at risk need to come in urgently under HLF's remit. Skills should be valued in themselves as part of our intangible heritage. Where it was still possible, they should be maintained as living skills, which provide livelihoods, and not just preserved in aspic.
- It was a huge wasted opportunity not to ensure that the training element built into capital projects was fully enacted and adequately policed. It makes no sense to give HLF more Lottery money to distribute without the staff to ensure this money is properly spent and grant conditions are fully monitored. Once work is sub-contracted, the training elements sometimes get lost. HLF shouldn't just be ticking boxes but checking systematically on this with the necessary staff resources to do so.
- The main commercial contracting companies need to be brought into this dialogue. They are also the ones working for private owners. All main contractors working on heritage should have CSCS cards.
- How does HLF support smaller organisations?
- It is important to ensure that work is there for those who are being trained and that the balance between projects and training initiatives is maintained in the funding portfolio. Companies need to have work so that they can invest in training.
- Cathedrals are unfortunately not eligible for HLF's Places of Worship scheme but there is a great need there. Could there be a Cathedral scheme?
- Micro and small businesses, Master Craftsmen and sole traders should be supported to take on trainees so that they can pass on their skills, knowledge and experience.
- Alongside HLF, Sector Skills Councils should be working together much more, joining up dots and providing a holistic overview of the H&C sector. This should include support for micro and small businesses and apprenticeships. What is the role of CCS in monitoring the quality of training provided in the sector?
- HLF should keep up the momentum on Training Bursaries and Skills for the Future and continue to encourage training culture in the sector.

The session ended with lively presentations from four recipients of HLF Training Bursaries who each talked about their training experience, the value of learning on the job and the positive impact on their career path.

HLF had tabled a questionnaire inviting written responses to the skills questions in the consultation. 34 delegates chose to complete this questionnaire and the responses are included in Appendix 1.

15.20-16.30 A voice to the sector - debating the needs of the Heritage and Crafts sector and how best to meet them.

Chair: Carole Milner; Panel: Alison Richmond, Icon; Patricia Lovett, Heritage Crafts Association (HCA); David Knight, Church Buildings Council (CBC); Paul Simon, National Heritage Training Group (NHTG); Kate Pugh, The Heritage Alliance (THA)

Introductory notes: A range of organisations in the sector will set out the key issues they see affecting its future, both collectively and individually. How do these resonate with the many other organisations present? What are the strong challenges that need to be addressed and who is in the best position to do this? Questions will be taken from the floor and responses will be welcomed particularly from the funding bodies and support agencies present.

The main issues raised by the speakers and subsequently in discussion for the most part reflected and confirmed discussions in previous sessions. Support is particularly needed in the following areas:

i) Infrastructure support for small organisations, particularly in the form of development grants which are time-limited, supported by a business plan and realistically based on full cost recovery. The sector felt it needed to be helped to help itself and not get into the trap of grant dependency. There should be a focus on growing organisations for a sustainable future. Core costs need funding; full cost recovery not always enough.

ii) Involving, engaging and training young people including: work in schools; taster days and "bite-sized" chunks of work experience that young people respond to; recompense for individuals and micro and small businesses providing training and apprenticeships; engagement particularly with young NEETS; strong advocacy for a change in the "dirty word" attitude to vocational training, for bursaries and possibly even student loans for this; carrots and sticks to be used with contractors to ensure that the training requirements embedded in the procurement process are respected and monitored e.g. through NHTG; advice and mentoring for start-up businesses.

iii) Funding for the work that needs to be done to preserve and maintain the stock of historic buildings and contents including our 16,000 nationwide CE churches. 12,500 of these are listed and all have churchyards which also constitute an important element of the natural environment (when aggregated they would create a space the size of a national park). Support and advice also needs to be provided to those such as local congregations who have to make applications, take them forward and manage the work to the correct standard but who are often inexperienced in these matters.

iv) Help to smaller, representative organisations such as professional bodies who, for example, have a key role to play on behalf of a whole sector in setting standards and providing professional qualifications that equate to a right to practice, especially in conservation. Funders, whether public or independent, can also play an important part in supporting standards through their grant-giving. Developing professional qualifications is worthwhile and the sector needs to use and recognise them.

v) The heritage crafts need support as living crafts providing livelihoods and there is a particular urgency in the case of skills at risk. Responsibility for crafts is currently falling between the different public agencies and this needs to be addressed. The UK should also sign up to UNESCO's Intangible Heritage convention for the recognition and protection of heritage skills.

vi) Clarity about whose role it is to carry out research across the H&C sector, providing the facts, figures and overview that enable a proper "industry" case for support to be made. Also needed - better long-term tracking of the impact of grants and an overview of the amount of grant-aid being provided. Without this type of information, how can funders be anything other than reactive?

v) The presence of so many funders was welcomed and their input was appreciated.

Carole Milner and Jo Reilly closed the final plenary and thanked those present for their participation.

After tea, a concluding session would be held for funders only.

17.00-18.00 Funders' Round Table (funders only) - reflections on the day and ways forward

Introductory notes: *What have we learnt that has been useful during the day? Can any of this inform our future thinking, either individually or as a group? Can we help raise and support standards? Is there a sufficient balance between support for training and support for the projects that provide the actual work that sustains the sector? What is our role with relation to that of a big public funder such as HLF? Whilst each preserving our individuality, is there scope for working together more?*

About 15 funding organisations were present. These were largely independent trusts and foundations (ITFs) whose primary function is the delivery of grants, but also livery companies, public funders and associated such as HLF, English Heritage and the Crafts Council and a small number of other organisations that give grants but also fundraise.

It was agreed that it had been invaluable for funders to hear the needs of the sector voiced directly and collectively and to meet other funders more widely, as at the previous Round Table event. It would be an advantage to all to be better informed about their respective grant-giving activities. A network was needed as not all present belonged to Association of Charitable Foundations (ACF). A better joined-up network of funders could be very powerful. All Trustees have a particular bent and all are looking for impact and cost-effectiveness. Better sharing of information through a network could enable funders to take a more pro-active stance in grant-making and so to achieve more impact. It could help raise standards, be used to stimulate the demand side and encourage improvements in practice.

Some more specific points were raised, many in relation to information sharing:

- Once HLF's major consultation on its future directions is over, it would be very useful if it sets out clearly what are likely to be its priorities. ITFs can then take proper account of this within their own grant-giving programmes, if they wish.
- Some organisations such as English Heritage are carrying out important research that provides overviews of potential use to everyone.
- There are many excellent candidates for grants but not all can be funded. More could be done to pass on this information e.g. QEST turns away 95% of very worthy projects, which have already been vetted and could be passed on very effectively.
- Small organisations do not know enough about independent funders and their workings. It would help to have more and better information.
- There is much more scope for work with young people: more work in schools, more taster days at an early stage, more NEETS work.
- There is a need for more development grants and support for core costs particularly for small organisations and membership organisations which may have large remits but limited income.
- The drop of £700m in the public purse for H&C will not be replaced by ITFs but better working together may, in time, enable a better distribution of ITF grant-aid.

Action

In order to improve our practice of grant-giving and the quality of the support we provide, it was agreed, as a start, that there should be more sharing of information about grants awarded and visits that are made to potential or current grantees. To be useful, this information should be shared as it is happening. Within the limits of data-protection, several organisations said they would be happy to pool this type of information electronically. It was suggested that LinkedIn could possibly be used. To begin with, all agreed to share email addresses.

The Trust Partnership (TTP) offered to provide some initial admin time to start this off. This was well received. Should the network develop further, there would be a need to review the resources needed to maintain it.

Some comments on the event:

I just wanted to send you an email to say thank you very much for a really interesting and inspiring morning. ... I think it is fantastic that The Radcliffe Trust wants to engage so closely with their fundees and find out how best they can support them

It provided an opportunity to discuss with other grantees progress on Skills for the Future projects and feedback to HLF. Listening to other funder's and grantee's priorities creates a perspective on what is going on and encourages us to reflect on what should be done in the future

Very important as funding is vital to encourage young employed people and people with transferable skills to train in the sector

I have to say that it was fantastically well organised and ran so smoothly

It will be very good if we can at least establish a method of communication between funders and others, about matters which may be of mutual interest

It was incredibly valuable to come together with the other Skills For the Future project managers in particular as well as funders and recipients of other similar grants, and to have an opportunity to talk openly about what the future may have in store for our sector

I just wanted to thank you for a really inspiring and well-organised day. I'm certainly glad I attended; I look forward to further events like it

Thank you for all the hard work that went into an excellent event last Thursday. Very informative, very enjoyable and very useful!

It was definitely worth it – I think we all left galvanized with new ideas, new contacts and a shared sense of the tasks which might lie ahead

[The theme of the conference is] a significant priority for us, both as an organisation (a museum) and a sector. We need more opportunities to work together and to think strategically

The most frequently heard comment from participants was that it was a truly unique event and the first time ever that such a range of people - public and independent funders, support agencies, beneficiaries and fundraisers - had been assembled to work together so successfully.

END