



CRONFA ARLOESI
DIGIDOL I'R
CELFYDDYDAU
YNG NGHYMRU

DIGITAL
INNOVATION
FUND FOR THE
ARTS IN WALES

PHASE TWO INTERIM REPORT



Cyngor Celfyddydau Cymru
Arts Council of Wales



Supported by
The National Lottery
through the Arts Council of Wales
Cefnogaidd gan
Y Loteri Genedlaethol



Noddir gan
Lywodraeth Cymru
Sponsored by
Welsh Government

INTRODUCTION

The Digital Innovation Fund for the Arts in Wales (the fund), launched on 1 October 2015, is a strategic partnership between Arts Council of Wales and Nesta. It is the successor to the Digital R&D Fund for the Arts in Wales that ran from 2013-2015.

The fund is supporting arts organisations to experiment using digital technology to enhance audience reach or to develop their business model. The programme has four phases, as detailed in the table below.

The fund differs from a traditional grant programme in that it is designed to support arts organisations through a process of experimentation – to investigate high-risk, high-potential projects, based around clear, testable research propositions. The results of these experiments are shared through events and publications so that the wider sector is able to learn from the experience.

This paper provides an interim report from the second phase of the fund – Build Teams and Generate Ideas. In this phase we provided financial and practical support to nine arts organisations to develop full Research and Development (R&D) proposals.

This report will include the following sections:

- **Fund activities** – the aims and structure of the second phase.
- **Data gathering** – the data gathered and reported on in this report.
- **Funded arts organisations** – an overview of the organisations we funded.
- **Project activity** – an overview of the activities carried out by the organisations we funded.
- **Expert feedback** – an overview of the feedback we received from arts and technology experts about the projects.
- **Arts organisation feedback** – an overview of the feedback we received from the arts organisations we funded.

We are encouraging all funded projects to share the lessons they learn as they progress, and this report is part of our attempt to do the same. It is important, we feel, that we respond directly to the feedback we have received, and to use it to shape the programme as it progresses.

We hope that other organisations supporting the arts sector, as commissioners or sector bodies, can learn from our experience. If you would like to know more about the fund, please contact us and we will be happy to discuss in more detail.

PHASES OF THE DIGITAL INNOVATION FUND FOR THE ARTS IN WALES

| PHASE | WHO'S IT OPEN TO? | WHAT ARE THE DATES? | HOW MUCH IS AVAILABLE? | IS THERE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT AVAILABLE? | HOW DO I APPLY? | DEADLINE |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---|--|--------------|
| 1. Identify Challenges and Opportunities | Any arts organisation or organisation with an arts project, based in Wales. | 1 Oct '15 - 11 Dec '15 | There's no funding available for this stage | Yes we're running workshops and surgeries across Wales to help you do this. You can sign up to a workshop or surgery. | N/a this is open to everyone. | |
| 2. Build Teams and Generate Ideas | Any arts organisation or organisation with an arts project in Wales. | 8 Feb '16 - 25 Apr '16 | £5,000 grant funding (fixed amount) | Yes, you'll attend three workshops and receive a day of business support as part of this stage of the programme. You'll also get support from our research manager. | Through our online application form. We'll also be running interviews for shortlisted projects. | 11 Dec '15 |
| 3. Research and Develop | Projects funded to undertake the team building and ideas generation stage. | June '16 - March '17 | up to £75,000 grant funding | Yes, you'll attend a comprehensive workshop programme and receive ongoing business and research support. | Through an application form and a pitch at the end of the team building and idea generation stage. | 25 Apr '16 |
| 4. Embed and Scale | Currently for projects funded through the predecessor Digital R&D Fund for the Arts in Wales. | Ongoing | TBC we are currently investigating risk-based financing options | Yes two days of business support for each project. Ongoing business support and mentoring for projects that receive investment. | TBC we're investigating options, depending on the type of finance that's offered. | Not yet open |

FUND ACTIVITIES

The aim of activity during phase two was to support arts organisations to build their project team and generate ideas as to how they could use digital technology to enhance their audience reach or to develop their business model.

Based on our experience of the previous fund (2013-2015), the decision was taken to ask arts organisations to make their initial application during phase one of the fund before having identified a technology partner to work with. This was to ensure that their digital project would start from a clear strategic challenge or opportunity before looking in detail at the specific technology. Our interim report from the first phase of the fund explains why we chose to take this approach.

During phase two, the arts organisations each developed a brief to put to prospective technology partners, and worked with their chosen partner to develop a full proposal for R&D funding of up to £75,000.

Each arts organisation funded during phase two received a £5,000 grant, with an expectation that half of this amount would be spent on securing the time of one or more technology companies to contribute to the development of their R&D proposal.

We delivered a series of workshops during this phase, and they are described in the table below.

| WORKSHOP | DESCRIPTION |
|--|---|
| Fund workshop 1 10 February 2016 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Networking and learning about the other projects.• Overview of the fund process during phase two.• Research planning – introduction to Research and Development.• Panel discussion – ten technology companies discussed what makes a good brief.• Technology surgeries – each arts organisation received feedback on their ideas from one of the technology companies. |
| Business support day 11-22 February 2016 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We commissioned a business development consultancy specialising in social enterprise to hold a one-day workshop with each of the nine funded projects. The workshop included a range of business planning activities to help them consider:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- How their proposal would effectively engage their intended audience or market.- The extent to which their proposal would require them to adapt their existing business model.- How they would engage key internal and external stakeholders in their work. |
| Fund workshop 2 16 March 2016 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Networking and hearing updates from each of the other projects.• Run through of the application form for full R&D funding.• Research planning – developing hypotheses and research questions. |
| Pitching day 25 April 2016 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rehearsal – each project was given a chance to run through their pitch in front of the other organisations, to give each other feedback and to hear about the other projects' work.• Pitching – each project then presented their pitch to a panel of twelve arts and technology experts, who were able to ask questions and provide some verbal feedback. |



DATA GATHERING

Data gathered during phase two included:

- **Post-application feedback survey** – the main feedback exercise from this phase was an online survey carried out immediately after applicants were informed of funding decisions. This was open to both the arts and technology organisations.
- **Technology company workshop feedback** – we carried a short survey of the technology organisations who offered their advice to the arts organisations at the first workshop.
- **Digital skills and activities survey** – a brief survey of digital skills and activities was carried out amongst the nine projects at the first workshop at the beginning of phase two.
- **Observations of project activity** – the fund team captured observations of project team activity to understand how they approached the development of their R&D proposal.
- **Applications** – we received nine completed application forms, one from each participating project.
- **Panel feedback** – we collected scores and feedback comments from twelve arts and technology experts who attended the pitching day.
- **Arts Council of Wales records** – we have used data held by the Arts Council of Wales to understand the context of each participating project and the wider arts sector in Wales.

We have included anonymised transcripts of the feedback we received from arts and technology companies as an annex, including:

- Post-application feedback survey.
- Technology company workshop feedback.
- The digital skills and activities survey.

FUNDED ARTS ORGANISATIONS: LOCATION, ART FORM AND TURNOVER

We funded a cohort of nine arts organisations during phase two, representing a wide range in terms of location, art form and size.

This cohort includes organisations based in local authorities across Wales: Cardiff, Rhondda Cynon Taff, Powys, Swansea and Gwynedd. This represents locations within each of the Arts Council of Wales regions.

Arts Council Wales divide the arts sector into six categories: community arts, music, theatre, visual and applied arts, arts venues and national companies. Our cohort of nine organisations included organisations from all but the last two of these categories, the venues and national companies. There were, however, strong applications to the fund from organisations within these two categories.

The following table gives an overview of the size of the organisations in our cohort, measured in terms of their annual turnover. This information was accessed from Arts Council Wales records relating to 2015/2016, with Companies House data for the same period.

As a point of comparison, we have also provided the turnover of organisations which belong to a group known in 2015 as the RFOs – these are the organisations which are provided with revenue funding by Arts Council of Wales. Since this data was collected this term has been changed to ‘Arts Portfolio Wales’ or APWs. We have also included a column which gives this information for the RFOs excluding the venues and national companies, as there are no organisations of this kind within our cohort. Four of the DIFAW phase two projects were also RFOs in 2015.

| TURNOVER (£000S) | DIFAW PHASE TWO PROJECTS (#) | | RFOS 2015 – EXCLUDING VENUES AND NATIONAL COMPANIES | | RFOS 2015 – ALL ORGANISATIONS (#) | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------|---|-------|---|-------|
| <100 | 1 | (11%) | 2 | (5%) | 2 | (3%) |
| 100-300 | 4 | (44%) | 16 | (37%) | 17 | (25%) |
| 300-500 | 2 | (22%) | 18 | (41%) | 22 | (33%) |
| >500 | 2 | (22%) | 8 | (18%) | 26 | (39%) |
| Total | 9 | | 44 | | 67 | |

FUNDED ARTS ORGANISATIONS: DIGITAL ACTIVITIES

At the first workshop delivered during phase two, we carried out a short survey of the digital activities carried out by the nine funded arts organisations. This was an exercise that drew on the Digital Culture Survey 2015, carried out amongst arts and heritage organisations in England.

The Digital Culture Survey included a section which asked arts and heritage organisations to state whether their organisation carried out a list of 27 digital activities. These activities were organised into five categories:

- Operations and new business models.
- Marketing.
- Reflection (production of content about arts or heritage).
- Mediation of existing work.
- Born digital (activities with no non-digital equivalent).

For the purpose of our survey, we selected ten activities from this list, including at least one from each category. A transcript of the data from this survey is included with the annex (note that this data also relates to individual skills and responsibilities, which is discussed in the next section).

As a point of comparison, the table also includes the relevant results from the Digital Culture Survey 2015, which received 984 responses from arts and heritage organisations across England. The data from the Digital Culture Survey is available to explore via a public access portal: <http://researchportal.artsdigitalrnd.org.uk/Home/Public>

Whilst this list of ten activities will not capture the full extent of these organisations' digital activities, it gives an indication of the different patterns of usage amongst this small cohort. All arts organisations we funded are already making some use of digital technology for their marketing and operations and seven of the nine organisations describe producing some digital content for audiences, including making existing recordings available for digital consumption and producing online educational content. Only one arts organisation (DSAAO4) was already engaged in producing 'born digital' work, which in their comments they note is carried out by contractors – "we contract specialists on a project by project basis to lead on digital activities" – with creative input from their own staff. Another organisation (DSAAO5) commented that they "support artists to develop and present digital art."

Any comparison made between our survey respondents and those in the 2015 Digital Culture Survey in England is hypothetical, and dependent on a number of assumptions. The pattern of digital activities may be quite different in England and Wales – the survey in England has found variations in levels of activity by region, artform, turnover and many other factors. The differences in the way that the two surveys were conducted may also account for some differences in the responses.

If it is the case that patterns of usage of digital technology reflected in the 2015 Digital Culture Survey in England is broadly similar to those in Wales, it would be possible that the nine organisations we have funded include some of the most digitally active arts organisations in Wales. Several of our cohort are engaged in the types of 'Born Digital' activity that in the England survey were only reportedly carried out by a minority of arts organisations – see, for example, the 'Born Digital' activity referred to above, and included as activity 9 in our survey.

On the same basis, it seems less likely that our cohort includes many, if any, of the least digitally active organisations in Wales. All nine of the organisations we have funded are using the most basic digital tools in some aspect of their work, whereas the survey in England has found that a consistent proportion of survey respondents did not do so – see, for example, activity 4 in our survey in the 'Marketing' category.

| ARTS ORGANISATION | OPERATIONS | | | MARKETING | | MEDIATION | | REFLECTION | BORN DIGITAL | | TOTAL # ACTIVITIES |
|--|------------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|----|------------|--------------|-----|--------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| DSAAO1 | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | N | N | 6 |
| DSAAO2 | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | N | N | 6 |
| DSAAO3 | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | N | N | 5 |
| DSAAO4 | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y | Y | 4 |
| DSAAO5 | Y | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | N | N | 4 |
| DSAAO6 | N | N | N | Y | Y | Y | N | N | N | N | 3 |
| DSAAO7 | N | Y | Y | Y | N | N | N | N | N | N | 3 |
| DSAAO8 | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | N | N | 3 |
| DSAAO9 | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N | N | 2 |
| % phase 2 projects (n=9) | 44% | 67% | 22% | 100% | 44% | 67% | 0% | 33% | 11% | 11% | |
| % Digital Culture 2015 respondents (n=984) | 34% | 41% | 19% | 86% | 31% | 52% | 7% | 37% | 23% | 23% | |

Key to activities:

Operations

1. Sell products or merchandise online.
2. Accept online donations.
3. Use crowdfunding platforms such as Kickstarter to raise money for new projects.

Marketing

4. Publishing content onto free platforms (e.g. YouTube, Facebook).
5. Track discussion about our organisation online by using free or paid software which monitors social media activity.

Mediation

6. Make existing recordings or archive material/exhibits available for digital consumption.
7. Provide online interactive tours of real-world exhibitions/spaces.

Reflection

8. Provide educational content or online events for schools and other audiences.

Born Digital

9. Standalone digital exhibits or works of art, i.e. without a non-digital equivalent.
10. Digital experiences designed to be used alongside and at the same time as the artwork or exhibition.

FUNDED ARTS ORGANISATIONS: PROJECT TEAMS

The nine arts organisations funded during phase two engaged a range of partners to deliver their project. These included:

- **Technology companies** – all arts organisations appointed a technology partner between weeks four and eight of this ten-week phase.
- **Arts partners** – one arts organisation led a consortium of three arts organisations brought together with the specific purpose of delivering this project. Another arts organisation was working closely with an existing project-based network of arts organisations.
- **Public sector and voluntary sector partners** – five of the arts organisations formally involved public or voluntary sector partners in their project, including schools, local/national government departments, and voluntary organisations supporting people with disabilities.
- **Artists** – four of the projects directly engaged artists in the development and delivery of their project.
- **Freelance arts professionals** – four of the arts organisations appointed freelancers to take a leading role in the management and delivery of their project.

Each arts organisation directly engaged two or more staff in the development of their proposal during phase two. Three of the projects directly engaged a higher number, three, four and five respectively.

There were therefore a total of 24 arts professionals engaged directly in the development of the projects during this phase, as follows:

- Four chief executives/artistic directors.
- Two board members.
- Seven senior/middle-managers.
- Seven learning/engagement officers.
- Four freelance arts professionals.

For the digital skills and activities survey, the staff were also asked to identify which of the activities they were directly responsible for and which were the responsibility of others. Sixteen individuals completed this exercise, with at least one person from each of the nine projects. Almost half (seven, 44 per cent) were not directly responsible for any of the activities, and one in four (four, 25 per cent) were directly responsible for three or more of the activities identified.



PROJECT ACTIVITY

This section describes the activities carried out by arts organisations during phase two, based on our observations and discussions with the projects.

We understand that the arts organisations carried out the following key tasks during phase two:

- Attended workshops and met with the DIFAW team.
- Held project team updates.
- Discussed their project with their networks in the wider arts sector.
- Refined and focussed their R&D proposal.
- Identified and met potential technology partners.
- Conducted desk-based research.
- Conducted primary research.
- Shortlisted and contracted technology partners.
- Prepared their application and pitch.

Whilst all arts organisations we funded have been through a broadly similar process, their experiences have been different based on their circumstances. The arts organisations' own perspectives are discussed in more detail further in the 'arts organisation feedback' section, below.

Based on our observations, we identified the following key variations in activity between the projects:

- **Developing new knowledge:** We saw that some individuals spent a considerable amount of time developing new knowledge to help them with the design and delivery of their project. We saw them study specific digital technologies and other organisations using them. We saw some of the group focus on exploring new working methods, including methods for conducting Research and Development, such as the use of 'lean' and 'agile' approaches. It is not possible for us to gauge the extent to which different individuals engaged in developing this kind of new knowledge, as this activity was largely self-directed. However our impression was that some had more/less interest and more/less time available to invest in developing this kind of knowledge during this period of the fund, outside of the formal fund activities.

- **Developing organisational buy-in:** In some cases, it was clear to us that people from all levels of the organisation – board members, management, front-line staff and wider stakeholders – were engaged and that the organisation was ready to explore new ways of working. In contrast, some of the projects were led by individuals who were fully committed to the project but working in circumstances where other priorities were occupying the organisation's focus. In such cases, the project teams had additional work to do to develop the necessary buy-in, which directly affected their ability to develop their proposal fully in the time available.
- **Conducting primary research:** We had not originally anticipated that the arts organisations would undertake primary research during phase two. In the event, four of the nine organisations decided that they needed additional data about their audiences or market to inform their proposal development. Whilst we are clear that this work will have had some benefit for those organisations, it was a substantial additional task. Primary research carried out by projects during this phase included:
 - Surveying arts professionals who were potential users of a proposed service, about their needs and expectations.
 - Gathering feedback from arts audiences, potential participants in proposed activity.
 - Holding workshops to consult artists and with non-arts stakeholders who would be engaged in the delivery of the proposed project.
- **Engaging technology partners:** We recommended to arts organisations that they look to appoint a technology company as a project partner by week four of the ten week process. Three of the nine organisations did so, with the remainder appointing their technology partner between weeks four and eight. We encouraged the arts organisations to meet several technology companies to ensure that they were able to find someone with whom they were confident they could develop a strong working relationship. In the event, some of the arts organisations met with only one or two potential partners whilst others made contact with a series of companies before coming to a decision. Whilst some of the organisations already had experience of commissioning a technology company and/or had access to technology expertise amongst their staff or board, others did not. Those with more expertise available to them were better placed to make a critical assessment of the information provided to them by prospective partners.

EXPERT FEEDBACK: WORKSHOP ONE

For the first workshop, we invited a group of ten individuals with extensive experience working in the technology sector, including some of the technology partners from the previous fund (2013-2015). They took part in a panel discussion in which they offered their advice to the arts organisation around how to develop a good quality brief to engage their technology partner. Following the panel discussion, we matched each arts organisation to one of the panel members, so that they could get some feedback on their ideas at this early stage in the process.

At the end of the session, we invited the panel members to give written feedback, including what they felt the fund team could do to support the arts organisations going forward. We received responses and a full transcript of their comments is included in the annex.

The positive feedback emphasised the arts organisations' ability to articulate the reasons for undertaking this work, and their openness to new ideas and ways of working.

“They have a good understanding of the core issue they wanted to respond to. [They are] Open to ideas and thoughtful and excited.”

“They were very receptive to advice on how to improve their approach to their problem.”

Where the feedback suggested areas for improvement they emphasised the need to translate their broader ideas into a clear focus and set of practical aims.

“[It would have been better if] They were able to specify certain ambitions within financial scope.”

“[They need to] Work on simplifying the problem ‘although it’s a big problem.’”

We also asked the survey respondents to identify the ways in which they felt the fund could support the development of the arts organisations' capacity to use digital technology. The need to develop a clearer focus for their proposal was identified by several respondents – as the workshop was at the start of this phase, it is to be expected.

“The project needs distilling into core deliverables - i.e., the output needs to be a little clearer! I feel some progress was made today... in the first instance, time needs to be spent on developing a narrative and looking at a potential business model and architecture as this seems key to their ‘problem.’”

Several respondents suggested that the arts organisations' capacity would be developed best if we were to support them to further develop their networks in the technology sector.

“To start helping them create scenarios of what ‘it’ would be. Also maybe get them to speak to a few ‘site specific’ based project people who have used tech.”

“They need a part time producer/digital consultant based within the [organisation] - there is so much potential.”



EXPERT FEEDBACK: PITCHING DAY

Following the submission of their application for funding for their full R&D proposal, all nine projects were brought together for a pitching day. At this workshop, each of the nine project teams presented to a panel of arts and technology experts.

This exercise was one aspect of the application process, alongside the application form. It had a number of additional benefits. It provided an opportunity for us to gain feedback about the programme and the projects we had supported so far, including key areas for development for each of the projects and for the fund programme. It provided an opportunity for us to share our experience of delivering the fund, and it was an opportunity for the projects to develop their skills and confidence in presenting their work with digital technology. And it also provided an opportunity to support the development of stronger links between the arts and technology sectors in Wales.

The panel members were asked to give the projects two scores, one for the project idea and one for the team. They also included comments against those scores, and general feedback comments. Not all panel members scored all projects in both criteria. A copy of the pitching feedback sheet, including detailed criteria, is included as an annex.

The following table provides a graphical overview of the scores given.

| PANEL MEMBER | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PROJECT TEAM | P | T | P | T | P | T | P | T | P | T | P | T |
| PT1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| PT2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| PT3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| PT4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| PT5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| PT6 | 1 | 1 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| PT7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| PT8 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| PT9 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

These scores can be summarised:

- Two of the nine project teams (PT1 and PT2) received consistently higher scores from the panel than the other seven, receiving 2/2 for both criteria from six and eight of the panel members, respectively, and 2/2 for at least one criteria from eight or more of the panel members.
- The next highest scoring project team (PT3) received 2/2 for both criteria from three of the panel members, and received 2/2 for at least one criteria from seven panel members.
- Of the six remaining project teams, four (PT4, PT5, PT6 and PT7) received 2/2 for both criteria from one or two panel members, and received 2/2 for at least one criteria from up to three panel members.
- Two project teams (PT8 and PT9) did not receive 2/2 for both criteria from any panel members and received 2/2 from at least one panel member for each of the two criteria.

The feedback comments from panel members help to explain the basis on which they gave individual projects higher or lower scores. As the comments refer in some detail to specific proposals we have not included quotes but we can provide a summary of the points they made.

The panel identified in their comments that they gave higher scores where pitch had the following features:

- Identified a clear niche or focus area, rather than looking to address a broad area of their work.
- Clearly set out how their product or service would have a specific and measurable impact.
- Gave reasons why there was a need to develop a new product or service rather than using existing tools, including why existing tools were unsuitable, or what was needed to make existing tools useful in a specific set of circumstances.
- Explained how their project would build on previous testing or feedback.
- Included evidenced insights about specific audience groups.
- Described what the offering would look like, and how it would provide a positive experience for the audience or user.
- Provided a convincing case as to how they would have an advantage over their competitors.
- Set out how they would be able to access expert knowledge about the new area into which they intended to move (new audiences, new markets and/or new technology).
- Displayed a thorough understanding of the data their product or service would handle, and how this would be appropriately managed.
- Showed the arts organisation had investigated a broad range of potential technology partners.
- Demonstrated that the team members understood each other's skills and capacity.
- Convincingly conveyed a shared sense of ownership from the team, including the arts organisation and the technology partner, that they had jointly arrived at the idea for their proposal.

Conversely, where panel members gave lower scores they felt that some or all of these elements were missing or not fully demonstrated by the pitch.

ARTS ORGANISATION FEEDBACK

The following section provides an overview of the range of feedback we received from arts organisations who engaged in phase two, and some of our initial responses to the points raised.

The quotes here are taken from a survey carried out following the funding decisions at the conclusion of this phase. We received feedback responses from seven of the nine project teams, and two declined to give feedback. The responses were anonymous. A transcript of all feedback comments is included with the annex.

Time management and expectations

Every feedback response received, without exception, commented that they found it challenging to dedicate the amount of time necessary to fully engage in the process.

“The amount of time needed to be dedicated to this project was far more than I was expecting, and for a small arts organisation this was to the detriment of other projects and tasks... [A way to improve the fund would be to] make all smaller organisations aware of how much time they will need to spend on the project, maybe offering them project management assistance.”

-Respondent A

We feel that this is an important aspect of the programme to address in future – helping arts organisations to clearly see what they will need to do in order to engage fully in the process, which means being prepared to dedicate time to the R&D process as well as dedicating time to the proposed project activity.

This report has provided an overview of the key tasks completed by the arts organisations, and building on this may be one way in which we can help to provide clearer expectations as to what the R&D process involves.

It may also be the case that, as the above feedback response suggests, there may be options that we can explore with projects about ways in which we can provide them with additional capacity, to allow key staff to engage more fully in the process with the limited time that they have.

The following feedback response describes the sense that some arts organisations would have been willing to accept a more rigid structure.

“It was equally helpful and unhelpful to be given so much freedom, although it’s understood that all organisations are different and a ‘catch all’ process is difficult to define. I think it’s a definite that [Nesta and Arts Council of Wales] can easily be more forthright in stating ‘exactly’ what they want in respect of outcomes, without feeling overbearing. If you can offer future participants a series of deadlines to

aim for, in hiring a digital partner, submitting research plans etc., then I think those are just one of a range of things you could do to offer people a greater sense of structure. People, generally, don't mind being given frameworks to work to and, having spoken to other participants, as long as lead times and deadlines are realistic, they'd appreciate [Nesta and Arts Council of Wales] setting more of the rules."

- Respondent G

Our own view at this stage is that we would like to explore ways that we could provide additional capacity to enable arts organisations to manage their time more easily, rather than creating a more rigid structure. It does, however, underline the importance of being absolutely clear on expectations, timelines and outcomes so that arts organisations have a clear framework to guide their planning.

Developing new knowledge and networks

Although the arts organisations felt that the process was demanding, some suggested that they gained new knowledge and new networks as a result of the time they invested.

"The application process forced organisations to reconsider methods of examining organisational structures and problems and it was certainly a lengthy and in-depth process of applying the theory of change, that required considerable input of staff time across the organisation... the focused and detailed research, evaluation and interpretation required has forced us to better examine and understand our organisational strength and weaknesses."

-Respondent F

"Digital innovation is not an area I'm familiar with, so the process of turning our identified challenge into a digital solution required a steep (but rewarding) learning curve."

-Respondent C

This included individuals who say they would have liked to have developed some of this new knowledge before they had begun this part of the process.

“I was a little naïve about the amount of work it would take... I had little experience of tech projects and in retrospect should have looked into the process in the commercial sector as since our project has finished I’m more aware of the nature of the industry, which I feel would have given me more insight into the process involved in hindsight.”

-Respondent B

“I am a relatively new Board member and found my knowledge of the sector was somewhat lacking... The [business support] day expanded my knowledge base.”

-Respondent D

The following feedback response, which focusses on the opportunity to develop their networks, suggests that they would have been able to realise greater benefits had this phase been longer.

“The process offered an opportunity to work and develop ideas in a new way for our company and provided the chance to meet and discuss initial ideas with various tech providers and other arts organisations. This element of ‘scoping’ and development I found very exciting and opened up new possibilities for both discussion and distillation of the concept (s) I came into the process with. This was positive but reasonably time consuming and I felt I wanted MORE time with this phase (between being accepted on [the programme] and writing the application) to allow for enough time to meet tech partners and digest which way would be the best for the company... I felt I needed more time with my tech partners to have adequate space to develop and formulate the proposed concept.”

-Respondent E

Preparation for business support

Two of the respondents commented that, for them, the business support workshop was not quite appropriate to the stage of development that their project had reached.

“The business support day wasn’t completely appropriate for the stage we were at in the project, which may be our fault more than the programme. I think that perhaps a more tailored experience with appropriate speakers would have been more helpful.”

-Respondent B

“The Theory of Change / Business Development workshop was really interesting and broadly useful to a degree, but it didn’t seem to inform our project proposal at the time it was delivered.”

-Respondent C

We deliberately included the business support day at the very earliest opportunity, in order to encourage projects to develop a focus early in the process on their target audience or market and the potential implications for their business model of the project they were proposing. In our experience, engaging with this way of thinking early in the process helps to ensure that there is momentum behind the project at the end of the R&D funding.

Nonetheless, the feedback here suggests that there may be scope for improving how we help arts organisations to prepare for these sessions so that they are able to get the most from them.

An institutional openness to new ways of working

Some of the respondents commented that there was a need for the whole organisation to be open to new ideas and ready to start a process of learning and change. The following two comments were both in response to the question of whether they would recommend the programme to other arts organisations:

“I would recommend the programme to other organisations, however I would stress the amount of work it takes, and the need for the whole organisation to be behind the project, and that they have the capacity for it.”

-Respondent B

“There would be a [few] qualifiers for my recommendation - firstly the issue of capacity (R&D requires dedicated staff time), and secondly I think there needs to be an institutional openness to new ways of working.”

-Respondent C

We agree that these are important factors. This phase of the fund was intended, in part, to be an opportunity to prepare the whole organisation as well as the immediate project team. This may be an area that would benefit from further study, as to how we can effectively support organisations that are more or less prepared for this kind of process of organisational change.

FURTHER STUDY AND DEVELOPMENT

At the time of writing, we are at the mid-point of phase three of the fund during which we are supporting five arts organisations to undertake research and development.

Based on the feedback we have received from fund participants during phase two, and our own observations, we have identified the following factors as being important in supporting the arts sector in Wales to make more effective use of digital technology:

- Reach and influence – generating insights that are relevant to organisations across the arts sector in Wales.
- Building capacity – achieving the right balance between being challenging and being practical within time and resource constraints.
- Arts-technology networks – building stronger links between arts and technology professionals.

In the following section, we address each of these themes in turn, describing how we intend to incorporate what we've learned so far into our ongoing project delivery and evaluation.

Reach and influence

The work of the fund so far has engaged a broad range of arts organisations. Nine organisations from across Wales have received funding. They include large and small arts organisations, those based in rural and in urban locations, those with considerable previous experience of digital projects and those with very little prior experience of digital.

Whilst the activity during phase two focused on this small group of nine arts organisations, each of them have undertaken extensive networking and engagement amongst their partner organisations and colleagues in the broader arts sector. This has been an opportunity to develop their project but also raises the profile of the fund, contributing to our aim to influence a wider culture of innovation in the arts.

We are committed to engaging as broad a section of the arts sector in Wales as possible, and our aim is to produce insights that can have value across all kinds of arts organisations that want to make more effective use of digital technology in their work.

We are conscious that our focus on the nine funded organisations means that there are areas of the arts sector with which we have had limited engagement during this phase.

There were no national companies or arts venues funded at this stage, despite there being some strong applications at the end of phase one. The national companies and arts venues include some of the largest and well-resourced arts organisations – and therefore possibly some of the most digitally active – in Wales. We are also aware that there may be organisations in the arts sector in Wales who make less use of digital in their work than any of the organisations we have funded.

We have planned a series of activities during phase three to enable us to achieve a wider reach, and develop insights relevant to the whole arts sector.

The funded projects will continue to engage with their partners and networks, as part of their project. We will provide support to each project to develop and deliver a communications plan that will run alongside their plan for their research and development activities.

During phase three of the fund we will also commission a series of piece of research to engage and inform the wider sector, including:

- o A review of the fund, gathering more in depth feedback from those engaged by the fund so far and the wider arts sector.
- o Further research into the patterns of use of digital in the arts sector, and into effective strategies for introducing digital technologies in an arts context.
- o Further research into the wider social and economic context of arts activity in Wales, current trends and future scope for innovation.

Building capacity

Feedback suggests that arts organisations found the activity during phase two to be demanding. Time pressures were identified by every feedback response we received as being a challenge.

We feel that this suggests there would be an opportunity to refine the structure of the fund, and to improve the information and support we offer to those we have engaged. There are key points in the process at which we could have done more to ensure that all organisations we have engaged get the maximum benefit from this process.

Another way to interpret some of this feedback is that a process which encourages organisations and individuals to challenge themselves can mean that managing time becomes more difficult. There is always scope for putting more time and effort into developing a complex and creative project. To a degree, this is inherent in any capacity-building process.

Feedback suggested that there was a 'steep (but rewarding) learning curve' for some of those who engaged with the fund during this phase, and that some people discovered new perspectives and ideas directly through their experience of the fund activities.

We have seen how projects are more able to engage fully in the process in the time available if they have already undertaken some groundwork. Having relevant knowledge within the project team to help the organisation understand new areas of work, either by bringing new team members in or developing the knowledge amongst existing members, can help. Having readily available data on audiences or the organisation's business model can also be of use, as well as primary research carried out for the specific purposes of developing the proposal.

There will be further opportunities during the next phase of the fund to explore these factors in more detail with the projects we have funded, and the wider sector.

In particular, we are interested in how we can help organisations make better use of the data they already hold. The arts organisations engaged by the fund during this stage have told us that they have found it useful to reflect on the existing data they hold, and in some cases have identified important gaps in the data they use to understand their audiences, markets and stakeholders. Whilst some arts organisations would need additional time and resources to explore this data further, there may be approaches to collecting and analysing data that are sufficiently quick and simple to be integrated into daily practice or as part of project delivery. If these 'quick and simple' approaches to using data are to be of real value to those organisations, they should also help to provide a clear path towards more ambitious and sophisticated research.

We are also interested in understanding how arts organisations that put less emphasis on the importance of digital technology can be supported to make effective use of it in areas in which they see some clear benefits.

The arts organisations we have worked with have told us that in order to develop an ambitious digital R&D projects, they need the rest of their organisation to be ready to engage with the process. Naturally, this can take time, particularly where an organisation is focussed on other important strategic challenges and opportunities.

In the next phase of fund activity we will develop a clearer understanding of the factors that influence how well-prepared an organisation is to engage with this kind of process, how they can make their own assessment, and what different strategies are available to organisations with different levels of current capacity on which to build.

Arts-technology networks

Our intention during phase two was to help arts organisations engage with a wide range of digital expertise, so that they would explore the many different ways that digital technology might help them with the strategic challenges they face. Our own assessment, and that of some of the arts and technology experts who gave us feedback, is that we did not enable all arts organisations to access as wide a range of expertise as we could have done.

Of the funding that arts organisations received during phase two, half was specifically allocated for securing the time of potential technology partners. All arts organisations that received funding during phase two had the opportunity to have a dialogue with a range of technology experts at the workshops – the panel of ten at the first workshop, and the panel of twelve at the final workshop. Both of these workshops involved each project receiving individual feedback on their ideas.

We encouraged all arts organisations to use their budget to engage with a range of digital expertise. We did not require organisations to report on how many responses they received to their brief but from our discussions we understand that some spoke to only one company in depth, and others spoke to three or more. As the feedback from arts organisations suggests, the number of technology companies engaged may in part be due to the amount of time available. We feel this was also about expectations on the part of the fund team. Specifically, on reflection we felt that we should have included a requirement for all organisations to receive a minimum of three formal quotations for the work, to ensure that they had considered a range of approaches and reached beyond their existing networks.

We are also aware that some arts organisations have access to more or less digital technology expertise – through board members or through well-established partnerships they have with technology companies, for example. Whilst we have not explored in depth if or how this makes a difference, we have received some informal feedback from arts organisations that they found it useful when they had board members, staff and others in their networks who can help to assess the ideas and suggestions they received from prospective technology partners.

In the survey of digital activities we conducted at the start of phase two amongst funded projects, we note that the two of the nine organisations who described carrying out 'born digital' activities – which may be less common amongst the arts sector in Wales than other applications of digital technology – both did so by collaborating with others rather than recruiting staff with those skills, or developing the skills internally. Whilst this may reflect the relatively small scale of these organisations, it may be worth exploring these types of collaborative relationships in more depth to understand how smaller arts organisations can effectively develop creative digital projects.

From our experience of delivering the fund so far, we take the view that there is much greater scope for developing new networks amongst the arts and technology sectors, and scope to develop a greater awareness of each other's work. The feedback we have had from both arts organisations and technology organisations suggests that there is a great deal of mutual interest and an expanding range of potential opportunities for collaboration.

ANNEX



DIGITAL INNOVATION FUND FOR THE ARTS IN WALES PITCHING FEEDBACK SHEET

Reviewer Name**Pitching Organisation Name****The Project**

To what extent do you feel like the proposed project is likely to achieve their desired research and development outcomes? Did the proposed activity seem logical? Was it clearly linked to their strategy as an organisation?

Please circle the statement you identify with most closely:

- The proposed project lacked clearly defined outcomes and/or the proposed activity is unlikely to achieve the desired R&D and strategic outcomes.
- The proposed project could contribute to reaching the team's desired R&D and strategic outcomes but requires further work and development;
- The proposed project is highly likely to contribute to reaching the team's desired R&D and strategic outcomes, with only a small amount of additional development required.

Comments**The Team**

To what extent do you feel like the team are the right team to undertake this work? Do you feel like they have the necessary skills and have entered into a collaborative, rather than client/service provider relationship?

Please circle the statement you identify most closely with:

- The team failed to demonstrate the necessary skills and knowledge to ensure that this project would be successfully completed and/or the relationship between arts and technology partners was as client/supplier, rather than a true collaboration.
- The team demonstrated some of the skills and knowledge to ensure that this project would be successfully completed - the gaps could be covered by bringing in additional support. The relationship was more collaborative than client/supplier.
- The team demonstrated most of the skills and knowledge necessary to ensure that the project will be completed successfully. The relationship was more collaborative than client/supplier.

Comments**General Feedback**

What are the questions that you'd like to ask this project?

Is there any other feedback that you have for this project?

POST-APPLICATION FEEDBACK SURVEY

| RESPONDENT REF. | RESPONDENT TYPE | 1. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ROLE? | 3A. ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 5, HOW CHALLENGING DID YOU FIND THE PROGRAM? | 3B. PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER | 4A. ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 5, HOW USEFUL DID YOU FIND THE PROGRAM? | 4B. PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER | 5A. WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS PROGRAM TO OTHER ARTS ORGANISATIONS WHO WANT TO MAKE MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY? | 5B. PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER | 6. WAS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT THE PROGRAM YOU FOUND HELPFUL/ UNHELPFUL? DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS WE COULD MAKE? | 7. IF YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT THE DIGITAL INNOVATION FUND FOR THE ARTS IN WALES, PLEASE ADD THEM HERE: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| PAFBA1 | Arts organisation | Chief executive | 5 - Very challenging | Time was the major challenge, the amount of time needed to be dedicated to this project was far more than i was expecting, and for a small arts organisation this was to the detriment of other projects and tasks. | 5 - Very useful | An excellent way of getting to understand your organisations problems, not only digital ones | Yes | I would wholeheartedly recommend the project to any arts organisation, but I would warn them that it is all absorbing both in terms of time and energy. | It was a shame to be shortlisted then after submitting the final application to be turned down, I understand the budgetary constraints. but maybe the pitch section could have been done earlier so that only a smaller group were shortlisted and these projects were given more time (and a budget) to develop their ideas to the full. I would make all smaller organisations aware of how much time they will need to spend on the project, maybe offering them project mananegment assistance. | Great group of staff and the assistance offered by NESTA and ACW was greatly appreciated |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--|-----|--|--|--|
| PAFBA2 | Arts organisation | Learning and engagement officer | 3 | <p>This was my first time applying for additional funding therefore the experience was all new for me, and I was a little naïve about the amount of work it would take. Our initial goal/aim had certain assumptions and ideas about what we wanted out of the programme, and what we would use to achieve our goal. This soon changed once we thought about the project in a wider context (in terms of the potential solution's application) and zero'd in on how we'd go about researching how to solve the problem. I had little experience of tech projects and in retrospect should have looked into the process in the commercial sector as since our project has finished I'm more aware of the nature of the industry, which I feel would have given me more insight into the process involved in hindsight. The project's scope increased dramatically during the initial workshops, and it took some adjusting to then clarify what we were doing. I feel, that if I'd have had a better idea of the industry I would have had a better overview of the process. I'm not suggesting that this is something that Nesta should have done, but something I wish I had looked into myself.</p> | 4 | <p>In term of getting us up to speed on the nature of the project, and the necessary concepts and ideas that we should be thinking about, it was very useful. The sessions introduced a lot of new information and it was discussed and disseminated very well. The structure of the workshops days was excellent, with great speakers and useful activities that illustrated the aims of the workshop well.</p> | Yes | <p>I would recommend the programme to other organisations, however I would stress the amount of work it takes, and the need for the whole organisation to be behind the project, and that they have the capacity for it. Also having a clear need that technology CAN fulfil would also be something that I'd emphasise.</p> | <p>The business support day wasn't completely appropriate for the stage we were at in the project, which may be our fault more than the programme. I think that perhaps a more tailored experience with appropriate speakers would have been more helpful. I felt that we didn't explain what we were hoping to achieve very well, and subsequently the day veered off into territory we weren't prepared for and didn't feel very relevant.</p> <p>e.g. by marking the scope and potential of our work with NEETS quite low in the impact visualisation graph, the rest of the day became focused on that sector of our audience. No criticism of Richard and Giacomo, perhaps we weren't well enough prepared.</p> <p>Support from Dan and Rob was excellent, they were quick to answer all our queries and offer advice where needed.</p> | |
|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--|-----|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|--|-----------------|--|-----|---|---|--|
| PAFBA3 | Arts organisation | Senior or middle management | 4 | Digital innovation is not an area I'm familiar with, so the process of turning our identified challenge into a digital solution required a steep (but rewarding) learning curve | 5 - Very useful | There was a high presence of advice and guidance at every stage, and I think significantly this was not characterised by 'hand-holding' - this meant our proposal was nurtured but allowed to grow independently | Yes | There would be a few qualifiers for my recommendation - firstly the issue of capacity (R&D requires dedicated staff time), and secondly I think there needs to be an institutional openness to new ways of working. | In the main the program was incredibly helpful - it was well structured, clearly explained at every stage and the level and content of the support available was brilliant. The Theory of Change / Business Development workshop was really interesting and broadly useful to a degree, but it didn't seem to inform our project proposal at the time it was delivered. The requirement for %age contingency towards research and another towards the overall project was confusing - it would help to have this clarified. | Very excited to be working with NESTA! Diolch yn fawr! |
| PAFBA4 | Arts organisation | Board member | 5 - Very challenging | I am a relatively new Board member and found my knowledge of the sector was somewhat lacking. I could not contribute to the discussions and activities as much as I would have liked. | 5 - Very useful | I found all of the facilitators very knowledgeable and helpful during the discussions and active sessions. The day expanded my knowledge base. | Yes | | All very helpful | |
| PAFBA5 | Arts organisation | Artistic director | 3 | The process offered an opportunity to work and develop ideas in a new way for our company and provided the chance to meet and discuss initial ideas with various tech providers and other arts organisations. This element of 'scoping' and development I found very exciting and opened up new possibilities for both discussion and distillation of the concept (s) I came into the process with. This was positive but reasonably time consuming and I felt I wanted MORE time with this phase (between being accepted on program and writing the application) to allow for enough time to meet tech partners and digest which way would be the best for the company. So this part was challenging time wise. | 5 - Very useful | The program offered a good balance of time to develop, distill and formulate the proposal individually and to share and meet with other organisations to evaluate and network. I found the program exciting, stimulating and informative - it offered me a unique opportunity to think, assess and be inventive in an original way. I thought the program was well organized, supportive and offered a pretty comprehensive structure that allowed enough time to work developing your own ideas and learning about the other prospective teams and organisations. This offered an interesting perspective to the program as usually an applicant to public funding works in isolation without any knowledge of the other applicants and the nature/concept of their research etc. This was interesting to be able to connect and network. Also the stages of the process, in the majority, worked extremely well. | Yes | Yes the program offers a unique chance or opportunity to reflect and assess on the potential and possibilities to engage with digital technology in a meaningful and profound way. | The program structure was well structured and I found the NESTA/ACW team both supportive and helpful. The program wasn't as restrictive and onerous as I originally thought and found it exciting and illuminating. The program should allow for a few more weeks in the process between being accepted on the program and until the application stage. I felt I needed more time with my tech partners to have adequate space to develop and formulate the proposed concept. | A great opportunity and program!! |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|-----|---|---|--|
| PAFBA6 | Arts organisation | Learning and engagement officer | 4 | The application process forced organisations to reconsider methods of examining organisational structures and problems and it was certainly a lengthy and in-depth process of applying the theory of change, that required considerable input of staff time across the organisation. | 4 | Similar to my above answer, the focused and detailed research, evaluation and interpretation required has forced us to better examine and understand our organisational strength and weaknesses. | Yes | | | |
| PAFBA7 | Arts organisation | Freelance arts professional | 4 | The programme was supported to an appropriate level, offering guidance at the time it was needed and, therefore, couldn't be pegged as being 5/5 in difficulty. However, it was a huge challenge in respect of knowledge, skills and time to be able to see the programme through to its conclusion. This, in essence, provided as much personal and professional growth and valuable experience as it did a range of problems. Dealing with the Technology Partner and their inability to step out of their standard, working practices and into an R&D project, was the greatest issue and one of personalities rather than programme structure or the demands placed on us. | 4 | In respect of individual experiences and understanding of progressive funding processes, it was of huge value. It also offered the impetus, space and time to be able to undertake research and establish partnerships that, unknown to us at the beginning of the programme, would develop an interesting, relevant and useable range of data. | Yes | NESTA will equally learn from the positives and negatives of our collective experiences during the programme. As something that is definitely not far off being the consummate, supported funding programme for arts organisations looking to spread their wings, the successive programmes will be a 'must do' for such organisations. | We under-budgeted in respect of people's time. The requirements of people to attend so many sessions in-person is both a benefit and a drawback, only really being able to see the true benefit in hindsight. Asking people to spend so much time with you fosters a sense of community, visibility and impetus, but it would be good to advise future participants to assign a minimum % of budget to staff time in attending events, workshops etc. It was equally helpful and unhelpful to be given so much freedom, although it's understood that all organisations are different and a 'catch all' process is difficult to define. I think it's a definite that NESTA can easily be more forthright in stating 'exactly' what they want in respect of outcomes, without feeling overbearing. | It was a pleasure to be involved. If you can offer future participants a series of deadlines to aim for, in hiring a digital partner, submitting research plans etc. then I think those are just one of a range of things you could do to offer people a greater sense of structure. People, generally, don't mind being given frameworks to work to and, having spoken to other participants, as long as lead times and deadlines are realistic, they'd appreciate NESTA setting more of the rules. A useful tool for the future would be a document that can be given to prospective digital partners for what DIFAW actually is, the agreement that they would be entering into in respect of the model 'partnership' etc. as you're sending individuals out into the digital sphere and effectively representing NESTA/Arts Council/DIFAW and that representation might not always be accurate. It would also help in respect of setting expectations. |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|---|-----|---|--|---|
| PAFBT1 | Technology company | Digital technology professional | 3 | The process wasn't particularly challenging, but as a technical partner, we found it quite labour-intensive in supporting the arts organisations through the process. We're very grateful that Nesta had the foresight to consider this and provide funding for it, however, we should have pushed our arts orgs for a greater chunk of the £5k - we charged £1,500 and found that we spend between 5-10 days on each. | 4 | The programme was well organised and really helped the arts orgs to refine their proposals | Yes | Yes, definitely. The programme was much better organised than applying for a direct government grant. | In general, the programme was very professionally run - we were really impressed. There were however a couple of instances where the guidance seemed to shift throughout the process, e.g. maximum budget recommendations, the prospect of a further fourth "commercialisation" stage etc. | |
| PAFBT2 | Technology company | Digital technology professional | 4 | | 5 - Very useful | Having the arts organisations start the process with a problem to solve rather than a complete solution forced them to think in more creative ways about their proposals. Introducing them to then idea of iterations and continued testing rather than expecting to understand the challenges ahead of time. | Yes | | I enjoyed the fact that all of the participants were able to feedback on each others projects. I would have been interested to see if connections between some of the more similar projects - identifying which technological problems they had in common for instance. | I've been very impressed with it so far. I particularly like the structure of the programme - it gives organisations the opportunity to really improve their pitch. |
| PAFBT3 | Technology company | Digital technology professional | 4 | It was fairly challenging finding enough time out my schedule to give sufficient time and energy to creating, developing and pitching the proposal. No more so than when pitching for commercial work however. | 3 | I didn't really partake in the program other than the pitch | Yes | | | Very beneficial in giving organisations the time to develop their ideas further, without which many good ideas would not see the light of day |

TECHNOLOGY COMPANY WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

| RESPONDENT REF. | WHAT THEY DID WELL WAS... | IT WOULD HAVE BEEN EVEN BETTER IF... | HOW SHOULD WE SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR DIGITAL CAPACITY? |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| TCFB-1 | Explain their business model. Articulate their ambitions. | They were able to specify certain ambitions within financial scope. | They need a part time producer / digital consultant based within the org - there is so much potential. |
| TCFB-2 | They have a good understanding of the core issue they wanted to respond to. Open to ideas and thoughtful and excited. | Not sure as not 100% sure how far along they are. | To start helping them create scenarios of what 'it' would be. Also maybe get them to speak to a few 'site specific' based project people who have used tech. |
| TCFB-3 | They had a clear idea of their goal and their potential challenges. Open to a variety of solutions around solving their problem. Excellent base knowledge. | We had more time. | Help them to develop a process and platform that takes advantage of digital assets, that will help them build an audience and sell [their products] globally. |
| TCFB-4 | Passion explaining the issues. Expertise in their field. | Work on simplifying them problem 'although it's a big problem.' | Get them to talk to as many people as possible, e.g., experts in particular fields. |
| TCFB-5 | Really understanding their requirements and communicating their rationale. | We had more time to discuss the projects one on one. | Sharing knowledge from past projects - presentations of the new ways arts orgs are solving problems through digital. |
| TCFB-6 | They were very receptive to advice on how to improve their approach to their problem. | I would have liked to have seen examples of some of the work they have produced already to give the conversation greater context. | The project needs distilling into core deliverables - i.e., the output needs to be a little clearer! I feel some progress was made today... in the first instance, time needs to be spent on developing a narrative and looking at a potential business model and architecture as this seems key to their 'problem.' |

THE DIGITAL SKILLS AND ACTIVITIES SURVEY

ORG REF INDIV REF PROFILE HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR CURRENT LEVEL OF DIGITAL SKILLS?

PLEASE INDICATE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DIGITAL ACTIVITIES YOUR ORGANISATION CURRENTLY DOES (TICK ALL THAT APPLY). WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER THIS IS SOMETHING YOU DO, OR WHETHER SOMEONE ELSE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS ACTIVITY, AS FOLLOWS:

YES (ME) - MY ORGANISATION DOES THIS, AND I AM RESPONSIBLE
 YES (OTHERS) - MY ORGANISATION DOES THIS AND SOMEONE ELSE IS RESPONSIBLE
 NO - MY ORGANISATION DOES NOT DO THIS
 NOT SURE - I AM NOT SURE IF MY ORGANISATION DOES THIS

IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER IMPORTANT DIGITAL ACTIVITIES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION CURRENTLY DOES, PLEASE ADD THEM HERE (AND INDICATE WHO DOES THEM)

| | | | | 1. Sell products or merchandise online. | 2. Accept online donations | 3. Use crowdfunding platforms such as Kickstarter to raise money for new projects | 4. Publishing content onto free platforms (e.g. YouTube, Facebook) | 5. Track discussion about our organisation online by using free or paid software which monitors social media activity | 6. Make existing recordings or archive material / exhibits available for digital consumption | 7. Provide online interactive tours of real-world exhibitions / spaces | 8. Provide educational content or online events for schools and other audiences | 9. Standalone digital exhibits or works of art, i.e. without a non-digital equivalent | 10. Digital experiences designed to be used alongside and at the same time as the artwork or exhibition | |
|--------|---------|---------------------------------|----------|---|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Operations and business models | Operations and business models | Operations and business models | Marketing | Marketing | Mediation | Mediation | Reflection | Born digital | Born digital | |
| DSAAO1 | DSAAO1A | Senior or middle management | Basic | Yes (me) | Yes (me) | No | Yes (me) | Yes (me) | Yes (others) | No | Yes (others) | No | No | |
| DSAAO1 | DSAAO1B | Senior or middle management | Advanced | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | No | Yes (me) | Yes (others) | Yes (me) | No | Yes (others) | No | No | |
| DSAAO2 | DSAAO2A | Senior or middle management | Advanced | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | No | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | No | Yes (others) | No | No | [Lifelong learning project], audio archive, partnerships with broadcasters (someone else) |
| DSAAO2 | DSAAO2B | Senior or middle management | Advanced | Yes (me) | Yes (others) | No | Yes (me) | Yes (others) | Yes (me) | No | Yes (me) | No | No | |
| DSAAO3 | DSAAO3A | Learning and engagement officer | Basic | No | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | No | No | No | No | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|---------------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| DSAAO3 | DSAAO3B | Learning and engagement officer | Basic | No | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Yes (me) | Yes (me) | Yes (others) | No | No | No | No | |
| DSAAO4 | DSAAO4A | Senior or middle management | Basic | No | No | No | Yes (others) | No | No | No | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | As a project company we contract specialists on a project by project basis to lead on digital activities, including social media marketing / creating digital games etc (apart from ongoing activity with website both artistic director and I input indirectly) |
| DSAAO4 | DSAAO4B | Artistic director | Basic | No | No | No | Yes (others) | No | No | No | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | Developing and steering new digital projects sourcing and collaborating with digital partners; working alongside digital collaborators to research new digital avenues ; collaborate with game design and digital animation for our projects. |
| DSAAO5 | DSAAO5A | Freelance arts professional | Basic | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | No | Yes (others) | No | Yes (others) | No | No | No | No | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|---------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----|----|----|----|---|
| DSAAO5 | DSAAO5B | Senior or middle management | Basic | Yes (me) | Yes (me) | No | Yes (me) | No | Yes (me) | No | No | No | No | I am responsible for overseeing the website and share responsibility for social media. I contribute and manage [our] blog. I support artists to develop and present digital art in outdoor/ alternative spaces. |
| DSAAO6 | DSAAO6A | Learning and engagement officer | Basic | No | No | No | Yes (me) | Yes (others) | Yes (others) | No | No | No | No | Podcast, videos animation and images of events. Google analytics to monitor marketing activity. |
| DSAAO6 | DSAAO6B | Learning and engagement officer | Basic | No | No | No | Yes (me) | Yes (others) | Yes (me) | No | No | No | No | Podcast - I am responsible for this. |
| DSAAO7 | DSAAO7A | Senior or middle management | Advanced | No | Yes (me) | Yes (me) | Yes (me) | No | No | No | No | No | No | |
| DSAAO8 | DSAAO8A | Freelance arts professional | Basic | Yes (others) | No | No | Yes (others) | No | Yes (others) | No | No | No | No | |
| DSAAO9 | DSAAO9A | Board member | Specialist | No | Yes (others) | No | Yes (others) | No | No | No | No | No | No | E-mail marketing (someone else) |
| DSAAO9 | DSAAO9B | Chief executive | Basic | No | Yes (me) | No | Yes (me) | No | No | No | No | No | No | Email marketing using our database (me) |