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Foreword

Attenborough Arts Centre, at the Richard Attenborough Centre

This document blazes a trail for disability arts research and provides a useful overview of the challenges faced by our sector for our young artists and participants. This research helps us identify regional organisations that are producing nationally significant work in this area in a climate of cuts to services.

The evidence shows that cuts are having a disproportionate effect on the arts and the activities organisations provide for young people with disabilities; due to the increased costs of making this work accessible. These are precisely the audiences and participants that benefit the most from dedicated schemes of work.

This work would not be possible without our partnership with colleagues at University of Leicester, Drs. Green and Newsinger and commissioning funds from the The Mighty Creatives. The participation from regional arts organisation and our local Big Mouth forum members who took part in focus group work has also been extremely valuable.

Our founder and former Patron, Lord Attenborough, campaigned all of his career for the rights of disabled people to have full access to the arts. As an arts centre that places inclusive practice at the heart of all that we do we are determined to meet the challenges identified in this report and will continue to produce great art experiences that remove barriers for everyone.

Michaela Butter MBE, Attenborough Arts Centre Director
Foreword

The Mighty Creatives is the children and young people’s creative development agency. We are working with Arts Council England to use our creativity and expertise to answer a simple but important question: how can we increase children and young people’s engagement in the arts and culture? Our aim is to ensure every child and young person has the opportunity to experience the richness of the arts and culture.

We know from our own research that we are a long way from achieving that aim. Specific communities of children and young people are under-represented in arts and cultural participation - these include very young children, children and young people with disabilities, culturally diverse communities (including travellers and economic migrants) and young people not in education, employment or training. Cuts to funding and changing policy priorities have had their own impact on children and young people’s access to the lifelong benefits of the arts.

As Arts Council England’s Bridge organisation for the East Midlands, it is our job to understand the challenges children and young people face, develop creative solutions that drive new opportunities and deliver increased engagement. We are delighted that the authors of this new research have mined such a rich seem of innovation within the cultural sector. They show how organisations of varying sizes and forms have sought to engage disabled children, young people and their families, offering a series of creative solutions that push boundaries. The value of a rich ecosystem of organisations and freelance practitioners is revealed in its complex detail, echoing the recent Warwick Commission report, as is the pervasive tension between policy and practice.

We want this report to contribute to society’s collective curiosity about how we help every child and young person realise their right to culture. Sharing insight and innovation is a valuable starting point. Looking to future challenges will steady our resolve and help scale our endeavours so no child misses out.

Our thanks to the authors, our various partners in commissioning and reviewing the finished report and the many experts, young and old, who have contributed their valuable opinion.

Richard Clark, Chief Executive, The Mighty Creatives
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1.0 Executive Summary

This research was commissioned by The Mighty Creatives in response to the funding cuts to the arts and cultural sector in the East Midlands, including Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland. It describes how funding cuts have impacted disabled children and young peoples engagement with the arts. The project was funded as a partnership between the University of Leicester and Attenborough Arts Centre who, championed by Lord Attenborough, are committed to the promotion and encouragement of engagement in the arts by disabled people.

1.1 Project Context and Research Question

The Arts are widely agreed to be a public good that confer a wide range of social, economic and cultural benefits to individuals and to society as a whole. They should be accessible to all. This is not just the legal position in the UK but also a moral position. Since the Equalities Act in 2010 there has been an increasing impetus to ensure the accessibility of the arts. In the current economic climate, however, funding cuts are having an impact on the arts sector to the detriment of arts organisations’ programme delivery and sustainability. This has inevitably had an impact on access to the arts for all and particularly for disabled children and young people. Therefore, this research answered the question:

In an environment of restrained resources, how is the arts and culture sector overcoming barriers to engagement for disabled children and young people?
1.2 Research Findings

First a review of the literature and of regional council websites was conducted in relation to disability in the East Midlands, disability policy, institutional perspectives and the cuts. Following this, data was collected from arts organisations across the East Midlands. Findings are summarised in relation to contemporary thinking and contemporary practice.

1.2.1 Contemporary Thinking

1. Disability in the East Midlands: prevalence of disability is reported but the most recent approaches to understanding disability move away from statistics with grounding in the social model of disability, e.g. The Life Opportunities survey. They report that experiences of impairments depend on the individual and change over time throughout people’s lives.

2. Disability, the arts, and Disability Arts: the Disability Arts perspective is the most progressive form of arts practice to emerge from the disability rights movement but is in tension with community and participatory arts practices. This represents a particularly difficult issue for policy and practice towards disabled children and young people.

3. Institutional perspectives on disability and the arts: more sophisticated and empowering understandings of disability are currently marginalised from official representations of disability arts policy across the East Midlands region. This should be addressed in future policy requirements.

4. The climate of reduced funding: multivalent challenges that arts and cultural organisations face due to cuts to arts spending will have a disproportionately negative impact on disabled children and young people’s opportunities to engage with the arts.

1.2.2 Contemporary Practice

To build a comprehensive picture of organisational practice and engagement with disabled children and young people and to what extent this has changed as a result of the current funding environment, interviews were conducted with 24 arts organisations based across the East Midlands between August and September 2014.

It is absolutely clear that arts organisations across the East Midlands provide exemplary opportunities to disabled children and young people in spite of external pressures of reduced funding to the networks of organisations that have historically supported projects through direct or in-kind funding. Six themes emerged through the analyses as significant in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of current practice:

- Organisation values and the programmes they deliver,
- Organisation engagement policy,
- Organisation experiences of the funding climate,
- Individual staff, freelancer and volunteer motivations,
- Negative project incidents that challenge successful delivery and
- Positive project incidents demonstrating inclusive delivery.
1.3 What this Research Means for the Sector

The organisations that participated in this research clearly have a dramatic and positive impact on disabled children and young people’s lives, but despite this, a number of barriers have been identified that will impact future engagement with the arts. The research has also uncovered examples of organisations that have great ability to create solutions and sustain engagement. Unfortunately a continuing restrained resource environment is likely to have a detrimental impact on organisations and their capacity to sustain innovation in engagement practices.

The implications of these findings for arts policy and practice for young people in the East Midlands are outlined through a series of questions. These are:

- Arts and cultural organisations demonstrate exemplary practice with disabled children and young people. How can they support public and private sector organisations to learn and better engage with disabled children and young people?
- Arts and cultural organisations rely on a freelance workforce that is continuously but increasingly under threat due to funding cuts. Is exemplary practice at risk? How can freelance art workers be supported to deliver inclusive and empowering arts activities?
- Arts and cultural organisations do not all have formal policy despite exemplary practice. Should arts organisations be encouraged to develop written policy towards disability? Will this continue to marginalise disability?
- Arts and cultural organisations differ in their approach to their provision to disabled children and young people. Should arts and cultural provision always be part of inclusive arts practices, or might specialised and impairment-specific activities be part of a plural model? Pragmatically, what does best practice look like?
- Individuals who work for arts and cultural organisations believe in the arts as a public good, and a moral case for art for all. Can the arts sector in the East Midlands make the moral case for diversity?

As opposed to outlining a set of prescriptive policy recommendations, the aim is for these questions to contribute to shared discourse and critical debate.

This report has recorded the passion, commitment and expertise of the arts and cultural sector in the East Midlands, while alongside this the report paints a negative picture of what the arts sector might become should funding cuts continue. It is the former that is the region’s greatest resource in challenging times. The Bridge organisation, The Mighty Creatives, is in a unique position to take a lead in building upon the research and expertise across the region. However, the biggest impact on the experience of the arts for disabled children and young people will come from empowering the arts organisations themselves.
1.4 How this Report can be Useful to Arts and Cultural Organisations

Pragmatically, this report is useful to arts and cultural organisations in the following ways:

1) It provides up-to-date thinking around disability and the arts, in particular:
   a. The prevalence of disabled children in the East Midlands that will be useful for funding bids or arguing for inclusive practice (section 3.2)
   b. Disability arts literature will support funding applications (section 3.3)
   c. Disability regional policy notably requires further development and may not reflect practice but local authorities may need support to develop policy (section 3.4)
   d. Current understanding of the impact of the cuts nationally and across the region (section 3.5)

2) It provides examples of real practice and experiences of the cuts across the region (section 5.1.2).

3) It provides examples of exemplary delivery from East Midlands arts organisations to disabled children and young people (section 5.1.2).

4) The vignettes which represent best practice will be contained together in a digital book available on the TMC website.
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Date:
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Disability has, until relatively recently, been a marginal issue to cultural and arts policy in Britain. This is despite the fact that, according to the Family Resource Survey (2010/11) there are over eleven million people with a limiting long-term illness, impairment or disability in Great Britain. The most commonly reported across the population are those affecting mobility, lifting or carrying. As one would anticipate, as we age the prevalence of disability in the population increases, from 6% of children (aged 0-18) to 16% of working age and 45% of adults over the pensionable age.

One of the most commonly used definitions of a disabled person is the one used in the Equality Act 2010:

“A disabled person is defined as someone with a physical or mental impairment that has a ‘substantial’ and ‘long-term’ effect on their ability to do normal daily activities”.

This definition moved on from the Disability Discriminations Act (1995/2010) which had emerged to protect people in areas related to employment and covered a very broad range of impairments. This includes, asthma, depression, Down’s syndrome, hearing and visual impairments, multiple sclerosis and schizophrenia. For the DDA (1995/2001) a disabled person was required to indicate how disability impacted normal day-to-day activity, for example, mobility, hearing and communication.

The Office for Disability Issues is a proponent of the social model of disability. This model is based on the tenet that disability is constructed by society through barriers that are designed in the environment, individual’s attitudes and by organisations, for example through policies, employment laws, working practices and draconian procedures. This approach emerged in the 1970s and rebuts any suggestion that disability is caused by an individual’s body.

The Equalities Act protects everyone in all aspects of society. For this research, the Equalities Act relates to ensuring arts and cultural venues do not discriminate against disabled people. The legal definition of disability relates to the Equalities Act. For this research and in relation to engagement with the arts, the Equality Act should provide wider protection against discrimination.
In relation to this, disabled people are already particularly underrepresented in the creative industry workforce in comparison to the rest of the economy. The most comprehensive creative industry workforce survey is conducted every three years by Skillset. Their most recent Employment Survey (Skillset 2012 - http://creativeskillset.org/assets/0000/5070/2012_Employment_Census_of_the_Creative_Media_Industries.pdf) for example, states that:

“Overall, the proportion of the workforce described by their employers as disabled has remained the same since 2006, at 1.0%. This is significantly lower than the proportion reporting themselves as disabled in Creative Skillset’s 2010 Creative Media Workforce Survey, in which 5.6% of the workforce reported they have a disability.”

While the reasons for this are undoubtedly complex, it suggests a lack of understanding and/or concern with disability among creative industry employers and a lack of confidence in the creative industries as a viable career path among disabled people. There is a need, then, to understand and overcome the barriers that prevent disabled people from being able to take a full and active part in the arts and cultural sector.

2.1 Research Question

The Mighty Creatives has commissioned this work as an independent piece of research across the East Midlands. This includes Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland. The research seeks to answer the question:

In an environment of restrained resources, how is the arts and culture sector overcoming barriers to engagement for disabled children and young people?

To answer the research question, interviews with arts organisations across the East Midlands sought to establish how organisations engage with disabled children and young people, and to what extent this has changed as a result of the current funding environment. The University of Leicester ethics committee approved all research.

The project and report has been structured as follows:

- Section 3: Literature review focusing on existing research surrounding disability, the arts and culture.
- Section 4: Primary data collection methods adopted for the research is discussed.
- Section 5: Findings are presented following 24 interviews with arts and cultural organisations
- Section 6: Discussion of the findings
- Section 7: Conclusions
- Section 8: Policy implications
3.0 Literature Review

3.1 Introduction

This review is intended to contextualise and situate the empirical research which makes up the main body of this report. It is structured into four sections.

The first explores attempts to report the number of disabled children and young people and the challenges involved in so doing. Disability prevalence figures fluctuate depending on the disability definition adopted, for example, Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), the SEN Code of Practice and the Children Act 1989. This is exemplified by Mooney et al (2008) who, when researching local authorities to estimate the prevalence of disabled children, discovered that many local authorities adopt the social model of disability in theory but in practice individual services adopt different disability criteria.

The second explores some of the major academic perspectives on disability and the arts. It particularly focuses on some of the tensions between therapeutic, workshop and community-based arts practice and the perspective of the Disability Arts Movement. It is argued that a progressive arts policy towards disability should aim to incorporate a Disability Arts Movement perspective, particularly around impairment-specific practices, networking and role models.

The third section outlines institutional perspectives on art and culture for disabled people, particularly in the East Midlands. Arts Council England’s Creative Case for Diversity is evaluated in relation to disability, and the extent to which more sophisticated understandings of disability and arts engagement are present within the publicly available policy documentation in the East Midlands region is discussed.

The final section of the review draws together a range of material on the current challenges facing the arts, particularly the cuts to local authority arts spending. It is noted that these funding cuts threaten to undermine many of the positive possibilities of disability arts. It is also noted that the effects of cuts to arts and cultural services on disabled children and young people cannot be separated from the more general cuts to social services and welfare.
3.2 Disability Amongst the Population in the East Midlands

Establishing the prevalence and profile of disability and impairment in the East Midlands is important for three reasons:

1. Central funding organisations use demographics to inform decision-making so it is important to be aware of the different approaches used to produce these figures.
2. Collating current demographics will be helpful to East Midlands Arts and Cultural Organisations in funding applications.
3. It allows the East Midlands to be compared to the rest of the UK and targeted strategies to be developed.

As such, a number of sources focusing on disabled children and young people in the East Midlands were reviewed, most notably:

- Family Resource Survey 2010/11 and 2011/12
- Public Health England - Learning Disabilities profiles
- Life Opportunities Survey (2014), Second Wave.

Data is presented as follows:

- Learning disability profiles for the East Midland region and counties.
- Disability profiles for the East Midland region and counties.
- Health and well being, education, skills and employment.

3.2.1 Learning Disability Profiles for the East Midlands Region and Counties

Table 1 and Figures 5-15 (see Appendix 5) illustrate the learning disability profile for the East Midlands region and counties. Data is based on Public Health England’s Learning Disabilities Profile which uses the Department of Education, Special Educational Needs in England data published in January 2012. Children are of ‘school ages’. Figures 5-9 (see Appendix 5) illustrate all counties by each of the learning disability types: children with autism, children with moderate learning difficulties known to schools, children with severe learning difficulties known to schools, children with profound and multiple learning difficulties known to schools and the cumulative data of children with learning difficulties (not children with autism). Figure 10-15 (Appendix 5) illustrate the prevalence of the same learning disability profiles but by county. In summary these data demonstrate:

- A lower prevalence of children with learning disabilities in the East Midlands 12 (per 1000 school children) compared to 20 (per 1000 school children) for England.
- Lincolnshire (11.54) and Nottingham (12.53) are the only two places in the East Midlands to have a greater prevalence of autism than the average for England (8.17), by more than 1.
- Leicester (30.54) and Lincolnshire (22.35) are the only two places in the East Midlands to have a greater prevalence of children with moderate learning difficulties known to schools than the average for England (19.65) by more than 1.
Table 1: Learning disability profiles for the East Midlands region and counties (adopted from Public Health England – Learning Disabilities Profile, 2013). Numbers are per 1000 school children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children with autistic spectrum known to schools</th>
<th>Children with moderate learning difficulties known to schools</th>
<th>Children with severe learning difficulties known to schools</th>
<th>Children with profound and multiple learning difficulties known to schools</th>
<th>Children with learning difficulties known to schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>24.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>19.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>35.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>24.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>17.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>7.443</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Disability Profiles for the East Midlands Region and Counties

The prevalence of childhood disability (aged 0-18) in the East Midlands is considered to be low (Blackburn et al, 2010). According to the most recently published Family Resource Survey 2011/12, 6% of children are disabled according to the DDA definition. Mooney et al (2008) drew comparisons between five sources of data when seeking an approach for prevalence of disability amongst children, these were:

“the total number of children with SEN statements; the total number of children with SEN (both with and without statements); the 2001 Census figure for the number of children with limiting long-term illness (LLI); the number of children in receipt of Disability Living Allowance (DLA); and the number of disabled children recorded in the CIN Census; and with figures based on the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS), which may now be outdated, and FRS (Family Resources Survey) estimates.” (Mooney et al, p. 7)
Based on this data, Mooney et al (2008) derived lower and upper bounds for the percentage of disabled children (see Table 2). The East Midlands lower (3.0%) and upper bounds (5.4%) are not dissimilar to the England lower (3.0%) and upper bounds (5.1%). The OPCS data is now considered to be out of date, similarly, the FRS data, used in Table 2, is based on the 2004/5 survey. Table 2 shows that the general prevalence of disability in childhood is less in the county than the neighboring city when Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Rutland are considered. Nottinghamshire bucks this trend however. In general, all counties within the East Midlands are similar to the national upper and lower bounds, with only Lincolnshire (1.2% above) and Leicester (0.7% above) more than 0.1% above the upper bound.

Table 2: Estimate of disabled children demonstrating the challenge in gaining accurate figures due to definition and data capture method (adopted from Mooney et al, 2008). Lower bound = the greater of two figures: the number of children with a SEN statement or the number of children in receipt of DLA. Upper bound = the sum of these two figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Lower bound %</th>
<th>Upper bound</th>
<th>Upper bound %</th>
<th>OPCS estimate (late 1980s): 3.2%</th>
<th>FRS (2004/5) estimate: 7.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>3862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>3940</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6891</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5136</td>
<td>11717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3415</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>4942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5642</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4291</td>
<td>9789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>4220</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8125</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4499</td>
<td>10264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>3740</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7122</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4890</td>
<td>11154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>4073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5664</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5171</td>
<td>11797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Mean</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England Mean</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351894</td>
<td>802759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.3 Prevalence of Childhood Disability in England

The FRS is considered to be the best source of data for estimating the number of disabled children (Read et al, 2007). The FRS is representative of the national population and has a high response rate. It therefore has data on a large number of children aged 0-18 and is also cross-sectional. The 2004/5 Family Resource Survey was analysed by Blackburn et al (2010) to report on the prevalence of childhood disability. Their analyses suggests the following for the UK:

- Males are twice as likely to be diagnosed with an impairment.
- The increased prevalence of disability by age is expected compared to other research and is explained by disability which does not manifest or are not identified until after five or so years of age.
- Prevalence in ethnicity does not reflect population and further research is required. For example, in the 2004/5 FRS only 90 disabled children were from black, minority ethnic or mixed parentage groups (Table 4, Appendix 6).
- The most prevalent difficulty experienced includes memory, concentration and learning (2.2%); communication (2%); difficulty if I didn’t take medication (1.9%); and mobility (1.5%) .
- Significantly more children with a DDA disability live in a one-parent household (34% compared to 26%).
- Almost 25% of children with a DDA disability live with a sibling with a DDA disability compared to 7% of non-DDA children.
- A large proportion of children with a DDA disability to have 1 or more adults in the household with a DDA disability (47%), and in the family unit (45%), a significant difference compared to children with no DDA disability.
- Children with a DDA disability are significantly more likely to be living in rented accommodation (47% compared to 33% for children with no DDA disability).
- Households with a child with a DDA disability experienced higher levels of debt, social deprivation and have a lower on average income. Blackburn et al (2010) attribute this in part to the greater dependence of households with disabled children on social security benefits. In addition other research suggests households with disabled children require 10-18% more income to sustain the same living standard (Bradshaw, 2008).
3.2.4 Health and Well Being, Education, Skills and Employment

The Life Opportunities Survey is a relatively new survey that provides data in relation to work, education, social participation, transport and use of public services. It is based on the social model of disability and, therefore, does not equate impairment to being disabled. It is longitudinal in nature, sampling participants randomly throughout the year. Initial interviews are conducted with participants (wave one) and in the subsequent year the same participants are interviewed again (wave two), to establish how people’s lives change and hopefully improve.

The second wave of research demonstrates the change in respondent’s lives since the first wave. In relation to the analyses of respondent’s impairments:

- 34% of respondents who declared having an impairment in the first wave of interviews did not declare an impairment at the second wave interview.
- The remaining 66% of respondents who declared one or more impairment at the first wave did so at the second wave. However, the type of impairment changed considerably in some cases.
- 13% of non-impaired respondents from the first wave interview declared an impairment at the second wave interview.
- These changes demonstrate the evolving and dynamic nature of the experience of impairments. A simple picture of impairment at a specific point in time does not necessarily represent a person’s experience. This reiterates previous research that reported that only up to 48% of people registered as disabled actually consider themselves to have a disability (DWP, 2002).
- Adults with impairments are likely to experience restrictions in relation to work, economic life, transport and accessibility outside the house.
- Adults with impairments were twice as likely to experience restrictions accessing education.

The Life Opportunities Survey provides a new approach to capturing people’s experiences of how their life changes and, arguably, reflects the growing appreciation for the social model of disability. This approach to understanding impairments adds greater depth to statistics, historically captured, that only describe the prevalence of disabled children. These statistics are complicated by the changing definitions and interpretations of disabilities and assume that everyone experiences impairments in the same way. The Life Opportunities Survey demonstrates how individuals experience impairments in different ways and how transient impairments can be. This leads to the next section of the literature review to consider how this relates to the major academic perspectives on disability and the arts.
3.3 Disability, the Arts and Disability Arts

Academic research on disability and the arts tends to fall into one of two categories: on the one hand it is a specialised area for those working in applied studies such as health care and social work and there is a body of work that explores arts practice and engagement as a therapeutic tool. On the other hand, coming from a sociological perspective, Disability Studies has explored disability as a socially constructed, relational category as elaborated in the social model of disability (See Oliver 1983, Swain and French 2000, Marks 2001, Oliver 2013). It is from this tradition that more empowering and autonomous conceptions of arts practice have emerged. Disability Arts is especially noteworthy for both its success in pushing arts practice to the forefront of the disability rights movement and for its critical engagement with arts policy and practice related to people living with impairments. This critical engagement is summarised below.

Colin Barnes notes, “Traditional responses to the issue of disabled people and the arts have been based on paternalism. Those disabled people viewed as inadequate and incapable have been given art as therapy in the context of special schools, day centres, and segregated institutions.” (Barnes 2003: 7) He continues:

Mainstream arts have not confronted disability. Moreover, disabled people are often dis-empowered, if not excluded, by arts training. Therefore, developing their own art, in environments controlled by themselves, is seen as critical if disabled people are to develop as creative producers, and compete with artists in the mainstream. (Barnes 2003: 9)

Disability Arts is defined in an Arts Council England publication as “art made by disabled people, which may or may not reflect the experience of disability” (Sutherland 2003: 2). Disability Arts is a diverse and debated field of practice (see Barnes 2003, Cameron 2007, Cameron 2011, Solvang 2012 for a discussion of more recent developments in Disability Arts) but many writers comment upon the particular transformative, communicative and socially empowering role that participation in arts and cultural events can have for people with impairments. As Colin Cameron comments:

For many disabled people, attendance at a disability arts cabaret, performance or exhibition has been a moment of epiphany. To begin to understand that the negative experiences you thought were yours alone, are shared and felt and understood by others and to begin to understand that it is not you, but the social environments around you that need to change is a powerful awakening. When an artist can communicate these things in words or music or through dance or image, a sense of connection and solidarity is established. (Cameron 2007: 505-506)

It is upon understandings such as this that Cameron and others champion the ‘Affirmative Model of Disability’ which “rejects personal tragedy narratives and that identifies impairment as part of human experience to be celebrated.” (Cameron 2007: 508)
In a similar fashion, Colin Barnes argues, “Disability arts […] is all about communication. In particular, it stresses the role of the arts in developing cultural (and by inference political) identity” (Barnes 2003: 9). Cameron sees an important role for community arts and the development of Disability Arts:

There is an important role for community development/community arts informed by the social model in acknowledging and exploring disability as a social construction in order to enable people with impairments and those alongside them to develop perspectives and identities which resist those offered by dominant culture. Community arts informed by the affirmative model is reflective practice, which examines and challenges its own knowledge and understanding in order to break free of the shackles of normality and embrace difference. (Cameron 2007: 509)

However, many writers are critical and even hostile to community arts and profoundly negative about the possibility of traditional arts practices to take on board a Disability Arts perspective. Take the following as an example:

The problem is that you will almost never see any actual Disability Art in a theatre, museum, gallery or even at a Disability Arts festival. Even if you do, it is there because it has been mis- or re-interpreted. Mostly, though, what you will see is pseudo-therapy workshop products or impairment-orientated works. Usually, it will be from a craft basis or developed in an empowerment course, superficially structured within the social model of disability but actually impairment-specific. This might be described as low level Community Arts […] Such art ‘activities’ have nothing to do with Disability Art, but they are to do with traditional preconceptions of art or therapy or, worse, as some form of inspirational role modelling. (Riddell and Watson 2003: 133 - emphasis added)

There are clear tensions between the perceived transformative, communicative and socially empowering impacts made possible through Disability Arts practices and some of the traditions of community and participatory arts that tend to work in impairment-specific contexts, often in partnership with the education, health and social care sectors. There is also a tension between these forms of intervention and the attempts by disabled artists to establish credibility and develop careers within the mainstream arts and creative industries, as noted by Cameron: “If disability arts are to be taken seriously is it not important that the end results are regarded as good art rather than tainted by association with amateur or community arts?” (Cameron 2011)

The question is also raised about possible distinct and specific positive impacts of engagement with the arts on people with impairments and how these can be promoted in terms of best practice. The problems of incorporating a social model of disability into arts policy are, arguably, intensified when viewing ‘impact’ through such a lens by understanding engagement and impairment in terms that are distinct to non-disabled forms. It is important to note that it is precisely these forms of participatory arts practice that tend to be most prominent in provision for disabled children and young people. This raises questions about the possibilities for the incorporation of a Disability Arts perspective into current practice.
The solutions to these difficult tensions and questions are not to be found in the existing academic literature. Nevertheless, there are studies that have found strong relationships between arts practices, affirmative understandings of impairment, and the development of shared, empowering, positive identities among disabled children and young people. For example, Margaret Taylor’s research found that:

An informed arts education, based on the provision of effective support, can offer disabled young people a vehicle for including the lived experience of impairment and disability as part of a multi-identity perspective of shared concepts, in ways that are not pitiable or tragic and that they can share through the images that they produce. In so doing they are empowered and more able to resist negative perceptions of disability and impairment that continue, insistently, to define them. (Taylor 2005: 777)

Taylor’s research particularly highlights the importance of disability awareness among arts professionals and teaching staff, and the importance of disabled artists as role models to the processes of empowerment and the development of shared identities.

Similarly, in a study of the career development of 47 young disabled artists, Heike Boeltzig et al found that “art making helped young people, particularly disabled young people, overcome barriers in learning, communicating and socialising.” (Boeltzig, Sulewski et al. 2009: 754) Like Taylor, their study found a relationship between arts practice and positive, affirmative understandings of living with impairments:

Several finalists saw impairment not as a hindrance, but as a factor in their choice to be an artist or even as an asset to their artwork. Others with mobility or fatigue issues said art provided a substitute for other pursuits. For example, one artist chose the art profession because after the onset of her impairment she could no longer work a 45-hour per week job. Teaching art accommodated her needs and interests. Others said that from childhood art had helped compensate for their limited ability to participate in physical activities, such as sports or outdoor play. One finalist said ‘I was never good at sports; my disability made it difficult. Instead, I developed and proceeded to explore the other areas that were open to me [such as music, writing and art]’. Another said, ‘art almost completely replaces the fact that I can’t walk’. A third artist said ‘I do not dance and I do not run – when I’m driven to express all that is within I pick up a brush and this girl’s life force pours out’. (Boeltzig, Sulewski et al. 2009: 757)
Boeltzig et al’s study emphasises that “Young disabled artists particularly need professional networking opportunities, as they may not be well connected with stakeholders in the arts community”. (Boeltzig, Sulewski et al. 2009: 768)

As is clear from the above, for many writers, impairment-specific activity emerges as reproducing and reinforcing some of the disabling categories of mainstream attitudes towards impairment. From this perspective, policy should enable children and young people with impairments to explore arts practice and engagement in inclusive, expressive and communicative ways, building confidence through collective experiences whilst avoiding segregation and specialisation. At the same time, policy should seek to enable children and young people with impairments to receive more specific training and career development opportunities, particularly focusing on encouraging networking and exposure to disabled artist role models.

The question then becomes: how far does contemporary arts policy and practice for children and young people reflect and respond to these debates?
3.4 Institutional Perspectives on Disability and the Arts

How is access to the arts and culture for disabled children and young people understood at an institutional level in the East Midlands? What principles and practices are reflected in the policies of major public and government institutions? As part of understanding the background to this research we looked at the publicly available policy documentation of the six local government authorities in the East Midlands. The websites of the city councils for Leicester (including Loughborough), Lincoln, Derby, Northampton and Nottingham were searched using the terms ‘disability’ + ‘arts’ and any relevant documentation was analysed. Further to this, a general Google search using the terms ‘disability’ + ‘arts’ + ‘East Midlands’ was conducted and any relevant documentation included. The full list of documents included in the discussion below can be found in Appendix 1.

Publicly available written documentation of this kind only gives a partial and highly mediated picture of the understandings and principles that guide provision within any ‘policy field’. Written documentation is the outcome of negotiations by various policy actors – some from above in the form of national legislation and central government policy, and some from below in the form of pressure groups, arguments, contemporary issues and local conditions. These official discourses often act only as guidelines to discussions at the micro-level, informing but rarely fully defining the principles and practices of organisations or individuals. This sort of research, therefore, serves to illuminate some of the categories, assumptions, concepts, values and so on, that make up the institutional understandings of particular issues but it should be noted that there is often significant variation and distance between these official policy discourses and the ways in which they are interpreted and negotiated by organisations and practitioners ‘on the ground’. Nevertheless, there are a number of points which can be made about the institutional perspective on the arts and culture for disabled children and young people.

The main official attitude towards disability and the arts in the contemporary period was outlined in the Arts Council England’s publication, ‘What is the Creative Case for Diversity?’ (2011). Here the argument is made that diversity, rather than presenting a problem to the arts and cultural sector, is actually beneficial; that “diversity and equality are crucial to the arts because they sustain, refresh, replenish and release the true potential of England’s artistic talent, regardless of people’s background.” (3) It continues:

Our key guiding principle will be that inclusivity of outlook and practice creates a better, richer and more dynamic arts sector. At the heart of this is the Arts Council’s desire to forge a new relationship with the arts sector on issues of diversity and equality characterised by shared discourses and critical debate. (Arts Council England 2011: 15)

The Arts Council England calls for an “arts and artists-led approach to diversity and equality” in which artists “take ownership” of the policy on diversity and equality, “to tailor it to its needs, to develop and share good practice, to probe the questions that it raises and to innovate creative approaches and solutions.” (15)
In its advocacy of the potential creative and artistic gains of a more diverse arts and cultural sector, the Creative Case conforms to a Disability Arts perspective which sees the experience of impairment and the contribution of disabled artists in an affirmative and empowering way. Furthermore, the Creative Case advocates an inclusive approach to diversity that breaks down “existing disability and race ‘silos’” (6), which fits very well with some of the critique of impairment-specific arts practice to have emerged from the movement.

On the other hand, the Creative Case is open to the accusation of being vague, non-committal and light on detail and policy applications. The case for diversity as a catalyst for innovation in arts practice is not made convincingly, for example. The removal of barriers to participation faced by disabled people is clearly a prerequisite to genuine equality and social justice, but it is hard to see how it will inevitably lead to an improved resilience in the arts sector. While specific problems are identified – such as widening inequality and narrowing participation, with entry to arts professions increasingly being secured through networks and unpaid internships, restricting entry to a privileged elite – there is little in the way of actual policy that can be implemented to address these problems. The field is left relatively open for organisations to interpret and implement (in this sense the Creative Case is an example of what Clive Gray has called ‘policy ambiguity’ (Gray, 2014)).

This aside, one of the main ways in which this call has been taken up within the Arts Council England itself is the policy of asking National Portfolio Organisations to compile a three-year equality action plan; a shift from a process of monitoring which attempts to move beyond the basics of minimum legal standards in terms of accessibility. It is described thus:

\[\text{This arts-driven concept of diversity as opportunity represents a shift in perspective, from regarding diversity as a prescriptive aspect of equality legislation to understanding its creative potential and the ways in which it can promote long-term organisational resilience. (Arts Council England 2013)}\]

In the East Midlands region, most councils\(^4\) have a publicly professed commitment to ensuring equality in access and participation in the arts in line with their responsibilities under the Equalities Act of 2010 to ensure that arts and cultural venues do not discriminate against disabled people. Many go beyond this and outline sets of principles and strategies around the arts and disability. However, the extent to which this is evident across the publicly available documentation of the local authorities in the region is inconsistent, suggesting significant variation in official understandings of disability and the arts, and variation in the penetration of more sophisticated understandings of diversity such as those outlined in the Creative Case and emerging from Disability Arts across local arts policy.

\[^4\] No documentation specifically addressing disability and the arts could be found through a search of the Nottingham City Council website.
Access to facilities and activities is the most prominent kind of initiative targeted towards disabled people, and the participatory arts sector is seen as having a key role in this. For example, Leicester City Council’s Cultural Services Division: Service plan 2006-2010 lists eight priorities for cultural services management, one of which is to “Achieve a more representative workforce” and another to “Improve disabled access”. Among the strategies for doing this are “Address disability through participatory arts programmes” and “Participatory Arts taking proactive steps to facilitate greater use of facilities by physical & mentally disabled, younger & older persons”. (Leicester City Council 2006: 43, 45)

At an organisational level, commitments to access often manifest as a process of monitoring of audience demographics to record the number of people who self-report an impairment who take part in an event or activity. The Northampton Museums Strategy 2008-2011, for example, mentions disability explicitly only in relation to visitor numbers self-reporting an impairment (6% compared to 16% of the general population). So, for example, the Leicestershire and Leicester Arts in Education Music Ensemble Groups 2010/2011 rules and procedures information sheet (2010) states that:

The county council is committed to “making equality a reality for disabled people” and a first step for Arts in Education is to monitor take up of performance groups by disabled children and young people. The Disability Act (1995) defines a person as disabled if they have a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day to day activities. We would encourage you to complete the question about disability on the registration form for your child.

This commitment is also manifest in professed commitment to staff training in issues related to impairment, disability and access, although again the extent to which this is taken up – in terms of designated roles within institutional bureaucracies, for example – is patchy

Often commitments towards disability and the arts are expressed within a discourse of economic development as citizen empowerment and community regeneration, with cultural and arts services seen as an instrumental vehicle for the development of employability and independence for disadvantaged groups. For example, Derby City Council’s Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for Grant Aid Strategy (2011) makes the commitment to “Enable children and young people to be included in mainstream learning or activities that reduce the number of young people not in education, employment or training, particularly teenage parents, young people with disabilities and young people who have been in the care system.” It further states:

Participation in arts activities can contribute greatly to people’s wellbeing, quality of life and sense of belonging. It can also develop individual and community aspirations and help people realise their potential. Services […] will demonstrate that they support a vibrant city centre arts programme that connect with all sections of Derby’s communities enabling everyone to have the opportunity to participate. (Derby City Council 2011: 6)
Overall, while a commitment to improving access to the arts for disabled people is present pretty consistently at a local authority policy level, there are varying degrees of specific strategy and research represented in publicly available documentation. The issue of disability and the arts, as in arts provision more generally, is primarily focused upon service level agreements and performance monitoring with little emphasis on developing innovative practice or incorporating more sophisticated understandings of disability. There is little made publicly available of more sophisticated policy or available information on disability and arts participation, for example of the kind considered in the Life Opportunities Survey (2014) regarding the dynamic and evolving nature of the experience of impairments and the arts. The criticism can be made, therefore, that official, institutional discourses about ‘disabled arts’ reproduce the category of ‘disability’ that has been effectively critiqued through the Disability Arts movement, outlined in the previous section. While efforts made to adhere to equalities legislation are to be welcomed, the limitations of these most basic prerequisites of equal participation are demonstrated through the still pervasive exclusion of disabled people from arts and cultural organisations. This issue is articulated by an anonymous senior arts professional:

**The view that prevails in our sector is that we have sorted disability – our buildings are accessible so everything must be alright. As a mid-career arts professional with 25 years in the creative industries who happens to be disabled, I can tell you everything is certainly not alright. It is my contention that there is a lack of training opportunities for disabled people in the arts, and consequently disabled people are nearly invisible in our sector with embarrassingly few leaders. Despite complex legal frameworks, discrimination thrives, and if anything, it is more insidious than it ever was before. (Anonymous 2014)**

Furthermore, despite the emphasis on measurement and monitoring of audience and user demographics, getting an accurate or even indicative picture of access to the arts for disabled children and young people in the region is difficult. There is no source of aggregate data of participation across the region’s various authorities of access to the various services and venues that might constitute the arts; a problem further compounded by the difficulties in measuring ‘disability’.

Finally, The Mighty Creatives’ own research to date has tended to marginalise disability. For example, the ‘State of our Region’ report for 2013, focused on cultural education, mentions disability and special educational needs only twice and both of these in relation to other agencies. This is despite the importance of impairment to the experience of arts and cultural participation being highlighted in the ‘Young People’s Cultural Lives’ (2012) report.
3.5 The Climate of Reduced Funding

The final section of this review draws together various sources to establish a picture of the contemporary funding environment for arts and cultural organisations in the East Midlands and explore the possible effects on participation for disabled children and young people.

The large cuts to public funding for the arts in England since 2010 represent a multivalent challenge to arts organisations and access to the arts for children and young people, including those with impairments. In October 2010 the Comprehensive Spending Review outlined the first wave of deep cuts to be made to public funding for culture over the next four years. These comprised cuts of between 15% and 30% to the operational budgets of some of the largest and most important cultural institutions in the UK, including Museums and Galleries, the British Film Institute and Arts Council England. A number of key institutions were closed outright: notably the UK Film Council and the Regional Screen Agencies (see HM Treasury 2010). This was followed up in 2013 with a further 7% cut to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport and a 10% cut to local authority spending, upon which many smaller, regionally-based cultural organisations depend (Newsinger forthcoming 2015).

Traditionally local Government has been a major funder of the arts, contributing up to twice the amount as Arts Council England. This is despite there being no statutory requirement for local councils to fund arts and cultural activities. As Eleanora Belfiore has noted

“Local authority funding is crucial to the cultural life of Britain. It sustains local cultural organisations and supports arts activities that often wouldn’t manage to secure funding elsewhere. This often includes participatory or community-based programmes, sometimes provided as part of the delivery of other services, such as health and social services.” (Belfiore 2013)

Since 2013, Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) statistics show a decline in local authority spending on culture by 4.2% for 2013/2014 which is larger than reductions to any other area of spending (Bagwell, Bull et al. 2014: 57-58). Some local authorities such as Westminster have gone further removing all funding for arts and cultural services, with others such as Newcastle cutting up to 50% (see Smith 2012, Smith 2013).
A 2014 report by the Local Government Association paints a bleak picture for local authority spending on the arts and culture if current patterns continue to the end of the decade. It notes that cuts to local government funding, combined with increases to the costs of delivering statutory services such as adult social care, will mean discretionary funding will need to be cut by 90% by 2020, all but eradicating this vital source of funding for regional arts (Local Government Association 2014). The concern is that cuts to local authority spending places local government in the unenviable position of having to cut arts funding in order to meet their statutory responsibilities to maintain basic services and choose between art forms and organisations in ways that has a negative impact on diversity, equal opportunities and access by prioritising more ‘mainstream’ popular venues and services. People within the cultural sector have voiced concerns over a number of years of the developing austerity agenda that repeated, deep cuts will prevent the development of innovative, experimental and exploratory social and educational provision, particularly in community settings and arts provision for marginalised and non-mainstream audiences more generally. All this is likely to be having a disproportionate effect on provision for disabled children and young people.

For example, as noted by BECTU, the trade union for workers in the audiovisual and live entertainment sectors, the potential consequences of the cuts include “a significant reduction in employment and skill levels and a reversal of recent progress in backing endemic low pay, exploitation of young people and lack of diversity” (BECTU 2010: 1) and “Broader education and community initiatives stemming from the arts sector are also likely to be seriously affected, as is the long term development of new work and talent for the future.” (BECTU 2010: 3)

In terms of the creative industries workforce, cuts are likely to increase the already significant pressures in the sector on labour intensive, causal, unpaid and voluntary forms of employment, all of which is likely to increase barriers to employment for new entrants and young people, particularly those with impairments.

The cuts to Arts Council England funding and the restructuring of National Portfolio Organisation funding have had a disproportionate effect on disabled-led organisations. These have fallen from thirteen to nine, a cut of 30.8%, with just four of these now based outside London. Disability-led organisations now make up just over one percent of the total portfolio, while their share of funding is less than 0.5 percent (Pring 2014).

The dramatic losses of local and regional arts infrastructure, knowledge and expertise clearly have implications for arts and cultural participation for disabled children and young people. The extent to which these more general challenges disproportionately affect disabled children and young people is not known, but is likely to be considerable. The previous section highlighted the particular importance of trained arts professionals and the opportunity to network with disabled artists as role models for the development of more empowering Disability Arts practice. It is the maintenance of provision and opportunities like this that present particular challenges in the current funding climate.
The final point to be made is that the cuts to the arts should not be seen in isolation to the cuts to public services more generally, which in turn disproportionately affect disabled children and young people. Ruth Gould, artistic director of DaDaFest, highlights this intersection of poverty and marginalisation with disability:

“We do have concerns that such a big cut (nearly 15 per cent) to the funds supporting user-led disability arts organisations will impact negatively on inclusion, engagement and high quality arts by and with disabled people […] These cuts need to be seen in light of the on-going welfare cuts to disabled people who are the hardest hit in these austerity measures.” (Quoted in Pring 2014)

The overall picture that emerges from the above is one of a combination of extreme challenges to local arts and culture, particularly in community and participatory settings, which disproportionately affect participation for disabled children and young people. This context dramatically undermines the possibilities of the development of more affirmative and empowering arts and cultural practices of the sort described in the previous section and made possible through the Creative Case for Diversity and the incorporation of a Disability Arts perspective into policy and practice. That said, what is missing from this picture is the passion, commitment, expertise and resilience of the arts and cultural sector in the East Midlands. It is at the organisational level that problems are negotiated and where the dynamism and innovation to overcome these issues will emerge. It is these stories that this report turns to next.
4.0 Primary Data Collection

To build on the literature base and to uncover some of the problems negotiated in the East Midlands following the cuts and surrounding disability engagement with the arts, we conducted interviews with arts organisations across the East Midlands. The interviews sought to establish how organisations engage with disabled children and young people and to what extent this has changed as a result of the current funding environment. The University of Leicester ethics committee approved all research.

4.1 Interview Protocol

Interviews were conducted with arts and cultural organisations operating in the East Midlands. This incorporated the cities and counties of Derby, Leicester, Lincoln, Northampton, Nottingham and Rutland. The interview protocol (see Appendix 2) was based on the research question:

In an environment of restrained resources, how is the arts and culture sector overcoming barriers to engagement for disabled children and young people?

In order to answer this question, we identified three areas of particular interest:

- Identifying barriers to arts and culture engagement as a participant as a result of restrained resources.
- Identifying innovation / solutions / opportunities (new ways of thinking and working, including collaboration, commissioning opportunities, resilience).
- Capturing what is working in delivering positive outcomes / types of outcome (i.e. cultural education, well-being, employment etc.) – this will be further developed into examples of best practice.

Data was collected through semi-structured interviews. The structure of the questions have been designed using principles of the Critical Incident Technique (CIT) to generate qualitative descriptors of positive and negative examples of the impact of restrained resources in the East Midlands. CIT is particularly appropriate for its utility to generate data on self-understandings of phenomena, and as an inductive tool to generate and develop theoretical models (Woolsey 1986; Butterfield, Borgen et al. 2005). CIT has, therefore, the distinct advantage of being exploratory and participant-centred, able to generate rich and authentic data which has direct real-world applicability and relevance. It is, therefore, particularly well suited to the collection of data on the determinants and characteristics of positive impacts of cultural participation and the determinants and characteristics of barriers to these impacts.

For this study, participants were asked to describe an incident that is representative of their thinking and/or behaviour in regards to a specific aspect of arts and cultural engagement with disabled children and young people. The descriptions that emerged were then generalised into a schema of critical responses to cultural participation.

The key challenge with CIT is to collect data with enough detail to elicit authentic, participant-led descriptors. It relies, therefore, on sufficient rapport between the investigator and participant and the articulacy of the participant to select, recall and describe critical events.

The participant interview protocol, information sheet and invitation email can be seen in Appendix 2-4.
4.2 Interview Analyses

All interviews were analysed systematically. A transcription of each interview was written from the audio recordings. Transcriptions were analysed using qualitative analyses software to support coding. Knowledge gained from the literature reviews were drawn upon for the purpose of sensitising analyses (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Throughout coding a method of constant comparison was used to interpret the interviews (Charmaz, 1997). Themes emerged from the data but are structured around the research objectives.

5.0 Findings

Following analyses of the interviews, six themes emerged. The themes are inter-related and the discussion will reflect on these interactions. First the sample of organisations is introduced prior to the themes discussed individually.

5.1 Sample

A comprehensive list of 183 arts and cultural organisations from across the East Midlands was created. Out of these over one hundred organisations were emailed in relation to participating in the research (the email is contained in Appendix 4). Of those that replied with interest, 24 organisations were interviewed through August and September (see Figure 1).

**Figure 1: Participating Arts & Cultural Organisations**

- Baby People, Derby
- Catalyst Theatre, Northampton
- Centre for Indian Classical Dance, Leicester
- Foundation for Community Dance, Leicester
- Converse Theatre, Lincoln
- County Youth Arts, Mansfield
- Dėda, Derby
- Derby Libraries, Derby
- Derby Theatre, Derby
- Fermynwoods Contemporary Art, Kettering
- High Peak Arts, New Mills, High Peak
- Junction Arts, Chesterfield
- Lincoln Drill Hall, Lincoln
- Northampton Music and Performing Arts Trust, Northampton
- Nottingham Contemporary, Nottingham
- Nottingham Libraries, Nottingham
- Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottingham
- Royal and Derngate, Northampton
- Salamanda Tandem, Nottingham
- Soft Touch Arts, Leicester
- soundLINCS, Lincoln
- TakeOver106.9, Leicester
- Unanima Theatre, Mansfield
- Writing East Midlands, Nottingham
The majority of interviews were conducted at the arts and cultural organisation’s base. A reasonable distribution of arts organisations is observed by county (Figure 14), when population is considered and by Arts Council England art form categories (Figure 15). No organisation from Rutland participated. When the Arts Council England categories are compared to the self-selecting art forms we can see that organisations select more than one art form, with the notable exception of libraries.

Of the 20 organisations that provided workforce data, when asked about the number of full time equivalents, organisations that participated have an average of 7 full time equivalent employees whilst employing 19 freelancers on a regular but adhoc basis.

When asked in the demographic questionnaire about funding, 21 organisations provided information related to funding sources. Only the two library organisations rely solely on a single source of funding which is in this case from the council, whilst the remainder have at least three and up to six clearly differentiated source of funding. Ten of the organisations are National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs) at the time of interview with one losing that status in the coming April and another gaining it. Ten organisations stated that they receive private funding, six mentioned charitable donations of up to 6%, and nine organisations receive funding from ‘other public source’, most notably Youth Music which was mentioned by six organisations. Whilst ten of the organisations are NPOs, 15 organisations benefit from Arts Council England funding in some form. Fourteen organisations receive funding indirectly or directly from councils and one organisation mentioned the lottery as a source of funding.

Figure 2: Distribution of arts and cultural organisations across counties
Figure 3: Categorisation of organisations by Arts Council defined art form

Figure 4: Self-selecting categorisation of art form across sample. The total number of art forms is above 24 as organisations could select more than one category.
5.1.2 Themes

Six themes emerged from the interview data (Table 3). Each theme will be discussed with illustrative quotes used to represent the voice of the organisations. Quotes have not been attributed to specific organisations to maintain anonymity of the individuals that participated in the research. It is worth reiterating that the themes are inevitably interrelated and some subjects, for example funding, are mentioned across themes.

Table 3: Emergent themes and description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisations and activities</td>
<td>Organisation values and the programmes they deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Organisation engagement policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding climate</td>
<td>Organisation experiences of the funding climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce and values</td>
<td>Individual staff, freelancer and volunteer motivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges to delivery</td>
<td>Negative project incidents that challenge successful delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary inclusive delivery</td>
<td>Positive project incidents demonstrating inclusive delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisations, participation and activities

In the first part of the interviews, participants were asked about their organisation’s mission and values in relation to the activities that they deliver. This led to discussions of how organisations emerged, have grown and evolved in recent years and what activities are delivered and the people that participate in them.

The organisations that participated in this research deliver a hugely diverse range of programmes and art forms to a wide range of audiences from early years through teenage years into older age. Programmes are delivered in a wide variety of organisations from schools, care homes and prisons. Activities go well beyond those art-forms detailed in an organisation’s website and when considering their core competency. For example, cross-art forming, choir, organising consortiums, engaging in debates, learning programmes, promotional activities, residencies, networking days, knowledge exchanges and conferences. The reason for having to move away from core competency is prompted by limited opportunities. What emerges in the interviews is that the most important aspect of the work is not necessarily the core competency but the core principles of delivering according to an organisation’s mission and moral values, as reflected in these quotes from organisation 4 (O4), 16 (O16) and 23 (O23):

“It’s about embedding our principles. Or having our core principles and making sure it’s embedded in all of the activity. In terms of facilitating access and excellence. So ensuring that we offer opportunities for all and we support everyone that we can” (O4).
In most cases, organisations will be flexible in what and how they deliver; the central tenet of their mission is not to deliver a particular activity but to enrich people’s lives. While organisations tend to have preferred delivery methods and mediums, they tend to be focused more on outcomes, which contribute to sustainability.

This tendency is reflected by O14 also as a great opportunity to reach a wider audience when describing the perceived trend of theatres moving to become art centres:

“If you come to see something on the Monday night or you don’t like what’s on, (…) you might like what’s on the Tuesday night. Whereas in a more traditional theatre model, if you don’t like the show that’s on now, you might have to wait a month for something else that you do like. So you know and because we offer that breadth (…) we are giving ourselves maximum opportunity to reach the widest number of people” O14.

Flexibility in what is delivered demonstrates the agility of arts organisations to grow and ensure sustainability in a climate of reduced funding. This is also reflected in the ubiquitous use of networks of freelancers by all organisations except for libraries that tend to be made-up of full and part-time staff. In this study, freelancers were reported to make-up almost three quarters of the workforce of the organisations (18fte of every 25fte).

All organisations reported having an inclusive, equal opportunities policy. Policy was both formal and documented, under revision, or not formally documented at all. These three positions reflect the positions of arts organisations in relation to inclusive and accessible participation and delivery. First, organisations reported purposively seeking funding to deliver art forms to disabled young people, as their only core target group. In this group are also organisations that purposely seek funding for inclusive delivery of programmes. Second, organisations attempting to incorporate inclusive and accessible programmes as part of other delivery and third, only seeking to deliver inclusive programmes if a funder demands it. These positions are reflected by these four quotes from O4, O16, O10 and O1.
An organisation that seeks not to segregate and offers all programmes to all.

“And also anyone who... as I say, we basically operate on the basis that we are accessible for all, so that includes people with disabilities as well, obviously. We don’t segregate – there’s an inclusive approach.” O4.

An organisation that purposely seeks funding to support equal opportunities.

“We’re always fundraising for those kinds of resources. We’ve been successful in getting a new hearing loop installed, we got the money for that, so y’know, but it is always... y’know the money is there, but it’s expensive to support. In this particular area that I’m describing we also have some young people, deaf young people that are active in (...) a professional show, but they worked alongside three teams of young actors (...) we didn’t necessarily set out to recruit young deaf actors, but we did and we want to be able to support them and work with them (...) but obviously supporting, interpreting those rehearsals every day is a lot of money, so that is a challenge” (O16).

An organisation that is inclusive across all programs of work as part of delivery.

“It kind of crosses throughout all the different strands of work. (...) Within those schools programmes, we have four who are special schools in the local area. What we think’s really important is that those schools which are for children with disabilities work with the mainstream schools as well. So it’s side-by-side, they’re exhibiting their work and sharing their practice” O10.

An organisation that is demand led and will endeavour to be inclusive when a funder requires it.

“You know it’s very important work, to work with children and young people with special needs, or disabilities. So we do take a lead. But it’s not – we don’t particularly initiate the projects, it will be as a result of somebody coming to us and saying “We’d like to work with you. Can you help us with this project?” Or “We’ve got an idea.” Or a local authority might come to us and say “We would like some work doing in this school, can you do the delivery?” We’re sort of back to that point that I made at the beginning – we don’t just sit around the desk and think “Oh I know, let’s go and do a project in a special school” (O1).
Some of these organisational positions are bound to be a result of activity being led by the boundaries of funding and the need to deliver particular project aims. It is clear that the central tenet of an organisation’s mission is one of moral values. The workforce within these organisations embodies these values and reported working in this sector because of their intrinsic belief in the arts as a conduit for enriching lives. This is reflected by O5 directly in relation to the inclusive delivery of projects:

“I want to make opportunities for children and young people and I don’t believe that just because somebody has a disability that should stop them being able to access the same sort of enriching cultural experience that any child can. Maybe even more so, sometimes, because there’s a lot of – you see a lot of – from my experience you see a lot of young people who do have disabilities of various severities that arts and movement can bring things out of them that aren’t there through other means. And they find ways of expressing themselves that they can’t do otherwise” (O5).

In summary, the activities delivered by organisations tend to embody their core moral values. Their existence is sustained through flexible delivery of inclusive programmes. All organisations seek to be inclusive and provide equal opportunities but there is a difference in organisations that actively seek funding to do so and those that do so if it is required of funders. Whilst the breadth of delivery of activities is huge, there is the suggestion that seeking funding to support inclusive activities is challenging due to the additional costs required. This is built upon further in relation to the subsequent themes.
Policy

All organisations were asked specifically about participatory policy. Organisations were unanimous in stating that they do not have a specific policy concerning disability. Rather, and perhaps in relation to the Equalities Act, they all stated that they have an equality policy emphasising inclusive programme delivery. This reflects the situation at the council level, as described in the review section above. A typical response when asked about policy was expressed by O3, “We don’t have a formal policy around disability; we have formal policies more around equality of access.” Many of the policy descriptions focus on stereotypical accessibility like provision of accessible buildings. However, in the stories told surrounding programmes and activities, it is clear that some organisations are aware of the necessity to go beyond this and in some cases already do so. For example, by specifically designing around individual needs, ensuring programmes run for appropriate lengths of time, ensuring support is available and by working alongside carers and guardians. Two quotes from O4 and O5 provide examples of this:

“The whole programme is inclusive. (...) we try to make all our (delivery) inclusive, whatever it may be, whether that means that we work with parents so they can enable their children to access the (delivery)... A lot of our creative (delivery), especially for the younger children, have a support worker in there with them. So there is that support. And they’re kept at a smaller number, so that there is that – they’re able to have that one-on-one sometimes with the children who need a little bit more time or help to access things” (O5).

“We have an organisational policy; it’s sort of standard if that helps! It’s sort of, you know, the standard procedures of being inclusive and ensuring that all of our opportunities are accessible. For example, providing disabled access or access for disabled... physical disability, in each environment that we hold a workshop, and things like that. But I think there is obviously, there’s a lot more we can do. There’s a lot more any organisation can do to make sure that we’re doing as much as we can to support people with disabilities, because there’s obviously such a wide scope of uh... [pause] I don’t know. There’s different disabilities, really, isn’t there? From learning disabilities to physical disabilities, mental illness. One thing to mention is we also do work with a group of people with mental illness...” O4.

In relation to the organisation, participation and activities theme, organisations described programmes that are either: designed purposely for disabled young people; are inclusive and accommodating; or, are inclusive only if it is a requirement of the funder. There is then a mismatch in the ubiquity of equality policy and the perception that some delivery is not inclusive. This would suggest that whilst all organisations aim to be entirely inclusive, some acknowledge that when it is not desired by funders explicitly, provision is not put in place. This will be discussed further in relation to the funding theme.
Some of the organisations suggested that equal opportunities policy does not mean standardising and treating everyone equally but rather that to give everyone the opportunity to have the same experience engagement must be designed around the individual. It is not about providing a one-size-fits-all programme:

“It’s about the ability to openly engage and say ‘what can we do to make your (engagement more comfortable)?’. I’m always very keen—I have always been very keen and I have always liked questions in interviews on what is an equal opportunity for me, because the number of people who still say, ‘well it’s about treating everybody the same’ and to my knowledge that would be completely opposite of that. It’s about treating people as an individual and recognising everybody’s uniqueness so that end experience that they have is the same. You might have to treat somebody completely differently to allow that experience. You see what I mean, and that’s what partly we’re doing with our (delivery)” (O14).

All organisations state that they are inclusive and have an equal opportunities policy. Some organisations go beyond the status quo and seek to do as much as they can within the boundary of projects. Other organisations interpret equal opportunities as a call to treat people individually and design programmes and delivery around them, so that everyone has equal opportunity to the same experiences. This leads us to the next theme related to Funding Climate.

**Funding Climate**

The demographic questionnaire, given to all participants following interviews, revealed that all organisations except for libraries declared between three and six distinct sources of funding. Even the ten NPOs rely heavily on non-Arts Council England funding as a core part of their sustainability. The sources of funding mentioned range from donations, public-funded institutions and councils, to private sector donations and commercial activity. It is clear that organisations have been active for long periods in seeking and sourcing funding from a variety of funding to achieve their aims. This is reflected in this quote from O3:

“So, it's a real mixed economy I suppose – of trying to find all the resources without it just being a single source of arts funding. We've been really good at that, but it's getting harder. Because again, it's not just our money that's reducing, it's everybody. So a lot of organisations that may have said “Oh, we can put £1500 into an arts project” – that's gone” O3.
Organisations were all asked whether the recent funding climate had any impacts on their organisation. Discussions around this topic are mixed. Like O3 above, organisations suggested that gaining funding always demands a creative and flexible approach. The environment for securing funding within the sector is always deemed to be challenging and there is never a period in which an organisation can afford to have a relaxed attitude, as reflected by O18:

“I could be really cavalier and honest and say it’s not changed, because we’re always under threat of cutting. I can’t remember a time when there’s not been somebody saying “I can’t do that because of cuts, I can’t do this, I can’t do that”. And I don’t know if it’s me just being a grumpy old (person) and saying “look fight!”. We’ve stopped at the point of saying “well this is going to be difficult, we’ve got cuts”. We’d have gone home years ago! And I know I’m always perceived as being very flippant with that, or I just bow my head down and keep going, keep going!” O18.

So in a sense, organisations could be said to be well prepared for a more competitive sector with reduced funding as they have experience in what could be called creative funding practice, i.e. applying for funding from non-typical sources and the private sector.

Here, however, we see how O18 reflects back on prior periods of funding, when the organisation started and the only person involved was the founder, working part-time:

“And I can remember getting a phone call, so there’s me part-time, on my own, we hadn’t got the office at that point, basically saying “can you put a half a million pound bid together” from the county council, who led it to start off with. And I can remember at the time saying sort of “does that mean I don’t get my grant from the county council?” which was £13,000. I said “that’s what you employed me to do”, ‘cause that’s more sustainable than half a million. No, that seems quite extraordinary when you look back at it going “ok, we’ll put a bid together”. In response we put in a three year bid and they said “no it has to be spent in one year!”” O18.

Completing a perpetual cycle of funding applications was described as a historic necessity to survive in the arts and cultural sector. It was also suggested that this had become an even greater challenge as a result of the current funding climate. This is reflected by one of the NPO organisations, O1:

“In this current climate? Well, you know, obviously – I mean, funding’s a problem. We are very lucky that we’ve retained our funders, but every one of them has cut our funding. So we are working – doing as much work, if not more, as we’ve ever done – but with less money coming in to core. And as I said earlier, we do have to fundraise. Constantly, we’re fundraising” O1.
Clearly, funding at some periods of an organisation’s life cycle is more straightforward than others. From both O3 and O18 we can see that whilst organisations are always conscious of the challenge surrounding funding and the resilience required to be sustainable, the cuts impact organisations across sectors. This in-turn has a knock-on effect as they form the network of funders that organisations rely on.

Organisations suggested that funding is always challenging. They also suggested that whilst delivery may currently be sustained, cuts are having a direct impact on the breadth, depth and resources available for delivery, as demonstrated by O5, O24 and O14. Here O5 discusses how the organisation is working with funders to find solutions to funding challenges but also how, to maintain quality, staff are increasingly forced to pay for resources themselves:

“The current funding situation is a difficult one for us. The local authority has, like every other local authority, extremely limited funds for arts and culture versus the need to do statutory provision. We’ve worked very hard with the local authority to find a way forward that doesn’t necessarily mean that they have to cut, completely, our funding. (…) I’m going to do a project in a special needs school next term, and I’ve got lots of ideas, but I know that it’s either going to come out of my pocket to get that interesting (props) and stuff that I want to use. That’s probably the only thing that I’ve noticed – is that there’s a lot more recycling and reusing. The resources aren’t there. We can’t go out and buy stuff. We have to, at the moment, make do with what we’ve got in stock, unless we would apply for some funding to get it. Which we could look at – is looking at that specifically – we could look at that” O5.

O24 discusses how cuts have led to staff reductions, thankfully through a natural process of staff retiring. This is coupled alongside a reduction in budgets that is leading to difficult decisions about what resources to purchase:

“Only in the fact that staff have not been replaced. We’ve been very fortunate, we are under major restructure now, had this happened after March next year goodness knows what I’d be saying. At the moment, we have been quite fortunate - if staff leave, they aren’t replaced. So we’re down to two team librarians as such, which are both part time - so it just equates to just over a post to deliver children’s services across 16 libraries, that’s quite tight really. That’s the lowest we’ve been for a very long time. Nothing will happen now until we’re restructured.

We’ve had budget cuts, as everybody else has had, that’s obviously affected what we’ve been able to buy and what services we’re able to buy into. We’d always think carefully about what services to buy into anyway, but I would think we would be even more careful now. For example, the Summer Reading Challenge, we always buy a braille collection for children that have sight problems. We have in the past and certainly one little boy has used that material and we’ve had great feedback from them. I don’t think we would ever not buy that, but we’ve bought even less of the materials to compensate, we feel we need to have that collection as well” O24.
Whilst O14 describes how ‘lean’ funding as a result of cuts has led to less “breathing space to do some interesting things”. In this example it refers to not being able to deliver a performance following a project with disabled people:

“it’s more that the funding allowed us the breathing space to do some interesting things with it and perhaps provide us with more resource to put on a (art form), bring in the specialised help, or specialised speakers, or it might provide some money for that group to interact with (specialist disability group) more, for example, to come and do the master class on creating theatre with and for disabled (people)” O14.

Organisations are resilient and innovative in their approaches to funding. This is reflected in attitudes that funding is always challenging. The current cuts affect the breadth, depth and resources available for delivery by, for example, reducing staff numbers, the availability of funding through networks of private and public organisations, forcing lean delivery and removing space for creative and experimental delivery. This is embodied by O1 who suggests that these changes due to the cuts will require a change in mind-set of their project partners, as they can no longer afford to provide the added extras without charging:

“We keep some capacity in the team for that phone call or email that comes in randomly – and quite regularly – asking us to do additional work. Now, we try and charge for our time where we can (...). But again, that’s quite hard to do, because it’s changing our whole mind-set from our partners, that now they might have to pay us to be involved in a project. I think to change that mind-set is going to take some time” O1.

This leads to the next theme which focuses on workforce, values and motivations.

**Workforce and values**

All organisations with the exception of the libraries rely on a large network of freelance artists. When discussing the workforce, it is clear that project success relies on these individuals. The variety of skills required to deliver the plethora of activities described by many of the organisations suggests that employing an individual permanently in a delivery role would only be sustainable if a large proportion of delivery is secured in one area. Given the flexibility and creativity required to secure funding, it is clear that a strong network of freelancers is one of art and creative organisations’ main assets. The reliance on freelancers is described by O3:

“We buy artists in, so we haven’t got a team of artists who are just kind of sat there waiting for the next project. We have to buy people (...)” O3.
This approach to the workforce is a result of the short-term nature of funded projects. The reliance on the network of freelancers for delivery also extends to the freelancer’s own resources and reliance on them to utilise their own material to support delivery:

“One guy said “What about resources and kit?” and we were saying, well, you need to provide them. He thought that was – he said “I think that’s crazy so I’m not doing it.” I mean not quite as bluntly as that, but he did say it’s crazy. But you want a fully-formed person to arrive with their kit and get on with it, you know, rather than us having to turn up every weekend with a load of kit that we hand over and then collect back” O3.

The reliance on freelancers was reported to have a large impact on delivery of inclusive programmes. With an adhoc workforce, training and continuous professional development is not necessarily provided as part of project delivery. Most organisations do attempt to train “our artists” when the funding is included as part of a project:

“So all of our artists have been able to extend their professional development and we’ve also run – or paid for – our (assistants) and our artists and some of the staff in the office to go to, I think it’s Level 2 autism training. So we’ve done Level 1 and Level 2 recently. Those additional funds have had that provision in there, which is absolutely brilliant, and they’ve been able to come back and train the rest of the team” (O10).

If organisations have no funding to pay freelancers or volunteers to participate in training and professional development, they have to give up paid work to participate. With no training or professional development, they miss out on gaining new skills and the pool of freelancers with expertise in working with disabled children and young people shrinks over time.

In the delivery of inclusive programmes expertise and training is fundamental. For example, O16 described how volunteers and in-training interpreters were not suitable for an amateur performance.

“The challenge is that… is for them, is that they didn’t feel that they were at a level that they could actually interpret… sign interpret the show. That’s where you get into the sort of area of its, well it’s, there’s a very high expectation and so there should be, but there’s a high expectation of deaf audiences on sign interpreters for the show and I guess my learning was… I sort of… I sort of said well the actors aren’t professional and I don’t think people’ll… will kind of be concerned if they’re not quite loud enough, or y’know… obviously we want them to be as professional as possible, but everybody knows they’re coming to see a training play, not a professional play. Surely, surely people will have the same… tolerance of a learner in the role of interpreter and they said, no, no that’s not the way it works”

This means that inclusive projects may rely on workforce outside of an organisation’s freelance community.
In relation to this, a key asset of a great project worker was described as someone who is confident and can see past barriers:

“For me, what makes a good practitioner or project worker is the ability to see past those barriers and the ability to ask the questions and not be scared to say, “I’ve never worked with somebody that has William’s disease, what does that mean for me to work with you? How can I help you to be in this session?” Or “I’ve never worked with somebody who is in a wheelchair, and I need to be able to deliver this piece of dance...” So asking those questions: “Are you able to get out of your chair? Are you happy with us swinging your chair around the room?” (O2).

Other project worker attributes were described as: being relaxed and patient, communication, compassion, creativity, empathy, flexibility, customised delivery, keeping your cool, organisation skills and perseverance. This is an extensive set of attributes for any workforce leading to the values and motivations identified.

The motivator for working in this sector reflects satisfaction and the importance of making a difference to individuals and communities. There is a common and strong belief that the arts should be available to all and that the arts make a huge difference to the participants regardless of ability. In relation to the motivation for this work, one interviewee said:

“The satisfaction really. Definitely. The little girl now who is brushing her hair, the families that have been involved and have got so much out of the session. I always think that if we can change one child’s life then actually we have done our job really - whether that child is disabled or not really. The children’s life experiences - I think, if they’ve got enjoyment out of the session, it ticks boxes for us and it would give me the satisfaction to run the session. Just being able to talk to children, talk to families, to signpost the right information and just having the knowledge to find out where information is for them and the relevant services for them if they are asked” (O24).

The altruistic motivation for this work is clear. It is also evident that provision goes beyond arts practice to signpost further support and opportunities. In relation to this O6 said the motivation of working in the sector is related to the values of the artists:

“So the motivation for those artists who want to work in these kinds of areas is seeing the difference that it can make; is knowing that they have made a difference. I think the artists that we work with have a strong kind of social and ethical conviction about working with different groups of people, and belief in the universal message of the arts. What they get out of it I suppose is that satisfaction of knowing that they’re living their values, perhaps” (O6).
Yet, the art is also fundamental. Here O16 suggests that inclusive delivery is not only about the community but also “pushes yourselves in new ways”.

“It’s just really important that we serve our community and we reflect our community both on the stage and in our audience, so in our participatory work. So I think by doing something like this it’s really immersive and intense even and quite long term, that you… that we as an organisation learn and then we’re able to develop ourselves artistically as well in relation to that area, so disability arts is a really interesting area for us artistically, cause I think you just push yourselves in new ways.” (O16).

On one hand the sector relies on a network of freelancers, their flexibility, their passion, their resources and their skills and experience. On the other, freelancers rely on the network of organisations to succeed in project funding applications and gaining funding in areas they can deliver. There is a perception that inclusive delivery is more challenging, costly and in some cases requires specific expertise. It is this expertise that may become void in a sector for which training may be cut as a result of lean project funds at the expense of inclusive delivery, innovative delivery and the loss of an altruistic workforce.

**Challenges to delivery**

All organisations were asked to provide examples of unsuccessful or challenging incidents in relation to projects with disabled young people. In all cases, participants initially found it very difficult to identify any unsuccessful or challenging projects. For example, three organisations could only think of projects that they wish had been delivered better, two following a change in plan that was out of their control and one as a result of being over-run by children, due to the popularity of participating in the creative project! Nevertheless, in all cases, the overriding project evaluations were that the projects were successful.

The majority of organisations spoke of challenges in relation to finance, time and the tensions surrounding the resulting compromise. For example, O1 said:

“I mean, it’s a very, very different way of working. Projects working with children and young people with disabilities, they need to be better financed. You generally work with much smaller numbers. You need a lot of support from staff who know the participants and know what their needs are. And the needs can be so diverse as well (…) Things take longer. They take longer to prepare, they take longer to deliver. So that really is an example of where you can’t cut corners, and you’re much better to do less if you haven’t got the money. Rather than to, you know, even do the same as you would somewhere else. (…) Again, in terms of access, making projects accessible. There are ways to do that without it necessarily costing a lot of money. (…) So being creative about the way that you make things accessible. It wasn’t – you do it for free. There’s not a cost to it, other than the time it takes” (O1).
This quote particularly emphasises the need for additional finance, additional support and additional time when delivering inclusive projects, suggesting that without them, delivery is changed rather than compromised. Whilst this was iterated by other organisations, many of the organisations also attempt to be, “creative about the way that you make things accessible (…) There’s not a cost to it, other than the time it takes” (O1). As discussed in the workforce and values theme, the individuals that work on the delivery of these projects believe that the projects their organisations deliver have a dramatic impact on the lives of all children and young people. This motivation leads to project delivery, despite funding cuts, following creative solutions and drawing on their expertise. This resilience is an asset and such solutions could be shared across organisations. On one and these non-financial solutions mean that projects are being delivered with less funding but the cost is falling on the workforce. This is not a sustainable solution and will inevitably lead to compromise in delivery.

Other barriers related to delivery are presented in Appendix 6. These include: accessibility, artists being treated badly, audiences, confidence, cost, curriculum and education, environmental factors, expectations, fear, funding, hidden disability, experience, preparation, communication, perception, political and social factors, progression routes, project management and leadership, public awareness, relationships, staffing and training, temporality, tensions, transport and value.

**Exemplary delivery**

All organisations were asked to report on particularly successful projects that demonstrate positive impact. In doing so, interviewees told us inspiring stories of the power of the arts to enrich the lives of children and young people. These stories, more than anything else in our research, expressed the sector’s values, moral commitment to the arts, and genuine belief that the arts have a demonstrable impact on disabled children and young people. Five examples are provided below in the form of individual vignettes. They particularly emphasise the impact the arts has for all children and young people and illustrate particularly powerful examples for disabled children and young people. Vignette five also brings-up issues surrounding the lengths of projects.
Vignette one – Organisation 1

“It was a project working with a special school and a mainstream school that were both having a new school built as part of the ‘Building Schools for the Future’ programme. And they were going to move onto the same site…the aims were twofold. One of them was to create an archive of both schools, a collective memory from pupils and staff, as the old ones were being knocked down. The other aim was, because the schools were going to be on the same site, was to begin to build up some positive relationships between the pupils, so they wouldn’t just all of a sudden be faced with each other. And not know how to communicate and deal with each other, you know. From the mainstream side they might have been a bit – well, from both sides – just a bit of anxiety. It’s a big thing anyway, moving schools, especially bringing the two schools together. So it was to break down barriers, and just make certainly the young people that participated, just so... They’d know a friendly face, and they’d feel more relaxed about what can be quite traumatic experience…

The lead artist was a writer, who was experienced in working with young people with special needs…it was successful because we identified an artist who had got the skills and experience to work with the participants. We got some absolutely fantastic memories, from both schools. It also succeeded because it really did engage with the local community as well, so we were able to get parents and pupils – again, past and present – involved in the project.

The young people, they got on really well. They became quite a tight-knit little team in the end. And again, I mean, I haven’t been able to monitor those relationships since the project finished, but I’m sure there was a trickle-down effect as well. So all the young people who took part had a positive experience, and then they would have told their friends, you know, “I’ve been working with these children from another school, and they’re okay, they’re nice.” I’m sure that happened. I know for quite a few of those young people, on the first day in a new school, they felt much happier.

As happens all too often, sometimes in schools if you go in or an artist goes in to do a workshop or a project, sometimes teachers see that as an opportunity to step back and leave it to the artist. That doesn’t work at all, the artist isn’t there to discipline, you know. It can make an artist’s job very difficult, sometimes, working with a school. This wasn’t the experience on this project. We had fantastic support from the staff, and lots of it. I suppose because of the nature of it, being a special school, I think there’s a member of staff for two or three children, so there was a lot of adult support there.

The product was an exhibition which toured a number of venues for twelve months. All the stories are also online. Because it took place in 2012, we were awarded an Inspire Mark, linked to the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games. That raised the profile of the project, because it was in all the national publicity around the Olympics…When the project was finished we had a celebration. The great and the good came along, councillors, the teachers and governors and parents and the children and the press. That kind of kicked the exhibition phase off really well.”
Vignette two – Organisation 10

“For this project we were able to innovate, learn and train our artists. So all of our artists have been able to extend their professional development and we’ve also run – or paid for – our play and learn assistants and our artists and some of the staff in the office to go to, I think it’s Level 2 autism training. So we’ve done Level 1 and Level 2 recently. Those additional funds have had that provision in there, which is absolutely brilliant.

As a result of this training, we did (a project) with Crocus Fields and children with extreme autism. The project started with an artist who is very experienced, with a huge passion for working with young people with autism. She went into Crocus Fields, and she starts off obviously building the partnership with the people who work there. Once the project is up and running, she does one-to-ones with each of the young people. We kept it to quite a small group – I think about five young people in the project. She would work in Crocus Fields with them, and then when we felt the time was right, bring them to the gallery, introduce them to the gallery situation, and workshops in the gallery.

I think that happened for about six to eight weeks, and at the end of that the young people exhibited their work. It was open to the public but we kept it very restricted on the numbers, so that it wasn’t going to alarm any of the young people. It was incredibly moving. But my personal reflection – or the thing I remember most – is the support workers almost in tears. Saying “I’ve worked with this young man, for over ten years.” He was about 15, so since he was a very small boy.

“I’ve been trying to do – I thought I was quite good at exploring his creativity through art with him – yet I feel a failure. Because in the last eight weeks, Sam (our artist), has been able to move him on such leaps and bounds, in terms of his expression and being able to communicate his feelings in a way that is not through speaking.” He said it was absolutely staggering. Although it was a bit sad, because it made him feel that he hadn’t achieved what he could have achieved in ten years. It certainly showed us that the work was really powerful.

And just intensely interesting, seeing how young people with autism view the world, and how it... One of our missions – one of our statements here – is about how we hope we help people to see the world differently, by presenting them with contemporary artists’ work who look at things a bit differently. And explore a side of your imagination which you might not have opportunities to do at other times in your life. And how closely this chimed with how differently people with autism see the world, and what those close connections between an artist and a person with autism, and the ways their brains work, was just really fascinating for us.

I think we make sure that the studio is kept very clear and bereft of other stimulants. So it’s concrete walls, white cupboards. The work that goes on in that space is the work that then will be put up on the wall – it will ‘flavour the room’ if you like. I think that’s really important, so that they’re not walking into a room that already has pictures, lots of colours, or distractions in it. It’s their space, to inhabit as they like.”
Vignette three – Organisation 14

“This idea of a sort of a night... which is specifically aimed at an environment where disabled children and young people could come and enjoy a disco or a party evening with their peers, make friends within their peer groups and one which they can do in a safe environment that wasn’t where they felt that they were being tokenised. So we tried the idea of a (Party night) and essentially we are doing it in here at our cafe bar, clear the tables, stick the PA in the corner and Person A comes in with her laptop and we run a disco night. And the first one we did I think we had about 15 people and now we do it every other month and we get 90 to a 100. It’s getting to a point where it’s sold out from in here and so we are trying and moving them into the main auditorium to create more capacity to deliver those evenings. They are very much... we don’t provide one to one care, so it is a mixture of carer’s having to bring in groups and we have people who come on their own.

Its three quid, so it’s very affordable and we keep it on our flat level because its easily accessible in here, there’s no stairs, no ramps, it’s close to where we have that sort of equipped toilet facility should anybody require it ... and it’s just a fun, a really fun night. We have a mixture of people who have both physical and learning disabilities come along. Person A is great in terms of people who take over the decks for a bit of the evening, those sort of the things, you know, it’s a very simple engagement. What I’m really hoping happens now is that this is one area where Person A is keen to try and develop a drama group for that cohort. So now that they are here and enjoying themselves in the venue, we want to try and move that engagement to another level and start a drama group for disabled young people which she is keen to lead and we just had some funding to try that out from the autumn onwards for the next year. So I think that’s our main and our regular, you know, engagement. We are having a number of special schools who bring returning groups to pantomime each year and because of the flexibility of the auditorium we can accommodate that within our auditorium. And we do seek out as I say interventions in work, interesting work that can engage so in the last year we have worked with (Organisation X) from (County), who specialise in work for the deaf audiences and as I mentioned earlier we have (Organisation Y) in the last couple of months who have done, as I say, a fantastic engagement for them, but also for the staff here in terms of getting the staff improving and understanding working with those people. But on a regular basis it is the simple party night; come and have a dance, come in and sit and, you know, just come in and enjoy the venue for what it is, it’s community arts.”
Vignette four - Organisation 24

“If I can tell you about a bag books session - we have a wide range of bag books. The one I have brought with me is ‘CJ the library cat’, but there’s another one about A Little Girl Who Brushes Her Hair and in that box you’ve got a wig, you’ve got a hairbrush. And, obviously, we would encourage the children to have a feel of the wig and have a feel with the hairbrush and, eventually, actually to brush the hair. There’s one particular child that had never brushed her hair, that would never touch her hair, would never have anything to do with her hair. After coming along to the session she actually started to feel her own hair, and started to brush her own hair eventually - obviously with lots of help and encouragement. The librarian who was delivering that session got a personal thanks - that never would have happened without that story.

(In relation to if the positive impact was influenced by the environment) It could well have been - yes. Because we would always encourage delivering our services from our library, we want people to come into the library. We would sometimes go into the school first and then encourage them to bring a group down to the library. So that could have helped because it’s a new environment, it’s a new person suggesting that she did it and it was probably the way it was delivered as well. Rather than saying ‘here’s your hair, have a feel’, it was actually a story and part of a story. So everybody was doing the same thing and everyone was being involved and encouraged to do the same thing which has obviously helped this girl to develop something that she was scared of beforehand.

She was part of a small group - yes. I think there are usually about 8 children that come along from a whole range of disabilities. They all take part and encourage each other to take part. They all come along with a care worker or a care worker between two. The care worker sits with them as well and encourages them to take taking part in the story and touch the storyboards that are going around.”
Vignette five – Organisation 3

“We did a project about 18 months ago. I’m not sure it’s to do with funding, but it was specifically around physically disabled young people and there were kids coming from across the country, who were then resident in (Location A) at the college throughout term time. We worked with up to 40 students in total, but in terms of a performance piece, there was about five young people. This was using iPads and other technology for young people to create and compose music. The performance was a live performance of them manipulating some of the sounds and things that they’d created in front of an audience. Which was incredible, I felt. And it’s something that we are developing further.

We initially worked with two or three artists, that were again – through our ‘stable’ of artists– people who we’ve worked with before. Some people that we will help develop their skills, who wouldn’t have seen themselves as a kind of disability music technologist. One of the guys, a guy called (Person A). But the guy is brilliant with – well, all kinds of young people – but with disabled young people. Just fantastic.

Basically we got commissioned to go over there and deliver it there, so we did. There was three artists, two music people and a digital visuals artist. So we did a piece there. That was, again, just remarkable. Creative young people. Probably – I don’t know – I suspect for the first time in their lives - able to kind of be musical in a real sense and control what was going on. And produced, I thought, quite a magical performance through manipulation of music and visuals.

We’re now looking to work with- through an organisation called (Organisation X), which is a (Charity X) organisation who tend to work with schools. There’s an opportunity to work with the (Company Z) concert orchestra. So we’re hoping that our next project will be with – there’ll be some physically disabled young people with the technology, iPads; there’ll be some non-disabled, traditional music people from some local ensemble or orchestra or whatever; and then members of the (Company Z) concert orchestra.

The plan for us – the ambition for us – was always that the disabled young people will work on equal terms with traditional musicians. That was our—when we saw the performance in (Location B), it was like instantly: “We need to take this further.” We want to do some collaborative work, but it must be... you know, the idea of saying to some guy from (Company Z) concert orchestra, “This is your piece. This guy – this disabled young person – has written this as part of a process. You’ve got to go away and learn this now, or score it. Likewise there might be something you want to add.”

We didn’t want it to be where you’ve got some traditional musicians, who are: “Here’s a bit of stuff that you guys will be able to do.” With all the best intentions in the world, “This is some stuff that you can actually do, so we’ll allocate a bit of time in the programme.” We wanted it to be a collaborative piece. We want these disabled young people to be creating music, and then saying to the other guys, “Okay, you’ve got to learn some of this now.” So it’s on equal terms. That’s the ambition with that, and that should take place early next year, because (Project Name) have got some funding.
But that is a project that we think can be developed. I would love for that to become a regional project. Bear in mind we really should only be working within Nottinghamshire. But I’d love a regional project where we’re working with several groups of – these are quite profoundly disabled young people. These are guys in electric wheelchairs, usually one-to-one care, and very limited mobility. But when it works it’s just the most incredible thing.

One of the guys from (School B), as part of his evaluation, said “It’s the best thing I’ve ever done in my life.” Which... you know... you can’t ask for more than that. I’m partly saddened by it, really, because I would hope he has had other things in his life that are equally fulfilling. So to provide that is really lovely, but in another sense it’s quite sad, thinking well – because we can only provide that little bit. It’s just a little part of his life.

This is the other dilemma, that we’re able to do projects that have quite a short lifespan; that can be massively impactful, but you have to then go away because the resources have stopped. That is an issue for all young people, I think.

Certainly working with (ACRONYM) around the impact of creativity on young people, you need a long—to have a real turnaround, if you want to change a young person’s behaviour, outlook, whatever you want to call it – you can’t do it in, you know, eight, two-hour sessions and expect that young person to [snaps fingers] suddenly be: “You know what, everything’s fine!”

You’re working with young people with really complex needs and difficulties in all aspects of their life. If you want to actually make a real impact on that, you’ve got to... long term. That’s sometimes an issue for us. And something we’ve realised, quite recently I suppose, is we need to do less but do more. So do less by volume of projects, but when we do a project, put more into it, longer-term, try and see it through.

That’s a bit of a dilemma, because you don’t want to turn away the possibility of working with a group somewhere, for eight weeks, two hours a week. You want to do that. But also, you realise that if you just do that and nothing else, it – will it make any difference? It’d be a bit of fun for them, and we try and provide a performance at the end of it, but we should be having a longer-term view.

I mean our approach; we’re trying to develop our approach and this model with a view to working with anybody. I don’t think it should make any difference whether it’s with a disabled or looked-after or whatever—if you adopt the same approach, it should work. I think if you start making a special- you know, if somebody’s disabled so you need to make some kind of different model – we’ve found that doesn’t matter. If you have the right model, it works with everybody.”
6.0 Research Summary

This research is concerned with disabled children and young people’s engagement with the arts and cultural sector in the East Midlands, given the current environment of restrained resources. To answer the research question a review of relevant academic literature, sector-wide reports and white papers was conducted. An audit of East Midlands’s council websites in relation to disability was also carried out. Empirical data was collected to establish the impact of the environment of restrained resources and how organisations are overcoming the challenges they face through interviews with 24 arts organisations across the East Midlands.

Organisations in the East Midlands all spoke of the transformative, communicative and socially empowering role that participation in arts and cultural events can have for children and young people with impairments. This belief is embodied in the arts and cultural organisations’ missions, and in the values and motivations expressed by the workforce. Examples of positive impact, illustrated in the vignettes, demonstrate the empowering nature of the arts (Cameron 2007). This is reflected by all of the participating organisations across the East Midlands who all provided examples of impactful stories. Assuming the stories of positive impact told by the participating organisations are accurate, this research provides further evidence that art can support people to overcome barriers (Taylor, 2005; Boeltzig, and Sulewski et al 2009).

To sustain delivery as a result of the restrained environment, organisations are flexible and creative to deliver programmes successfully. Three reasons for this necessity emerged. First, as a result of the ongoing and recent constraint in funding, workforces are declining and not being replaced, projects are inevitably leaner with for example, fewer project resources, shorter time-scales and available to fewer participants. Organisations must then show resilience and be creative in delivery.

Second, with less funding available, organisations are adopting diverse and innovative approaches to securing funding from sources that they may not have considered previously. Organisations spoke of the impact on all organisations in their networks and how even small amounts of funding have disappeared. Third, organisations spoke of a reduction in the breadth and depth of projects; that there is no longer spare project money for the non-core elements of projects – one example provided was no longer putting on a public performance. This means that some of the benefits of participation in projects will inevitably be lost.

One of the greatest threats to delivery of projects to disabled children and young people seems to be how to sustain expertise in a transient, freelance workforce when training budgets are limited or non-existent. This is a definite impact of the reduced resources climate and will have a greater impact on delivery where specialist knowledge is required, such as programme delivery with children on the autistic spectrum. In this case having specialist art organisations may be one approach to sustaining inclusive delivery albeit one that may not be advocated by all.
All organisations stated that they have an equal opportunities policy. However, in a similar way to that reported in section 3.3 that councils ‘profess’ commitment to the Equalities Act (2010) but may not substantiate it, organisations may not have any supporting written documentation regarding equal opportunities. As one might expect there are also distinct differences in the approach to inclusive programme delivery; some organisations only delivering to children and young people with disabilities, some delivering inclusive programme, and others only deliver to disabled children and young people when a funder demands it. This latter case could be interpreted as an organisation only meeting the basics of legal accessibility standards – they profess equal opportunities but do nothing to encourage participation beyond the norm. All of the organisations that participated in this research, however, have first-hand experience of delivering projects with disabled children and young people. Some of the academic literature (e.g. Riddell and Watson 2003) may suggest that delivering exclusively to disabled children and young people, as in the first example, will reinforce mainstream attitudes towards disability and disabling categories. With a few notable exceptions, there is little in the current practice of the organisations that participated in this research that would conform to a Disability Arts perspective. The types of organisations that participated in this research would, surely, defend their position as having expertise to ‘work with’ particular groups that require it. In many cases, the defence of their position is reinforced, as other organisations that do not ‘specialise’ will recruit ‘specialists’ to support inclusive programme delivery. The moral commitment and passion of the organisations and individuals in our sample is a key strength.
7.0 Conclusions

The research sought to answer the question:

*In an environment of restrained resources, how is the arts and culture sector overcoming barriers to engagement for disabled children and young people?*

To answer the research question, interviews with 24 arts organisations across the East Midlands established how organisations engaged with disabled children and young people, and to what extent barriers have emerged as a result of the current funding environment.

In conclusion, this research has identified a number of barriers that will have impact on disabled children and young people’s engagement with the arts. The research has also uncovered examples of organisations that have great ability to create solutions to overcome some of these barriers to sustain engagement with disabled children and young people. Evidence has also emerged of the empowering nature of the arts for children and young people. Unfortunately the restrained resources environment is having an impact on the funding available to organisations and will eventually inevitably have a detrimental effect if and/or when organisations find themselves in unsustainable positions.
8.0 Policy Implications

This final section of the report will consider the implications of the research for arts and cultural policy in the East Midlands. Below we discuss the findings of our research by outlining four questions that we hope serve as the provocations for the development of policy and practice.

Should arts organisations be encouraged to develop written policy towards disability?

Perhaps surprisingly, we wish to avoid advocating more policy where possible; that is, more written guidelines, targets, conditions, boxes to tick and so on. Our research has found wide variation in the levels of written, explicit equal opportunities policy and procedures. However, the importance of this in determining better provision is not self-evident. All the evidence we have looked at shows that adherence to the basics of equal opportunities legislation can quickly become a box-ticking exercise.

Rather, we believe that sustainable change happens most effectively where it develops from the ‘bottom up’, rather than being imposed from the ‘top down’. This means identifying areas of best practice, understanding the conditions that have produced them and supporting them. One of the strengths of Arts Council England’s Creative Case for Diversity as discussed in the review section of this report is the emphasis on “Shared discourse and critical debate” (Art Council England 2011: 15).

That said, the vast majority of organisations that we spoke to had no specific written policy towards disability and inclusivity. Instead, disability was one assumed element of written equal opportunities policy, where this existed at all. It is fair to say that, in general, issues around disability are marginalised from policy and practice in the East Midlands. In this context, the development of broad guidelines regarding the removal of barriers to inclusivity might be appropriate. Organisations need to be encouraged to make inclusivity a central tenet of their practice by recognising the barriers to participation that are built into environments and attitudes.

Should arts and cultural provision for disabled children and young people always be part of inclusive arts practices, or might specialised and impairment-specific activities be part of a plural model? Pragmatically, what should best practice look like?

One central tension running through this research is that between inclusive arts practices that are available for all and the barriers to participation faced by children and young people with impairments. Sometimes these barriers are designed into the environment; sometimes they are present in the design of activities in non-inclusive ways; sometimes they are part of the perception that inclusivity is too difficult. Much provision designed specifically for children and young people with impairments effectively reproduces the segregation and marginalisation that has been critiqued through the social model of disability. At the same time it is important to recognise the value of these arts experiences to people with impairments. This is a difficult area for policy makers and arts organisations to negotiate.

Inclusivity is not just about the built environment. It is also about the quality, experience and confidence of arts workers to work with children and young people with different forms of impairment. Pragmatically, it is recognised that it is unrealistic to expect all or even most organisations to have this sort of specialist knowledge in-house, particularly during times of reduced funding. The use of specialist arts workers and specific interventions therefore seems appropriate as part of a plural model of arts provision that includes disabled children and young people.
Budgets for accessibility should become a standard part of funding procedures. This would help maintain the flexibility of organisations and prevent accessibility and inclusivity being a victim of the ‘lean delivery’ response to the cuts in arts funding described earlier in the report. This will also help to retain the capacity for inclusive delivery where it exists.

Future interventions should seek to learn from the most progressive organisations and schemes. The Unlimited programme (see: http://weareunlimited.org.uk), part of the London 2012 Cultural Olympiad, was the world’s largest ever commissioning fund for Deaf and disabled artists. The Unlimited II grant programme, running 2013-16 and delivered by Shape Arts, a disabled-led arts organisation, continues this work through a series of commissions and a complementary mentoring programme. The Unlimited Impact scheme, announced in 2014 and also delivered by Shape Arts, has three aims: develop and inspire the next generation of young disabled people passionate about making change through the arts; support venues to programme work by disabled artists; and deepen discussion and debate around work by disabled artists. These schemes serve as a model for empowering cultural policy, putting Disability Arts on an equal footing to non-disabled arts, demonstrating that work made by disabled people can draw audiences on an equal platform.

The importance of disabled artist role models and mentors, opportunities for communication and self-expression and the commissioning of disabled artists – all of these are areas that would inspire the next generation of disabled children and young people to make the jump from community and participatory arts into careers in the creative industries. Schemes such as these could lead the way for the development of regional Disability Arts for children and young people.

**How can freelance art workers be supported to deliver inclusive and empowering arts activities?**

Training and experience emerge as central to the delivery of inclusive arts and cultural programmes for children and young people. The organisations whose practice moves towards more inclusive, sophisticated understandings of equal opportunities and disability tended to be those with the most experienced staff. With around three quarters of arts workers employed on a freelance basis, it is clear from our research that the quality of the network of freelance art workers is central to the strength of the arts sector in the region and to the quality of the experience of the arts and culture for disabled children and young people. Yet little is known about the freelance workforce: what are their levels of experience working with disabled children and young people? What is their experience of working as a freelancer and how they are being affected by funding cuts? What are their training needs to help deliver inclusive practice? We think that more research is needed to answer these questions about the freelance workforce in the region. However, we are sure that the freelance workforce is one area that targeted support could have a big impact on the quality of the arts sector, especially during times of reduced funding. Locating and promoting disabled freelance arts practitioners would go a long way to join up a policy towards freelancers with the aim described above of promoting role models and mentorship.
How can the arts sector in the East Midlands make the moral case for diversity?

Finally, our research demonstrated very strongly that organisations and the activities they deliver tend to embody a set of core moral values. The best way to describe this set of moral values is as a commitment to the power of the arts and creative practice to enrich people’s lives. It is this moral commitment, more than a commitment to particular art form, delivery method, or anything else, which determines the strength and resilience of the sector and the quality of the experience for disabled children and young people. People told us stories of the powerful impacts that arts practice can have and it is these stories that help sustain the commitment that will enable the arts sector to endure times of financial hardship.

The moral case for equal access to the arts is a key strength of the sector and key to provision for disabled children and young people. In our research, this was expressed through telling stories of the various impacts that arts and creative practice can have. Foregrounding this moral and ethical commitment through the sharing of stories is one way in which the sector can be supported and we would encourage the development of platforms and opportunities for this. We hope that this report makes a contribution to this process.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Leicester City Council</td>
<td>Access to culture - The cultural needs and rights of individuals</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leicester.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=15146&amp;">http://www.leicester.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=15146&amp;</a>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2 Appendix 2: Participant Interview Protocol

Arts and cultural sector engagement with disabled children and young people
Interview Guide

Part One: Information and consent

The project should be explained and the purpose and structure of the interview outlined.

In particular, make it clear that the purpose of this research is to explore how good arts provision for disabled children and young people can happen, and we think the best way to find this out is to speak to organisations themselves. We want to get a sense of what ‘good’ provision looks like, what barriers to ‘good’ provision might be and how funding cuts and financial austerity is being dealt with by organisations ‘on the ground’.

You should also emphasise that, while funded by The Mighty Creatives (TMC), this is independent research and all information is anonymous – we will not identify interviewees or any organisations or people they discuss in any of our reporting.

Any questions should be answered and, once both interviewer and participant are satisfied that the all relevant information is understood, written participant consent should be obtained.

Participants should complete the demographic questionnaire.

Part Two: Interview

Explain to the interviewee that in a moment you will ask them to recall an example of good engagement with disabled children and young people, and also to talk about examples where there have been barriers to ‘good’ engagement. That ‘good’ can be defined in any way or combination of ways. We have found that ‘priming’ this line of questioning at the beginning of the interview helps with participant recall.
Warm Up Questions

Your organisation

1) Can you briefly describe your organisation? What kind of activities do you deliver? How big are you? How long have you been operating?

2) What is your role personally?

3) Do you have a policy on disability and engagement? Is this formal or informal? Can you tell me about it?

4) Do you have any staff with dedicated responsibility for disability?

5) Do you have any staff trained in disability issues?

6) Can you give us a sense of your provision for disabled children and young people?
   a. How important a part of your activities is this?

Barriers and innovation

7) How has the current funding climate affected your organisation? In general and in terms of provision for disabled children and young people.

8) How have you adapted to these changes?

9) Focussing on provision for disabled children and young people, are there any things that you used to do that you no longer can?

10) Are their things that you’d like to do that will now not be able to?

11) Has the current environment/climate resulted in any positive outcomes?

Determinants of positive engagement

We are interested in learning about how and why good kinds of arts and cultural engagement for young people with disabilities take place.

Can you tell us about an example or examples of ‘good’ engagement with disabled children and young people? This can be from anytime and can be good in any way or kind of ways.

12) Describe the project/activity.

*Probing should aim to elicit detail on the project/activity and what makes up ‘good’ engagement. We are looking for as much detail as possible.*

13) Why was it successful? In what ways? What were the ‘good’ outcomes, as you see them?

14) Where and when did it take place? Describe the environment. Who was involved? How did this affect the outcome? – we are not looking for names here, but a sense of how relationships, experience and collaboration inform ‘good’ provision.

15) What do you think the benefits to the participants were? Do you think these benefits are specific to people with disabilities? Are they things that are specific to your art form, or more general?

16) How were the outcomes recorded or evaluated? Formally, or informally?

17) Are there any other things that we haven’t covered that you would highlight as important to ‘good’ arts engagement with disabled children and young people?
Determinants of negative impact

We are also interested in understanding any barriers to ‘good’ engagement.

Can you give us examples of things that have worked less well? Again, this can be for any reason or combination of reasons – it doesn’t have to be a ‘disaster’. This can be any aspect of a project, any problem or issue encountered and whether/how it was dealt with, for any reason or combination of reasons.

18) Describe the project/activity.

*Probing should aim to elicit detail on barriers to ‘good’ outcomes in a similar manner to the probing in the above section.*

19) Why was it unsuccessful? In what ways?

20) Where and when did it take place? Describe the environment. How did this affect the outcome?

21) Are these issues specific to engagement with disabled children and young people, or more general issues? Are they specific to your art form?

22) Are there any other issues that you would highlight as barriers to ‘good’ kinds of engagement with disabled children and young people? Particularly in the current context of reduced funding? How can these be overcome?

Values and motivations

We are also interested in the experience of doing this kind of work – the personal values and motivations of cultural workers.

23) What motivates people to do this kind of work? What do they get out of it?

24) What motivates you? What do you get out of it?

25) What makes a good project worker?

Thank the participant for taking part.

Remind the participant that they can get in touch at any time and that findings will be shared with all participants.
Project: Arts and cultural sector engagement

Background information

The project seeks to explore how the arts and culture sector are engaging with disabled children and young people in a period of restrained resources.

The focus of the research will be telling the stories of organisations, young people and their families engaged in the arts and cultural sector. This includes barriers experienced in relation to accessing arts and cultural sites and employment in the arts and culture sector. A variety of arts and culture collaborations will be included in the research, this includes: a variety of settings (i.e. education, Local Authority, community outreach), geographical spread (urban, rural and coastal) and art form (music, art and design, dance, drama, film / digital).

The data we collect will be used to provide a rich picture of art and cultural organisations in the East Midlands. This will include, success, challenges, barriers and innovation in relation to engagement with children and young people. This research has been commissioned by The Mighty Creatives, a Leicester-based Arts Council England Bridge organisation. It will inform their future planning and produce a report and case studies that should be of interest to arts and cultural organisations, schools and others engaging children and young people in arts and culture.

Procedures and protection

The research involves an interview where you will be asked questions about your background, your organisation and perspectives on your work, and your work itself. The interview will be recorded and later transcribed. It will take around an hour.

Your participation in the research is entirely voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the project at any point. If you are uncertain or uncomfortable about any aspect of your participation please contact ANINYMISED to discuss your concerns or request clarification on any aspect of the study.

Any information you supply to use will be treated confidentially in accordance with the 1998 Data Protection Act: your name and identifying affiliations will be anonymized during transcription and any other identifying information will be removed in any resulting publications, unless you give us your explicit consent to identify you as a subject.

If you have any questions about the ethical conduct of this research please contact the ANONYMISED the School of Management ethics officer: email address.

Thank you very much for participating.

CONSENT STATEMENT

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Before we carry out the research, we would like you to read the following statements and confirm your agreement to take part in this study.

PLEASE TICK TO CONFIRM

☐ I confirm that I have read and understand the Participant Consent form
☐ All the questions that I have about the research have been satisfactorily answered.

☐ I give my consent to the recording and transcription of the interviews by the researcher.

☐ I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, without giving reason.

I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE.

Participant’s signature: ...............................................................................................................

Participant’s name (please print): ...............................................................................................................

☐ Tick this box if you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study (no personal results) by e-mail

E-mail: ...............................................................................................................................................

Date: ...............................................................................................................................................

Dear Organisation XXX,

Subject: Arts and cultural sector engagement research project

We are a research team at the University of Leicester that have been commissioned by The Mighty Creatives to conduct independent research in relation to how arts and cultural organisations engage disabled (including deaf) children and young people and we would like your organization to take part. The Mighty Creatives is the East Midlands Bridge organisation (EMBridge). We are part of a national network of 10 Bridge organisations, funded by Arts Council England to use our experience and expertise to help more children access more great art and culture more of the time.

The research will be conducted across the East Midlands incorporating the cities and counties of Derby, Derbyshire, Leicester, Leicestershire Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire and Rutland. The research is made up of two stages. The first involves interviews with arts and cultural organisations regarding their engagement with disabled children and young people (up to 25 years). The second involves focus groups bringing representatives from arts and cultural organisations together to discuss particular opportunities and challenges.

Please could you reply to let us know if you are happy for us to get in touch to organise an interview. We would prefer face-face interviews but could conduct telephone interviews if this is preferable.

Interviews should last no more than one hour and will be held during July at a time and location convenient to you. All findings will be published and made available to all participating organisations directly, and will help to improve the arts and cultural sector in the East Midlands.

We hope that you will be able to participate in this important research project.

Further information regarding this research is attached to this email. This includes an information sheet with further details. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards,

XXX XXX
10.5 Appendix 5: Figures and Tables Relating to Prevalence of disabled people

Figure 5: Children with Autism known to schools per 1,000 pupils

Children with autistic spectrum known to schools

Figure 6: Children with Moderate Learning Difficulties known to schools per 1,000 pupils

Children with moderate learning difficulties known to schools
Figure 7: Children with Severe Learning Difficulties known to schools per 1,000 pupils

Figure 8: Children with Profound & Multiple Learning Difficulties known to schools per 1,000 pupils
Figure 9: Children with learning disabilities known to schools per 1,000 pupils

Figure 10: Derby and Derbyshire learning disability profiles in relation to East Midlands and England
Figure 11: Leicester & Leicestershire learning disability profiles in relation to East Midlands and England

![Chart showing disability profiles in Leicester & Leicestershire compared to East Midlands and England.]

Figure 12: Lincolnshire learning disability profiles in relation to East Midlands and England

![Chart showing disability profiles in Lincolnshire compared to East Midlands and England.]

- Children with autistic spectrum known to schools
- Children with moderate learning difficulties known to schools
- Children with severe learning difficulties known to schools
- Children with profound and multiple learning difficulties known to schools
Figure 13: Northamptonshire learning disability profiles in relation to East Midlands and England

Figure 14: Nottingham & Nottinghamshire learning disability profiles in relation to East Midlands and England
Figure 15: Rutland learning disability profiles in relation to East Midlands and England

![Figure 15: Rutland learning disability profiles in relation to East Midlands and England](image)

Table 4: Prevalence of children with DDA defined disability by gender, age and ethnic group (FRS 2004/5 as reported by Blackburn et al, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% [95% confidence intervals]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Children</td>
<td>952,741</td>
<td>7.3 [6.9, 7.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>583,278</td>
<td>8.8 [8.2, 9.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>369,463</td>
<td>5.8 [5.3, 6.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 Years</td>
<td>129,074</td>
<td>3.7 [3.2, 4.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11 Years</td>
<td>409,862</td>
<td>8.2 [7.6, 8.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15 Years</td>
<td>302,485</td>
<td>9.5 [8.6, 10.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 Years</td>
<td>111,320</td>
<td>8.5 [7.2, 10.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White UK/Other</td>
<td>870,603</td>
<td>7.6 [7.2, 8.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed parentage</td>
<td>12,186</td>
<td>9.5 [5.4, 14.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>7,947</td>
<td>2.7 [1.4, 5.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani and Bangladeshi</td>
<td>24,097</td>
<td>5.1 [3.4, 7.6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>26,610</td>
<td>7.1 [5.1, 9.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
<td>11,298</td>
<td>4.4 [3.6, 7.2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Proportion of children with a DDA defined disability (FRS 2004/5, from Blackburn et al, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty/Problem experienced</th>
<th>% [95% confidence interval] of population (weighted)</th>
<th>% [95% confidence interval] of disabled children (non-weighted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>193,950</td>
<td>1.5 [1.3, 1.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifting and Carrying</td>
<td>84,759</td>
<td>0.7 [0.6, 0.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Dexterity</td>
<td>107,798</td>
<td>0.8 [0.7, 1.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continence</td>
<td>88,748</td>
<td>0.7 [0.6, 0.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>255,534</td>
<td>2.0 [1.8, 2.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory, concentration, learning</td>
<td>288,203</td>
<td>2.2 [2.0, 2.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising physical danger</td>
<td>171,352</td>
<td>1.3 [1.1, 1.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical coordination</td>
<td>167,427</td>
<td>1.3 [1.1, 1.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>268,427</td>
<td>2.1 [1.9, 2.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty if didn't take medication</td>
<td>247,898</td>
<td>1.9 [1.7, 2.1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Children with and without a DDA disability and living circumstances (FRS 2004/5, from Blackburn et al, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child has DDA-disabled</th>
<th>No DDA Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parent family</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adult family</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of children in household</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with 1 or more siblings with a DDA-defined disability</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more adults with DDA disability in family unit</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more adults with DDA disability in household</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rent/other</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Owner-occupied</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number rooms house</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in flat</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in detached house</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median equivalised total weekly income after housing costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All</td>
<td>€334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 adult in family</td>
<td>€277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 or more adults in family</td>
<td>€395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 child</td>
<td>€370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 children or more</td>
<td>€321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported ethnicity if head of family:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• White UK/other</td>
<td>€344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Black/Minority ethnic/other</td>
<td>€253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income quintiles:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quintile 1</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quintile 2</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quintile 3</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quintile 4</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quintile 5</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported test statistic:
* Yates continuity correction
** Mann-Whitney U
*** Pearson Chi-square
**** Chi-square for linear trend
Figure 16: Infographic adopted from the Life Opportunities Survey (2014) illustrating barriers people with and without impairments face when accessing work, transport, education and training.
Top barriers to transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motor vehicles</th>
<th>Public transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26% of working age adults didn’t use their motor vehicle as much as they would have liked.</td>
<td>63% of working age adults didn’t use public transport as much as they would have liked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Motor vehicles**
  - 1. Cost
  - 2. Too busy
  - 3. Vehicle not available

- **Public transport**
  - 1. Cost
  - 2. Too busy
  - 3. Transport unavailable

*Cost as a barrier to using motor vehicles might be associated with the rising cost of fuel prices over the period covered by the two waves of the survey.*

Top barriers to education and training

20% of working age adults didn’t have access to all the education and training they wanted.

- **First barrier**
  - 1. Financial reasons
  - 2. Financial reasons
  - 3. Financial reasons
  - 4. Financial reasons

- **Second barrier**
  - 1. Health conditions
  - 2. Too busy
  - 3. Too busy
  - 4. Too busy

*The economic climate between 2009 and 2012 might be behind the reporting of ‘financial reasons’ as a common barrier.*

Main findings

- Most barriers reported fall into common themes relating to cost (financial reasons/lack of money/afford it), lack of time (too busy/not enough time), and family or caring responsibilities.
- Generally, cost-related barriers were the main barriers reported for education and training, and transport, whereas ‘family responsibilities’ was the main barrier reported for work.
- Having an impairment may be associated with experiencing impairment-based barriers (for example, health conditions). Unlike other groups, adults with impairment at both waves tended to report ‘impairment-based’ barriers in addition to the main barriers experienced by other groups.

WAVE ONE

- Barriers may change over time
- For example, most adults who were economically inactive at both waves tended to report ‘family responsibilities’ at both waves as their reason for not working or seeking work.

WAVE TWO

- There were some exceptions

Explanation of barriers

- Health conditions
- Disability-related reasons
- Cost
- Lack of job opportunities
- Financial reasons
- Too busy
- Family responsibilities
- Transport unavailable
- Lack of qualifications
- Office for National Statistics

www.ons.gov.uk
## 10.6 Appendix 6: Table of Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Illustrative quotes to support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>Building and individual requirements, e.g. technical (hearing loops), mechanical (lifts) or personal (chaperone or signing).</td>
<td>&quot;it would be nice to have someone that specifically looked into services to disabled children and young people, and the same with adults. And specifically looked at any barriers that they may come across - any requirements that they're needing that we're not necessarily meeting...&quot; (O24).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artists treated badly</strong></td>
<td>Artists being criticised for unknowingly behaving inappropriately (related to confidence and training).</td>
<td>&quot;Everybody’s scared to death of saying the wrong thing or doing the wrong thing around disability. I’m sure it’s the same around other targeted groups. You know, ethnicity or that kind of thing, or migrant families or whatever. About being seen to be very politically correct and not upsetting anybody. There’s a lot of... power, I think, sits with the people that are the kind of primary support network for disabled young people. But it doesn’t go both ways. Inclusive working is, you know - the way that they treated this musician, I think, is pretty horrible. Thinking well... why’s that alright? You know. It almost could be subtle bullying, you know, if you’re making somebody feel uncomfortable. Just because he’s an artist, it’s not right. You wouldn’t do that with a disabled young person, why would you...?&quot; O3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions towards arts venues</strong></td>
<td>Disabled people not considering arts venues to be ‘for them’.</td>
<td>&quot;I think that for a lot of people especially young people, there is still that, that suspicion that the arts venue is not for them. That there is an expectation of behaving in a certain way or in a certain manner that creates a barrier&quot; O14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence to work with disabled people</strong></td>
<td>Fear of saying the wrong thing, not knowing the abilities of people, ensuring everyone can participate.</td>
<td>&quot;Everybody’s scared to death of saying the wrong thing or doing the wrong thing around disability&quot; (O3); &quot;somebody involved who was more familiar with what the young people could manage, what their needs were, that kind of thing&quot; (O4). &quot;You can’t have anybody that can’t participate, you have to find a way for everybody to take part, who’s been either identified to take part in the project or who wants to...We were using speech machines. But they wanted to be as involved as anybody else, so when it came to doing the interviews and asking the questions, their questions had to be typed into the speech machines&quot; (O1). &quot;I remember a... young person said “Bruce, the support worker, said this about the workshop.” Then this dance worker said “Ignore what Bruce said, it’s this.” That young person took that literally, and started to ignore Bruce, all the time. It’s just – you just wouldn’t know that would happen, you know? But because their level of autism was... “Right, ignore Bruce. Right, okay.”&quot; (O3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Education</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum does not cater for equality.</td>
<td>&quot;...education is a huge barrier. Curriculums aren’t set up to cater for disabled children who dance. Early years, there’s very little stuff that’s happening...how do you make something inclusive? How do you do that? They’re the barriers, really. And I think barriers are often about getting to the right people, the right movers and shakers, really&quot; (O2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Illustrative quotes to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations too high</td>
<td>Project expectations being unrealistic, in part due to inexperience.</td>
<td>“The young people all had a great experience of what they did, but the project as a whole, I think it was a case of it needed to be broken down a lot more and made more realistic in terms of what could be done within the time. And also, again, somebody involved who was more familiar with what the young people could manage, what their needs were, that kind of thing” (O4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for accessible provision including participants attendance</td>
<td>The travel can cost as much as a performance, professional translators are always required, doing it for free becomes a necessity, training costs</td>
<td>“Our conference in November, we’re talking about bringing some disabled young people to the conference. It’s going to cost as much in transport as it is in anything else, you know? So I think it’s about people being realistic with that...there’s obviously the space and the venue, there’s training. You know, in-house training for staff, how to deal with disabled people” (O2). “I think transport is sometimes a barrier. That can be a barrier. Obviously with all children, there is a dependence on a parent sometimes to bring people in transport. But I know with our inclusive programme, sometimes, that transport isn’t always – can be more problematic if you have disabled children” (O5). “I sort of said well the actors aren’t professional and I don’t think people’ll… will kind of be concerned if they’re not quite loud enough, or y’know… obviously we want them to be as professional as possible, but everybody knows they’re coming to see a training play, not a professional play. Surely, surely people will have the same… tolerance of a learner in the role of interpreter and they said, no, no that’s not the way it works” (O16). “So being creative about the way that you make things accessible. It wasn’t – you do it for free. There’s not a cost to it, other than the time it takes” (O1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater resources/ managing expectations/ project management</td>
<td>Delivering inclusive projects requires greater resources and the right skill set.</td>
<td>&quot;Things take longer. They take longer to prepare, they take longer to deliver. So that really is an example of where you can’t cut corners, and you’re much better to do less if you haven’t got the money. Rather than to, you know, even do the same as you would somewhere else” (O1). &quot;We’re not quite sure why there aren’t enough people out there with the right set of skills. Or whether we’re not paying enough money. Or it’s that commitment of Saturdays.” (O3). &quot;We would be very interested, as an organisation, I think to have a disability officer of some description and actually embed that in our programme in terms of... widen our reach and opportunities, and work with other organisations who support people with disabilities. Including obviously children and young people. So that’s the main one&quot; (O4). &quot;I think some of it is around capacity, and with that financial constraints - of not actually being able to dedicate enough time to be able to do the investing in the going out and doing tasters. And ‘converting’ young people that we meet along the way into participants on our class programme. Some of it is, I think, related to finances, and some of it’s related to capacity. And a spread of priorities that we have that we still need to keep the projects that we have already going.&quot; (O5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Illustrative quotes to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and perception</td>
<td>Segregated participation being the norm.</td>
<td>“Where are the platforms for young people who are disabled and deaf to participate in a non-segregated way? And be treated equally, and be... I mean I think because I come from a theatre background, theatre is a totally different ball game in that sense, but within dance there are very much kind of... It’s that “aww, bless,” culture of “oh didn’t they do well” because they’re disabled, and that links in with the artistic and quality issue. How do we move that on? How do we get to a place where the work that we’re seeing is valued in the same way that non-disabled dance work is valued?” (O2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness of activities</td>
<td>Working at capacity means there is limited or no resource to publicise the work and encourage more artists and young people to get involved.</td>
<td>“At the moment we’re just struggling to get the word out and to recruit new members for that group. Some of it is around capacity in our team, because we are out delivering and we’re doing strategic development and we’re setting up, you know, other projects. And some of it is just kind of... where you would go to target those young people and bring them in, and is that actually a realistic thing to want to do anyway.” (O5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Struggling to find staff with the right skill-set.</td>
<td>“We’re trying to find some more artists to work with this particular group and we can’t find anybody that’s available and with the skills to do what we want. So it’s like, do we go back to the previous artist (But the barriers are there from the staff)? So it’s a really tricky one. And it’s a real live problem. It’s not like I can say “We’ve solved it by doing this, this and this,” I don’t know how we’re going to solve it. It’s a bit of a dilemma...One guy said “What about resources and kit?” and we were saying, well, you need to provide them. He thought that was – he said “I think that’s crazy so I’m not doing it.” I mean not quite as bluntly as that, but he did say it’s crazy. But you want a fully-formed person to arrive with their kit and get on with it, you know, rather than us having to turn up every weekend with a load of kit that we hand over and then collect back.” (O3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporality</td>
<td>Providing full accessible provision when performances are short-term.</td>
<td>“We can’t easily offer sign performances because we only have it (the performance) for a night you know, we do it with pantomime, we do a signed performance from our pantomime but we also do a relaxed performance from our pantomime because that’s in the city for a month so it give that more of that opportunity whereas I think it’s always a little, it is a bit difficult...(to) have full sight and you know with full hearing. Its difficult for us to deliver a complete a engagement because we can’t guarantee...we can provide the means that they might need to enjoy the performance...so that’s certainly a barrier” (O14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Illustrative quotes to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions between and within organisations - ownership of projects</td>
<td>Ownership of 'disability services' within larger organisations, and designing the provision.</td>
<td>&quot;But we can really only heavily influence the artist, because we're the ones who are paying for the artist. We can't dictate to the Service X, we can't dictate to Service Z...So there's your three groups of people. And you need all of it. It's quite a lot of personalities and politics involved in all this, which makes these things quite difficult.&quot; (O3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Complex needs, lack of experience working with disabled children, training required to better interact with children with a particular disability, breadth of work necessitates a plethora of skills, staff leaving leaves a void an organisations skills.</td>
<td>&quot;if we're talking specifically about young people, there are a lot of young people that don't have opportunities or support because they have a hidden disability, whether it be dyslexia, whether it be Asperger's, whether it be ME. Whatever it is. There's a whole host, I think, of issues that need addressing there&quot; (O2). &quot;to have more training and input in terms of how best to engage and include young people, and provide access – equal access – for creativity, the arts, freedom of expression. Which is one of our values and aims&quot; (O4). &quot;So all of our artists have been able to extend their professional development and we've also run – or paid for – our ...assistants, artists...and office staff to go to... Level 2 ...training. So we've done Level 1 and Level 2 recently. Those additional funds have had that provision in there, which is absolutely brilliant, and they've been able to come back and train the rest of the team&quot; (O10). &quot;that regular pattern of work and that regular change of work does make it difficult to offer some engagement and so that's a barrier&quot; (O14). &quot;So it's (training) something that we're really committed too and yeah but it is a case often trying to find extra funding and that can be challenging&quot; (O16). &quot;the lady who was trained to do the ... session, to run sessions specifically... to children with learning disabilities. I think you would need to have certainly some kind of training to be able to deliver that session effectively&quot; (O24).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>