

Leicester City Council

Scrutiny Review

Engagement with Leicester's arts, culture and heritage offer

A review of the Heritage, Culture, Leisure and Sport Scrutiny
Commission

September 2017



Leicester
City Council

Background to scrutiny reviews

Determining the right topics for scrutiny reviews is the first step in making sure scrutiny provides benefits to the Council and the community.

This scoping template will assist in planning the review by defining the purpose, methodology and resources needed. It should be completed by the Member proposing the review, in liaison with the lead Director and the Scrutiny Manager. Scrutiny Officers can provide support and assistance with this.

In order to be effective, every scrutiny review must be properly project managed to ensure it achieves its aims and delivers measurable outcomes. To achieve this, it is essential that the scope of the review is well defined at the outset. This way the review is less likely to get side-tracked or become overambitious in what it hopes to tackle. The Commission's objectives should, therefore, be as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic & Time-bound) as possible.

The scoping document is also a good tool for communicating what the review is about, who is involved and how it will be undertaken to all partners and interested stakeholders.

The form also includes a section on public and media interest in the review which should be completed in conjunction with the Council's Communications Team. This will allow the Commission to be properly prepared for any media interest and to plan the release of any press statements.

Scrutiny reviews will be supported by a Scrutiny Officer.

Evaluation

Reviewing changes that have been made as a result of a scrutiny review is the most common way of assessing the effectiveness. Any scrutiny review should consider whether an on-going monitoring role for the Commission is appropriate in relation to the topic under review.

For further information please contact the Scrutiny Team on 0116 4546340

To be completed by the Member proposing the review		
1.	Title of the proposed scrutiny review	Engagement with Leicester's arts, culture and heritage offer
2.	Proposed by	Cllr Malcolm Unsworth Chair, Heritage, Culture, Leisure and Sport Scrutiny Commission
3.	Rationale Why do you want to undertake this review?	<p>Leicester's arts, culture and heritage profile is on the rise. The discovery of Richard III's remains, 19 Leicestershire organisations being included within Arts Council England's National Portfolio, and Curve receiving the 2015 UK Theatre Award for Promotion for Diversity all highlight the city's offer and the increasing number of opportunities to engage with arts, culture and heritage.</p> <p>The Government's Culture White Paper 2016¹ emphasises a desire for "greater participation among communities who currently do not benefit from many cultural opportunities... particularly... those with young families, and those who are disadvantaged and socially isolated."</p> <p>A previous review by this Commission examined the role of arts and culture in delivering health and well-being outcomes.² In line with the recommendations of that review, it is important to ensure that the city's arts, culture and heritage offer is available to as many people as possible in order to facilitate positive health and wellbeing outcomes.</p> <p>However, it is unclear whether there is proportionate engagement with these opportunities across all of Leicester's communities. As such the review will seek assurances and clarity on this and identify whether there is a problem in engaging certain demographics, why this problem might exist, and how it can be overcome – if, indeed, it is a problem that needs to be overcome.</p>
4.	Purpose and aims of the review What question(s) do you want to answer and what do you want to achieve? (Outcomes?)	<p>The purpose of this review is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To explore <i>how</i> and <i>where</i> arts, culture and heritage is offered to the people of Leicester; • To identify <i>who is and who is not</i> engaging with Leicester's arts, culture and heritage offerings; and if they are not, why not; • To identify barriers to engagement; • To look at <i>how</i> lack of engagement may be addressed, in particular, by identifying examples of good practice in other authorities and agencies; • To provide feedback to appropriate services on good practice in relation to community engagement.
5.	Links with corporate aims / priorities	This review would align with the <u>City Mayor's vision</u> " to enhance people's confidence and pride in our city, because when

¹ Department for Culture, Media & Sport, 'The Culture White Paper', 2016, p20

² Leicester City Council Heritage, Culture, Leisure and Sport Scrutiny Commission, 'The Role of Arts and Culture in Delivering Health and Wellbeing Outcomes', 13 June 2017

	<p>How does the review link to corporate aims and priorities?</p>	<p><i>people feel proud about where they live they become part of it.</i>³</p> <p>Under the ‘Sport and Culture’ Priorities, identified in <u>Leicester’s Economic Action Plan 2016-2020</u>:</p> <p><i>“Priorities for the city council will be to effectively animate these new spaces by creating cultural events and activities that engage all sections of the community and by maximising the scope of arts, culture and sport to tackle social exclusion as well as to celebrate excellence.”⁴</i></p> <p>In the ‘<u>Leicester Tourism Action Plan: 2015-2020</u>’:</p> <p><i>“There is a need to champion culture, heritage and new experiences to draw people to the city. A key priority will be to improve the promotion and awareness of the city’s cultural and heritage offer.”⁵</i></p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Scope Set out what is included in the scope of the review and what is not. For example which services it does and does not cover.</p>	<p>The scope of this review will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is currently available in arts, culture and heritage in the City, for example, festivals and events; • How are these opportunities communicated to residents; • In terms of marketing and communicating these opportunities, what works well and what does not: how effective is print versus social media; does marketing address low literacy/IT access; how can effectiveness be increased and costs reduced; • At whom are the City’s arts, culture and heritage offerings targeted; • Assessing any problems in engaging all communities in Leicester with the arts, culture and heritage opportunities available; • Who is engaging with arts, culture and heritage in Leicester and who is not; • Why certain communities might not be engaging; • How can the problem of lack of engagement be addressed; • Considering the balance of priorities, <i>is</i> lack of engagement a problem that needs to be addressed? • Examples of good practice which can be found in other authorities/cities in terms of engaging hard-to-reach groups. <p>The review will not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An extensive exploration of why it is important to

³ City Mayor, ‘My vision’, Leicester City Council, accessed at: <http://www.leicester.gov.uk/your-council/city-mayor-peter-soulsby/my-vision/> on 21/08/17

⁴ City Mayor, ‘Leicester’s Economic Action Plan 2016-2020’, Leicester City Council, p29, accessed at: <http://www.leicester.gov.uk/media/57817/economic-action-plan-2016-2020.pdf> on 21/08/17

⁵ City Mayor, ‘Leicester Tourism Action Plan: 2015-2020’, Leicester City Council, p24, accessed at: <https://www.leicester.gov.uk/media/180622/leicester-tourism-plan-reduced-size.pdf> on 30/08/17

		<p>encourage engagement with Leicester’s arts, culture and heritage. This topic will be addressed briefly in order to set the context for the review, but not in any great depth.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Methodology Describe the methods you will use to undertake the review.</p> <p>How will you undertake the review, what evidence will need to be gathered from members, officers and key stakeholders, including partners and external organisations and experts?</p>	<p>The Commission would like to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather evidence about how arts, culture and heritage opportunities are marketed to city residents, what works successfully and what is not very effective; • Gather visitor data regarding arts and museums in Leicester in order to identify who attends; • Gather evidence about why communities and individuals engage/do not engage with Leicester’s arts, culture and heritage; • Gather evidence from relevant external organisations and internal staff engaged in outreach work as to how they attract hard-to-reach communities, what difficulties they encounter and how they overcome them; • Identify good practice in engagement with hard-to-reach communities.
	<p>Witnesses Set out who you want to gather evidence from and how you will plan to do this</p>	<p>Internally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Dalzell – Director of Tourism, Culture and Inward Investment • Cllr Piara Singh Clair – Assistant City Mayor, Culture, Leisure and Sport • Sarah Levitt – Head of Arts and Museums • Nisha Popat – Business Development Manager, Tourism, Culture and Investment • Sally Coleman – Heritage Manager • Kerem Cetindamar – Digital Access Officer • Anne Provan – Team Leader (Generic Planning) • Big Mouth Forum, Disabled Children’s Service <p>Externally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft Touch Arts • The Y Theatre • The Mighty Creatives • Attenborough Arts Centre • Leicester Print Workshop • King Richard III Visitor Centre • Cllr Danny Myers – in his capacity as Commercial Director for The Mighty Creatives • Chris Stafford – Chief Executive, Curve Leicester • John Rance – Chief Executive Officer, Phoenix Cinema and Art Centre • Pete Groschl – Leicestershire and Rutland Co-ordinator for the Big Country Rural Cinema Network, Phoenix Cinema and Art Centre • Laraine Porter – Senior Lecturer in Film, De Montfort

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University Sue Porter – Part-time Lecturer, De Montfort University Voluntary organisations Other relevant arts, culture and heritage organisations in the City Other local authorities
8.	Timescales How long is the review expected to take to complete?	6 months <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping document to be agreed at 19th September 2017 HCLS Scrutiny Commission Meeting. Task Group meetings to take place between September 2017 and January 2018. Draft findings and recommendations between January 2018 and February 2018. Final review report to be presented to HCLS Scrutiny Commission on 6th March 2018.
	Proposed start date	September 2017
	Proposed completion date	March 2018
9.	Resources / staffing requirements Scrutiny reviews are facilitated by Scrutiny Officers and it is important to estimate the amount of their time, in weeks, that will be required in order to manage the review Project Plan effectively.	The Scrutiny Policy Officer will facilitate the whole review.
	Do you anticipate any further resources will be required e.g. site visits or independent technical advice? If so, please provide details.	It may be useful to make site visits to relevant arts, culture and heritage organisations to observe how they engage in outreach work. The need for this will become more apparent as the review progresses.
10.	Review recommendations and findings To whom will the recommendations be addressed? E.g. Executive / External Partner?	Recommendations will be presented to the City Mayor and the Executive for consideration.
11.	Likely publicity arising from the review – Is this topic likely to be of high interest to the media? Please explain.	It is not expected that the review will be of high interest to the media, however Leicester City Council's marketing and communications team will be kept updated if any media interest arises.
12.	Publicising the review and its findings and recommendations How will these be published / advertised?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review report will be published on the Leicester City Council website; The findings and recommendations will be presented as a public meeting of the Heritage, Culture, Leisure and

		Sport Scrutiny Commission.
13.	How will this review add value to policy development or service improvement?	<p>The review hopes to achieve the following:</p> <p>Service Improvement: the review intends to identify barriers to engagement with arts, culture and heritage, and to formulate recommendations regarding how these barriers can be overcome. Examples of good practice within other local authorities will inform the relevant services' approach to engaging all communities. It is hoped that this feedback, in turn, will bolster the Council's applications for arts, culture and heritage funding as it can demonstrate that engagement with hard-to-reach communities is an active priority, thereby making the City's organisations more attractive for funding and investment.</p> <p>Policy Development: ensure that engagement with all communities remains a priority when shaping future arts, culture and heritage initiatives, thereby encouraging a culture of inclusivity.</p>
To be completed by the Executive Lead		
14.	<p>Executive Lead's Comments</p> <p>The Executive Lead is responsible for the portfolio so it is important to seek and understand their views and ensure they are engaged in the process so that Scrutiny's recommendations can be taken on board where appropriate.</p>	I fully agree the theme of this review and would be happy to be involved and support this. I hope it will add value to the involvement of the wider community in Arts and Cultural activities.
To be completed by the Divisional Lead Director		
15.	<p>Divisional Comments</p> <p>Scrutiny's role is to influence others to take action and it is important that Scrutiny Commissions seek and understand the views of the Divisional Director.</p>	<p>I welcome this review. It would be useful to explore and capture what we and other partners in the arts and cultural sector are already doing and what else we could learn from best practice. I think the current scope and objectives are sound and I and my officers look forward to supporting the commission as best we can on this.</p> <p>Encouraging engagement is a priority for key funders such as the Arts Council so there should be an interested audience there too for the outcome of this work. If we have a good story to tell it may prove to be a useful report that supports the ambitions of the wider sector and in future fundraising efforts.</p>
16.	Are there any potential risks to undertaking this scrutiny review?	It would be useful for scrutiny commission members to be aware of the information that many arts and culture organisations are already typically required to provide on the subject of

	E.g. are there any similar reviews being undertaken, on-going work or changes in policy which would supersede the need for this review?	'engagement' to key funders such as the arts council. There is a risk that the review is perceived as additional or duplicating work. In reality there will be easy access to a fairly rich set of data and information about this subject. The review can benefit from this – without necessarily requiring organisations to commit a lot of extra time – which might otherwise hinder participation.
17.	Are you able to assist with the proposed review? If not please explain why. In terms of agreement / supporting documentation / resource availability?	As noted above we will be happy to participate in this review and already hold a lot of data on who does and doesn't participate in existing council supported activities.
	Name	Mike Dalzell
	Role	Director, Tourism, Culture and Inward Investment
	Date	4th September 2017
To be completed by the Scrutiny Support Manager		
18.	Will the proposed scrutiny review / timescales negatively impact on other work within the Scrutiny Team? (Conflicts with other work commitments)	The review will be supported by the Scrutiny Policy Officer and is not expected to negatively impact on her work, as it is the first review of the commission in this scrutiny cycle.
	Do you have available staffing resources to facilitate this scrutiny review? If not, please provide details.	The Scrutiny Team, as per my comments above, can adequately support the review.
	Name	Kalvaran Sandhu, Scrutiny Support Manager
	Date	6th September 2017