

# Arts Council England: Museum Development Impact Evaluation



Supported using public funding by  
**ARTS COUNCIL  
ENGLAND**



## Museum Development Impact Evaluation

For Arts Council England

Prepared by TBR's Creative & Cultural Team



Supported using public funding by

**ARTS COUNCIL  
ENGLAND**

Enquiries about this report can be addressed to:

**Sam Nair, Research Consultant**

**Martin Houghton, Director**

02 December 2016

Floor D, Milburn House  
Dean Street  
Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 1LE

Telephone: +44 (0) 191 279 0900

Email: [sam.nair@tbr.co.uk](mailto:sam.nair@tbr.co.uk)

[www.tbr.co.uk](http://www.tbr.co.uk)



### Document information

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Project reference number</b> | PN0716R  |
| <b>File name</b>                | PN00716R_ACE_MD_evaluation_Summary_2.7_Final                 |
| <b>Title</b>                    | Museum Development Impact Evaluation                         |
| <b>Version number</b>           | 2.8  |
| <b>Last update</b>              | 2 December 2016  |
| <b>Name of author</b>           | Mary Marshall, Sam Nair, Martin Houghton                     |
| <b>Name of reviewers</b>        | Victoria Pirie, Sara Selwood, Scott Dickinson, Andrew Graves |
| <b>Document status</b>          | Public   |
| <b>Review status</b>            | Complete   |
| <b>Approval status</b>          | Approved   |

Table of contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 ABOUT THIS EVALUATION.....                                      | 1         |
| 1.2 ABOUT MUSEUM DEVELOPMENT 2012-15.....                           | 2         |
| 1.3 ACCREDITATION.....  | 4         |
| <b>2. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS.....</b>                              | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>3. THE ARTS COUNCIL'S FIVE GOALS AND MUSEUM DEVELOPMENT.....</b> | <b>7</b>  |
| 3.1 GOAL 1: EXCELLENCE.....   | 8         |
| 3.2 GOAL 2: AUDIENCES.....  | 9         |
| 3.3 GOAL 3: RESILIENCE.....   | 10        |
| 3.4 GOAL 4: WORKFORCE AND LEADERSHIP.....                           | 12        |
| 3.5 GOAL 5: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE.....                          | 13        |
| <b>4. ANSWERING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....</b>                     | <b>15</b> |
| 4.1 IMPACT AGAINST PROGRAMME AIMS.....                              | 15        |
| 4.2 NATURE OF PROGRAMME IMPACTS AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION.....         | 16        |
| 4.3 HOW DOES THE PROGRAMME WORK?.....                               | 16        |
| 4.4 MATCH OF INTENDED IMPACTS WITH PROGRAMME NEEDS.....             | 16        |
| 4.5 VALUE ANALYSIS.....   | 17        |
| <b>5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>                      | <b>18</b> |
| <b>6. APPENDIX.....</b>   | <b>23</b> |
| 6.1 LIST OF REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED.....                    | 23        |
| 6.2 LIST OF NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED.....                    | 24        |

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 About this evaluation

Arts Council England commissioned TBR, in partnership with consultants Pomegranate and Scott Dickinson (hereafter, "the consultants"), to evaluate the Arts Council funded programme of Museum Development activities undertaken between 2012 and 2015. The work sought to investigate the impacts produced by, or attributed to, these interventions, and how these led to the achievement of the overall programme aims. This evaluation aimed to address the following questions, as set out by the Arts Council in its invitation to tender:

- How did the impacts of the programme compare against the programme aims?
- What was the nature of the programme impacts and their distribution?
- How does the programme work?
- To what extent was there a match of intended impacts with programme needs?
- To what extent did the programme deliver value?

In addition to these five research questions, the project sought to understand better what good practice looked like and how it could be used to best effect.

The evaluation study used three methods to understand the aims, activities, outcomes and achievements of the work undertaken within each region under the banner of the Museum Development Programme:

#### 1. Document and data review

First, the consultants collated and reviewed the information provided by the Arts Council for each regional Museum Development Provider. This included the Renaissance Museum Development Programme applications and funding agreements, monitoring reports, annual reports, budgets and evaluations.

#### 2. Local stakeholder consultation

To supplement the available documentation, a minimum of four interviews were conducted in each region with Museum Development Providers, the Arts Council Relationship Managers, participant museum staff and other local stakeholders.

#### 3. National stakeholder consultation

In addition to the regional consultation, the consultants undertook interviews with individuals representing national sector organisations.

A list of the local stakeholders interviewed in each area and the national sector organisations is presented in the Appendix (Section 6).

The evaluation faced a number of challenges regarding its ability to generate evidence and report against its brief:

- Key performance indicators (KPIs) were used inconsistently across the Museum Development Programme.
- Where used, the indicators tended to focus on activity outputs, rather than on outcomes or impacts. This made it difficult to evaluate the Museum Development Programme against the Arts Council's Goals.
- The monitoring data lacked sufficient consistency to enable the evaluation to assess Museum Development at a programme level. Rather the focus was on a wide range of individual projects that could be loosely grouped as addressing one or more of the Arts Council's Goals.
- The work was intended to review the performance of the 2012-15 programme from a position of hindsight, ie an ex-post, summative evaluation. However, Museum Development continues and is now operating as the 2015-18 iteration. With many of the lessons learned from the 2012-15 programme having already been put into practice, elements of the evaluation were overtaken by events.

## 1.2 About Museum Development 2012-15

Museum Development seeks to help Accredited museums in England<sup>1</sup> be more resilient, to help them to continue to improve their offer to their visitors and local communities. The Museum Development Fund was originally set up in 2004 by the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council as part of the Renaissance in the Regions programme. The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council was disbanded in 2012, at which point Museum Development passed over to the Arts Council. Thus the 2012-15 programme was the first to be run by the Arts Council. However, many of the Museum Development Providers and staff continued in their roles over the transition to the Arts Council, providing a degree of continuity.

Museum Development support was perceived as vital to the small and medium sized museums that constitute the majority of local museum provision. For example, in August 2016, there were a total of over 1,300 fully or partially Accredited museums in England<sup>2</sup>. Of these, 920 were self-defined as scale one or two, which equates to small or medium based on the Accreditation definitions<sup>3</sup>.

From August 2012 to 31 March 2015, the Arts Council wanted to ensure that there was suitable development support available to all Accredited museums in England, to benefit museums, audiences and communities across the country. The Arts Council achieved this by funding Museum Development organisations across the nine regions of England to deliver services that complemented other strands of Renaissance activity, as well as support services provided by other agencies, including local authorities and funding from organisations such as the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF).

The ultimate goal of the Arts Council's Museum Development Programme was to drive development and deliver sustainability, resilience and innovation in regional museums across the country. The Arts Council articulates its overall priorities through five Goals. These are:

1. **Excellence** is thriving and celebrated in the arts, museums and libraries.
2. **Audiences:** everyone has the opportunity to experience and to be inspired by the arts, museums and libraries.
3. **Resilience:** the arts, museums and libraries are resilient and environmentally sustainable.
4. The **leadership and workforce** in the arts, museums and libraries are diverse and appropriately skilled.
5. Every **child and young person** has the opportunity to experience the richness of the arts, museums and libraries.

These goals cover all the Arts Council funded activities and not just museums.

During the period under review, Museum Development was principally funded by the Arts Council with some partnership monies from local authorities, who also co-funded Museum Development organisations. In total during 2012-15, £8 million was spent on the Museum Development Programme. This money was allocated to the regions according to an agreed formula and Museum Development Providers were free to bid to undertake activities across their regions within this funding envelope. The regional allocations were based on a range of factors including: population; geographical size of the regions; the number of Accredited museums; and the number of museums needing mentors. Details of the allocation and Museum Development Providers are set out in Table 1, below.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Arts Council England Accreditation Scheme sets nationally agreed standards for museums in the UK. It defines good practice and identifies agreed standards, thereby encouraging development. It is a baseline quality standard that helps guide museums to be the best they can be, for current and future users. See: <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/accreditation-scheme/about-accreditation> for more details.

<sup>2</sup> Arts Council England, List of Accredited Museums in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man, September 2016: <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/document/list-accredited-museums-uk-channel-islands-and-isle-man>

<sup>3</sup> Accreditation data, Arts Council England, August 2016

**Table 1: Museum Development allocations and Providers for 2012-15**

| Region             | Grant holder   | Grant value | Museum Development Provider             | Abbreviation |
|--------------------|--|-------------|---|--------------|
| East Midlands      | Leicestershire County Council  | £719,887    | Museum Development East Midlands        | MDEM         |
| East               | Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service  | £1,141,000  | SHARE Museums East                      | SHARE        |
| London             | Museum of London   | £650,190    | London Museum Development               | LMD          |
| North East         | TWAM   | £416,000    | North East Museum Development           | NEMD         |
| North West         | The Manchester Partnership and The Cumbrian Consortium   | £880,000    | North West Museum Development           | MDNW         |
| South East         | Royal Pavilion & Museums, Brighton & Hove; HCC Arts & Museums; Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust; Oxfordshire County Museums Service   | £1,400,000  | South East Museum Development Programme | SEMDP        |
| South West         | South West Museum Development Programme (Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery and Archives; Plymouth City Museum and Art Gallery; Royal Albert Memorial Museum and Art Gallery; South West Federation of Museums and Galleries) | £1,192,000  | South West Museum Development Programme | MDSW         |
| West Midlands      | Wolverhampton City Council, The Marches Network  | £832,000    | Museum Development West Midlands        | MDWM         |
| Yorkshire & Humber | York Museums Trust   | £840,000    | Museum Development Yorkshire            | MDY          |

Further support for Museum Development activities was also provided, eg as in-kind assistance from agencies and organisations such as the Regional Federations, Bridge organisations, Major Partner Museums, universities, and as grant funding from Heritage Lottery Funds for development projects.

The Arts Council continues to support museums, through its investment in Major Partner Museums, Museum Development Grants 2015-18, PRISM Fund, the Arts Council Museum Resilience Funding, Designation Development Funding and a range of other schemes which are open to the wider sphere of arts and culture organisations.

### 1.3 Accreditation

Accreditation advice was an important feature of the 2012-15 programmes as the Museum Development Programme focused its support on museums which had achieved Accredited status or which were working towards Accreditation. The Arts Council wanted "...to ensure suitable development support is available to all Accredited museums in England so that they can maximise their benefits to audiences and communities" (the Arts Council 2011: 3).

The Accreditation Scheme sets nationally agreed standards for museums in the UK. It defines good practice and identifies agreed standards, thereby encouraging development. It is a baseline quality standard that helps guide museums to be the best they can be, for current and future users<sup>4</sup>. Areas of activity covered by Accreditation include effective planning, responsible collections management and active engagement with communities.

The scheme operates as a partnership between the Arts Council, the Welsh Government, Museums Galleries Scotland and the Northern Ireland Museums Council. As of September 2016, there were over 1,300 Accredited museums across England<sup>5</sup>. The number of Accredited museums in a region was a contributing factor to its Museum Development funding allocation (the Arts Council 2011: 22). In practice, the focus was on supporting small and medium-sized museums that were either volunteer-led or had few paid staff, to achieve and sustain Accreditation. Support was delivered through Museum Development Providers, guidance, training programmes and small grants programmes.

Details of the number of Accredited museums, and those seeking Accreditation, in each region is provided in Table 2, below.

**Table 2: Accredited museums across English regions**

| Region          | Number of Accredited museums <sup>6</sup> | Number of museums working towards Accreditation <sup>7</sup> |
|-----------------|---|--|
| East Midlands   | 101                                       | 12   |
| East of England | 162                                       | 4  |
| London          | 135                                       | 13   |
| North East      | 63  | 1  |
| North West      | 140                                       | 3  |
| South East      | 233                                       | 25   |
| South West      | 196                                       | 15   |
| West Midlands   | 136                                       | 5  |
| Yorkshire       | 142                                       | 3  |
| Grand Total     | 1308                                      | 81   |

<sup>4</sup> The Arts Council – About Accreditation.

<sup>5</sup> Arts Council England, List of Accredited Museums in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man, September 2016: <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/document/list-accredited-museums-uk-channel-islands-and-isle-man>

<sup>6</sup> As of September 2016

<sup>7</sup> As of September 2016

### 2. Summary of key findings

This section presents a range of findings that applied across the regions and Goals. More specific evidence on the performance of Museum Development activities is set out in Section 3.

- The Arts Council's Museum Development Programme was flexible in design and operation. Many of the Museum Development Providers carried out research to establish the needs of museums in their regions. This was reflected in the applications for funding and subsequent delivery of the programmes. However, flexibility also meant that there was significant variation across the regions in terms of what was delivered and the profile of development activities.
- Museum Development Providers prioritised activities within the Arts Council's five Goals. The flexibility of Museum Development meant that the Goals were afforded different levels of priority by each of the Museum Development Providers. Interviewees regarded the objectives encompassed in Goals 1, 3 and 4 as being most relevant to Museum Development.
- Notwithstanding challenges in evaluating the achievements of Museum Development against the Arts Council's Goals, there was clear feedback from museums and Museum Development Providers that relevant activity took place and that the museums gained benefits from participating in the programme.
- As a development programme, the outcomes and impacts from Museum Development were expected to be realised over the medium to long term, rather than immediately. Nevertheless, there was evidence to say that outcomes were achieved. For example, there were instances of revenues from museums' retail activities increasing following Museum Development intervention.
- Examples of the long term nature of the challenges that Museum Development sought to address included: ongoing CPD for staff; activities to enhance the historical value of collections; and developing retail and other commercial opportunities. The review of activities delivered during 2012-15 suggests that these interventions will have enhanced participating museums' capacity to plan for, avoid and, if necessary, deal more effectively with shocks in the future. Similarly, embedding organisational change and enhancing skills, along with the development of networks and partnerships, will help contribute to a more strategic approach to support in current and future rounds of Museum Development. However, due to the long term nature of many of the interventions undertaken as part of the 2012-15 Museum Development Programme, as well as the delays in acquiring the data to measure them, it is not yet possible to determine, with any certainty, whether or not museums will be able to survive all shocks in the future.
- The models for delivering Museum Development varied across the regions; some providers opted to build and utilise internal expertise and capacity, while others tended to rely on external contractors. There was no evidence to suggest, overall, that either model was any more or less effective. There was feedback indicating that staff from Museum Development Providers needed to keep their skills up to date if they were to maximise their input. The consultants received a range of views on the effectiveness of Museum Development Officers, which seemed to reflect the nature and experience of the individuals, who ranged from part time officers at the start of their careers, to those with extensive experience. Nevertheless, the Museum Development Officers were seen as core to the success of the programme.
- Although there were differences in approaches to implementation across the regions, there were factors which appeared to influence the quality of Museum Development delivery, for example:
  - Level of resources: the extent to which Museum Development Regional Managers and Museum Development Officers felt they were able to maximise the potential of Museum Development depended on having sufficient resources to achieve the desired impacts. For example, interviewees cited cases in which Museum Development was only able to help a museum *survive*, rather than to undertake a comprehensive programme of work that went further and enabled the organisation to *develop* and *thrive*. Thus there was an element of only being able to address symptoms rather than root causes.
  - Continuity of Museum Development Programme team: in some regions the Museum Development Officer had been in place since the days of MLA funding, whilst others had changed provider between programmes. Feedback indicated that the balance between maintaining relationships over time and the potential benefit from new ideas could influence quality. However, the consultants were equivocal

about this, insofar as the introduction of new staff could mean an injection of fresh thinking, or the replacement of an ineffective team member.

- There was much feedback suggesting that only those museums committed to change, and with the capacity to implement such change, should receive substantive support. Concern was expressed that development assistance could be wasted if it were applied to those museums unwilling to change or unable to put ideas into practice. Maintaining relationships and the sharing of ideas was not covered by this concern.
- The effectiveness of working between the Museum Development Providers and other partners appeared mixed, largely influenced by the role of the partners, eg whether the organisations were funding or delivering services and the extent of any previous relationship in working together. However, interviewees acknowledged that in many cases any difficulties could be attributed to a lack of clarity around objectives and a lack of understanding of relative remits. An example was the focus of Museum Development on Accredited museums and those working towards Accreditation, whereas local authorities were primarily concerned with those that they owned or sponsored and where different criteria might be applied in terms of eligibility and the support available.
- The nine regional providers were also seen as working in isolation, despite the commonality of challenges and efforts to meet common aims. The development of the Museum Development Network is now providing a mechanism for providers to engage with each other, share best practice and information and avoid duplication. For example, one regional Museum Development Provider felt that the Museum Development Network could be a point of contact in future to discuss how programmes that are to be rolled out or managed by Museum Development teams are to operate and to clarify what the Museum Development role is. It was highlighted that a number of "national projects" relied on Museum Development to broker partnerships in regions. Greater and ongoing use of the Museum Development Network by 'national projects' would have enabled planning discussions to be more effective. The fact that the Museum Development Network continues to develop and improve their co-ordination is an example of how the evaluation had been overtaken by events.
- Encouraging the uptake of good practice and providing skills were the main delivery mechanisms used. Feedback identified two areas of concern. First, identifying and validating what constituted good practice appeared to be subjective, giving rise to unease regarding the appropriateness of what was being advocated as good practice. Second, individual staff members and volunteers were the principal beneficiaries of the skills development and there was worry that museums were vulnerable, if and when, staff moved on. This latter point is not confined to Museum Development and affects training more generally. It should be noted that the concerns around the latter point tended to focus on the gains and losses to individual museums, rather than the sector itself, where a degree of staff churn may be considered positive for introducing new thinking.

## 3. The Arts Council's five Goals and Museum Development

Museum Development Providers were required to align their proposed activities and support towards the Arts Council's five strategic Goals for arts and culture across England, which are listed below. Table 3 provides a summary of the types of activity supported by Museum Development under each Goal.

**Table 3: Types of activities delivered by Museum Development under each Goal**

| Goal                                | Overview of activities delivered   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>1. Excellence</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collections development and care programmes, training, support and funding</li> <li>• collections reviews, hidden collections made available and accessible, including online activity</li> <li>• conservation advice and support</li> <li>• established networks, knowledge sharing and workshops</li> <li>• increase and maintain standards to Accreditation level</li> </ul>   |
| <b>2. Audiences</b>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support to review provisions for audiences and improve visitor experience</li> <li>• programmes to involve audiences in collections development</li> <li>• marketing advice, training, and grants</li> <li>• new audience development support</li> <li>• community and schools' programmes</li> <li>• support for digital strategies</li> <li>• guidance for better audience numbers and satisfaction monitoring</li> </ul> |
| <b>3. Resilience</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support around fundraising and writing bids</li> <li>• support for reviewing and improving retail offer</li> <li>• support for identifying strategies for diversifying and increasing sustainable income generation</li> <li>• provide governance and business planning support</li> <li>• support for environmental sustainability initiatives to reduce environmental impact and operating costs</li> </ul>               |
| <b>4. Leadership and workforce</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities</li> <li>• digital skills training</li> <li>• mentoring programmes</li> <li>• support to improve volunteer training and skills</li> <li>• sharing good practice and increased collaborative and partnership working</li> </ul>  |
| <b>5. Children and young people</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support to enhance education and young people outreach</li> <li>• family and community learning programmes</li> <li>• Arts Award initiatives</li> <li>• training and CPD for staff, volunteers and boards to improve work with children and young people</li> <li>• support to recruit more young volunteers</li> <li>• support to engage with young people when developing audience offer</li> </ul>                       |

This report studies the activities delivered by Museum Development and investigates what the programme achieved within the context of the five Goals. Particular attention is paid to Goal 3, as addressing the financial challenges facing museums and achieving economic resilience was a priority issue in most regions.

## 3.1 Goal 1: Excellence

### Findings against Goal 1

- Museum Development Managers felt positive about Goal 1 activity, asserting that it had resulted in museums' collections being better managed, better cared for and more accessible.
- Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries suggested that projects delivered under Goal 1 resulted in:
  - the upskilling of staff
  - equipping organisations with skills in collections management
  - sharing expertise about collections across regions, which interviewees indicated meant that the prospects for maintaining the impacts over the medium to long term were good
- Evidence suggested that the programmes which established networks of skills and knowledge sharing had been successful in raising the expertise of museum staff.

The Arts Council's first strategic goal is to ensure that "excellence is thriving and celebrated in the arts, museums and libraries" and that museums specifically "show excellence in the way that they use their collections to enrich people's lives"<sup>8</sup>.

During the 2012-15 Museum Development Programme, one of the key activities to help museums demonstrate excellence was to support them to develop better understanding, exhibiting and care of their collections.

The North West's work on numismatics provided an example of how a Museum Development intervention was designed and delivered to address a very specific local challenge (Box 3.1).

#### Box 3.1 Numismatics skills, North West

A need for numismatics skills was identified when the sole regional expert on numismatics was due to retire, leaving the region's museums without specialist expertise.

The Museum Development team responded by joining with the Money & Medals Network at the British Museum to create a regional numismatic network. As a result of the formation of the network:

- a number of training events were held addressing storage, cataloguing and research, identifying Roman coins and paranumismatica
- a training day was held in partnership with Museum Development Yorkshire
- a quarter of applications to the first round of the Art Fund's "Treasures Plus" funding were from the North West
- 18 North West museums were given a starter kit of materials
- presentations from British Museum speakers were captured on the Museum Development North West's YouTube page, creating a permanent resource
- a Museum Development Officer was one of the speakers at the Money & Medals Network conference at the British Museum in March 2014
- an email network was set up, comprising 35 people from 24 organisations in the North West

Training days were well attended, and included participants from smaller museums, resulting in numismatics' expertise reaching beyond the original sole expert.

<sup>8</sup> Arts Council England (2013), *Great art and culture for everyone: 10-year strategic framework*

## 3.2 Goal 2: Audiences

### Findings against Goal 2

- Activities appeared to have reached the intended number of beneficiaries and in several regions were spread across more museums than were originally targeted.
- However, activities which saw lower than expected take-up of support and engagement, such as data sharing and audience development support, may not have reached those museums most in need of support.
- Training which could be put into practice quickly and with visible results appeared to be the most effective. This included improved digital marketing and the use of social media.

The Arts Council's strategic framework outlines the aim to increase the number of people who contribute to and experience the arts, museums and libraries and to reach wider and more diverse audiences<sup>9</sup>. Museum Development activities sought to meet these aims.

All nine regions undertook activities in support of Goal 2, however it was given greater prominence in some regions than in others. In those regions where there was less emphasis on Goal 2, this was in part a result of the success of previous Museum Development and Renaissance programmes meaning that there was less work to be done during 2012-15.

In order to achieve their aim of widening the reach of museums and increasing visitors, Museum Development Providers delivered activities to support the marketing of museums. Developing museums' digital media skills was an important part of improving their marketing capabilities. Box 3.2 provides an example of how the North East Museum Development Provider undertook marketing activities and increased museums' skills and engagement with digital marketing.

#### Box 3.2 "I like museums" brand and website (North East)

In the North East, it was considered valuable to share resources and make full use of existing digital platforms, since a large proportion of museums had little budget for marketing activity. As such, the Museum Development Provider's communication team developed the "I like museums" brand and website and promoted the use of it by the region's museums.

#### PROJECT OUTPUTS

Improvements were made to the website to make it easier for museums to upload events and information about exhibitions.

Activity included raising awareness of the brand across volunteer-run museums and providing them with training on how to upload content to the website.

Initiatives included:

- advertising "I like museums" in the *North East Museums Bulletin* and *Primary Times* to coincide with the February half term
- making improvements to the website so that events information was up to date

#### PROJECT OUTCOMES

Museums engaging with Museum Development North East's digital marketing programme reported having gained confidence in using digital tools to engage their audiences and increased their Facebook and Twitter activity, resulting in increased followers and "likes".

<sup>9</sup> *Great art and culture for everyone: 10-year strategic framework*, Arts Council England, 2013

## 3.3 Goal 3: Resilience

### Findings against Goal 3

- Museums improved their ability to raise grants and other funding from new sources, eg a rise in the number of museums making successful applications for Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) funding.
- Over the short term, museums increased capacity to generate revenues through improved or diversified retail operations, better business planning and enhanced tools for measuring performance.
- Actions which changed the way the museum operated, eg diversifying income streams, were considered, on balance, more likely to be sustainable.
- Initiatives that only benefitted individuals, eg staff training, had limited persistence in the organisation, due to skills being lost through staff turnover.
- Evidence suggested that some individual museums used the Museum Development Programme to lever in additional income from other sources, for example sponsorship for exhibitions or in-kind support from other larger museums.

A key aim of Museum Development was to support museums to become more resilient, sustainable and innovative. Becoming more innovative referred to the ways museums engaged audiences, developed collections and identified new funding streams<sup>10</sup>.

Across England, Museum Development addressed these aims by providing different types of support, covering the themes of environmental sustainability, income generation, and organisational resilience. Delivery was via grants from the Museum Development Programme to beneficiary museums, direct support to museums using the expertise of Museum Development Officers or using consultants to deliver training and consultancy.

All regions emphasised the importance of supporting museums to become financially sustainable. Providers of development services recognised the increasing focus on commercialisation and the need for museums to think and operate as businesses, in addition to their cultural roles.

The nature of the provision varied widely across, and within, the regions and reflected the desire to respond to the needs of the museums being assisted. An example from Museum Development Yorkshire is provided in Box 3.3, which reviews specific support provided to help museums increase income generation. The provision included workshops, "ask the expert" blog sessions, a "how to" guide on legacy giving, and mentoring for individual museums, support on improving retail offers, and a feasibility study on collaborative purchasing.

#### **Box 3.3 Captain Cook Memorial Museum – review of the retail offer and fundraising activity (Yorkshire and the Humber)**

---

<sup>10</sup> *Culture, knowledge and understanding: great museums and libraries for everyone*, Arts Council England, 2011

## The Arts Council's five Goals and Museum Development

The museum had not looked at its retail offer for seven or eight years prior to the project. Museum Development provided support from a retail expert, which led to an increase in revenues from the museum's shop. This contributed to the museum's drive toward financial sustainability.

The review benchmarked spend per head and sought to maximise the use of the limited amount of space available for retail activity. Following the review and the changes made to the retail offer, income increased by around 50 per cent to £19,000 during the 2012-15 period.

The museum also benefited from expert advice on fundraising. The museum established a patrons and supporters scheme and a system for legacy donations. The scheme attracted 20 patrons and raised nearly £50,000 during the 2012-15 period.

Grants formed part of Museum Development and were integral to delivering activities to develop resilience. Museum Development grant funding was mainly provided through Small Grants (up to £500) and larger Capital Grants (up to £2,500 or £10,000 for joint applications).

Box 3.4 shows how a Small Grant helped a museum revise its business model and highlights the long term, developmental nature of Museum Development.

### Box 3.4: The University of Nottingham Museum of Archaeology: Re-opening a closed museum (East Midlands)

The University of Nottingham Museum of Archaeology was closed prior to receiving MLA Renaissance funding for one staff member to re-open it in 2008. Since then the museum has gone from strength to strength. This case study highlights what the Museum of Archaeology delivers today, and how Museum Development activities helped achieve this outcome.

#### Small Grants for collections

The museum reported that:

"Collections are at the heart of the museum; you can't do anything without these."

When the museum re-opened in 2008 with one curator the collections were archived and unknown.

An initial grant of £9,000 enabled a full audit of the collections to take place to give the museum an understanding of what they had and paved the way for opening the museum.

This continued through 2012-15 with further Small Grants and now the museum is active in using its collections for:

- outreach to schools with Saxons and Romans now being part of the KS1 syllabus
- training for curators on weekends
- public and learning programmes around the exhibition: lunch time talks with up to 200 members of the public
- summer school in association with the art gallery for pupils to attend during holidays

As an award winning and Accredited museum, the Museum of Archaeology has received the largest resilience grant in the East Midlands.

#### Resilience funding and Capital Grants

Before 2012, the museum had to turn down the chance to show temporary exhibitions in partnership with national museums. This was due to not having the right quality of display cases to obtain indemnity cover.

"There was no other funding to apply for before we were able to buy the display cases, which also overcame frustration of having to turn down exhibitions, including from the British Museum and the V&A."

With plans in place for exhibitions, the museum was successful in being awarded funding for new display cases.

This has enabled:

- a higher profile loan from the British Museum's Egypt exhibition
- exhibiting of previously unseen collections from the City Museums
- collaboration with the Ashmolean, where the new display cases allowed an exhibition to be developed with loan pieces
- establishing of the Money and Medals Network
- hosting the Festival of British Archaeology, including marine archaeology for the first time.

"Small Grants really kicked this off and got us where we are, we would not have achieved this without Small Grants."

The museum is now the "money and medal regional centre" for the British Museum.

## 3.4 Goal 4: Workforce and leadership

### Findings against Goal 4

- Museum Development activities delivered against the Goal 4 aims relating to skills, but not those focused on diversity.
- Where targets and outputs were recorded, especially around training courses, more museums and individuals attended courses than originally targeted.
- In some regions, challenges facing small or volunteer led museums were identified and activities tailored to meet these needs.
- There was evidence to indicate that lessons from the programme were being used in the design of activities for the 2015-18 Museum Development Programme.

It is self-evident that resilient, well-managed, environmentally sustainable and creative museums depend on the skills of their leaders, staff and volunteers. Thus training played a central role in the delivery of Goal 4.

All regions delivered a programme of training to its museums, with regions designing and delivering training through different approaches. Box 3.5 summarises the variety of workforce development approaches offered by Museum Development in the South West. This shows the range of activities delivered during Museum Development 2012-15, and how lessons learned from these activities informed the 2015-18 programme.

### Box 3.5: Delivering the skills and workforce development programme (South West)

A number of methods were used:

- As a South West Museum Development Programme partner, the SW Federation of Museums and Galleries delivered a programme covering core skills and development related to Accreditation and thematic issues such as health and wellbeing.
- Skills and development needs were identified through an annual survey and training participant feedback.
- A regional workforce development plan was produced.
- The Conservation Development Service delivered one-to-one museum training and development to address particular needs.
- Individual projects had a skills and development component including, for example, sustainability and digital engagement projects.
- An apprenticeship scheme was run, but proved unsustainable due to cost.
- Networking and the sharing of knowledge and skills between museums was encouraged, guided by the concept of museums taking responsibility for skills development themselves.
- The provision of skills training bursaries for travel.

- The provision of online resources through the SW Federation website.
- Shared Accreditation development training with the South East.
- Museum Development Officer skills development to support museum development.

Participants' feedback was sought, and training and development externally evaluated and reported on in the published annual reports.

Volunteering research in 2014-15 explored trends, needs, best practice and measuring the impact of volunteering. In response to this, the 2015-18 programmes established a volunteering advisory service led by a Sustainable Volunteering Officer, whose work includes developing skills networks.

## 3.5 Goal 5: Children and young people

### Findings against Goal 5

- Activities under Goal 5 peaked following changes to the national curriculum.
- Working with schools was reported as becoming more challenging. An example cited was the difficulty in taking children out of school to visit museums.
- Goal 5 activity tended to be delivered in partnership with other local organisations, primarily the Arts Council Bridge organisations.
- There was evidence that some regional Museum Development Providers did not fully embrace Arts Award and Artsmark.

The key aim of Museum Development Providers in relation to Goal 5 was that museums engage with children and young people, through a variety of methods. Learning, in various forms, was considered a key role for museums. As with other Goals, there were variations in the priorities and focus across regions, driven by the Museum Development Providers' assessments of museums' needs.

A case study from the North East is shown in Box 3.7, where the Museum Development Provider commissioned Hopkins van Mil to deliver the Building Resilience programme. This programme offered museums the opportunity to explore new, or build on existing, methods of generating income from education and young people's services.

#### Box 3.7 Building Resilience project, North East

The Building Resilience programme delivered to two museums, providing support for exploring ways of increasing income generation. This involved site visits by consultants and remote mentoring for the participating museums, featuring support to devise and pilot their products and services.

There was a limited timescale from commissioning to beginning work with museums. As this phase included the recruitment of museums the contractor recommended that this lead in time be increased in the future. This would (a) allow more museums to be able to consider participation in the scheme and (b) ensure that teams had sufficient capacity to take on the work involved.

The short programme duration of four months (possibly dictated by the fiscal year) meant it was not possible to hold a broader "share the learning" day with other museums in the region. It was understood from previous programmes that this was potentially valuable for the mentored museums as they were able to demonstrate the learning gained and progress made. It also provided the chance to showcase the Building Resilience programme and what it could achieve.

The programme provided a method for assisting museums to develop an income stream from children and young people services. The provider, HVM, recommended that progress be monitored further by the museums and that the programme run over a longer duration. The latter would allow more museums to

take part and for them to have more time to assess the income generation activities they wish to take forward.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Hopkins van Mil, *Museum Development North East – Building resilience programme: new and tested ways of generating income*, 2015 <http://www.museumdevelopmentne.org.uk/geisha/assets/images/Final-project-report.pdf>

### 4. Answering the research questions

The findings from the research were assessed against the objectives for the evaluation, as set out in section 1.1 above. The results are presented below, with each sub-section addressing one of the questions posed.

#### 4.1 Impact against programme aims

- The use of different KPIs in grant offer letters meant that it was not possible to provide an aggregate quantitative assessment of the Museum Development Programme at the national level. Furthermore, over time, the original KPIs were not seen or used universally by the Arts Council and Museum Development Providers to guide or measure activity; as a result some regions did not report performance against all of the original KPIs.
- The Museum Development Programme sought to achieve long term and lasting impact. The relatively short time between the programme interventions and the evaluation limited the extent to which long term outcomes and impacts could be captured, but process outcomes, such as changes in behaviour indicating progress, were observed.
- The flexibility built into the Museum Development Programme resulted in each region taking a different approach to delivering the objectives contained within the Arts Council's five Goals. This limited the ability of the evaluation to compare performance between regions.
- Where data was recorded on the number of museums supported by Museum Development activity, the outputs generally met or exceeded target numbers.
- Museum Development Managers felt most positive about Goal 1 and Goal 3 activity, although these did have overlap with Goals 2 and 4.
- Museum Development Managers asserted that the support had resulted in museums' collections being better managed, better cared for and more accessible. However, this claim could not be verified independently. Interviews suggested that projects delivered under Goal 1 resulted in the upskilling of staff. By equipping organisations with skills in collections management, and sharing expertise about collections across regions, it could be surmised that the prospects for maintaining at least some of the impacts over the longer term are good.
- Where financial evidence was collected against Goal 3 activity, the data suggest that museums have increased their revenue levels, diversified revenue sources, and reduced energy costs.
- Similarly, Museum Development Managers and the Arts Council's Relationship Managers reported that Museum Development activity had positive impacts on organisational health and Goal 3. Regional business development programmes helped museums to think about the health and long term sustainability of their organisations. This led to observed changes in many museums beginning to see themselves as businesses: with income generation an important part of their operations, and strong leadership and governance by boards and trustees recognised as vital for their future success.
- The evidence from interviews and reported outputs indicated that the 2012-15 Museum Development activities delivered against Goal 4 aims, with the exception of diversity, which was not prioritised in the programmes. Where targets and outputs were recorded, especially around attendance at training courses, these targets were generally exceeded, with more museums participating and individuals attending courses than planned.
- As a whole, it was evident that Goal 5 saw the least Museum Development provision. Furthermore, where Museum Development programmes focused on Goal 5, this was most often in partnership with other local organisations, primarily the Arts Council Bridge organisations. This made it difficult to assess the extent to which any impacts could be attributed solely to Museum Development.
- While it is too early to say what the long term impacts<sup>12</sup> of Museum Development 2012-15 could be, the fact that many individual projects met their output targets and that many of the activities were designed to have a long term impact, there was sufficient evidence to suggest that Museum Development will, over time, contribute towards the Arts Council's Goals.

---

<sup>12</sup> Long term was considered to be five years and more.

### 4.2 Nature of programme impacts and their distribution

- Accredited museums, and those working towards Accreditation, were the intended beneficiaries.
- There was evidence that a wide range of museums accessed help through the Museum Development Programme. However, not all museums were capable of making full use of the assistance available.
- A number of small and volunteer-run museums were unable to participate, due to a lack of capacity, time or motivation. For those that did engage, there were further resource challenges in terms of implementing lessons learnt.
- It was felt by Museum Development Managers and Officers that some museums were limited in their ability to apply for grants. As grants to undertake development projects formed a vital part of the package of assistance, an inability to apply for this help reduced the support available.
- The ability of small museums to apply varied depending on the grant awards. The smallest grants (up to £500) tended to be less problematic, although even for these finding the resource to complete and submit applications was sometimes challenging. These challenges included not just the time taken to complete the application, but the thought required to identify what grants could be used for. The application process became more challenging for larger grants, where match funding and partnerships were required. For example, in the North East it was indicated that applications from most museums were often submitted close to the deadline due to a lack of capacity to submit during the preceding year, which in turn put pressure on the capacity of the small North East Museum Development team when reviewing applications.
- Notwithstanding this, the evidence does show that small grants were essential for small museums, were viewed positively, and helped unlock opportunities. The role of the Museum Development Providers in guiding museums through the process was also important.
- The differing priority accorded to the Arts Council Goals meant that the distribution of assistance on a given Goal was not even across all regions.

### 4.3 How does the programme work?

- Flexibility was central to the 2012-15 Museum Development Programme. This meant that development activities reflected the needs of museums in each of the nine regions. Specifically, it allowed Museum Development Providers to target resources towards things that appeared to work well and away from areas where there was less demand.
- Museum Development Officers' ability to react to need in the short term was valuable. However, some Museum Development grants/activities were quite specific to an issue which may have been current at the time of the application, but which had been resolved once Museum Development funding became available or before the end of the funding period.
- The provision of training and sharing of good practice were the principal mechanisms for delivering Museum Development interventions.
- Museum Development Providers tended to deliver services either using an in-house team or by contracting out to specialist consultants and trainers. Those Museum Development Providers that utilised in-house teams were able to take on specialist expertise, eg an organisational health expert in London and a qualified teacher in Yorkshire.
- The evidence indicated that there was no difference in the effectiveness of the in-house or out-sourcing models of Museum Development delivery.
- The role of Museum Development Officers was seen as important, by the Arts Council Relationship Managers and beneficiaries. In several cases museums talked about the Museum Development Officers as if they were the Museum Development Programme; providing a consistent and on-the-ground link between the Arts Council and beneficiaries was considered crucial. Some even commented that the success of Museum Development at a regional level was down to the individual Museum Development Manager.

### 4.4 Match of intended impacts with programme needs

- All regions delivered activity in support of the Arts Council Goals, though the degree of coverage varied based on local priorities.
- The aims and activities of Goal 3 in particular, around resilience and sustainability, chimed well with the needs of the museums, which needed to become more resilient in the face of budget cuts.
- The short timespan between the delivery of Museum Development activities and the evaluation meant that there was little evidence of impacts being achieved. Nonetheless, there was sufficient indication, based on the nature of the interventions and outputs achieved, that outcomes and impacts should be achieved over time.

### 4.5 Value analysis

- There was evidence that some individual museums used the Museum Development Programme to lever in additional funding from other sources. Examples included grants from the Heritage Lottery Fund, increased revenues from retail activities, and museums undertaking sufficient improvements to enable them to gain loans from the British Museum. However, there was insufficient data to provide a quantitative assessment of the funding brought in by individual museums supported by the Museum Development Programme.
- There was no quantitative evidence to indicate the extent to which Museum Development, as a whole, was able to attract additional funding at a programme level. Nonetheless it was clear that local authorities continued to fund support for museums, despite their own challenging circumstances, although the extent of this support did vary and has declined in some areas. There was also some indication of support in kind, eg of the Bridge organisations applying their resources to assist Museum Development activities or universities which hosted Museum Development teams.

### 5. Conclusions and recommendations

In this final section, the report seeks to draw conclusions and present recommendations for future iterations of the Museum Development Programme.

The conclusions have been grouped together under a set of nine headings. It should be noted that the allocation of individual conclusions to the groups involved judgement, as they may have been relevant to more than one heading. Likewise, the recommendations may address several of the issues raised.

#### **National programme versus regional devolution**

There were tensions between Museum Development presenting itself as a national programme, while the actual design and delivery of activity was based around the assessed needs of museums in each of the nine English regions. The focus on regional activity led to variety in the nature and type of support offered, even where initiatives sought to address common issues, eg seeking to achieve financial resilience.

The regional Museum Development Providers were funded on the basis of the applications that they submitted. Whilst application forms required Museum Development Providers to address all aspects of the five Arts Council Goals, the needs in each region varied and tended to prioritise some Goals above others. This resulted in differing profiles of support, with some aspects of the Goals only receiving limited attention.

The regional needs were identified by Museum Development Providers in consultation with museums in their region, and these needs formed the basis of the aims and objectives set out in the applications submitted by Museum Development Providers.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The Arts Council needs to determine whether or not it wishes to see a “core offer” made available to museums as part of the Museum Development Programme. This would apply across England and represent a national programme.
- If the Arts Council wishes to establish such an approach it needs to determine what such an offer should cover and how it should be procured, eg through a lead Museum Development Provider, by the Arts Council itself, or as a requirement set out in grant offer letters.
- Any regional element could be specified and procured based on the current arrangement. A variation might see regions providing small scale grants as well as more directed interventions.
- Alternatively, the Arts Council could maintain the status quo with national offers, such as Future Proof Museums, and regionally distinct offers with limited ability to compare the performance of activities within regions.
- The Arts Council should work with regional Museum Development Providers to develop a logic model for each region in a consistent format. Starting with the needs identified by museums, the logic model will set out the activities needed to effect the changes, what indicators can be used to measure progress, outcome and impact and how to collect this data. This will allow stories of change to be mapped out more clearly.

### Regional flexibility

Having flexibility in how and what was delivered in each region proved valuable in allowing Museum Development to adapt to local need. For example, stakeholder consultations indicated that when additional funding became available (eg Resilience funding) the Museum Development team re-allocated resources between projects and activities. Likewise, budgets were transferred between Goals.

#### Recommendation:

- The Arts Council should seek to ensure that the regions retain sufficient devolution to enable them to respond to the needs of museums in their areas. This would need to be in addition to any “core offer”.

### Quality assurance

There were challenges in establishing standards of quality for the services delivered through Museum Development. This was primarily a function of the diverse provision and lack of comparability between interventions.

There were concerns regarding the identification and validation of good practice and where its replication was appropriate.

#### Recommendations:

- The Arts Council needs to determine how consistency of a “core offer” could be achieved and assessed. This is likely to involve the use of key performance indicators (KPIs), including quantitative measures at the level of individual museums as well as more qualitative information. Examples might include changes in visitor numbers, turnover, earned income, donations, sponsorship, grants, etc, following support as well as changes to a museum’s confidence in its ability to manage change in relation to its collection, commercialisation, or audience development.
- Indicators should reflect impacts and outcomes, eg increased turnover, registered “friends” of a museum or diversity of the board and staff, rather than process outcomes, eg number of attendees on a course, or the results of post intervention questionnaires.
- To be assessed as good practice; interventions should be considered against a range of objective criteria such as contribution to achieving outcomes, validation of impacts, and preconditions for application.
- The Arts Council’s Museum Resilience funded Future Proof Museums programme, run by the Arts Marketing Association, incorporates diagnostic sessions and assists museums to align interventions with long term strategic change. The Arts Council should consider applying such tools to ensure there is fitness for purpose between the intervention and the needs of the museum.

### Futureproofing

Enhancing the resilience of museums was identified as the key objective of Museum Development. By extension, this should be applied to the Museum Development Programme itself, eg to help it reduce costs and increase its value for money.

#### Recommendations:

- The Arts Council should seek to focus Museum Development funding on bespoke interventions and the development of new approaches. Established, or well proven, support including training should be funded separately, possibly as part of a “core offer”. Thus courses on social media for marketing, or advice on basic merchandising could be delivered by specialist providers, rather than the Museum Development Providers themselves.

- The Arts Council should make it incumbent on Museum Development Providers to utilise existing resources wherever possible and only fund additional tools when required, eg by licence arrangements, etc.
- The Arts Council should seek to identify, review and publicise, where appropriate, resource sharing websites and groups, such as Culturehive.
- Ensuring best practice and knowledge is embedded in organisations, and stays relevant over the long term is important. The Arts Council should work with Museum Development Providers to encourage this. One example museum from 2012-15 send their staff on different CPD and other training courses by rotation on an ongoing basis so over time the staff gain a mix of skills. This not only means that the individuals in question broaden their skills but also that the organisation has sufficient skills embedded so that they do not lose a skillset if a staff member leaves.
- It may be appropriate to explore how expertise within the many support organisations, including the networks, could be utilised more fully.

### **Assessing impacts**

The differing timescales between the duration of the Museum Development Programme (three years between 2012 and 2015), the point at which the evaluation took place and the time it takes for interventions to deliver measurable outcomes meant that it was difficult to assess the actual impact of Museum Development on a museum's journey towards the Arts Council's five Goals.

The inconsistent collection of monitoring and evaluation data across regions made the attribution of change and success to specific Museum Development activities particularly problematic. This contributed to the challenge of evaluating the performance of the programme. In many cases it was difficult to establish the extent to which Museum Development was the sole or main cause of an identified impact.

Interviews emphasised the cumulative nature of Museum Development support, with the development of museums resulting from the aggregated effect of a number of different interventions made over the years, rather than as a result of a single project.

### **Recommendations:**

- The Arts Council should consider using the logic models or theory of change to underpin any evaluation. This would have the advantage of helping to identify the different types of change expected to be achieved over time, eg outputs immediately following an intervention, impacts after implementation and outcomes thereafter.
- The Arts Council should work with Museum Development Providers to put in place appropriate KPIs or build on other existing data collection methods, including those identified above in relation to a "core offer" in order to measure change on an objective basis.
- For example, the Museum Development Annual Data Survey is now carried out by Museum Development Providers in the South West, South East, East Midlands, East of England, and from 2016 the North East, having been launched in 2010 in the South West. Extending this across all Museum Development regions would provide a longitudinal and comparable dataset to track how museums change over time. In the survey Accredited museums are asked to provide core statistical data about their visitors, educational engagement, volunteers, staff and financial operations.
- Combining national datasets such as this, with more targeted data collected in the regions as part of specific Museum Development support programmes (eg increases in retail revenue amongst museums who received retail support) would enable more comprehensive measurements of impact and change over time.
- Snapshot tools such as Heritage Lottery Fund's Resilient Heritage Strength Checker should be utilised, or similar ones developed, in order to acquire baseline levels. These can then be reapplied to assess the extent of change over time.

### **Multiple and conflicting agendas**

The research evidence suggests that perceptions of the effectiveness of joint working between Museum Development Providers and other organisations was mixed and that this, in large measure, reflected the roles of the organisations involved and their specific remits. For example, the Arts Council noted that it focused its funding on Accredited museums, or those working toward Accreditation, whereas local authorities tended to prioritise museums at risk.

There was evidence of duplication of activity. Interviewees identified instances where Museum Development Providers had replicated extant provision. For example, Museum Development Providers were perceived to offer free courses that were similar to fee-based courses run by the Collections Trust. Learning from the 2012-15 programme resulted in change; since 2015, the Collections Trust has supported Museum Development through identifying collections' needs and providing support with strategic collections.

#### **Recommendations:**

- While the Museum Development Providers provide guidance on the support available to museums, the Arts Council may consider providing greater clarity about the wider Museum Development landscape and the roles of the key players and areas of possible overlap.
- The Arts Council already indicates that Museum Development funding should be for activities that are not eligible for support elsewhere. The Arts Council should adopt a keener focus on value for money and consider how a "core offer" may assist in preventing duplication of activity.

### **Diversity**

The 2012-15 programme did not address diversity issues in a robust way. Funding applications submitted by the Museum Development Providers generally stated that activity would not be targeted in relation to ethnicity, disability, age or social exclusion. Consultations indicated that Museum Development work on diversity focused on increasing the diversity of board members, rather than working with museums on diversity issues.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The Arts Council should scrutinise, for impact on diversity, the Museum Development Equality Action Plans submitted at procurement and ensure regular monitoring of the delivery of Museum Development Equality Action Plans by Relationship Managers. It should consider a standard approach to monitoring and taking action where performance is not satisfactory.
- Guidance on how to apply for Museum Development funding should state whether or not targeting specific groups was a priority and whether it was part of the appraisal process.

### **Targeting beneficiaries**

The size and nature of museums was important to the effectiveness of Museum Development. For example, there were limits to which small and volunteer-led museums were able to participate in training or implement changes.

The review of activities and outputs suggested that activities which required ongoing commitments, such as collecting visitor data were less successful than those which were less human resource intensive, such as marketing training. This could also lead to future challenges if ongoing commitments were not sustained.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Museum Development Providers should consider the ability of small museums, or those staffed primarily by volunteers, to take advantage of support before it is offered. Logic models pertaining to resource intensive interventions should be reviewed and assessments made as to whether target organisations are capable of converting outputs into outcomes.
- The Arts Council should encourage the use of mechanisms such as the VCSE diagnostic tool, produced by the Big Lottery Fund, to assess the development needs and capabilities of organisations.

### **Accreditation**

Ongoing delivery of training for Accreditation was vital. Access to Museum Development funding was seen as key to many museums, particularly those reliant on volunteers, so achieving the standard, or at least making progress towards it, was critical.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The Arts Council and Museum Development Providers should continue to promote the benefits of museums achieving the standard.
- Museum Development Providers should continue to provide support to assist museums to achieve Accreditation.
- Information from Accreditation Returns should be utilised to establish potential demand for support, eg for a "core offer" and for diagnostic purposes.

## 6. Appendix

### 6.1 List of regional stakeholders consulted

| Region        | Organisation  |
|---------------|---|
| East          | Norfolk Museums Service                             |
| East          | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| East          | Sheringham Museum                                   |
| East Midlands | Leicestershire County Council                       |
| East Midlands | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| East Midlands | The University of Nottingham Museum of Archaeology  |
| East Midlands | Bakewell Old House Museum                           |
| East Midlands | Ruddington Framework Knitters' Museum               |
| London        | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| London        | Museum of London                                    |
| London        | Central Saint Martins                               |
| London        | Museum of Brands, Packaging and Advertising         |
| North East    | Tyne and Wear Archives and Museums                  |
| North East    | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| North East    | Woodhorn Museum                                     |
| NW            | Manchester Museum                                   |
| NW            | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| NW            | Lakeland Arts (arts and heritage organisation)      |
| SE            | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| SE            | Royal Pavilion & Museums, Brighton & Hove           |
| SE            | Artswork  |
| SE            | The Roald Dahl Museum and Story Centre              |
| SW            | SW Museum Development Programme                     |
| SW            | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| SW            | Cornwall's Regimental Museum                        |
| SW            | Thornbury and District Museum                       |
| SW            | SW Heritage Trust                                   |
| WM            | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| WM            | Library and Archives, Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust |
| WM            | Staffordshire County Council                        |
| WM            | City of Wolverhampton Council                       |
| Yorkshire     | Yorkshire Museums Trust                             |
| Yorkshire     | Arts Council England Relationship Manager, Museums  |
| Yorkshire     | Independent evaluator                               |

## 6.2 List of national stakeholders consulted

| Organisation                         |
|--------------------------------------|
| National Museum Directors' Council   |
| the Arts Council Director of Museums |
| Accreditation Manager                |
| Association of Independent Museums   |
| Collections Trust                    |
| Museums Association                  |
| Heritage Lottery Fund                |