

CREATIVITY WORKS

TACKLING YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT THROUGH THE ARTS: EVALUATION SUMMARY



**“THE PROGRAMME WAS THE BEST THING I EVER DID FOR MYSELF,
IT GAVE ME CONFIDENCE TO START MY OWN BUSINESS.”**

(PARTICIPANT)



Contents

1. Executive summary
2. Creativity Works - background
3. Programme aims
4. What makes Creativity Works so special?
5. Value for money
6. Participants
7. Mentoring
8. Measuring success
9. Governance
10. Conclusions
11. Testimonials

Appendices

Attached separately



I Executive Summary

The Mayor's Fund for London **Creativity Works** programme is an arts-based employability project for 16-24 year olds. It aims to improve access to employment for young Londoners by raising confidence and self-belief through transferable skills learned in the sector and by addressing the barriers they face in the creative industry. It is an ongoing programme, now in its third year of delivering creative skills, employability training and links into sector networks.



Although the sector has increasing skills shortages that may be exacerbated by Brexit, routes into jobs in the sector are opaque and accessing jobs is difficult for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds with no connections into industry networks.

The Creativity Works Programme improves labour market intermediation and addresses this obstacle. This then benefits unemployed young people and the sector alike and proves to be a valid and much needed programme.

Key issues addressed by the programme:

- Youth unemployment levels are high and higher in some areas such as east and south east London than in others.
- The creative industries sector is increasingly important and jobs numbers are growing, as are gaps in skills.
- The sector is disproportionately dominated by people from more advantaged socio-economic groups.
- Barriers to these jobs exist for people from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Creativity Works is run in partnership with and funding primarily from the Berkeley Foundation and is delivered by organisations in the creative sector. The projects that make up the programme vary and target different elements of the creative sector such as fashion, film and social media.



Participant offer:

- Employability training – supports in career planning and goal setting, and covers basic issues such as timekeeping and presentation.
- Industry specific training – to understand the rigours of the specific work places and roles, this takes a number of other forms including masterclasses and supported group work to produce a product e.g. film, vlog, event.
- Support with developing a good CV, social media presence and help with job search, applications and interview preparation.
- One to one mentoring is also provided and this is seen as adding an important component to the programme.

The programme as a whole is achieving both good outputs and positive feedback from participants; however, to gain a better understanding of lessons to be learned, the Mayor's Fund for London and the Berkeley Foundation commissioned Urban IQ to undertake a full programme evaluation.

Urban IQ examined a wide range of documentary sources, observed programme delivery and conducted research involving over 20 interviews and a participant survey.

This document is a summary of the programme evaluation.

Since the pilot project proved the programme concept in June 2014, over 280 young people have been through a Creativity Works project and more than 200 young people have already accessed jobs or further training. The programme effectively supports the most disadvantaged who are achieving positive outcomes at rates equal to or higher than the average.

Barriers to employment are reduced significantly and participants leave their training feeling far more confident (Fig1).

Main findings include:

- Creativity Works achieved a conversion rate of completer to positive outcome of 72%
- The participant survey demonstrated high levels of satisfaction - 96% of respondents said they would recommend the programme, 92% said they had learnt new skills and 89% said the programme increased their confidence levels
- The programme is innovative with a range of new bespoke projects targeting different sub sectors of the creative industries
- Value for money is being demonstrated as the programme evolves
- The project outcome levels are rising and unit costs are reducing
- The programme has a broad spread across London (30 out of 33 boroughs) but also delivers higher numbers in deprived areas.
- Mentoring is seen as a vital component of the programme and is valued by all parties
- Participants are from mixed social groups with 50% living in social housing and 40% having been on free school meals
- Delivery partners sometimes struggle to support problems young people disclose during project delivery
- Partnership on the programme is good with a strong sense of shared endeavour
- The aims of the programme are well understood, shared and evidenced
- Governance arrangements are kept under review and becoming sharper and more robust
- Management is reflective and constant improvement and refinement is evident

In many ways the message from this is to “keep doing what you are doing”, however, resources are only just covering costs and delivery partners are struggling with some aspects of delivery.

Also, some areas of programme management would benefit from fine tuning and additional consideration needs to be made about longer term planning and scaling which is problematic without additional funders.

A number of areas for improvements have been highlighted in the summaries of each chapter within this evaluation.

The table below outlines the main points.

Work area	Actions
I. Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The programme achieves value for money and is providing innovative labour market intermediation and good outcomes.• The programme is therefore ready to be scaled up should additional funding be identified.• Should funding commitments be given over a longer term (at least two years subject to continued good delivery) then indications are that delivery partners would be able to deliver further improvements to quality of programmes and customer satisfaction including addressing issues in sections

	<p>3 and 4 below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel and catering budgets for participants use a significant portion of budgets and potential sponsorship for these elements needs to be considered.
2. Programme Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference developed for the Quarterly Reviews and Steering Groups and notes of meetings should be tracked and filed. • Headlines need agreeing that are reported by both providers and the Mayor's Fund for London and have these agreed in the contracts/grant agreements. • The grant agreements need to set out expectations on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ data sharing; ○ sharpen target groups including defining qualification levels; ○ job duration/sustainment; ○ reporting categories and KPIs. • The work to standardise reporting needs to be completed.
3. Programme Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate support for young people with mental health issues was a recurring theme. A more systematic way to support these issues should be developed across the programme. • Accommodation is a problem for projects, especially in central London. • Levels of access to technical equipment should be increased to ensure participants have ample opportunities to handle equipment and become adept at using it.
4. Project Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing support - to those who are NEET (not in education, employment or training) and those in work, was a recurring topic. • It is suggested this is addressed through alumni events across the programme. • Freelancing has emerged as a more significant proportion of job outcomes than originally anticipated and work to support the freelancers still in their infancy needs further development but could form part of ongoing alumni support.
5. Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring – is a great asset to the programme but a review of processes could further strengthen it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Communications. ○ Resource packs/on line resources. ○ Matching with mentees. ○ Time. ○ Clarity on mentor role in the different projects.



2 Creativity Works - background

Creativity Works is aimed at 16-24 year old Londoners who have been to secondary school in the capital, but are not in employment, education or training. It uses the creative industries to increase confidence, skills and employability, offering personal development projects across fashion, film, music, digital multimedia, community arts and product design.

It is an ongoing programme, now in its third year and to date, it has delivered thirteen projects.

The programme has been developed and managed by the Mayor's Fund for London and is funded by the Berkeley Foundation and the Mayor's Fund for London. In year 2, a third party, the Be Open Foundation also part funded the programme. Together with being the major funder, the Berkeley Foundation has provided mentors for over 190 young people on the programme.

To date, there have been four delivery partners: A New Direction (AND), Create, the Media Trust and Watermans Arts Centre (under the aegis of the Hounslow Arts Trust Ltd).

Projects have been delivered either by a single delivery partner or by collaboration between partners.

As well as helping young people to access opportunities within the arts, the programme also inspires and motivates them to engage with broader career options.

Each 12-week project is delivered using the same framework and components:

- Induction and employability training
- Industry-specific masterclasses
- Individual work placements
- Field visits to meet leading industry figures
- Business mentoring
- A showcase event demonstrating skills learned and engaging other young people in the community

These elements combine to help disconnected and potentially disillusioned young people to discover new opportunities, and a new focus and direction.

The programme is not solely about helping young people secure a job; it also builds vital soft skills to help them move towards employment. Creativity Works aims for 80% of participants to successfully move into paid employment, education or training at the end of the course.

The programme as a whole is achieving both good outputs and positive feedback from participants.



3 Programme aims

Creativity Works is primarily designed to address high levels of unemployment among those who are 16-24 by developing their skills and work experience and breaking down the following perceived barriers for people from a working class or disadvantaged background to careers in the cultural industries. The main issues are summarised below:

- Youth unemployment and need
 - The unemployment rate is 4.7% but for 16 - 24 year olds it is 12.3% (Office for National Statistics (ONS), Jan - Mar 2017)
 - 2015 figures for London show an unemployment rate across all age groups of 6.3% but a rate for those 16 – 24 of 17.9%
 - A breakdown by borough of youth unemployment and NEET (Not in Employment, Education or Training) figures demonstrates that there are areas with greater concentrations of need that programmes like Creativity Works should be targeting (Table 1)

Further analysis of these figures at a borough level is demonstrated by maps showing claimant rate (Fig 2) and NEET numbers (Fig 3) which provide the evidence of high unemployment the Creativity Works programme aims to address, and show its geographic spread at a borough level.

- Creative industries – issues and opportunities
 - The importance of creative industries to the UK and especially to London is acknowledged to be growing¹²³⁴. It is estimated that the sector will need 1.2 million new workers by 2022 in order to keep up with its growth.
 - In February 2017, the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, unveiled plans to turn Thames Estuary into a creative industries hub and announced plans to develop creative infrastructure, including film and theatre making studios and art manufacturing through the estuary⁵
 - The 2016 Key Findings report by the DCMS shows that music, performing and visual arts have had the biggest percentage growth, while IT, software and computing services have had the biggest growth in job numbers (Table 2).

While the sector offers some of the most exciting and inspiring job opportunities, many with great appeal to young people, it also suffers from increasing skills gaps.

¹ Sector insights: Skills challenges in the digital and creative sector UK Commission for Employment and Skills 2015

² Creative Industries 2016 Focus On – Key Findings 2016 DCMS

³ The Geography of Creativity in the UK. NESTA 2016

https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/the_geography_of_creativity_in_the_uk.pdf

⁴ Building Our Industrial Strategy: Green Paper HM Government. 2017

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/611705/building-our-industrial-strategy-green-paper.pdf

⁵ Taken from a GLA Press Release

<https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/thames-estuary-vision>

These skill gaps are in part, due to the speed of digital change. Added to this, many companies, being small, increasingly seek a mix of technical, creative, entrepreneurial and administrative skills in all workers and often find that workers with the right technical skills may lack the business or softer skills to be effective in a role.

The argument that working class and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds face barriers to jobs in the cultural industries springs from a few different and concurring ideas:

- Barriers to accessing jobs in the cultural industries
 - An increasing prevalence of people who did not go to state schools are in top jobs in the cultural industries
 - Cultural industry jobs require unpaid internships to get a foot in the ladder (something young people from poorer households cannot afford to do)
 - Lack of transparent or widely understood career paths for these sectors
 - The Warwick Commission's 2015 report, 'Enriching Britain: Culture, Creativity and Growth', found that there are barriers and inequalities which prevent many people from being able to live a cultural life.

IT is driving rapid change across the cultural industries and many technologies being harnessed are new. The sector is dependent on young and highly skilled recruits, who often enter employment through connections and linking into networks. Career guidance is patchy, and training often lags behind technological advances in the industry itself.

Due to these issues, many young Londoners find the industry difficult to enter. Unpaid internships are particularly difficult for young people without access to other means of support. Despite this, the jobs and roles the sector has to offer are inspiring to young people.

Summary

From the evidence above we can establish that the creative industries are an important and growing sector in London and the UK as a whole and that job opportunities are growing faster in this sector than for the economy as a whole.

However, access to jobs in this sector is problematic for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. Therefore we can conclude that the problems set out to be addressed by the Creativity Works Programme exist and the programme proposition, to improve labour market intermediation for disadvantaged young Londoners, is valid and required.

In summary, the proposition and aims of Creativity Works are based on firm evidence:

- Youth unemployment levels are high and higher in some areas such as east and south east London than in others
- The creative industries sector is increasingly important and jobs numbers are growing, as are gaps in skills



- The sector is disproportionately dominated by people from more advantaged socio-economic groups
- Barriers to these jobs exist for people from disadvantaged backgrounds

To address these issues Creativity Works harnesses regional government links, private sector companies and charitable bodies with sector specific organisations with strong industry links. This partnership delivers projects that link young people into career paths in a growth sector.

The partners involved in funding, managing and delivering the programme have a strong sense of shared aims and are ambitious for the young participants. All partners evidenced a clear understanding that the programme was to support disadvantaged young Londoners into work.



4 What makes Creativity Works special?

It's an inclusive experience and allows any individual to flourish in their next steps of a career.

Quotes from participant

Up-skilling the population and labour market job brokerage or intermediation is largely delivered by or commissioned by public sector bodies and educational institutions. The Creativity Works programme, backed by charitable bodies and delivered by small, sector specific third sector organisations and social enterprises, is a more innovative variation on this.

It harnesses the combined strengths of regional government links, private sector companies and charitable bodies to manage and oversee the governance and commission bespoke third sector organisations to deliver projects that link young people into cultural industry career paths. It provides training that is currently relevant to the industry and provides direct links into employers.

The extent, to which Creativity Works diverts from the basic labour market intermediation carried out by DWP Job Centres among others, is displayed by key elements of the various projects that make up the programme:

- goal setting
- developing a strong CV/social media presence
- identifying suitable job opportunities
- applying for jobs
- preparing for interviews

Then two additional key elements are added to all programmes; bespoke training with industry professionals and one to one mentoring.

In addition to this, the delivery partners add the following to the mix:

- A work experience placement for every participant
- The opportunity to gain a Silver Arts Award qualification
- Ensure participants develop their social media and digital presence
- Paid internships for those that successfully complete the course
- Introductions via mentors that have led to both paid and unpaid work placements

It is through this mix of training that the programme provides good results and builds considerable confidence quite quickly. As a result outcome levels are high.



Programme diversity

The range of interventions covers most areas of the cultural industries and each project has unique features (Table 3).

- Projects covered include: fashion, film, theatre, photography, media, music, and events and centre administration including festivals
- The exposure of young people to media professionals is significant as is the hands on training and work experience and participants valued this part of the course
- On being asked what the less favourable parts of the programme were, participants said they struggled in bigger groups and that group size also impacted on the time each person had available to handle and learn how to use equipment.



On being asked to score the different elements of the programme, most participants had said it was the 'industry link's and 'specific skill training' that made the project what it was but the scoring put 'help with CV' at the top:

Table 4 Rating the programme elements.

The programme you were on had a number of elements . On a score of 1-10 where 1 is not helpful and 10 is very helpful please rate each applicable element below:												
Answer Options	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Average rating	Response Count
Work placements	2	1	1	6	7	4	8	13	5	6	6.70	53
Training in specific skills	0	2	0	3	4	6	11	15	6	6	7.23	53
Industry links and networking	0	1	2	2	2	4	10	15	7	10	7.60	53
Mentoring	1	2	1	3	8	6	11	6	7	8	6.87	53
Help with CV	1	0	0	1	5	6	2	15	10	12	7.88	52
Help with finding jobs to apply for	2	0	1	1	5	5	11	14	7	7	7.28	53
Help with job applications	2	1	0	4	10	4	6	12	9	5	6.85	53
Help with interviews	1	1	3	6	7	4	4	13	9	5	6.75	53

Source: Participants survey

Bespoke courses

Creativity Works projects provide a cocktail of work placements, training in equipment, the chance to contribute towards real programming and exciting opportunities such as meeting and interviewing celebrities, visiting cultural and arts venues.

These aim to be fun, informative and inspirational sessions. Examples include:

- Fashion - masterclass with Jean Charles de Castelbajac
- Music – masterclass with Harvey and Mega from So Solid Crew
- Festivals – masterclass with Michael Eavis of Glastonbury festival
- Image and Style - with Chandni Modha & Ruth Butha (Dolce & Gabanna)
- Film - Mo Ali, British film director
- Social media – Peter Andre

This element of the training makes the work of strengthening and improving CVs easier and feedback from participants rates this aspect of the programmes very highly.



Limiting factors

While the training is seen as positive, with innovative courses, great industry links and trainers who are often both practitioners as well as trainers, a few problems have arisen with delivery.

Space for training and meetings came up a number of times as a problem. This is partly due to the funding being short term so rooms and venues can't be booked far in advance or for repeat bookings where cheaper deals could be brokered.

Summary

The Creativity Works programme is innovative. It is assembled from a range of new bespoke projects targeting different sub sectors of the creative industries. Strong industry links are evident and courses are immersive and intense. Participants are kept very busy and believe that they amass a great deal of new knowledge. All elements of the training are valued. The length of the training seems right and no one suggested it should be longer.

There are a few areas where further improvements could be made at a programme level:

- Accommodation is a problem for projects especially in central London. Options to address this include:
 - Smaller groups
 - Providing funding over a longer term period so that projects can plan better
 - As part of the work to gain extra funding partners, potential match funders could be asked to provide meeting space
 - The Mayor's Fund for London could pre-book rooms in City Hall
- Equipment deployment to ensure that participants get enough opportunities to learn how to use it. Options to address this include:
 - Smaller groups
 - Providing funding over a longer term period so that projects can better plan (individually or together) for equipment hire
- Ongoing support to those who are NEET and those in work, especially freelancers was a recurring topic, as was the need to address the sudden cliff edge when the programme ends. Referrals to Young London Working are not an answer as they don't have the industry contacts. A New Direction have set up events for alumni to help them keep in touch and be supported but don't have enough funding to make this a full regular offer. Options to address this include:
 - AND and Media Trust having a joint programme they take turns to organise
 - Working alumni events into projects so current participants organise them
 - Fundraising for a business to sponsor the events.



5 Value for money

Funding and allocation

The Berkeley Foundation is the main funder of the Creativity Works programme and has provided a grant of £190K per annum. In year 1, this was supplemented by the Mayor's Fund who funded a £31k gap. In year 2, a third-party funder, Be Open Foundation, also provided £190K which resulted in an additional three programmes being commissioned (Table 5).

Projects have contracts agreed with the Mayor's Fund for London that include both budgets and targets. However in the management of the programme, targets are reported for the whole programme and unit costs are identified as a whole across the programme. The figures are exclusive of management overheads and time spent by the Mayors Fund for London and the Berkeley Foundation.

Costs to the Berkeley Foundation for managing Berkeley Mentors are not accounted for and can be seen as further match funding to the programme as can the value the volunteer mentors provide to the whole programme. This issue is detailed below.

Unit costs

There is some debate about how the Mayor's Fund for London overhead should be accounted for and reflected in unit costs. In this report we have looked at unit costs purely in relation to the grant awarded to each delivery partner as that is the element delivering outputs and demonstrating differences (Table 6).

If these positive outcomes are apportioned in relation to the funding provided, we can see the unit costs for the programme as a whole and per year:

Table 7. Creativity Works - Unit costs by year

Year	Outcomes achieved		£		
	Completers	Positive Outcomes	Funding	Completer unit cost	Outcome unit cost
Year 1	93	61	221,648	2,383	3,634
Year 2	144	111	374,978	2,604	3,378
Year 3	50	36	100,413	2,008	2,789
Total/average	287	208	697,039	2,429	3,351

Source: MFL reports

This shows that the unit costs across the programme are currently £2,429 per completer and £3,351 per positive outcome. Over each of the last three years this unit cost has fallen per positive outcome from £3,634 in year 1 to £2,789 at this point in year 3.

The unit costs can also be reviewed per project, an exercise which demonstrates great variety in unit costs per positive outcome. This ranges from £9,996 for a Winterlights project down to £2,632 for a Festivals project (Table 8).

Finally the unit costs can be analysed by delivery partner which shows a range per positive outcome from £8,568 for Watermans to £2,908 by AND/Create (Table 9).

Value for money

- Unit costs show that A New Direction and Create are providing the best value for money especially as they are also providing qualifications as part of the programme. Projects they run have the lowest cost per completer and the lowest cost per positive output.
- Watermans' projects had the highest cost per outcome and contracts with Watermans were terminated after the second project completed. It should be noted though that the second Watermans project is the only one which achieved 100% positive outcomes for all completers.

Should the Mayor's Fund for London overheads be added in it would add approximately £550 to each outcome.

Compared with other NEET programmes, Creativity Works has achieved a conversion rate of completer to positive outcome of 72% and a gross unit cost per job entry or into education or training of £3,351 over the programme as a whole and a conversion rate of 72% and unit cost per outcome of £2,789 in year 3.

Therefore Creativity Works participants have a higher conversion rate into EET than the average of 49% average (and 69% average of top 40% of projects).

Given that Creativity Works unit costs are falling as the programme evolves and has reduced in year 3 to £2,789, the programme can demonstrate that it provides value for money in relation to these conversion rates and unit costs.



Resource pressures

The Mayor's Fund for London has at times struggled to interest additional funders in the programme. Delivery partners find that the funding just covers all their basics and it is clear that they are struggling to provide enough equipment and space for the number of participants in each course.

Delivery partners also raised the issue of funding being relatively short term. They believe that longer term commitment on funding would allow them to plan better and buy in better resources within the same funding envelope. With longer term planning projects could also be scaled up/run more frequently.

Other areas identified as budget issues were participant travel and catering. Delivery partners questioned whether a retailer could sponsor the programmes with provision of lunches or if TFL could support cheap Oyster cards.

Summary

The analysis of contract outcomes demonstrates that value for money is being achieved on the programme and outcome levels are good.

Delivery partners are achieving more outcomes with the same resources as projects are refined and repeated. However resources are only just covering the costs and delivery partners are struggling with aspects of this. Additional consideration needs to be made about longer term planning and scaling.



6 Participants

The programme is really useful and beneficial for young people in London, especially those who may be coming from disadvantaged areas of London or who have personal barriers. It is really useful to have these projects in London that invest in young Londoners particularly in careers such as media which are sometimes dominated by people with the right connections.

Quote from participant

The Creativity Works programme originally set out to include 30% of participants who had been NEET for 6 months or longer and 60% with less than 5 GCSEs; however, the resulting programme looks quite different.

Registration details held by delivery partners shows:

- The majority of participants were not in employment prior to commencing the scheme
- The split between those in social housing and private accommodation was relatively even
- Similarly there was an even split between the number of participants who did and did not claim benefits
- Overall there was a larger number of female than male participants
- The majority have achieved a qualification above GCSE level with only 5 people selecting GCSEs as their highest qualification and only 4 people selecting that they had no qualifications (Table 10)
- 23 people selected that they had a disability
- Mental health issues appear to be the most common form of disability
- Overall the most common barrier for participants joining the scheme was listed as lack of confidence and experience.

Participant survey

A full breakdown of the participant survey can be made available on request.

The results paint a positive picture of the Creativity Works programme. The current status of respondents suggests that the programme overall has almost reached the target for positive outcomes, with 79.2% of respondents currently in education, employment or an unpaid work placement/ internship compared to the target of 80%. Results after 6 months are slightly lower with 75.6% EET and for after 12 months it is higher with 87% EET. Table 11

- 96.2% of respondents saying that they would recommend the programme
- 92.5% said they had learnt new skills
- 88.7% said the programme increased their confidence levels
- Rates for those in EET reached 80% and above (depending on time lapsed after the programme)
- Participants highlighted the following impacts:
 - Increased confidence was specifically mentioned by half the respondents



- Greater knowledge, understanding and awareness
- Networking and friendships
- Increased skills, including team working and interpersonal skills
- Career direction and employment
- Barriers to employment and training were significantly reduced by the programme (Fig 1).
- Employment rates do not seem to be affected by ethnicity but those living in council housing seem to have higher levels of unemployment
- Those with higher qualifications are more likely to gain employment but this is not linear
- Over time a growing proportion heard about the programme through word of mouth.

If conclusions can be drawn from this small sample it seems that the projects really benefit those who are disadvantaged. Those who are BAME, had received Free School Meals, have low qualification levels or who live in social housing are at least as likely (and more so in many cases) to have positive outcomes as the average participant. The youngest participants also have very good outcomes.

Targeting disadvantage

Places on each project are targeted at young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. Regardless of the terms used in delivery partner contracts, it is clear from the interviews, survey and document review that a considerable number of participants recruited onto the projects have very real difficulties in their lives and these difficulties are creating barriers to employment.

While low qualification levels were barriers for some young people, homelessness and mental health were the issues that the delivery partners found more challenging to support.

Projects also recruit participants from other backgrounds including graduates and those with some industry knowledge. This aims to build aspiration in the target group for those who have had little exposure to working alongside people with such a range of experiences before.

Neither the participant registration data nor the survey show a high percentage of young people with less than 5 GCSEs at grade A-C, a target group that funders were keen to include. This issue needs additional thought in the way questions are asked in future

Geographic Spread

The numbers of participants per delivery partner per borough split by youth claimant, NEET and IMD scores can be seen in Table 12. Areas of high deprivation and need are highlighted, as are boroughs with high numbers of participants.

- Participants come from all over London with at least one participant from 30 of London's 33 administrative districts.
- With the exception of Hounslow, the higher participation rates are all in boroughs that have the highest levels of need.



- Overall then the programme seems well balanced and targeting the right areas in terms of geography.

Outliers are:

- Hackney with 23% of programme (63 participants) because of sheer numbers
- Hounslow with 8% (19 participants) despite not figuring on any deprivation profiles
- Greenwich with 1% (3 participants) despite figuring on all 3 deprivation profiles.

The location of the delivery partners in Hackney, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow may play a factor in this as more young people may apply for a course within a reasonable commuting distance.

Summary

Participants have provided very positive feedback on the programme and positive outcomes are achieved by those from disadvantaged backgrounds and by the youngest participants at rates equal to or higher than the average.

This is extremely positive but there are areas of pressure in the programmes and further improvements that can be made in relation to:

- Mental Health issues - the programme is being delivered to young people with a range of barriers to the employment market. Some of their issues take considerable time and resources to address, especially mental health. Consideration on a more systematic way to support these issues needs to be workshopped and developed at programme rather than project level.
- Targeting qualification level - the percentage of participants with very low qualifications is less than anticipated and target numbers for this should be thought through and added to the contracts. We suggest 66% less than Level 4 of which 33% have a less than Level 3.
- Geographic spread. The programme is attracting young people from across London and is well balanced and targeting the right areas in terms of geography with a couple of outliers that could be addressed through more recruitment in Greenwich and less in Hackney.



7 Mentoring

The strength of the Berkeley mentoring is the experience of working in a large business that the mentors bring. They provide straight, no nonsense support. *Quotes from delivery partner*

My mentor was very helpful as she was a great example of what I wanted to become. She was able to offer me loads of advice and tips and we were able to meet up and go to events. *Quotes from participant*

When you are a few years in you forget what it's like just starting out. I really enjoyed helping them and blast from the past in remembering excitement of own first job. *Quotes from Berkeley mentor*

Mentoring contribution

- Mentoring is seen as a vital component of the programme and is valued
- The Berkeley Foundation provides mentors for young people on the A New Direction/Create projects and had so for the Watermans projects
- Media Trust provides their own mentoring service and has changed and adapted this twice. Both approaches have strengths and areas for improvement
- While external mentors to date are volunteers and their prime motivation seems to be “to give something back,” their contribution does have a fiscal value
- On being asked to estimate the value of their time and any additional support, volunteers contributed approximately £1,000 to the project for each person mentored. Across the programme this is a significant amount of match funding.



Berkeley Mentoring programme

The Berkeley Foundation has provided mentors for nine out of the thirteen projects run so far, which adds up to 192 mentoring relationships by the end of November 2016. The mentors have been recruited and trained from volunteers working in the Berkeley Group.

Interviews with mentors provided the following insights:

- The Creativity Works programme materials and logistics are generally well regarded though they could do with livening up with visuals
- They found the introduction sessions a bit too long and not interactive enough and the matching with the mentees needed more explaining and modification
- Mentors raised the issue of time allotted to the mentoring process. This was a theme for both the Berkeley and Media Trust mentors as they thought they should mentor the young people over a longer period.
- Overall mentors did feel that they were making a difference although there were times when they could not measure this. Also different tools worked well for different mentors to help mark achievement, certainly when their mentee secured a job the mentor also felt they had succeeded.
- There was also an appreciation that the mentoring could help the mentor's own management skills
- On being asked what they would change, the primary focus was on length of engagement; there does seem to be the will to make a longer commitment.



Delivery partners showed that they really valued the contribution of the mentors but felt that not all young people were ready to positively engage in a mentoring relationship.

The mentees perspective

- 77% of survey respondents stated that they had a mentor
- 27% of these stated that they are still in touch with their mentor
- 63% found the mentoring relationship beneficial
- Over 70% of respondents were mildly or strongly positive about their mentoring experience
- Approximately 30% had more negative feelings about the process.

Summary

What has emerged from feedback from delivery partners, mentors and mentees is a positive picture though there are some differences in feedback, with responses to the Media Trust programme being more positive. The survey showed 100% of Media Trust participants were happy with the mentoring compared to 63% of A New Direction participants.

This is a result of the different role the mentors play in the Media Trust programme. They provide industry knowledge, links and leads. Many of the mentors encourage their mentee to do work shadowing in their organisations. Some have helped their mentee secure a job in their organisation. The Media Trust mentors also have 6 sessions over a six-week period, twice as many as Berkeley, so have a greater opportunity to make an impact.

Areas identified where additional consideration may be needed are as follows:

- Communications
 - Clearer advice on role and aim of mentoring – then backed up with the pack
 - More information on what the mentee's training is involving them in
 - More regular communication to mentors.
- Resource packs
 - Most people said these were useful, but a little dense
 - Media Trust mentors have requested on line resources
 - Berkeley and Media Trust could work together to develop on line resources to support all mentors across the programme.
- Matching with mentees
 - The basis for Berkeley matching was not widely understood. From those it did not work well for there have been suggestions of a more interactive participatory matching.
 - Media Trust matching, where the volunteer was not involved also drew criticisms. On the third Media Trust project, a speed matching approach worked well for mentees and mentors alike.
 - Ensuring that the most experienced and competent mentors are grouped with the most disaffected young people
- Time
 - A number of people said they would have preferred more time/sessions and that three did not seem enough to provide sustainable help to a young person
 - Monthly meetings after initial sessions could support while young people become embedded in a new job, internship or freelance role.
- Clarity on mentor role in relation to mentee's motivations



It is important that both mentor and mentee understand the role the mentoring provides in the full package of each programme, before mentoring commences.

Some mentees do not value the mentoring for a variety of reasons:

- They are just not ready for it, whether due to behaviours (bad at timekeeping) or their attitude (they are not yet open to listening to views outside their peer group)
- They find their mentor too different and see the gap rather than the possibilities so don't see what they can learn from them
- They believe that they can only learn from someone doing the job they want to do.

From the mentoring work being developed by the Media Trust, young people presenting with the first two of these issues are mentored in house and not partnered with a media professional that they would let down. A New Direction/Create with the Berkeley Foundation may want to contemplate something similar; or when doing an interactive matching exercise ensure that the most experienced and competent mentors are grouped with the most disaffected young people.



8 Measuring success

I learned to trust my instincts and to love what I make because others will love it too. After years of being told 'no' I finally got the support I needed from a brilliant team. I have grown in confidence and therefore am more and more creative.

Quotes from participant

Delivery

All the projects have been delivered in the timeframes agreed for the resources allocated. To this extent the projects making up the programme can be seen as successful.

Value for money

This has been assessed above and again found to be successful.

Project outputs

The contracts with providers drafted by the Mayor's Fund identify positive outcomes as participants taking one of the following three routes:

- Employment including self-employment/freelancing
- Higher education or further study
- Follow on work placements.

Contracts largely look for 80% positive outcomes often with the following balance:

- 30% of participants move into employment
- 20% move into higher education or further study
- 30% move into follow-on work placements.

From the documentary sources and in Table 6 we can see that in the first and second years of the programme, 80% and 81% delivery of positive outcomes against targets was achieved.

This has increased so far in year 3 where 90% has been achieved with the first two projects. This success rate may still rise as it is only 3 months into the 6 month monitoring period for the Film project.

Over the three years, this represents 65% of the 315 completers targeted in the grant agreements going on to positive outcomes or 81% of actual completers achieving positive outcomes. This conversion rate is high and represents a successful programme.





If results are broken down by delivery partner it shows that the results are quite different. Watermans achieved only 58% of positive outcomes, the Media Trust achieved 75% and A New Direction/Create achieved 89% (Table 13).

The grant agreements set very high targets requiring a conversion rate of participation to positive outcome of 80%. Given the group being targeted includes young people with some significant barriers, an 80% outcome target is considerably higher than most programmes where on average 60% job entry and 33% sustained at 6 months is sought.

The participant survey asked for participants' current work status as well as six and twelve months after the programme ended. The results are detailed in Table 11. Given that approximately 40% of those that responded did the programme less than 12 months ago, it is encouraging to see that the percentage of people currently in 16+ hour jobs and those self-employed has risen over the period. Self-employed/freelancing is the outcome with the highest percentage, an issue picked up in the interviews.

It should be noted that reading through the file notes and reports there seems to be a lack of clarity about the required duration of a job or training/qualification outcome. Jobs that last a month or two seem to not be counted but we could not find where job duration featured in the grant agreements and schedules.

Wider programme objectives

As well as the positive outcomes around employment and education, the Creativity Works programme has three further aims:

- Young people have learned new or increased skills (sometimes this includes specific qualifications)
- Young people have discovered their own potential and talent
- Young people have increased confidence in a working environment

These are more challenging to measure and evidence, however the survey results along with feedback from past participants provide a good insight into how well these aims are being met.

- 92.5% said that the programme helped them to learn new skills or increase their existing skills.
- Similarly 88.7% said that the programme helped to increase their confidence levels and this is mirrored in the interviews that have been done with past participants,

It is clear from these figures that the programme is succeeding at these objectives.

There was not a specific question in the survey to identify whether the programme helped young people to discover their own talent however the comments suggest that this was the case. Again, this is supported in the interviews with past participants.

The results to this show that the Creativity Works projects have reduced barriers to work, especially in the areas of work experience and confidence as demonstrated in Fig 2.

Summary

The Creativity Works programme has proved its success against the four criteria of:

- delivery within time and resources
- value for money
- the project outcomes and objectives set out in each contract;
- wider programme objectives.

Freelancing has emerged as a more significant proportion of job outcomes than originally anticipated and work to support the freelancers still in their infancy needs further development.

Additional consideration needs to be made about longer term planning which would help delivery partners. Job duration targets should be defined more precisely in contracts. Project scaling options also need to be considered although without any additional funds options are restricted.



9 Governance

The governance arrangements for Creativity Works are depicted in Fig 4.

- Quarterly review meetings (attended by Mayor's Fund and the Berkeley Foundation) are held to discuss costs, performance of current projects and planning of future projects
- Steering Group meetings (made up of representatives from Mayor's Fund, Berkeley Foundation and providers/delivery agencies) are loosely organised to ensure the programme is learning from and refined in relation to past experience
- Each delivery partner reports on the programme to the Mayors' Fund; and one to ones are held when there have been any performance issues.

Contracting & Monitoring

- The Mayor's Fund issues contracts with each delivery partner for the projects they deliver. These set out key project outcomes and KPIs and contract sums.
- However Schedules 1 and 2 in these contracts differ by partner in the terminology used to describe young people - "disadvantaged young Londoners", or "harder to reach young adults who will most benefit from participating".
- Monitoring is an ongoing process rather than at set quarter ends due to delivery partners reporting in relation to different start and completion dates for projects throughout the year
- Completions are verified through registers of attendance and positive outcomes are verified by looking at evidence from participants of where they have progressed on to. In early 2016 standardised forms for participants/employers to complete were developed to support robust evidence gathering.

Reporting and Decision Making

- Delivery partners send regular reports and updates to the Mayor's Fund which are reviewed by the Steering Group
- The Mayor's Fund produced Annual Reports for 2014/15 and 2015/16 and developed a lessons learnt framework in 2015
- Early reports vary in format however, more recently a universal template is being used which has helped to provide better clarity
- There are cases where Annual Reports and delivery partner reports gave slightly different information and are reporting different headlines
- The Steering Group is able to respond to new information and make decisions to tweak and change programmes quickly, in what is now an increasingly tightly run programme, which is beneficial as it ensures a greater focus on the key issue of supporting young people into work.



Summary

From the document review and the interviews it is clear that the processes and systems for managing and reporting Creativity Works are regularly reviewed and sharpened. The partnership dynamics and reporting processes allow for reflective practice that finesses approaches and systems.

A number of issues have been highlighted above and these are summarised below:

- Meetings should have terms of reference drafted so the interrelationships between the Quarterly Reviews and Steering Groups have a common understanding that can be shared with any future funders. Notes of meetings should be tracked and filed.
- The grant agreements need to set out expectations on data sharing.
- Schedule 1s of grant agreements should clearly set out the target group and reporting categories as well as the KPIs. Phrases like “disadvantaged young Londoners” need to be defined.
- The work to standardise reporting needs to be continued to the point that much work on the Annual Report can be a simple cut and paste job and reporting requirements need to be taken through every step of the process e.g. registration forms, grant agreements, monitoring templates, reporting templates, annual report. Rationalising the report cycles and the reporting year may support this.
- Presentation of Annual Reports should be improved so that they can be used as a supporting document for work to find additional funders.

Once these issues are addressed consideration should be given to further work on data protection and security issues.



10 Conclusions

The Creativity Works programme can prove its success against four criteria:

- **delivery within time and resources**
- **value for money**
- **the project outputs and objectives set out in each contract**
- **wider programme objectives**

The evaluation study has found good practice throughout the Creativity Works programme.

The Creativity Works programme delivers projects that **link young people into career paths** in the creative industries, an important and growing sector in London and the UK. As job opportunities are growing faster in this sector than for the economy as a whole it is an important sector to focus on. In addition, it is a sector that it is difficult for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to get in to as jobs are often accessed through sector connections.

The Creativity Works **programme is innovative**. It is assembled from a range of bespoke projects targeting different sub sectors of the creative industries. Strong industry links are evident and courses are immersive and intense. Participants are kept very busy and amass a great deal of new knowledge. All elements of the training are valued. Delivery partners are achieving more outcomes with the same resources over time as projects are refined and repeated. Value for money is being achieved on the programme and outcome levels are good. The outputs and objectives set out in each contract and wider programme objectives are largely being met, all within time and resources.

Participants have provided **very positive feedback** on the programme; 89% said the programme increased their confidence levels, 92% said they had learnt new skills and 96% said they would recommend the programme. Rates for those in EET exceeded 80% for those who completed the training over 12 months ago and barriers to employment have been reduced significantly. The programme effectively supports the most disadvantaged who are achieving positive outcomes at rates equal to or higher than the average.

A **positive picture of the mentoring** is provided though there are some differences in feedback from different delivery partners as the role played by the mentor is greater in the Media Trust programme as work experience placements are not provided. **Barriers to employment are reduced significantly** and participants leave their training feeling far more confident. All aspects of the programme are appreciated by participants.

From the document review and the interviews it is clear that the processes and systems for managing and reporting Creativity Works are regularly reviewed and sharpened. The partnership dynamics and reporting processes allow for **reflective practice** that finesses approaches and

systems. The partners involved in funding, managing and delivering the programme have a **strong sense of shared aims** and are ambitious for the young participants. All partners evidenced a clear understanding that the programme was to support disadvantaged young Londoners into work.

In many ways the message from this is “keep doing what you are doing,” however, resources are only just covering the costs and delivery partners are struggling with some aspects of delivery. Also some areas of programme management would benefit from fine tuning and additional consideration needs to be made about longer term planning and scaling which is problematic without additional funders.

Areas for improvement include:

- Terms of reference developed for the Quarterly Reviews and Steering Groups and notes of meetings should be tracked and filed.
- Headlines need agreeing that are reported by both providers and the Mayor’s Fund for London and have these agreed in the contracts/grant agreements.
- The grant agreements need to set out expectations on: data sharing; target groups; job duration/sustainment and reporting categories and KPIs.
- The work to standardise reporting needs to be completed.
- Adequate support for young people with mental health issues was a recurring theme. Consideration on a more systematic way to support these issues should be workshopped and developed at programme rather than project level.
- Targeting qualification levels need rethinking and adding into contracts to ensure the right groups are targeted and a good mix of participants with a range of skills and knowledge is achieved.
- The programme is attracting young people from across London and is well balanced and targeting the right areas in terms of geography with a couple of outliers that need rebalancing.
- Accommodation is a problem for projects especially finding accommodation in central London.
- Equipment deployments to ensure participants get enough opportunities to become adept at using it.
- Travel budgets for participant travel and potential sponsorship need to be considered.
- Ongoing support for those who are NEET and those in work, especially freelancers. It is suggested this is addressed through alumni events across the programme.
- Mentoring is a great asset to the programme but a review of processes could further strengthen it.
- Freelancing has emerged as a more significant proportion of job outcomes than originally anticipated and work to support the freelancers still in their infancy needs further development but could form part of ongoing alumni support.



II Testimonials

“The content of the course was really interesting and the industry professionals were great. The opportunity to work in high profile roles at well-respected festivals **helped improve my social skills as well as my ability** to make judgements decisively in a professional manner.”

“**I thoroughly enjoyed** my work placement as I was given a great team to work with and tasks to keep me on my toes.”

“Paris was excellent, I loved it and the atmosphere and I am very grateful for such an experience, it **gave me first hand insight** into the fashion world.”

“I cannot thank you enough for connecting me to that opportunity with Nice One Films! I really didn't expect this. First day was incredible, **exactly what I'm looking for!**”

“It changed my thinking and work ethic, **helped me discover my own talent...**my confidence was slightly crushed by my time at university and this has helped me build right back up.”

“We spent six weeks in training but it felt like we'd **received years' worth of knowledge.**”

“I was inspired by speakers like Fiona Rutherford from Buzzfeed, Austin Daboh from BBC Ixtra and film director Mo Ali who had come from absolutely nothing and still managed to make it-this **inspired me SO much.**”

“My Mentor was extremely supportive, available and **genuinely interested in me** and my pursuits based on a connection we built.”

“All of the practical stuff we had done, we were never sat in one place. We were always on the move, meeting new people, gaining new skills and networking with loads of different organisations (to this day, I still keep in contact). The team were more than helpful and they had honestly **changed my life around for the better.**”