

Project information

Grants for the Arts

Applicant name: eQuality Time

Project title: ANGEL Arts Project

Project number: GFTA-00063383

Amount requested (£): £18,000

Project type: Over £15,000

Decision letter

10 October 2017

**Joseph Reddington
eQuality Time Ltd
Trading as eQuality Time
302 Cannon Hill Lane
LONDON
SW20 9HN**

Dear Joseph Reddington

**Programme: Grants for the Arts
Applicant name: eQuality Time
Reference: GFTA-00063383
Name of activity: ANGEL Arts Project**

Thank you for applying to Grants for the Arts. I am sorry to tell you that your application for ANGEL Arts Project was not successful.

We realise that this is disappointing news and we recognise the time and effort you have taken to prepare and submit your application. We have carefully appraised your application against the criteria published in the Grants for the Arts guidance.

Grants for the Arts is a competitive programme and we are unable to fund all eligible applications. There are a number of factors we consider when we appraise applications.

Your application was not successful mainly because:

- ** Comparatively weaker – management**
 - We decided that the plans to manage your activity were less strong than other applications we received.**

- ** Comparatively weaker – public engagement**
 - We decided that the public engagement outcomes of your activity were less strong than other applications we received.**

To help you understand our decision, you can find our full appraisal report attached to this letter. This shows all the appraisal comments we made about your application in relation to each of the criteria, and shows the word score we gave for each.

The word scores we use are:

- met (outstanding): the application meets the criteria and shows outstanding qualities.
- met (strong): the application meets the criteria and shows strong qualities.
- met: the application meets the criteria.
- potential: the application does not meet the criteria but shows potential to do so.
- not met: the application does not meet the criteria.

If your application was scored as met, met (strong), or met (outstanding) against all the appraisal criteria this means that it was recommended for funding at appraisal, but then was unsuccessful at the panel decision stage.

If your application was scored as potential or not met against one or more of the four appraisal criteria, it was not recommended for a grant by the appraiser. The appraisal report will show why each score was given.

You can find more about how we appraise your application in the information sheet Understanding how we appraise your application.

Next steps

Grants for the Arts is a rolling programme and you can reapply at any time if you wish. However, please note that any new application for the same activity must sufficiently address the reasons that the original application was not successful. We will not be able to consider any reapplications that have not done this. If you would like to reapply you will need to begin a new application form using the online portal. For guidance on how to do this please read the How to apply guidance.

If we have told you that your application was not successful because of limited funds, you can submit the application again without revising your answers but you may wish to look again at the How to apply guidance on our website to make sure that your application is as strong as it can be. If you would like to reapply you will need to begin a new application form using the online portal.

If you would like to know more about other sources of funding, we hold a comprehensive database of other funding opportunities.

If you require further assistance relating to the application process please contact us on 0845 300 6200 or enquiries@artscouncil.org.uk.

Yours sincerely,

**Edward De Souza
Investment Centre Director**

Appraisal

Appraisal ratings

Criteria	Rating
Quality	Met
Public engagement	Met
Management	Met
Finance	Met

Statements and evidence

Appraisal criteria	Statement	Evidence
Quality	The activity involves recruiting and supporting...	Application form: Basic details p8, Artistic Qu...
Quality	The activity aims to develop the writers chosen...	Application form: Artistic activity p12
Quality	The organisation demonstrates a good track reco...	Application form: Artistic quality p10, p13; Pa...
Public engagement	The applicant has not answered the questions in...	Application form: public engagement p14, 17. Ad...
Public engagement	Plans could be stronger for how they will engag...	Application form: public engagement p14; Activi...
Public engagement	Diversity has been considered in the aims of th...	Application form: Artistic Quality p11; Partner...
Finance	£18,000 (or 56%) is requested of a total projec...	Application form: Finance p19, p22.
Finance	The application demonstrates some income from o...	Application form: Finance p19, 22, 28, 29.
Management	The activity appears mostly realistic and well-...	Application form: Activity p35
Management	The applicant has a track record of managing si...	Application form: Activity p30
Management	Plans to evaluate activity are appropriate. Art...	Application form: Evaluation 39

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Quality

Statement:

The activity involves recruiting and supporting a number of BAME authors who will work together over one week to produce a collaborative novel which aims to be representative of contemporary society and reactive to recent cultural events. The applicant states that the nature of the project is 'time-to-write' (although the budget includes PR, publicity and marketing costs). There is some inconsistency in the application form and additional documents about how many writers will be supported and novels produced; 10, 20, and 24 writers, along with one or two novels, are mentioned variously throughout.

The aims of the activity to redress the imbalance in publishing of published writers from underrepresented groups are clear. In addition the application positions this particular process and product as a new approach to long-form fiction which will push the boundaries of collaborative published fiction as an artform. There is potential in this proposed idea of collaborative fiction, and much merit in working with underrepresented groups as a key part of it. However the artistic idea would have been strengthened by more detail on the methodology of the collaborative process and in particular evidence of how it achieves a high quality output e.g. through evidence of past similar projects and their critical reception. Support from industry partners does give some confidence that a high quality outcome will be achieved.

Evidence:

Application form: Basic details p8, Artistic Quality, p10-12. Additional attachment: ANGEL audience and development plan.

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Quality

Statement:

The activity aims to develop the writers chosen for the project through the benefits provided by the collaborative process e.g. through influencing and being influenced by other's writing, rather than only sharing work at defined stages. This seeks to ensure the writers develop the range of literary skills required to produce a publishable work. The case seems reasonable although more evidence of the success of this methodology (e.g. participant feedback from previous projects) would have been useful. A secondary developmental goal concerns the exploration of collaborative published fiction as an artform by challenging the perception of what the relationship between work and author should be.

Evidence:

Application form: Artistic activity p12

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Quality

Statement:

The organisation demonstrates a good track record in terms of previous similar projects, winning the 2015 Inclusive Technology Prize and being one of 2016 Nominet's top 100, along with working with partners such as Kings College London and Bath Spa's MIX conference to deliver courses and installations. Past projects appear to have been largely delivered in educational and institutional settings, with over 60 collaborative novels produced to improve outcomes. It is unclear whether the applicant has a track record of placing these novels with publishers or of working with professional writers, which is relevant to this application since it seeks to redress the imbalance of BAME writers being published by the industry.

No artists have been listed in this application since the selection process, which is largely described in the additional documents, will take place after the project has started. The involvement of reputable industry partners gives some confidence that high-quality writers will be recruited.

Evidence:

Application form: Artistic quality p10, p13; Partners p32. Additional documents: ANGEL Audience Development Plan

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Public engagement

Statement:

The applicant has not answered the questions in the application form for this section, but instead referred the assessors to an uploaded audience and development plan. This plan seems to be a general project proposal for a project running in August 2017 under a different name, although the project description suggests it is the same project in format as in the application. More clarity over this would have been useful.

As a time-to-write project, the application does not estimate there to be any live or readership audience, listing 20 artists (in this section of the form) as taking part during the funded period. In terms of future engagement, the Audience and Development plan identifies audiences as: the writers themselves (although these are more correctly listed as Artists on the application form), readers of contemporary fiction who buy fewer than five books a year, and professionals in the UK publishing industry. More detailed identification of readers as the key audience would have strengthened the application (with publishers as a means to reach them.)

Evidence:

Application form: public engagement p14, 17. Additional documents: ANGEL Audience and Development plan

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Public engagement

Statement:

Plans could be stronger for how they will engage their target audience of readers, which have been identified as those who buy fewer than five books a year. The chief approach appears to be running focus groups with representative samples of UK readers which will provide starting points for the writers. This could be an interesting approach but the Audience Development Plan states that these groups will not dictate the work of the writers while at the same time enabling the project to be intensively tailored to the audience. More clarity over this approach would be useful. In addition, this work with focus groups does not appear in the Activity Plan or Beneficiaries of the application form. Plans to work with a Communications firm on press strategy give some confidence of reach but more detail of these plans would have been useful. Smart targets are included around profiling the activity, such as writing eight articles for publications and national newspapers, one review of the published work in a national newspaper, and five talks at publishing industry events. Although there is a supplementary letter from an literary agent expressing interest in the approach, firmer plans/track record that give more confidence of how a publisher for the work will be secured (or how the novel will reach audiences in another way) would have strengthened the application.

Evidence:

Application form: public engagement p14; Activity plan p35. Additional documents: ANGEL Audience Development Plan

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Public engagement

Statement:

Diversity has been considered in the aims of the project to increase the diversity of authors published by the industry and the recruitment of the authors to the project. There are reputable partners confirmed as part of this process (e.g. Creative Access, Sable LitMag, inclusive Minds), which should help its effectiveness.

Evidence:

Application form: Artistic Quality p11; Partners p32. Additional documents: ANGEL Audience Development Plan

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Finance

Statement:

£18,000 (or 56%) is requested of a total project cost of £32,160. The budget appears appropriate for the scale and type of activity which includes a number of writers and project management costs. There is no support in kind, while cash expenditure includes artistic spending (59% of total), staff costs (3%), marketing and audiences (10%), assets (11%), overheads (9%), and core costs (9%). Areas of income and spending appear largely appropriate, although a few items are not correctly categorized e.g asset costs include hire of space. The application states that the Arts Council's guidelines have been used to calculate the payment fee of £11 per hour for artists; however, we recommend applicants use the Society of Authors' guidelines in this matter, and reference to this in working out fees would have been useful.

Evidence:

Application form: Finance p19, p22.

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Finance

Statement:

The application demonstrates some income from other sources, but only 14% of this is confirmed which is from the organisation's reserves. Other income is expected from a trust who have been identified as being suitable to fund the project. As the application is in preparation stages it is unclear with what confidence it is expected to be successful and as this accounts for 86% of other income, a condition has been put against the first payment. There is no support in kind which the application explains is due to paying artists rather than asking them to volunteer their time. However some support in kind in the form of partner or venue support would have strengthened the application.

Evidence:

Application form: Finance p19, 22, 28, 29.

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Management

Statement:

The activity appears mostly realistic and well-planned, although some items mentioned in the Evaluation plans and Audience Development Plan e.g. focus groups with readers, do not appear in the activity plan. This is part of a lack of clarity throughout the application about whether the project period focuses on just time-to-write activity or public engagement activity (e.g engagement with press/media through a PR manager appears to be ongoing throughout the project)

Evidence:

Application form: Activity p35

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Management

Statement:

The applicant has a track record of managing similar activity, although mainly in educational and institutional settings working with school-aged creative writers rather than professional writers, as proposed in this application. The activity is supported by confirmed and appropriate partnerships some of whom are likely to ensure quality support for reaching BAME authors e.g. Creative Access, SableLit Mag, Inclusive Minds.

Evidence:

Application form: Activity p30

Statements

Appraisal criteria: Management

Statement:

Plans to evaluate activity are appropriate. Artistic output will be evaluated through interviews and focus groups with artists and members of the public. Formal reviews meetings each month with eQuality management and directors will help review project progress and smart objectives for audience and media engagement have been listed.

Evidence:

Application form: Evaluation 39

Submission summary

Page	Last Updated
Project information	No Input Required
Decision letter	No Input Required
Appraisal	22/10/2017