



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE
27 APRIL AT 1130 IN PERSON AT UCP

Note for the published papers: Part 1 of papers were mailed a week before with Part 2 arriving as updates shortly before the meeting. For the purposes of publication these two parts are grouped together in agenda order.

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 1 | Introductions and apologies | 1130 |
| 2 | Notes of last meeting | 1140 |
| 3 | Financial Update and budget | 1145 |
| 4 | Recruitment | 1205 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on where we are in the process as at 18 April (Part 1) • Update on interviews as at 25 April - Part 2 | |
| 5 | The Collaborative Programme | 1215 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process to date – Part 1 • Bids received and Panel deliberations – Part 2 | |
| 6 | Expression of Interest | |
| 7 | Comms (NP/PH) | |
| 8 | Peterborough Festival & ACE visit – Alliance presence (verbal updates) | |
| 9 | Upcoming dates | |
| 10 | AOB | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Attractions Network and Tourism meeting (verbal) | |

Item	Attachment (items marked with an asterisk are in the second mailing)
2	PCA Notes 300323
3	Financial update and budget PCA 270423 PCA Budget 22-24 v4*
4	Recruitment as at 18 April Part 1 Recruitment as at 25 April Part 2 *
5	Collaborative Prog Process to Date Part 1 Bids received and Panel deliberations – Part 2 *
6	Expression of Interest PCA 270423 (part 1) Expression of Interest PCA 270423 (part 2) * and PCA BUDGET TO MARCH 26V2 *
7	Forthcoming Comms plans *



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE
30 MARCH 2023

NOTES

1 Introductions and apologies

Apologies from Steph, Emillia, Ally, Jamie, Penny and Dave

Present: Caroline Wallace, Kate Hall, Liz Knight, Ruth Campbell-Ekins, Karima Shah, Ivan Cutting, Sarah Haythornthwaite, Natalie Phillips

Karima was welcomed and people introduced themselves. The new group is the Diaspora MultiCultural Arts Forum (DMCAF).

Ruth has been confirmed as the director of Metal in Peterborough and congratulated. Cresset has also won £2m+ for their roof from the Youth Investment Fund of which is excellent news.

11 Notes of last meeting

Agreed.

12 Financial and other contextual updates:

Noted papers circulated.

Plan is to open a bank account when staff are appointed. Noted risks of confusion and ensuring management of profiling especially around Xmas coming back to the issue in September. The proposal is to apply via NPT and the CIC to gain the track record through this programme.

13 The Infrastructure leg of the programme

- *Data*: update on discussions with companies: Sarah H has spoken with Indigo who have done some very interesting work with Birmingham and Coventry, and they were very generous with their time. Indigo now asked for their proposal around £20K, which at the least will benchmark TAA. The issue is thinking about the practicalities; meeting on Monday to discuss. Noted that this will be of value to the wider sector and making sure everyone can have access to data and use it in different ways.
- *DCMAF*: Karima reported that DMCAF needs to be going a little slower and concerned that too difficult to engage. Also feeling that things going too fast in a way that is difficult for artists from Black, Asian and Ethnic Minority communities. These points were discussed and Karima thanked for her honesty. The issue is to recognise the DMCAF is in a development phase and needs time and support to do that and that the aim is to get relationships right. Also we do think there will be proposals from some of the communities involved in DMCAF, which may not be fully representative but will be moving (with this fast train) in the right direction.



- *The Collective*: verbal report given from Emilia (who is unwell). There will be a meeting with the designer regarding branding on 6 April: Sarah will ask for details so people can support if possible, **Penny** being nominated for that possibility. Also possible meetings on 12th or 19th re creative careers: doodle awaited.
- *Recruitment*: **Sarah** with chase Jason on website traffic. Please share and push out as much as possible; subject to data on website, **Sarah** to pursue the additional website Kate suggested. **Natalie** also asked for hit rate on recent Selladoor recruitment.

14 The Collaborative Programme - update on process, and panel

- *Cultural Forum* – planned for next Monday as part of the commitment to openness and opportunity. Some concern is about whether this is the best use of potential bidders time and whether potential bidders are well aligned to the systems required. The meeting felt that while this is not a perfect process it is much more open than it was, and to cancel it now would be to destroy the trust that it has been developed. It is also crucial to recognise that elements of the Collaborative Programme *can/must* be about development or R&D, about testing things we have never done before. The value of ‘pilot project’ as a description was noted.
- *DCMAF*: A key opportunity is to include support over this and future years of work for money to buy time to develop the DMCAF and grow it, at the right pace, towards the ambition for a strong and robust network which is able to support people in fostering good relationships with the Alliance over time. This will need to include time, translation, training etc. The PCA reiterated its commitment to finding ways to buy/give/provide time.
- SH and SCT to finalise the scoring and guidance.

6. Peterborough Festival & ACE visit – Alliance presence (discussion)

Everyone encouraged to put forward their proposals

7. Upcoming dates

Everyone urged to ensure the forthcoming dates are in their diary.

8. *The meeting had to defer the other items due to time.*

27 April 2023 **at 1130** – in person. At UCP

25 May 2023 **at 1130** – In person. At University House ARU

22 June 2023 **at 1100 and suggest two hours** – in person. Chauffeurs Cottage



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

MEETING OF 27 APRIL 2023

FINANCIAL UPDATE AND BUDGET

By Sarah Tanburn

The Board is asked to consider:

- Subject to the conditions (i) to (v) below being met, whether to amend the budget as shown
- In that case, to proceed with the Indigo proposal and whether to include focus groups in 23/24
- To amend the Transition Programme and Shared Prosperity Fund allocations as shown and seek relevant approvals from ACE and PCC

Context

This is an issue relating primarily to the Year One budget, the Shared Prosperity Fund allocation and the Transition Programme profile. There are four relevant elements to that budget:

- (i) The Board decided at its meeting of 2 February 2023 to include the potential costs of a feasibility study for Chauffeur's Cottage in the budget. This recognised the crucial importance the Alliance attaches to the resource it represents for the cultural sector. Some 13 organisations are hosted there, it is a major base for events, networking, collaboration and more and its central location makes it uniquely accessible to groups and organisations throughout the creative and cultural sectors in Peterborough.
- (ii) The budget contains £20,000 for building the data framework in Year 1. (Data was part of the transition programme and a key feature of the Strategy)
- (iii) The £2000 for evaluation needs to be decided upon, and
- (iv) Profiling and implications need to be understood and agreed.

Since February, discussions between Metal and Peterborough City Council have progressed significantly as there now appears to be much less need for such a study. If it is not needed, clearly the £40,000 allocation could be transferred to other priorities. However, at the time of drafting, this has not been confirmed by PCC. Metal would want to see that written confirmation before the funding is released.

This report therefore seeks approval to a budget shift, *conditional on receiving written agreements*. This would enable work on the data platform to proceed at good speed should it be received.



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

Costs for data work and Indigo proposal

The budget as agreed in February and March contains £20,000 for developing a data framework to be shared across the sector. At the March meeting it was agreed to explore a range of options to enable a fully rounded proposition to come forward.

Further discussions have led to a proposition which is attached in an email as a *confidential annexe*. It is still commercially confidential, and we have asked Indigo for further details and formal proposition so it will not be included in this published paper. It has been discussed and agreed by the core data sub-group who met with Indigo (Sarah H, Jamie F and Natalie). This approach would deliver an annual city-wide survey, a public platform for data to be shared by all stakeholders (not just cultural sector) and regular focus groups.

To be successful, this approach would rely on strong support from all partners, not least ward councillors encouraging take-up in their constituency. This is a positive aspect, building both buy-in and awareness of the work.

This proposal *including VAT*, is summarised as:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Year 1 (SPF) 2023-2024</i>	<i>To be part of bidding for future years (per year)</i>
Basic programme (as previously discussed)	24000	19200
Public platform	18000	6000
Focus groups	9000	9000
<i>Total</i>	<i>51000</i>	<i>34200</i>
<i>Total excluding focus groups</i>	<i>42000</i>	<i>25200</i>

In the following paragraphs I have assumed this full budget but it would be possible to proceed without the focus groups in Year 1.

The future years requirements are included in the longer-term budget attached at item 6, the Expression of Interest.

Note that the Board has also had a strong interest in undertaking an Economic Impact Assessment for culture, including but not restricted to tourism. This was always an item for future years. Indigo have been asked if they undertake such work and if so their estimate for it. This will be included in planning for future years but will be an area where other partners will be expected to contribute as it is of considerable wider value.

Note that in all cases, clear core values and objectives for the Alliance are that the Alliance itself owns the data (not the funders nor the contractor) and that it is publicly available (within anonymity constraints). Thus I have not considered alternatives where the VAT might be reclaimable as they carry a sizeable risk of compromising those objectives.



Evaluation

The Festival represents a major opportunity to test public and practitioner awareness of the Alliance and understanding of the work so far and to come. Subject to agreement to the rest of the proposals contained in this report, it is therefore proposed that Indigo be commissioned to carry out an awareness evaluation at the Festival plus, if the budget permits, commissioning a photographer to record activity in the Alliance Dome as a final element in this stage of the Alliance journey.

Transition Programme profile

It is crucial this is spent by the end of June both to ensure a robust end of programme report and so that none of it is counted as (inadmissible) match funding for the ACE proposal. Given the importance of data and the ongoing proposals for comms and advocacy, I suggest a reprofiling of the expenditure as follows:

Transition programme breakdown

	12440	Carried forward	
of which		6750	in comms & advocacy
<i>in current plans</i>		2000	Evaluation
		3690	Data
Of which		3000	in comms & advocacy
<i>proposed</i>		2000	Evaluation
		7440	Data

This amendment would require approval and inclusion in the final report.

Reprofiling the budget in 2023-2024 to maximise PCA ambitions

In addition to the data ambitions above, PCA needs to be aware that:

- The remaining TP resources should be spent by end of June 2023 and the final report submitted. (This is drafted but will need updating at completion.);
- The TP resources include 2000 on evaluation and this needs to be decided and commissioned as above;
- The allocated SPF funding across 22/23 and 23/24 is 5,000 and 135,000 respectively (leaving 125,000 for 24/25). Whilst NPT are willing to offer cash flow support the Board should be aware of this restriction and support¹;
- If the ACE proposal is decided in (say) September, the relevant match funding will be that available at that date.

¹ The attached spreadsheet suggests that if no other cash is available in 23/24, this would be £16760 (excluding the £10000 contingency line) but we hope to address this via the ACE proposals.

The Council is interested to support the public platform element of this proposal and has offered £7,500 for this element (although not yet fully confirmed in writing). There is already £20,000 in the budget, so £27,500 is available. This leaves £23,500 (or 14,500 if the focus groups are omitted in Year 1).

If the £40,000 for the feasibility study is not required, as identified above), then it is recommended that this be partly used to fund the data work. Including the focus groups. This would result in the budget (v3) attached at Annexe 1. It would leave £16500 of the SPF unallocated. This resource *must* be spent on infrastructure (as it comes from the SPF) and I have used it to ensure the profile more closely matches the SPF allocation and reduce call on the NPT cash flow support.

This would suggest (if spending matches profile) £194,240 available to show as matched funding at the key decision point on the Priority Places programme in September (assuming resources already spent cannot be included and including money spent during the ACE decision period). If no other matching cash was assumed (unlikely) so that this was the total 15% of programme required by ACE, it would enable a bid of £1.3m. As the bid must be capped at £1m, it still represent sufficient cash match. However, this will be reduced with each month, hence the ambition to submit the bid by the end of Quarter 2.

Required steps

- (i) Fully costed and documented proposal from Indigo agreed by the core sub-group on data;
- (ii) Written confirmation from PCC that a feasibility study is not needed to finalise an SLA with Metal for use of Chauffeurs Cottage;
- (iii) Agreement to for-going of the feasibility study from both PCC and Metal
- (iv) Written confirmation from PCC that £7,500 will be contributed to the data framework for the public platform element;
- (v) Agreement from ACE (regarding the Transition programme) and PCC (delivery body for SPF) to the proposed amendments;
- (vi) Board agreement to the rearrangements in the budget.
- (vii) Agreement (not conditional) on the approach to evaluation

This report asks for Board agreement to proceed conditional on achieving steps (i) to (v).

Annexes

- 1 V3 of the Year 1 budget (see note and attached spreadsheet)
- 2 Confidential email regarding the proposal from Indigo



Annexe 1

The attached spreadsheet offers a view of the budget specifically for the years 2022-23 and 2023-24, ie the first two years of the Shared Prosperity Fund (which also includes £125000 in 24-25).

Note that v4a includes all the Transition Programme carry forward, the £7500 for the public platform, all the focus group costs to Indigo and an a £10,000 contingency.

V4b only covers the SPF funding and shows how this is projected to be spent. The note attached shows the recommended reallocation of the Transition Programme funding to ensure spend by the end of June.



Annexe 2: email setting out the Indigo approach following discussions.

Three questions for you to consider (which may be intertwined):

- Are we happy to run with Indigo instead of The Audience Agency? If so, do you want me to follow up with references?
- Do we need to take this to a PCA meeting to agree?
- If we want to go with this, Sarah – can we chat re the budgets to assess what we can contract them for

In short - They have a clear approach to the data collection that is based on experience of delivering across organisations – and one which respects that we're all collating information already for ACE and other funders etc. I think we all feel that they would bring experience to the table, establish strong baselines, ensure what we find is helpful to the wider sector and help us prepare for future ambitions. There are add-ons that we need to consider the finances over.

Some notes: (please add in Jamie / Natalie)

- Indigo have costed them coordinating a city-wide survey as the council no longer run one. This would mean every one of the 85,500 households getting a postcard through their doors and agreeing text that all partners (cultural and non-cultural) can circulate asking people to complete. It will ask about people's habits of engaging with arts / culture. They need ideally 100 responses per ward to get a decent sample. Might be a way to get the ward councillors on board? They have included £1,200 of incentives to get it completed but we could add in extras from the PCA members??
- Sarah – I checked and yes, we would own the data.
- In previous commissions they created a public platform which enabled people to use the data collected to steer their own programmes. It brings together all of the baseline data created through the city-survey so that you can see it on a map of the city. This would be an additional cost to us of £15k in the first year and £5k thereafter to manage it. Natalie wondered if some of the comms and advocacy funding could go towards this. She was going to check with Penny but she felt that it was doing some of the work they wanted to achieve. Jamie also has some ideas about how this could be managed within budget – it surrounds the feasibility study but he needs to explore this a little further. The potential return on investment due to allowing people to use this data as evidence to lever in additional funding should be worth it. **Actions for Jamie and Natalie**
- If we go with this option I will ask them for a more detailed cost breakdown as it is quite basic at the moment. **Actions for Sarah H**
- I'll also check if Indigo do economic impact assessments too as it would make sense to tie all of this together if so and I could get them to give a rough quote for one. It might help the budgeting. **Actions for Sarah H**
- Need to explore the PCA budget to explore what options we can afford **Actions for Sarah H and Sarah T**

Their basic costed programme is £20k + VAT in Yr 1 and £16k + VAT thereafter

Additions could be:

- £15k Yr 1 public platform creation (£5k thereafter)
- £7.5k for qualitative analysis etc (6 focus groups per year)



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

PCA BUDGET V4 27 APRIL 2023

VERSION 4 for 27 April PCA Board

3a Year 1 projected spend
3b SPF profiled spend plus notes

4a: Year 1

	Q4 22/23	Q1 23/24	Q2 23/24	Q3 23/24	Q4 23/24	Totals	Notes	
Recruitment to Director	4000					4000	actual	
17 month of salary inc costs			175500	0%	17550	17550	52650	Now includes 3 months in Q2. NB 17% oncosts included
Governance & set up			2500	750	750		4000	Consultative Panel etc
Recruitment to team			2000				2000	Increased to allow updated pack but reflecting efficacy of word of mouth & LI
Team salaries for 12 months				8775	8775		17550	
Data		12000	21000	9000			42000	Profiling currently draft only
Support till recruitment			7500				7500	
Comms		3000		2000			5000	Allows for input to the Festival Dome
Collective	2000		10000		8000		20000	Profiling to be confirmed
Forum		2500	2500	2500	2500		10000	Detailed proposal awaited
Multicultural Forum	950	200		3850	5000		10000	Development funding to be included in bid and worked up
Evaluation		2000					2000	
Festivals					21240		21400	Only in ACE proposal
Other /Contingency					10000		10000	To be carried forward to Year 2 if unspent

PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

Totals	6950	19700	63050	44425	73975	20810	0
Remainder of TP	12440	Allocated to data, advocacy and evaluation					
SPF	264000						
PCC contribution to public platform	7500						
	283940						
4b - SPF spend							
	Q4 22/23	Q1 23/24	Q2 23/24	Q3 23/24	Q4 23/24		
Recruitment to Director	4000					4000	
			175500				
9 month of salary inc costs			0%	17550	17550	52650	
Governance & set up			2500	750	750	4000	
Recruitment to team			2000			2000	
Team salaries for 6 months				8775	8775	17550	
Data		4560	13500	9000		27060	7500 PCC contribution & 7440 TP not shown
Support till recruitment			7500			7500	
Comms				2000		2000	
Collective		2000	10000		8000	20000	3000 arried forward from TP not shown
Cultural Forum		2500	2500	2500	2500	10000	
Multicultural Forum	950	200		3850	5000	10000	
Evaluation		0				0	2000 carried forward from TP not shown
Festivals						0	Proposal to ACE not shown
Other / Contingency						0	
						0	



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

	4950	9260	55550	44425	42575	15676	0
<i>Remaining SPF at the end of Quarter Two</i>							
<i>Transition programme breakdown</i>						87000	in 23/24
	12440	c/f unallocated				107240	outstanding 24/25
of which	6750	in comms & advocacy				194240	
in original	2000	on Evaluati					
	3690	Data				140000	SPF 22-24
						156760	Projected SPF spend 22-24
Of which	3000	in comms add advocacy				16760	<i>if no other cash awarded</i>
in proposed	2000	on Evaluati					
	7440	Data					
<i>Cash flow requested from NPT</i>							

The logo for Peterborough Cultural Alliance features several overlapping, semi-transparent lines in various colors (pink, yellow, grey, blue, green, red) that create a sense of movement and intersection.

PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

MEETING OF 27 APRIL 2023

RECRUITMENT AS AT 18 APRIL – PART 1

By Sarah Tanburn

The Board has devised a core team for recruitment, being Sarah Haythornthwaite (chair), Ivan Cutting, Jamie Fenton, Ruth Campbell-Ekins, Penny Hansen, Caroline Wallace and Liz Knight. All members have been asked to score applications received and others attended and contributed to the longlisting meeting held on 14 April.

The application window closed at midday on 11 April. By then 5 applications had been received. A further one was received later that afternoon – so six in all - but was not included for further consideration.

Four candidates have been chosen for longlisting. Their names are not included on this report as it will be a public document but will be reported verbally to the Board and have been circulated via email. At the time of writing three of the four have confirmed their attendance.

The interviews for these four candidates will be held (by zoom) on Monday 24 April. All members of the Board may attend but must indicate their intention to do so in advance. If they have not notified me of their intention to attend they will not be able to join the meeting, This is to ensure clarity and consistency. All Board members are invited to propose questions (generally and specific supplementaries) which I will round up and will be determined before the interviews begin.

The outcome of those longlist interviews will be reported to the Board for discussion on 27 April. Final interviews will be held **on 26 May** at UCP. This process will include opportunities to meet stakeholders and partners and some form of presentation. The detailed format of the day will be decided when we know how many people we are interviewing. All Board members are asked to be available throughout the day if at all possible.

Not every applicant completed the voluntary equal opportunities monitoring form. I have encouraged them all to do so in the hope of a complete picture. At the time of writing, only three have completed this form, of which all are male in sex and gender identity, one is Black African and two are White British, they are from 3 separate age groups all over 35, one is heterosexual, one bisexual and one did not disclose. None reported long term disability challenges or being neurodivergent. Those who reported said they had heard about the role via Linked In or through industry contacts.

As it is clear at least two of the long-listed candidates have not completed the form we cannot arrive at any firm conclusions yet about the process. The longlisting panel reminded itself that this job is not reserved for candidates with one or more protected characteristics: it is not eligible for such a restriction, but the selection process will be exploring candidates' commitment to and understanding of diversity in the Peterborough context and what that will mean for how they would do the job.



Note for published document – names of interviewees redacted. The process was further amended following lengthy discussion in the meeting.

MEETING OF 27 APRIL 2023

RECRUITMENT AS AT 25 APRIL – PART 2

By Sarah Tanburn

As set out in Part 1 of this item the core panel interviewed the four longlisted candidates on 24 April. The Panel agreed to meet all four in person for a final round of interviews in person on **24 May**. (Please confirm you have this date correctly in your diaries.)

Each candidate will be asked

- (1) Make a presentation on their first 6 months in the role to the Board and Stakeholder Panel
- (2) Be formally interviewed and
- (3) Take part in lunch with the Board, Stakeholder Panel and other candidates.

The draft timetable is:

0930 Stakeholder group, panel and board convenes

(All present: might ask questions but only 15 mins for that max, plus each fills in a simple template about the candidate.)

1000 Presentation: A

1030 Presentation: C

1100: Formal Panel: A

1200: Formal Panel: C

1300: LUNCH FOR ALL

1345: Presentation: J

1415: Presentation: R

(Stakeholders etc free to go after they've filled in their templates)

1500: Formal Panel: J

1600: Formal Panel: R

1700 – 1800: Discussion and if possible decision



The following is the draft make-up of the Panel, Stakeholder Group with some additional invites for lunch:

Panel:

Sarah H
Ruth
Ivan
Jamie F
Kate
Liz
Karima
Caroline
Emillia
(Sarah T in support)

Stakeholder Panel:

Names redacted for confidentiality



MEETING 27 APRIL 2023

COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMME PART 1: PROCESS TO DATE

By Sarah Tanburn

This note is to update the Board on the preparation of the Collaborative Programme to date and lay the ground work for the considerations by the Consultative Panel next week.

The Board agreed:

- A call out for proposals from priority communities
- The creation of a Consultative Panel to advise on proposals
- To include all pre-existing proposals in that consideration
- To ask bidders for a 4 minute audio/video *or* 500 words by 24 April 2023

Sarah Haythornthwaite and I prepared a guidance and scoring sheet (attached as Annex 1). The materials for the call out are on the website. This note for the Board meeting is being drafted before the closing date.

The Consultative Panel is:

Julia Fernandez (could not attend premeeting)
Anamika Ghosh
Dorothy Halfhide
Del Singh
Kiel Richardson
Eva Woods

The Board members working with the Panel (following our allocation of workload) are:

Ruth Campbell-Ekins
Penny Hansen
Kate Hall
Jamie Jones
Ally Oberrotman
Natalie Phillips
Karima Shah
Stephanie Peachey
Emillia Zirker
Sarah Wilson

Karima, Emillia and Ally made it for all or part of the pre-meeting.

That discussion was held on zoom on Friday 14 April and went well with members commenting but seeming confident with the guidance and scoring, as well as the inevitable uncertainties over workload and programme shape (ie lots of smaller projects or a few bigger ones).

The Panel will meet again (depending on number of proposals received) the evening of 26 April. I plan a short update note on proposals to circulate after the closing date and a verbal update on the Panel's consultation at the Board meeting on 27 April.



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE
GUIDANCE ON REVIEWING PROPOSALS FOR THE PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMME

This note is to help the Consultative Panel and Cultural Alliance Board evaluate artistic proposals. The context is in the call-out papers (attached when circulated). The overall aim of this programme is to demonstrate and embed the values and vision in the Cultural Strategy. We are considering proposals for inclusion in a large scale Priority Places bid to Arts Council England

If you are also making a proposal, please see the note on probity. In short: you must not participate in any discussion about your own proposal.

The evaluation is in two parts:

- Each proposal on its own merits, followed by
- How do we shape the programme as a whole?

Both of these should be captured on the attached form, which you should complete for *each* proposal you review.

Each proposer has been asked:

- Not more than 500 words or a 4 minute video/audio file
- To provide contact details, and
- To tell us which of the priority communities they are coming from

If they have not done this, they will not have been circulated.

As we prepare this process, we do not know how many proposals we will get – anywhere from 2 to dozens! *If we have a large number of proposals*, they will be grouped into themes and you will get the proposals from a theme (eg all the young people ones together).

Before the meeting on 26 April, we will ask you to

- Score them as below
- flag the best two in the set of proposals you have
- consider whether or not there should be a stronger focus on one ‘themed group’ than another

Please try to complete this form for all the proposals you have been sent before we meet during the fortnight beginning 24 April (date yet to be confirmed); you will not have long to do this.

Marks out of 5 will mean:

0. Has none of the experience or ambition required to meet the programme
1. Does not achieve this at all or (eg it is a single organisation proposal with no evidence of partnership)
2. It has a spark but not more (eg the proposer has done this before and there’s no new challenge in it)
3. Definitely promising (eg I can see how this might be fun. Can they step it up to be amazing?)
4. Great idea needing a bit more work (eg there are several partners here but I don’t see anyone there the proposer has not worked with before)
5. Amazing! (eg we will be talking about this for a long time and they really know what we’re looking for)

The criteria and the information we need for prioritisation mean:

	Criterion & prioritisation	What it means
--	----------------------------	---------------



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

A	Joy	Do you love this? Will others? Will it be amazing, beautiful, inspiring and fantastic?
B	Ambition	Is this a new challenge for the proposer and others involved? Will it show the best they and Peterborough can offer? How does it move our creative/artistic/heritage offer forward?
C	Partnership and collaboration	Is this a multi-partner project? Does it bring new people to the table and keep them there? Who has had the chance to be part of this? How broad are the originators and decision-makers? Can it be better?
D	Create a step change in how cultural things are done in Peterborough	What will be different for the proposer, for partners, for Peterborough because of this project? Will it have a long-term impact, or a legacy?
E	Ability to serve/meet the needs of a priority community?	Will it promote Peterborough's diversity and vibrancy? Does it support leadership, participation and creativity in our priority communities?
F	Experience and capacity to deliver	Does the lead organisation or their partners have some track record in projects of the size they want to deliver?

When we meet we will:

- Ensure we have identified any conflicts of interest and who needs to leave the discussion for which proposal
- Review each proposal to arrive at either an agreed upon scores or (if we cannot) an average
- See how many we think are good enough to go the next stage on their own merits
- Consider what this means for the programme as a whole and whether that means some other proposals may not go through.

The outcome of those discussions will shape a group of proposals who will be asked for more information to complete the decisions on the Collaborative Programme.

Probity

We recognise that Peterborough is not a big city and that people may be both on this Panel or the Board *and* making a proposal for the programme. We do not want to disqualify people from either role. However, it is important that you, the Alliance and everyone else involved is seen to act fairly and impartially.



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

If you are making a proposal or are a major partner in one, you must not evaluate the submission and you must leave the room during any discussion of that proposal.

We also ask that if you have a positive or negative, professional or personal relationship with a proposer (organisation or individual) which means you might find it difficult to be impartial and fair, that you excuse yourself from considering that proposal.

Failure to comply with these expectations would mean any proposal on which you are a lead or major partner would be disqualified from further consideration for the Collaborative Programme.

NAME OF PROPOSAL												
Name of reviewer												
SCORE OUT OF 5							Led by a priority group? (tick)					Feedback / Notes
A	B	C	D	E	F	TOTAL	Global Majority*	Eastern European	People with Disabilities	LGBTQIA+	Young People	
Joy	Ambition	Collaboration	Step change	Community	Experience							
<p>Should this proposal, on its own merits,:</p> <p>(1) Be considered for the next stage?</p> <p>(2) Be suggested for possible future call-outs?</p> <p>(3) Referred elsewhere and not considered further for the collaborative programme?</p>												
<p>Comment (if any) on how this fits with other proposals.</p>												



MEETING 27 APRIL 2023

COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMME PART 2: SINCE THE CALL OUT CLOSED

By Sarah Tanburn

This note is to update the Board on the preparation of the Collaborative Programme to date.

10 proposals were received:

NAME OF PROJECT	LEAD
County Borough Tales	Del Singh
Digitising the Arts	UCP
Durga Puja	Bengali Sanskriti Club
Growing up in Peterborough	Eastern Angles
Joy	Small Nose
Landmark Youth Hub	Landmark (was Selladoor)
Peterborough Heritage Festival	Peterborough Museum and Art Gallery
Rural Connections	Peterborough Presents
The Mysteries of Milton Hall	Eastern Angles
UROCKEMBED	URock

The Consultative Panel is meeting in 2 bites (due to availability) to consider these:

- (i) In person Wednesday 26 April and (proposed)
- (ii) Zoom Tuesday 2 May

Kate is chairing these proceedings and we will report verbally on Thursday.

The Board is asked to note that several members are involved in these proposals.

I have sought to deal with the ongoing work in the presentation of the Expression of Interest at item 6 as we would wish to submit that before we will have final decisions.

MEETING 27 APRIL 2023

Note for published papers: the text on this EOI has been significantly amended since this meeting

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR A PRIORITY PLACE PROGRAMME BID (Part 1)

By Sarah Tanburn

The Board is asked to

- Note the timetable and development of the Expression of Interest
- Note criteria, requirements and scale
- Comment on the draft
- Identify up to five members who can sign it off for submission
- Acknowledge the importance of NPT's role in this process

Timing and decision points

Before any strategic organisation can make a significant bid for funding for a Priority Place it must be invited to do so by Arts Council England (ACE). In order to be invited, it must submit an Expression of Interest (EOI). At the time of writing I am still trying to determine the exact format but the questions given in the guidance are those used in Annex 1 below with the draft answers.

ACE says it will take up to 8 weeks to determine an EOI. Once it is decided we would have not more than 8 weeks to submit the actual bid. Determining timing of submitting an EOI is therefore crucial. The outline timetable to which we are working (assuming success) is:

- Submit EOI end of April
- Invitation to submit received by end of June but possibly earlier
- Submit bid end of June
- Wait up to 14 weeks for decision (latest therefore mid-October)
- Agree documentation etc by end November ideally

All proposers to the Collaborative Programme are therefore being advised that they should not be seeking funding for events or work before the end of this calendar year.

The Board is reminded that our approach has two elements or 'legs':

- Infrastructure
- The collaborative programme

Criteria, requirements and scale



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

The opening pages of ACE guidance² on such bids sets out clearly:

We define an application as a Place Partnership project when it is for over £100,000 and:

- *is a strategic place-based intervention that is intended to make a long- term difference to the cultural and/or creative life of the local community **and***
- *makes a clear step change in provision in that place **and** is informed by robust needs analysis and responds to relevant local strategies **and***
- *is led by a consortium of partners who are relevant to delivering the project*

The guidance says ‘Applications can be for several complementary activities that amount to a step-change in provision and clearly deliver against local long-term cultural development plans.’ This sits with the consistent emphasis on step change in the advice we have received. I am therefore taking this to mean that:

- Each element must demonstrate how it generates real change **and**
- How the whole programme is more than the sum of its parts – how together it will be more than doing the parts separately.

This is a high bar for us to cross but will ensure the application is robust.

The guidance makes it clear we will have to respond to the Investment Principles of Ambition & Quality, Inclusivity & Relevance, Dynamism and Environmental Responsibility. There does not appear to be a question about these in the EOI, but we will need to be aware of them in designing the final bid, especially Environmental Sustainability.

Although Place Partnership funding does allow for some (not more than 30% by value) building related expenditure, we are not currently considering any such investment.

The guidance also makes a clear that a minimum of 15% cash match is required. However, for our situation, it is not clear *when* the cash match would count – eg from submitting the EOI (late April), from submitting the bid (late June, or anticipated decision (late September. The core of our match is the yet-to-be-spent part of the SPF funding. In the spreadsheet related to financial issues at item 3 I have shown the related match as at the end of September 2023 as £194,240. This is more than adequate for a bid of £999,999 but would be insufficient by the end of the third quarter.

The documentation puts a cap of £1m on these bids. However, I am also advised that most proposals are coming in at the 600-800,000 range. We are currently looking at reaching the cap so our bid will need to be even stronger.

Draft Expression of Interest

Drafted answers to questions are at Annex 1. This is the meat of this report and needs to be considered and reviewed by the Board.

² NLPG_InfoSheet_Place_Partnerships_11Oct2022.pdf circulated with the agenda for reference



Please note that I will circulate a further amendment after the call-out has closed and we will further discuss it at the meeting. I also hope to have answers to the questions around timing and quantum of match funding etc by then.

Agree sign-off

It would clearly be helpful to have a process for signing this off for submission. I strongly suggest that both Stephanie and Sarah H are involved with their multiple hats on, along with Kate as co-chair and running the Cultural Forum. The Board is asked to consider such a sub-group and who else should be involved.

NPT are also asked to consider whether they want further sign-off processes before submission.

Acknowledging NPT's support

The Trust has been extremely important in making this process possible by hosting the financial arrangements, offering cash flow support if needed, by contracting staff and shouldering a number of the risks. The aim is for PCA to become a freestanding CIC but there is no doubt that the journey from 2019 onwards would have been much harder (at best) without their practical and ongoing help.



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

ANNEXE 1 – DRAFT ANSWERS TO EOI QUESTIONS

Question	Draft answer	Comments/note
The total project budget amount	2,000,000	The combined SPF and proposed bid would be 1.263m. It is far from unreasonable to anticipate (over 3 years) and additional 750K in both match and cash
The amount being requested from Project Grants Place Partnership	999,999	See comment above on cap and scale
Where will any match or partnership funding for this project be coming from?	PCC: 264,000 (poss plus 7500 depending on timing) Anticipated other sources include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HLF • Charitable foundations • Earned income • Other sponsorships 	Any other examples or opportunities we could mention. Will need clarity on whether the whole 264+7.5 can be mentioned or only that unspent at either time of submission or time of decision.
Tell us about any earned income, fundraising activity, other public sources of funding, other Lottery distributors, and any other sources. Tell us whether they are confirmed or expected at this stage	The PCC funding is confirmed and in place. For the Collaborative Programme, we are currently shortlisting projects following a callout. Deliverability and funding are part of the criteria and will open up other options for funding eg HLF, commercial, philanthropic or needs based support. For the infrastructure element we are actively seeking partner support (eg from the BID) for specific elements eg the Economic Impact Assessment, alongside this bidding process.	We get 1000 characters for this answer so may wish to expand.
Have you received advice from the Arts Council? If so, who from?	Yes. Caroline Wallace, Relationship Manager	Thanks Caroline!
Which strategy or strategies covering the place for which you are applying does your project deliver against and how will you measure success ?	<i>The Peterborough Cultural Strategy</i> was developed to drive step change and ambition for the sector, audiences and communities. It has five recommendations, to which the Alliance and Collaborative Programme are central. (see www.peterboroughculturalstrategy.org.uk) Development of the Strategy has been slowed by intra-governmental funding challenges but the Cultural Strategy remains the guiding document. It has 9 key outcomes and PIs which will be used to create the specific evaluation framework for the programme.	Not clear how many words we have here yet. Other strategies?!

PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

Question	Draft answer	Comments/note
	Other important strategies include delivering of Levelling Up and related regeneration: we have SPF funding and an Economic Impact Assessment will be an important outcome.	
Which Area(s) of Focus as set out in the applicant guidance are you responding to?	<p><i>Cultural Communities:</i> all but particularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve communities • Improve cultural education for young people • Build the economic impact of the sector <p><i>Creative People:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting participation by all • Promoting creative opportunities for communities • Developing pathways towards creative careers 	Can we say it like this or must it be one?
Give an outline of the proposed project (2000 characters)	<p>Over 3 years, the programme covers 2 parts:</p> <p><i>Infrastructure and cultural ecology:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) embedding the Leadership Model through establishing the Alliance with a small staff; (ii) creating/supporting the basket of networks in the Model with brokerage, development, funding and relationship building, including the existing Culture Forum and young people’s Collective and the emerging Multicultural Arts Forum, Festivals Group and Heritage Network; (iii) building a strong data framework and public platform for data, learning from Cities of Culture to inform all cultural development and investment (iv) ensuring strong comms and advocacy for culture. <p><i>A Collaborative Programme</i> demonstrating and embedding the values and vision in the Strategy. As we prepare this EOI, this programme is subject to a call-out to practitioners and groups in our priority communities of people from black, Asian and ethnic minority communities, rural areas, under 26, from LGBTQ+ communities and disabled people. Along with a few previously articulated projects, these will be reviewed by our newly developed Consultative Panel, created to ensure the leadership of people from those communities across the Collaborative Programme. Criteria emphasise joy, ambition, partnership and creating step-change. A specific</p>	NB: this section can be updated after the end of the call out period so space left for that. May also allow expansion around the infrastructure element.



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

Question	Draft answer	Comments/note
	element of this programme may also focus on creative career pathways for young people.	
If the applicant is an NPO: Are you applying as part of a place partnership or consortium?	The applicant is not an NPO but we are proud that both NPOs and the local CPP Consortium are well represented on the Board of Alliance	Do we want/need to say this?

MEETING 27 APRIL 2023

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR A PRIORITY PLACE PROGRAMME BID (Part 2)

Part 1 contains the material on timing etc. This copy has an updated Eol draft answers.

By Sarah Tanburn

Draft Expression of Interest

Re-rafterd answers to questions are at Annex 1. This is the meat of this report and needs to be considered and reviewed by the Board.

I do not yet have answers to the questions around timing and quantum of match funding etc but will need those urgently to submit.

I suggest the final sign-off for the Eol is with the co-chairs and Stephanie (for NPT). Please could the Board determine whether this is acceptable.

Draft 3 year budget

The attached spreadsheet sets out as best I can the current three year projection including a potential breakdown of the Collaborative Programme across two call outs and the Creative Careers Work.

In summary this breakdown *for ACE funding proposal* is

Callout 1 (in evaluation)	135000
Callout 2	145000
Creative Careers - R&D and co-design	35000
Creative Careers - project	120000
Subtotals	435000
Contingency	40000
<i>Total Collaborative Leg bid</i>	<i>475000</i>
<i>Total Infrastructure Leg bid</i>	<i>521130</i>
Total request in bid	996130



The Board should note that the spreadsheet

- (1) Does not include any identified match yet on the collaborative leg but we should expect to identify at least some elements before submitting the final bid
- (2) Includes 283,940 already resourced for the infrastructure leg (PCC SPF, PCC data platform, and Transition Programme)
- (3) If the 12440 from the TP is not allowed as match, this still represents there is still 271,500 shown as matching cash already achieved. A key issue however is the timing of when the match is taken into account, as Part 1 of this paper made clear.

I have been trying to wrestle Grantium to the ground to get answers to some of these questions and will continue to do so before the meeting.

ANNEXE 1 – DRAFT ANSWERS TO EOI QUESTIONS

Question	Draft answer	Comments/note
The total project budget amount	2,000,000	The combined SPF and proposed bid would be 1.261m. It is far from unreasonable to anticipate (over 3 years) and additional 750K in both match and cash
The amount being requested from Project Grants Place Partnership	996,130	See comment in Part 1 on cap and scale
Where will any match or partnership funding for this project be coming from?	PCC: 264,000 (poss plus 7500 depending on timing) Anticipated other sources include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HLF • Other parts of public sector eg Health • Charitable foundations • Earned income • Other sponsorships 	Any other examples or opportunities we could mention. Will need clarity on whether the whole 264+7.5 can be mentioned or only that unspent at either time of submission or time of decision.
Tell us about any earned income, fundraising activity, other public sources of funding, other Lottery distributors, and any other sources. Tell us whether they are confirmed or	The PCC funding is confirmed. We are actively seeking partners support from both legs For the Collaborative Programme, we are currently shortlisting projects following a callout. At the time of submission we have received ten proposals. We are working with a panel of community representatives to develop these before the final bid. Deliverability and funding are part of the criteria and will open up other options for funding eg HLF, commercial, philanthropic or needs based support.	We get 1000 characters for this answer so may wish to expand. This is 663.

PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

Question	Draft answer	Comments/note
expected at this stage	For the infrastructure element we are actively seeking partner support (eg from the BID) for specific elements eg the Economic Impact Assessment, alongside this bidding process.	
Have you received advice from the Arts Council? If so, who from?	Yes. Caroline Wallace, Relationship Manager	Thanks Caroline!
Which strategy or strategies covering the place for which you are applying does your project deliver against and how will you measure success ?	<p><i>The Peterborough Cultural Strategy</i> was developed to drive step change and ambition for the sector, audiences and communities. It has five recommendations, to which the Alliance and Collaborative Programme are central. (see www.peterboroughculturalstrategy.org.uk)</p> <p>Development of the Strategy has been slowed by intra-governmental funding challenges but the Cultural Strategy remains the guiding document. It has 9 key outcomes and PIs which will be used to create the specific evaluation framework for the programme.</p> <p>Other important strategies include delivering of Levelling Up and related regeneration: we have SPF funding and an Economic Impact Assessment will be an important outcome.</p>	Not clear how many words we have here yet. Other strategies?!
Which Area(s) of Focus as set out in the applicant guidance are you responding to?	<p><i>Cultural Communities:</i> all but particularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve communities • Improve cultural education for young people • Build the economic impact of the sector <p><i>Creative People:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting participation by all • Promoting creative opportunities for communities • Developing pathways towards creative careers 	Can we say it like this or must it be one?
Give an outline of the proposed project (2000 characters)	<p>The 3 year programme offers a major change in how Peterborough does culture and is more than the sum of its parts. It has two legs:</p> <p><i>Infrastructure & cultural ecology:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (v) embedding the Leadership Model through establishing the Alliance with staff; (vi) creating/supporting the basket of networks with brokerage, development, funding and relationship building, including the existing Culture Forum and young people’s Collective and the emerging Multicultural Arts 	NB: this section is updated. Also see the spreadsheet. Currently 1940 characters.



PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

Question	Draft answer	Comments/note
	<p>Forum, Festivals Group and Heritage Network;</p> <p>(vii) building a strong data framework and public platform for data to inform all cultural development and investment</p> <p>(viii) ensuring strong comms and advocacy for culture.</p> <p><i>A Collaborative Programme</i> demonstrating and embedding the values and vision in the Strategy. This programme is subject to a call-out to practitioners and groups in our priority communities of people from black, Asian and ethnic minority communities, rural areas, under 26, from LGBTQ+ communities and disabled people. These are under review by our newly developed Consultative Panel, created to ensure the leadership of people from those communities across the Collaborative Programme. Criteria emphasise joy, ambition, partnership and creating step-change.</p> <p>Over the three years we expect this part of the programme to have three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the outcome of this callout (b) another callout in (approximately) September 2018 (c) a focus on building creative careers in Peterborough <p>In both legs of the programme there are elements of R&D and building capacity, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) in the networks, especially the Multicultural Arts Forum and the young people’s Collective, (ii) in developing a collective approach to careers interventions, and (iii) (potentially) supporting elements of proposals submitted to the callout. <p>Peterborough has taken a journey to develop the strategy and the guiding principles throughout this programme are partnership, joy, ambition and inclusivity. It is our time to step up.</p>	
<p>If the applicant is an NPO: Are you applying as part of a place partnership or consortium?</p>	<p>The applicant is not an NPO but we are proud that both NPOs and the local CPP Consortium are well represented on the Board of Alliance</p>	<p>Do we want/need to say this?</p>

PETERBOROUGH CULTURAL ALLIANCE

Note for published papers: this three years budget has since been considerably amended not least because of the ACE advice regarding a maximum possible proposal to the Priority Places Programme.

The table below is the summary of a much larger spreadsheet.

	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	3 year total	
<i>INFRASTRUCTURE COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMME</i>	5000	255190	2849	2799	825070	(NB includes commissions from Collective, Festivals and evaluation)
<i>TRANSITION PROGRAMME</i>		12440	1022	0	12440	(NB excluding previous spend)
<i>SHARED PROSPERITY FUND</i>	5000	156760	40	0	264000	(NB including NPT support to cashflow)
<i>PROPOSED ACE BID infrastructure</i>	0	58490	1827	2799	521130	99613 ACE 0 bid
<i>PROPOSED ACE BID collaboration</i>		80000	2050	1900	475000	(subject to decisions on cashflow and projects)
<i>PCC CONTRIBUTION TO DATA</i>		7500			7500	
<i>TO BE CONFIRMED</i>		20000			20000	(for EIA)
<i>Totals</i>	<i>5000</i>	<i>335190</i>	<i>4899</i>	<i>4699</i>	<i>1300070</i>	