



MAKING CULTURE OURS CLIC / LESE

A policy discussion document in support of an expanded, sustainable, and democratised arts and culture industry

CLIC is the Creative and Leisure Industries Committee within the London, East and South East Region TUC (LESE). Trades Unions represented on the committee include the MU, BECTU/ Prospect, Equity, PCS, Unite, Artists' Union England, and UCU.

These unions represent, for example, performers, stage management, directors, musicians, theatre, film, TV, and radio technicians, museum, and gallery staff, visual and socially engaged artists, and college lecturers.

CLIC - along with our counterparts in the Midlands and Yorkshire C Humberside regions of the TUC - works closely with the "Show Culture Some Love" campaign. In addition to trade unionists in the sector, it has worked with politicians, academics, students, and audience members to identify and address issues of concern - mainly through annual "Future of the Arts" conferences.

The proposals contained in the discussion document - "Making Culture Ours" - were drafted by a working party and endorsed at the 2019 "Future of the Arts" conference. It was subsequently updated in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic and the rising cost of living. The regular working party members were John Gillett, Frances Rifkin, Mike Wayne, Pam Foley and Martin Sundram. The discussion paper covers a number of areas of concern - primarily arts funding levels, patterns of distribution, and how practitioners and audiences are represented in the sector - and we hope that organisations in the sector will both consider it and take a position on it.

December 2024

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Imagine a world without decent health provision and education, without efficient public transport or care for the old. This prospect is materialising before our eyes in this new age of austerity. Now imagine a world without television drama, film, concerts, recordings, art galleries or theatre, variety entertainment, opera and ballet. Just as the NHS, schools and all our public services are suffering, so our everyday world of cultural experience is being diminished and devalued. We need food, shelter, and transport to survive. We need good health and education. Equally, we need the human experience and enlightenment, entertainment and sheer fun provided by imaginative and creative inspiration and expression.
2. Creativity and culture are not an add-on, a surplus luxury we can only afford when other needs of social life have been dealt with. We experience cultural life individually and collectively every minute of our work and leisure, whether through music, art and photography, dance, theatre, TV, film or video games. The arts run through our lives like an element of the air we breathe.
3. It is these experiences that give the arts a unique, vital and intrinsic value for us, something irreplaceable by anything else. More than this, they help us to get our bearings in the world and to understand and critique society in ways that factual information cannot because they address not just our intellectual understanding but our whole humanity, our emotions, aspirations, visions of a future, our collective human spirit, compassion and drive to make life better. Take this away and you diminish the whole of society and what is best in us.
4. We also see the value of cultural activities spread into other areas where they have an instrumental and powerful effect, as will be indicated throughout this document, for example:
 - for social inclusion, enrichment of life quality and local regeneration
 - for physical and mental health
 - for enhancing education and learning ability
 - for the economy
 - for tourism
 - for engaging young people and creating confidence and motivation
 - for skills creation and transferability and increasing employment chances
 - for national reputation
5. We call for legislation to protect artists' and creative workers' intellectual property rights and to ensure that AI is used ethically, on a consensual basis and that creators are re-numerated appropriately for use of their content - as well as ensuring that AI-generated "creative work" is labelled as such.

Long standing problems in the entire ecology of arts and culture have been exacerbated by deep cuts since the 2008 crash, by the potential loss of funds, business investment and job opportunities resulting from the government's handling of Brexit and now by the devastation wreaked on the sector by the Covid-19 pandemic.

We support the promotion of sustainable, optimistic and fulfilling careers for arts workers within a valued and equitable arts and entertainment industry that serves a wide and inclusive audience. To achieve this, a radical rebuild of the UK's arts and culture is needed.

The aims we set out are to inform future campaigning, both in the short and long-term. We recognise that many of the proposals below will take time, effort, vision and determination to implement and that we need to engage with organisations outside the Trade Union movement - arts organisations, audiences, arts managers, theatre and media managements, funders, political parties, local authorities and central government, Local Enterprise Partnerships and metro mayors - in ongoing joint campaigning on a number of fronts.

These proposals focus on:

1. Increased public funding and ownership by central and local government to ensure the expansion of the visual and performing arts with greater employment on a living wage.
2. Fully inclusive representation and access for all practitioners and audiences, widening the audience, and restoring and extending arts education.
3. An equitable balance of funding, without cuts to established areas, through a restructured national, regional and local funding system, and the establishment of more inclusive artistically and socially based criteria for funding.
4. Creative leadership, and accountability of funding bodies to practitioners, trades unions and audiences.
5. Protection and enhancement of public service broadcasting and UK film production and the creation of a publicly owned and financed film sector.

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

INCREASE FUNDING TO TRANSFORM THE ARTS

- Raise arts funding from an average of 0.4 % of UK government expenditure to the European average level of 1% in order to boost work opportunities and pay rates.
- Restore local authority arts services, and make vital local arts funding statutory in England, and wherever else possible, with increases in line with inflation.
- Oppose all arts cuts and austerity measures.
- Establish Creative Enterprise Zones in all boroughs to promote performance, visual arts opportunities, and other arts events with open and inclusive access.
- Restore all funds lost from Europe through Brexit and protect arts practitioners' rights and freedom to live, study and work where they choose.

FIGHT FOR A LIVING WAGE

- Raise the wages and fees of cultural staff and practitioners to reflect our worth, training, professional expenses, living costs and frequent periods of unemployment for freelance workers.
- Funded arts organisations must pay at least trade union minimum rates, or at least the Living Wage Foundation living wage where agreed with the unions. Local authorities should insist on payment of such rates as a condition of granting licenses to arts and performance venues.
- A living wage in TV and film, with a fairer share of the digital economy for all cast and crew members.
- Ensure all film schools pay a trade union minimum rate to freelance professionals.
- Introduce changes to benefits payments that enable artists to better sustain their careers through periods of unemployment.

FULL REPRESENTATION FOR ALL

- Fully inclusive representation and equal opportunity for all as practitioners and audiences.
- Challenge discrimination against and the lack of opportunity for working class, women and Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) practitioners.
- Spread diversity and education on diversity among powerful stakeholders in the industry (e.g. employers, casting directors, etc).
- End the broken tuition fee model that threatens participation in arts training and education.
- Repair the pathway from education and training into careers in arts and culture.
- Widen creative engagement with the arts and culture for producers and audiences.

MAKE FUNDING BALANCED AND FAIR

- Increase per capita spend outside London, to be achieved within increased overall funding and without cuts to London-based organisations.
- Raise the share of funding to the independent sector, an established and central part of theatre provision, and promote innovatory practitioners and independent companies of varying nature and size.
- Introduce longer-term grant allocations to enable secure planning across the whole range of companies, organisations and individual practitioners.

DEMOCRATISE FUNDING CRITERIA AND ORGANISATION

- Establish a devolved and autonomous regional funding structure - each regional board to include practitioners and community representatives with commitment to the arts.
- Reject centralised and undemocratic decision-making on funding and provide local audiences and participants with the widest possible range of cultural provision: a model of socially beneficial provision rather than the current business model of Portfolio investment and general and abstract notions of 'excellence'.
- Create a special national co-ordinating body to publicly fund cultural centres prioritising the promotion of arts and training for youth in deprived areas.
- Assert the right to experiment and take risk.

ESTABLISH CREATIVE LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Set up local advisory boards of practitioners and residents to advise funding bodies and local authority arts services.
- Transparency, honesty, and equitability in the process of grant applications and creative job appointments.
- More creative production and less bureaucracy.
- Create cultural facilities, cheap performance and rehearsal spaces, and visual arts spaces, in every major town, extending public ownership to facilitate this.
- Increase the employment of local actors and other creative staff in production outside London.
- Public funding for performance in schools, libraries, youth clubs and other community venues.

EXTEND PUBLIC TV, RADIO AND FILM

- Protect and expand public service broadcasting, restore lost funding to the BBC, and bring sold-off facilities and more production back in house.
- Diversify the workforce and audience and expand training in technical skills.
- Increase drama production on radio, and on television in regions outside London.
- Provide new and specific funding to the BBC, C4, S4C and BFI to increase the number and range of films produced and create a national publicly owned and financed film sector.

INCREASE ARTS EDUCATION AND TRAINING

- End tuition fees, audition fees, and visual arts opportunities fees and introduce grants for all students in further and higher education.
- Student grants to cover living expenses and special clothing and equipment costs.
- Improve the preparation of students for life in the industry and create mentoring and support networks in schools.
- Funding for ongoing training for young and established professionals.
- Scrap EBacc and other constraints on arts subjects, such as Progress 8, and increase arts education and theatre visits in junior and secondary schools.
- Restore and increase the Education Maintenance Allowance for students in England.

<p>Raise respect - emphasise the value and importance of jobs in the arts and of creativity in society.</p>
--

MAKING CULTURE OURS

LESE CLIC's proposals for an expanded, sustainable, and democratised arts and culture industry

INTRODUCTION

'I do not want art for a few, any more than education for a few, or freedom for a few' - William Morris

Economically the cultural sector is a powerhouse. Before the Covid-19 lockdown, the UK's creative sector was growing at five times the rate of the wider economy. It employed more than 2 million people and in 2018, it contributed £111.7 billion to the exchequer. It has been estimated that for every £1 invested in the arts, £4 is generated for the economy.

Despite this multiplier effect, successive governments have been reluctant to provide the public funding and policy leadership the sector needs to overcome the structural weaknesses lurking behind the bald growth statistics.

Freelance employment, which is common, is precarious, reinforcing existing socio-economic inequalities in terms of access. A low value is often placed on creative workers, both in terms of their remuneration and perceived value in society, helping drive down wages.

Brexit and Covid-19 will add to the economic uncertainties going forward.

Recent Conservative governments emphasise the role of philanthropy, aspiring to an inadequate US model of funding; but private funding has never been anything but a small proportion of the overall funding mix in the UK and is highly selective, unreliable, and accountable to no-one.

Meanwhile public and local government investment in the sector has been cut and the distribution of what remains is deeply inequitable. Funding is organised by highly centralised bodies lacking in transparency and accountability and the criteria for offering or refusing funding is perceived by many practitioners to be narrow and discriminatory, blighted by elitist notions, favouritism and bias.

Audiences for the arts and culture sector remain disproportionately middle class. Many young people are increasingly deprived of contact with arts and culture through poverty or the failure of the education system, and later, discrimination in the world of the professional arts. Mass arts education at all levels is openly disparaged by government ministers as a waste of time even though a version of the arts remains highly prized in elite circles. The signal this sends is that the production and consumption of arts and culture is for the few, not the many.

We still experience a lack of inclusive representation among practitioners and audiences, and a sense of exclusion in many parts of the country and within society, especially in terms of class and race. The Me-Too movement has also recently exposed sexual exploitation and abuse within the arts and culture sector.

A radical overhaul of UK arts and culture is needed.

Those of us who work in the arts and culture sector should not be seen as second-best and expect to have our work cut. Our work interlinks with the vast majority of people and with public services and industry: no one vital sector should be placed in competition with any other to justify cuts.

We are against austerity policies that punish our arts and public services and the continual downgrading in the importance of the culture sector by senior policy makers. We need to embrace and extend the public funding, investment, and ownership element in the industry, since this creates and stimulates the greater part of our work and only this offers the possibility of long- term stability and development.

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- Expansion of arts and culture to serve the community
- Equitable funding distribution and an accountable regional structure
- More inclusive socially and artistically based criteria for funding
- A democratic culture with creative and community leadership
- A living wage for creative practitioners and staff and sustainable careers
- Full and inclusive representation in arts employment and audiences, and increased arts education

NATIONAL CULTURAL PROVISION - CULTURE FOR ALL

1. The cultural industries contribute £101.5 billion to the economy (DCMS, 2018), and account for 18.9% of total UK service exports (DCMS, 2016), and 5.5% of the economy. The performing arts alone contribute £5.4 billion (DCMS, 2016), and culture and heritage attractions generate £4.5 billion annually from overseas visitors (Visit Britain).
2. According to a recent survey by Arts Council England (ACE- Conversation), 79% of people see the arts as important. 70% participate in an arts activity (Active Lives survey, 2015- 17). An Equity/National Campaign for the Arts/Stage newspaper survey revealed that 63% of people in the UK want to see their local council spend at least 50p per person every week on the arts, museums and heritage.
3. Recent Tory governments have emphasised philanthropy, but private funding has never risen beyond 18% of the total income of arts organisations (ACE, 2017). It has never been sufficient to offer a substitute for public funding and viewing it as such acts as a disincentive to provide the increases in public funding needed.
4. Although George Osborne as Chancellor stabilised government arts expenditure in 2015, central government cut the DCMS budget in half between 2012-15 (PCS - An Alternative vision for the culture sector). ACE has been cut by 36% in recent years, with substantial funding reductions to other UK nations, for example, a 30% cut to N. Ireland Arts Council, 2012-18.
5. Due to Brexit, we now face a potential cultural loss of £10 billion from EU creative and development funds (Equity, 2016).
6. UK culture funding falls way behind European levels.
 - In 2023/24 the expenditure of the UK government is expected to reach £1,189 billion, up from £886 billion in 2019-20 (Statistica and IFS).
 - Public sector expenditure on cultural services in the UK from between 2009/10 to 2022/3 has averaged at £4.1 billion (Statistica).

- £4.1 billion, which was the exact amount spent in 2019-20, represents 0.4% of the total government expenditure in 2019-20. This is a typical percentage of total government expenditure on cultural services for UK governments. The overseas aid budget for the same year represented 1.7% of total government expenditure.
- Between 2008-2016 the average per capita spend on cultural services in the UK was only higher than Portugal and Italy in Western Europe.
- As a percentage of public spending over the same period (2008-2016) the UK's spending was only higher than Portugal and austerity wracked Greece.
- In 2021 general government expenditure on cultural, broadcasting and publishing across the EU amounted to an average of 1% of all government expenditure (EuroStat).
- Raising UK government expenditure on cultural services from its current average of 0.4% to 1% would on the projected UK expenditure for 2023-4 of £1,189, increase spending from an average of £4.1 billion over the last 14 years to £11.89 billion.

CLIC's alternative proposals

We believe that consideration should be given to the following proposals:

1. Commitment to fully funded, sustained public investment, as the only way to reverse austerity, Brexit and the impact of Covid-19 and guarantee development of the arts.
2. Increase central arts funding to at least the European average percentage levels - which would mean doubling it by some comparisons - to spread and sustain professional work across the country and encourage creativity in every local community".

<p>Raise cultural spending to 1% of total government expenditure and improve our lives by 100%!</p>
--

3. The Labour Party pledge of a £1 billion Cultural Capital Fund to upgrade infrastructure is welcome, but although its focus on digital as a growth area is important, there is an argument that capital funding must also be made available to expand access to live performance and visual arts studios by upgrading or establishing major arts facilities in every region. The urgent priority though should be an increase in money to expand the amount, range and distribution of creative work, widen access for audiences, and improve practitioners' and employees' unacceptably low wages.
4. Guaranteeing replacement of the funds lost to the arts due to Brexit, and campaign to protect workers' rights and financial benefits achieved through the EU, and the right, so important for many dancers, singers, variety entertainers and actors, to live, study and work anywhere.
5. Private sponsorship deals must be clear about their conditions and length and not interfere with free artistic expression. Each organisation in receipt of private funding must make their own judgements over ethical issues but needs to be clear about the knock-on effects on public perception of receiving money from certain companies.
6. Increasing progressive taxation on large corporate profits and high earners - which could cover increased spending on culture and general increases in public spending. For

example, a 5% increase in UK 'tax take' from 35 to 40 percent of GDP, to make it equal to the German and EU average, would pay for an increase in public spending of no less than 14% (Royal Economic Society: To tax or not to tax? 2018).

7. The 25% tax relief for some theatres, orchestras, and film production, currently raising an extra £251m, could be extended - this would be extra to raised public funding and most relief should be earmarked for actual creative production.

LOCAL CULTURAL PROVISION - EXTENDING AND INTEGRATING THE SERVICE

1. Outside London, arts departments of local councils 'are the biggest funder of arts and culture in England' (ACE, 2016, Funding Arts and Culture in a Time of Austerity). They spend £806 million on libraries, £450 million on museums, galleries, arts development, and public entertainment, and are the major source of theatre funding (Local Government Association [LGA], 2015: The Policy and Funding Landscape for the Arts).
2. There is a close connection between national and local funding. Since 2010, central government has slashed Revenue Support Grants to LAs, so that there is now a £5.8 billion budget gap: a 60% cut between 2010 - 20 (LGA, 2018). Councils such as Northants, Somerset and Norfolk are simply going bust through this Government's austerity measures.
3. The government has spent £2 billion on Brexit staff, but a decade of austerity has reduced English councils spending power by a third resulting in further devastating cuts to social care, education and the arts, museums and libraries. LAs actual control only 1.6% of GDP, whereas in Germany they control 11% - another damning comparison.
4. Despite the importance of LA funding, English spend on arts and culture fell between 2010-15 from £1.42 billion pa to £1.2 billion, a 16.6% reduction, and London spending fell by £53 million. Up to 40% of all arts departments in England and Wales have closed (Arts Development UK, 2017-18), including, for example, Somerset and Westminster.
5. Organisations face insecurity due to cuts, short-term and inadequate funding. Jobs, conditions, and wages are under constant threat. Many theatres have already closed, plus 60 museums and as many as 700 libraries with the loss of over 8000 jobs (Show Culture Some Love response to the DCMS Inquiry on the social impact of participation in culture and sport). In 2018 alone, over 700 full-time library employees lost their jobs and volunteer labour numbers increased to over 51,000 (Guardian, 2018).

CLIC's alternative proposals

We believe that consideration should be given to the following proposals:

1. **Stop the cuts!** The funding lost through years of austerity cutbacks should be restored. LAs should consider campaigning against further cuts and/or drawing on reserves and legal borrowing powers to defend arts provision.
2. LA arts departments must be defended from impending collapse and arts spending should become a statutory requirement along with health and education, increasing in line with inflation: every £1 of local investment generates £4 to the local economy (LGA, 2013).

3. Money for cultural organisations and events should also come from multiple departments' budgets, showing the role the arts play in strategic local objectives such as education, regeneration, parks, libraries, and public health.

4. Open up Creative Enterprise Zones in all boroughs to promote performance, visual arts, and other arts events with open and inclusive access for all workers and audiences.

For example, the Hackney Wick and Fish Island CEZ includes plans for the build of a new theatre. London is set to lose 30 per cent of its artist spaces over the next five years, so plans have been announced to create artist zones by helping artists buy workspaces, and two underused Council buildings will become temporary studios.

5. LAs should create new publicly owned cultural centres, rehearsal and performance spaces, and artists studios and galleries, for example, by taking over unused buildings, as above; and encourage local businesses to provide spaces within their own properties. These should be offered to artists, variety and circus entertainers, visual artists, music, and theatre performers free or at cheap, affordable rents.

6. Regeneration of areas involving creative spaces should not take place at the expense of the local population, nor should artists become the victims of 'gentrification' and be forced out by rising rents and corporate development, which has happened to numbers of visual artists.

As many as 3,500 studio spaces in London are under threat, one-third of all creative spaces. 16% of artists' workspaces identified as at risk in 2014 have now closed (London City Hall, 2018). Greater protection should be applied in planning procedures with cultural venues designated as 'Assets of Community Value'.

Practitioners, especially those in community-oriented work situations, could be encouraged and supported by business rates relief and local grants for living and materials costs. The Arts and Humanities Research Council report, Understanding the value of arts and culture (2016), points to the dangers of gentrification and the value of 'small-scale cultural assets - studios, live-music venues, small galleries and so on - in supporting healthier and more balanced communities.'

7. Integrate the local infrastructure of roads, transport, workspaces, parking and services to facilitate and encourage the working of the cultural sector; and use the planning process and community infrastructure levy in consultation with local creative practitioners.
8. LAs should financially assist local initiatives to create community centres that showcase and encourage local culture, for example, the Moston Miners Community Arts and Music Centre in Manchester and Salford Arts Theatre.
9. By such initiatives above, we want to see wider access and participation of all sections of the community, both as audience and creators, and to create greater opportunities for working class practitioners, who often face exclusion in mainstream arts.
10. Establish meetings specifically for people working in the creative industries in each borough, chaired by the relevant Council cabinet member/committee chair; and encourage chambers of commerce to hold meetings on cultural development for local employers and institutions and to which practitioners would be invited to contribute.

UNBALANCED AND INEQUITABLE FUNDING - DEMOCRATISING CULTURE

“It will not be possible to do as much as we want to do as quickly as we want to do it. But that is no excuse for not doing as much as we can and more than has hitherto been attempted”.

Jennie Lee’s White Paper of 1965, “A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps”, set out to develop and improve knowledge and practice of the arts and to increase public accessibility and participation. We have a long way to go to achieve those aims.

1. Although 40% of audiences are outside London, we have seen arts funding favour London over other regions by a ratio of as much as 15:1. Londoners receive £65.18 per head as opposed to £4.91 for those outside. Since the start of the Lottery as additional funding, 82% of its funding has gone to London, four times the amount received by the rest of England (The Next Steps, GPS Culture, 2016).
2. Arts Council of England (ACE) has been pressed by numerous surveys, including from the DCMS, to commit to a fairer distribution of taxpayer and lottery money, and has embarked on the Creative People and Places scheme to address the wide disparity in arts involvement across the country: for example, 88.1% of people in Richmond upon Thames are engaged in arts activity, whereas only 44% had attended arts events in Blackburn with Darwen. ACE is now committed to offer 56% of its budget and 75% of Lottery money to regions outside London (2017-18), although these figures have been challenged (GPS research).
3. English Regional Arts Boards, which had some degree of autonomy in regional distribution of funding, were wound up in 2001 and replaced by local offices, essentially business units, of the central funding body, ACE.
4. Funding decisions by UK bodies have been marred by lack of transparency and accountability, when peoples’ creative work, livelihoods and careers are at stake. There is plentiful anecdotal evidence of bias, favouritism, backstairs dealings and lack of real consideration for the community and practitioners. This does not just relate to ACE. Applicants to Creative Scotland have found the application process to be opaque, bureaucratic, time-wasting, and full of business-speak. Administrators have been criticised for being:

“Uncommunicative, apathetic, inflexible and unhelpful. . . showing little concern for how their processes and behaviour affect the lives of the very artists they are being paid to support”.
5. The core characteristic in all this is a business model of funding dating from the Thatcher period, as opposed to one of socially beneficial provision and accountability to each community.
6. ACE offers £622m pa, 2018-22, to 831 National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs), in grants for arts and culture and strategic funds. Although boxes have to be ticked relating to scope of touring and community connection, we note the key criteria for judging funding worthiness to be business efficiency and ‘excellence’. This sets up a business-style competition and hierarchy of value, defined by undisclosed and arbitrary establishment values. This delegitimises what is not perceived as ‘excellent’ and can constantly move the goal posts of judgement to justify cuts and changes of policy, creating insecurity and lack of continuity with poor accountability - all elements of which were present in the ACE swathe of cuts over ten years ago and challenged at a famous meeting at the Young Vic Theatre in London.

7. Another disparity is in large and small-scale organisation funding.
 - 84 organisations receiving £1m or more per annum get 81% of the national budget for ACE.
 - The top 16 NPOs receive 35.4% of total funding, which leaves the remaining 815 NPOs in receipt of 64.6% of the total (based on ACE figures, 2018).
 - Large London-based organisations receiving over £1m pa take 32% of the total.
 - Funding of smaller organisations receiving under £100,000 pa has halved since 2007-08 (Rebalancing Our Cultural Capital, GPS report, 2014), and most of these often innovative and community-based companies are on short-term project funding. Smaller opera companies receive nothing now, most funding going to the Royal Opera House.
8. We believe in rebalancing funding within a much-increased pot of funding: an alternative model of distribution, and funding criteria that is more inclusive of all participants - practitioners, peer groups and audiences - and relates to the interests and needs of communities across the country; to enhancement of the amount, quality and range of work produced; and to various qualities of judgement that actually identify work of value.
9. We are not suggesting that London and large national organisations like the ROH and National Theatre should be robbed of funds - we disagree with the recent 3% cut imposed on them by ACE to spread more funding into the regions outside London. We also acknowledge the importance of London as a major cultural centre for national and international institutions. However, there are major towns, cultural centres, festivals, theatres, galleries, museums, opera, and dance companies north of Watford, and a rebalancing of our culture and infrastructure to address all geographical areas and UK countries needs to happen if Britain is to be a culturally equitable nation.

Equally, smaller and middle-scale independent organisations, and individuals, need to benefit from equitable funding according to their social and artistic contexts and needs. We are not seeking to dictate what and how work is produced artistically, but to increase the opportunities for wide-ranging, accessible, inventive and challenging work of quality.

CLIC's alternative proposals

We believe that consideration should be given to the following proposals:

Autonomous, balanced, and accountable regional funding with creative leadership:

1. Cultural provision should be expanded, balanced, socially responsive, and democratic.
2. Without cutbacks to London arts organisations, and through rebalancing funding within a substantially increased arts allocation as above, we believe per capita spending should be raised in the regions outside London, at least to London levels in the long-term, and Lottery spending immediately equalised, so that a major new cultural investment programme is begun across the country to reach all those areas currently under-resourced.
3. An autonomous regional funding structure, able to make funding allocations independent of a national arts council. A new version of the old regional arts boards - Regional Culture Councils - should be revived but in democratic form: to include local

practitioners and community representatives with knowledge of and commitment to expansion of local cultural opportunities. These councils would liaise with LAs about specific areas of funding in each locality.

4. Advisory bodies to these regional councils, representative of the local community, should be established consisting of trades unionist's representative of practitioners drawn from all levels and areas of skill (not just prominent figureheads), and other local residents and workers. These would be consulted by venues, regional funders and Local Authority arts services on criteria for funding, priorities and perceived value, and be able to make recommendations on possible local cultural programming.
5. The Labour Party has previously suggested that workers have one third of all seats on company boards. We suggest that representatives of creative workers have the right to sit on all private and publicly owned arts organisations, but must oppose cuts, urge an expansion of creative work and be subject to recall.
6. End corporate cronyism in appointments to funding boards - for example, the recent appointment of Elizabeth Murdoch to ACE National Council.
7. Develop a vision of what arts provision is needed across the country through debate and feedback in the regions, rather than pursuing the current top-down policy determined from the centre. Consultation should occur with local arts organisations, professional and community-based, to determine their potential needs before grants, management, marketing structures, etc. are put in place. Lack of consultation leads to inadequate distribution of arts provision.
8. Because of these suggestions, the central UK arts councils themselves need to be reconstituted with different structures, a facilitating rather than controlling role, memberships more representative of the population - and maybe different names to complete the transformation: National Culture Councils perhaps?
9. Establish a new national co-ordinating body for cultural centres prioritising access to arts and culture for young people in the most materially deprived geographical locations: this would help to reverse the current class-stratified access to public funding for the arts. These cultural youth centres (for ages 16-26) would offer equipment, training, and the opportunity to produce creative practitioners- and audiences would have access to a wide range of visiting visual artists, musicians and performers. The centres would be initiated by local people (for example, the award-winning Moston Miners Community centre), using existing spaces wherever possible. They would work with each other, local schools, creative professionals, arts-based trades unions, and publicly funded arts organisations (for example, making their outreach programmes genuinely outreach). The national co-ordinating body would award budgets and provide advice, training and understanding of best practices amongst the centres. A small tax on the UK's nearly £6 billion spend on private advertising could fund the initiative.

Expanding regional production:

10. Create new cultural centres, performance, rehearsal, and visual arts spaces in every town, extending public ownership to facilitate this.

11. The smaller-scale sector of independent practitioners in whatever artistic field should have ring-fenced funding and be further developed and seen for what it is, an established and key part of cultural provision and source of employment. Rebalancing of funding needs also to respect the importance of small and medium- scale organisations run by and servicing less represented communities both outside and inside London, where there is a high concentration of, for example, BAME practitioners and audiences.
12. Introduce longer-term grants to enable secure planning. Individual practitioners and organisations of proven worth and vision, in whatever area of work and of whatever size and nature, should be guaranteed long-term funding of up to 10 years.
13. Creative production should predominate over administrative bureaucracy: in theatres, for example, there has been much evidence of administrations increasing in size out of proportion to the number of creative practitioners who create the productions visited by the audience. The workforce, like funding, needs to be rebalanced towards creative practitioners, but as new creative spaces develop with the increased funding suggested above, there need be no cuts to the number of administrative jobs available.
14. More opportunities for local workforces, with local castings and interviews for performers and other musicians and arts practitioners. Too often the interview process takes place only in London.

Representative and transparent funding criteria:

15. The process of application for arts grants needs to be made transparent, with clear and accessible language in application forms, full explanation of decisions, and support for the future development of organisations and individuals that fail to receive grants.
16. Replace the general criterion of ‘excellence’ with a wide range of specific criteria that could be used to analyse any artistic work and determine funding. ACE’s own unfortunately titled ‘Quality Metrics’ and ‘Consumer Insight Toolkit’ surveys offered a possible way forward (although they have been limited to helping organisations understand their audiences better and need substantial renaming and rethinking).

There have been objections by some arts organisations to the very notion that we can apply specific qualities of judgement to any creative work. This to us is as elitist as the notion of ‘excellence’ itself and leaves a handful of administrators in funding bodies free to continue applying this model.

17. We suggest that a variety of criteria could be more fairly and productively applied, for example, ones relating to a creation’s concept and skill in presentation, the diversity of representation among practitioners and audience, its distinctiveness and current relevance, it’s rigour and challenging quality, the local impact and value to an audience and wider community, etc. These criteria could be adapted flexibly according to the type of organisation and local community being served. The judgements on which funding would be based must come from a tripartite combination of the audience, practitioner peer groups, and the organisation itself, wherever feasible, and the process should apply to all organisations seeking funding, not just selected NPOs. The process should be offered free, and care must be taken not to favour the already favoured.

Opportunities must be offered for new organisations and people starting out in the industry. In other words, a more democratic and flexible process for determining funding decisions.

A LIVING WAGE!

1. 91% of creative workers have worked for nothing (Warwick Commission, 2015). In some areas of Fringe theatre, low budget television and film, music videos, dance, music and modelling, professional workers are regularly regarded as cheap labour, not doing a 'proper job', to be offered low or no fees. Many young people are expected to work for nothing to 'gain experience'. AUE, Equity, the MU, Writers' Guild and BECTU have resisted this with campaigns for professional payment and enforcement of National Minimum Wage legislation.
2. The national average wage is around £550pw (ONS, 2017). For example, Equity's lowest theatre minimum wage is £360pw (2018). According to Equity surveys, 50% of members earn less than £5000 pa and 67% earn under £10,000 pa from professional work, with 45% of members only doing around 10 weeks professional work per annum. Stage Directors UK believe half their members earn below £5000 pa. Visual artists have similarly low incomes from their work, and all public employees have seen their wages held down below inflation since the 2008 crisis.
3. The Arts Council's Information sheet on "Fair pay" in respect of National Lottery Project Grants (November 2018) states that they are "not able to offer specific guidelines on rates of pay for artists or creatives from parts of the sector that don't have a lead union body" following a ruling by the Office of Fair Trading on competition law. They do say, however, that when someone is employed on a contract or freelance basis, the number of hours needed to complete the activity - which should include research, development and planning as well as delivery - should be agreed. Further, they have an expectation that fees and salaries for those aged 25 or over should match the National Living Wage as an absolute minimum. Fees and salaries for under 25s vary, but should match or be more than the National Minimum Wage: https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/ACNLPG_Fair_pay_0.pdf
4. Stage Directors UK believes half their members earn below £5000 pa. Visual artists have similarly low incomes from their work, and all public employees have seen their wages held down below inflation since the 2008 crisis.
5. Such low pay or no pay further discriminates against working class cultural workers who cannot rely on financial support from families or friends. They also make it almost impossible for mothers with babies and young children to work, so women are hit.
6. The "Not Here to Help" report, (written by Heidi Ashton for Equity) points to the impossibility of navigating the social security system in times of need and calls for a strengthening of the safety net to properly support workers in the culture sector, (see: <https://www.equity.org.uk/campaigns/policy-work/universal-credit-report>)

The report contains a number of key findings:

- Current employment status frameworks do not adequately respond to workers in the arts and culture sector

- Universal Credit and the "Minimum Income Floor" are not designed to respond to the conditions of work in the sector
- The "Minimum Income Floor" is driving culture sector workers deeper into poverty and hardship

The report puts forward two recommendations that were supported by TUC Conference 2023:

- Abolish the "Minimum Income Floor" The Universal Credit system requires culture sector workers to show they are "gainfully self-employed". This is sufficient to ensure that bogus self-employment cannot be claimed. The TUC also supports this call, (see: <https://www.tuc.org.uk/research-analysis/reports/replacement-universal-credit#>)
- Initiate a full, evidence-based review of the effectiveness of the social security system in supporting atypical workers with multiple jobs and careers in non-standard work environments and sectors

Culture sectors workers do not fit into Universal Credit's current binary system. The review should examine relevance of the current system in terms of meeting the needs of workers in the sector and should make recommendations for reform following the abolition of the "Minimum Income Floor".

CLIC's alternative proposals

We believe that consideration should be given to the following proposals:

1. A living wage! Professional practitioners and cultural employees are workers in the arts and culture sector and industry, most of us have trained at considerable cost and effort, and we serve communities like other public sector workers. We have to say no to low pay and no pay and demand wages that cover our everyday living expenses, exorbitant housing costs, necessary professional expenses, and frequent periods of no work.
2. We also believe it is the job of the industry to create a more understanding, flexible and stable framework so that we are supported by wages that help us to sustain careers. This would increase public understanding of the industry and our nature as creative workers serving the public rather than being perceived as irrelevant or superfluous.
3. That means paying the going industry Trade Union minimum rates at the very least for each area of work and skill, and recognition of trades unions and encouragement of trades union membership.
4. Where organisations have public funding, that funding must be sufficient for them to pay the Trade Union rate. Where budgets are very low, for example, in Fringe theatre, at least the Living Wage Foundation living wage must be paid and legal action taken against dodging employers.

NB Details of current Living wage rates - both in London and outside - can be obtained via the following websites:

<https://www.gov.uk/national-minimum-wage-rates>

<https://www.livingwage.org.uk/what-real-living-wage>

Employment Tribunals should admit cases from TUs, not just individuals.

5. Local councils should insist that TU rates or the LWF living wage be paid as a condition of granting licenses.
6. Local councils should insist that TU rates or the LWF living wage be paid as a condition of granting licenses.
7. End zero-hours contracts, unpaid internships, and expenses-only work.
8. No cuts to museums, galleries and libraries, no reintroduction of entrance fees, and defence of all employees against privatisation accompanied by sackings, declining working conditions and wage cuts, threats all faced by employees at the National Gallery in London.
9. Ensure training institutions pay an agreed TU wage to employed practitioners, e.g. actors, directors, and camera operators employed by film schools.
10. A living wage in TV and film, with a fairer share of the digital economy for all cast members and crew.
11. Reform the benefits system so that cultural workers can apply for extra allowances (such as the old Enterprise Allowance) to help sustain careers during periods of unemployment.
12. Living benefits for all - replace the existing Universal Credit system, unrealistic housing benefit limits, and all adverse welfare reforms brought in since 2010 - as called for by the TUC, (see: <https://www.tuc.org.uk/research-analysis/reports/replacement-universal-credit#>).
13. Artificial Intelligence. Address threats posed and approaches undertaken to combat them. See page 26 for full analysis.

TELEVISION AND RADIO - DEFEND PUBLIC SERVICE BROADCASTING

1. The BBC was once the cornerstone of public service television and regulatory authorities mandated strong public service obligations on the commercial channels. However, television has not been immune to decades of pressure to cuts, marketisation, outsourcing, the opening of the sector to international capital, and the looming threat to privatise Channel Four. This has meant reduced job security and opportunities for all practitioners and weakened the ethos of public service broadcasting that once made British television amongst the best in the world.
2. As the Murdochs seek to ever expand their commercial empire, the BBC, with a much bigger audience share than Sky, has been under collusive political attack. The government froze the licence fee from 2011 to 2017 while adding £340m of new responsibilities to the corporation, including the funding of the World Service and S4C channel. There has been a cut in real terms to resources of 16%: 2000 jobs have gone, leading to cuts in news and investigative journalism, to the Asian network, local radio, coverage in Wales and Scotland, and to radio drama and original drama on BBC 4.
3. The BBC is now required by government to cover the cost of the licences of the over-75s. This will rise from £250m in 2018 to £750m in 2020. In return, the government has agreed to allow the licence fee form of funding, linked to inflation, to run till 2020 - but for how long will this be secure? The BBC already cut another 1000 jobs in 2015 due to a shortfall of £150m - this because of declining licence fee payments and TV watching (Guardian, 2015).
4. There are pressures to extend privatisation within the BBC. Most drama and comedy shown on the BBC is currently made by independent Producers Alliance for Cinema and Television (Pact) companies, and the BBC management wants to increase independent commissioning of programmes. Further, BBC Studios, an independent company within the BBC, also produces drama and comedy both for the BBC and commercial companies. BBC Resources, Technology and Broadcast have already been sold off to the private sector. (Federation of Entertainment Unions (FEU): BBC Cuts and The Alternative White Paper).

The rigorous training of technical talent by the BBC has now all but disappeared. The private independent companies have gained producers, directors, camera operators, lighting, hair and make-up technicians arguably as a result of this long-term investment in staff training. The profits made by the independent companies no longer finance future programme-making as was the case under PSB, nor do they noticeably benefit the cast and crews of successful TV programmes, being hived off as investor profits and dividends.

5. Tony Hall, the BBC's Director-General, has pointed to an uneven playing field between the traditional broadcasters and the new companies like Netflix and Amazon:

"In so many ways - prominence, competition rules, advertising, taxation, content regulation, terms of trade, production quotas - one set of rules applies to UK companies, and barely any apply to the new giants" (Guardian, Sep. 2018)

He urges that their video streaming services be regulated to the same extent, as are the UK's traditional broadcasters. Also, Netflix paid nothing in corporation tax last year but got a £200,000 tax rebate. It made £500 million in streaming services and a UK pre-tax profit of £1.2m, whilst the BBC is having to jump through numerous hoops.

6. At the same time, the question of funding has been limited to a narrow debate. While recent polls have revealed majority support for keeping the licence fee, also supported by Equity and the FEU, it is under constant threat from this government. The only alternatives offered are advertiser funding and subscription funding; but licence and subscription fees can be viewed as regressive taxes that hit the majority of Equity members and the wider viewing public disproportionately hard. Advertising carries the risk of distorting content in line with the profitable interests of advertisers, as well as degrading the viewing experience. Nowhere is general taxation via the public purse discussed as an option that could avoid all these pitfalls and keep at bay private empire-builders such as Sky.

CLIC's alternative proposals

We believe that consideration should be given to the following proposals:

1. Stop all further moves to extend privatisation and marketisation of public service broadcasting in C4, S4C and the BBC.
2. Remove the burden of the BBC paying for over-75s' licences.
3. BBC Worldwide should remain within BBC ownership and sold-off facilities and commissioning to independent companies under BBC Studios be brought back in-house. Further commercial commissioning would deprive regions outside London, where most of the commissioned companies are based, lead to cuts in training, and threaten all programme production with privatisation. In-house production must be protected and expanded, but on fees that match Pact fees.
4. Independents must be members of Pact and observe the agreements made with the FEU unions.
5. Expand digital services to make historic BBC programming available through iPlayer, while challenging the dominance of the new media platforms such as Netflix, Amazon, and Apple.
6. New media platforms must be brought under union agreements so that members can receive a greater share of their huge profits. The same rigorous rules on production and taxation that apply to UK broadcasters need to be applied to these companies. Tax incentives benefiting them should be made available to public service broadcasters. Netflix, Amazon, and other multi-national digital platforms should be required to invest in material qualifying as original British drama as part of their public service obligations.
7. Training and development across all skills and paid apprenticeships, with guaranteed jobs at the end, to widen the opportunities in media employment.
8. A platform for emerging artists across all performing and visual arts. Reinstate BBC3 and fund facilities and airtime for new talent across all BBC and C4 channels.
9. Inclusive representation across all jobs in front of and behind the camera. Project Diamond, investigating diversity, must extend to monitoring cast and crew breakdowns of individual programmes.
10. Increased drama production on radio.

11. Protect regional TV production in all major regions such as Birmingham, where facilities have closed.
12. The BBC's governing body should include diverse, elected representation from viewers, practitioners' TUs, and staff.
13. Defend the BBC's funding and restore funds lost in cuts since 2010 - and open discussion on a choice between the licence fee and a ring-fenced public broadcasting fund, paid from general taxation and state revenues and available only to publicly owned networks.
14. Ban immediately all television advertising for betting companies to combat addictive gambling.
15. Abolish OFCOM and establish a new regulatory body that will develop, through a wide public consultation with practitioners, audiences and all other interested parties, policy proposals to ensure a viable future for Channel 3, 4 and 5 as broadcasters with enhanced public service commitments. This would reverse the diminishing of such commitments over the last three decades. Proposals should include the return of significant live coverage of the most popular sporting events to free-to-air broadcasters.

FILM - EXPANDING PRODUCTION AND PUBLIC FUNDING

1. The UK film industry has explored four major strategies to support film making: quotas for homemade film exhibition, the Eady levy on cinema tickets, tax breaks and public funding and film institutions (Stephen Follows, film data and education). The public funding option is the one that has led to most production.
2. The National Film Finance Corporation (NFFC), set up in 1949 under Attlee's post-war Labour government, financed independent films and aimed to offer an alternative to the domination of the industry by Rank and the Associated British Picture Corporation. It was later heavily constrained by Heath's Conservative government of 1970 and abolished in 1985 by the Thatcher government.
3. In 1948, there were 25 functioning film studios. By 1972, the number was 14, with losses of, for example, Denham, Isleworth and MGM Elstree studios. Nevertheless, between 1971-73, over 250 films were made, an average of 83 a year. In 2018, we have around seven major studios, producing far fewer films.
4. The Film Council was established in 2000 and wound up by the Conservative-Liberal Democratic coalition government in 2011. It had invested £160m of Lottery money in 900 films over that period, an average of 81 a year.
5. Its functions passed to the British Film Institute. Between 2011-15, the BFI put £129m into film production, festivals, and funds. 75% of these projects were actual films, of which around 32 were major feature films such as *High Rise* and *Pride*. (Stephen Follows, film data and education, 2015).

The BBC and C4 also finance feature films. Although films are often referred to as 'British', this usually means they were initiated and arranged by a registered British company but financed and made by US companies. American companies have historically dominated production, distribution, and exhibition in the 'British' industry. In 2016, US and US-backed UK productions (such as *Rogue One: a Star Wars Story* and *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*) accounted for 87.5% of the box

office. On the other hand, independent UK films only constitute 7% of the domestic market, one of the lowest shares in Europe (BFI Statistical Yearbook, 2016). The historic blockages that British films have had to overcome to access British audiences need to be addressed.

Although the current level of actual production here compares with European countries such as Sweden and Russia, France is way ahead. The public bodies, Film France/Centre National du Cinema, gave €799m to 258 films in 2014. 300 predominantly French films were made with public money in 2015 alone. This, along with diversifying film choices within theatrical exhibition, points the way forward for an independent UK industry.

6. The deregulated theatrical exhibition market is leading to escalating costs in ticket 3 prices, squeezing out younger patrons who may then lose the cinema going habit. There are wide regional variations in ticket prices with Londoners paying markedly more than cinemagoers elsewhere.

CLIC's alternative proposals

We believe that consideration should be given to the following proposals:

1. Increase public funding for film production at the BBC, C4, S4C and BFI and their commitment to showing British films (and foreign language films) to British audiences.
2. Raise production to at least French levels.
3. Re-design film tax reliefs so that they prioritise low and medium budget British qualifying films.
4. Commit to training and expansion of film jobs across all skills, and inclusive representation at all levels of skill and management.
5. Create a publicly owned and/or financed film producing sector with a long-term vision for a fully integrated production, distribution and exhibition system for small and medium budget UK and foreign language films, funded by general taxation.
6. Regulate the theatrical exhibition sector in terms of prices, ownership, diversity of films on offer and greater equality of theatrical runs (for example, UK independent films have half the median number of weeks on release than US studio backed films).

FULLY INCLUSIVE REPRESENTATION FOR ALL - INCREASED DIVERSITY AND ARTS EDUCATION

1. The FEU unions have campaigned hard and achieved much to advance diversity and more equal representation among practitioners in the performing arts. However, despite the BAME community constituting 13% of the UK population, only 5.4% of workers in the media industry are from BAME backgrounds, even though the industry is concentrated in the SE where the ethnic minority population is more than 40% (Kate Oakley, Leeds University); and half of large-scale theatres employ less than 5% from BAME backgrounds (ACE report). Ethnic minorities are rarely seen behind the camera, teaching in drama schools, as directors, producers or casting directors. Forty years since the publication of Naseem Khan's seminal report on diversity, The Arts Britain Ignores, she says it is extraordinary that the issues around diversity and the arts remain as "sharp, troubling and vibrant as ever" (Khan, 2016).

2. Women are 51% of the population but men outnumber women 2:1 for example, in acting roles on our screens and 3:1 in children's TV. These ratios become higher as women get older. As performers or visual artists, whether young, middle-aged or older, women experience various forms of discrimination and stereotyping, and although progress has been made in the amount and nature of representation of women on TV as a result of sustained campaigning from Equity and others, there is still a long way to go before we see equal representation across the whole field of performance and other jobs in the media and in visual arts arena.
3. A recent survey by Sphinx theatre revealed that only a fifth of English theatres were led by women, who control a mere 13% of ACE's theatre budget. There has never been a female Artistic Director of the National Theatre or RSC. Sir Nicholas Hytner, former director at the NT, never directed a play by a woman in his tenure of twelve years.
4. Women are only 36% of the media workforce and concentrated in lower status jobs, figuring rarely in writing and directing roles (Kate Oakley, Leeds University). The BBC commissioned 32 men and 8 women to write drama in 2017. Channel 4 has transmitted only two prime-time original drama series created by a woman since 2004. In 2017 no Comedy programming on ITV was written or directed by a woman. Less than 10% of feature films are made by women (Equal Representation for Actresses, ERA 50:50).

"The vast majority of actresses working in television, film and theatre struggle with lack of opportunity. Compared to men, many women find it impossible to sustain meaningful and economically viable careers into their forties and beyond and find themselves faced with an early retirement and uncertain future. The business squanders talent and their rich CVs" (ERA 50:50).

Practitioners with impairments are particularly under-represented in our industry. These aberrations, and the discrimination against LGBT+ practitioners and the extent of sexual harassment and bullying are all being challenged by numerous campaigns such as Equity's Play Fair and Safe Spaces initiatives.

5. A major area of discrimination only recently receiving some attention is of practitioners from working-class backgrounds. According to Dave O'Brien from Edinburgh University, only 18% of creative industry employees come from the working class, whereas 70% come from upper middle-class and privileged backgrounds (interview for Equity, 2018). Census figures since 1971 reveal a decline in social mobility. According to The Acting Class film (dir. Mike Wayne and Deirdre O'Neill) 67% of Oscar winners have been privately educated. There is also a pay gap of around £10,000pa between those from senior professional and managerial backgrounds and those from the working class (Dave O'Brien, The class problem in British acting, 2015).
6. The sheer costs of training (over £9,000pa), audition and visual arts opportunity fees (£30-80 each), headshots (up to £300), directory fees (£154pa for Spotlight, 2018), agency fees (10-20% of earnings) can make a career in acting prohibitive for many, and those who do start out may not be able to take the unpaid or low-paid jobs that provide a 'showcase'. In addition, working class practitioners may not have had equal access to many cultural resources when young, and later to certain art and drama schools, agents and jobs. Stereotyping is also a major problem for the ethnic minority and working-class practitioner.
7. We can conclude from all this that employment in the media, in the visual arts, and in the performing arts does not reflect the composition of society as a whole.

8. The problems for the young, who along with older people are the most vulnerable, begin with the educational system. Students have a dearth of advice on careers in the arts, performance and in the media. EBACC is bringing a savage decline in arts subjects. There are 1700 fewer drama teachers than in 2010, and 15% fewer drama teaching hours. School plays, and visits to the theatre and by theatre companies are the first items to go in the current cutbacks (Labour Party's Acting Up report, 2017).
9. GCSE arts entries overall since 2016 are down by 46,000, 8%. Drama GCSE exam entries are down by 15.9%, music by 8.3% and arts and design by 1.6%. The STEM (science, technology, engineering, maths) subjects grew in 2015-16 by 105,000 (Ofqual stats). This is despite the fact that low-income students taking part in arts activities are three times more likely to get a degree than those who do not.
10. The Arts on Prescription survey revealed that arts engagement brings better mental well-being, a decrease in anxiety and depression, more community cohesion, and improved cognitive abilities. The arts, whether you take a career in them or not, also set you up for life, increasing confidence, creativity and communicative abilities, and adaptability, transferability of skills and range of employability.
11. The lack of fully inclusive representation in employment and training is mirrored by the lack of access for many in our communities who feel alienated as audiences by mainstream culture and buildings. Every person, whatever their age, ethnicity, gender or sexuality, class, ability or impairment, should feel able to engage with our arts and culture at all levels, as practitioners or audience.

CLIC's alternative proposals

We believe that consideration should be given to the following proposals: Diversity:

1. Fully inclusive representation and access for all practitioners and audiences, with 50:50 representation for women in all areas of the industry.
2. Diversity monitoring, to include class, across all areas of the creative industries.
3. Immediate implementation of the provisions originally written into the Equality Act 2010 (but never implemented by successive governments) for public bodies to pay 'due regard' to reducing socio-economic inequalities as part of their policymaking.
4. Monitoring should also focus on diversity among visual arts managers, directors, producers, commissioners, writers and casting directors, who also need to be encouraged to embrace the full and rich potential of the composition of the country and realise their responsibility in reflecting that.
5. Commitment to fully inclusive representation should be a requirement of public funding.
6. All arts organisations should maintain high health and safety standards, and clear policies for dealing with harassment, discrimination and bullying with effective measures for reporting, investigating and resolving complaints.
7. Within the Independent Theatre field there are already companies and individuals specialising in and representing diversity in its many and developing contexts and forms. It is potentially a major source of employment and creative involvement for our communities but is under-funded and requires commitment and support for development.

8. Part-time tutors, as well as full-timers, must be given clear and adequate instruction on a school or college's policies on equal opportunities, sexual harassment, bullying, health and safety, safeguarding of young people and children, etc.

Education policy:

9. End tuition fees and audition fees - and visual artist exhibition fees - free education for all with adequate maintenance grants to cover living and high housing expenses, and specialist clothing and equipment needed for training, to be covered by public funds.
10. Restore and increase the Education Maintenance Allowance for students in England.
11. Training in drama, dance, visual arts, music schools and academic arts education in universities must be done with the aim of a job at the end, rather than the expectation of unemployment and low/no wages. The previous policies suggested in this document would vastly increase the range of creative work and jobs available. Everybody should have the right to choose to study and train for what they want in life.
12. Fully prepare students for the industry through talks on the professions, how to start an art business, theatre or dance company or band, deal with accounts, getting an agent, organising publicity, etc.
13. Create mentoring and support networks in all creative educational establishments for students and graduates. Create student forums at which students can discuss and challenge their training or education. Some drama schools, for example, already have these practices.
14. Funding for ongoing training for young and established cultural workers, and seed money for young graduate projects.
15. Scrapping EBACC and other constraining policies on curriculum such as Progress 8. This evaluates students based on prioritising English and Maths and marginalising creative subjects. We are for a broad and varied curriculum, which gives equal priority to academic, vocational and creative subjects and prizes the fulfilment of individual human potential.
16. Promote theatre, gallery, concert, and museum visits for students and arts practitioner visits to schools - these should be seen as learning experiences in their own right - not as optional expenses or adjuncts to the priorities of exams.
17. Careers advice in schools on the creative industries and performing arts - many schools act as if they do not exist.
18. End the appointments of the privileged by the privileged - introduce local democracy and representative appointments to arts boards and advisory bodies, as in section 7 below.

Widening creative engagement:

19. Castings and other job interviews should be local as well as in London, where 80% presently take place - and every effort should be made to increase the employment of local practitioners. Travel expenses to and from interviews should always be paid.
20. A publicly owned, free or low-cost artists' directory to offer an alternative to expensive companies with control by registered clients over policy on, for example, advertising of interviews, auditions and visual art opportunities.

21. Free or reduced ticket prices for performance and visual arts professionals, and low prices for all in certain periods (McMaster Report, 2008). End VAT on tickets.
22. Investigate the establishment of a central, publicly owned ticket agency to replace the various box office groups, secondary agencies and touts who contribute to making ticket prices unaffordable for many.
23. Some creative organisations and individuals already connect strongly with local communities. This engagement can be increased through contact with Trades Councils, and specifically the Federation of Entertainment Unions (FEU) at local and regional level, and with community and immigrant organisations, for example.
24. The trade union movement can be involved with culture at every level: every union to have an arts officer.
25. Variety, music, dance, theatre and circus entertainers should receive local public funding to reach out to wider audiences.
26. Local theatres, community and cultural centres can bring different artists together to offer a wider cultural experience; organise education and outreach projects, talks and discussions; community workshops and courses in visual art, drama and music financed by local or central government.
27. Raise respect for the value and importance of jobs in the arts, and for creativity in all people in society regardless of who they are and where they come from.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

1. Introduction

The growing impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the world of work has generated a number of concerns within the trade union movement in recent years.

The Trades Union Congress (TUC), for example, published a manifesto, “Dignity at Work and the AI revolution” in 2021. In its Introduction, former General Secretary, Frances O’Grady pointed both to the opportunities it offered to improve life at work as well as the risks it posed - including “entrenching inequalities, unfair treatment and unsafe working practices”.

To stop this, the TUC set out the task of ensuring that the introduction of AI systems is based on a set of values that will guarantee they are “for the benefit of everyone” by re-asserting the “importance of human agency”.

2. The main threats posed by Artificial Intelligence

The TUC convened a union AI working group in 2020 in order to take these issues forward. With input from this group, as well as a creative sector AI working group convened this year, the TUC has published a series of reports and guidance on AI, including most recently guidance on generative AI and impact assessments : <https://www.tuc.org.uk/artificial-intelligence-ai>.

The TUC also launched an “AI Taskforce” in September 2023 with the AI Law Consultancy at Cloisters Chambers and the Cambridge University Minderero Centre for Technology and Democracy (see: <https://www.tuc.org.uk/news/tuc-launches-ai-taskforce-it-calls-urgent-new-legislation-safeguard-workers-rights-and-ensure>).

A vital part of its work has been to draft a “ready to go” bill aimed at regulating the use of AI in workplaces, (see: <https://www.tuc.org.uk/blogs/launching-tucs-ready-go-ai-bill>). The Artificial Intelligence (Regulation and Employment) Bill seeks to ensure that the rights of employees and jobseekers are protected, and that unions and workers are consulted on new technology. So, for example, it emphasises the need for action to counter “intrusive” work monitoring technology and “electronic HR” decision-making systems that are unfair and discriminatory. It is being used as the basis for technology-related discussions with Labour on the Employment Bill and also in relation to the upcoming government AI Bill.

A motion on AI - submitted by Accord, the Artists’ Union England and UNITE covering “AI: regulation, equality, skills, training and the arts” - was carried at 2024 TUC conference. It commits the TUC to lobby in support of the AI (Regulation and Employment) Bill and, specifically, in relation to the culture sector, for legislation which protects artists’ and creative workers’ intellectual property rights as well as seeking to protect them with regard to AI and its development.

Further, it commits the TUC to propose that the government takes steps to ensure that AI is used ethically, on a consensual basis and that creators are re-numerated appropriately for use of their content - as well as ensuring that AI-generated “creative work” is labeled as such, (see motion C16: <https://congress.tuc.org.uk/category/carried/#sthash.fxEA0Fly.dpbs>).

BECTU/Prospect and the NUJ have identified a number of workplace concerns over the use of AI for purposes of staff surveillance, monitoring, work allocation and appraisal - including the use of tracking and surveillance software, keystroke monitoring and performance management - without explicit collective agreement and transparency. BECTU/Prospect has published a guide for union representatives on Digital Technology which covers these concerns- as well as setting out a bargaining agenda:

<file:///C:/Users/Admin/Downloads/2022-00121-Leaflet-booklet-Digital-technology-%E2%80%93-a-guide-for-union-reps-Version-11-02-2022.pdf>

AI also poses other challenges of a different character in the arts & culture sector. Many of those working in the sector are self-employed and/or freelancers and, as such, aren’t necessarily affected by the issues described in the TUC Bill. This includes authors of original literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic works; producers or principal directors of films; performers of literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works; etc.

The Wales TUC held a conference in 2023 which concluded that AI is creating a “tidal wave” of copyright infringements by making it easier for technologies to “use and adapt people’s music, writing, image and voice, without consent and without payment”, (see:

<https://www.tuc.org.uk/blogs/how-ai-using-creatives-work-voices-and-images>).

3 AI and the Arts & Culture Sector

Unions in the arts & culture sector have produced a wealth of material which sets out both the main concerns arising from the use of AI and the measures which should be taken to protect livelihoods. This has been taken forward both individually and through the Creators' Rights Alliance - which is a collective of trade associations, unions (Equity, National Union of Journalists, Musicians' Union and the Writers' Guild of Great Britain), and other organisations.

One of the features of "Generative AI", according to Equity, is its ability to "create new content....by learning the patterns and structure of the input data....and generate outputs that resemble human-created content or synthetic media" that is used, for example, in voiceover, film, TV, modelling, music, dance and gaming - see:

<https://www.equity.org.uk/advice-and-support/know-your-rights/ai-toolkit/understanding-ai>)

Unions are particularly concerned that these "outputs" are the product of "performance cloning" - whereby "machine learning" programmes create synthetic performances by recording original works - a process also known as "scraping". Frequently, Generative AI models have, however, used copyright-protected work on an unauthorised basis.

These processes raise a number of concerns. AI has already displaced jobs and depressed pay rates. Some voice artists, for example, have experienced a significant reduction in corporate narration work since March 2023 - when a number of AI products, (that claim to imitate voice artists, video presenters and actors), were rolled out.

Using AI-generated compositions as background in TV or films could not only oust composers and musicians from the creative process - but would also cost less. Similarly, the NUJ has highlighted how the use of AI to replace parts of creative processes poses a wider risk to visual creators such as photographers, videographers, illustrators and cartoonists. Further, the NUJ has pointed to the important role that journalism plays in the democratic process - pointing out the need for transparency and that a failure to label AI content as such is likely to undermine public trust in it:

<https://www.nuj.org.uk/resource/nuj-briefing---artificial-intelligence--docx.html>
<https://www.nuj.org.uk/resource/artificial-intelligence.html>

A WGGB survey in April 2023 revealed that 65% of its members believed AI would reduce income and 61% feared it would replace jobs. The WGGB has outlined these challenges and risks in "Writers and AI: A policy position": https://writersguild.org.uk/wggb_campaigns/writers-and-ai/. It also raises fears over the generation of harmful content, ("deepfakes").

The MU is calling on the government to publicly state that UK copyright law will be enforced, and to set out how they intend to support that. Equity wants the government to adopt the Beijing Treaty - which would help combat the misappropriation of images, likenesses and performances - see:

<https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/111017/html/>

Compensation is being demanded - as is the option of having such work removed - where copyright-protected work is used on an unauthorised basis. The AUE has called for new legislation to protect artists and creative workers' intellectual property, (<https://www.artistsunionengland.org.uk/a-manifesto-for-artists-and-the-arts/>), and Equity's "AI Vision Statement" summarises the position as follows:

"Going forward, we need the government to step in and ensure that AI system developers and users are held liable for complying with existing legal frameworks, including intellectual property, data protection and privacy laws. As a longer-term priority, we are campaigning for wholesale reform of our intellectual property framework, including new synthesised performance rights, new image rights, and improved moral rights".

The Creators' Rights Alliance has identified a wider risk from AI - in that the arts & culture sector could make a reduced contribution of the UK economy. This amounted to £115.9 billion in 2019. Additionally, it is a core pillar of the UK's national identity is influential in bringing in revenue and investment in other sectors. Allowing AI developers - many of which are based abroad - a "free hand" could undermine the UK creative economy -
see: <https://www.creatorsrightsalliance.org/news>

4. The potential Benefits of AI

Whilst AI, on a "lightly regulated" basis brings serious threats, it can also have potential benefits if it is used in partnership with workers and their unions. Equity has pointed to how it could allow performers to appear in multiple productions around the world across a single period boosting income levels. Similarly, the WGGB have suggested it could allow writers to diversify and increase income streams.

Equity have also raised the possibility of accessibility to the labour market for deaf and disabled performers being improved; enhancing the safety of working as a stunt performer; and aiding dubbing and automated dialogue replacement by matching an actors' mouth and facial movements to the dialogue they are speaking.

December 2024