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Executive Summary

Overview and background

1. The Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS) Heritage Horizons Traineeship programme 2014-16 provided opportunities for 20 non-graduates to take part in a ground-breaking, structured 12-month, work-based training programme which included an SVQ Level 3 qualification in Museums and Galleries Practice. The trainees were paid a tax-free stipend of £15,000.

2. In developing Heritage Horizons, MGS aimed to provide an alternative route of entry into the sector for people who would not otherwise have felt able to pursue or consider a career in the sector, particularly those who had up until that point been unable to take part in degrees, post-graduate study and/or unpaid placements. The programme aimed to address skills gaps in the sector, improve training resources, and diversify the workforce by encouraging applications from non-graduates who would not usually apply for posts in the sector. It was hoped that this would encourage applications from people from as wide a spectrum as possible.

3. Trainees were given the opportunity to undertake roles identified as sector-wide skills gaps, including: collections care and management, digitization, public programming and volunteer development management. The trainees were placed in 17 venues across Scotland with the placements beginning in February 2015 and ending in January 2016.

4. Heritage Horizons contributes to the aims of the Heritage Lottery Fund's £15 million Skills for the Future programme, which funded the initiative. Skills for the Future aims to address skills shortages in the sector and help diversify the workforce by supporting organisations to deliver paid training placements.

5. By enhancing the skills and employability of trainees, and by helping the museums and galleries sector to address skills gaps in the workforce, Heritage Horizons contributes to the aims of the Scottish Government's Economic and Skills Strategies, both of which outline the Government's commitment to enhancing the skills of Scotland's workforce. Heritage Horizons is also consistent with the Scottish Government's Programme for 2016-17, which again acknowledges the importance of workforce skills development, and outlines the Government's support for the museums and galleries sector, pledging support for cultural infrastructure including investment in museums and galleries.

6. Heritage Horizons's aims are consistent with key strategies and workforce issues in the museums and galleries sector, and the Scottish Government's wider priorities, and there was clear evidence of the need for the programme.

Evaluation methodology

7. Blake Stevenson Ltd was commissioned to undertake a summative evaluation of the impact of the programme on individuals (trainees, supervisors, mentors), organisations (host museums, training providers, MGS) and the wider museum/heritage/cultural sectors. The methodology employed for the evaluation included a desk-based literature review and qualitative interviews with trainees, supervisors, mentors, relevant MGS staff and external stakeholders. In addition, we conducted four “deep-dive” visits to host organisations where
we conducted face to face interviews with a range of key relevant individuals in the organisation and trainees where they were still on-site and available.

**Key findings**

8. The programme has had significant impacts on participating trainees. Overall, 79% of those completing the traineeship went on to access employment, which included roles within the museums galleries sector such as supervisory positions, visitor services and digital labelling, and positions in the third sector. In addition, one trainee went on to undertake a Modern Apprenticeship. More broadly, trainees have benefitted from enhanced skills, increased confidence and employability, and the attainment of the newly developed SVQ Level 3 in Museums and Galleries Practice.

9. The payment of a stipend was vital in enabling trainees to participate in the programme. The vast majority of participants told us that they would have been unable to participate without receiving a stipend and it was clear that this was a key contributing factor to achieving the aim of working towards greater diversification within the sector.

10. The new SVQ was of significant value to programme participants who welcomed the opportunity to gain an accredited qualification. The SVQ involved significant time and effort on the part of MGS at the design stage (the SVQ was newly developed for this programme) but has left an important legacy at the end of this programme. We identified examples of host organisations now investigating opportunities for it to be taken forward internally, and a number of opportunities being explored for the SVQ to be implemented by other organisations. It will be important to ensure that sufficient promotion is undertaken to gain maximum benefit from the SVQ moving forward and encourage its use in, and beyond, the sector.

11. The impact of the programme on host organisations was also considerable. The organisations experienced increased short-term capacity and trainees brought fresh insight, skills and experience. As a result, host organisations were able to attract and engage with new audiences, develop their use of new technologies and media and undertake new areas of work.

12. Staff in host organisations also benefited through the broadening of their skills and experience, particularly in relation to management, which in some cases proved challenging (and as such, a valuable learning experience). They also had the opportunity to experience implementing and supporting vocational qualifications and to explore the potential for the SVQ to be further applied in their own organisations to develop staff and volunteers.

13. Some challenges were faced in relation to recruitment, SVQ assessment and dealing with traineeships that did not progress as anticipated, but these were dealt with as they occurred and important lessons have been taken on board for future. The fact that the SVQ was new and the process of SCQF accreditation was still ongoing during the early part of the programme caused some challenges for trainees, host organisations and assessors, and although these were peculiar to this programme there are lessons to be learned for future programmes in terms of operational planning.

14. As with its previous internship programmes, MGS sought to challenge perceptions in the sector with regards to diversification of the workforce. This programme builds on the successes of the previous internship programmes (which created opportunities for graduates to enter the sector through different routes), and offered opportunities to non-graduates to access work experience in the sector. This programme has again contributed to developing new routes into employment in the sector, and has shown how diversifying the workforce can be beneficial to museums and galleries. The scale of this programme means that the extent to which this has happened has largely been limited to those participating...
organisations and a relatively small group of stakeholders who are aware of the programme, but the programme is another strong contribution to the widening access debate and demonstrated that a workforce that offers diversity in terms of skills, background and experience, can make a fresh and significant contribution to the sector.

15. The programme has provided useful learning that can be used to inform a more comprehensive and strategic response to the issues of workforce development and widening access, which will be important for the museums galleries sector to consider in its future strategic planning.

16. It is likely that achieving a more significant shift in the sector’s attitudes towards diversifying the workforce will require a larger scale and more cohesive approach by both MGS and its stakeholders, but that does not detract from the significant achievements of this programme. Moving forward, there is a need for greater synergy in the sector between what its skills needs are, what it can offer to staff in relation to development opportunities, how recruitment practices need to be changed, and for a framework that demonstrates clearly where the SVQ sits in relation to other skills and qualifications needed by the sector.

**Recommendations**

17. Blake Stevenson made 19 recommendations overall, 12 to support the development of similar initiatives and seven strategic recommendations for advancing the legacy of the programme.

18. Recommendations focused on ensuring that participating organisations are fully enabled to engage in the different stages of the programme and that they in turn take advantage of the opportunities made available by MGS in terms of training and information provided. MGS and the sector should build on the opportunities arising from the newly developed SVQ; organisations in the sector should identify ways of widening access to employment by reviewing their recruitment practices and developing their own initiatives. Importantly, MGS and the sector should work together to develop a strategic and comprehensive approach that goes beyond one-off programmes.
1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Introduction

1.1 The Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS) Heritage Horizons Traineeship programme 2014-16 provided opportunities for 20 non-graduates to take part in a “ground-breaking”, structured 12-month, work-based training programme which offered work experience combined with an SVQ Level 3 qualification in Museums and Galleries Practice. Trainees were paid a tax-free stipend of £15,000.

1.2 The selected trainees were placed in 17 museums and galleries across the sector with placements beginning in February 2015 and ending in January 2016.

1.3 Trainees were given the opportunity to undertake roles identified as sector-wide skills gaps, including: collections care and management, digitization, public programming and volunteer development management.

1.4 As the national development body for Scotland’s museums and galleries sector, MGS is instrumental in fostering innovation and sharing good practice within the sector and in ensuring that the sector is in a position to meet current and future needs. This programme builds on two successful internship programmes delivered by MGS in 2011-12 and 2013-14, which offered internship opportunities to people without a post-graduate qualification. The Heritage Horizons traineeship programme sought to take diversification of the workforce a step further by creating opportunities for non-graduates.

1.5 In developing Heritage Horizons, MGS hoped to address skills gaps in the sector, improve training resources, and diversify the workforce by encouraging applications from people without a graduate-level degree and from a diverse range of backgrounds. It aimed to provide an alternative route of entry into the sector for people who would not otherwise have felt able to pursue or consider a career in the sector, particularly those unable to pursue degrees, post-graduate study and/or unpaid placements. The specific aims of Heritage Horizons are listed in Figure 1.1.

---

1.6 Heritage Horizons’ aims of enhancing workforce skills, and developing capacity and diversity within the sector are closely linked issues that have been identified within the sector by key strategies and funding programmes.

1.7 Most notably, the aims of the programme relate directly to Aim 3 of ‘Going Further: The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries’: “empower a diverse workforce to increase their potential for the benefit of the sector and society” and to “share and develop the skills and competencies of all parts of the workforce”\(^2\). The strategy responds directly to challenges recognised within the museums and galleries and broader heritage sectors that relate to:

- the need to increase the quality of work-based training to develop skills in the sector;
- addressing skills gaps and shortages over the long-term;
- increasing the capacity of the sector to deliver training and share good practice; and,
- developing a more diverse and inclusive workforce.

1.8 Heritage Horizons contributes to the aims of the Heritage Lottery Fund’s £15 million Skills for the Future programme, which funded the initiative. Skills for the Future aims to address skills shortages in the sector and help diversify the workforce by supporting organisations to deliver paid training placements.

1.9 As shown in Table 1.1, addressing these issues of diversity and skills development are core to the Heritage Horizons programme and aligned with the aims of the National Strategy and the HLF Skills for the Future programme.

---

Table 1.1: Heritage Horizons Programme aims in relation to HLF Skills for the Future and the National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Horizons Programme Aims</th>
<th>HLF Skills for the Future Outcomes</th>
<th>National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim 1. Provide a high-quality work-based skills development opportunity to a cohort of new non-graduate entrants into the Scottish museums and galleries sector</td>
<td>Outcome 1. Increase range and quality of work-based training to develop skills in the heritage sector.</td>
<td>Aim 1. Maximise the potential of our collections and culture. Aim 2. Strengthen connections between museums, people and places to inspire greater public participation, learning and well-being. <strong>Aim 3. Empower a diverse workforce to increase their potential for the benefit of the sector and beyond.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim 2. Address gaps in core skills in the Scottish museums and galleries sector to meet current and future needs</td>
<td>Outcome 2. Meet identified skills gaps or shortages in the heritage sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim 3. Build the capacity of museum and gallery organisations to provide work-based learning and development</td>
<td>Outcome 3. Increase the capacity of the sector to deliver training and share good practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim 5. Leave a legacy of a more inclusive culture in Scottish museums and galleries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10 Previous research in the sector provides clear evidence of the need for programmes such as this one. The Creative Industries: Focus on Employment, for example, notes that more than half of jobs (58.8%) in the creative economy in 2014 were filled by people with at least a degree or equivalent, compared to 31.8% of all jobs in the UK. In addition, research conducted by MGS found that skills development was one of the top five resource needs, and workforce development and training was one of the top five priority areas for the future identified by representatives of Scottish museums.

1.11 Similarly, the Creative and Cultural Skills Council’s Qualifications Blueprint (2011) acknowledges that the majority of people working in the creative and cultural industries are “overqualified for the specification of their roles”, and “there is a lack of both technical and professional skills within and across sectors of the industry.”

---

1.12 The Cultural Heritage Blueprint – a workforce development plan for the cultural heritage sector in the UK - identified opening up entry to the sector and diversifying the workforce as one of the key challenges of the sector.  

1.13 Heritage Horizons’ aims are also consistent with those of the Scottish Government: to ensure that the workforce in Scotland has the skills that the economy requires, to help people overcome barriers to participating in work; and to support people to move into employment. 

1.14 By enhancing the skills and employability of trainees, and by helping the museums and galleries sector to address skills gaps in the workforce, Heritage Horizons contributes to the aims of the Scottish Government’s Economic and Skills Strategies. The Economic Strategy sets out the Government’s intention to “invest in Scotland’s people at all stages of life to ensure that we have a well-skilled, healthy and resilient population and an innovative, engaged and productive workforce” and to “address long-standing barriers in the labour market so that everyone has the opportunity to fulfil their potential”. The Skills Strategy states that “continuing to develop a highly, relevantly skilled population… is a priority”. This strategy also recognises the importance of supporting employers to assess the skills they will need in the future, and ensuring that the workforce has these skills. Heritage Horizons is also consistent with the Scottish Government’s Programme for 2016-17, which again acknowledges the importance of workforce skills development, and outlines the Government’s support for the museums and galleries sector, pledging support for cultural infrastructure including investment in museums and galleries.

How the traineeship programme worked

1.15 As noted above, the traineeship programme comprised a 12-month, work-based training programme that offered work placements in host museums and galleries across Scotland. In addition, participating trainees were given the opportunity to undertake an SVQ Level 3 qualification in Museums and Galleries Practice and were paid a tax-free stipend of £15,000.

Programme funding

1.16 The Heritage Horizons Programme was funded through the Heritage Lottery Fund’s Skills for the Future Programme.

Traineeship stipend

1.17 Each of the trainees received a £15,000 tax free stipend from MGS. This was considered to be important in encouraging applications from people who could not afford to undertake unpaid volunteering and work experience and/or to do a degree or postgraduate degree which have historically been seen as pre-requisites to gaining entry level jobs in the sector.

---

Payment of a stipend for an extended placement such as this is also consistent with published good practice in relation to the delivery of internships in the UK.

Management and support role of MGS

1.18 MGS had a key role developing and overseeing the implementation of the programme. They had responsibility for designing and developing the SVQ, and for the day-to-day running of the programme.

1.19 MGS delivered a programme of support, learning and networking opportunities for trainees, supervisors and mentors. This included induction sessions and regular contact between trainees, hosts and the Traineeship Programme Manager; regular training events for trainees in Edinburgh; training and action learning sets for supervisors; training for mentors; and three events including a celebratory event at the end of the programme. MGS also facilitated an online network for trainees, allowing them to share information and experiences with each other.

1.20 In addition, MGS was responsible for monitoring and evaluating the learning outcomes of the programme.

1.21 An important component of the traineeship was the opportunity to complete a newly developed SVQ Level 3 in Museums and Galleries Practice. This is described in more detail below.

SVQ Level 3 in Museums and Galleries Practice

1.22 Fourteen trainees completed the SVQ. Those trainees who did not complete the SVQ were early leavers from the programme (except one trainee who completed the placement but did not complete the SVQ qualification).

1.23 MGS appointed a training company, Rewards, to support the trainees to complete the SVQ and to assess and verify the trainees’ evidence which is required to be collected for an SVQ. SVQ Assessors from Rewards met regularly with each trainee and supervisor to map progress against the SVQ units and provided guidance on collating the evidence required.

1.24 To achieve the SVQ Level 3 in Museums and Galleries Practice, candidates had to complete the six mandatory units along with three of the optional units listed in Tables 1.2 and 1.3.

**Table 1.2: SVQ mandatory units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand the Sector in which you Work and the Wider Creative and Cultural Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Responsibility for your Work in a Creative and Cultural Organisation and Self-evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and Implement your Professional Development in the Creative and Cultural Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist Customers, Visitors or Audiences in Getting the Best from their Experience of a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Specific Information on a Collection for a Cultural Heritage Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the Care of Items within a Cultural Venue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.3: SVQ optional units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist with Learning for a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the Organisation of Events and Exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver Community Engagement for a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the Customer, Audience or Visitor Experience of a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for and Deliver Guided Tours for Visitors to Cultural Venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver Interpretation for Exhibitions or Displays for a Creative or Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Objects and Collections within a Cultural Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the Design of Exhibitions and Displays in Cultural Heritage Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the Build of Exhibitions and Displays in a Cultural Heritage Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Cultural Heritage through Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect and Monitor Conservation Needs of Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Maintain Information Systems for a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph Items for Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Online Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Learning Resources for a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Volunteers in a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit and Place Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Organise and Monitor Volunteering Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the Development of Volunteers’ Knowledge, Skills and Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist with Marketing for a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in Securing Funding for a Creative and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recruitment and selection of trainees

1.25 MGS appointed Adopt an Intern (AAI), an organisation that had successfully worked with them on recruitment for previous internship programmes, to manage the recruitment drive and shortlisting process. In order to attract applicants, AAI:

- worked closely with the 17 hosts to develop job specifications for each of the traineeships;
- created a dedicated section of the AAI website to host descriptions of the programme as a whole and the individual traineeships;
- created job adverts and distributed these via various channels including:
  - MGS and Adopt an Intern social media outlets and websites
  - Indeed (a global online recruitment portal)
  - the Jobcentre network
  - targeted adverts on Facebook
  - all universities
  - various specialised museums and galleries online recruitment services
- monitored application numbers on an ongoing basis with targeted promotional activity taking place locally where there had been very few applicants forthcoming.

1.26 MGS and AAI created a basic person recruitment specification to cover the generic needs of the programme, as outlined in Table 1.4.
Table 1.4: Basic person recruitment specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee requirements</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Minimum of three Highers, including English or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graduate</td>
<td>The primary focus of the programme is for non-graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>Demonstrable work based transferrable skills and experience</td>
<td>Some work/volunteer experience within the museum/heritage sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/ empathy</td>
<td>A desire to work in the sector and some demonstrated interest in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or</td>
<td>A period of unemployment or underemployment will not necessarily be viewed as an impediment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Good communication</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working in a team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing own activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to combine work and study towards a qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical skills</td>
<td>Able to use Microsoft Office and communicate by email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to work on own initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional</td>
<td>Aspiration to a career in the museums/heritage sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.27 In total, AAI received 214 applications.

1.28 AAI shortlisted the applicants and selected up to six to be interviewed for each traineeship. The AAI Internship Manager was available for shortlisted candidates to discuss any queries or concerns they had about the interview process.

1.29 In total, 75 candidates took part in 94 interviews with the host organisations (some candidates were interviewed by more than one host organisation) in order to select a trainee for each of the 20 placements.

1.30 In four cases, the host museum’s preferred candidate refused the offer of a traineeship. Where possible, in these instances the host museum offered the traineeship to their second preferred candidate. In two cases, the host museum did not feel that there was a suitable second preferred candidate from the original pool of six interviewees. To fill these two posts, three of these candidates decided to take up another opportunity not connected to Heritage Horizons and one took up a traineeship at another of the host museums.

11 Three of these candidates decided to take up another opportunity not connected to Heritage Horizons and one took up a traineeship at another of the host museums.
AAN contacted all remaining suitable applicants to the programme with an invitation to apply for one of these traineeships.

1.31 For a number of different reasons, five trainees did not complete their traineeship. Two of these were undertaking traineeships related to digital collections, two related to collections and one was a museums trainee. The reasons for non-completion were varied but reasons for leaving did not directly relate to the type of traineeship. We consider reasons for non-completion later in the report.

Host organisations

1.32 Table 1.5 lists the 17 host organisations involved in Heritage Horizons and the nature of traineeship hosted at each organisation.

Table 1.5: Host organisation names and type of traineeship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host organisation</th>
<th>Traineeship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City Council (Aberdeen Maritime Museum)</td>
<td>Curatorial trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders Regimental Trust</td>
<td>Digital Collections Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Heritage Trust (Various Sites)</td>
<td>Learning Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City of Edinburgh Council (Various Sites)</td>
<td>Learning and Programmes Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Life (Various Sites)</td>
<td>Heritage Horizons Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencoe Folk Museum Trust</td>
<td>Digital Skills Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian Transport Museum</td>
<td>Collections Care Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groam House Museum</td>
<td>Museum Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comhairle nan Eilean Siar (Museum nan Eilean)</td>
<td>Exhibitions and Events Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museums Scotland (National Museum of Scotland)</td>
<td>Community Engagement Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Islands Council (Various Sites)</td>
<td>Collections and Interpretation Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council (now Culture Perth &amp; Kinross) (Perth Museum and Art Gallery)</td>
<td>Collections Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews Preservation Trust</td>
<td>Collections and Exhibitions Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders Council (now Live Borders) in partnership with both Tim Stead Trust, and The Trimontium Trust (Various Sites)</td>
<td>Collections and Creative Projects Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Fisheries Museum</td>
<td>Learning and Access Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Maritime Museum</td>
<td>Volunteer Management Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture NL (Summerlee Museum of Scottish Industrial Life)</td>
<td>Visitor Engagement Trainee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.33 Hosts were located across Scotland and as can be seen on the map below, traineeships were offered across a wide range of locations, although we understand that the locations were determined by those organisations who indicated an interest in taking part, rather than by design.
Role of supervisors

1.34 Each host organisation designated a supervisor for their trainee, who was responsible for providing supervision and support. In some organisations the supervisory role was provided by more than one individual.

1.35 MGS was keen that the skills and experience gained by supervisors on the programme would have sustainability beyond the programme period, and it provided supervisors with the opportunity to take part in training, networking and action learning sets for those undertaking the role, although attendance at these was not compulsory.

Mentors

1.36 Trainees were given the opportunity to be matched with a mentor from the museums and galleries sector to provide support with the traineeship and to help the trainees prepare for their post-traineeship career.
1.37 Nine trainees took up the offer of a mentor. All mentors had a strong background in the museums and galleries sector: five from a museums background, one from a galleries background, two work for MGS and one worked for Historic Environment Scotland.

**Purpose of the evaluation**

1.38 In May 2016, MGS commissioned Blake Stevenson Ltd to carry out a summative evaluation of the Heritage Horizons traineeship programme. The aim of the evaluation was to assess the social and economic impact of the programme on individuals (trainees, supervisors, mentors), organisations (host museums, training providers, MGS) and the wider museums/heritage/cultural sectors.

**Evaluation methodology**

1.39 The evaluation methodology we applied is set out below.

1.40 Following the inception meeting with MGS, we reviewed the paperwork related to the programme including programme documentation and reports, host organisation application forms, traineeship job descriptions, and SVQ documentation. This informed the context for the research and the design of the research tools.

Identification of deep-dive host organisations and key stakeholders

1.41 The evaluation team and MGS selected the host organisations to take part in ‘deep-dive’ evaluation visits, as well as key stakeholders for interview. The deep-dive visits were selected carefully to ensure that we collected data in a range of settings. In particular, we selected on the basis of geography, size of host organisations, type of traineeship, and hosts where trainees had both completed and not completed the traineeship.

Deep-dive visits

1.42 We visited four host organisations to undertake ‘deep-dive’ evaluation activity. Table 1.6 identifies the four deep-dive host organisations and the interviews completed at each.

**Table 1.6: Deep-dive visits to host organisations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dundee Heritage Trust                  | • Interview with trainee  
• Interview with supervisor  
• Interview with senior manager  
• Interview with curator |
| National Museums Scotland              | • Interview with trainee (face-to-face interview after the deep-dive visit)  
• Interview with supervisor  
• Interview with supervisor’s line manager  
• Interview with head of service  |
| Perth & Kinross Council Museums & Galleries Service (now Culture Perth & Kinross) | • Interview with supervisor  
• Interview with head of service  |
| St Andrews Preservation Trust          | • Interview with supervisor  
• Interview with Convener of Committee  |
Trainee interviews

1.43 All trainees were given the opportunity to take part in an interview with the evaluation team.

1.44 Ten agreed to take part (eight by telephone, one in person during a deep-dive visit and one trainee from a deep-dive host organisation took part in a face-to-face interview after our visit). Six of the other trainees did not respond to our emails and phone calls, three agreed a time for us to phone them but did not answer our call at the agreed time (and did not respond to further attempts to make contact) and one informed us that they did not want to take part. This meant that we were not able to interview trainees who did not complete the programme, however we were given valuable insight into reasons for non-completion by host museums staff and MGS staff.

1.45 The purpose of these interviews was to gain insight into the experience each of the trainees had whilst undertaking the traineeship, discuss the impact taking part had on them and exploring what they have undertaken since completing the traineeship.

1.46 We designed interview schedules to guide all interviews conducted and these are attached at Appendix 2.

Supervisor interviews

1.47 We interviewed 13 supervisors, nine of whom took part through telephone interviews and the remaining four were interviewed in person during deep-dive visits.

1.48 In addition, we interviewed another five members of staff at three of the deep-dive host organisations, and a convener of the committee at one, as listed in the diagram above.

1.49 These interviews were an opportunity to discuss in depth with the supervisors how successful the traineeship was, the impact of taking part on their organisations and on them personally, and how they expected to sustain any benefits in future. We also discussed with them any challenges they encountered in their role and whether they would be likely to take on a trainee again in future if the opportunity arose. In organisations where the trainee did not complete, we discussed with them the reasons for non-completion and whether anything could have been done differently or would be done in future to mitigate against this happening again.

Mentor interviews

1.50 We conducted interviews with eight mentors, seven by telephone and one face-to-face.

Stakeholder interviews

1.51 We interviewed 12 stakeholders by telephone. The stakeholders, who were selected by MGS, were involved in the programme in a range of different ways including in recruitment, assessment and in a management or strategic role. These included representatives of:

- Adopt an Intern;
- Rewards (Project manager and assessors);
- University of St Andrews;
- MGS (board);
- MGS (staff);
- City of Edinburgh Council;
- Archaeology Scotland;
- National Museums Scotland;
• Scottish Maritime Museum; and,
• Grampian Transport Museum.

1.52 Interview guides for the stakeholder and mentor interviews are contained in Appendix 2.

1.53 We initially planned to hold an event for organisations from the wider museums and galleries sector to discuss the findings from our evaluation and inform our development of recommendations prior to finalising our report. This has not yet taken place, however MGS intends to re-schedule this event at which we will deliver a presentation of our findings.

**Report layout**

1.54 The remainder of this report is set out under the following headings:

• Chapter 2: Programme content, processes and lessons learned;
• Chapter 3: Impact on individuals;
• Chapter 4: Impact on organisations;
• Chapter 5: Impact on the wider museums, galleries and heritage sector;
• Chapter 6: Cost/Benefit Analysis; and
• Chapter 7: Conclusions and recommendations.
2. PROGRAMME CONTENT, PROCESSES AND LESSONS LEARNED

2.1 In this chapter we give an overview of the content of the traineeship programme, the processes put in place to deliver it and the lessons learned. These lessons may inform future delivery of similar programmes and approaches to widening access within the sector.

Application, recruitment and selection process

Motivation for applying

2.2 We explored motivations for taking part in the traineeship programme through our interviews with trainees, who told us that they were keen to gain experience of working in the cultural heritage sector with the aim of finding a job in the sector.

2.3 They were attracted to the traineeship because of their interest in museums, heritage and/or history: “it sounded fantastic... right up my street in terms of the world of museums and art history”. One told us he had experience of volunteering in the museum in which he was placed while another had a particular interest in the specialist facility in which they were placed.

2.4 Some had previously worked in unrelated fields (e.g. digital marketing, housing and the police) and wanted “a complete change” of direction.

2.5 The SVQ attracted trainees to apply because they were keen to have something to show for their work at the end of the traineeship, but this did not seem to be crucial in their decision to take part. A few said that they would still have done it even if there was no SVQ, solely to gain experience of working in the sector: “it helped to have a qualification at the end but [the reason for applying] was more the opportunity to learn and work in a museum”.

2.6 All trainees, except one, said that it was very important that the traineeship was paid and they would not have been able to take part otherwise: “wouldn’t have been able to do it without payment”. Another said she “couldn’t give up a full time job” to do the traineeship without it being paid.

2.7 We understand from supervisors we interviewed that some of the trainees who did not complete their traineeship may have been less motivated by a desire to find work in the sector than those who completed and took part in this research but we are unable to verify this as non-completers were unavailable for interview.

Selection of trainees

2.8 As stated earlier and based on their positive experience for previous internship programmes, MGS opted to outsource the recruitment process to Adopt an Intern.

2.9 We had mixed feedback about how effective this process was. Some hosts were happy with the process, the role of Adopt an Intern and the support they provided, but others were disappointed with the range of applicants offered to them.

2.10 Some host organisations told us that they would have liked to have seen all of the applications and shortlisted themselves. Some supervisors felt that people were shortlisted who should not have been because they were not suited to the work. One said that they had been sent people who were “unemployable”. Adopt an Intern reported “a huge variation in written and presentation skills between applicants”.

2.11 There were also some concerns raised that traineeship opportunities were not advertised through a sufficiently broad range of sources, despite MGS encouraging this. Hosts would
have preferred to use local contacts and advertising methods to reach the right people: “there was not a rich array of candidates”.

2.12 Adopt an Intern reported, however, that they did receive enough applications for most traineeship opportunities apart from a few geographical locations e.g. Fife. Where there were difficulties attracting sufficient numbers of applicants they worked with local hosts in these areas to promote the opportunity through local organisations.

2.13 A combination of location and type of opportunity made some traineeships less popular than others. One interviewee felt that having a longer lead-time for promoting the traineeship might improve the pool of applicants, and enable people to plan ahead financially to take part in the opportunity in future.

2.14 There was a sense among some interviewees that Adopt an Intern was perhaps not experienced enough in recruiting people without a degree or from more diverse backgrounds, and we understand from Adopt an Intern that prior to 2014 their organisation had not undertaken much recruitment with non-graduates. In addition, some interviewees noted that alternative approaches to selection may be worth considering for non-graduates, including considering a range of different interview techniques to enable skills or experience to be demonstrated in different ways.

Selection of type of traineeship

2.15 Trainees were able to rank placements on offer in order of preference, meaning that they could effectively apply for more than one placement (a system which had been used in successfully in previous programmes). Whilst this had clear benefits if one placement was over-subscribed, some hosts reported that this had led to them having to get into “awkward” negotiations with other organisations and “uncomfortable” situations where they knew that their organisation was not the trainee’s first choice and were concerned that the trainee was disappointed and in a placement that did not interest them as much.

2.16 Although one supervisor we consulted thought that not getting their first choice may have eventually contributed to the decision on the part of the trainee to leave the programme early, most trainees we consulted who had not got their first choice of placement were disappointed at first but said they were happy with their placement in the end.

2.17 Trainees noted a range of reasons for selecting their placements. The main reason given was the proximity of the host organisation to their home. Many applicants said they would have been unable to re-locate due to family and other commitments, and due to the cost implications of moving, and were therefore restricted to the opportunity(ies) in their local area. Some also had a personal connection to a particular organisation, for example one said he was keen to work in museums which he had enjoyed visiting as a child and which he enjoys taking his child to, and another had a keen interest in the host museum’s specialism.

Interview process

2.18 A structured and robust interview process was put in place across the participating host organisations to ensure consistency of approach. MGS provided a day’s training on interviewing, although not all hosts took up the training opportunity, and they provided facilitated support and guidance for hosts with the interview process.

2.19 Some hosts felt that even stronger guidance on interview structure and questions would have helped. One opted to use their own competence-based approach (which went against the guidance provided by MGS) and acknowledged in retrospect that this did not work as candidates with little or no experience of the sector found it challenging to provide relevant examples.
Some hosts also observed that it had been difficult to interview trainees without knowing the content of the SVQ and noted that they had to develop the job profile without having sight of the content. However, we were advised by MGS that, although the SVQ was not fully accredited at this stage, information about the content of the SVQ was made available and hosts had already indicated their ability to support specific units in their application forms. Hosts’ comments are likely to be a reflection of their own level of knowledge about SVQs or their expectations about the scope and depth of information required, and are symptomatic of teething problems that might be expected with the introduction of any new system.

One interviewee suggested that it may be beneficial for MGS to consider creating opportunities for people to experience the museums galleries workforce earlier - e.g. whilst still in school - to nurture interest and talent spots.

Induction

MGS advised all hosts that they were required to provide trainees with a comprehensive induction and MGS provided training to hosts to facilitate this to happen and ensure best practice.

Most of the trainees received an induction process that reflected the host organisation’s usual practice. All trainees interviewed (except one who had previously volunteered at the museum and was familiar with the museum’s staff and procedures) received some form of induction although this does not seem to have been as structured or formal as MGS had recommended. Mostly it seems to have involved being introduced to key people, a tour of premises and basic health and safety training. Some hosts noted the value of having to develop an induction process which their organisation had not previously had in place.

We heard of a number of examples of good induction processes in place, for example in one organisation a trainee was asked to give a presentation to different teams in the organisation to explain what they were doing and to promote their role.

SVQ

An SVQ 3 in Museums and Galleries practice was an integral part of the traineeship programme. The SVQ, which was developed specifically for this programme, was created by combining relevant elements from across existing National Occupational Standards to give a vocational route for the museums sector in Scotland. This was an extensive process and involved significant input from MGS staff ahead of the traineeship programme starting. The traineeship programme was seen as the first opportunity (and the trigger) for offering the SVQ but the intent within MGS was for the SVQ to be available beyond this programme to a range of organisations in the sector.

The SVQ was important for a number of reasons – in addition to providing an accredited qualification for trainees participating in this particular programme, it addressed a need for skills in the sector that were not fully reflected in pre-existing qualifications and it “gave the sector something to own”. One member of staff in MGS described it as “addressing a desire for a vocational pathway into the heart of the sector”.

All trainees who completed the programme, except one, attained the SVQ qualification. (The one trainee who did not complete the qualification had moved into full-time employment and did not have time available to complete the qualification within the lifetime of the programme.)

Feedback about the process of undertaking the SVQ and its benefits was overwhelmingly positive. The SVQ helped to provide a focus for the traineeship, and supervisors and trainees
alike indicated that it was positive for trainees to have an accredited qualification at the end of the programme, particularly as some lacked post-school qualifications.

2.29 As previously noted, the SVQ only seemed to be a deciding factor for a minority of people applying to the programme but trainees across the board valued the skills development opportunity this provided.

2.30 The SVQ did not start until trainees were some two months into the programme which was unavoidable due to the amount of work and length of time that the SCQF accreditation process took. This resulted in the amount of time available to the trainees to complete the qualification being less than had been anticipated at the outset, which made a few trainees feel under pressure to complete, and meant that some opportunities for producing evidence for the SVQ were missed initially and had to be uploaded onto the OneFile system later (after registration was complete). Whilst unfortunate, this was clearly a one-off situation resulting from the development process which would not occur again in future.

2.31 Trainees and supervisors had mixed views of OneFile, the online system for logging evidence for the SVQ. Some trainees took a while to get used to it, while others were comfortable using it once they knew what they were doing. One trainee noted that the assessor was as unfamiliar with it as she was so the trainee had to work it out herself. Supervisors tended to be less comfortable or have less to do with the system and this was at least in part due to familiarity with the use of technology. As previously noted, host organisations were located across Scotland. As some were located quite remotely, having remote access via the system was highlighted to us as an important and necessary feature of the assessment process.

2.32 The SVQ and all that it entailed in terms of processes was challenging for some host organisations at first, especially smaller museums, but once properly up and running all those we consulted reported being comfortable using the system.

2.33 Feedback across the board was positive in relation to the content of the SVQ with hosts reporting that it contained all of the core elements it needed to at basic level, and all hosts consulted reported that it tied in with the needs of their organisation.

2.34 In undertaking the SVQ, trainees had to select modules. Most trainees reported that their hosts gave them the opportunity to choose the modules they wanted to work on. However, one trainee said that their supervisor chose the units for them because they had a clearer understanding of which modules were most appropriate to the work she would undertake, and in addition we heard of a number of instances of discussions about module selection between trainee and supervisor to ensure that the trainee would be able to evidence their work.

2.35 Some trainees selected modules that were very similar. This made it easier in terms of the evidence they had to gather, but limited the range of experiences they were exposed to. One supervisor noted that they thought it might have been beneficial to have sub-groups of elective modules that forced trainees to take part in a wider range of experiences, but we understand that SQA guidance specifies that units cannot be grouped in this way.

2.36 A small number of trainees found the work required to undertake the SVQ overwhelming - "how on earth am I going to cover this?!", and some said that it was difficult to find evidence related to some aspects of the SVQ. For example, one interviewee said it was difficult to gather evidence related to marketing because the museum she was working at was closed for refurbishment. Another said it was difficult to gather evidence related to changing policy because this was a difficult thing to do in local authority-run organisations, particularly at the level of trainees. It was easier for trainees in some organisations than those in others to have sufficient opportunities to gather evidence and the selection of options had to reflect that.
2.37 Most hosts thought that the paperwork involved was manageable but, as noted, for some smaller organisations it was challenging initially, until systems were better understood and established.

Level of qualification

2.38 The level at which the SVQ is delivered (Level 3) was regarded by those we consulted as appropriate and reflecting the level and nature of work the trainees were undertaking. Some trainees were identified by their assessor and/or supervisor as being more than capable of undertaking a Level 4 qualification, however, a Level 4 SVQ includes a management component that some of the host organisations would have had difficulty in supporting.

2.39 One trainee noted that she was part way through an Open University degree prior to taking up the traineeship opportunity and that had the SVQ on offer been a Level 4 SVQ, this would have counted towards her degree but this higher level of qualification would not have been appropriate for all trainees.

2.40 One supervisor observed that having a higher level SVQ could be useful for graduates as an alternative to doing a Master’s degree.

Future application of the SVQ

2.41 One of the aspirations in developing the SVQ, was that it would be able to be offered to other individuals and organisations beyond those involved in the traineeship programme. Early indications suggest that there is some interest in this.

2.42 One organisation consulted was considering opportunities to make the SVQ available to volunteers in future, and lessons learned from using the SVQ in this way may be of interest to other organisations. We understand from MGS that other organisations are also looking at ways in which they could use the SVQ internally and that MGS is able to help facilitate this process.

Role of supervisors

2.43 Most supervisors were relatively hands-off when it came to the SVQ, although not all. Some did comment on a need for additional and timely training about the SVQ and would have liked more support from Rewards on this.

2.44 A key component of completing an SVQ is the collection of evidence of skills learned and this can be evidenced via witness testimony (from a suitable museum professional with knowledge of the skill being assessed). The requirement to have these “expert witnesses” caused occasional problems if the supervisors could not fulfil this role, and we heard of instances where the trainees had to pursue statements from expert witnesses elsewhere in the organisation retrospectively, however overall trainees reported being well supported to gather the necessary evidence.

Assessment

2.45 Trainees and supervisors gave mixed feedback about the support they received from Rewards. Some reported good experiences and noted that they had been helpful but others felt the advice they offered was generic and showed a lack of understanding of the museums sector. Whilst it was understood that this was due to the SVQ having been newly developed, it did cause some challenges for hosts and trainees.

2.46 We also heard of instances of lateness in marking, vague instructions and comments, and a sense that the Rewards assessors were not as well prepared as they should have been.

2.47 One trainee observed that her assessor did not mark work frequently enough, and on a number of occasions marked work face-to-face when she had a meeting with the trainee,
cutting into the time available for other discussion. This trainee also had to push the assessor at the end to tell her if she had any gaps in her work and then had only limited time available to complete it.

2.48 Rewards assessors seemed in some cases to look at SVQ evidence in isolation and whilst this may have been strong, it did not necessarily give any indication of how effectively the trainee was undertaking the traineeship. Hosts noted with some frustration that Rewards assessors did not seem to try to find out if the trainee was performing well otherwise, which in some cases they were not. For hosts, there was some lack of clarity about role-boundaries – one host, for example, could not understand how their trainee, with whom they were having complex absenteeism and performance issues, was perceived by the assessor to be succeeding because they were meeting the requirements of the SVQ. It may be helpful in future to have further clarity about role definitions at the outset, in order that expectations are realistic on all sides.

Stipend

2.49 The stipend, which amounted to £15,000 (tax free) was a crucially important element of the traineeship and was critical to almost all trainees’ decisions to apply to take part. The level of the stipend was set at the same level as in the previous internship programmes that MGS had run, and was intended to enable participants to cover living costs. This was an important means of ensuring equality of access to the traineeship opportunity.

2.50 Trainees emphasised the importance of receiving the stipend. For example, one trainee had been working part-time and increased her hours to full-time to enable her to take part in the programme. This meant she incurred additional childcare costs, which would have been impossible to meet without a stipend. (The issue of childcare costs and whether these could be met outwith the stipend may be worth consideration for future programmes of this nature, to ensure equality of access).

2.51 It should be noted that the trainees undertook “real” work whilst based in the host organisation, which added value to the organisation – and for some trainees, gave them reassurance that their contribution had justified the stipend being paid. One trainee, for example, noted that the level of work she was undertaking during her traineeship was of high value to the organisation and so the payment of the stipend felt commensurate with the work.

2.52 The stipend was paid quarterly and we heard from some supervisors that this had made budgeting challenging for some trainees (although we understand that in exceptional circumstances MGS arranged for the payment pattern to be changed). In addition, the first payment to trainees was not made until two months into the programme which meant that some had a cash-flow issue in the interim period. A number of hosts indicated that they thought that monthly payments would be preferable in future and could also discourage non-attendance in situations where the traineeship was not progressing smoothly.

2.53 Some issues were raised in relation to the value of the stipend being broadly similar to the salary of “qualified” staff supervising some of the trainees which caused some degree of resentment on the part of paid staff, which was an issue raised during the evaluation of the first internship programme MGS delivered, and highlights yet again the issue of low pay in the sector.
2.54 Supervision

Each trainee had a named supervisor who supported them throughout the traineeship. Trainees noted the value of having this support and it seems to have been a core component of the successful delivery of the traineeship programme. “You need a point of contact and someone to guide you through the process week by week”.

2.55 Most trainees reported highly valuing their supervisors’ inputs and advice, and only a small number had encountered challenges. We heard of one or two instances of trainees feeling that their supervisor was too busy to support them adequately and commented that their traineeship lacked sufficient structure resulting in them having to seek out opportunities for tasks themselves, rather than having a structured programme of work to follow or project to work on, but these examples were in the minority.

2.56 One trainee was left without a supervisor when their original supervisor went on sick leave and then left for another job. However, the trainee reported this situation to MGS who “got things back on track” by speaking to the host organisation which responded by appointing another supervisor for the trainee.

2.57 Supervisors commented on the additional demands placed upon them in undertaking this role but all felt that it was worth it for the benefits to the trainee and the organisation. On a personal level they often gained valuable experience of line management, which had for some been a driver for wanting to undertake the supervisor role at the outset.

2.58 Supervisors spoke positively of the opportunities for training that they received through and from MGS. One supervisor felt that the training inputs were frontloaded and would have preferred to have training staggered more, but most were very satisfied with the training they received.

MGS inputs

2.59 Overall, MGS was viewed as being very supportive and the programme well organised. MGS provided ongoing support to trainees, mentors, and supervisors for the duration of the traineeship programme, through Ailsa Macfarlane and her predecessor.

2.60 Trainees were very positive about MGS, describing MGS staff as “very helpful... running and co-ordinating everything” and “very responsive”. Another trainee said she was “always well looked after and helped” by MGS.

2.61 Mentors and supervisors also commented favourably about the support provided to trainees by MGS. Most reported being very satisfied with MGS’s support.

2.62 There was a sense however that when problems arose MGS could have been quicker to assist and to resolve the situation, and MGS staff themselves noted the lessons they have learned from this experience. This particularly related to management of trainees whose attendance was erratic due to a range of reasons, in different organisations. Some of the participating museums/galleries were very small organisations with one member of staff who up until supervising a trainee had had little or no experience of personnel management issues. Dealing with these issues through the traineeship programme was a big learning curve for some of them, and they may have benefited from more guidance and advice from MGS in relation to these issues. MGS staff are already considering how they may provide additional support for these issues in any similar future programme.

2.63 Some further uncertainties arose in relation to the employment status of the trainees. Whilst MGS was the organisation which had an agreement in place with the trainee, the hosts were advised to treat them as an employee although they did not have that legal status. This led
to uncertainty for hosts in dealing with challenging situations, for example in determining the relevance and validity of procedures that should be followed.

**Mentoring**

2.64 As previously noted, each trainee was offered the opportunity to have a mentor to support them during the traineeship, which most took up. The mentor role was intended to be significantly different to that of the supervisors, giving the trainees opportunities to tap into the wider knowledge and networks of their mentor, in order to explore opportunities for future development and employment.

2.65 It should be noted that all mentors appointed undertook the role in a voluntary capacity, with travel expenses able to be claimed.

2.66 Most mentors indicated that they would have liked to have been appointed earlier in the process, for example by the end of the first quarter. They felt that this would have given more time for face-to-face contact which would have strengthened the mentor-mentee relationship. One felt she needed to be in place earlier than the last three months of the programme in order to make a difference.

2.67 Some participating mentors felt that MGS did not explain the purpose of the mentoring programme clearly enough or clearly define the mentor role – for some it felt “added on”. Mentors felt that there was a need for a clearer explanation of what was expected of them and that more structure may be helpful. However, in response to feedback on the previous internship programmes, MGS did offer a day’s training for mentors (which few took up, however) and provided documentation including a mentorship agreement. There may be value in considering making attendance at mentor training/induction a compulsory element of becoming an MGS mentor for future programmes, to ensure that there is a consistent understanding of what is intended within the role, and to ensure that mentors take full advantage of the information and advice being provided by MGS, leading to a robust mentoring offer for trainees.

2.68 There was not a high uptake of mentoring among trainees and this could reflect a lack of understanding about the benefits, but it also seems to have been due to timing and some trainees being happy with the support they were receiving from their supervisor and not seeing the need for mentor support. This suggests they were not completely clear about the different nature of support that might have been forthcoming from a mentor and is potentially a missed opportunity. There may be value in considering how future trainees on programmes of this nature could be more actively encouraged to take up such an opportunity. One option could be to make the mentoring support a compulsory element of taking part.

2.69 The mentoring was left relatively unstructured and could be determined by individual mentors. This clearly suited some mentors but may have been insufficient for less experienced mentors. In order to address this, MGS could, for example, be more prescriptive about the frequency and content of meetings, and consider having some reporting element built into the process. One person asked if there was any monitoring by MGS of the quality of mentoring and while we are not aware of any such checks currently (other than what might come through the programme’s broader reporting processes), this may be worth consideration for the future.

2.70 Mentors usually met their trainee once or twice in person but most communication took place by phone and/or email. Sometimes this was by necessity, e.g. where the mentor was based a long way from the mentee, sometimes it was because the mentor and/or mentee were too
busy to meet, and sometimes it was because the mentee’s needs were able to be met by phone and email contact.

2.71 One trainee felt that the mentoring relationship would have been more beneficial if there had been more face-to-face contact but this was not possible due to the physical distance between the mentor and mentee and because the mentor had an unexpectedly busy time in her own work.

2.72 Some mentors reported that their mentees did not need significant support and what they did need seemed to focus around career progression, job hunting, provision of useful contacts, CV tips etc. This also reflected in the views of trainees we interviewed. One mentor felt that “the mentees were less keen on the mentoring than the mentors”. He had to chase his mentee for contact. Another commented that the mentee’s schedule was very tight in the later stages of the programme “so mentoring went on the back burner”. The late start of the SVQ may have compounded this situation.

2.73 MGS put in significant effort to ensure that mentors/mentees in this programme were well matched, and put in place support for both the mentors and mentees, which are important components of an effective mentoring offer. However, inevitably the success of mentoring relationships can be affected by external factors outwith the control of the programme – including the level of priority placed on the mentoring component by both mentor and mentee.

2.74 The programme is another positive step towards encouraging a culture of mentoring and has had a positive effect on wider thinking in relation to mentoring and what it can offer – for example, one mentor called for more mentoring of individuals to take place across the sector as a whole, and others also emphasised that collaborative relationships should be encouraged more widely. It should be noted that museum-level mentoring is available for museums across the sector which do not have a professional member of staff through Accreditation.

**In-house training/ MGS training**

2.75 Trainees had the opportunity to take part in a series of in-house training courses. MGS put in place a programme of training which took place at key points throughout the period of the traineeship but, in addition, some of the trainees were given the opportunity to take part in other training opportunities within their host organisation, or organised by their host.

2.76 Trainees reported that most of this was very relevant and interesting, for example training on care of collections. Other courses were seen as being less useful, for example, those trainees employed by local authorities had to undertake basic training including health and safety and lifting and handling, and whilst they recognised that these were necessary and often standard for employees in the sector, they did not necessarily find these as relevant.

2.77 We were told of a number of good examples of trainees having access to additional training that was offered to host organisation staff during their placement, on topics such as Photoshop and working with people with dementia, which they welcomed.

**MGS training**

2.78 MGS delivered a series of six training events in Edinburgh for trainees. These covered a variety of topics related to working in the museums and galleries sector including caring for collections, using social media, marketing, project management, leadership and community engagement.

2.79 Most were positive about the MGS training and said that it helped them to learn new skills related to the sector. They also valued the opportunity it gave them to meet and share
experiences with other trainees, although at least one trainee noted that time to do so either side of the training itself was sometimes limited due to travel time.

2.80 Some interviewees noted that some of the training was not relevant to the demands of their specific traineeship but generally they valued the opportunity to learn more about different aspects of the industry, even if the training was not directly relevant to their traineeship.

2.81 Delivering the training in Edinburgh did cause some challenge for the trainees based further afield. One trainee suggested that more could have been done online to save travel time, and another suggested that some of the training could have taken place in some of the larger host organisations which would have had the additional benefit of enabling trainees to experience another host organisation.

**MGS events**

2.82 MGS ran three events during the programme: a launch event to introduce the programme; a careers event midway through the programme which provided advice on career development for trainees, an opportunity to meet potential mentors, and training for mentors; and a celebratory event for trainees and hosts to showcase their work and share experiences.

2.83 The events were regarded positively and were seen as useful for networking with other trainees and managers from other museums. Trainees noted that the first event held to introduce the programme was useful for meeting other trainees and “finding my bearings”.

2.84 Trainees also enjoyed the celebratory event at the end of the traineeship programme. They described it as a “nice send-off” and “good to see what others did”. It also provided an opportunity to raise the profile of the programme and the sector with government ministers.
3. **IMPACT ON INDIVIDUALS**

3.1 In this chapter we explore the impact that the traineeships had on trainees, mentors and supervisors individually. The impact on organisations and MGS is outlined in later chapters.

3.2 Heritage Horizons aimed to address skills gaps in the sector, improve training resources, and diversify the workforce.

3.3 Specifically, the programme aimed to provide a high-quality, work-based skills development opportunity to a cohort of new non-graduate entrants into the Scottish museums and galleries sector.

3.4 Applications were encouraged from a diverse range of people (and nets were cast wide in relation to recruitment to ensure the opportunity was seen by as wide a range of people as possible), and the programme was targeted solely at non-graduates, in contrast to previous internship programmes run by MGS which targeted graduates.

3.5 Statistics collected by MGS show that of the 214 applicants:
- 65% were female, and 35% were male
- 65% were aged between 18 and 30 years
- 50% of people applying were from families where neither parent has a degree.

3.6 Of the 20 people who were selected to take part:
- 60% were female, and 40% were male
- 75% were aged between 18 and 30 years
- 45% came from families where neither parent has a degree.

**Impact on trainees**

3.7 Overall, the programme has been of significant benefit to those who took part. All of the trainees we consulted were overwhelmingly positive about their experience and found their placement beneficial.

3.8 Most trainees were very positive about the MGS traineeship and said that it helped them to develop sector-specific skills. It also allowed them to meet and share experiences with other trainees. All agreed that they would not have had the opportunity to develop these skills in the museums and galleries sector without this sort of traineeship programme. One trainee said the traineeship “benefitted me in a big way”, another said he “learned an awful lot over the year”, and another commented that it was “a really rewarding year”.

3.9 Below we outline their experience of the different components of the programme.

**Experience in their host organisations**

3.10 Trainees we interviewed were mostly very positive about their host organisations. They reported being able to gain valuable insight into the sector and gain hands-on experience. They also reported feeling well supported working on their projects. For example, one trainee said that everyone at the host organisation was very supportive, another said he felt part of the team, and another said that she “couldn’t have asked for a better place to go - fab”. One trainee noted that any training offered to staff in the host organisation was also open to her. This made the trainee feel included as part of the team as well as giving an opportunity to develop skills and knowledge.
3.11 Where there was criticism it was minimal and related to the nature of some of the tasks they were asked to do, or a sense that their traineeship lacked structure with no programme of work to follow or project to work on. For example, one noted that it felt like he was “punted a job nobody else wanted to do” and another said that some of the tasks she was given seemed pointless and this was “soul destroying”. Although this does not seem to have happened in many cases, it emphasises the importance of host organisations being able to offer trainees a meaningful experience.

The SVQ

3.12 The introduction of an SVQ was a significant milestone for MGS in its steps towards encouraging a more diverse workforce and through this research we sought to establish whether the SVQ was a valued component of the traineeship for the trainees who were the first to experience it. Feedback in this regard was very positive.

3.13 Trainees identified the achievement of an SVQ qualification as a key benefit of the traineeship, and for some it was an important factor in their decision to apply for the traineeship. Trainees described having the qualification as providing them with “something to show” for completing the traineeship and a qualification which “could be useful in the future”. For instance, one trainee told us he was particularly pleased to gain the SVQ because it enhanced his CV, which previously only included qualifications he had achieved at school. Another trainee said that it was “good to have the qualification”, and a different trainee said that the traineeship “gives you an insight into the job” and the SVQ provides “a qualification to go with it”.

3.14 Most trainees found the process of completing the SVQ very manageable and received the support they needed for all elements of it. However, some trainees found the SVQ challenging including feeling that the evidence requirements for some of the SVQ units was unclear because the wording was vague; one feeling overwhelmed by the tasks set; some having difficulties using the OneFile system, and some finding the support from Rewards inadequate.

3.15 As most of the concerns largely arose as a result of the SVQ being new, or reflected the experiences of a small number of trainees, they are unlikely to be a significant concern in any future programme. They are, however, useful pointers for future programme planning purposes, particularly for those aimed at similar groups with less experience of post-school education and qualifications.

Outcomes for trainees

Improved skills, experience and prospects of finding employment in the sector in the future

3.16 Trainees felt that the traineeship provided insight, skills and experience which will improve their prospects of finding a job in the sector.

3.17 The programme allowed trainees to increase their knowledge and understanding of how the sector works. As one said, it provided “a real insight” into how museums work. Others told us they had learned about new types of jobs that they were unaware of before – for example, one trainee, who had been doing an Open University degree in Art History, was given a traineeship in the community engagement team at their host organisation and had been unaware of this sort of work previously but now would like to pursue it. This increased understanding of the sector will be beneficial to trainees when applying for jobs in the sector.

3.18 Trainees were mostly very positive about the training they received from MGS and host organisations. They told us they developed a range of soft and sector-specific skills related to working in museums and galleries including:
• personal organisation;
• customer service;
• project management;
• marketing;
• risk assessment;
• caring for collections;
• planning educational events;
• handling objects;
• leading guided tours;
• using Photoshop; and
• using social media.

3.19 There is no doubt that these skills will strengthen the trainees’ chance of finding work in the sector in the future, and accrediting these skills through the SVQ qualification is an excellent means of enabling the trainees to evidence their skills to prospective future employees.

3.20 The experience also gave trainees a chance to demonstrate their ability to work in the sector. As one said, it was a chance to “show people what you’re capable of” and to “demonstrate that I can work”. The traineeship gives trainees solid evidence of their experience, abilities and achievements in the sector. This, together with the skills and qualification gained through the traineeship, will undoubtedly strengthen their CVs and give them high quality experience to cite in job applications in future.

3.21 Some information was available to us in relation to destinations of trainees since the traineeships have completed. Of those trainees where the destination is known:

- Eleven are in employment, nine of whom are working in museums, galleries, tourism, and arts and heritage organisations, including one of whom is hoping to be accepted to university to study archaeology
- One person is volunteering in a historic building
- One person is undertaking a Modern Apprenticeship
- One person is unemployed.

Improved confidence

3.22 Trainees commented on the “confidence boost” that the traineeship gave them, particularly in terms of their ability to work in the sector. One said that it “gave me more confidence in what I was doing” and another said the experience provided “much more confidence in terms of looking for jobs and in job interviews”. A supervisor described the impact on one trainee as “transformational” in this respect.

Networking

3.23 Trainees found the networking opportunities provided by the traineeship beneficial. They gave them an opportunity to meet professionals working in the host organisation and in other organisations and noted the value of this for future potential employment opportunities and in making contacts for general support or advice in the future.

3.24 Trainees also enjoyed networking with each other and sharing their experiences and some would have liked to have more opportunities to do so.
3.25 One said the “networking opportunities were almost invaluable”.

Legacy of the traineeship for trainees

3.26 Twenty trainees started the programme of whom fourteen completed it. Of these, employment destinations are known for twelve.

3.27 Of these eleven, nine have gone on to use their skills working in museums, galleries, tourism, and arts and heritage organisations. Another is working for a charity in volunteer management which reflects their learning on the programme and another has gone back to their role prior to undertaking the traineeship but at a promoted level and is doing freelance work for their host organisation. One person has gone on to take up a modern apprenticeship in an unrelated field and another is working in the field of homelessness.

3.28 Four trainees we interviewed had been employed by their host organisation after their traineeship ended, but all of these posts were advertised externally and the trainees competed against external candidates to be awarded the post. One became Assistant Steward at one of the museums where her traineeship was based. Another was retained by the host organisation because they said he was “too good to lose” and he has since been promoted to a managerial position. The third returned to full-time home care immediately after the traineeship but has recently been appointed as a Visitor Assistant at the museum which hosted the traineeship. The fourth trainee is undertaking freelance work for the host organisation, which was competitively tendered.

3.29 These trainees feel that the traineeship was critical in gaining employment in the sector following the traineeship. One said the experience was “fundamental” in getting her the job because it allowed her to get to know the staff at the museum. Another felt it was very important because now “the team know what I’m capable of” and it “gave me an insight into the job and a qualification to go with it”, which “gave me a head start” on the other applicants.

3.30 Some of the other trainees we spoke to have not found work in the sector to date following their participation in the programme. In some cases trainees failed to secure an interview for advertised posts in their host organisations and we understand that this is because they still lacked experience or qualifications compared to other applicants to the posts, though organisational fit may also have been a factor. Other barriers identified by trainees include a lack of opportunities in the sector in their local area.

3.31 Those we spoke to who have not found work have been disappointed that their expectations have not been fulfilled. Whilst this is understandable, it is also early days (the programme only completed in January 2016 and research interviews took place in May/June 2016) and it is reasonable to assume that they may yet be successful in gaining work in the sector. However, there remain barriers to non-graduates gaining employment in competition with very qualified graduates and we explore this issue later in the report.

3.32 Despite this, these trainees still felt that, overall, the experience gained through the traineeship was positive. Most felt better-placed to find a job in the sector than they did prior to taking part and some noted that the experience had a positive impact on their career even if they have not found work in the museums and galleries sector. For example, one trainee who recently started a Modern Apprenticeship in Business Administration at a legal practice felt that, although this is not in the museums and galleries sector, the experience was important in finding this job because it gave her examples of her experience to refer to in her interview for the position.

3.33 All but one of the completing trainees also successfully gained their SVQ.
3.34 It is also important to note that five trainees did not complete their traineeship. We were unable to speak to these trainees, despite inviting them to take part in an interview, so are unable to reflect their reasons for leaving the programme more fully. We were told, however, by MGS and their host organisations that a range of different health issues were the main reason for drop out.

3.35 One trainee noted that, although she has not remained in employment in the sector following her traineeship, the major legacy for her is that the traineeship prompted her to move from central Scotland to the Western Isles. She said the traineeship “brought me to where I feel I belong”.

Impact on supervisors

3.36 The supervisors we interviewed all had a high regard for the programme and felt it had been of value to participants, hosts and staff alike, even in situations where the traineeship had been challenging to deliver and the trainee left early.

3.37 The programme presented an opportunity for some supervisors to gain experience of managing a staff member for the first time. Supervisors also welcomed the opportunity “to get things done” by being able to implement projects that they would not otherwise have been able to resource and some also learned from the trainees e.g. in relation to social media.

3.38 For some supervisors the amount of time they spent managing the trainee came as a surprise. Particularly in the smaller organisations, supervisors had underestimated the amount of time and energy that they would have to input to supporting the traineeship, and this is an important lesson to share with future prospective supervisors.

3.39 Some supervisors found handling difficult situations with the trainee a real challenge. Although supervisors appreciated the support provided by MGS, as previously stated, some would have liked more guidance from MGS on how to deal with difficult personnel matters.

3.40 Poor/difficult experiences with a trainee on occasion affected the supervisor’s own motivation levels. One supervisor described the experience as “distressing” though it also resulted in them gaining valuable experience of managing difficult workplace situations.

3.41 Not all supervisors participated in the action learning sets which were offered to supervisors as part of the programme but those who did felt they were useful and that they benefitted from the opportunity to meet and talk with colleagues. One supervisor found the language/terminology challenging at first but gradually became used to it.

3.42 The extent to which these meetings could be regarded as formal action learning sets is perhaps questionable. In reality they seemed to be more of an opportunity for supervisors to come together informally and were facilitated in a way that suited members of the group. Supervisors welcomed the opportunity to meet with colleagues from other facilities.

3.43 Although, as noted earlier, some supervisors had said that they would have liked more guidance with interviewing, those supervisors who had attended the training that MGS provided for supervisors on recruitment, delegation etc. described the training as “excellent” and particularly helpful for those new to the role.

3.44 As noted earlier, the issue of low pay in the sector was raised again as it had been during the evaluation of the previous Interns programme. There were instances where some supervisors noted that they earned very little more after tax than their trainee, despite their levels of qualification and experience, and some noted that the stipend had caused a degree of discontent among colleagues because it was paid at a level similar to what they earned.
Impact on mentors

3.45 Mentors gave very positive feedback about their experiences of the programme overall.

3.46 They reported that it had resulted in useful learning for the sector about how non-graduates can contribute, but most felt that this particular programme had been too small scale to have any significant impact on its own. Some felt that this sort of programme needs to be delivered on a far larger scale, a view echoed by other stakeholders. It was also seen as a way of developing the workforce and engaging people in the sector.

3.47 There were clear personal benefits to participating mentors (“It makes me feel good about myself”) and they welcomed the opportunity to give something back and to play a part in supporting the sector. “It’s nice to continue to develop other people. I would have valued this opportunity earlier in my career, and so I like to support others now.” Another commented that it “gave me an opportunity to reflect on my own career and what I could do differently”.

3.48 Mentors valued the MGS training, especially when new to mentoring. One who had never mentored before found it really useful especially in terms of setting expectations and boundaries. She enjoyed meeting some trainees and other mentors too. “Felt prepared after receiving it”.
4. IMPACT ON ORGANISATIONS

4.1 Seventeen host organisations participated in the traineeship programme, ranging from very small organisations with one employee and a volunteer board, to large organisations such as National Museums Scotland with some 500 members of staff.

4.2 In this chapter we discuss the impact of Heritage Horizons on the participating host organisations.

4.3 Potential host organisations were identified as any organisation that runs at least one Accredited Museum in Scotland. They were all invited to apply to host a trainee via a submission of an application to MGS. In this application they were asked to specify which type of traineeship they were interested in supporting and how many places they were able to offer. MGS selected the successful host organisations based on this. In addition, in one instance the organisation already had an individual volunteering who fitted the criteria and when a place arose the facility was invited to apply, which they did so successfully.

4.4 This chapter also considers the impact of the programme on MGS as an organisation.

Impact on host organisations

4.5 Host organisations chose to participate in the programme for the following reasons:

- To increase capacity within the team or service (short-term);
- To develop areas of work;
- To bring in new skills, particularly digital expertise;
- Interest in attracting a different sort of person with a more practical approach and experience;
- Line management was seen as a development opportunity for the supervisor to gain experience of managing people in museums with one or only a few staff who otherwise had no way of gaining this experience;
- Fit with broader approach and commitment to widening access (audience and volunteers/employees);
- Wanting to support the initiative; and,
- Previous positive experience of similar schemes.

4.6 These reasons translated into real benefits for the organisations, particularly in increasing capacity, albeit short-term, and bringing in new skills and energy. All participating organisations said they would be involved in a similar programme again, even where they had experienced some challenges and the trainee had withdrawn from the programme, which is a very significant finding.

4.7 The types of benefits that the host organisations articulated were varied, depending on the size of the organisation and the nature of the traineeship. The impacts included impact on capacity, staff, systems and processes, and organisation’s culture. We explore each of these in turn below.

Impact on capacity

4.8 The trainees were able to make a real contribution to the work of the facility, creating temporary exhibitions, cataloguing objects, developing links with the wider community and developing projects, for example with non-English speaking groups. This created additional
capacity and meant that in some facilities the organisation was able to take its work in new directions. Some trainees were able to bring an interest and skills in social media and digital access which was of particular use.

4.9 Having a trainee in a larger establishment also allowed the host team to raise awareness of their role among colleagues and of the museum to wider audiences where the traineeship involved community engagement, education and outreach.

4.10 A number of host museums, particularly those with only one member of staff, had to acquire new IT equipment, desks etc. for their trainee. Smaller museums were eligible for a Purchase Fund Grant to assist with purchasing these items – these costs were not met through the Heritage Horizons programme.

4.11 One supervisor reported that having an additional trainee meant that she had the capacity to plan for more challenging events than she normally would have. However, in practice her trainee was absent for some of the scheduled events and that made her realise that she could actually manage them herself and subsequently since the trainee left is now bolder about the types of events she arranges.

4.12 However, hosts raised concerns about not being able to sustain the activities undertaken by the trainee beyond the period of the traineeship. Inevitably, where increasing capacity had had a significant positive impact on the host organisations, losing this additional capacity again impacted on services, and in some organisations, morale.

Impact on host organisation staff

4.13 We frequently heard that in providing support and working with the trainees, staff in host organisations were “forced to reflect on their own practice”.

4.14 Some of the participating host museums reported to us that having a trainee brought a new dynamic to their facilities, noting that they brought new and fresh ideas. “Trainees bring a sense of energy to the sector”. In another museum (which until that point had had only one female member of staff), a supervisor noted the benefits of having a male member of staff, improving the diversity of the organisation for the period of the traineeship.

4.15 A further benefit of participating in the programme was that supervisors were able to develop their management skills – which for some had been an explicit reason for taking part in the first place. Although this was sometimes challenging it was nonetheless a learning experience which they may not otherwise have had an opportunity to undertake.

4.16 We were also told that having trainees helped other staff to explore broadening their own CPD and increased awareness of the need to develop their skills throughout their career, a point of importance that was also highlighted by one of the stakeholders we consulted. We were told that at the moment, some staff have to fight with managers to gain permission to attend training.

Impact on systems and processes

4.17 Participating in the programme resulted in smaller organisations, sometimes with only one member of staff, having to put in place new systems e.g. induction processes, policies for staff absenteeism, staff management handbooks etc. This has been a positive development, formalising some processes and introducing others entirely, leaving a legacy for the future. One museum, for example, subsequently adapted the pack created for the trainee into a pack which is now given to volunteers.

4.18 As already noted, some host organisations were particularly challenged in dealing with personnel issues that arose with trainees (e.g. unexplained absences, extended sick leave, under-performance), and some would have liked to receive more guidance from MGS on
these issues (whilst noting that MGS had been very supportive). A few felt that more guidance, and potentially sharing of lessons learned, would be useful in future.

4.19 The programme also encouraged some host organisations to consider how they might alter their recruitment practices to widen access, both as part of a broader approach to better reflect the diversity of the communities they serve (i.e. both current and potential future audiences), and also in response to the changing needs of their organisations e.g. in relation to succession planning or a change in structure from local authority to trusts.

Impact of delivering an SVQ on the organisation

4.20 In addition, some hosts indicated an interest in giving further consideration to how the SVQ might be delivered beyond the traineeship programme and were considering possibilities for offering the SVQ to volunteers and front of house staff, although recognising that identifying funding to support this happening was likely to be a potential challenge.

Impact on culture of the host organisations

4.21 One of the aspirations of the Heritage Horizons programme was to have some influence on the attitudes and practices of the sector towards widening access. We explore this further in the next chapter, but a number of issues are also highlighted below.

4.22 Supervisors and other staff we interviewed clearly derived satisfaction from seeing how trainees had benefitted from the experience. Having the trainees did seem to demonstrate to the participating organisations that people without a degree, and not having come through the more traditional routes for recruitment to the sector could make a valuable contribution and often bring new skills, maturity and experience. The trainees’ passion and enthusiasm played a key part in influencing host organisations’ views in this respect.

4.23 We also identified examples of host organisations being more alert to ways in which they can change their recruitment practices to widen the field, for example by making a degree desirable rather than essential for some specific roles, and by placing a greater emphasis on experience. A number of larger organisations suggested that there was a need to reach those responsible for designing person specifications and the recruitment process e.g. HR departments, and share the learning from this programme with them.

4.24 A small number of organisations also informed us that they are looking at ways in which they can build on the experience of this programme, for example by developing their own HLF projects and considering how the SVQ may be applied among trainees, volunteers and other staff in future.

MGS

4.25 The development and delivery of Heritage Horizons built upon the learning gained from the previous MGS Internship Programmes (2011-2014) implemented by MGS, and funded through the Heritage Lottery Fund. The new traineeship programme presented an opportunity to build the profile of non-graduate entry into the sector and for MGS to work with stakeholders to promote workforce development and widening access to employment within the sector.

4.26 The programme allowed MGS to pilot the delivery of an SVQ in a museum setting and to promote alternative, vocationally based qualifications to the sector as well as this SVQ specifically.

4.27 The programme also gave MGS an opportunity to support the sector to gain a better understanding of what is required to “widen access” from the point of recruitment onwards,
and for MGS to gain an understanding of the types of support needs that the sector has in relation to implementing this type of traineeship.

4.28 Implementing this programme gave some MGS staff the opportunity to develop skills within their roles as project managers and mentors.

4.29 As with previous programmes, MGS has demonstrated an eagerness to learn from the experience of implementing this new programme and evaluation has been given high priority. This has been evidenced in the commitment to undertaking both internal and external evaluation activities, and identifying opportunities for sharing lessons learned. In addition, MGS has sought to ensure that the programme produces outputs that have a wider application.

4.30 The programme has built on the previous internship programmes and again acted as a vehicle to address some deep-seated and long-standing views about entry routes to the sector, and diversity, and has enabled MGS to begin to continue to make some impact on addressing these and to consider next steps. For example, MGS has changed its grants policy so that appropriate posts funded by them must be open to “or equivalent” candidates and is no longer restricted to people with degree-level qualifications only.

4.31 In addition, MGS has alumni programmes in place for ex-interns and trainees and these opportunities have been opened up to others including supervisors from the programme.

4.32 We understand that MGS is also planning a new HLF application, which will develop and build on the success of this programme, and is likely to be based on a traineeship model.
5. IMPACT ON THE WIDER MUSEUMS, HERITAGE & CULTURAL SECTOR

5.1 As noted earlier in this report, a key aspiration of the programme was to impact on the wider museums and galleries sector.

5.2 Our findings from this research are broadly similar to the findings of the previous Skills for the Future Internship Programme evaluation in terms of identifying wider sectoral issues around access to employment for people from non-traditional routes – breaking into the sector without following the “traditional” route of pursuing an undergraduate degree and then masters-level qualification remains challenging, particularly for non-graduates and the need for programmes such as this one remain clear. However, some of the comments made throughout the evaluation do suggest that there is an appetite for change and a growing recognition of the opportunities that can be offered to the sector by non-graduates.

5.3 This programme was distinct in its approach compared with the previous internship programmes as it offered opportunities for work experience to people who did not hold a degree-level qualification and who came from a range of backgrounds, whose experience in accessing work experience and employment was even more challenging than those graduates taking part in MGS’s previous internship programmes.

5.4 Whilst the potential impact of the programme on the wider sector has been limited by its scale - with only 20 traineeship places and 17 host organisations participating - the programme has nevertheless managed to have a significant impact on those participating organisations and individuals (staff, trainees and stakeholders) who can play a key role in sharing and promoting the benefits based on their positive experiences of the initiative.

5.5 To varying extents, those organisations that elected to take part in this programme as hosts were already viewing this as a potentially beneficial approach or could see the need for a person with a different skills set and experience, and it remains the case that a change in attitude is needed in the wider sector. Sharing the lessons learned from this programme will be key to affecting a wider change.

5.6 Achieving that coveted first post in the museums galleries sector remains challenging for graduates and post-graduates and perceptions remain that non-graduates will take opportunities away from graduates. Stakeholders continued to emphasise to us how unhealthy it is for the sector that very qualified people (often holding Masters-level qualifications) are in very junior roles. However, getting new people with new skills into the sector remains important to the sector’s sustainability and development and was recognised as such.

5.7 During the research, some consultees highlighted particular job roles which may be more appropriate entry points for those without a degree e.g. volunteer management and some learning and outreach rather than curatorial posts. Certain types of facilities also require more practical skills and experience e.g. engineering or industrial museums and often in the small independent sector. There is a view that the museums and galleries academic route does not adequately prepare people for practical work and for some host organisations this was part of their rationale for participating in the programme and was borne out by a positive experience with their trainee.

5.8 Recruitment criteria and selection processes remain an issue. Feedback from trainees that had applied to posts being advertised is that they were not shortlisted because of the high quality of other applicants who invariably held degrees and post-graduate qualifications and
had more experience. There seems to be a clear need for greater clarity and flexibility about what is meant by “degree or equivalent” in recruitment processes in the sector.

5.9 Recruitment processes in the sector still involve more traditional approaches including requiring written applications, which inevitably does not suit everyone and may not necessarily result in the best outcome in terms of selection, particular when recruiting non-graduates. It is important that moving forward, staff in the sector consider more carefully what the core values are that they are looking for in a candidate and to think beyond the more traditional ways of attracting them in to the sector. A good example from elsewhere is the National Theatre Company in England which recruits front-of-house staff via an open call, and a guaranteed 10-15 minute interview for all applicants, although clearly this approach would not work for all types of employment.

5.10 A key challenge in the sector, is that the staff working in it (because of the traditional and expensive routes into it) do not usually represent the diversity of audience they are trying to attract. A wider cultural change is needed and a shift in mentality. One stakeholder queried whether there is a true commitment to diversity - “Are we really committed to and interested in a diverse workforce?” If there is, and there seems to be given the range of programmes implemented by MGS during the last year that are addressing this issue, then it is important that alternative approaches to recruitment and diversification continue to be prioritised.

5.11 Interviewees commented on the narrow range of “type” of people that apply for jobs in the sector and the need for the sector to secure or develop people with different skillsets such as digital and business.

5.12 Current funding constraints do not make diversifying the workforce easy. There is little scope for movement and high levels of competition for posts. Applications from non-graduates would therefore still be less likely to make it to the interview stage.

5.13 The SVQ is useful but perceived by some to be limited by the perceptions in the sector - academic qualifications are still preferred and it will take time for vocational qualifications to be properly valued. It is important for MGS to promote the SVQ widely to enable it to gain more traction but organisations also need to embrace the SVQ and run with it themselves and there is a role for MGS in supporting and facilitating that.

5.14 There is a sense from some of those we consulted that there may be too much current focus on developing people in the early stages of their career, and not enough on developing skills later on. There is a need for greater mobility in the sector and to empower people to take control of their career development. Even if this or future programmes were to succeed in widening access, progression would present a continuing problem because of the implicit commitment to a degree requirement among employers, competition and a lack of mobility.

5.15 One stakeholder spoke of the need for a “progressive model for people’s entire career” being needed – noting that there is currently a lack of development opportunities in the sector beyond early career stage. There is a need for professional skillsets to be developed beyond academic skills, noting that in future “Everyone has to see themselves as a training organisation”.

5.16 An Alumni programme is now in place for former trainees and interns and this could be opened up to others in the museums workforce. We note that supervisors from the programme are already participating.
6. **COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

6.1 Undertaking a cost/benefit analysis as part of an evaluation such as this is challenging. It is often complex to isolate the costs associated with implementation, beyond the more obvious direct costs, and it can be challenging to establish a causal link between the intervention being examined, and other inputs received by participants from other organisations. As a result, the cost/benefit analysis we undertook during this evaluation concentrated on taking a high-level overview of value for money, added value, collaborative gain, and deadweight, which we describe below.

**Value for money**

6.2 The total cost of the traineeship programme was £513,676, £422,400 of which was awarded to MGS by the Heritage Lottery Fund, and each participating host organisation made a nominal contribution of £500. In addition, Heritage Lottery Fund calculated a value of £35,000 for volunteer hours contributed in the form of in-kind contributions of MGS staff time, but no value has been placed on the staff time incurred by supervisors or other museums staff within the host organisations.

6.3 The project costs include the cost of the £15,000 stipend paid to each trainee, and £70,000 for the assessment costs associated with delivery of the SVQ. Other costs incurred include management and operations (including the traineeship programme manager’s salary and travel costs), extensive staff time spent on the development of the SVQ, delivery of training to trainees, supervisors, and mentors and ongoing support to participating individuals and organisations.

6.4 The cost per traineeship (based on the original 20 places created), calculated most basically, was therefore approximately £25,684. Museums benefited crudely from labour worth at minimum £15,000 (the value of the stipend paid), but we know from some participating host organisations and participants that the value of the work undertaken by them was valued more highly than this figure. Trainees benefitted crudely from £15,000 for the work they undertook, but in addition were provided with a range of mentoring and training opportunities whilst participating in the traineeship programme which it is difficult to place a numerical value on. In addition, trainees benefitted from the SVQ which has a significant assessment cost associated with it, and has a tangible positive impact on employability. This suggests good value overall for both groups.

6.5 However, we cannot consider costs in this basic way, since the purpose of aims of the programme were far broader than to simply provide traineeship opportunities as has been highlighted throughout this report.

6.6 The programme has resulted in: greater capacity within the sector to offer traineeship opportunities to people without a degree; staff who have acquired new skills; training materials which remain available beyond the lifetime of the programme; improved understanding of the requirements of running a traineeship programme in the participating organisations and within MGS; further signs of cultural shifts with regards to alternative entry routes to the sector; and a pool of upskilled potential future employees, who have acquired an accredited qualification.

6.7 Without exception, those we consulted were of the view that the programme had provided value for money and in the section below we explore the extent to which we found this to be the case.
Additionality

6.8 This programme has again enabled a new approach to recruitment and diversification of the workforce to be developed and tested. With this programme, in contrast to the previous internship programmes, this has also included an intensive and time-consuming period of development of an accredited SVQ qualification. Without the external funding provided by HLF, the programme would not have taken place, and MGS is unlikely to have been able to invest in development of the qualification. In addition, the participating host organisations would not have had sufficient resources or necessarily the expertise to provide this type of traineeship opportunity.

Added value

6.9 The programme has brought a number of added value benefits:

- Upskilling of 20 individuals who would have struggled to break into this sector otherwise;
- Staff who have acquired new skills and experience including understanding of the requirements of managing a traineeship programme involving non-graduates;
- Staff gaining experience in mentoring and promoting the benefits of mentoring to the wider sector;
- Development of new materials and processes within host organisations which will be used for other purposes in future, and have made the organisation’s personnel processes more robust;
- Positive influencing of the sector in relation to the benefits of recruiting non-graduates;
- Some project work undertaken by trainees which would not have been able to be resourced otherwise;
- Employability of 20 individuals increased through acquisition of an accredited qualification which they would not have undertaken otherwise; and,
- New opportunities for networking of staff within the sector.

Collaborative gain

6.10 The programme has given a number of opportunities for collaborative gain. These have included creating opportunities for colleagues in the sector to meet at dedicated networking and learning events, giving them opportunities to exchange learning; and increasing their exposure to MGS and its staff. The staff involved across the sector have access to a wider pool of contacts than was previously the case, and have strengthened the ways in which they can work together in the future.

6.11 Some hosts have already identified opportunities for collaborating with other museums in future to offer any future trainees an opportunity for traineeship across two organisations – giving the trainee an opportunity for a wider learning experience, and easing the burden on an individual (and in this particular case, small and under-resourced) organisation to deliver the traineeship on their own.

Deadweight

6.12 Research participants indicated clearly that most of the outputs resulting from this programme would have been unlikely to have occurred without the funding intervention (or would have happened at a far slower pace). Some of the organisations had previously hosted interns, and whilst most indicated a willingness to be involved in a traineeship...
programme in the future, we were told clearly that there remained significant financial constraints to them being able to take part without the HLF grant.

6.13 Similarly, the trainees fed back that they would have been unable to take part without the stipend which was offered.

**Displacement**

6.14 In evaluating the previous internship programme implemented by MGS, a number of consultees at the time raised concerns with us about displacement. They were of the view that entry level jobs to the sector were already over-subscribed and as such no programme was needed to attract ‘new’ applicants for those posts. They believed that the interns on that programme were effectively taking jobs that had previously been available to graduates with Masters degrees and that unemployment levels for this group would go up as a result. We had no such feedback during this evaluation, but it is likely that some of these concerns would equally apply to the trainees on this traineeship programme.

6.15 We believed then, that any displacement of this sort was likely to be minimal given the relatively small number of interns (40) and also believed that it failed to take account of that programme’s aim to bring new skills into the sector – particularly more business skills. This thinking equally applies to the traineeship programme and we again found evidence that introducing a new group of people to the sector brought fresh perspectives and new ideas which added value. It also introduced a group of people to the sector who may mirror more closely the wide range of audiences that museums and galleries wish to attract, a further added benefit of widening recruitment which has already been touched on earlier in this report.

6.16 Significantly, those views failed recognise that equality of access to jobs advertised in the sector was simply good practice and should therefore be encouraged – and that attracting the best person for a job based on the requirements of the post remains the most important factor in recruitment.
7. **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 The Heritage Horizons Traineeship programme was a further step towards MGS achieving its aspirations to address skills gaps in the sector, improve training opportunities, and diversify the workforce. This traineeship programme built on the learning from the previous two internship programmes delivered by MGS and sought for the first time to offer traineeship opportunities to non-graduates. It is the largest single cohort of its kind currently being implemented in the sector and as such has been a ground-breaking opportunity to test new approaches to encouraging more diversity in relation to recruitment.

7.2 Overall, the programme has been an overwhelmingly positive experience for participating trainees, supervisors, mentors and host organisations. Whilst the scale of the programme was relatively small, and consequently the impact on the wider sector or beyond is limited at this stage, it has again made steps in the right direction, and the programme has significant potential to be scaled up or replicated in future. It is also important to note that this evaluation was undertaken shortly after the trainees had completed the programme, and therefore longer-term impact has not been able to be measured at this stage.

**Delivery of aims**

7.3 In Chapter 1 we outlined the Heritage Horizons programme's aims and noted their alignment with Heritage Lottery Fund outcomes and the National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries. It is clear from the research that in large part these aims were met as evidenced by the programme's outputs and outcomes for trainees, supervisors, mentors hosts and the wider sector (Table 7.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Horizons programme aims</th>
<th>Extent to which these have been addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 1.</strong> Provide a high-quality work-based skills development opportunity to a cohort of new non-graduate entrants into the Scottish museums and galleries sector.</td>
<td>Effective model developed and deployed. Trainees benefitted from work experience and skills development, and enhanced employability skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 2.</strong> Address gaps in core skills in the Scottish museums and galleries sector to meet current and future needs.</td>
<td>Programme addressed gaps in skills in the sector. Trainees evidenced skills gained and applied in practice. Supervisors received supervisory training and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 3.</strong> Build the capacity of museum and gallery organisations to provide work-based learning and development.</td>
<td>Capabilities of staff within host organisations to deliver programmes have been developed. Capacity was developed in the short-term, but it will require continued commitment from participating organisations to build on the legacy of this programme if this capacity is to be retained in the longer-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 4.</strong> Leave a legacy of training resources and skills in the Scottish museums and galleries sector.</td>
<td>The SVQ was successfully launched and delivered and available to the wider sector. Across trainees, supervisors, mentors and MGS staff new skills were developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aim 5. Leave a legacy of a more inclusive culture in Scottish museums and galleries. Host organisations committed to greater inclusivity. Some evidence of further initiatives being undertaken or in development. The small scale of the programme limits the extent to which this legacy will be evidenced in the sector more widely.

7.4 As previously noted, the longer term impact of the intervention cannot yet be established, but it is reasonable to expect this programme, in addition to the legacy from previous internship programmes, to contribute towards wider efforts to have a positive impact on the culture of the sector in relation to diversity (as per Aim 5 above).

Key success factors

7.5 The Heritage Horizons Traineeship programme was well managed and implemented, and feedback in relation to management and support was very positive.

7.6 The SVQ, which was newly developed for this cohort of trainees, was widely felt to be applicable, and an asset for the participating trainees going forward. It was also recognised as a valuable qualification which could be offered to others in the sector – including volunteers, and existing staff. Whilst the time and effort that went into developing the SVQ was significant, all those we consulted were of the view that the effort had been worthwhile, and that the SVQ was a valuable legacy of the programme.

7.7 The majority of participating trainees reported having had a very positive experience, accessing an opportunity for work experience in a sector that interested them, which would have been very difficult to access otherwise. Trainees highlighted particular benefits of taking part including gaining a greater insight into the range of employment opportunities within the sector, acquiring new skills and a new qualification, developing new contacts that will be valuable to them in future, and strengthening their CV.

7.8 The stipend was a crucial component of the programme and the vast majority of trainees noted that they would have been unable to participate in the programme without it. It is absolutely clear that the stipend was a vital element of ensuring equality of access.

7.9 Supervisors valued opportunities to attend training, events, and to network with colleagues, and they gained valuable experience from managing trainees which they would have been unlikely to have the opportunity to do otherwise.

7.10 At an organisational level, hosts also reported having benefited from introducing new systems (eg induction processes, personnel management processes) which would be applicable beyond the lifetime of the programme, and from the additional (albeit short-term) capacity created by having an additional member of staff. This additional capacity also created opportunities for host organisations to try out new activities, which they are now continuing to take forward despite the trainee no longer being with the organisation. In addition, they recognised that the programme had been an opportunity for upskilling their own staff who were involved in supporting the trainees, and in raising awareness of the benefits of recruiting non-graduates into the profession.

7.11 At a sectoral level, this programme sought to make further in-roads into encouraging the wider sector to consider employing non-graduates – in order to diversify the workforce for the benefit of the sector. The small scale of this programme was limited in what it could achieve in this respect, but feedback from stakeholders indicated that some impact had been made, and that any efforts to encourage this cultural change could only be a good thing for the sector.
Lessons learned

7.12 This programme was a new departure for the sector, and as such there were inevitably lessons to be learned from its implementation. These were relatively minor but are noted below to inform any future implementation of this type of programme.

7.13 Recruitment was undertaken through a very structured process, using an external agency to undertake the initial short-listing, followed up by an interview process conducted by the host organisations. Whilst broadly successful, some hosts felt that the pool of candidates short-listed were not strong enough (limiting their choice) and the external agency recognised that a different approach to selection needed to be taken for this group of applicants. This included taking a broader approach to advertising the opportunity beyond usual channels to ensure a wider reach, and considering advertising the opportunity at an earlier stage to enable forward planning on the part of interested candidates.

7.14 A small number of hosts encountered some challenges in managing their trainees. The issues encountered mostly related to absenteeism, but some of the organisations affected had not had any experience of managing these issues previously and found the situations challenging as a result. Whilst they were positive about the support they received from MGS, some noted that they would have valued more decisive early intervention from MGS when problems arose, and MGS has already committed to building in further advice of this nature into future programmes.

7.15 Host organisations were responsible for ensuring that participating trainees received an appropriate level of supervision and for some this required a more intensive level of commitment by supervisors than had been anticipated. This is an important point of learning that could impact on an organisation’s decision to take part.

7.16 Some mentors felt that the mentoring support role should have started earlier in the traineeship programme, which may be valuable to consider for future programmes. In addition, some trainees chose not to access a mentor because they did not see how it could add value to the support they were already receiving. This is a missed opportunity, and making the mentoring component of the traineeship compulsory rather than optional may again be worth considering in future.

7.17 The feedback we gathered suggests that some roles and types of organisations might be better placed to accommodate or champion non-graduate entry than others. These include, for example, industrial heritage facilities where people with experience and a practical aptitude would be valued, or community engagement roles where relevant experience and skills and knowledge of particular groups can help to open up new audiences. Similarly people from a business background or those with digital marketing skills developed in other sectors could transition into the museums and galleries world where, as interviewees pointed out, these skills are required.

Conclusions

7.18 The programme has had a significant impact on individual trainees in terms of skills development, attainment of the SVQ qualification, increased confidence and employability. Staff in host organisations and mentors also benefited through developing skills and broadening of experience.

7.19 The programme has successfully helped trainees to progress into employment in the sector and in related areas of arts and tourism. For some individuals their participation has led directly to employment or continued involvement with host organisations through freelance and volunteering work and has reaffirmed their desire to develop their career in this field.
7.20 Some of the programme processes worked better than others in relation to recruitment, SVQ assessment and support when the traineeship presented challenges, however this seems to be largely due to this being a new qualification and a lack of experience in dealing with the needs of this group of trainees or familiarity with the sector on the part of assessors.

7.21 As with its previous internship programmes, MGS sought to use the Heritage Horizons Programme to challenge perceptions within the sector in relation to diversifying the workforce and creating new entry routes into the sector. This has happened to some extent but mainly with the host organisations that were already open to the proposition, and selected external stakeholders who had more insight into the programme. The longer term impact cannot be determined at this early stage after completion. For example, it is difficult to know whether not holding a degree-level qualification will block progress later in an individual’s career in the sector and it will be important that MGS continues to observe career progress longer term in order to observe any such trends.

7.22 Heritage Horizons has made a valuable contribution to the widening access debate and demonstrated that a workforce that offers diversity in terms of skills, background and experience can make a fresh and significant contribution to the sector. However, single programmes dealing with relatively few participants and host organisations can only ever have a limited impact. They do, however, provide useful learning that can be used in what needs to be a more comprehensive and strategic response to the issues of workforce development and widening access.

7.23 To achieve significant shift will require a larger scale and more cohesive approach by MGS, its stakeholders and the sector. There is a need for greater synergy in the sector between what it needs and what it can offer, and for a framework that demonstrates clearly where the SVQ sits.

7.24 Numerous interviewees from within the sector highlighted that high levels of competition from very well qualified applicants for a limited number of posts will continue to cause challenges for non-graduates’ entry into the sector.

7.25 We understand that MGS is undertaking further work in this area in the form of a skills audit and this is to be welcomed.

**Recommendations**

Recommendations for similar initiatives in future:

7.26 MGS should:

1. Enable host organisations to be more closely involved in recruitment of trainees and ensure that promotion of the scheme and application processes reflect the needs of the target group.

2. Re-visit the use of preferred placements in the application process to explore whether negotiations between host organisations “bidding” for the same trainee can be avoided as can tension and disappointment arising for those trainees not getting their first choice.

---

3. Continue to offer funding to support participants at the same level but make more frequent payments to avoid cash-flow challenges for participants.

4. Ensure that hosts and trainees are effectively and quickly supported when there are problems. This requires greater clarity in the relationship between MGS, the trainee and the host organisation.

5. Introduce mentoring at an earlier stage and ensure that both mentor and mentee are clear about what is involved and what can be gained from the process and consider building in some quality control mechanism.

6. Consider being more prescriptive about the frequency and content of mentoring meetings, depending on the format of future programmes.

7. Consider making mentoring a compulsory element of future internship programmes.

8. Build on the information already provided to supervisors and expert witnesses in relation to their support to individuals to undertake the SVQ, based on the lessons learned from this programme.

9. Clearly define the role of “Assessor” organisations and put in place agreed standards for service delivery and associated monitoring arrangements.

7.27 Host organisations should:

10. Fully consider the implications of having a trainee and ensure that appropriate support structures and relevant HR policies and procedures are in place.

11. Ensure that the trainee’s role and any associated projects are well defined and they are given adequate supervision to meet their needs.

12. Ensure that they take advantage of any training opportunities on offer, and implement processes in line with recognised good practice.

Recommendations for advancing the legacy of the programme

7.28 MGS should:

13. Build on the development of the SVQ by promoting it within the sector (and beyond) and support organisations to identify ways of incorporating it into their volunteer and staff development plans.

14. Develop an approach to widening access to employment in the sector that is more comprehensive and strategic and based on an analysis of the market, and less focussed on the delivery of relatively small, stand-alone programmes.

15. Work with the sector to reach relevant influencers and those directly involved in recruitment with a view to altering practice.

16. Support and encourage the sector to develop their own approaches and initiatives in relation to widening access to employment.

7.29 Within the wider sector, organisations should:

17. Develop recruitment practices that facilitate applications from under-represented groups.

18. Examine ways of using the SVQ to develop their workforce and volunteers. MGS can play a part in supporting this.

19. Develop their own initiatives for broadening access to employment and seek funding to do so.
APPENDIX 1 - LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Trainees
Bragela Hornal (City of Edinburgh Council)
Anna Mackenzie (Comhairle nan Eilean Siar)
Maree Hoy (Comhairle nan Eilean Siar)
Alistair Gellatly (Dundee Heritage Trust)
Craig McNally (Glasgow Life)
Sueve Mariner (National Museums Scotland)
Gillian Foster (Orkney Islands Council)
Kenneth McElroy (Orkney Islands Council)
Calum Fraser (Scottish Fisheries Museum)
Jane Strawhorn (Scottish Maritime Museum)

Supervisors
Jenny Brown (Aberdeen Maritime Museum)
Robert Layden (Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders Regimental Museum)
Margaret Findlay (City of Edinburgh Council)
Mark Simmons (Culture Perth & Kinross)
Brian Kelly (Dundee Heritage Trust)
John Ferry (Glasgow Life)
Jenna Rose (Glencoe Folk Museum Trust)
Mike Ward (Grampian Transport Museum)
Molly Duckett (Groam House Museum)
Jane Miller (National Museums Scotland)
Sheila Garson (Orkney Islands Council)
Samantha Bannerman (St Andrews Preservation Trust)
Linda Fitzpatrick (Scottish Fisheries Museum)

Other interviewees at deep-dive organisations
Jenny Kinnear, Head of Service (Culture Perth & Kinross)
Mark Munsie, Operations Director (Dundee Heritage Trust)
Louisa Attaheri, Curator (Dundee Heritage Trust)
Christine McLean, Supervisor’s line manager (National Museums Scotland)
Stephen Allen, Head of Service (National Museums Scotland)
Anne Morris, Convener of Committee and Trustee (St Andrews Preservation Trust)
**Mentors**

Jason Finch (Aberdeen City Council)
Fiona Sinclair (CF Associates)
Fiona Colton (Live Borders)
Tamsin Russell (Museums Association)
Catherine Cartmell (Museums Galleries Scotland)
Devon McHugh (Museums Galleries Scotland)
Fiona Carmichael (Scottish Maritime Museum)
Another mentor who preferred not to be named

**Stakeholders**

Tim Street (Adopt an Intern)
Rebecca Boyde (Archaeology Scotland)
Diana Morton (City of Edinburgh Council)
Mike Ward (Grampian Transport Museum)
Ailsa Macfarlane (Museums Galleries Scotland)
David Gaimster (Museums Galleries Scotland Board Member)
Stephen Allen (National Museums Scotland)
Lorraine Sim (Rewards)
Jennifer Redpath (Rewards)
Louise Kirkpatrick (Rewards)
David Mann (Scottish Maritime Museum)
Ann Gunn (University of St Andrews)
APPENDIX 2 - INTERVIEW GUIDES

Trainee Questions

Before the programme

1. How did you find out about the Traineeship Programme?

2. Why did you decide to apply?

3. Did the fact that the traineeship included an SVQ have any influence on your decision to take part?

4. Before you applied for the traineeship had you previously applied for jobs or paid internships in the cultural heritage sector? If so what was the outcome?

5. Did you end up at your first choice traineeship? Why was this your preference? If not, how did you feel about not getting your first choice?

6. How important was it that the traineeship was paid?

Your experience of the Trainee programme

7. Did you have an induction? If yes, how helpful was this? Could it have been improved in any way?

8. How helpful, if at all was it to have a named supervisor? How, if at all, could supervision have been improved?

9. Other than your SVQ work did you take part in any in-house training? In what ways was this useful?

10. How did you benefit from the training provided by Museums Galleries Scotland? (Did it cover the right topics, was it delivered at the right time in the programme?)

11. How useful were the events held during the programme (start/midway/celebratory)?

12. Did you have a mentor?

13. a. If yes, how often did you meet / talk on the phone? What kind of support did he/she give you? How, if at all, could the mentorship have been more useful to you?

   b. If no, why did you decide not to have a mentor?

14. Did you receive other support from MGS (e.g. from the Traineeship programme manager)? Was this useful? What additional support, if any, from MGS would you have found helpful during your traineeship?

Experience of the SVQ

15. Were you clear about what you were required to do to achieve the SVQ?

16. Were you able to choose the options you wanted?
17. Were there any challenges in undertaking the SVQ? (e.g. did it fit well with the work you were doing; were you able to gather evidence for all elements, did you have enough time etc).

18. Did you feel well supported to undertake the SVQ? Could more have been done to help, if so by whom?

19. How helpful was the assessor from Rewards (e.g. were meetings organised well and in advance, could you contact them at other times, was their guidance clear, how much contact did you have with them?) How easy was it to access OneFile the online system used by Rewards for assessment documents and reporting)?

20. Was an expert witness easily identifiable – any problems or did it work well?

21. Overall how did you find the SVQ experience?

   **Outcomes for you**

22. What were your expectations of the programme and were these met?

23. Did you experience any additional benefits from a personal or professional point of view?

24. What have you done since completing the traineeship? Do you now feel more qualified to apply for jobs in the sector?

25. Has the traineeship helped you into your current job in any way?

26. Would you recommend a traineeship in the sector with vocational training to others? Why/why not?

27. Do you have any final comments on the programme?
Supervisor Questions

**Background**

1. What is your role within your organisation?

2. How did you find out about the MGS Traineeship Programme?

3. Did you have any awareness/opinion of vocational qualifications before you became involved with the programme? (past interns/trainees?) – What factors were important to the specific traineeship placement for your organisation?

4. Why did your organisation decide to get involved?

5. Before you got involved in the MGS traineeship Programme how did your museum recruit entry level staff?

6. Why were you identified as the appropriate supervisor/did the supervisor change during the process?

7. How clearly was the programme explained to you? Was there any process of induction/training for you – either from MGS or from your own organisation?

**The programme**

8. What was your role in the selection of the trainee/s? How well managed was this process from your perspective? What could have been improved?

9. Why did you select the candidate? (if you did)

10. How did you find the quarterly reporting process? Was it clear what was expected of you?

11. What induction did you provide for the trainee?

12. What in-house training did your organisation provide?

13. Did any difficulties arise during the traineeship and did you feel that these were adequately supported by MGS?

14. Did your trainee prepare as expected for supervisory meetings?

15. Did you attend any of the Action Learning Sets for Supervisors? How did you find these and did they help you address any specific issues? (What issues came up?)

16. What was your role in relation to the SVQ? How were you briefed and supported in this? How time consuming was this?

17. How satisfied were you with the interaction/communication provided by Rewards? Involvement with OneFile? How clear were you about the role of ‘expert witnesses’?

18. How satisfied were you with the support you received from Museums Galleries Scotland during the traineeship?
Benefits/ Costs

19. What were the main benefits to your organisation of the traineeship? What skills did the trainee bring to the organisation?

20. Were there any disbenefits?

21. What were the main costs (e.g. supervision time)?

Longer-term influence of programme

22. What has been the learning for you personally and for the organisation?

23. Has being a host organisation led to any current or planned change in systems or practice towards

   ▪ recruitment for entry level jobs
   ▪ learning and development

24. Are you more or less likely to recruit people without a degree in the future as a result of your experience?

25. Would you encourage or support other staff/volunteers to undertake the SVQ? Why/why not?

Overview

26. Does this model represent an effective way of meeting the workforce needs of the sector?

27. How relevant is the SVQ to your organisation’s needs and those of the sector? Has your opinion of vocational qualifications (if you had one) changed during the programme?

28. Based on your experience of this programme do you see value in introducing a higher level SVQ?

29. In your view what are the barriers to employment in the sector and has the programme helped to address these?

30. How important was the payment of the stipend? Would your organisation have participated if you had had to pay the trainee?

31. Would you host a trainee again?

32. Would it have been beneficial to your trainee to have a secondment at a different type of host organisation? (eg an independent or LA if in a national)

33. If you were taking part in the Associateship of the Museums Association (known as AMA) – did you use your supervisory experience as part of this?

34. Do you have any final thoughts or suggestions from your experience of being involved?
Mentor Questions

Background
1. Why did you decide to get involved as a mentor? Have you provided mentoring to anyone before?
2. Describe the process of selection? Could this be improved at all?
3. What induction or training did you receive and how helpful was this? Could it be improved?
4. How clearly defined was the mentoring role and did this match your experience in practice?
5. Prior to involvement in the programme any awareness of vocational qualifications – did your opinion/awareness change due to the programme?

Mentoring
6. How were you matched with your trainee? Are you still in touch?
7. How often were you in contact with the trainee and how did this take place (e.g. on the museum/gallery premises, elsewhere, by telephone or email)?
8. Would you say your time input was manageable? Was it sufficient to meet the trainee’s individual mentoring objectives? Over what time period did you support your trainee?
9. What did the support involve?
10. Do you feel that the trainee was clear about the role of the mentor?
11. Do you think the trainee made the most of the mentoring opportunity?
12. In what ways (if any) do you feel the mentoring support benefited the trainee? Did the SVQ component of the traineeship affect the type of support you provided to the trainee in any way?

Satisfaction
13. How satisfied were you with the support you received from MGS?
14. Do you feel that MGS capitalised on your mentoring experience to improve the programme in any way?
15. Would you recommend this type of programme to other people you know who might be interested in being a mentor?
16. Would you do it again?

Influence of programme
17. What do you feel the trainee you mentored gained from their involvement in the programme and can you give any examples of what you observed?
18. What have you personally learned or gained as a result of involvement?

**Overview**

19. In your view what are the barriers to employment in the sector and has the programme helped to address these?

20. Does this model represent an effective way of meeting the workforce needs of the sector?

21. Do you have any final comments or suggestions?
Stakeholder questions

1. Name, designation, role, awareness of and relationship to the MGS traineeship programme?

2. What do you understand to be the aims of the programme (to recruit interns from diverse backgrounds – from lower socio-economic background, BME backgrounds or with disabilities) – and how relevant do these aims continue to be?

3. Awareness of the structure of the traineeship programme – perceived strengths and weaknesses?

4. What other models exist which they are aware of which fulfil the same objectives? What are the strengths of these different models?

5. Do you have any views on how the MGS traineeship programme could have been strengthened?

6. How might the programme be built on to widen its impact to the rest of the museum and gallery sector?

7. Do you feel that the MGS Internship has or could succeeded in creating a more diverse workforce?

8. Views on the SVQ – relevance, could it be more widely used, is it the right level?

9. Impact of programme on widening access/non degree?

10. Are there other ways in which MGS might achieve the above objectives?

11. Are there ways in which MGS could work with your organisation to deliver its intended impacts?
Other Staff at Deep Dive Institutions Questions

Background

1. What is your role within your organisation?

2. Did you have any awareness/opinion of vocational qualifications before you became involved with the programme? (past interns/trainees?) – What factors were important to the specific traineeship placement for your organisation?

3. Why did your organisation decide to get involved? (manager)

4. Before you got involved in the MGS traineeship Programme how did your museum recruit entry level staff?

5. How did you identified as the appropriate supervisor/did the supervisor change during the process? (service manager)

6. How clearly was the programme explained to you?

The programme

7. What involvement did you have with the trainee?

8. Why did you select the candidate? (if you did)

9. What induction did you provide for the trainee?

10. What in-house training did your organisation provide?

11. Did any difficulties arise during the traineeship and did you feel that these were adequately supported by MGS?

12. What was your role in relation to the SVQ? How were you briefed and supported in this? How time consuming was this?

13. How satisfied were you with the interaction/communication provided by Rewards? Involvement with OneFile? How clear were you about the role of ‘expert witnesses’? (if relevant)

14. How satisfied were you with the support you received from Museums Galleries Scotland during the traineeship?

Benefits/ Costs

15. What were the main benefits to your organisation of the traineeship? What skills did the trainee bring to the organisation? (to your team/function if relevant)

16. Were there any dis-benefits?

17. What were the main costs (e.g. supervision time)?
**Longer-term influence of programme**

18. What has been the learning for you personally and for the organisation?

19. Has being a host organisation led to any current or planned change in systems or practice towards
   - recruitment for entry level jobs
   - learning and development

20. Are you more or less likely to recruit people without a degree in the future as a result of your experience?

21. Would you encourage or support other staff/volunteers to undertake the SVQ? Why/why not?

**Overview**

22. Does this model represent an effective way of meeting the workforce needs of the sector?

23. How relevant is the SVQ to your organisation’s needs and those of the sector? Has your opinion of vocational qualifications (if you had one) changed during the programme?

24. Based on your experience of this programme do you see value in introducing a higher level SVQ?

25. In your view what are the barriers to employment in the sector and has the programme helped to address these?

26. How important was the payment of the stipend? Would your organisation have participated if you had had to pay the trainee?

27. Would you host a trainee again?

28. Do you have any final thoughts or suggestions from your experience of being involved?