xR StOries

Funding Futures: Tackling inequality and exclusion in the distribution of research and development funding in the Creative Industries

Reporting from the Funding Futures symposium held in York on 17 April 2026

Leah Kurta,
Emma Willingham,
Emma Brown,
Damian Murphy

CONTENTS

Executive summary 1

1. Introduction 2
   - 1.1. The Funding Futures collective 3
2. Symposium structure and aims 4
3. Emerging themes, insights and recommendations 6
   - 3.1. Application re-design requires a systems approach 6
   - 3.2. Measuring what matters requires iterative and longitudinal approaches 8
   - 3.3. Time and structural pressures flow down through the whole ecosystem as widespread equity and inclusion barriers 9
   - 3.4. Community trust is the foundation that everything else depends on 11
   - 3.5. Leadership and accountability are barriers we cannot afford to overlook and accountability requires joined up approaches to mission, values and data 13
4. Conclusion and next steps 15

Funding Futures: Tackling inequality and exclusion in the distribution of research and development funding in the Creative Industries

Reporting from the Funding Futures symposium held in York on 17 April 2026

Executive summary

The UK Government's 2025 horizon scan on participation, diversity and inclusion in cultural and creative industries highlights the entrenched inequality and exclusion that exists within the sector.[1]

The distribution of research and development funding within the sector is one area where university funders can take proactive steps to widen access and address systemic barriers. Implementing EDI interventions at this juncture can bring about changes that reverberate across higher education and the Creative Industries.

The Funding Futures collective is a group of UK universities responsible for distributing research and development funding within the creative and digital sectors.

Established by XR Stories at the University of York, the collective is united in a shared aim to bring about tangible change through inclusive practice, both within their own networks and more broadly.

This report presents the common challenges and key themes from the first Funding Futures symposium:

- Application design needs to be addressed as a system.
- Measuring social impact requires tools and timescales that are not yet standard practice but that are urgently needed.
- Structural and time pressures flow through the whole ecosystem to create pressure in application windows, project cycles and the pace of community building, disproportionately disadvantaging those with the least existing resource, and eroding the trust and continuity that inclusion depends on.
- Leadership and accountability shape whether equity and inclusion work has the legitimacy and resource to take root. Coherent and joined-up approaches to data collection, mission and values are required, rather than the fragmented monitoring that currently prevails, at every level.
- Community trust is the practical foundation that underpins everything. Without the trust of the community, even the most well-resourced programme will fail to reach the people it intends to serve.

The Funding Futures collective is funded by the Valuing Voices for Equitable and Responsible Research project, a collaboration between the University of York and Mahidol University in Thailand, funded by Wellcome.

The research has been supported in part by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) XR Network+ Virtual Production in the Digital Economy project (EP/W020602/1).

[1] UK Parliament (2025) Horizon scan: Participation, diversity and inclusion in cultural and creative industries, available at https://post.parliament.uk/participation-diversity-and-inclusion-in-cultural-and-creative-industries/.

1. Introduction

In April 2026, XR Stories convened the first Funding Futures symposium for UK university funders with responsibility for distributing creative research and development grants to the creative technology and media sectors.

The purpose of the session was to share learnings, understand common challenges and explore ways to address those challenges as a collective.

Many of the attendees are evaluating the types of barriers to access and inclusion that exist within their specific funding infrastructures, and working to improve equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) across the board.

This report summarises the key learnings and themes from the half-day symposium which took place at The Guildhall in York on 17 April 2026. The session was designed and facilitated by XR Stories and Ida XR Studio, a social enterprise working with the creative technology sector to improve equity and diversity.

1.1 The Funding Futures collective

The Funding Futures collective comprises representatives from the following institutions and organisations who attended the symposium. This report therefore represents only the thoughts and comments of those in attendance. Not all invitees were able to attend, and the collective is growing, so future events will welcome new partners and institutions.

XR Stories (University of York)

Ida XR Studio

Arts and Humanities Research Council

CAMERA (University of Bath)

Createch Frontiers (represented by Birmingham City University)

CoSTAR Foresight Lab (represented by Goldsmiths University)

CoSTAR Live Lab (University of York)

CoSTAR Realtime Lab (represented by University of Edinburgh)

CoSTAR Screen Lab (represented by Ulster University)

Future Screen NI (Ulster University)

Immersive Arts (University of the West of England - UWE Bristol)

Institute for Design Informatics (University of Edinburgh)

Music Futures (represented by University of Liverpool)

My World (represented by University of Bristol)

Watershed

ReFrame VP (University of York)

2. Symposium structure and aims

The day was organised around the following four questions:

Barriers	Systems	Solutions	Challenges
What barriers are we seeing in our own funding practices, and what common access and inclusion barriers exist across the sector?	Where do these barriers sit, and what's shaping them? Are they driven by processes, expectations, networks, formats, access needs, or something broader?	What could we change, individually and collectively, to reduce these barriers? What tools, approaches, or design changes would help?	What might get in the way of making these changes, and how could we navigate that?

Attendees were invited to reflect on the questions of the day in small groups. Discussion themes were then shared with the plenary to understand where there were similarities and differences across the groups.

Attendees also shared case studies and perspectives on barriers and practical methods for reducing barriers to different applicant groups.

Ulster University

shared details of their work supporting people from lower income groups, and the significant role that class plays in the barriers to access within the local communities in and around Belfast.

Edinburgh University

shared learnings from their Creative Informatics Cluster and associated Inclusive Capital Funding programme which targeted support across a broad range of marginalised groups. They also discussed the role of partnership and trust in reaching less socio-economically privileged communities.

Watershed

shared their learnings from Immersive Arts and presented their Inclusion Framework as a practical method for deciding which target groups to improve access and inclusion for, and practical approaches to committing to equity and inclusion workstreams.

Ida XR Studio

shared their equitable design principles and their innovation and equity tools for designing more inclusive funding systems.

XR Stories

shared their work applying Ida's tools to its XR Network+ grant process, and the key successes.
XR Stories also shared findings from their research to understand the barriers that have been experienced by academic and industry practitioners from marginalised groups applying (or considering applying) for R&D funding from XR Network+ and other similar programmes[2].

As a final action, the group was invited to plan their next meeting. This task included drafting an agenda and preparing an invitation list to reach out to relevant people who were not in attendance at the first symposium.

[2] Neyra, R., Palmer, S. (2026) Designing more inclusive funding calls: Evidence, lessons and future directions. XR Stories. Available at https://xrstories.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/XR_Stories_EDI-Report_March-2026-DIGITAL.pdf

3. Emerging themes, insights and recommendations

Five cross-cutting themes emerged from the symposium. Together, they paint a picture of a funding ecosystem under pressure; one in which the structural conditions that shape how money is distributed are often at odds with the equity and inclusion commitments that funders hold. These themes are deeply interconnected and highlight the need for a collective and systems-based approach to funding reform.

3.1. Application re-design requires a systems approach

In summary: Application forms are often the first point of contact between a funder and a potential applicant. They carry significant weight, communicating not only what is required but who is expected to apply. Addressing individual problems can help support inclusion, for example simplifying complex language or offering multiple ways to apply (e.g., using video and audio options). However, a piecemeal approach will be hamstrung if broader systems thinking is absent. The barriers embedded in application design are interconnected and often trace back to upstream decisions about eligibility, success criteria and funding aims. Improving access and inclusion in application design requires a deliberate, systematic approach that holds those connections together.

The detail: The funding application is often one of the first interactions a funder has with an applicant. In reading an application form and associated guidance, applicants get a sense of a funder's priorities, expectations and ambitions. Application forms in the right circumstances, with accessible design, can empower, inspire and motivate a range of individuals to apply. Yet reflections at the symposium charted their potential to disempower, disadvantage and disengage marginalised groups. Since application forms hold so much weight in the process of accessing funding or not, funders noted the importance of improving design to better meet the needs of diverse applicants.

Multiple barriers were highlighted, from overly complex forms to use of technical jargon. The types of barriers concentrated within application design consist of:

- content barriers, e.g., the type of language and phrasing used,
- process and eligibility barriers, e.g., not recognising less traditional company structures and,
- format barriers, e.g., relying on written formats to express creative and innovative ideas.

The group shared their concerns that forms are overly reliant on specialist language associated with creative and technical research and development. This could disadvantage non-native English speakers, for whom there is little support in application writing, or those with less industry experience. The length of forms was noted as another barrier. When forms are overly long and complex, it privileges those who have more time and resources to fill them out. Disabled people, working parents, carers and part-time workers can be disadvantaged by a lengthy application process.

The group also considered that the ability to develop and write a convincing funding application is a separate skill to project delivery; the ability to write convincingly does not necessarily equate to project delivery success. This raised the question of whether application forms themselves serve their purpose of surfacing the most innovative and creative formats. Indeed, new formats may not

easily be described with words. The group reflected on the industry's reliance on the written forms, and whether formats like video, audio or imagery may render more inclusive and better identification of creative and technical innovation.

The 'red tape' of the funding process was seen as an extinguisher of creative expression. Part of this red tape is eligibility criteria. The group noted that smaller, less traditional collaborations such as co-operatives of freelancers and artists, or self-organised groups and newer companies may not be able to access funds which require limited company or charitable status. The funding process is not typically set up to recognise less traditional or 'innovative' structures.

Proposed solutions: Reducing the complexity of language used could be considered an easy win, analysing forms for use of jargon, acronyms or complex question phrasing could support more accessible and inclusive design. The group suggested that staged application processes which introduce a shorter expression of interest stage could ensure that only those with the most promising ideas need to spend additional time and energy on applications. This was seen as positive for both applicants and reviewers and staff, noting that time limitations apply to both funders and applicants.

Offering video, audio or non-written formats was also posed as a solution to the reliance on written forms. Whilst positively received, the group also cautioned that video and audio formats, where applicants are more identifiable to the reviewer, could introduce new biases. The importance of reviewers understanding unconscious bias within application assessment is a necessary mitigation step to any assessment process, and particularly pertinent to formats like video and audio.

MusicFutures was offered as an example of a fund which welcomes applications from freelancers and entrepreneurs, suggesting that funds may be able to relax some of the stricter eligibility requirements around company structure.

The group also noted that many funds offer access support, yet it is not always known about or promoted adequately. Making the most of current resources is a priority area.

Creative Informatics talked about their support and scaffolding approach that is available for all applicants, rather than specifically access support (although this was also offered where required). The Creative Informatics team found that this approach improved application quality and relevance. The value of feedback on outcomes as part of a scaffolding and learning process was also cited as a valuable activation that supports applicants to both understand decisions and improve performance in further funding.

Finally, reviewer diversity, training and compensation was key to improving application processes. The group noted that finding reviewers with a broad range of knowledge of new innovations can be challenging, spreading the net wider to find more reviewers from less traditional backgrounds could help with a diverse assessment process. Yet reviewers also need support, training and compensation to be able to carry out the assessment task with clarity and confidence.

The application process is one of the most important steps in the applicant's journey. It is also the place that surfaces design decisions made up stream, for example eligibility criteria, success measures and funding aims. Therefore, addressing the design challenges may not be possible piecemeal. The group noted that to achieve success, a systems approach, drawing from human-centred and service design methods could support re-designing application forms.

3.2. Measuring what matters requires iterative and longitudinal approaches

In summary: Current evaluation frameworks are not well-suited to capturing the social impact of creative technology projects. Social change is non-linear and takes time to emerge; short project timescales and an emphasis on financial return mean that meaningful downstream impacts are often invisible to funders. The sector needs shared, accessible methods for measuring social value, alongside a willingness to build in the time and flexibility for impact to be tracked iteratively, and to surface in unexpected ways.

The detail: As noted in the review of application design, there was a sense that written applications miss some of the impact that creative technology can achieve. Many funders ask applicants to detail their financial return on investment and share how research and development will contribute to their financial sustainability. However, there is less attention to the social impact that creative technology products can achieve. The barriers noted here centred on the funder's ability to measure social returns on investment. Where a project might have a high social impact, how is this measured and weighted alongside financial assessment? The group acknowledged that some of the potential down-stream social impacts of diverse projects are being missed due to a lack of tools for measuring social value and impact within the creative sector.

Social impact also takes time and the group discussed that evaluation timescales are too short to gather accurate data on the social impacts of projects. The group also highlighted that ecosystems of change are non-linear, yet funding structures typically adopt linear approaches. The fundamental incompatibility between these systems makes measurement of impact a significant challenge.

Proposed solutions: To support improved measurement of social impact, the group suggested a joined-up approach, a need to define key social impact variables and accessible, clear methods for assessing them. The understanding that impact takes time and can emerge in unexpected ways means that agile and emergent impact measures are needed alongside traditional measures. The need for a holistic and human-centred approach which could be adopted across the sector was suggested and well received by the group.

3.3. Time and structural pressures flow down through the whole ecosystem as widespread equity and inclusion barriers

In summary: Short application windows and compressed project timescales place disproportionate strain on those with the least capacity to absorb pressure: people managing illness or disability, carers, those without established networks or prior delivery partnerships. Beyond individual hardship, rushed timescales erode the conditions that make inclusion possible. Community trust takes years to build, and relationships forged within a funding window can dissolve when the money runs out. The need for speed is, in this sense, also a driver of fatigue and disengagement, for applicants and funders alike.

Many of the pressures that funders and applicants experience originate upstream. Government spending cycles, political priorities and the requirement to demonstrate impact before the next election all shape the conditions in which funding is distributed. University funders feel these pressures and can unintentionally absorb and transmit them to the creative sector, often without fully recognising the cumulative effect on communities further down the chain. Understanding where pressure originates, and how it travels, is a necessary precondition for disrupting it.

The detail: The specific timings of when funds open and close are dependent on many factors. Government spending deadlines, the grant period of the fund, holidays and academic deadlines as well as stakeholder preferences, are just some of the influencing factors in setting funding deadlines. The group noted that this can result in short turnaround times for applicants to apply for funds. Building successful partnerships and consortiums, often a prerequisite for successful bids, takes time, connections and track-record. Those with established working relationships or consortiums with track-record have an advantage when applying for bids with tight deadline windows which then reinforces inequity for those without these resources. This is further compounded by eligibility requirements which stipulate specific partnership makeup, for example, requiring an academic lead partner, or researchers from specific institutions. The group reflected that short time scales can exacerbate the need to have established networks and contacts whom applicants can call on at short notice. Suffice to say, this disadvantages those without established networks or prior delivery partnerships.

Structural pressures also flow down through the whole ecosystem. Short timescales were noted within the project delivery window as well as the application window. The sense was of an industry rushing to solicit applications and then rushing to create innovation. This need for speed places strain on many working in the industry and is particularly challenging for those managing illness, a disability or caring responsibilities.

Yet short delivery timescales have another associated barrier, that of curtailing knowledge exchange including equity, diversity and inclusion knowledge and expertise. The group spoke of partnerships and consortiums gaining momentum only to dissolve and fade when funding ends. The need for continuity, to nurture relationships, to share learning, to reflect on progress and build community are directly at odds with short funding windows.

The barriers faced by applicants of short-projects and short application times were felt for funders too. There was a sense that everyone loses when time is tight. The group expressed their vulnerability to losing key staff, including support staff, partnerships and communities when their own projects to disseminate funds and nurture creative innovation were too short. The pressure from the government

to spend money quickly and show results (e.g., before an election) hampers the ability to embed inclusive practices. Yet inclusive practices shape a more sustainable ecosystem for funders and applicants. Deep, long-term collaborations build trust, shared learning and a stronger creative technology sector overall.

The group also discussed how funding cycles and the times of year where these cycles align as another barrier. Discussion took place regarding the poor alignment of some UKRI and EU deadlines to periods soon after school holidays. This has an immediate negative impact on those with childcare responsibilities - disproportionately women.

Proposed solutions: A solution to short turnaround times is, in short, to make them longer. This would allow time for trusted relationship building, sharing learning and cultivating a sense of community which were all acknowledged as activities which require care, time and sustained attention. There were some specific recommendations such as an open call without any deadlines, which could support those who need time to develop partnerships and their project ideas. Another suggestion was ring-fenced follow-on support which could be spent on shared learning and community development. A shared calendar of funds showing opening and closing dates was suggested. The group felt that sharing deadlines further in advance might help mitigate short application windows, letting applicants know that a fund would soon be opening.

The group also considered their role as community cultivators and advocates who could share learning and expertise across the wider industry. It was noted that the community is not just successful applicants, but anyone considering applying as well as unsuccessful applicants. These solutions may help support people outside of funding cycles when key development and learning activities can take place.

3.4. Community trust is the foundation that everything else depends on

In summary: Without trust, the most well-resourced and thoughtfully designed funding programme will fail to reach the communities it intends to serve. Trust is built through sustained, honest engagement, through feedback that is timely and useful, communications that are transparent about success rates and eligibility, and a genuine investment in applicant development beyond the application window. It is eroded by repeated rejection with no explanation, by opaque decision-making, and by the sense that a funder's interest ends when the deadline closes. Rebuilding and sustaining trust, particularly with historically marginalised communities, must be treated as a core function of any funder.

The detail: Building trust is not only a skill, but a practice which cannot be achieved without the necessary time. Funders noted that their most successful programmes where they had built the trust of marginalised communities had taken years, not months. Notwithstanding the time pressures discussed, the group also noted communication practices which create additional barriers to successful community building.

The group spoke about practices of encouraging large scale uptake to funds with low success rates. They noted the resulting erosion of trust and confidence that consistent rejection has on applicants. Whilst the intent may be to reach as many people as possible and improve access to and awareness of a fund, when success rates are low (some as little as 3%) a blanket approach to encouraging applicants to apply, can have an unintended negative consequence. The group spoke about rejection fatigue. Many applicants face numerous rejections and very little feedback, which can lead to low confidence and low mood.

This negative cycle is, of course, influenced by the cuts to public funding for creative industries. With less money to go around, there are higher rejection rates. Yet funders were aware that unless they approach their communications with sensitivity to the experience of rejection, the problem could worsen. For marginalised groups with less resource, time and support, rejection can lead to disenfranchisement and reduced trust in the funding system leading to lower rates of applications from diverse groups over time.

The homogeneity of those applying to and being awarded creative technology grants was cited as an ongoing concern, specifically that creative R&D funds disproportionately attract white men who in turn are awarded more funding than other groups. The group spoke about the need to adapt their communications strategies, their trust building efforts and expand their role to encompass community cultivation to improve applicant diversity.

Proposed solutions: The group noted that a more tailored approach to communicating the funds aims, objectives and success rates could help build trust and confidence across the board. Tailored communications to specific marginalised groups was a noted ambition. The 'build it and they will come' argument was discounted in favour of building trust with grass roots communities, seeking out online groups such as those on Discord, Twitch, Tik Tok and the like. The symposium suggested that more investment and time spent on reaching marginalised communities was needed to see a more diverse pool of applicants. Creative Informatics referred to a specific example of how applicants with chronic fatigue and with caring responsibilities were explicitly included as eligible for one of the programme's funding opportunities. They noted that these applicants appreciated being actively included in this way.

There was also an ambition to improve honesty and transparency in terms of what funds can support and where the fund might not be the right fit for the applicant. It was advised that the kinder and better approach might be to offer support in partnership building or connection to a better suited fund, rather than encouraging everyone to apply. Transparency is also needed in discretionary or ring-fenced funding. The group suggested that greater accountability around who, when and why projects get funded is needed, and could restore good faith in the funding system. The group discussed that creating more ring-fenced funds for global majority applicants or disabled creatives is one method for increasing uptake of funding from groups who are statistically less likely to apply.

On the need for more feedback, the group discussed their own capacity limits. Immersive Arts' general feedback was cited as an effective way to offer feedback on consistent weaknesses and trends, yet it was acknowledged that this could not be applied as a panacea to the problem. With more resources directed to feedback and training, the community of practitioners could improve their skills, and in turn, their applications. This could have a knock-on effect of creating stronger applicant, funder relationships.

Building communities before the application period and after, could support successful and unsuccessful applicants develop skills, find opportunities and partnerships. Immersive Arts' *Big Thing* was cited as a successful example of building a community around a fund. This approach was described as 'a human-centred and joyful' method of developing feedback and feedforward cycles and sustaining relationships with a diverse applicant community.

3.5. Leadership and accountability are barriers we cannot afford to overlook and accountability requires joined up approaches to mission, values and data

In summary: The person at the top of an institution funding call shapes the legitimacy, priority and resourcing that equity and inclusion work receives. Where leadership is indifferent or uncommitted, even the most passionate practitioners within an organisation can find their efforts undermined or deprioritised. The group called for stronger and more consistent leadership on EDI from research councils and government bodies and recognised that their own institutions and principal investigators needed to demonstrate the same.

EDI monitoring is taking place across the sector, but not always in ways that are coherent, consistent or well understood by the people doing it. Disparate Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), uncertainty about how to use protected characteristics data responsibly, and a mismatch between stated values and day-to-day practice all undermine the accountability that meaningful change requires. Greater consistency in how data is collected, what it is used for and how it connects to institutional missions would help funders move from good intentions to genuine impact and, in turn, rebuild trust with the communities they are trying to reach.

The detail: To make significant and sustained change, leaders must be ideologically and practically up for the job of inclusion. A significant barrier to progress was discussed as stemming from leadership that is opposed to, or indifferent to access and inclusion. The person at the top; their awareness, ambitions and passion for equity and inclusion, matters deeply.

Leadership was described as its own category of barrier which impacts the legitimacy, priority and funding that EDI work gets. The group noted that weak leadership can contribute to unclear EDI missions and values. With lack-lustre EDI commitments from leadership or inauthentic 'boiler plate' EDI missions those within the organisation who want to make change can feel disconnected. When people feel unrepresented by their institution's, project's or leader's EDI mission, efforts can lack integrity and authenticity. Restoring the personal connection to mission and improving leadership awareness are important long-term workstreams to support a broad range of access and inclusion work.

Yet university funders noted that they too needed strong leadership from funders such as UKRI and DCMS. They noted that strong leadership was critical to their own accountability, and they welcome clearer guidance on how to translate EDI ambitions into practice.

The group discussed accountability, stating that equity, diversity and inclusion, whilst a noted priority of research councils, does not have clear and consistent KPIs, leading to disparate efforts for affecting change. For example, one institution noted a KPI for the number of jobs created, but no KPI for the diversity of applicants to the jobs.

Funders also noted that they lack tools and confidence in how and whether to use equity and diversity criteria as part of funding selection processes. There was a sense that EDI monitoring activities take place without proper understanding of the best or most appropriate ways to use the data. It was acknowledged that collecting protected characteristics data is challenging in a changing political landscape, and not without risk to applicants. Again, trust and transparency were cited as key ingredients for successful data collection and evidence mapping. Ensuring applicants understand why their data is collected and what it is used for is critical to building trust.

Overall, a lack of confidence for how funders themselves use EDI data, build more inclusive processes, and tackle systemic inequalities, compounded noted barriers. There was a sense of overwhelm, with some people mentioning that low confidence can lead to lack of action, the fear of getting something wrong or making a mistake held people back from actively engaging with challenges and making practical changes.

Proposed Solutions: Whilst allied leadership is clearly important, a distributed accountability structure is necessary for change. The group noted that EDI leads were an effective way for championing inclusion and access and keeping it on the agenda, but that a community, connected to and working on behalf of positive change is what will keep the flame burning. There was a sense that institutions need to remove abstraction from EDI initiatives, make them more personal and connected. A co-created equity and diversity ambition, for example, which could be used across the creative technology sector was one approach to joining the dots. Another approach was values-based action, asking everyone to consider what values feel most aligned to them personally and using this to better understand what social challenges feel most important to champion. Watershed shared their Inclusion Framework which highlights the importance of deciding on beneficiary groups in advance of EDI efforts. Knowing that whilst individual institutions can't make change for everyone, they can still make some change, is one way to reduce overwhelm and ensure that positive action is happening.

4. Conclusion and next steps

The symposium brought together a group of university funders who, in many respects, already understand the access and inclusion barriers that applicants face and the challenges to affecting change. They know that application forms can exclude people, they know that short timescales advantage those who are already well-resourced and connected, they know that trust takes years to build. The day surfaced a shared awareness that these challenges are common across the sector and the shared desire to act on that awareness more coherently. There was recognition that doing so will require structural change as well as incremental improvement.

Across the day's discussions, five themes consistently emerged:

1	Application design needs to be addressed as a system.
2	Measuring social impact requires tools and timescales that are not yet standard practice but that are urgently needed.
3	Structural and time pressures flow through the whole ecosystem to create pressure in application windows, project cycles and the pace of community building, disproportionately disadvantaging those with the least existing resource, and eroding the trust and continuity that inclusion depends on.
4	Leadership and accountability shape whether equity and inclusion work has the legitimacy and resource to take root. Coherent and joined-up approaches to data collection, mission and values are required, rather than the fragmented monitoring that currently prevails, at every level.
5	Community trust underpins everything and the practical foundation without which the most well-resourced programme will fail to reach the people it intends to serve.

None of these themes can be meaningfully addressed in isolation. A shorter, more accessible application form does not help if the funding window is too tight for under-resourced applicants to respond. More consistent EDI data collection does not translate into change if leadership does not treat it as evidence that demands action. Longer project timescales create the conditions for community trust to develop, but only if the communications strategies and feedback practices around a fund are genuinely tailored to the people they are trying to reach. The challenge is systemic and the response needs to be too.

There was a sense that community building around this mission should involve people across all connected domains. From government officials, those working in the research councils and those working on policy; the community committed to this work needs to grow. The conversations at the symposium demonstrated that there is meaningful room for action, and that the power of acting collectively as a group who share common goals and can amplify each other's efforts to quicken the pace of change.

This report marks the beginning of that collective work. The Funding Futures group will reconvene with a broader set of contributors bringing voices from across the funding ecosystem. These voices will include practitioners, applicants and those working at the margins of the sector, to deepen the conversations started at the first symposium and begin to translate them into shared commitments and practical action.

The scale of the collaboration must match the scale of the problem. A more equitable and inclusive funding ecosystem is possible. Building it will take exactly the qualities this group is committed to cultivating: time, trust and persistence in making meaningful change.

Please email enquiries@xrstories.co.uk to enquire about joining the Funding Futures collective.

xR Stories

XR Stories
The Guildhall
St Martins Courtyard
Coney St
York YO1 9QL

xrstories.co.uk
enquiries@xrstories.co.uk

ida

wellcome

xR NetwOrk+

UNIVERSITY of York