+

Evaluating Scotland's London 2012 Cultural Programme
Prof Gayle McPherson & Prof David McGillivray, UWS

Scottish Cultural Evidence Network (SCENe) seminar 26th April 2013

+ The Project

- UWS-led consortium commissioned in July 2012

- Evaluation objectives:
    - conduct a mapping exercise to identify existing activities already being monitored and /or evaluated and partnerships formed
    - evaluate leadership, investments and impacts
    - evaluate the impact of London 2012 on cultural and wider sectors
    - develop an outcome monitoring and evaluation framework
    - produce five case studies illustrating London 2012 activity in Scotland

+
Multi-layer, -agency, -impacts

- Scotland's London 2012 Cultural Programme one response within myriad of programmes and investments
  - Cultural Olympiad, Year of Creative Scotland, LTUK, Artists Taking the Lead, etc

- Attribution of impact complicated by partnership funding model – yet delivery unlikely without it

- Defining the 'object of study' was crucial:
  - Which projects or programmes are part of the Cultural Programme?
  - Where will impact take place?
  - When will impact take place

+
Framing impacts

- We used rationalised range of strategic objectives to isolate the key areas of impact to assess:

- Collaboration:
  - new ways of working, partnerships and international networks

- Celebration:
  - New opportunities for practitioners to develop and deepen practice – presenting artistic excellence in output

- Participation:
  - Meaning and opportunities for audiences

- Promotion:
  - The contemporary image of Scotland

+ A flavour of findings: Collaboration

- There is evidence that fruitful partnerships have been forged as an outcome of this programme at a strategic level and within projects. Though the formation of new partnerships across the sector is limited and further attention needs to be paid to fostering greater international connections, encouragingly, there is evidence to suggest that projects were interested in continuing with their projects in the future, albeit the form of the project may alter.

- Strategically, though operating in a challenging complex cultural programming environment, working relationships have been strengthened, which provides optimisim looking forward to Glasgow 2014

+ A flavour of findings: Celebration

- There is evidence that the outputs did create new contexts, sites and settings for artistic, cultural and creative practitioners to develop and deepen their practice. New geographical settings were created or utilised and new artforms used the existing landscape in innovative ways. Audiences were able to see the best of UK and International culture in Scotland, with the Big Concert at Stirling Castle and NVA's Speed of Light on Arthur's Seat good examples.

- There is need for more robust indicators to assess the quality of artistic production to ensure that these judgments include the experiences of audiences and not just of the creative elite.

+

A flavour of findings: Promotion

- *There is evidence to suggest that projects experienced a benefit from being involved in the Cultural Olympiad. National and international profile was enhanced for projects and being part of a national celebration was deemed beneficial. The absence of robust data on employment, international visitor numbers and other indicators associated with investment in the creative economy means that it is difficult to place a value on the promotional benefits generated by London 2012 for Scotland.*

- Increase visitor numbers, or contribution to creative economy requires dedicated marketing activity and/or collaboration with tourism/other agencies (e.g. VisitScotland, EventScotland)

+

A flavour of findings: Participation

- *It is difficult to confirm that Scotland's London 2012 Cultural Programme met or exceeded its ambitions in terms of participation because there is no baseline/benchmark against which to measure, either at a project or programme level. However, the evidence available suggests that there was a significant volume of participation, producing a variety of public engagement interactions (c2.5m) (with participants, volunteers, artists, performances). Looking forward to Glasgow 2014, it is necessary to set out a benchmark, project by project, against which participation can be measured.*

- This is a key issue for the audience development agencies and the sector itself

+ Learning from London 2012

- Imperative that overarching objectives of Glasgow 2014 Cultural Programme are translated into SMART objectives, KPIs and data needs in order to assess impact systematically

- Funding partners need to support/require grant holders to gather audience & participant data and embed at earliest opportunity – this would ameliorate absence of/patchy demographic data available:
  - Currently an over-reliance on project self-reporting on targeted audiences & expected beneficiaries.   That does not, of course, tell us whether anticipated outcomes were achieved

- It is important to ensure data collection processes can disaggregated, where possible, between free and paid ticketing arrangements

- Development of consistent, agreed measurement of broadcast & online audiences to avoid over-statement

+ Towards and beyond Glasgow 2014

- Apportioning impact is challenging with multi-agency/multi-region investment. Ownership will be less complicated for 2014 but expectations need to be clear from outset

- The evaluation of the legacy of Glasgow 2014 is expected to run to 2019 allowing policy makers and evaluators to evaluate what the effects from the Games may be several years later.

- If this approach is followed for an assessment of impact for cultural activity supported as part of the Glasgow 2014 Cultural Programme then there would be an opportunity to assess:
  - Activity or developments which take place post-2014, but as a result of Glasgow 2014, which are relevant in terms of strategic imperative of, say the Scottish Government (e.g. Flourishing, Active, Connected and Sustainable)

+ The challenges of measurement and impact – convincing the sector

- Need to ensure alignment between what the sector believes its contribution is and how this influences policy appraisal processes

- Multi-criteria framework required, which addresses requirements of policy makers/appraisers (Scot Gov, funders) whilst also 'speaking' to the sector in a language they understand and value

- Skill shortages in conducting evaluation accentuate problem

- Danger of evaluation overload and lack of clarity over impact of 'impact' data on policy/practice

Aims	Context	Inputs (Resources)	Activities/ Mechanisms	Audiences/ Participants	Outputs	Outcomes	Contribution to wider programme themes
What we want to achieve	What are the external factors that affect us? What are the starting points for our activity? What is the baseline of our audiences/for our potential audiences?	What resources are we putting in? Why have we chosen them? What partners are we working with? How is that partnership working? How will we know if we have chosen the right partners and resources for the project?	What activity are we undertaking? What activity is required to bring in the audiences/ participants we are seeking? How will we know what the 'take-up' will be? How will we know if it is the right/ appropriate activity to achieve our aim?	Who will the audiences/ participants be? How many audiences/ participants are there? What do you know about their audience/ participant habits before your project? How will you know if you have reached the audiences/ participants which you wanted to? What was the audience/ participant experience of the project?	What outputs do we expect? How will we know if they have happened? Did anything happen that we didn't expect?	What outcomes do we expect? How will we know if they have happened? Did anything happen that we didn't expect?	What is the impact of our work on wider programme themes?

Baseline analysis

Tier	Data	Resources
Baseline	- Basic standardised output data, including volume and type of activity, and volume and type of public engagement - Information about the funding support for the project - Some baseline information to identify the 'type' of project, perhaps by the main artform, or programme theme - Enables production of size and scope numbers for the whole Glasgow 2014 cultural programme	- Supplied through standardised monitoring forms at the end of projects - Projects receiving funding are told in advance that this will be a requirement - All projects which are part of the Glasgow 2014 Cultural Programme supply this data

Mid-level analysis

Tier	Data	Resources
Midlevel	- Building a standardised picture of the demographics of audiences and participants - This could include information about audiences and participants' previous cultural experiences - This could include information which would be relevant to social and economic impacts, potentially identifying: tourists and their motivation and spend; those new to particular artforms or experiences; and other characteristics. - Potential to build up a cohort of contacts of those who engaged, amongst which a longer-term assessment could take place.	- The majority of organisations and individuals normally delivering cultural programmes would be unable to supply this data - A strategic programme-wide approach, with standardised surveys and support to train volunteers to undertake survey work or place field researchers on the ground at events, could potentially build a significant and rich dataset for the Glasgow 2014 Cultural Programme. - Could work with existing audience development agencies to support project evaluation of audience demographics

In-depth analysis

Tier	Data	Resources
In-depth	- Exploring the value of individual projects or clusters of projects attempting significant change/new achievements. - Suitable for long-term participatory work, complex industry interventions (e.g. to target growth/innovation in the creative industries), etc. - Would allow more complex/risky projects to be assessed more fully.	- Would require commissioning on a case-by-case basis, but supported within the overall context of a central evaluation framework. - May use more complex and longitudinal methods, and could be the best source of data about long-term impact. -

+

Thank you – any questions?

twitter.com/gmp01

gayle.mcpherson@uws.ac.uk