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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The research aims
This study was carried out by OPENspace research centre on behalf of ixia. The brief asked for “a tool for assessment that will be of use to the key parties engaged in public art practice”. The research was aimed at providing “guidance on impact, to better understand public art practice and promote professional relationships”, and to allow consideration of the relationship between impact and quality, in respect of context and process. The results are of relevance to artists, commissioners, funders and collaborators across the disciplines engaged in public art practice.”

Methodology
The research was designed to take into account the changing nature of public art, resistance to evaluation and the policy context for evaluation and impact assessment. It involved the following steps.

a) Exploration of the purpose and nature of evaluation and impact assessment, including definitions of evaluation, different evaluation processes and methodologies, the nature of programme vs. project level evaluation, and methods for identification of measures and indicators.
b) A review of current claims for public art in relation to impact and arts practice and a mapping of good practice.
c) Development of an evaluation framework and tools for assessing the impact of public art
e) Recommendations for development of the framework and toolkit.

Findings
There are many current issues to be addressed in evaluating the impact of public art:

- the difficulties inherent in defining quality and success in art
- a reluctance to identify criteria for measuring quality and success;
- the challenge to evaluation in the notion and practice of activist art;
- the number and range of actors that may be involved in delivering and hosting public art;
- the difficulty of measuring economic and social impacts of public art, especially in the context of large-scale regeneration initiatives;
- the difficulty of measuring other impacts, e.g. health, education, social inclusion
- understanding how the results of evaluations are to be used and shared

An effective approach to assessment of impact in public art projects must address the following questions:

- who are the key players or stakeholders and which need most attention or careful categorisation;
- what are the different values that are important to capture and
- what are the key stages in the process of a public art project where the evaluation and assessment process need to play a part?
Recommendations
OPENspace developed an evaluation framework that is sensitive to the needs of public art and the nature of public art practice. It is designed to be used by all stakeholders in a public art project from the outset. Its overall aim is to increase mutual awareness of diverse agendas and desired outcomes of a project, so that
a) the potential of the project can be maximised and different goals identified
b) an appraisal of project feasibility can be carried out
c) . The stakeholders can identify and agree on the outcome measures that are appropriate to assess impact
d) systems for collecting, storing, analysing and reporting on the information gathered can be agreed.

Two tools have been developed and piloted: the matrix and personal project analysis. Both are designed to be used at several stages in a project: at initiation, to evaluate objectives and approaches; during the life of the project, to evaluate process and outcome; and to evaluate impact after completion of the project.

The Matrix. In contrast with existing evaluation tools, this is a multi-dimensional tool that places the artist and artistic values at the core of the process. Its first dimension facilitates the identification of the range of stakeholders involved in any public art project, including creators, hosts and commissioners and funders. Its second dimension facilitates identification of the range of values that may need to be taken into account in assessing outcome and impact. These include artistic, social, environmental and economic values. The third dimension is flexibility, as the matrix can be adapted to the needs and priorities of the different stakeholders and context of the public art project. It allows relevant measures and indicators of quality and impact to be identified.

Personal project analysis. This allows the artist and other key players involved in a public art project to explore an individual view of the project and their personal relationship with it, in the context of understanding outcome and impact. This tool allows the artist and project manager, among others, to evaluate the project at different stages, including the impact of different stakeholders on the evolution of the project.

Using the evaluation framework and assessment toolkit
Guidance on how to use the framework has been prepared. This involves:
a) identifying a facilitator and introducing the Matrix;
b) identifying what outcomes are important to different stakeholders and coming to an agreed view of what are the most important (and perhaps diverse) values, taking into account all stakeholders’ priorities;
c) defining outcomes, outputs and indicators in relation to these values;
d) planning for the collection, storage and analysis of data, including baseline information;
e) identifying when and how to use personal project analysis for key stakeholders;
f) giving feedback to stakeholders, learning from the results of the evaluation and dissemination as appropriate.
Testing the toolkit
Elements of the toolkit were tested in four different public art projects. This demonstrated that all parts of the assessment toolkit are usable and potentially useful. Appropriate training for facilitators is needed and, ideally, the toolkit should be introduced to stakeholders in person at a meeting early on in planning the project.

The test case studies demonstrated the value of both the Matrix and the Personal Projects Analysis, since they reveal quite different but complementary and useful aspects of a project and its outcomes.

Taking the evaluation framework forward
The framework and toolkit is now ready for full trialling and production as a package for use by all those engaged in public art. The following are recommendations to take this forward:
a) training workshops for evaluation facilitators, to introduce them to the use of the toolkit and to methods that assist in forum discussion and consensus-building.
b) publication of the evaluation framework in an attractive and user-friendly format for wide dissemination
c) evaluation workshops and seminars for artists, for commissioning bodies and for community groups, to introduce them to the benefits, principles and practice of evaluation
d) trialling across a range of projects and contexts
e) development of a database of evaluations of public art, in a comparable format, so that long-term monitoring and analysis can be carried out across projects. This will allow for identification of good practice and better understanding of the relationships between process, output and outcome in terms of the quality of public art.
1. INTRODUCTION: PUBLIC ART AND THE POLICY CONTEXT

1.1 Introduction to the Research

This study has been carried out on behalf of ixia, who commissioned OPENspace to undertake research on assessing impact and quality in public art. The brief points to the need to “develop a tool for assessment that will be of use to the key parties engaged in public art practice”. The work is aimed at providing “guidance on impact to better understand public art practice and promote professional relationships. In addition the work should consider the relationship between impact and quality, in respect of context and process. The assessment tool for impact and quality will be of relevance to artists, commissioners, funders and collaborators across the disciplines engaged in public art practice.”

The framework for assessing impact in relation to public art practice is intended to explore new methodologies for measuring impact and the relationship between these measures or indicators and quality. Ixia recognises that measures to ascertain the impact of public art may need to be more responsive to peculiarity rather than consistency. Assessment of impact is not seen as a process by which to determine ‘value’ alone, nor should it be assumed that impact is always positive or of identifiable benefit.

The framework is intended to be used by ixia to promote excellence in practice. To this end, the proposed assessment tools developed as part of this research were tested on case studies by a number of advisors. The framework and toolkit is now ready for full trialling and production as a package for use by all those engaged in public art.

1.2 The Nature of Public Art

Public artists and agencies have been responsible for creating some of the most dramatic and successful projects on the UK cultural landscape. However, over recent decades, professional opinion has become increasingly concerned with ‘public art’ as a meaningful term. Once institutionalised, the many practices included within the term ‘public art’ demonstrably change, often in order to resist categorisation, despite the often conventional funding and project management structures in place to deliver objects of ‘public art’. Its traditional usage to denote ‘sculpture in the open air’ refers now only to one kind of sub-genre of ‘public art’ alongside others. The term ‘public art’ has become problematic on a number of other levels (some of which is discussed in detail in the Literature Review in Section 3).

Some key problems are briefly indicated here. Firstly, public art commissions within a private commissioning context may often stop the artwork being freely accessible to the public. Secondly, the interior siting of public artworks in spaces such as museums (often with free access) contradicts the traditional sense of ‘public art’. Thirdly, in the 1970s and 1980s artists and critics generated explicit ideas on ‘site-specificity’ that fragmented and overturned the commonly
understood paradigm, both conceptually and physically. Fourthly, interventions of a non-physical and/or process-based type became commonplace in the 1990s (ref. Walter Grasskamp on ‘art as service’ in Munster Sculpture Project 1997 publication, or Suzanne Lacy’s discussion of ‘new genre public art’ (1995). Projects of a social and political nature stretched an already elastic term. Finally, issues of authorship have come increasingly to the fore, particularly in contexts where artists work collaboratively with other professionals and/or within communities of interest or communities of place in order to realise a project.

Artists are now more often acknowledged by the public and by professionals as working within dynamic ‘contexts’ of complex natures rather than that physical ‘sites’ alone. This movement signals an expansion of the potential impact of public art, and a realisation of its social complexity. Clearly, a claim for the autonomy for ‘public art’ as a genre is a misguided assumption (see Matzner, 2004, p.11, for example). Indeed, the name change of the Public Art Forum to ‘ixia’ might also be seen as part of this transformation of the field and ambitions of public art.

1.3 Resistances to evaluation
A new publication, Public Art. A Reader, (Matzner, 2004) has no reference at all to evaluation, despite sections on ‘Art and Society’ and ‘Art and the Public’ (including one essay by Birgit Sonna ‘From Official Art to Day-Trip Destination: Public Art Reflected in the Media and Opinion Polls’). Eileen Adams’s more practice-orientated Public Art: People, Project, Process (1997) has only four paragraphs on evaluation. Reinforcing some of the issues raised in the Literature Review (Section 3), informal verbal feedback on the issues under research points to a number of resistances to evaluation that exist within the professional public art sector. These can be summarised as follows:

**Financial barriers** – a) when budgets are tight, evaluation is often seen by commissioners/clients as an unnecessary expense, b) financial and time constraints often impel project managers onto the next project rather than to evaluating past work.

**Bureaucratic barriers** – evaluation can be perceived as an over-complex activity, where the outcomes are uncertain or potentially unhelpful to future work.

**Lead responsibility** – according to the perception of the value of evaluation, it can be unclear who benefits from evaluation and therefore who takes responsibility for driving the evaluation process.

**Artist barriers** – practitioners themselves can perceive the evaluation process as exposing the ‘mythic narrative’ of what happens during a project, and how well initial intentions were realised. (Katherine Clark, MUF, pers. comm., 2004) This is seen to threaten future funding for projects, but also raises complex issues about the ultimate ‘meaning’ and ‘value’ of a work of art, and whether or not that meaning and value is shared or individually arrived at.

An example which illustrates how distanced some European thinking is from the UK notion of evaluation in public art can be seen in the response of Walter Grasskamp, an acknowledged international expert on public art for many years, when asked whether the City of Munster or the curatorial team undertook evaluation of the Sculpture Project series. He replied in the affirmative, saying that
the artistic content of ‘Sculpture Project 1997’ was itself an evaluation of ‘Sculpture Project 1987’ (pers. comm., 2004). Whilst this may be an important statement on an unmeasurable curatorial level, it signals at the very least the problems of how to conceive of evaluation in ways which have explicit and communicable meaning and value for all stakeholders.

In summary, cultural barriers to evaluation would need to be overcome in order to establish that evaluation brings clear benefits to artistic practice and commissioning.

1.4 The Policy Context

1.4.1 Government Policy
At all levels within public services and government agencies there is an increasing emphasis on integrating evaluation into the commissioning of work. For example, a recent communication on evaluation from the European Commission (EC, 2003) reflects a growing demand to integrate evaluation into all of its own activities. Politicians and policy-makers are increasingly asking for evidence of which policy initiatives are working.

The government’s advice on appraisal and evaluation for government departments and agencies, captured in HM Treasury’s Guide to Economic Appraisal (the Green Book) and in Cabinet Office Strategy Unit’s guidance on policy analysis (the Magenta Book) (both 2003), set out the importance of providing evidence to support policy.

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) research strategy for 2003-6 reflects a desire to support and develop ‘Evidence Based Policy’. They state that careful monitoring of programmes and systematic evaluation of their outcomes compared to objectives, and actual costs and benefits compared to plans, is a key element in the standard Rationale, Objectives, Appraisal, Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback (ROAMEF) policy framework. Evaluation against the three pillars of sustainability - economic, environmental and social values - is becoming a standard requirement in policy and practice.

1.4.2 Quality of Life Indicators
The UK Government has developed 15 headline indicators as a ‘quality of life barometer’ (originally DETR 1999). They cover the three pillars of sustainable development, namely social progress, economic growth and environmental protection, including people’s everyday concerns like housing development, health, jobs, air quality, educational achievement, wildlife and economic prosperity. They are intended to focus public attention on what sustainable development means and to give a broad overview of whether we are “achieving a better quality of life for everyone, now and for generations to come”. Underneath these headline indicators are an expanding range of national and regional indicators and those that relate to building sustainable communities, for example, form an important background to the assessment of the impact of public art.
1.4.3 Projects in the Public Realm
Many organisations, including CABE, the ODPM, the Community Fund (now the Big Lottery Fund) and the Countryside Agency, have recognised recently that better evaluation frameworks need to be developed to assess the effectiveness of projects in the public realm. They emphasise the need to look for outcomes rather than outputs and to understand the process by which aims are agreed and related to outcomes. Monitoring and evaluation are closely linked with policy development at the strategic level and when specific projects or initiatives are being implemented. Programme aims and objectives are influenced by political aims, which in turn will influence the context for monitoring and evaluation. Thus, any evaluation or assessment process cannot be divorced from a wider political or cultural context. Recent work for the Countryside Agency (2003, see also OPENspace Research Centre 2003) has set out recommendations for development of evaluation frameworks for projects (including art projects) relating to accessing and enjoying the countryside.

1.4.4 Responsiveness to Users and the Community
Clients, service users and project participants are increasingly recognising their entitlement to obtain the services or access the opportunities they want and need. Service providers and those working in the public realm need to take into account UK legislation that prohibits discrimination on the grounds of gender, race, disability and sexual orientation; legislation prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of age is due in 2006. The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (and in prospect, 2005) covers the provision of aids and adaptations as well as physical access to sites and premises within its requirements. In this context, monitoring and evaluation take on particular importance in assessing the experiences of disadvantaged groups in relation to projects in the public realm.
2. WHY EVALUATE? THE PURPOSE AND NATURE OF EVALUATION AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2.1 Definitions of Evaluation

The European Commission (2003) defines evaluation as:
“…[the] judgement of interventions according to their results, impacts and needs they aim to satisfy.”

In a conventional context, monitoring and evaluation have been seen as:
• providing a framework in which objectives are set in terms of targets;
• allowing progress towards the achievement of objectives to be monitored;
• give funders assurance that investment is being put to effective use;
• allowing examination of the mechanisms of programme or project delivery;
• guiding the modification of strategies and polices throughout the lifetime of projects
• assessing and recording of the outcome and impact of actions; and
• providing feedback for programme or project management purposes.

Even if one steps outside the conventional and economically-driven model, into a creative and cultural environment that is a major context for public art, evaluation has been seen as an important tool to aid all stakeholders involved in a programme or project to be clear about their goals, to be effective in working towards them and to demonstrate the outcomes and impacts to others.

2.1.1 Formative (Process) and Summative (Outcome) Evaluation

There are two main types of evaluation (HMSO, 1992):

(a) Process (or formative) evaluation aims to assess how policy is put into practice, what happens and how policy is meant to work.

(b) Outcome (or summative) evaluation aims to identify the final impact of a project/programme – how far did it achieve what it set out to achieve and were there any unexpected impacts?

2.1.2 Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback

Monitoring involves the systematic collection and recording of data that demonstrate how well projects, programmes and policies are delivering their intended outputs. This may be related to timetables and schedules, input from different personnel and communities and outputs in a variety of forms, from activities to physical elements in the environment.

Evaluation refers to looking at the processes and outcomes of projects, programmes and policies and making some judgement as to their comparative effectiveness. Therefore, it takes a wider perspective and is generally understood to best be undertaken by referring to a ‘baseline’ situation (i.e. before project/programme/policy implementation). Formative evaluation should take place at one or more key points in the project/programme, while summative evaluation takes place at the end and, for some aspects of the programme or project at least, may often be undertaken by independent evaluators.
Feedback provides stakeholders with the evidence to make decisions on whether and how such programmes or projects should be carried out in future.

2.1.3 Outcome vs. Impact
Outcomes are seen as directly attributable, at least in part, to the programme or project in question, and are usually measured at, or shortly after, completion. Outcome indicators show clear progress towards project aims, as evidenced through the changes and effects resulting from specific interventions.

Impacts are generally seen as intended or unintended changes in organisations, communities or systems at a broader level and often on a longer time scale; thus they are unlikely to be measurable within a project’s lifetime and are usually evaluated or assessed some time after projects or programmes have finished. There may be intermediate outcomes that address subsidiary aims (e.g. increasing self-esteem and confidence in community members) on the way to a long-term impact such as better chance of education and employment for a group of people.

2.2 The Evaluation Process
The W K Kellog Foundation of America (2004) has developed a simple way of envisioning community programme planning and evaluation that is systematic and readily accessible to different groups with different ways of thinking. The Kellog Foundation’s work has some relevance to public art evaluation, in particular those projects with community-related objectives. Here, a programme is a series of projects designed to meet a specific policy objective (in this case community development). The key components are:

- Resources/inputs – human, financial, organisational, community
- Programme activities – processes, tools, events, technology and actions
- Outputs – including types, levels and targets of services to be delivered
- Outcomes – changes in participants’ behaviour, knowledge, skills, status and level of functioning;
  - short-term outcomes, within 1-3 yrs
  - longer term outcomes, 4-6 yr timeframe
- Impact – intended or unintended change in organisations, communities or systems, within 7-10 years, generally after project funding is finished

The Foundation points to the need to identify the audience for evaluation of different programme elements and for this audience to agree how they will use the information in evaluation results. In this framework, outcomes are seen as more-or-less direct effects that can be shown to result from a programme, while impacts are seen as broader and longer term effects. The framework is useful in giving a simple and clear understanding of the components of evaluation and in showing how programmes that incorporate a number of initiatives, or projects, should be evaluated.

The DCMS recognises that research and evaluation planning needs to be explicitly incorporated in the very early stages of policy/programme/project development. The Community Fund and Charities Evaluation Service (2003) have provided useful guidance on evaluation, including definitions of outcomes, impacts and indicators of quality or success. The Countryside Agency has also recently developed guidance...
for commissioning bodies and a monitoring and evaluation toolkit for project leaders (ECOTEC and OPENspace, 2004) which provide an integrated approach to programme and project evaluation.

2.2.1 The ROAMEF cycle

The ROAMEF cycle (Rationale, Objectives, Appraisal, Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback) is a model favoured within UK government departments which sums up the various stages of a robust evaluation process (HM Treasury 2003). The value of the ROAMEF cycle is that it is systematic: it follows a logical process through which all stages build on to the next. In addition, it includes a feedback mechanism, which is central to learning from the activities, services and/or projects. The evaluation cycle can be a one-off process, where lessons are learned for the future, or it can be carried out several times within an implementation period.
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The White book (DCMS March 2003) makes a comparison between a typical research process which tests a hypothesis or theory compared to the evidence-based policy-making process embodied in ROAMEF. Arts-based projects need evaluation processes relevant to the nature of their work in order to harness the ROAMEF cycle effectively to feed into future, evidence-based arts policies.

2.2.2 Rationale, Objectives and Appraisal

Programme or project appraisal ensures that, when all the benefits are aggregated, projects will fulfil all the objectives of the commissioning body (the strategic fit). It is at this point that a baseline against which to measure change should be established.
To measure robustly the effectiveness of a programme or project, and value for money, appraisal ideally then considers the ‘counter-factual’. The rationale is that desirable outcomes are to be achieved from an intervention, so the question of whether the objectives could be achieved without an intervention – the ‘do nothing’ option – must be taken into account. In practice, this type of appraisal is extremely difficult for certain types of projects, including public art projects, where there are many practical difficulties, for example in identifying control groups that are meaningful and appropriate comparators. It may be easier to demonstrate the counter-factual for a programme of interventions than for an individual project.

2.3 Evaluation Methodology

It is considered good practice to choose evaluation methods appropriate to the need, i.e. fit for purpose. The form of evaluation will be determined by the aim of the evaluation and the questions which need to be answered in relation to the objectives, the type of data needed, the audience for the evaluation and the timescale involved.

2.3.1 Indicators and Measures

Goals-based evaluation sets specific indicators to be recorded and assessed in advance of programme or project implementation. These may be indicators identified and/or measured by external bodies, e.g. certain health statistics or measures of economic deprivation, or they may be developed specifically for a particular project. Indicators of impact need to be set against baseline information and recognise that ambitious aims and innovative processes will influence the indicators against which quality and success can be measured. Impact assessment must also take into account outcomes that fail fully to achieve expectations but nonetheless result in high quality and possibly unexpected impacts, and equally outcomes that fail to meet any standard of quality or success.

2.3.2 Who conducts the evaluation?

Internal or self-evaluation is carried out by programme or project coordinators using information gathered from project workers, participants and stakeholders. It can use any evaluative tools or methods and be sensitive to the nature of the project and the history of those involved. If well-planned, it can be effective and inexpensive but may be vulnerable to the lack of objectivity which self-assessment inevitably entails.

External or independent evaluation is carried out by professionals who have not been directly involved in the programme or project. It is considered more objective than evaluation carried out by staff involved but may be more expensive to carry out. Project initiators may feel more vulnerable in the context of external evaluation but, in some cases, outside consultants may elicit more honest responses from participants. This approach is only successful if all parties ‘buy in’ to the process and recognise its value.

A compromise form of evaluation may be carried out by independent evaluators who nonetheless work within the project organisation to develop capacity and assist the organisation or project team to evaluate itself. This is sometimes called the ‘critical friend’ approach.
2.3.3 What kind of data or information sources are used?
There are a wide range of existing methods by which to collect data to inform evaluations; they reflect the different research paradigms in which they have been developed. These range from quantitative, measurable data such as numbers of participants, income gained or health attributes, through conventional qualitative data collected by interview and questionnaire, such as responses to questions on people's perceptions, memories or feelings, to more phenomenological or embodied approaches where self-recording of responses using diaries, expressions of self-image, etc. may be used (See Appendix C for some examples). Statistical analysis may be used on a range of data, even if the focus of data collection has been ‘soft’ information such as the level of agreement with certain statements or attitudes about the quality of the environment, and this may help to add a level of robustness to conclusions about outcome or impact.

2.3.4 Stakeholder involvement
There has been renewed emphasis placed on the need to ensure that user groups, like consumers' groups, communities of interest or communities of place, are consulted and involved in the evaluation process. The increasing involvement of all stakeholders in initiating and developing projects is generally encouraged as good practice. The experiences and perceptions of ‘end-users’ on the effectiveness of project interventions are important and need to be recorded; they can provide vital information for the evaluation of outcomes. However, the involvement of user groups in the evaluation process raises particular issues about sensitivity, inclusiveness, timing, capacity, resources and communication. In this context, forward planning, the early identification of target groups and a commitment to early consultation about the aims, objectives and outcomes of the evaluation process are all important. It has been assumed that the cost is worth paying but “longer term costs, benefits and implications of different approaches to community engagement are likely to come under increasing scrutiny” (Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research 2003). If there is inclusive consultation about aims and objectives then there must also be agreement on access to the results for all stakeholders.

Any project which is aimed at the public or community as a whole may want to have monitoring in place to ensure that particular groups, e.g. ethnic minorities or disabled people, have been effectively included. For effective inclusion of black and minority ethnic groups, for example, any written material should be presented in minority languages, and interventions should be sensitive to gender and religious traditions.

2.4 Programme or project level evaluation?
Evaluation can be carried out at the level of individual projects and at the level of programmes which implement a number of projects. It is likely that both programme and project level evaluation will be useful in many situations. For example, it would be good practice for a local authority to evaluate a public art
programme that it has implemented over several years as well as requiring each project to undertake an appropriate level of individual evaluation. Some impacts, such as economic growth or enhancement of community cohesion in an area, may be better measured at a programme rather than project level, since the interaction and intervention of different factors at project level may make attempts to measure such impacts meaningless. On the other hand, project level evaluation can be important to capture impacts that are particular to a certain type of process or intervention. They can be undertaken in a way that is more sensitive to local conditions and communities and often capture richer data on the experiential impacts of an intervention.

Project level monitoring and evaluation focuses on a single project but it may also need to serve the evaluation requirements of a programme under which it is funded or commissioned, and so gather evidence which can be passed up to a more strategic level of assessment.

2.5 Project-level measures and indicators

2.5.1 Identifying outcomes and indicators
As identified above, evaluation methods at project level should be chosen to reflect the question(s) the evaluation is expected to answer, the leaders, actors and participants involved in the process and the resources involved. Good practice will engage all stakeholders, in the broadest sense, in identifying the key aim(s) and objectives of a project at the outset and defining outcomes and indicators of success. Work on the ODPM’s New Deal for Communities initiative (Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research 2003) suggested that it is a common mistake for projects to identify too many outcomes for evaluation; it is recommended that evaluation be focused on a more limited tranche, perhaps as few as three to five outcomes (Charities Evaluation Services, 2002, 2003).

Key indicators are then derived which will demonstrate most effectively (and in ways that can manageably be measured) whether the outcomes have been achieved. The methods that are used to collect information should be fine-tuned to fit the requirements of the indicators. At a project level, it is often the case that participatory or even peer-led methods will be appropriate to collect some of the data needed, in addition to more conventional data collection via project initiators or managers. There must also be opportunity for negative outcomes to be identified, so that these, too, can be recorded and assessed.

If all stakeholders have been effectively engaged in development of the project objectives and identified outcomes which would signal project success for them, then there is much greater likelihood of the evaluation process being seen as a benefit, not merely a chore. If the evaluation process has been handled well from the outset, all stakeholders are likely to ‘buy in’ to the results.

2.5.2 Types of indicators
Output indicators help monitor and assess the work generated by a project and show progress towards delivering against objectives. In the context of many
projects, these indicators are used to examine the activities undertaken, the processes involved in attaining the desired outcomes. Outcome indicators help assessment of changes that take place as a result of a project and show progress towards meeting overall aims.

As suggested above, it is important to limit the indicators which illustrate outputs and outcomes to those that are most important. ODPM (2004) have developed a model to supplement the Green Book for spatially-targeted interventions – Assessing the Impacts of Spatial Intervention - which gives guidance on principles and evidence in relation to valuation of impacts, including: time savings; health and environment; heritage and culture impacts. It suggests that projects should follow available best practice guidance on choice of indicators and development of an indicator system – don’t reinvent the wheel, they say, look for indicators already defined.

2.5.3 Examples from the Government’s Quality of Life Indicators
Indicators of sustainable development were first published in Quality of life counts (DETR 1999). These indicators provide a baseline assessment for monitoring and reporting on progress towards economic, social and environmentally sustainable development as set out in the Government’s sustainable development strategy for the UK A better quality of life (DETR1999).

There are Headline (15), National (now 147), Regional and Local (29) indicators as well as International indicators. Objectives and indicators listed below are drawn from Annex A, pp. 291-298 of DETR’s 1999 Quality of life counts, and might be relevant to public art projects.

**National Indicators for Building Sustainable Communities**
(Improve access to education, jobs, leisure and services; and reduce the need to travel) indicators -

J2: Access to services in rural areas - Ensure that disabled people have access to a wider range of goods, services and facilities,
J3: Access for disabled people (In 1996 about 40% of people with a disability reported difficulties in accessing goods and services, (DSS Survey 1996 in DETR 1999)
J4: Participation in sport and cultural activities
L3: Community spirit – (help build a sense of community by encouraging and supporting all forms of community involvement)

**Local Indicators – Social Indicators**
The Local indicators are more relevant to individual projects, particularly the Social indicators, e.g.:

14: Access to Key Services
21: Fear of Crime
22 Social participation
23 Community well-being

**Local Indicators – Sustainable Local Economy**
29 Social and Community Enterprises
For the full set of current indicators, see: http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/indicators/index.htm

2.5.4 Examples from the Community Fund
The Community Fund (2003) recommends a range of indicators, many of which may be relevant to public art projects:
• Improved community relationships
• Improved social well-being and psychological health
• Improved employability
• Improved personal independence
• Improved physical health
• Increased individual resources
• Increased voluntary and community group capacity
• reduced isolation

The Community Fund recognises that outcomes may apply to more than one indicator and some project-related outputs and services may contribute to a number of different outcomes

2.5.5 The New Economics Foundation and the Groundwork Trust
Prove-It! (NEF and Groundwork Trust 2000) has a useful hierarchy of potential outcomes to be measured:
• individual;
• relationships between members of local communities; and
• connections between community members and agencies such as local council.

These are perhaps particularly relevant for self-evaluations and user involvement, including (it is claimed) “fun methods”.
3. LITERATURE REVIEW: CLAIMS FOR PUBLIC ART IN RELATION TO IMPACT AND ARTS PRACTICE

3.1 Introduction

This section reviews existing studies and reports on the impact of public art. It maps out the areas which have been covered most frequently in relation to key players and stages in the process of commissioning, delivery and ‘afterlife’ of public art projects and identifies gaps in the coverage. Appendix B maps out in a matrix the coverage of issues in the literature review.

Drawing on the literature review, this section also gives a summary of the claims made for the impact of public art and the evidence produced for this, giving examples of good, and sometimes bad, practice in evaluating impact. It sets out the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of literature, studies and projects and for appraising the quality of evidence presented.

3.1.1 Scope of the literature review

The review has covered as diverse a literature as possible, deriving from international English-language and European sources. Initially, UK reviews of public art were used to identify the major themes and authors for follow-up. Techniques used to uncover literature included a wide-ranging key-word search of library catalogues, including Edinburgh College of Art, Edinburgh and Heriot-Watt Universities and the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana and the National Library of Scotland. Web-based index and keyword searches were also conducted for case studies and news items.

The review that follows is based on English-language sources. A number of searches in Swedish, French and Spanish were undertaken but did not reveal any results that added significantly to the already complex picture obtained from English language sources.

Both the Arts Council of England (ACE) and the Scottish Arts Council (SAC) have commissioned a number of research projects in recent years to assess and evaluate the impact of public arts projects, particularly those which they have funded. Such research, although limited in scope at times, has provided additional material on which to draw in this research.

3.1.2 Methodology of the review

The literature on art impact evaluation as a whole is vast and there have been several attempts to critically review the subject (Shaw, 1999; Coalter, 2001; Getzkow, 2002, Reeves, 2002; Arts Council England, 2004), particularly in what concerns urban regeneration. It must be noted, however, that the bulk of the literature refers to “the arts” which, particularly in economic evaluations, means primarily “the performing arts”. In contrast, evaluations of public art have rather followed the “art critique” format, in which seasoned practitioners, facilitators, educators or experts have highlighted aspects of the process in order to provide insights into a problem, a failure or a success that could help in learning from past experiences. As the main aim of this review is to highlight good practice, whenever
possible the highlighted element has been one referring to public art. In the absence of that, or when the public art evaluations were found lacking in methodology, examples of good practice in the arts in general were included.

3.2 issues in Evaluating the Impact of Public Art

Selwood (1995), in what still seems to be the most multifaceted and balanced approach to the impact of public art in Britain, states that “expansive claims are made for public art [as] it is credited with being a cultural investment vital to the economic recovery of many cities”, humanising the built environment, promoting tourism and “creating employment and confidence”. Many of those claims were soon to appear in François Matarasso’s much quoted work *Use or Ornament?* (1997), where the foreword states that “evaluating the social impact of participating in the arts has long been a sort of *terra incognita*, a continent whose existence is known, but which remains unexplored [and] filled with dangers for the unwary” (p.1). Seven years later, the *terra* may not be so *incognita* any longer but the dangers seem to remain the same. Whether or not *Use or Ornament?* is “the first large-scale attempt in the UK to gather evidence of the social impacts arising from participation in the arts” (Reeves, 2002, p.16) (that is if one ignores Selwood’s less sweeping and more systematic evaluations), the problem is that, according to Merli (2002), Matarasso’s “desire to be useful and relevant to the policy process” was achieved to the detriment of the quality of the research work (p.107). Furthermore, when it comes to measuring the impact of the arts, methodological problems are by no means limited to those listed in Matarasso’s study.

Reeves (2002, p.103), in the conclusion of a detailed critical review of impact evaluations for the Arts Council, draws up a very long list of detected deficiencies in this area of research, such as

- Narrow conceptualisations of social and economic impact;
- Use of small samples and the reliance on self-reports with little corroborating evidence of impacts;
- Over-reliance on official statistics presenting a partial picture of the arts and creative industries;
- Lack of methodological transparency, especially with regard to sampling frames and methods, sample representativeness, survey response rates, procedures for applying weightings, multipliers and extrapolating findings;
- Lack of a common framework of research principles, assessment processes and standards for evaluation and impact assessment;
- Simplistic or naïve explanations for attributing positive outcomes to arts projects, which thus fail to acknowledge the often complex issues associated with changing the perceptions and behaviour of individuals and communities, their skills, social networks, economic status and quality of life;
- Overestimation, in conclusions and recommendations, and through unfair comparisons, of the impacts of art at different stages.

In an interesting attempt to systematically approach the benefits of art, McCarthy et al (2005) distinguished between “instrumental benefits,” which they defined as “indirect outcomes of art experiences” (art as a “means” of achieving benefits in other areas) and “intrinsic benefits”, that is, those inherent in the art experience. Intrinsic benefits accrue in a wide spectrum between the private and public domains,
with an intermediate stage of “private benefits with public spillover.” Nevertheless the crux of this approach is the *art experience* and involvement in the arts, which seems to occur mostly in those adults who were exposed to them as children.

A recurrent theme in most of the approaches, however, is that the world of public art has been slow to develop effective mechanisms for gathering the range of evidence available and feeding findings back into the system.

There is a view that none of the existing research attempts to establish any type of methodology for evaluating benefit or even how benefit is conceived and benchmarked (Grennan, 2000). This is a particularly sensitive area since methodology and advocacy are seen as “just as vital to establishing the benefits that art can offer as the quality of work itself... [as well as] essential if public art is to avoid the tendency it has so often suffered from in the past, of making unsubstantiated claims” (Thackara, 2000, p.2). The problem is complicated by the fluid borders of public art, an area that Selwood (1992) considers “notoriously ill-defined” and where “definitions are contradictory [while] the litany of its merits is relatively constant, especially in its contribution to urban regeneration” (p.11).

Selwood’s case studies (Selwood, 1995), attempts at systematic evaluations of impacts seem to be very thin on the ground and, when at all available, the information about evaluation methods has proved to be rather elusive. Whether this is the result of a need for confidentiality, lack of interest in publishing the results or a combination of these factors is not clear.

### 3.3 Quality/Success

During the 1980s, funding Public Art became increasingly justified, not necessarily in aesthetic terms but rather on the basis of its supposed contribution to ‘urban regeneration’ (Hall & Robertson, 2001). In institutional and policy circles, the realisation that the arts “did not occupy an autonomous aesthetic realm but rather were part of the material relations and reproductions of society” (Selwood, 1992, p.24) took hold at broadly the same time. Yet in cultural policy as well as in the literature on evaluation, although mentions of aesthetics, quality and even “good art” are frequent (Adams 1997, Dormer 1984, Barret 1994, CABE, 2002, Welsh Development Agency, 2004), definitions of what any of those qualifiers means are not forthcoming. This is a rather sensitive point because, as Belfiore (2003) notes, while many local authorities do not put artistic concerns at the top of their list of funding criteria, funding agencies do, and “the less money there is to spend on the arts the more necessary it is to make judgements based on quality” (p.100).

It is therefore not surprising that quite often quality issues have caused friction between major funding bodies. From the standpoint of indicators and best practice, this poses a problem, as there seems to be in the literature a reluctance to specify what it is meant by “quality” and, consequently, how it is measured.

Most importantly, applying the quality principle means that works should be selected not only on the basis of the requirements of the market or the likes and dislikes of the masses, or because of some political or ideological fad. For Honout (2002), part of the problem is the way “cultural pluralism” also affected artistic and aesthetic
judgments, i.e. that forms of culture hitherto regarded as trivial (e.g. pop music, comic books and B-movies) started to be taken seriously, so that quality had to be judged on a case-by-case basis.

This problem is compounded by “aesthetic value”, which has been seen as a construct within complex sets of relationships: between the specific work of art and the institutional discourse or theory; between the art world discourse and the art world as organisational system; between the art world elite and the rest of the art world, and between the art world and the broader context of social culture (Vickery, 2004). Adams (1997) maintains that the most frequent demand from bodies outside the Arts Councils is for assurance that there is a clear aesthetic assessment of public art applications.

Unfortunately, there is no agreement on what the nature of this process should be (Adams, 1997). In the Design Guide of the Welsh Development Agency (2004), identity and innovation, along with nature, are the elements that define good landscape design and “quality in the public realm” means places that “are attractive, safe, uncluttered and work effectively for all in society, including disabled and elderly people” (p.31). This is echoed by CABE’s (2002) statement that good design is as much about the aesthetic improvement of the environment as about improved quality of life, equality of opportunity and economic growth. For Willet (1984) public art “is a special kind of socio-aesthetic pudding and its proof must be in the eating” (p.11), meaning that the “triumph” of a piece of art has to be measured not just by the standard of the detached critic but above all by the long-term relationship with the casual viewer.

In evaluation terms, quality and aesthetics are moot points, and indicators are not forthcoming. If, following Willet (1984), “triumph” is used as synonymous with “success”, then one of Bovaird’s (1997) indicators when assessing value, i.e. frequency with which the work of art appears in tourist guide books and promotional literature (what Powell (2002) called “branding”), may be used as a proxy for “success”:

**Good practice:**
Is The Angel of the North a successful piece of public art? Using Bovaird’s indicator mentioned above, but replacing “frequency with which the work appears in tourist guides” with “number of hits on the Internet”, this piece of public art is, indeed, a successful one; the name of the sculpture hits more than 700 web entries and the interesting point is that the name of the sculpture is also used, among other purposes
- By other artists as title for their own work;
- As a restaurant name;
- By companies selling web domains;
- For promoting other places on the web (“We are getting our own Angel of the North”);
- As advertisements to attract investors to the area.

However valuable, this method of evaluation may have the disadvantage of being limited to large, very well-known or controversial examples of public art, thus being of
limited use in areas such as participatory art, in which quality has also emerged as an important attribute. A 1999 HEA study (quoted by Coalter, 2001, p.10) of 90 art health-related projects found that the quality of the finished product played an important role in whether the participants took pride in their work. The problem is that defining quality is a contentious issue, even in the relatively tame field of architecture where, as Biddulph (2004) noted while discussing different types of housing awards, the Royal Fine Arts Commission's attempt to define quality in formal terms had to be replaced by broader notions such as recognising that environmental meanings are socially constructed and transmitted. Belfiore (2002) argued for a notion of quality related to a “pluralistic-universalistic normativity” where the experience-process determines the quality; however, he did not suggest how this could be evaluated.

A way out of the impasse was proposed by Senie (2003) under the term "responsible criticism". In her view, at present not even the public art generated by artists receives that criticism, a point with which Phillips (1995) – who sees public art as operating in a "critical vacuum [as if] unworthy of the attentions of devoted critics" (p. 66) - and Kins (1998) concur. Yet Senie believes that “responsible criticism” may not occur until public art “is consciously reframed as art” [my emphasis]. Furthermore, when the art under consideration is community-based the question that immediately arises concerns what is being evaluated: process or product? For Senie it makes sense to begin with concept: was this a good or viable idea? This is followed by the question of whether the process achieved the project goals and, finally, what was the intended role of the product? What implicit criteria does it suggest?

Good practice: Responsible Criticism Model (Senie, 2003).
This model involves asking the following questions:
1. Is it good work according to its type: art, urban design, community project?
2. Does it improve or energise the site in some way, providing an aesthetic experience/seating/prompting conversation/raise social awareness?
3. Is there evidence of relevant or appropriate public engagement or use?

In this model, public art has to score on all three, or it is not successful.

Limitation: Time factor, although considered by the author, was not incorporated into the model, so relevant questions such as: After a certain number of years, has the use changed? Is the art being evaluated recognised as part of a place identity? Has it been vandalised? Is it used as a place for photographs? are not included

A challenging view, due perhaps to his profession as an architectural critic, is that advanced by Boys (2000), who considers that the particular tension that exists in the practice of public art derives from the fact that the public artist simultaneously wants to improve the quality of the public realm and to partake creatively in the concerns of artistic practice itself. This, Boys adds, is not about the popular/high culture opposition, or even about integrating both, but about exploring (with artists and non artists) “the spaces in-between” for which, when it comes to understanding the meaning and value embedded in the objects produced, there are two main solutions: education and participation. But Boys has his doubts as to whether it is possible to establish a methodology for understanding benefit or value, since there will always be a tension that cannot be resolved. In the public domain, says Boys, “the audience
is distracted”, as they are there not to contemplate the environment but to do something else. This implies that there are limits to the notions of how important it is to love or value art. Summarily put, public art is a type of art that
- needs to accept the distracted nature of the audience,
- should give something back to the public, and
- should imply participation rather than contemplation.

The problem, however, may be more complex than that. Phillips (1995), who considers that public art, when innocuous, can become a “public menace” – and “one that requires maintenance” (p.65) – seems to believe that promising and responsible public art strategies are those in which the artist assists “in the creation of ... a participatory audience where none seemed to exist” (p.67). These two positions illustrate what Mark Lewis (quoted by Phillips, p.63) calls “the ambiguity” of public art, with Boys and Phillips at the opposite ends of the spectrum. While Boys is concerned with what Selwood (1995) calls “permanent art in public places” and Phillips (1995) with art that has “cheerfully cooperated with prevailing and questionable urban (and suburban) initiatives” (p.63), Phillips’ conception of public art is one that “convenes a constituency to engage in collective exploration – even a difficult interrogation...[in which] the inherent radicality of its objectives and processes must be accepted” (p.69).

Selwood (1995), when discussing the criteria by which works of public art are judged, addresses some of the ambivalences involved. In the focus groups she conducted as part of an evaluation there was some reluctance to make judgments about quality, and perhaps a fear of establishing “a professional priesthood which determines what is quality and what is not” (p.69). Thus a councillor may point out that “quality should be decided by the customer”, attributing great weight to consensus from the public. However, Selwood also points out that in the artistic community “it is comparatively rare for the artist or the agency to be blamed for the failings of particular commissions”. If the public is unappreciative it may be dismissed as “ignorant”, “philistine” or “visually illiterate”. This is further complicated by the fact that – as critics such as Mary Sara (quoted by Selwood, p.68) maintain – the most successful pieces of public art are those the public really does not really see, namely those one walks across or leans against and feels “it should always have been there”.

**Good practice: Selwood’s model**

Selwood (1995) devised a highly integrated model to evaluate public art which was consistently used in all her case studies to make comparisons possible. In each case that was evaluated, the following were taken into account:

- **Background**: what prompted the commission, who was involved, for whom was the work intended, how was it funded, who had final responsibility for it and what did the different constituencies hope to gain from it? And what steps were taken to ensure that the criteria of the funding bodies were met?
- **Processes**: How decisions about theme, contents and appearance were made; what was the basis for the selection of artists, nature of the artist’s personal engagement, whose values the work expressed, in which way were the specifications relevant to the location and how was it introduced to the public?
- **Impact**: has the work been evaluated and by whom? How has this
subsequently informed the people involved? How has it impacted the public? Have the different constituencies opinions' shifted? Does the work hold any symbolic values?

Example: evaluation of “A Light Wave”, Westgate Station, Wakefield (1985-1988) a relatively small scale artist initiated project that involved a considerable number of institutions and funders as well as the community and was not free from controversy and problems although it resulted in a wealth of experience for the artist and an opening to further opportunities in public art (Selwood 1995, pp. 215-234).

Limitations: this is a complex evaluation, involving background research, focus groups and systematic analysis of the results, so it may demand more resources that some evaluations may be allocated. On the other hand the analysis of the process could provide valuable information when the outcomes did not reach the objectives. Thresholds are not considered but combined with Bovaird’s proxy indicators, it constitutes a powerful tool. It would profit from a greater involvement of the constituency in the definition of the indicators.

3.4 Activist Art

Evaluating social activist public art is not easy, and the very notion of evaluation is one that, according Hall & Robertson (2001), some activist artists would reject. There is little doubt about the visibility of the genre due to the publicity that many of the projects generate, but Felshin (1994) rejects the idea of calling this “the new public art” as this tends “to lump together artists who effectively employ process-oriented activist strategies with those who employ only its trappings” (p.21). Werner (2004), exploring strategies of activist art, sees contemporary activist artists inspiring engagement with social issues “by crafting resonant objects, images, or environments”; likewise Freiser (2003) sees public space as a site for critical interrogation by artists. According to Phillips (1995) this art is no longer “fixed, immutable and complete” as the role of the artists becomes “less privileged and detached” thus becoming an art that “registers the messy vitality of the world”.

Hall & Robertson (2001) argue that awareness of issues explored in this type of projects is high among international groups of educated elites such as curators, critics, teachers and students but that the extent to which they have been incorporated into the geographies from which these issues originated is less apparent. Phillips (1994) concurs that it is impossible to evaluate empirically the effectiveness of large and short-lived projects such as Peggy Diggs’ “Domestic Violence Milkcarton” in which issues connected with domestic violence were printed on milk cartons that were sold in supermarkets in areas where domestic violence was widespread. Although increased calls were reported to the National Domestic Violence Hotline, “the actual effects remain elusive”. The paradox of this piece of activist art is, as Phillips notes, that it did not become an activist public project until it invaded the sanctuary of the home.

For these very reasons, whether this art should be evaluated at all is very much open to discussion. As Lacy (1995) puts it, the art critic's problem is "what forms of evaluations are appropriate when the sites of reception for the work and the premise
of ‘audience’ have virtually exploded?” (p.172). In her view, one alternative could be to emphasise descriptive writing, considering that “recontextualising the work within other frames of reference – the larger social context prescribed by the issue — is an appropriate critical response”. Nevertheless, in this context, the most “honest” alternative seems to be a “partisan criticism” that takes into account the artist’s intentions as well as the “audience’s beliefs and intentions with respect to the art and its subjects” (p.182). The main problem of this approach is defining the audience and assessing their beliefs and intentions assessed since, as in the case of the milk carton project mentioned above, not only is the audience difficult to define but the ethics of actually approaching its members for evaluation purposes may be questionable in itself.

A concise and comprehensive model to evaluate art projects in general was developed by Woolf (1999). It may be flexible enough to accommodate “activist art” as well as place specific art. This model links success to the aims of the project while emphasising the value of the process. Furthermore, an outstanding aspect of Woolf’s model, which seems as relevant to activist as to place specific art, is the inclusion and relevance given to what Woolf calls “unexpected outcomes”.

According to Woolf, evaluation is making judgements, based on evidence, about the “value and quality” of a project. It involves all partners and helps in decision making, both during the project being evaluated and for future projects. The purposes of evaluation are twofold: (1) improve practice during project and for future projects. (2) to show what has happened as a result of the project. This is important because projects evolve and change and partners (including participants) can feel that the evaluation is for their benefit and not just for funders. Because of evaluation, projects can be better next time and standards raised. For Woolf, evaluation is part of the process and is defined from the onset in such a way that a baseline is defined.

Evaluation in this model involves five stages:

1. WHY to do the project; WHAT want to achieve and HOW to identify success?
2. HOW to collect evidence?
3. WHAT does the evidence tell us?
4. WHAT have we learned? WHAT would we do differently in the future?
5. WHOM would we tell about the project? WHAT do we tell and HOW?

STAGE 1: Planning
This stage involves determining who would have overall responsibility, who would participate and when the project would be evaluated. In this stage it is important to be clear about: (1) aims (main purpose of the project) and (2) objectives (specific things partners want to achieve). Objectives should be **SMART**: Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Realistic and within a Timescale. In Woolf’s view, measures of success are whether the objectives have been achieved; these are called performance indicators, success criteria or outcomes and can involve gains in skills, knowledge or understanding of the arts, or personal or social change. An important point concerning aims is that they should be acceptable to all partners although they may not be shared by all. A relevant aspect of this model is its emphasis on what Woolf calls “unexpected outcomes” which, in her view, are as important as those planned. Also important is what has been achieved by the end of the project and in the long term.
STAGE 2: How to collect evidence
Woolf also emphasises the need to determine a baseline. The proposed methods of
documentation are flexible and varied, including video/tape recordings, diaries and
minutes of meetings, and if one aim of the project is more important than the others
then the evidence to be collected should be related to it. Woolf emphasises the need
for both qualitative and quantitative evidence, pointing out that qualitative evidence is
more convincing if collected from people with different perspectives. In this stage
Woolf analyses a number of evaluation instruments, with their advantages and
disadvantages (see next page):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument:</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Completed in private, large numbers</td>
<td>Superficial info; not returned; rely on literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In depth discussions</td>
<td>Time consuming; can be intimidating; danger of leading responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group discussions</td>
<td>Secure setting to get range of opinions</td>
<td>Difficult to arrange; may not be typical group as only more confident participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Easy to manage; provides documentation and evidence: all can participate; does not depend on literacy skills</td>
<td>Difficult to decide who or what to photograph as good evidence; end with huge amount of descriptive material which is difficult to interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Flexible, would appeal to young people; independent of literacy</td>
<td>Can be intrusive; danger as above; expensive equipment; people can “perform”; quality difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape recordings</td>
<td>Cheap and independent from literacy</td>
<td>Danger as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written diaries</td>
<td>Simple and cheap but needs structure</td>
<td>Reliance on literacy skills; seen as private; may present a falsely positive view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment boxes</td>
<td>Simple, cheap; easy to organise; anonymous (honesty)</td>
<td>Comments too wide ranging; Reliance on literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti walls</td>
<td>Simple, cheap, fun; mass of comments</td>
<td>Not anonymous (peer pressure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings and diagrams</td>
<td>Simple and cheap; no literacy required</td>
<td>Drawing can be intimidating; evidence difficult to interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory techniques</td>
<td>Enjoyable; no literacy needed</td>
<td>Need special skills; can be intimidating; evidence may be difficult to interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Can give in-depth insight; good for evaluating skills of leader and whole experience</td>
<td>Time consuming; labour intensive; difficult to systematically observe a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display or performance</td>
<td>Opportunity to share</td>
<td>End product can be disappointing; show the result not the process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Evaluation Instruments, from Woolf (1999)

STAGE 3: What does the evidence tell us?
According to Woolf, the key issue at this stage is to establish the majority view and the focus should be on evidence that shows change, progress and development; the crucial point is not to be influenced by small number of either very positive or very negative comments. It is at this stage that the evaluator(s) should look for unexpected outcomes. The information can be presented in a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses, and Threats)

STAGE 4: What has been learned
The key issues at this stage are (1) what the partners/participants have learned from the project and (2) how things should be done differently in the future. At this stage, comparisons with previous evaluations should help in future decisions making.

STAGE 5: Reporting and sharing
Reporting and reflecting on a project is important for improving practice; the report should be as short as possible; photos and diagrams help as they save on words. The key issues of this final stage are (1) whether and how the evidence was interpreted (2) whether the judgements have been based on evidence and conclusions drawn.

As in this model the “audience” is considered one of the partners, the issue raised earlier by Lacy (1995) concerning the difficulties of defining the audience and, in some cases, of the ethics of actually approaching it, largely remain.

3.5 Economic and Social Impacts/Regeneration

Reeves (2002), in a comprehensive and critical review of the literature on the economic and social impact of the arts, argues that, despite a growing body of studies claiming to provide evidence of the impact of the arts and culture on social and economic development, “few studies define what they mean by impact” (p.22). There is not even an agreement as to what constitutes the creative industries sector, as the creative industries “represent a stunningly diverse range of economic activities, institutional forms and working patterns, rivalled by few other areas of the economy” (Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies, 2001, p.1). Perhaps the most important point to note from the onset is that public art is nowhere identified as such in this literature.

Radich (quoted by Reeves 2002, p.27) defines economic impact as the effect of a given phenomenon on the economic behaviour of consumers, businesses, the market, industry, the economy as a whole, national wealth and income, and employment and capital. The European Task Force on Culture and Development (1997) simplifies the issue by defining impacts as direct (creating jobs, economic effects) and indirect (“socially profitable”, such as cultural credit or esteem for people and institutions); the latter are seen by Landry et al (1993) as social impacts, that is, those effects that go beyond the artefacts and events and have continuing influence in people’s lives.
The increasing interest in impact evaluation has sprung partially from a recognition of the role played by art in many spheres, from urban regeneration to the economy, partially from the growing advocacy of evaluation as a valuable decision-making and learning tool. Nevertheless the main problem with impact evaluation seems to have been lack of robustness – particularly at neighbourhood level (Shaw, 1999, quoted by Reeves, 2002) – as well as lack of systematic evidence of the impact of art projects. Furthermore, although the importance of evaluation as a learning tool is proclaimed by a vast spectrum of agencies (from cultural organisations such as UNESCO to agencies engaged in economic development), according to Reeves (2002), in the art field several factors contribute to the lack of robustness of art evaluations:

- Lack of interest in evaluation in the art world. Pally (2003), a practising artist himself, maintains that this is due to evaluations being seen as measuring the success of art which could have an impact on funding (or rather possibilities of no future funding), thus putting artists in a defensive mode.
- Evaluations being regarded as additional rather than integral to art activity.
- Perceptions that an organisation’s primary objectives for evaluation are to fulfil the funder’s objectives rather than evaluating the impact of their activities.
- Data collection perceived as a chore rather than a tool.
- Cultural resistance to evaluations from those involved in art projects

This is in stark contrast to the Arts Council of England (2004b) view of the role of evaluation and self-evaluation for artists as:

- a good way of dealing with ‘quality assurance’ – you keep an eye on things to make sure quality is maintained,
- an instrument that helps prove the value of what the artist is doing,
- a means to record the artist’s contribution to the field he or she is working in.

Miller (1998) takes this a step further and warns of the dangers on not undertaking evaluations. In her view the absence of any critical evaluation for public art results in established artists equating their time engaged in public art with a period of hibernation because, in the absence of critique, their public art work appears to be regarded by many curators and gallery owners as a distracting side-line

Yet, as Carlsson and Engel (2002) have pointed out, part of the problem of traditional, summative (as opposed to formative) evaluation is the way that it could end up being used for:

- Legitimising use: legitimises decisions and positions that have already been taken on other grounds,
- Ritual use: evaluation as a symbolic act,
- No use: potential users are not aware of findings, or see no relevance in them.

These seem particularly important in the light of the factors enumerated above.

The issue of measuring social impact is compounded by the difficulties involved in judging the scale of those impacts (Annabel Jackson Associates, 2000). Is more necessarily better?
Another problem often highlighted is lack of clarity by arts organisations about the intented outcomes of interventions. Bovaird (1997) distinguished between two types of outcomes: intermediate impact on individuals or groups or investment, and strategic impact, often the result of successful intermediate outcomes, such as reduction in crime and improved quality of life. This, according to Matarasso (1997), requires the development of indicators that capture the complex nature of potential art impacts. Yet, as Matarasso’s own research seems to show, the identification of indicators and the impacts they intend to evaluate may be more elusive and problematic than is openly admitted.

Merli (2002), reviewing Matarasso’s 1997 research into the impact of the arts, maintains that it lacks “internal validity” as “many of the hypotheses are expressed as relationships between abstract concepts that cannot be observable or measurable.” To Matarasso’s argument that internal validity is unattainable in the evaluation of artistic programmes because creative initiatives cannot have internal validity, Merli responds that he should have inferred, from his own premises, that “the impact of the arts programmes cannot be studied by using predefined indicators [which] are methodological tools not suited for the task of discovering the unpredictable results of activities”. Yet those indicators were “constructed by the researcher and agreed with project partners without preliminary discussions with the people who had taken part in the activities” (Merli, op.cit, p.112).

Most studies of cultural activity and social regeneration deal with the impact of participation on individuals and communities (Evans and Shaw, 2004), participation meaning hands-on activities. There is less research on seeing and watching and a tendency to concentrate on those who participate with exclusion of those who do not. Furthermore, most of the evidence relates to the immediate and short-term results of the activities.

Shaw (2003), reviewing cases of art’s impact on neighbourhoods, describes a number of cases which were evaluated using large or relatively large population samples. Many of the claims made by Matarasso (1997) appear as an outcome of those studies: participants making new friends, trying something new, feeling more confident about what they could do, feeling satisfied with themselves. Shaw also mentions a survey by Comedia of more than 500 people which concluded that art participation contributed to personal growth, improved skills and environmental renewal. The authors of the survey, however, did not mention whether those impacts were derived from direct evaluation through questionnaires and interviews and, if so, whether there was a way to check the answers for possible bias. The indicators developed by Craig et al (2003, see below) use Web facilities to allow the interested parties to discuss the indicators, although at a stage where these were still quite broad.
Good practice: Performance Indicators
Craig et al (2003) devised, through consultation with over 200 local authorities, a number of quality-approved performance indicators for the arts intended for 'off-the-shelf' use by local authorities. According to the authors, the indicators were developed to meet the need for more consistent and comparable measures of the role played by local authorities in supporting the arts; they:

- Recognise the diversity of local government while allowing ready benchmarking,
- Identify standards of service,
- Make explicit how the arts support corporate policies,
- Encourage an approach consistent with partners’ performance assessment frameworks, and simplify reporting,
- Meet the needs of elected members for performance indicators which are readily understood by the public,
- Recognise the need to maintain a realistic balance between quantitative measurement and more qualitative and outcome-based evaluation,
- Reflect local authorities’ enabling role within a complex picture of arts provisions which include the voluntary, independent and commercial sectors.

The aim of the indicators is to evaluate a wide range of interventions such as (i) adoption of cultural policies, (ii) support provided to artists, art groups or other organisations, (iii) strategies of accessibility to the arts for disabled people and attendance at art events by target groups.

The scoring devised gives three points for advanced descriptors, two for each established one, and one for emerging descriptors. The indicators are grouped under headings based on the Audit Commission's five dimensions for performance. The authors also highlighted where the indicators are related to crosscutting priorities, including public service delivery priorities.

The indicators are published on the Internet with facilities to identify the interested parties as well as to receive their comments.

Limitations: Does not specifically target Public Art or deal with quality. Indicators are very general. Does not indicate whether indicators for audience, e.g. disabled people, were developed in consultation with communities and disabled people's organisations.

The above example is concerned with the arts in general, with strong emphasis on the performing arts, as indeed is most of the literature on impact and regeneration. Bovaird (1997) points to four main strands of objectives for urban regeneration: economic, political, social and cultural, and suggests that benefits can be assessed by means of a series of questions that could be considered more pointed towards public art:
- How much do residents, workers or visitors care about those benefits?
- How much added value does public art bring to the city?
- Does the city have a competitive advantage relative to other cities in respect of the benefits brought to it by public art?
- Which residents, workers or visitors benefit most from the contribution of public art?

**Good practice: Measuring Economic Impacts**

Bovaird (1997) constructs a model of measuring economic impacts by proxy indicators. A way to measure whether art enhances a place is by investigating to what extent people use the art as a label or as a way of place identification. Attractiveness to tourists can be assessed by how often the art is mentioned in guidebooks and sightseeing tours or is sold on postcards.

Closer to the economic and political arenas, another way proposed for measuring impact is whether art gives the city any competitive advantage through three indicators: 1) Attraction of inward investment; 2) Enhanced influence in national decision-making; 3) Enhanced image. City image surveys among national and international businessmen can serve as a proxy for attraction of investment. A number of issues are important here: how much do key decision-makers care about cultural facilities in a city when making investment decisions? How much value added does the art bring to the city? Which residents benefit more from the economic benefits of inward investment?

Public art would also impact on: 1) Key decision-makers and their families; 2) Key workers; 3) Key professionals and managers who might otherwise migrate. The most noteworthy issue in Bovaird’s model is one of threshold, since the impact of each item of public art in itself may be too small to discern, and public art as a whole may be only part of overall cultural assets. A way to gauge value attributed to art is to assess private sponsorship, although it may not be possible to use such measurements with works that challenge dominant images or interests. Another way to assess whether art contributes to competitive advantage is to trawl the literature produced for publicity purposes.

Time is also a relevant factor in this model because it raises two questions: 1) could it be that the trickle-down effect to the neediest sectors is a slow process, thus a long-term impact only)? 2) Could art act as an accelerator in regeneration, since expenditure on the arts may have symbolic effects, thus reverse any “bad image” that the city might have with investors?

3.5.1 Opportunity Costs and Value for Money

Landry *et al* (1993) drew attention to the term “opportunity costs” in relation to the arts, which Chartrand (1987, cited in Landry *et al* 1993) defined as “cost comparisons with alternative methods”. Although Poirier (2003) considered that Matarasso’s 1997 research on social impact evaluation provided “precise evaluation instruments”, one of the main criticisms levelled by Merli (2002) is that Matarasso claimed that art projects could provide cost-effective solutions through impacts (social and economic) that were out of proportion to their cost, yet he never proved that such benefits existed in the first place. Likewise, in a study commissioned by RAND and the Wallace Foundation on the benefits of the arts, one of the main criticisms by McCarthy *et al* (2004) on the body of literature reviewed was the failure to consider opportunity costs.
Both “value-for-money” and “opportunity cost” seem to be difficult indicators to evaluate objectively. In Essex County Council’s impact study (2003), value-for-money is assessed through a question put directly to the audience. While this may be admissible in the context of the performing arts it cannot be applied to a work of public art, with a diffuse audience much more difficult to identify. Likewise, in the Lottery Millennium Assessment (Annabel Jackson Associates, 2003) this question was asked to the institutions receiving Lottery funds; not surprisingly, 90% of the responses were affirmative, suggesting that, in fact, this was not necessarily an effective evaluation. Opportunity cost is not only the opportunity cost between cultural and ‘non-cultural’ investments in regeneration, but between which culture (and where) the investment best serves the regeneration and community objectives.

Today few would dispute the role and value that culture has in regeneration – in the narrow and, increasingly, also in the wider sense – but there is much less understanding of the very different effects that diverse types of cultural intervention produce in the short and longer term. Thus, it is clear that more evidence is needed concerning the cost of cultural opportunities and of general regeneration programme outcomes (London Borough of Newham, 2004). Guetzkow (2002) pointed out that, from a policy perspective, the issue is no longer whether the existence of the arts has a beneficial impact but whether money spent on art programmes will have more of an impact than if spent on other programmes. Indeed, one flaw with the literature on art impacts is the lack of studies that compare the arts with other programmes or industries.

The key question for policy makers (or grant givers) is how some pre-defined goal can be most effectively reached. Thus, instead of “what are the benefits of the arts?” the question becomes "what are the opportunity costs of using the money in the arts?” Guetzkow recognises that determining whether one programme is more effective than another is no simple matter. It not only demands precise definition of the goals but comparisons are further complicated by the fact that many of the benefits that are associated with the arts, such as increased creativity or feelings of well-being, are ‘intangible’ and therefore difficult to measure. Furthermore impact studies often are “anecdote-rich and evidence–poor” as they rely on accounts of people who are either involved in arts programmes or participate in them, so are ultimately self-selected.

It is worth noting that the type of indicators discussed to date are fairly static and compartmentalised; it could be argued that what is needed in the arts are indicators such as those used to measure sustainability, i.e. showing relationships among the components.

In the Evaluation of Public Art projects funded under the Lottery (Annabel Jackson Associates, 1999) the participants were asked whether they or others thought the art was value for money, getting overwhelmingly favourable responses. Not only is this kind of assessment purely subjective but, as the researchers themselves acknowledged, for some respondents value for money resided in the fact that some artists had under-priced their work. Since some projects had several pieces, the interviewees were able to compare the fees of different artists and noticed inequalities – an irony that an artist could perhaps exploit for his next piece but not a
very reliable indicator of “value for money”.

Evans and Shaw (2004) have shown that art-led regeneration projects have an economic impact. However, the projects analysed were large art units e.g. the Tate Gallery at St. Ives and the Eden Project in Cornwall. Public art projects are much more problematic since, as Bovaird pointed out, they may need to reach a critical mass or threshold, and this may only occur after a considerable period of time. In the specific field of public art, Hall and Robertson (2001) have provided a useful analysis of why research into public art so rarely manages to measure impact: The two prevailing critical paradigms (commonly employed in combination) in public art research are:

- Productionist, and
- Semiotic.

In the authors’ view, both paradigms are flawed as a basis for evaluating the regeneration claims of public art, although both have been utilised to this end. The nub of their argument is that much public art criticism, although avowedly about the reception of public art by the public, is actually written from within a ‘productionist’ framework, i.e. by artists and arts administrators who fail to say very much about the public reception of the works. The semiotic approach, on the other hand, “fails to acknowledge the contested, fragmented and mutable nature of [concepts of] nature, identity, place and community which public art is said to influence” (p.19). Thus Hall & Robertson propose a number of questions for debate:

- Empirical: what tangible, measurable impacts does a project have on its locality, landscape, economy, culture and society?
- Policy related: What is the relationship between the art programme and broader regeneration initiatives?
- Structural: What limitations do deep structural conditions impose on the initiative and in which way did the art impact on those structural factors?
- Civic: which impacts go beyond the locality?
- Ideological: what comment does public art offer on the conditions that give rise to the problem?

It is clear then that, while opportunity costs and value for money could appear as “objective” measures to evaluate art, the methodological and structural difficulties involved are quite formidable, even if the opposition of those who maintain that the benefits of the arts cannot be measured in economic terms is surmounted.

3.6 Art Deliverers

3.6.1 Artists

In today’s art world there is, at times, a hybridisation of roles across artists, designers and planners. Far from being confined to making "art pieces", artists’ roles include taking into account the whole environment as well as public dialogue and debate (Herrera et al, 1997; Willet, 1984). This new, broader role has emerged from two factors: (i) the recognition of an ampler scope of environmental art, and (ii) the public artist’s desire to increase the relevance of his or her art by interacting with the community. This interaction is not limited to community participation but includes advocacy and performance by what has been variously called “the citizen artist” (Burnham & Durland, 1998), “the town artist” (Roth, 1998) or “the artists of activism”
(Felshin, 1995). Furthermore, as Locke (2001) points out, in the last five years “there has been an exponential rise in the use of communication devices ... and with them relationships with the invisible architectures of networked communications” (p.42).

Larkinson (2004) points out that when an artist is asked how he or she would assess the success of a public art project, the response is more likely to be “whether I can sleep at night” than an assessment of economic or social factors. Poirier (2003), quoting Matarasso (1996), Shaw (2000) and Jermy (2001), pointed out “that artists and managers in the cultural realm rarely consider evaluation and monitoring as parts of their creative work.” Furthermore, “some artists worry that an evaluation of the economic and social impacts of the arts would reduce culture from being an end in itself to the means by which other ends are achieved. In short, measures must not replace our faith in the importance of culture” (p.19). The latter is an interesting comment as it may summarise one of the main obstacles to evaluation. But, as Thackara (2000) points out, art funded through the public purse demands accountability, so when the state pays it is reasonable that the artist should deliver something in return.

Since local authorities are currently the principal clients for public art, it is their social and economic imperatives which are now most likely to determine its form and purpose (Thackara, 2000). For Landry et al (1993), successful schemes using the arts are those that identify potential in seemingly intractable and difficult areas. This is often done not only by giving new life to abandoned buildings that are considered ugly but by attracting artists and cultural producers to help break cycles of decline. Landry, considering Simon Rattle’s role in the regeneration of Birmingham as well as that of artists in creating “the largest art gallery in the world” in Stockholm’s underground rail system, considers that artists themselves, through their capacity to see things from a different perspective, can be regenerating factors – as can indeed marketing and planning regulations, among others. But Landry et al find it difficult to assess statistically the impact of cultural programmes and would rely, instead, on audits since what ultimately counts is monitoring and evaluating progress to ensure that the desired outcomes are reached.

O’Connell (2001) maintains that it is as collaborators and supporters of change that artists show great potential: “Artists have consistently sought participation in change. Not that they are especially equipped to deal with it but through the nature of their work they are consciously questioning the world they find themselves in” (p. 54). O’Connell found himself at a City Development and Regeneration Services meeting, sitting with planners and trying to find the way to influence the planning process. Excluded from decision-making, O’Connell suggested a number of projects which, although never carried out, acted as foci for the discussion between artist and planners. As the “outsider”, the artist was in a position to identify clear systems of communication and open the view to new perspectives. Nevertheless, the literature seems to suggest that, as is discussed later, partnerships between artists and building professionals are not very common and still subject to a good deal of strain and misunderstanding.

Selwood (1995) in her evaluations of public art projects included the impact of the project on the artist’s career and subsequent development. A model that seems promising in this area (although it was not conceived specifically with the artist in
mind), as it covers the artist’s needs, from economic rewards to self expression is Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs.

According to Huitt (2004), Maslow, who started to develop his model in the 1950s, attempted to synthesize a large body of research related to human motivation. Maslow proposed a hierarchy of human needs based on two groupings: deficiency needs and growth needs. The fundamental tenet of the model is that each of us is motivated by needs that have to be satisfied, starting with lower order ones (needs of physical survival and emotional well-being) and moving towards the higher order needs of influence and personal development. Maslow’s original model of five needs: (1) biological and physiological needs; (2) safety; (3) belongingness and love; (4) esteem; and (5) self-actualisation needs; was later expanded to an eight-needs model with some alterations in the hierarchy. Self-actualisation moved to the seventh place after (5) Cognitive needs and (6) Aesthetic needs. Transcendence needs were added in the eight place.

According to Huitt, levels 1 to 4 are deficiency motivators; level 5 (and by implication 6 to 8) are growth motivators. The thwarting of needs is usually a cause of stress, and is particularly so at level 4. Although it may be argued that without interpretation and thought, Maslow’s model can be a blunt instrument (Chapman, 2004) it seems that, in the evaluation of an art project, the hierarchy can be useful in determining how the interplay of needs, career goals, the need for self-expression, etc., affect the outcome of a project as well as how external factors affecting the artist at any level get reflected in the project’s outcome.

3.6.2 Architects/Planners/Partnerships
Although the importance of partnerships is often mentioned as a desirable goal (Cowen, 2004, Melvin 2002; Balkin Bach, 2001), it is interesting to note that collaboration between artists and architects and its mechanisms are not often made explicit in the literature. Adams (1997), after evaluating many case studies, mentions the role of the artist as an “idea person” in a design team. Walwin (1992) offers some insights into “invisible partnerships”, stating that in the last 30 years there have been good examples of collaboration but, for reasons of economics, the law and training, which all militate against a more open approach, such examples are few. Bradford (quoted by Walwin) believes that the reason artists get squeezed out when it comes to building is the risk of litigation; with architects being liable even after death they want to ensure that contracts and criteria are adhered to.

Partnerships present challenges for artists as they can mean many different things to different stakeholders. Jermyn (2001) found that partnership projects highlighted the importance of:

- Setting clear aims and objectives that were understood by partners;
- Delivering projects that fit naturally with organisations’ respective goals;
- Being realistic about the level of contribution individual partners could make;
- Discussing how the partnership would work, particularly as organisations can be so different;
- Creating strong partnerships with non-arts agencies.
The 1982 Institute of Contemporary Art's conference was a catalyst for the Art and Architecture Group for collaboration among the disciplines. However, critics of the programme “one percent for art” claim that developers will become “the arbiters of taste” and that “a real conceptual collaboration at the ideas stage” is still missing.

The experience of architects working in France shows to what extent professional indemnity insurance influences the degree of collaboration in the UK: In France, the architect shares liability with other participants in the project; in the UK, it is usually the architect who is *prima facie* liable for professional indemnity (Walwin, 2002). Kelley (1995) maintains that, although conventional wisdom assumes that an artist would bring an unencumbered sense of design to architectural projects, true collaboration between architects and artists rarely happens, and what passes for “collaboration” tends to be “a frustrating process of compromise and concessions”.

The main reasons for this are:

- loss of professional identity;
- bureaucratic hassles by the public sector; and
- views, held both by architects and artists, that the other wants to dominate in his/her role.

For Kelley (1995) the main problem – and paradoxically the common ground for collaboration – resides in the difference between site and place. Sites “are like frameworks. Places are what fills them out and make them work”. In Kelley’s view, rediscovering “place” would be a critique of both architecture and art as they are practiced. Collaboration could liberate both architects and artists from institutional
modes of thinking, and thus help both to discover that “the gaps among the arts, or between the arts and sciences tend to be full of life” (p.148).

These views echo many of the principles articulated by landscape architects, who set high value on place and the articulation of space and its use. Selwood (1995), when analysing the conflicts and dilemmas of public art in relation to architecture asks a very interesting question: “what can [artists] contribute to the built environment over and above architects, landscape architects and designers? What distinguishes a bollard designed by an artist from that of an architect or an industrial designer? Collaborations such as the Advanced Water Treatment Plant (AWTP, see above) point to a distinctive role for the artist, as the artist took it upon himself (i) to understand the ways in which engineers and architects work and (ii) to create a concept that, while respecting functional and economic constraints went against the traditional ways of doing things, viz. conceiving the treatment plant as an engine to be visible to the public rather than hiding it under landscaping and earth works. Nevertheless the problem is a complex one. As Selwood (op.cit) points out, one of the issues is whether the art is “integral or at least complementary to its surroundings” rather than a mere add-on.

A further challenge is that partnerships are often found to be difficult to set up and manage, even in relatively small projects, as in the cases evaluated by Carpenter (2003); not surprisingly it was found that partnerships worked better when the partners allocated time to plan the work together and see how the different agendas could work together; nevertheless lack of required information often played an inhibitory role.

3.6.3 Commissioners/Funders
Selwood (1995), based on her case studies, pointed out that architects regard themselves as ideally placed to commission work because they have a view of the whole process. However the space and time limits imposed by their contractual relationship with the client make possible to argue that the ones who should have wider responsibilities are the planners. Yet, in focus groups Selwood conducted, both planners and architects commented on their own lack of training for commissioning public art. This seems to point to the need for “education” for all parties concerned, and that extends to the artists themselves.

In an artist-oriented literature, funding bodies are treated as an end to a means rather than as entities in themselves; thus, besides some information about their historical background, the existing literature dealing with funders refers mostly to how to approach them, and for what (Adams, 1997; Petherbridge, 1984; Manson, 2000). These organisations make their appearance sporadically when the issue of taste is mentioned (Willet, 1984) but as often as not remain in the background, like a reclusive patron. One category of them, however, is more visible than most: local authorities, which are often seen as imposing aesthetic judgments and notions. Selwood (1995) provides a panorama of the historical development of public art funding in the UK which is as wide as it is complex, involving (i) the central government frameworks with their shifts in policies, channelling funds though local authorities (ii) the art funding bodies, the Arts Councils and the regional art funding bodies (iii) local authorities and (iv) environmental bodies e.g. the Countryside
Commission/Agency, English Nature, which over the years have directly or indirectly also funded projects.

3.7 Health and Social Inclusion

Calls for evaluation and self-evaluation programmes aiming at social inclusion have mushroomed, along with tool-kits and detailed descriptions of how to carry out the evaluation. White (2003), after recognising the limitations of Matarasso’s claims for the benefits of the arts on health, points out that The Arts Council of England’s response to the Policy Action Team 10, Report 5, emphasised the need for longer-term evaluation studies. A report from The Health Development Agency (2000) on the impact of the arts on health noted there are “no established principles and protocols for evaluating outcomes, assessing the processes by which outcomes are achieved, and disseminating recommendations for good practice” (White, 2003) but identifies three emergent approaches to evaluation:
- Health-based approaches, testing what the arts contribute to self-esteem and its effect on qualitative self-assessments of wellbeing;
- Socio-cultural approaches derived from recent assessments of the social impact of the arts;
- Community-based approaches adapted from social capital theory on health improvement.

Carpenter (2003) conducted external evaluations of six “creative” neighbourhoods, developing “indicators by agreement” with the applicants of the project and using a combination of “positivistic and phenomenological approaches”. The positivistic approach involved information about number, employment status and ethnic background of participants and artist. One of the complex and unresolved questions was how to assess the impact of the projects on young people at risk and the incidence of racism, as the time scale did not allow for effective assessment.

Shah (2003) reviewed a wide range of evaluation and monitoring tools that could be applied to voluntary organisations (Kaufman & Malley, 1999); to social exclusion matters (Moriarty, 2002b; Meyrick & Sinkler, no date); to health issues (Moley & McIldoon, 2002); to working in partnerships and to outcomes. Although some of these toolkits provide sound qualitative methodologies and indicators, there is a considerable danger that in the hands of people lacking methodological rigour they could produce evaluations lacking in validity while giving the illusion of the contrary, at least to the evaluator. There is a danger of squandering resources if invested in unsound data collection or analyses.

Jermyn (2001), in a report to the Art Council of England, analysed a wide range of inclusion projects through the arts, and found that current practice targets a range of groups, from the ‘socially excluded’ or at risk of exclusion, such as young offenders, homeless people or recovering drug addicts, to neighbourhoods that were identified as experiencing social exclusion because they ranked highly in deprivation indices, for example. But Jermyn also found that those art projects “were not necessarily seeking explicitly to tackling the four common policy indicators of social inclusion, i.e. health, education, employment and crime. Thus while the purpose of some projects was to use the arts to address certain problems associated with social exclusion, others had no such social objectives.
Good Practice: community development

In 2001 Noema Reassert and Planning Ltd carried out an external evaluation of the Royston Road Community Parks Project in Scotland and followed an approach that represents a shift in emphasis from needs-driven to asset-based community development strategies (Ghilardi, 2001). The aims of the evaluation were twofold: (i) to provide some evidence of the intangible impact that participation in the project had on local community and (ii) to show the funders that the investment they had made was good ‘value for money’. The areas evaluated were:

- The capital building programme, in order to identify the potential linkages between the activities developed under these initiatives and their relation to the cultural planning-type of development (for example, connections between the newly created parks and local housing projects; participation in arts projects and improvements in the quality of life of the local community).

- The training programme, to assess the types of skills created within the programme.

- The arts programme. For this assessment the evaluators looked at the linkages between audience development and artists' residencies. Existing information about the needs, desires and aspirations of local cultural organisations and of local residents in relation to cultural activities were examined against the programme’s outputs: original objectives, outcomes, difficulties encountered, and other issues that could influence future outcomes.

Limitations: The evaluators mentioned an interest in Value for Money but did not pursue the issue further. Also, there was no mention of an evaluation baseline but at least the conclusions are based on outcomes and not on self-reported perceptions of benefits.

Public art has also been used to promote inclusion among offenders (Randell, 2002). Although most of the programmes seem to include performance or video, some reach out to the community and produce site-specific art.

Good practice: working with young offenders

Ceramic Water Garden Project – The Unit for the Arts and Offenders with East Kent Youth Offending Team.

The Unit for the Arts and Offenders has been exploring the relevance of the arts to community-based restorative justice through an action research project funded by The Paul Hamlyn Foundation and Canterbury City Council (Randell, 2002).

A group of young offenders worked with the residents, staff, and three ceramic artists in a residential care home for the elderly in the same area in which they had committed their offences. They worked to create a water garden based on the residents’ design ideas. The final product was a ceramic water garden with three fountains and decorative wall-planters, located in a raised flowerbed in a previously neglected courtyard.

The process included a twofold evaluation, one consisting of a video modelled on
the feedback room from the Big Brother TV programme and the other comprising tracking of the participants for one year. Initial findings demonstrate that out of the 14 participants who began the project, 13 completed it and none has re-offended in the six-months period following its completion.

Hughes (2005), reviewing theory and practice of the impact of art on offenders, concluded that, while there is evidence that art contributes to changing individuals’ personal responses to drivers or triggers that lead to offending, there is “a lack of baseline information/detailed appreciation of level of ‘exclusion’ and existing problems” (p.72) as well as an over-reliance on anecdote. A sobering conclusion of inclusion evaluation is provided by Goodlad et al (2002), who stated that “social inclusion might be supported by participation in the arts, but it is unlikely to be the only factor in securing inclusion in more than a very few distinctive cases. This makes unrealistic some of the expectations held of evaluations. This raises ethical and commercial issues for evaluators – to point out that they cannot provide easy clear answers may be the same thing as talking themselves out of the contract” (p.14).

3.7.1 Health benefits
Claims of the beneficial effect of art on health were made by Matarazzo (1997) and their validity discussed by Merli (2002), Reeves (2002), Evans and Shaw (2004), and Coalter (2001). The Health Education Authority (1999), considering that to date there was “no single sound and established set of principles and protocols for evaluating outcomes, assessing the processes by which outcomes are achieved and disseminating recommendations for good practice to workers in the field” (p.2), commissioned a review of good practice on art projects and health that carried some interesting findings.

**Good practice: assessing health benefits**
Health Education Authority review of good practice (1999). This review makes very modest claims for the study and highlights important findings:

- Participation was often seen as the key to provide a link between health and arts activity;
- Participation was also seen as helping in the development of interpersonal skills and making new friends;
- Best practice case studies indicated that, in participatory art, the attitude “anything goes” is detrimental to the project;
- Most UK projects have carried a formal (45%) or informal (54%) evaluation. However, those evaluations do not occur according to single methods or with the funds necessary for a formal evaluation; furthermore there was a fear of evaluation as the participants suspected it would be linked to funding.

Limitations: the study includes the questionnaire used showing that the data collection relies on self-appraisal.
3.8 Hosts

According to Lacy (1995), identifying a “community”, which may act as a host or as participants for public art projects, can be problematic. It may be relatively easy when dealing with what planners and sociologists define as “proxemic” spaces, that is with recognisable and familiar locales of a definable and close, albeit changing, community of users. At the other end of the spectrum are the so-called distemic spaces: large, important and impersonal spaces which are used by diverse people; they can be considered the domain of the individual because they accommodate a degree of non-conformity (Petherbridge, 1984) but for this reason the “community” is much harder to identify.

In an impact study by Essex County Council (2003), researchers found that satisfaction with public art was higher among those who participated in an art project than among those of the general public (p.45); also participation was found to be overwhelmingly female (92%) while response from the general public was more balanced (66% female); ethnicity was also overwhelmingly white British (92.2%).

A study by Annabel Jackson Associates (2002) raised the interesting possibility that client-led programmes might, in fact, be more effective at reaching strategic objectives than more explicitly policy-led programmes. Client-led programmes are customised around what the award recipient understands to be the needs, circumstances and working conditions of the target group. Policy-led programmes are more explicitly strategic, filtering out applications and organisations that do not meet central criteria.

One of the frequent criticisms of art evaluation is that:

- Evaluations have tended to focus on those directly engaged as participants in arts projects. There have been few attempts to survey those who have not been engaged in arts projects and to uncover the reasons why they have not participated in such projects;
- Evaluations have tended to focus overwhelmingly on short-term outcomes from projects. While acknowledging that these are important, evaluations have not examined the relationships between these short-term outcomes and sustained, longer-term, impacts;
- Evaluations have not yet demonstrated with sufficient robustness the link between the outcomes of arts projects and wider regeneration impacts throughout deprived neighbourhoods;
- Finally, evaluations have not yet seriously considered the issue of whether arts projects are able to address the structural constraints that impinge upon and affect deprived localities, and often create and sustain their economic and social marginalisation, such as their dependency on resources and decisions from outside their own area (Hall & Robertson, 2001).
Good practice: evaluating different hosts’ responses

Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, London’s newest NHS teaching hospital, was one of the first to commission works of arts at the drawing-board stage to complement innovative architectural design. Chelsea and Westminster Hospital Arts worked within the hospital since its opening in 1993, providing all the visual arts as well as weekly live performances in public areas and wards. In the second and third years the study will address the effects of the integration of arts into healthcare by measuring physiological and biological changes of clinical significance and their effect on parameters of outcome after treatment. Different groups of patients will be investigated, such as patients after surgical procedures. Outcomes after surgery will include length of stay, time of wound-healing and post-operative analgesia requirements. Outcomes in obstetrics will refer to duration of labour, pain management and level of blood pressure in high risk antenatal patients. Outcomes in patients receiving chemotherapy treatment will include levels of anxiety and depression. Finally, this study will investigate the effect of the arts programme on other aspects of healthcare such as the ability to recruit and retain staff.

The evaluation form was designed to assess the responses of three separate groups - patients, staff and visitors - to: a) visual art; b) performing arts; c) the general environment and d) the value of the work of Chelsea and Westminster Hospital Arts and the role of the arts in the healing process. The study lasted from April 1999 to April 2000. It was particularly important to compare the responses to visual arts with that of live performances. The researchers found a significant difference only in the case of performances being more effective than visual art in helping to take the mind off immediate worries or medical problems. This is not surprising since, while a picture is perceived as unchanging, live music changes continually and holds the attention for a longer period (Lelchuk Staricoff et al, 2002).

3.9 Educational benefits

Some examples of work undertaken have had strongly educational aims, for example Kent’s involvement in DCMS’s ‘Creative Partnership’ scheme (Cutler and Plowright, 2004). Following a period of research and project analysis, the team published findings on the impact of public art on learning (educational impact being the project’s specific brief), along with a matrix diagram – ‘The Cutler Creative Learning Matrix’ – mapping out the many features relating to educational impact. It explicitly acknowledges the possibility of “unexpected outcomes”. Of particular interest to an arts-focused research exercise is Kent’s view that artists, alongside all other participants, are involved in an active learning process that comes from the process of being creative.

Good Practice: capturing inputs and outputs

Essex County Council (2003) carried out a longitudinal study evaluating its art programmes to ensure continuity in the information gathered and with the purpose of capturing inputs and outputs. Organisations receive an incentive to participate in the survey while participants in art programmes and audiences do not. Participants are handed the questionnaires by their project leaders but post them directly to the
research centre. In this research, artists are considered as institutions and handed the same questionnaire as local authorities and authorities at county level.

Limitations: self-reported evaluation of participants carried out without a baseline; non-participants completely excluded from the research. However, longitudinal studies make it possible to detect patterns changing over time and possible significant thresholds.

3.10 Measuring Impacts

The most effective evaluations of impact involve baseline information against which impacts can be measured, and a long-term commitment to evaluation that starts at the earliest moment in the project and may extend well beyond its completion.

Good Practice: evaluation planned from the onset.
The new Bristol Royal Hospital for Children (completed 2001) encompasses commissioned artworks by over twenty artists, many of which are site specific and are integral to the design. In 1997 arts consultant Lesley Greene was commissioned to develop an arts strategy for the new hospital which would integrate both art and colour in its interior design, and reflect the hospital’s commitment to consultation and the family. Lesley involved artists in an active research programme of residencies and commissions as an integral part of the feasibility stage (Connarty 2002). As a result, the artists contributed to the planning of the major commissions programme leading to significant input into the concept-design stage of the hospital interior.

From an early stage Lesley Greene recognised the need for project evaluation and was keen to assess the role that art could play in relieving stress. Professor David Baum was a supporter of the arts programme and he also saw it as imperative that it be evaluated. He recommended the involvement of Maggie Redshaw, an environmental psychologist from the Institute of Child Health, University of Bristol, and raised support for the study from the Champions of Child Health Fund.

The study was planned in two phases. The first stage set out to collect the baseline data on views and attitudes of patients, staff and families who had been at the old children’s hospital during the month of July 1999, on the old environment and facilities. The second phase, aiming to collect comparable data following the move to the new children’s hospital, was planned for six to eight months after doors opened to patients. The delay was “built in” to allow staff and patients time to get to know their new environment. Data collection began in February 2002 and was completed during the spring or 2003. At the time of writing the research team were in the process of analysing the data and writing their final report for NHS Estates.

Legislative issues are not often addressed in impact evaluations. The two main legal issues are mandate and liability. Liability has already been discussed in relation to partnerships. Mandate, on the other hand, is strongly related to commissioning
bodies. Chartrand (1987), when discussing issues concerning international evaluation of arts council funding, considers it important to focus on whether the legislative emphasis of the mandate is related to “consumption of the arts” (audience) or “responsive to the creative and experimental aspirations of the creative community” (artists). Furthermore, operating objectives also must take into account whether there is a balance in the support of the different types of art: fine, commercial, and amateur art. In Chartrand’s view this is important due to the links one type of art has established with others. The three are intimately related in that the individual artist is the ultimate source of art in all three. The amateur arts, by actualising the talents and abilities of the individual citizen, also provide an educated audience and initial training for the fine and the commercial arts. The fine arts, in the pursuit of artistic excellence as an end in itself, provide research and development for the commercial arts. The commercial arts, in the pursuit of profit, provide the means to market and distribute the best of the amateur and the fine arts to a large enough audience and in a form suited to making a profit.

3.11 Conclusions

Demonstrating the impact and value of projects and programmes across the funded cultural sector and determining how to measure outcomes rather than outputs are identified as one of the most difficult issues in impact evaluation (Reeves 2002). There is also a widespread consensus among commentators that there is a lack of robust evaluation and systematic evidence of the impact of arts projects despite a wealth of anecdotal evidence (Reeves, 2002 p.33). Furthermore, there is a lack of robust evaluation of these impacts at neighbourhood level (including neighbourhood renewal and community structures) and on family life (Shaw, 1999, Coalter 2001, Reeves, 2002). In addition, the lack of baseline data on which to measure outcomes is a common problem in impact evaluation.

One of the key issues, however, was underlined by Suter (2001) and concerns the importance of being clear about what different kinds of information are for, how often they should be collected, and who should collect them. This point is particularly relevant when discussing public art. The key to understanding this issue is that impact studies have referred to “the arts” in general, with the performing arts constituting the leading elements, particularly in economic evaluations.

While there seem to be a widespread call for evaluation along with calls for accountability and transparency, it is clear that in the arts there are many contentious points as to what should be measured and what the indicators should be. Concerns over the way that the results of an evaluation are tied to funding presents a serious operational problem as this could lead to evaluations being carried out purely for symbolic use, or simply “no use”.

An additional challenge is that valid indicators could easily be turned into affirmative measurements of predetermined hypotheses if evaluators over-rely on self-reports. The main problem seems not to be how to measure but what and why. The possible existence of thresholds, as indicated by Bovaird, seems an avenue worth exploring; his proposed proxy variables also deserve some attention as a way out of a constant reliance on self-reported information. Selwood’s model also offers a range of possibilities.
4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT

An effective approach to assessment of impact in public art projects must address the following questions:

• who are the key players or stakeholders and which need most attention or careful categorisation;
• what are the different values that are important to capture and
• what are the key stages in the process of a public art project where the evaluation and assessment process need to play a part?

These must be resolved before any choice is made as to the range of indicators (and types of indicators) that will be used to evaluate impact. In order to address the issues, an evaluation framework has been developed which can provide an over-arching structure for assessment processes.

4.1 Introduction to the Evaluation Framework

At the heart of ‘Total Quality Management” (a concept from economics) is the concept that the expectations of all stakeholders can be met (Bovaird, 1997). However, in the context of public art, there are likely to be conflicts, and indeed conflicts of interest, since public art may often excite controversy and debate. There is thus a need to be explicit about which stakeholders are ‘customers’ in any evaluation process and to recognise that consensus on objectives may not be possible, or even desirable in some cases.

Drawing on the understandings developed in the previous chapters of the report, an evaluation framework has been developed that is sensitive to the needs of public art and the nature of public art practice. It is designed to be used by all stakeholders in a public art project from the outset. Its overall aim is to increase mutual awareness of diverse agendas and desired outcomes of a project, so that

• the potential of the project can be maximised and different goals identified
• an appraisal of project feasibility can be carried out
• the outcome measures appropriate to assess impact can be identified and agreed with stakeholders.
• systems for collecting, storing, analysing and reporting on the information gathered can be agreed.

The framework drafted below is set out in matrix form with two axes (see Table 1). The horizontal axis sets out a wide range of possible ‘Stakeholders’ involved, that is, the major players and those who have a key interest in a project. The vertical axis sets out a wide range of ‘Values’ by which outcome measures can be identified and agreed with all stakeholders.

A conscious decision has been made to exclude exploration and classification of the diverse range of practices which constitute ‘public art’ from the Matrix. This exclusion is aimed at assisting stakeholders to target the values each group is placing in the project, rather than naming or categorising the outcome in terms of a (sub)genre of public art.
A second conscious decision has been to place the artist and aesthetic values at the top of the vertical and horizontal axis, rather than at the periphery. This hierarchy serves to place the artist at the centre of the project; however it should not be read as making any assumptions about how ‘aesthetic’ is defined. Equally, there is no assumption that the artist has only one discrete role in the project.

Although the Matrix has been developed and tested with a view to being as comprehensive as possible, it should be viewed as a flexible aid. It is unlikely that all (or even most) categories of stakeholder and values will be relevant to all projects. Equally, the Matrix is open to the insertion of additional elements across either axis if the particular circumstances of a project require it.

### 4.2 Stakeholders

Stakeholders may be categorised as the creators, hosts and commissioners of a project. The categories help explicate the different roles that are involved in the initiation and life of a project but it is accepted that some actors may play more than one role in practice, e.g. if the commissioning body is also host to the project.

#### 4.2.1 Creators

Creators may be broadly subdivided into those working as artists; those working as architects, landscape architects, urban designers or other built environment professionals; and those working as designers outwith this second category, e.g. metalwork or signage designers. For each of these sub-categories, there may

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Title of Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Location of work</th>
<th>Commission/Funding Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Public Organisation</td>
<td>Charitable Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td>Private/Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Visual / Aesthetic / Enjoyment
- Social Activation
- Innovation / Risk
- Host Participation
- Community Development
- Health & Well Being
- Crime and Safety
- Inter/Personal Development
- Travel and Access
- Skills Acquisition
- Education
- Employment
- Project Management/Sustainability
- Value for Money
well be the lead artist or professional and collaborators who may be other professionals or non-professionals, e.g. members of a non-arts community, assisting in the production of work. For many arts projects, a contractor may also play an important role in the creation of the work.

4.2.2 Hosts
Hosts for the public art project are those who accept the role of providing the locus of the project, whether in the physical form of a place or in some other way as appropriate to the project. Hosts may be broadly subdivided into public, community or private.

Public hosts may either be a local authority or some other form of public body, such as a government agency. Where the local authority is involved, the project may be hosted by an arts-related section and personnel with appropriate arts expertise within the local authority, or by a section that is not specifically arts-related, e.g. education or transport sections. Other public agencies are more likely to act as hosts without having a professional arts-based section and personnel.

Community hosts may fall under the heading of users or the audience for public art, or they may be more active as local participants in the project. They may have some other role that is specific to the particular project.

Private hosts are likely to fall under the heading of commercial or corporate hosts or collaborators of some kind in the project.

4.2.3 Commissioners and funders
Commissioners and funders are likely to come from the following groups: public agencies/bodies (including local authorities), specialist arts organisations, and private companies or individuals.

Public commissioners and funders, like public hosts, may either be a local authority or some other form of public body, such as a government agency. Where the local authority is involved, the project may be commissioned by an arts-related section and personnel with appropriate arts expertise within the local authority, or by a section that is not arts-related. Other public agencies under this heading exclude those that are focussed specifically on arts or public art projects.

Specialist arts organisations are likely to fall under the heading of public art agency, Lottery or Arts Council related bodies, or charitable arts trust.

Private commissioners fall under the headings of trusts or foundations (that are not arts-related), commercial or corporate organisations, individuals or other bodies, e.g. in relation to a web-site.

4.3 Values
There are a range of values that may need to be taken into account in understanding what might be desirable or possible in terms of outcome and impact in public art.
Artistic values will certainly be a concern for the artist(s) and perhaps for many of the stakeholders; other values have been categorised under the three broad headings of sustainability: social, environmental and economic values. These relate to international definitions of sustainability:

- social values are about people and the community
- environmental values relate to place and the physical environment
- economic values relate to costs and income, including marketing, regeneration, tourism, employment and the local economy.

Values other than those related to a person’s own experience or professional expertise often prove hard to understand and may contribute to difficulties or tensions between stakeholders on a project. To address this, each set of values is given a brief explanation below. These are not intended to be exclusive definitions but provide an initial guide to what is meant by each heading on the vertical axis in the evaluation Matrix.

4.3.1 Artistic Values

Visual/Aesthetic/Enjoyment: This refers to the formal aspects of a work of art. Here the value of the work is measured in terms of aesthetic experience, contribution to the aesthetic of the place or, in the case of performances, by the enjoyment it provides. The term “aesthetic experience” is significant as this allows for the inclusion of works that are intended for blind people, for example, for whom aesthetic experience would be derived from senses other than vision.

Design quality: This refers to way in which the work is an elegant and possibly innovative solution to problems or challenges which need to be addressed. In architecture, Vitruvius’s ancient Roman dictum, usually translated as ‘commodity, firmness and delight’ is still referred to as a measure of quality. This is often borrowed into other design spheres to refer to the necessity for functional integrity and fitness for purpose, as well as pleasure-giving attributes that are the hallmarks of design quality.

Social activation: This refers to the values that are attributable to “activist art”. By its very nature, activist art’s formal and physical attributes may not be considered an important part of it, since the value of the content or message is deemed more relevant. Activist art also often encourages direct social change as a consequence of its production and reception.

Innovation/risk. Innovation, more often than not, involves a certain degree of risk, to the artist (reputation, future funding) as well as to the work itself. Innovation and risk as an aspiration in art has been commonplace at least since the late 19th century. An innovative work, due to its newness (and lack of familiarity among the viewers), scale or placement, may end up being reviled, rejected or unloved until it either is accepted or vandalized or dismantled.

Innovation and risk are both important factors at different stages: first as perceived risk, then as latent risk and finally as either superseded risk (one that was turned into acceptance) or as a risk that ended in the demise of the work.
At any stage the differentiation between conceptual and technical risk is relevant. While conceptual risks may be controversial, technical risks may involve at some stage health and safety issues and those are factors that are important to take into account.

**Host participation:** The term “host” refers to those who participate either as audience or in the actual creation of the work of art along with the artist. This is an expanded and more active concept than “audience”. Since “audience” often implies a passive (viewing/receiving) attitude towards the work of art, the term host is more appropriate to indicate (i) those for whom the work of art is intended but (ii) who may also take an active part in the making of the art work. It would be important to establish whether this participation takes place during the actual process of making or after (as audience, visitors, or inhabitants of a particular place).

**Challenge/critical debate:** This point is quite likely to be related to innovation/risk and, in fact, it could be considered the next stage of risk evaluation. An innovative or risky project is likely to be challenging; this is therefore the point where there is an opportunity to register whether the challenges involved were debated and if so, who participated in the debate.

### 4.3.2 Social Values

The factors in this section are particularly relevant for those projects in which artistic values may be intentionally allied to, or even subordinated to, the social objectives. These are likely to be projects linked with the “social activation” factor included in the “Artistic” values.

**Community development:** In some cases “community development” or capacity-building (as provision of new skills, increasing self-esteem or neighbourhood improvement) is one of the main aims of a project; in other cases it may be the result of unexpected outcomes. In any case, positive impacts, intended or realised, would be recorded here. The distinction between short term and long term is important. Some community impacts may only be for the duration of the project; some impacts may not occur immediately or may occur in combination with other factors over the longer term. This cell in the matrix records general and community outcomes; the ones that follow, e.g. social inclusion or health and wellbeing, focus on more specific or individualised outcomes.

**Poverty and social inclusion:** Is the promotion of social inclusion (of black and minority ethnic groups, elderly people, disabled people or other potentially disadvantaged groups) one of the aims of the project? Does the project aim at reducing poverty or social exclusion by providing skills, integrating and empowering excluded groups or improving access to services and opportunities?

**Health and Well being:** If the project is related to a hospital or health care service, then improved health outcomes are likely to be an aim of the project and relatively straightforward to measure via indicators such as shortened recovery times, fewer demands for pain-relieving drugs or general well-being in response to questionnaires. Health and well-being may be more difficult to measure in a non-
medical context but a project that aimed to contribute to people’s relaxation and release from stress in response to the quality of a place or an intervention might be evaluated using questionnaires that explore these issues.

**Crime and Safety**: Does the project aim to increase safety by means of changing physical features (ampler views, more light, traffic restrictions); functional features (bringing more people to the place, new businesses) or improving neighbourliness and informal social contact? All of these may lead to improved safety (as demonstrated by reductions in crime or accidents) and/or improved perceptions of safety (which may not be the same thing).

**Inter/Personal Development**: Does the project aim to promote personal development, such as self-esteem or identity, or increase aspects of interpersonal development such as intergenerational or intercultural relationships? If the stated aim is the promotion of any of these factors, it may be important to elucidate whether these are achieved or developed in conjunction with, or subordinated to, other values such as those considered in part of the artistic module.

**Travel and access**: This refers to projects which aim to increase people’s access (real or perceived) to facilities or services through interventions which relate to physical access or transport. This is likely to reflect where the work is sited, e.g. is it easily encountered, either by pedestrians or people using public transport, or is private or specialist transport required? Projects which relate to the accessibility of the physical environment are likely to refer to values in the environmental module as well.

**Skills Acquisition**: A project directly aimed at public participation may include the development of skills that would, for example, increase employability or the ability to undertake new social or leisure activities. This factor relates to projects where specific skills are targeted, although it is likely that they may also relate to personal and interpersonal development as outlined above.

4.3.3 Environmental Values

The factors in this section will be important for many projects and, particularly for environmental art projects.

**Vegetation and Wildlife**: This relates to the natural and semi-natural environment and particularly to living elements within that environment – plants and animals – and the habitat that supports them. Thus, the project may relate, for example, to endangered species or rare plant communities, issues of soil erosion or woodland coverage.

**Physical environmental improvement**: Does the project contribute to environmental improvement? This value relates to both urban and rural contexts, for example where a project is focused on the transformation of a derelict industrial site or the restoration of a place lost to neglect. Physical improvements may relate to functional or aesthetic aspects of place, such as accessibility or the imageability of a place. Physical improvements may also work at a range of scales, from large
landscape areas, e.g. an abandoned quarry, to individual elements within the environment, e.g. telephone booths or lighting in an urban square.

Conservation: This relates to the care and protection of the environment, or environmental attributes, for future generations. The most common focus of conservation is the cultural environment, whether it is built heritage, archaeology or historic landscapes. While vegetation and wildlife as natural elements in the environment are covered separately, above, historic patterns that arise from cultural use of, and constructions in, the environment, e.g. old field patterns, may be the focus of a conservation-related art project, and would be identified under this factor.

Pollution and waste management: air, water and ground quality: Does the project focus on issues of pollution, waste and waste management by drawing attention to these issues or by using, for example, waste products or polluted materials in the construction of the project? All aspects of the environment that are vulnerable to pollution or damaged environmental quality are relevant under this factor.

Climate change and energy: Does the project raise awareness of issues such as climate change and energy conservation or highlight hidden factors embedded in practices we consider environmentally friendly but are not?

4.3.4 Economic Values

All values in this section are closely related. If the project is marketable and contributes to place identity (first point), it is likely to contribute to one or more of the other values too. Including the other areas has the advantage of allowing the evaluators to identify issues such as whether the project is marketable but the marketing is not actually taking place, as well as pinpointing specific areas of economic contribution such as regeneration, tourism, etc. It also permits a distinction between whether the contribution is limited to within the community or whether it would attract investment/income from outside its specific area.

Marketing/Place identity. Does or would the project (in itself or as part of a larger project) help in marketing the place? Does the project photograph well for brochures or does its description make a place sound more interesting? The project could be marketed for a variety of purposes, for example contributing to the amenities of the place, inviting the relocation of industries, attracting tourism or an economically active resident population. Overall, would the project contribute to the place’s identity, either as a landmark or as a centre or activity? At what scale would it do this: national, regional, local?

Regeneration: this factor is closely related to the previous one but relates specifically to projects which focus on renewal in an area which has been in economic (and therefore probably also environmental) decline. Might the project contribute directly to economic regeneration? Does it aim to help the local population to get out of an economic rut or cycle of vandalism? If the latter, then it would be contributing indirectly to regeneration, but worth taking into account. It will be important to define and identify the ways in which the project is or might effectively contribute to regeneration, instead of evaluating the wish that it would.
**Tourism:** This factor is related to marketing. Does or would the project attract tourists? Is it especially targeted at tourists? This point may be particularly important as tourism is an “export” industry in the sense that it generates an income from non-local sources, thus producing a net injection of cash.

**Economic investment and output:** This factor may be related to the marketing or regeneration values of the project but is not necessarily dependent on those factors. Would the project attract investment in the form of new businesses, an economically active population, more public funds or other sources of outside investment? Would it contribute to the economic output of the area or to increasing local productivity?

**Resource use and recycling:** Does the project focus on use of resources, the benefits and the economic consequences of recycling? Does it draw attention to the consequences of over-use and wastefulness of resources for sustainability? The project may take into account both short and long-term economic factors and explore resource use and recycling on a global, national or local scale.

**Education:** Does the project contribute to education? Does it benefit specific populations or communities; who are the target audience? Education can be seen as a benefit independent of any employment or income that is generated as a direct result. What kind and level of education is promoted or achieved through the project?

**Employment.** Does the project create direct employment opportunities through participation in the project or indirect ones through the creation of skills or attraction of investment in the area? Does it create sustained employment or is it only temporary?

**Project management/Sustainability:** How is the project managed into the future? Would the project require constant funding from one source or another to continue functioning in future? Will it self-generate the necessary income or, if not, is it likely to attract future funding? What are the implications for loss of investment or waste if the project is not self-sustaining or manageable into the future?

**Value for Money:** Has the project been a good investment, considering the output? Value for money does not always equate to lowest cost, and full account should be taken in valuing the impact of both design and sustainability. Points that will need to be considered include opportunity costs: could the same or better outcomes have been achieved if the funds had been invested in a different project? Would the project eventually represent a better investment due to dividends which accrue in the long term? Will the project generate value proportionate to the investment it required?

### 4.4 Types of Measures and Indicators

The evaluation Matrix provides the basis for choosing appropriate measures or means of collecting reliable information on outcomes of the project that are relevant to the stakeholders and their values. This will also point to indicators which can demonstrate whether a desired outcome has been achieved and what impact this has had.
Indicators need to be set against baseline information and recognise that ambitious aims and innovative processes will influence the indicators against which quality and success can be measured. Indicators must take into account outcomes that fail to fully achieve expectations but nonetheless result in high quality and possibly unexpected impacts. Equally, they must capture outcomes that fail to meet any standard of quality or success.

This report does not set out in detail the full range of potential measures and indicators that might be used in public art projects. This is partly because the nature of public art is so diverse that it would be difficult to cover all possible measures. It is also the case that there is a large and increasing number of publications (see the references in section 8, particularly Woolf (1999) and Annabel Jackson Associates (2004), and examples in Appendix D) which offer a range of different methods; many project managers will find that there are existing methods that can be readily adapted for their use.

It is likely that a combination of qualitative and quantitative measures will be appropriate in most public art projects. Questionnaires can be used with participants and the wider public or targeted audiences to elicit both qualitative and quantitative information, such as how many days a person was involved with a project, what they most enjoyed about a project, what they feel about their health and wellbeing, or whether they believe they have learned new skills. Collecting data from people who were not involved in a project can be as important as from those who were participants, to give a balanced view of what can reasonably be attributed to the project’s impact. Independent measures or data, collected from observations or from other independent sources, e.g. levels of vandalism or local crime statistics, can also be important to provide a robust basis for any claims that are made from those involved in the art project.

It is important that the measures chosen are the most appropriate for the particular project under consideration and it is for this reason that we have focused in the above section on identifying the purpose and importance of any outcome measures, through the Matrix.

4.4.1 Identity and the Transactional Nature of People’s Relationship with Place.
People’s personal and collective identities are bound up with place in a way that is well established in environmental psychology. People’s local environment becomes part of their identity, part of what helps them to define who they are, and to distinguish themselves from others. The relationship between the physical and social environment is transactional; if changes are made to the physical environment, their impact will depend on the extent to which they affect how people can carry out their daily lives and tasks. Equally, if their economic or social circumstances change, what they want to do will also change, and so will their perception of the suitability of the physical environment.

Thus criteria for the evaluation of public art which has expression in the physical environment will need to take into account not only the economic opportunities that it provides and the support that it can give to the community but also the shape it
gives to people’s personal sense of identity. Indicators and data collection methods which are sensitive to this last issue will be particularly useful in some kinds of projects.

Although there are a range of methods which can be used to explore personal engagement with place and with public art projects that intervene in place, we have identified one, new method – Personal Project Analysis - which has proved particularly valuable. It has not been used in art project evaluation before and is therefore described in detail below.

4.4.2 Personal Project Analysis

Personal Project Analysis (Little, 1983) is a tool which has not been used elsewhere and which has provided useful insights in the case study tests of the framework. It has been developed in this project to offer a different perspective on the public art project from that conventionally associated with evaluation. The Matrix, and any measures derived from it, are intended to lead to an evaluation which gives a dispassionate, external view of the outcomes and impacts of a public art project. Personal Project Analysis is a questionnaire based on a personal view of the project which places the artist and other key stakeholders at the centre of the evaluation. It is taken from the work of Brian Little (2000) and is grounded in personal construct psychology.

The Personal Project questionnaire allows an individual view of the project and a personal relationship with it to be expressed. It allows different stakeholders the chance to explore their own feelings about how a project is going and how it impacts their own lives. As with any questionnaire, the respondents need to be clear about the purpose to which the responses will be put and whether anonymity will be maintained, so that honest responses are elicited. If used appropriately, it can give the project officer a picture of the different stakeholders’ involvement and empowerment within a project and illuminate, in particular, how the process impacts on the quality and outcome of the project.

The questionnaire is set out in Appendix B and its use is discussed in more detail in section 5. As with the evaluation Matrix, it is designed to be used flexibly and can be effective at different stages in the project. If certain questions are inappropriate for a particular project or stage in a project, they can be omitted. At an individual project level, this tool allows a set of internal, individual views on a project to be triangulated with external, democratic and agreed values arrived at though the Matrix. It is also possible for cross-project data to be collected which would allow analysis of common patterns of individual views of process that are associated with certain outcomes.
5. USING THE ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT

The evaluation framework described in section 4 sets out the whole evaluation and assessment philosophy, as well as the principles and practical aspects of the toolkit. What follows is a description of how to use the toolkit – the Matrix and the personal project analysis – in practice, in the context of a public art project.

5.1 Initiating the Evaluation Cycle: Why Use the Matrix?

There are clear benefits for undertaking an attempt to make explicit, and ideally to achieve consensus on, values and measurable outcomes before a project starts. There may not be always be agreement on this but the framework will make the process transparent and allow for discussion either to build consensus, to agree outcomes of differing importance to different stakeholders, or to come to the decision that conflicting aspirations mean the project should be abandoned as unworkable or unlikely to be an effective investment of time, effort and funds.

Engaging in a participatory process to identify and agree outcome measures with potential hosts and communities at the initiation of the evaluation cycle may of itself have a positive impact on the successful realisation of a project. The Matrix is designed to facilitate this process. It creates a space for dialogue and allows all stakeholders to unpack and share ideas concerning their own key values and variables present in the project. It also opens the possibility of stakeholders, perhaps for the first time, engaging with others’ rather different values. Thus, discussion of the importance and nature of conceptual risk to an artist, for example, might assist in transforming a disengaged local authority officer into a passionate advocate for art. Equally, the Matrix allows for stakeholders to recognise others’ values, even if they do not identify or engage with them, so that a mutual recognition of and respect for a wide range of values can be agreed.

The Matrix is designed to be used at several stages during a project’s life: at the outset; at one or more interim stages in the life of a project, for monitoring and process (or formative) evaluation and at the end of a project, to evaluate both anticipated and unexpected outcomes.

5.2 How to use the Matrix

The Matrix works across all public art, it doesn’t matter what form, type or genre of public art is being considered. It is not necessary, therefore, to classify the public art project in any way before using the Matrix.

5.2.1 Identify a Facilitator

Use of the Matrix requires a facilitator. The best person to undertake this role will depend partly on the nature of the project’s organisation and management and partly on the stage of the project. It also depends on whether resources have been allocated for external evaluation of the project; many project funders will consider this if it is included in the costings from the outset. There are benefits and drawbacks to both internal and external facilitation and evaluation and the decision should be based on what is best for the particular project. One likely scenario is
where the project officer acts as facilitator for the initial use of the Matrix, at the
beginning of the project (the outset of the evaluation cycle), and at one or more
interim stages in the life of the project, but an external facilitator is brought in for the
final stage to provide a level of independence for outcome and impact assessment
at the end of a project

The facilitator may need some training before leading the project into use of the
Matrix. He or she will need to explain to all stakeholders what is involved, and
encourage discussion and consensus-building as the stakeholders come
together to agree a set of shared values.

5.2.2 Introduce all stakeholders to the Matrix
The facilitator will need to decide how best to introduce the Matrix and its use. It is
probably advisable to have an introductory meeting with all stakeholders. If some
of its language is unfamiliar, then explanations will be needed for what the
different headings in the Matrix might mean for the particular project under
consideration. If it is considered likely that distributing the Matrix will deter
newcomers to the evaluation process from engaging, then the facilitator may
decide to use the Matrix as an internal guide to the agenda for an initial meeting,
where all the items are discussed.

The stakeholders listed along the top row of the Matrix cover the main kinds of
creative practitioners, recipient communities, commissioners and funders
possible. However, each project may have a smaller or larger range of people
involved. The values along the left-hand side column of the Matrix set out a range
of different values associated with public art projects, that can be used as an
agenda or checklist which each stakeholder is invited to address.

The Matrix should be treated as a flexible tool and can be altered to accommodate
changes to values and stakeholders on a project-by-project basis. Additional
columns or rows can be added or certain ones removed to suit the needs of each
project. The layout of the Matrix has been developed in order to encourage an
artist-centred evaluation process to measure impact and quality but it is important
that all stakeholders can find a place and a set of values that are relevant to them.

All key stakeholders should be represented in discussions and use of the Matrix.
There must be ‘champions’ for all the stakeholders identified as relevant, who can
speak on behalf of each of them and be involved in identifying values and
developing the evaluation. The facilitator and project group may need to assist the
process of identifying champions if none already exist for some key stakeholder
categories.

5.2.3 Identify what outcomes matter to different stakeholders
This stage involves asking all stakeholders what ‘success’ would mean for them –
what are the most desirable (yet realistic, even if of high aspiration) outcomes that
are important to them. Stakeholders may want time to think about these and
should be given the opportunity to work on a copy of the Matrix on their own before
sharing their values with others at a joint meeting of all stakeholders.
The most important task initially is for each stakeholder to identify which values are important to them. If it is appropriate, stakeholders may also be invited to consider what values might be important to other stakeholders; this will facilitate the subsequent discussion and consensus-building stage; however, it is not necessary if some stakeholders do not feel able to undertake this task.

The simplest use of the Matrix would involve filling in each box with a tone where there is a value identified as important for a stakeholder. If transparent/acetate sheets are used with the Matrix printed on them, then they can be overlaid at the group discussion stage to see where values overlap most frequently. It is not recommended that stakeholders rate or grade the importance of the values that matter to them, just identify all that are key for the project, although people may wish to identify their top three priorities with a star in the box.

5.2.4 What are the most important values?
This stage involves bringing together every stakeholder’s individual values identified on the Matrix. The meeting is an important one at which all stakeholders must be represented, so that the negotiation of outcomes against which the project will be evaluated reflect all stakeholders’ values.

Different stakeholders will probably place importance on different parts of the Matrix. Nonetheless, there is likely to be a gathering weight of support for values in certain rows and boxes of the Matrix. This stage should be part of a democratic process where there is mutual respect for differing views and priorities, recognising that a value that is important to one stakeholder only may still be important for the project as a whole.

Agreement on the key values for the project is the basis on which the outcomes are determined for project evaluation. It is important that the final range agreed are not too many or too unmanageable. They may be as few as three or as many as 20, but it is recommended that they are kept to as few as possible, ideally 5-10.

The facilitator will need to lead the discussion of what values are most important across all stakeholders in order to arrive at the final, agreed ones. It might help to ask each stakeholder what they (or the group they represent) couldn’t live without. Methods for coming to agreement can also use voting methods such as presenting the full set of identified stakeholder values on an enlarged Matrix and asking each stakeholder to vote (using sticky dots) for the three or five most important. Such methods can be useful but should not be the final arbiter, since the final result must be one that all stakeholders can subscribe to if the project is to go ahead. Ultimately, a consensus should be arrived at.

5.2.5 Defining outcomes and outcome indicators
Outcome indicators help assessment of changes that take place as a result of a project and show progress towards meeting overall aims. The agreed set of values determines the kind of outcomes against which any assessment will take place. For example, if conceptual risk and physical environmental improvement are two agreed values, then assessment must examine whether the art project did involve conceptual risk and whether the environment has been improved. The
process of using the Matrix to arrive at agreement should ensure that all stakeholders care about the outcomes.

Indicators allow progress against outcomes to be measured. Put another way, it is necessary to ask how one could tell if the desired process had been effective and/or outcomes have been achieved. This needs careful thought to ensure that measures are fit for the purpose intended and to avoid time-consuming collection of data which may be inappropriate or irrelevant. There are many off-the-shelf indicators that have been developed and used in a range of projects and programmes (Section 2 gave some examples of outcome indicators that may be relevant), and these can be used or adapted as appropriate. It may be that some specific to the nature of the project will also need to be developed.

If the stakeholder involvement has been effective from the start, then there should be an enthusiasm for gathering information against outcome indicators because these represent what is important to the people involved. It is necessary also to consider the potential pitfalls and failures in process and outcome, so indicators should allow for, and be sensitive to, negative as well as positive results.

5.2.6 Monitoring and output indicators
Output indicators help monitor and assess the work generated by a project and show progress towards outcomes. Monitoring outputs are often straightforward statistics collected as part of project management, e.g. numbers of people involved in the project or attending certain events, expenditure against, budget, etc.. Clients and funding bodies will usually have some requirements for output data to be collected. In order to ensure that commissioners and other stakeholders will have all the information they need at key stages in the project and to ensure that monitoring does not become too burdensome, it is important that outcome measures are clearly identified at the start.

5.2.7 Planning for the collection, analysis and storage of data
The tools for the collection of data to set against indicators will range from publicly available statistics (e.g. levels of reported crime) through questionnaires and interviews to more empowering individualised or self-evaluation methods (see Appendix D for some examples). As with the identification of indicators, it is likely that there are many off-the-shelf data collection tools that have been developed and used in a range of other projects and programmes, and these can be drawn on as appropriate (see Section 8: References, for sources). Questionnaires that relate to people’s self-confidence or positive outlook on life, for example, have been refined and tested for validity and reliability over a number of research projects that use standardized scales developed by psychologists. It is only where there are no reliable data collection methods for some aspect of a particular project that it makes sense to develop new, or to adapt existing, ones.

It is important to be clear and transparent about the way that data will be analysed and stored (bearing in mind the requirements of the Data Protection Act) and who will have access to it for analysis, monitoring or evaluation purposes. A good storage and backup system is necessary while ensuring that confidentiality and other ethical issues are addressed.
5.2.8 Baseline information
Some outcomes and processes may be targets for which no baseline is necessary but it is almost always the case that some outcomes can only effectively be measured against a baseline, i.e., the situation before the project started. This means that before a project is implemented, or as a first action within the project, baseline data will need to be collected. The methods used will be those that have been identified as appropriate to the agreed values and outcome measures. Thus, the indicators and data collection tools will be used for the first time at the start of the project. This is also helpful in ensuring that methods are usable in practice and for piloting techniques so that they can be repeated with confidence later in the project.

5.3 Using the Matrix throughout the project

5.3.1 Project initiation
The above section described the way the Matrix should be used from the outset of a project, to establish the basis for evaluation throughout its life and after completion. Any subsequent evaluation and assessment of outcomes should be referred back to the original Matrix of values. It may be that the values change for some stakeholders during the project and the Matrix should allow some flexibility to take this into account.

5.3.2 Evaluation during the life of the project
In order to check whether the project’s processes are effective, formative evaluation is advisable at one or more points in the project lifecycle. This allows adjustments to be made if inadequacies are identified. Data is collected and evaluated against the agreed indicators as identified at the start. The artist’s process of engagement with the community, for example, may be measured through exploring the activities and interventions that have been undertaken and the community perceptions of and response to these. It may also be useful to look at progress against baseline data, e.g., has there been a measurable improvement in the physical environment, or in people’s perceptions of the environment, to date? If a project has a very short timescale, such interim evaluation may not be appropriate but it is both helpful and good practice for projects that span over many months or years.

5.3.3 Outcome evaluation
The Matrix provides the basis for outcome evaluation, using the indicators and data collection methods agreed at the outset as being most effective measures for the values agreed upon. The assessments must be open to positive as well as negative outcomes and it may be that an external evaluator is useful at this stage, to provide an independent facilitator. The outcomes should be set against baseline data, where appropriate, to demonstrate what change, and how much change, has taken place associated with the project.

The Matrix also provides a reminder of the range of possible outcomes that were not identified as important when agreeing shared values between stakeholders at the start. This may alert the project group and/or the evaluator to unexpected
outcomes; ones which were not anticipated but have nonetheless proved important. The outcome evaluation should be open to these and alert to opportunities where analysis of data may reveal them.

5.3.4 Impact evaluation
While outcomes can be measured at the completion of a project, impact may often only be measurable at some point after the project completion, assuming a clear completion point is identifiable. In any case, impact evaluation may require a separate activity which draws on funding support post-project to complete. Impact needs to be seen in a wider context as well, and this may require evaluators to set the project in the context of a programme or against similar projects and contexts elsewhere. The values and outcomes identified in the Matrix will still be important as the basis for evaluating impact. However, caution is required in attributing impacts to public art projects alone where a range of other, changing circumstances in the context of the project may also have had an effect. Good data collection against a baseline and comparison of outcomes and impacts from different art projects will assist in producing a reliable impact evaluation.

5.4 Personal Project Analysis

5.4.1 Why use Personal Project Analysis?
Section 4 set out the basis for a particular form of evaluation that is unique to this assessment toolkit: Personal Project Analysis. This analysis allows all people involved (artists, communities, funders and commissioners) to offer an internal and personal view of the process and context. It allows the artists, as well as other stakeholders, to place themselves at the centre of the assessment process. An external view of impact and quality will emerge when outcome assessments are carried out to address the key values emerging from the Matrix. Cross-referencing all the stakeholders’ Personal Project Analyses with the outcome assessment will provide a highly comprehensive picture of each project’s value, impact and quality. It allows, in effect, a triangulation between an external view that is shared, agreed, and likely to be stable over time with an internal view that is personal, dynamic and likely to change as the project progresses.

5.4.2 How to use Personal Project Analysis
The evaluation coordinator will need to make a judgement about the confidentiality of Personal Project Analysis. It may be that the results should be confidential to each person, that they can be gathered by the coordinator but in anonymous form, or that they can be identified as coming from the artist or other stakeholders before being collated by the coordinator. The choice should be determined by what stakeholders are comfortable with, but may be most useful if people feel confident enough to share their views.

The evaluation coordinator must make clear from the start what information will be collected and stored, in what format (e.g. anonymous or otherwise), what purpose it is to be used for and who will have access to it or a summary of it.

The analysis form should be straightforward to use. Stakeholders respond to each of the statements in a personal way, ticking the box against the rating that best expresses their experience or perceptions. There are some open-ended questions
at the end of the form that allow more flexible responses and personal outcomes to be identified.

5.4.3 When to use Personal Project Analysis
Some aspects of Personal Projects Analysis can be explored at project inception, during the process and after project completion. Certain items are only possible to respond to at the end of a project, but Items 1 and 13, ‘Importance’ and ‘Progress’, may be helpful even at the outset of the project.

The coordinator should amend the list of questions if it seems appropriate, either to the nature of the project or to the stage of the project. Item 14, Risk, is included as a potentially important and positive dimension in public art, and one that has a range of implications. It is distinguished from item 3, Difficulty, which reflects the practical dimensions of challenge.

Interim use of Personal Projects Analysis during the process of a project can help the project manager to diagnose problems or potential challenges to the project, and can feed into interim evaluation. It may assist in redirecting the project or the processes to keep all stakeholders appropriately engaged and ensure the outcomes are achieved.

5.5 Feedback
It is important to provide a forum where the stakeholders in a project can receive feedback from the evaluation process and outcomes. Ideally, the group of stakeholders that met initially to agree values is reconvened to examine and discuss outcomes and impacts.

The results of evaluations may have several potential audiences and feedback may take different forms depending on its purpose. All participants in a project are entitled to access some element of feedback, so reporting to the local community may be planned as part of an event or publication quite different from that required to report to commissioning bodies or stakeholder representatives, for example.

The purpose of feedback is not only to report on evaluations but also to identify processes, outcomes and impacts that have useful lessons for future projects and for the wider community, whether the community of artists or other design professionals or different communities of place or interest.

5.6 Project or Programme Level Assessment?
The Matrix and Personal Project Analysis can be used at programme level as well as for individual projects. There is a cascade of activity and an associated set of stakeholders and values at each level. Thus, the assessment toolkit can be effective at a number of different levels and may serve the needs of public art commissioning agencies or local authorities, for example, in different ways.
6. TESTING THE TOOLKIT

6.1 Preliminary Case Studies

The limited time frame within which the preliminary case studies needed to be carried out in this phase of the research placed constraints on the testing of the toolkit. Ideally the assessment process begins with the evaluation Matrix at the start of the project and with a clear identification of values, outcome goals, indicators and baseline information before the public art project is undertaken. Equally, the impact of the public art may not be fully apparent until some time after the project is considered completed, which may require a delay in post-project assessment. For this report, the case studies to test the toolkit were only able to capture part of the full evaluation process in any one project. However, the case studies were chosen to represent different stages in the process of planning, commissioning, undertaking and completing public art projects, and cover several stages of the process between them.

All the project officers involved in the case studies who tested use of the toolkit were initially invited to a workshop designed to introduce them to the evaluation framework. They had an opportunity to discuss how the different elements could be used and what kinds of issues might arise with different stakeholders.

6.2 Project Initiation – Out of Suburbia

This case study was a project at the early stages of development, based around Walkenden Gardens in Manchester. The project officer, facilitated the use of the toolkit and provided a commentary on the results. The project involves a number of different stakeholders and provided a valuable test of how easy the Matrix would be to use. Stakeholders included members of the local community – Friends of Walkenden Gardens – students on courses at Manchester Metropolitan University in Engineering and in Arts and Environment, and the project officer representing a public art agency.

6.2.1 Using the Toolkit
The Matrix revealed some shared values across all these stakeholders, namely:

- Visual/aesthetic enjoyment
- Community development, especially long-term
- Physical environmental improvement/sensitivity and sustainability.

Marketing/place identity, education and project management and sustainability were also important for the local community but less so for the student artists and engineers.

A small version of the Matrix is shown, below, as an illustration of how the final version might look as a basis for agreeing values.
A. **Visual/aesthetic enjoyment.** To create a scheme that is foremost an art work, visually pleasing and a focal point in the Gardens that sits comfortably in the Garden.

**Outcome indicators:** Determine the focal point of the Garden, if it exists, at present for users and measure whether that changes through the project. Examine how people describe the work e.g. the art, the theatre support.

B. **Community development, especially long-term.** To create a project that encourages more people to participate and have an involvement with the gardens.

**Outcome indicators.** Set against baseline data on previous events and visitor numbers and visitors to the gardens when no events are on (provided by the Friends of Walkenden Gardens). Test the impact of changes to this space and how people use the space.

C. **Physical environmental improvement** Use environmentally suitable or reclaimed materials and be sensitive to the environment around the art work, but not to the detriment of the aesthetic.

**Outcome indicators.** How does this relate to materials currently used in the Gardens?
D. Marketing/place identity. Provide the Gardens with new images through this project.

Outcome indicators. What images exist now of the Gardens; does the artwork get used in promotion of the Gardens in the future?

E. Project management and sustainability. To keep within the budget determined by the Client and provide value for money.

Outcome indicators. Self evaluation through budgeting.

F. Education. To involve the community in the development of the project and provide an educational involvement with the Garden.

Outcome indicators. What activity has taken place and is now activated by this project?

6.2.2. Commentary on using the toolkit

The Friends of the Gardens found using the toolkit difficult initially as it was the first bit of work the project officer has asked them to do; they said it felt a bit like homework. It took them longer to work through it than the students and it is clear that the facilitator’s role is important here. The students were keen to use the Matrix and the personal projects analysis as they are looking at ways to prove the benefit of their work and are more familiar with working together on an art project.

A summary Matrix was produced with numbers in each box referring to the amount of people who thought each was an important value in a group discussion. The project officer initiated the discussion and explained the Matrix, then stakeholders individually chose values. The group discussed these and decided their top priorities. Each key value was then discussed and, in particular, how it would be measured. Baseline data will be taken from visitor figures and profile which the Friends already have gathered. Environmental impact may be harder to assess and needs further thought. The group had an interesting conversation about the arts project encouraging people to garden by engaging in horticultural values and notions of excellence.

As the toolkit to establish roles, responsibilities and values at the start of a project, it was not possible to complete the final questions in the Personal Project Analysis.

6.3 Interim Project Assessment – Look Ahead

This project involved Look Ahead Housing Association, working with a landscape architect, architect and artist on a housing project in London. After 1.5 years of collaboration, the project is now ready to go out to tender. Five people were involved in completing the Matrix and Personal Projects Analysis: the housing project development manager, the art project manager, the lead architect, the landscape architect and the lighting designer, although the last only completed the Personal Projects Analysis part of the toolkit.
6.3.1 Using the Toolkit
There were no common values across all four professionals who completed the Matrix. The only value where three out of four concurred was:

- visual/aesthetic enjoyment

The architect placed emphasis on challenge and critical debate, social skills acquisition, climate change and energy and marketing and place identity, whereas the landscape architect placed more emphasis on social activation through art. The housing project development manager placed most emphasis on economic investment and output.

Look Ahead: completed Matrix

The personal projects showed a comparatively wide range of responses, although most were weighted towards the high end of the scale. The housing project development manager gave the lowest score to how much he/she felt responsible for initiation of the project but was much more positive about the likely successful outcome. The architect gave lowest scores to the degree of difficulty and stress involved in the project but clearly identified very positively with the project’s importance, values and likely legacy.

This was the only case study where the open-ended set of questions on the Personal Projects Analysis were answered and they reveal some useful findings at this stage. While the housing project development manager thought the uniqueness of the project and its enhancing of the development were the best thing about the project, he/she would firm up costs earlier on a future project. The architect enjoyed stretching the imagination and working with the artist and the landscape architect; he/she was most surprised at getting the funding. The landscape architect
considered working with a figurative artist was one of the best things and was most surprised about the design solution. He/she had learnt to take a freer approach and not get so ‘hung up on professionalism’ in future.

6.3.2 Commentary on using the toolkit
This is an interesting example of a project where values are very different among stakeholders and need to be shared and debated to provide an agreed basis for outcome assessment. The matrix allows these differing views to come to the surface so that all involved are aware of them. Although the project is in progress already, it is not too late for the matrix to serve a useful purpose in developing the way that the project will be evaluated.

The comments made to the final questions on the Personal Projects Analysis illustrate the value of this analysis as part of an interim evaluation. They also suggest that these questions are particularly important in identifying unexpected outcomes, even if they are only important at a personal level.

6.4 Post Project Completion – Beyond the Cut

The Beyond the Cut project involved seven artists worked together to develop seven different projects that explore and celebrate the communities and environments of the Galton Valley in Smethwick. For one weekend in April 2004, over 600 people gathered to celebrate and share in these projects and get a feel for the real diversity and wealth that exists in the area.

The Public worked in partnership with British Waterways to manage these projects with the aim of transforming people’s perceptions of the area and to highlight the significance and historical legacy of the magnificent canal network. From lighthouses to scrapbooks, from flowers to futures and from stories that touch the four corners of the earth, each artist made a very meaningful connection with people who live and work around the Galton Valley.

6.4.1 Using the Toolkit
In 2005, one year after project completion, the project manager contacted the seven artists, her colleague at British Waterways and the colleague with whom she had co-managed the project, to ask them by post to fill in the Matrix and personal Project Analysis. At this point, one of the artists had moved abroad, and the co-manager of the project had since left The Public to pursue his artistic practice full time, so it was not practicable to convene a meeting of all stakeholders to discuss the Matrix together. From nine letters sent out, five responses were received.

Common values across the Matrix were:

- Visual/aesthetic enjoyment
- Social activation
- Challenge/critical debate
- Short-term and long-term community development
- Regeneration

Four out of five stakeholders identified inter/personal development and landscape and wildlife as important.
Most respondents on Personal Projects Analysis chose ratings at the high end of the scale. However, the representative of the co-commissioning body, British Waterways, rated item 10, Self-identity, item 16 Competence and item 17 Autonomy very low by comparison with the four artists, who all rated these items highly. On the other hand, item 18, Legacy, was rated highly by British Waterways and low by the artists.

6.4.2 Commentary on using the toolkit
One artist, the co-manager of the project at the time, said “I had a good look at the Matrix and found it very hard to understand. I can’t see how the Personal Project Analysis relates to the Matrix form as it seems completely different. I have done my best to fill it but it may not be particularly accurate as a reflection of my experiences.” This person is now a full time artist, and also contributed a piece of artwork to assist with interpretation of the event, as well as delivering a project management role. In spite of the apparent difficulty he had with filling in the Matrix and the personal project analysis, his response was very detailed, and appeared useful.

The British Waterways stakeholder responded in under three days, which suggests that she felt confident with this kind of format for measuring the impact of projects. One artist said that she felt the toolkit would be useful for project planning, rather than using it after the event. This is useful reinforcement of the way that it is intended to be used in future. Another artist, a sound artist, made an amendment on his hard copy of the Matrix document; on the artistic values axis, he crossed out the word ‘visual’ in the subject line ‘Visual/Aesthetic/Enjoyment’ and replaced it with the word ‘sonic’. This shows that the Matrix can be used flexibly so long as people feel free to modify it to suit the nature of their project.
The comments highlight the need for future training in use of the toolkit, the need to use the Matrix in a flexible way, and the value of its introduction at a facilitated meeting at the outset of the project.

6.5 Conclusion

The results of these case studies suggest that all parts of the assessment toolkit are usable and potentially useful, so long as there is appropriate training for facilitators and that the toolkit is introduced to stakeholders in person at a meeting early on in the project. Some stakeholders will find the formats of the toolkit difficult or off-putting without an explanation and an introduction. Nonetheless, the value of toolkit as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself, has been illustrated. Groups involved in projects have identified commonalities or differences in values, where they feel involved and confident or less involved and concerned, and what might be the outcomes they would attach importance to, both at a group and at a personal level.

What has been demonstrated across just three case studies is the necessity of engaging in both the Matrix and the Personal Projects Analysis, since they reveal quite different but complementary and useful aspects of a project and its outcomes.

There were details of format and presentation that have been improved as a result of these case studies. Further work on effective formats for presentation of the toolkit and its use are advisable if it is to be widely used in future.
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7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES.

7.1 Further Research

Where serious gaps in the evidence base and methodologies for effective evaluation have been identified (see Appendix C), it is recommended that further research be undertaken (or promoted for others to undertake, e.g. DCMS, AHRC).

7.2 Future Trialling across the Lifetime of Public Art Projects

Further case studies are needed that can trial use of the toolkit over the full lifetime of a project and across a range of public art practice. The Matrix should be used at the start of each project so that a clear identification of outcome goals, indicators and baseline information is established before the project is undertaken. The impact of the public art may not be fully apparent until some time after the project is considered completed, which may require further post-project assessment. The limited time frame within which it may be desirable to complete the case studies may limit which projects are appropriate for the next stage in the development of the assessment toolkit. Nonetheless, the opportunity to provide examples of fully worked-through evaluations using the toolkit should not be missed.

7.3 Discerning Good Practice

There is a long term goal in which the assessment toolkit plays a key role – that of providing examples of complete assessments which may be compared. In this way, examples of good practice can be developed, identifying the critical paths in relation to process and the criteria for supportive contexts through which quality may be achieved.

7.3.1 Long-term Monitoring and Analysis

It will be important to set up a long-term monitoring programme whereby the evidence gathered using the assessment toolkit for different projects is gathered. A comparative review will only be possible once sufficient projects have used the toolkit but will allow the effectiveness of different processes and contexts to be compared in relation to impact. This should allow ixia and others to develop evidence-based best practice guidance. The review should also allow for critical appraisal of the assessment toolkit itself, and revision if appropriate.

Personal Project Analysis offers the opportunity to explore across a number of projects how the internal view of different stakeholders changes over time and, indeed, whether certain aspects of responses predict successful outcomes for projects. This would have to be a long-term goal since a number of examples would need to be collected before any reliable analysis could take place, but worth exploring. It may be that an artist’s perception of risk is highly correlated with successful outcomes against inter/personal development for people in the community, for example. Such relationships can only be established once a sufficiently large set of data is gathered.
7.3.2 Gathering the data in a common format
A common format should be developed for gathering data and evidence from project managers and/or evaluation coordinators, to facilitate comparison and analysis. This may need further work to identify appropriate formats and databases to ensure consistency and effectiveness. Without such a system, there is a danger that lessons and data from individual project evaluations are never amalgamated to inform the process at higher level.

7.4 Supporting Activities

In addition to further research, there are a number of supporting activities that have been identified as necessary or desirable to enhance the effectiveness of the assessment toolkit.

7.4.1 Evaluation training workshops for artists. These would give artists an understanding of the benefits of good evaluation for their own practice, an opportunity to become familiar with appropriate techniques and approaches, and an opportunity to test out the assessment toolkit on a hypothetical project of their own. The workshops will help artists develop good practice that is also sensitive to their particular working process.

7.4.2 Evaluation seminars for commissioning bodies and community groups. These would educate stakeholders in the benefits of evaluation and the use of appropriate methods through the assessment toolkit. They would allow important issues and potentially conflicting views on the evaluation process to be fully aired and examples of good practice to be disseminated.

7.4.3 Training Evaluation Facilitators
The role of facilitator is a vital one in using the Matrix and involves a good understanding of the evaluation framework and the assessment toolkit as well as skills in facilitating discussion and consensus-building. There is likely to be a demand for training for facilitators.
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# APPENDIX A: PUBLIC ART EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Location of work</th>
<th>Commissioning/Funding Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual / Aesthetic / Enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Activation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation / Risk</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge / Critical Debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Social Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Well Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environmental Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution and Waste Management: air, water and ground quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change and Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing / Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Investment and Output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Use and recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management/Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: PERSONAL PROJECTS ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE

The artist or other stakeholder rates each project according to the following dimension, using a rating scale of 1 to 5 as described against each, e.g. 5 = very important, 4 = important, 3 = quite important, 2 = a little important, 1 = not at all important, 0 = irrelevant.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance* – how important is the project to you at the present time? (5 = very important, 1 = not at all important)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enjoyment – how much do you enjoy working on it? (5 = enjoy a great deal, 1 = don't enjoy at all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Difficulty – how difficult do you find it to carry out the project? (5 = find it very difficult, 1 = don't find it difficult at all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Visibility – how aware are the relevant people who are close to you and your work that you are engaged in it? (5 = project very visible, 1 = project not at all visible to those around/close to me)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Control – how much do you feel you are in control of the project? (5 = in complete control, 1 = have no control over the project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Initiation – how much do you feel responsible for having initiated the project? (5 = fully responsible for initiating, 1 = no part in initiating the project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stress – how stressful is it for you to carry out the project? (5 = very stressful, 1 = very relaxing to carry out)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Time adequacy – how much do you feel that the amount of time you spend working on it is adequate? (5 = amount of time spent on it is perfectly adequate, 1 = for whatever reason, the amount of time you spend working on it is not at all adequate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Outcome – what do you anticipate the outcome of the project to be? (5 = extremely successful, 1 = a total failure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self-identity – how typical of you is this project? (5 = very typical of me, 1 = not at all typical of me)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Others' view - how important is the project seen to be by relevant people who are close to you and your work? (5 = seen as very important by others, 1 = seen as not important at all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Value congruency – to what extent is it consistent with the values which guide your life? (5 = totally consistent with your values, 1 = totally at odds with them)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Progress* – how successful have you been in the project so far? (5 = very successful, 1 = no success at all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Risk – to what extent does the project involve risk for you? (5 = most risky, almost more than I can handle, 1 = not risky at all, almost boring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Absorption – to what extent have you become engrossed or deeply involved in the project? (5 = tend to be very absorbed in the activity, 1 = tend to be uninvolved when carrying out the project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Competence – to what extent do you feel competent to carry out this project? (5 = completely competent, 1 = do not feel competent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17. Autonomy – how much do you feel you are acting autonomously in carrying out this project? (5 = engaged entirely according to my own free will, 1 = completely
acting according to someone else’s wishes).

18. Legacy – how much of a lasting legacy do you think this project will create?
(5 = long-lasting, high profile legacy, 1 = no evident or lasting legacy)
Support for your project— which component helps or hinders your project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Other people directly involved in carrying out the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 = fully facilitates, 1 = thwarts my efforts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Social environment for the project – the community of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 = fully facilitates, 1 = thwarts my efforts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Physical milieu and environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 = fully facilitates, 1 = thwarts my efforts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What were the best things about the project?* (List up to three)

*What were the worst things about the project?* (List up to three)

*What surprised you about the project?*

*What did you learn?*

*What would you do differently another time?*

THE CONTEXT
A. Others - Who else is directly involved with you in carrying out the project? – Identify the people and their roles
B. Physical setting for project activity – where do you usually work on the project?
C. Physical setting for completed project (if relevant) – where will the final setting for the project be?

*NOTE: questions marked with an asterisk are only possible to answer once the project is in progress or at completion*
APPENDIX C: Matrix showing coverage of issues in the literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Social impact</th>
<th>Economic impact</th>
<th>Environment, imp.</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project deliverers</td>
<td>Commissioners/funders</td>
<td>Hosts</td>
<td>Public Agencies &amp; Authorities</td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>Architect/Planners</td>
<td>Commissioning bodies</td>
<td>Funders</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object perform</td>
<td>Process/consult</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Separate concerns</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational/motivational</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>RRR</td>
<td>✓ R</td>
<td>✓ R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ R</td>
<td>✓ R R</td>
<td>✓ R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place identity</td>
<td>R ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ R</td>
<td>✓ ✓ R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency of use</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity cost</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best value</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mapping enables people to draw their own local environments through visual and diagrammatic techniques. Mapping activities are good icebreakers and provide a means of introducing the research as they facilitate discussion about peoples’ perceptions of what they feel to be important in a particular area (their community, a park, a landscape, school, office etc). Mapping also allows full participation since the ability to write is not necessary.

A timeline is a useful visual tool for participants to order and record significant events and experiences in their lives. The timeline helps to capture broad changes in an individual or community’s life. For example, it could show the times an individual has
visited a green space in their life, or a much bigger history such as moving from a rural to an urban environment. It can illustrate emotional progress as well as responses to specific events. The peaks and troughs representing emotional highs and lows provides a useful basis for further exploration. The timeline can be considered as a whole or in parts and can be used to explore future needs and aspirations as well as relating to the past.

**Body mapping**

Body mapping enables participants to draw their bodies and make links between their physical and mental health. This helps people to explore and share problems and possible solutions. Like other forms of mapping, body mapping draws on personal experience. For example, it could be used to help people communicate and how they feel when they play sport, or go for a walk in the countryside.
Venn diagram

Venn diagrams can be used to capture peoples’ perceptions of organisations/institutions that are important to them. The size of the shape indicates relative importance or relevance. The positioning of shapes depicts peoples’ perceptions of the relationships between these organisations and the extent to which they impact upon peoples’ lives.

Causal impact diagram

A causal impact diagram is a visual representation of a key issues and the factors, which caused the situation. It enables participants to list causal factors and consider their implications. Causal impact diagrams also allow people to make links between factors and to think about possible solutions. It can be used to show causes of problems such as social or health problems, or to examine social attitudes such as racism.