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Evaluation is fashionable. In many areas, evaluation plays an important role, and in some countries, it has even become a central element to steer political actions. At the end of the sixties, the professionalism of evaluation procedures became more established, especially within the framework of the effective measurement of education, development, health and social policy to demonstrate the effectiveness of implemented programmes in Europe. What about the cultural sector? Financial constraints, legitimacy pressure, service agreements, objective achievements, efficiency control, effective cultural policy and facilitation, are these just empty words? Not at all. The reality of every cultural institution today shows that evaluation in this particular sector has become a necessity.

It has become obvious that guidelines are needed for the implementation of evaluation in the creative sector from discussions with cultural funding institutions and key players in culture. Therefore, it was agreed to develop simple, competent and practical guidelines, which show how to plan, organise and execute an evaluation. Lessons learnt from practice, and evaluation examples from the creative sector are available to interested audiences.

Pro Helvetia and Migros Culture Percentage are the joint publishers of these guidelines. Both institutions play an important role in the development and promotion of cultural and artistic life in Switzerland. They are interested in outstanding projects and understand that evaluation is a contributing factor to the safeguarding of demands for quality.
Both institutions have had a few years of practical experience in external and internal evaluations, and recognise the extent to which qualitative differences become visible internally and externally as a consequence of evaluation: Pro Helvetia has, amongst other matters, augmented the quality of various support measures due to its evaluation culture; it has made their structures leaner and their processes more efficient. Migros Culture Percentage has had similar experiences. Regular evaluation ensures the development of their own projects; it also opens spaces for new interventions. Pro Helvetia and Migros Culture Percentage are fulfilling a need with these guidelines, as there has not been anything comparable thus far.

Hedy Graber, head of the Directorate of Cultural and Social Affairs Migros Culture Percentage, and Anne-Catherine de Perrot, Head of Administration/Evaluation Pro Helvetia, took the initiative for the guidelines as well as the work involved in them. Both wanted to incorporate the experiences and needs of other key players from arts and culture. A group of experts from various areas has supported the process:

* Private foundations were represented through Beat von Wartburg, Head of the Department of Culture, Christoph Merian Foundation.
* Public administration was represented until the end of 2007 by Hans Schmid, Head of the Technical Department of Culture, of the City of St Gallen.
* The international connection was made by Kirsten Haß, Head of the General Project Promotion of the Federal Cultural Foundation, Germany.
* Technical expertise with reference to evaluation was made available by Regula Bäbler, Head of Controlling in the area of bilateral development cooperation at DEZA (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation).

It was a fruitful cooperation and without this expert assistance, the guidelines would not have materialised. Thank you.

The brochure was co-written by Anne-Catherine de Perrot, a sociologist and evaluator at Pro Helvetia with vast experience as a contractor and implementer, with the assistance of Tina Wodiunig, ethnologist, experienced evaluator, curator and museumologist. Their knowledge comes from practical experience and similar publications in the area of health and development cooperation.
Twenty exponents from private foundations, public administration, and cultural institutions and organisations were invited to present their impressions, wishes, criticism and additions. We would like to thank: Isabelle Chappuis, art historian and museologist, Lausanne; Susanne Dédial, assistant at the Directorate of Cultural and Social Affairs, Migros-Federal Cooperative Zurich; Regula Düggelin, commissioner for cultural projects, Department of Culture, Education Department of Basel-City; Beate Eckhardt, Managing Director of SwissFoundations, Zurich; Ursula Freiburghaus, Management Gare du Nord, Basel; Thomas Gartmann, Head of the Department of Music, Pro Helvetia, Zurich; Sonja Hägeli, Cultural Promotion Ernst Göhner Foundation, Zug; Christoph Haering, Head of Performing Arts and Literature, Directorate of Culture and Social Affairs, Migros-Federal Cooperative Zurich; Cornelia Hürzeler, Project Director of Social Affairs, Directorate of Cultural and Social Affairs, Migros-Federal Cooperative Zurich; Daniel Kessler, organisational consultant; KEK-CDC Consultants, Biel; Pius Knüsel, Director Pro Helvetia, Zurich; Sibyle Lichtensteiger, Co-Director Stapferhaus, Lenzburg; Petra Miersch, Scientific Collaborator, Canton of Aargau, Department of Education, Culture and Sport, Department of Culture; Marimée Montalbetti, Head of the Section Culture and Society, Federal Office for Culture, Bern; Roland Sprenger, President of the Cultural Council of the Canton of Valais, Sion; Anne-Catherine Sutermeiser, Director Théâtre du Jorat, Mézières; Sabina Schwarzenbach, Head of Communication, Pro Helvetia, Zurich; David Vuillaume, Secretary General, Association of the Museums of Switzerland, Zurich.

Jakob Schmid, weiter im text, Kommunikation für Kultur und Wirtschaft, Zurich, produced the final editing.

We hope you find a great source of ideas in these guidelines and valuable inspiration for your own evaluation.

Hedy Graber, Migros Culture Percentage
Anne-Catherine de Perrot, Pro Helvetia

November 2008
Introduction

A CULTURAL MANAGER MAY QUESTION THE DIRECTION AND FOCUS OF THE PROJECT. CULTURAL WORK MEANS COMMITMENT TO THE PROJECTS WHICH HAVE TO BE CONTINUALLY DEFINED AND JUSTIFIED AGAIN AND AGAIN. EVALUATION ASSESS PROJECTS AS OBJECTIVELY AS POSSIBLE AND BRINGS TRANSPARENCY WHETHER THE PROJECT IS SUCCESSFUL OR UNSUCCESSFUL. THEY SUGGEST IMPROVEMENTS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE, GUIDE LEARNING PROCESSES, CONTRIBUTE TO DEVELOPMENT AND PREPARE THE WAY FOR DECISIONS. THEREFORE, THEY ARE AN ALMOST IDEAL INSTRUMENT FOR THE WORK OF THOSE WHO ARE IN CHARGE OF CULTURE.

These guidelines aim to develop a culture of evaluation in the cultural sector. They provide practical examples on what and how to evaluate, motivate participation and show that evaluation is not so difficult if some of the principles are respected.

Possible evaluation applications are demonstrated through a number of practical examples from cultural evaluation in practice, and specific subject areas are explored in more detail.

The publishers had the objective to create a practical, user friendly and easy to understand working aid. Therefore, the guidelines concentrate on the essentials, and integrate background information to be comprehensible for both newcomers and novices in this area. The guidelines are supposed to prepare anyone to reflect on their activities independently, or to work in collaboration with an external evaluation.
In the first part of the guidelines, the prerequisites for professional evaluation and the use of evaluation for the cultural sector are explained. Theoretical knowledge about purpose and application is conveyed, and amongst other things, the objective definition, the indicator definition, as well as the effect are discussed. The second part is a step by step guide on carrying out the evaluation process. Where practice makes it necessary, differences in the procedures of evaluation in smaller or larger institutions, both in external or internal evaluation are shown. Therefore, single chapters or modules can be skipped whilst reading, but the principles will always stay the same.

All the important, specific terms can be found in the glossary at the end of the guide.

Although publishers are convinced of the benefit of evaluation, these guidelines would not imply contribution to every cultural activity evaluated. Efforts, costs and benefits of evaluation must be in reasonable proportion. Therefore, the guidelines have criteria to determine whether an evaluation is necessary or not. The pros and cons are discussed.

If your line of work is cultural responsibility and you successfully engage with this evaluation instrument in the future where it would bring clarity to projects, then these guidelines have fulfilled their purpose. In this sense, the publishers hope the publication will be to your satisfaction and that you develop an interest in evaluation. Begin as soon as possible and do not stop: Evaluation is a continuous process in the direction of improvement.
Target Audience
The guidelines address cultural managers who are involved in co-shaping the framework conditions of cultural and artistic work, and who design strategies or implement projects themselves. These include cultural mediators, culture hosts, sponsors, cultural promoters and cultural professionals, engaged conceptually, organisationally, and are supportive of the mediation and dissemination of arts and culture in major and minor institutions. Evaluation is considered a useful instrument for verifying the varied activities for any person or place.

For textual clarity, the variety of positions and activities has been captured in two terms, namely:

Culture Managers This refers the target audience of the guidelines, which is active in different areas of work.

Projects This refers to short-term projects and processes, and also long-term programmes and strategies.

What is not subject to guidelines?
The guidelines do not apply to decision making when requesting financial support. The assessment of applications is not the subject of the guidelines, neither is the evaluation of works of art and artistic productions. The guidelines do not assist in assessing the quality of art.
Theory

THE FIRST PART OF THE GUIDELINES GIVE INSIGHT INTO THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF EVALUATION THEREBY ENABLING THE NAVIGATION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS. IT IS POSSIBLE TO LEARN WHICH PURPOSE THE EVALUATION TO FOLLOW AND WHAT OUTCOME COULD BE EXPECTED. THERE IS INFORMATION ON TOPICS SUCH AS: IN WHICH CASE IS AN EVALUATION METHOD APPROPRIATE? HOW TO RESPOND TO QUESTIONS ABOUT A PROJECT, AND IN WHICH CASE NOT TO RESPOND? OR WHICH EVALUATION TYPE IS BEST TO USE IN WHICH CASE? THE PREPARATION OF AN EVALUATION BEGINS WITH SUCH CONSIDERATIONS, BUT NOT ONLY THOSE! AN IDEAL PREPARATION BEGINS WITH THE PLANNING OF A PROJECT, EVEN WHEN AN EVALUATION IS USED AND UNDERSTOOD AS AN INSTRUMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT. CHAPTERS 2 AND 3 OF THE FIRST PART SHOW EVALUATION IS A USEFUL AND HELPFUL TOOL.
Basic knowledge for professional evaluation
1 Evaluation? A definition

EVALUATION IS A PURPOSEFUL, SHORT-TERM INVESTIGATION WHICH SERVES AS THE ASSESSMENT OF ONGOING OR COMPLETED PROJECTS, INCLUDING CONCEPTION, IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES. AN EVALUATION USES A SYSTEMATIC METHODOLOGY AND OBJECTIVE CRITERIA IN ORDER TO EVALUATE A PROJECT. IT ALSO SEEKS CLARIFICATION, IF A CERTAIN PROCESS DOES NOT DEVELOP AS DESIRED.

Project evaluation therefore means to analyse whether:

* the objectives formulated in the concept have been achieved
* the measures have led to the objectives
* the objectives have been achieved without an unreasonable amount of effort
* the expected effects have been achieved.

Evaluation has an analytical function and gives recommendations on the adaptation, termination or further development of a project.
2 Why evaluate? Purpose of evaluation

EVALUATION CAN HAVE DIFFERENT PURPOSES, ACCORDING TO THE PURPOSE, OTHER QUESTIONS ARE ASKED AND RESULTS ARE USED DIFFERENTLY. IN THE GUIDELINES, EVALUATION IS SHOWN PRIMARILY AS A PARTNERSHIP INSTRUMENT IN ORDER TO JOINTLY DEVELOP A QUALITY CONSCIOUSNESS, TO LEARN AND TO MAKE ACHIEVEMENTS TRANSPARENT.

Evaluation supports project employees to optimise their plans, adapt their approach to the quality standards and to increase efficiency. Evaluation serves to uncover blind spots and to promote institutional learning within an institution or a task force. The process helps management to make decisions, and to externally legitimise activities and give accountability for projects. Evaluation, therefore, moves in the area of conflict between transparency, control and change. These tensions can have an explosive effect and often concern the decision between a project’s continuation or termination, or in questions of funding. Cultural managers can demonstrate the project achievements and aims, and how these can be achieved by means of evaluation.

The four principal purposes of evaluation are defined below:

* Check, optimise and secure quality
* Prepare decisions
* Learn
* Provide accountability

**Verify quality, optimise and secure**

Evaluation should have a positive effect on the project quality as part of the cultural leaders’ quality assurance. By means of evaluation, cultural projects can be checked and improved. An evaluation helps to understand why certain aims are achieved and others are not. On the other hand, it enables the setting of realistic objectives for the future, the continuation of the project and to develop strategies for control. In this sense, evaluation is an instrument of quality management.
A first monography can serve as a stepping stone for an international artistic career. Pro Helvetia has supported up-and-coming talent in the visual arts field since 1997, by offering them the opportunity to publish through the “Collection Cahiers d’Artistes”. In 2007, the department of visual arts is planning to examine the effects the “Cahiers” have on the artists and how the “Cahiers” are perceived by art agents (museums, galleries and independent curators). Is this type of support strategy a good tool to promote up-and-coming artists? A first evaluation is being carried out.

The “Cahiers” are being praised, however, without adequate accompanying support mechanisms; they play a limited role in the development of the careers of the artists and in propagating Swiss art abroad. The evaluation is critical in relation to the support activities. The Department of Visual Arts consequently changes the form of the presentation in response to these findings. The next collection comes out in 2009 as part of the Swiss Awards in Basel, at the same time as Art Basel, the biggest contemporary art exhibition of Switzerland. A curated production introduces the “Cahiers” and the artists. The opening takes place on the occasion of the awarding of the Swiss art prizes by the Federal Ministry of Culture.

This new form of presentation is being evaluated through a small survey conducted on site. The answers are nearly unanimous, the first objective has been achieved: The collection is visible and part of the present; the presentation is effective and politically adequate. The second objective, however, was not achieved quite as well: The artists remain on the fringe of the activities, even though they are present. The next support activity will aim at showcasing them in a better manner.
In 2012, a new evaluation interviews professionals and artists. The tone has changed. The art agents prefer the selection of the artists compared to those in 2007. The artists feel supported. Everyone believes that the presentation of the Collection during the Swiss Art Awards is an adequate form of support. The "Cahiers" are much better known than they were previously. Several projects have been organised in order to further increase the support of the artists in different Swiss institutions since 2013. In 2015, the focus shifts to support artists on an international level by setting up the cooperation with foreign institutions as well as by building up an online platform for promotion, documentation, and archiving.

*The purpose of the evaluation is to assess, optimise, and ensure quality.*
Preparing decisions
Evaluation helps to make decisions and to set priorities. The process provides solid foundations for strategic and operational decisions through results and recommendations.

An evaluation does not make any decisions, but rather paves the way for the project management’s decision making process.

EXAMPLE

CASTLE WILDEGG

The Castle Wildegg in the Canton of Aargau is well visited and offers the visitor an opportunity to be immersed in a baroque atmosphere. A survey amongst the visitors is conducted in order to find out how the directorate can continue to keep the place alive. The gathered data support the directorate in its decisions concerning the future, namely to focus on activities relating to the life at the castle in the past, and on performances about concrete historical aspects, rather than contemporary art exhibitions.

FILM SUBSIDY

Every four years, the Department of Film at the Federal Ministry of Culture formulates new support strategies for film projects. The Swiss Film Law ensures that new support concepts are regularly evaluated. Since coming into effect in 2001, the support concepts are evaluated regularly and are embedded into discussions — mainly with the film sector — related to the development of the next support concept. Thus, for example, the support for the development of film projects is intensified, the system of expert panels is restructured, or the objectives of the section are more carefully defined. In this way, the evaluation prepares the decisions of the Ministry (with the consent of the Federal Department of Internal Affairs) for the subsequent phase.
artlink, Office for Cultural Cooperation is a documentation and funding institution in Switzerland for art and culture from Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe. In 2009, an external evaluation is carried out on behalf of DEZA (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation), the most important donor. The evaluation also examines data that has not yet been covered by artlink, such as the origin and current residence of the artists or the relationship between the contributions that are directly going to the artists or to other actors, respectively. These indicators prove to be so useful that artlink absorbed them into their regular statistical surveys, and make it possible to continuously monitor whether the planned direction is maintained. They also provide a broader basis for decisions. The fund which artlink administers will be doubled in the next phase of the programme. The evaluation establishes that artists and organisers have concurrent needs, and that by the expansion of the fund, the existing capacities of the organisation can be used more effectively.

The purpose of the evaluation is to prepare a structural decision.

Learning
Evaluation means learning from experience. Learning processes can be set in motion when projects are critically assessed by those involved in them, or by external parties. An evaluation contributes towards a better understanding of the functionality of projects. In an ideal situation, the evaluation forms a learning structure that is open to other points of view, allows contemplation of methods, and encourages the development of new perspectives.
The liaison offices of Pro Helvetia in Cairo, Johannesburg, New Delhi and Shanghai promote the dissemination of contemporary Swiss artistic creation and cultural exchange between the regions concerned and Switzerland. For the 2012—2015 programming period, regional efficiency objectives were established with corresponding indicators for the first time. In 2014, Pro Helvetia led an internal interim evaluation of the implementation of these objectives. This evaluation supplies the liaison offices with new insights into both the context and the effect of their work, and permeates into the elaboration of the objectives for the follow-up phase.

It can be seen that contemporary dance at Pro Helvetia Johannesburg is difficult, and much more costly and laborious to promote because of the fragility of the local independent platforms. In the future, the emphasis should, therefore, be focusing more on formats that reach a wider audience in South Africa. In the field of music, Pro Helvetia is successful and has an adequate network in South Africa at its disposal. The evaluation shows that new regional music networks have emerged which now allows a stronger focus on regional cooperation.

The action objective of Pro Helvetia Cairo to create a network between functional partners in the region could not be realised. This is due to political instability, the lack of suitable partners, and the limited interest in contemporary Swiss art. Therefore, the follow-up phase foresees the development of new forms of long-term cooperation between Swiss and Egyptian cultural actors that includes an exchange of knowledge and project development.

Another purpose of the evaluation is learning in order to ensure quality.
To be accountable
Cultural managers must prove that they handle available resources carefully and efficiently, in particular public funds. They thereby want to show that they reach the expected objectives with their achievements. Whereas the usual monitoring and regular reporting should be further explored concerning certain aspects or several aspects; an evaluation can deliver additional and comparative data and probably legitimise an activity. The evaluation shows that the work performed corresponds to the political mandate, to the aims of the institution or the project, or to those of the agreed achievement.

EXAMPLES

ACCOUNTABILITY

• A private company wants to support a cultural project to promote its name and image in a cultural context. In order to achieve this, a small department is created. After a few years, the company wants to know whether the objective of its expenditure has been reached. A neutral external expert carries out an evaluation. The department as an implementing organ for the evaluation would have been less credible to the company management.

• A community at the outskirts of a major city supports some minor cultural institutions. These institutions should be more attractive to the community as places to come together and offer opportunities for young people to make music. The cultural facilities seem to achieve these objectives, as the quantitative results are very satisfying. However, not all the voices in the community agree with the relatively high costs of this cultural investment, especially when many cultural activities are offered in the nearby city. Prior to a new financial period, the district council decides to evaluate the smaller cultural institutions. A college receives the order to examine the specific benefits for the community. Only an external partner can persuade the executive that cultural institutions constitute an asset for the community, that they fulfil their purposes, and that they should therefore receive further financing.

In both cases, the evaluation helps to legitimise the project to those responsible.
3 What to evaluate? Substantive aspects of evaluation

EVALUATION CAN DEAL WITH THE VERY DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF A PROJECT. THE QUESTION IS DIFFERENTLY DEFINED DEPENDING ON THE PROJECT’S ISSUES AND THE PURPOSE OF EVALUATION. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE EVALUATION HAS A CLEAR FOCUS AND THAT IT CONCENTRATES ON ONLY A FEW ASPECTS. AN EVALUATION WITH TOO MANY, OR TOO BROAD QUESTIONS RISKS BECOMING OVERLY ELABORATE, DELIVERS IMPRECISE ANSWERS AND REMAINS INCONCLUSIVE. AN EFFECTIVE EVALUATION LIMITS ITSELF TO A RESTRICTED NUMBER OF QUESTIONS.

The content of an evaluation must be precise. Evaluation basically concentrates on one or several of the following aspects:

**Relevance** Does the evaluated intention address the correct aspects (in comparison to the context, the need for change as well as the requirements of target groups)?

**Sustainability** What presumably remains after the termination of the measures? Are long-lasting processes and effects set in motion?

**Impact** Which effect does the evaluated plan have on the context? What will be achieved beyond the set objectives?

**Effectiveness** Will the objectives of the plan (of the project or of the durably produced achievements) be achieved?

**Efficiency** Are the correct actions taken? Are they worth the effort required?
Five concepts are central in the evaluation theory. Therefore, they are further explained in the guidelines; first in chapter 7 (effect analysis and its application in evaluation) and later in the practical section (chapter 11, stage 2). There is a list of questions to be found concerning every single aspect to which evaluation can give an answer. The list should help cultural managers to formulate suitable evaluation questions for their projects.

Often, an evaluation explores several aspects of the project; in so doing, the aspects are not exclusive, but are rather complementary. For example, the investigation of the impact is often tied together with the analysis of the objective achievement. The efficiency rate, which is the relationship between effort plus expenditure and yield, also expresses itself as one of the objectives of an evaluated project. Sustainability is not at all representative without looking at the relevance. Moreover, evaluation deals with the context of evaluated projects, with the contribution of projects to a whole programme, or with the processes that are taking place between the people involved; one single aspect alone cannot encompass every element of the project.
4 When to evaluate? Criteria for evaluation

Systematically evaluating all activities and achievements is impossible and is undesirable. Each institution will have already properly considered what it wants to evaluate, or in which area it needs additional information, from a financial point of view. The more participants are involved in the evaluation process, the more they would also benefit from an evaluation.

An evaluation is only carried out if several of the following criteria are fulfilled:

**Necessity** The decision about the continuation or adaptation of a project approaches.

**Ability to generalise** The evaluation will show results that are transferable to other subjects. The results will be exemplary and generalisable.

**Effectiveness** The evaluation and its results will have consequences. The knowledge gained can flow into the planning, the continuation of the project or into other projects.

**Solutions** There is need for solution proposals on a content, organisational or structural level.

**Ratio** The effort, expenditure, and the benefits of the evaluation are in appropriate relation to each other.

**Motivation** The participants and project management are prepared to take part in the change process. The recommendations of the evaluation will be taken seriously and there will be readiness to implement them.
Of course, further or other requirement criteria can be of importance to an institution or project management. In any case, it is important to define criteria. Therefore, the answer to the question whether to evaluate or not, becomes easier, and the decision can be made with more deliberation. Cultural managers should determine what weight the individual criteria have for them and their projects.

**Evaluation and employees**

As a rule, project employees and managers are interested in an evaluation process. They want to learn and they would like to improve their projects qualitatively and to shape changes. Evaluating is a chance for development, but not only for the institution. Teamwork is strengthened, and the recognition of the project increases. Modern company culture demands cooperation between managers and employees; shared participation in the project planning and evaluation preparation is the best way to promote motivation.

If senior management implement evaluation, it is quickly perceived by those that are being evaluated as a control measure or as a vote of no confidence on the work being carried out. Hence, the opposition towards such evaluation is usually greater and the gains appear fewer, than in the case of evaluation that was initiated by the employees themselves. It is important to emphasise the benefits for the project and the people involved. Practice shows that many fears and anxieties disappear if the evaluation is carried out professionally. A certain critical position will continue with some of those evaluated but this belongs to the practice of evaluation. The evaluators are aware of this and have learnt to cope with it.

**TIPS**

**About the Characteristics of an Evaluation**

* It is useful because it orientates itself along the question and the information required by the evaluated and the evaluation user.

* It is achievable because it has been realistically thought through, checked for cost effectiveness, and is marked by mutual respect.

* It is correct because it has sufficient ethical and juridical criteria, and considers the privacy and the well-being of all partners.

* It is exact because its results are clear and understandable.
THIS SPEAKS FOR AN EVALUATION

- Changes are envisaged in the political or institutional sphere.
- A new and important measure or a new project has been introduced; the quality should be ensured.
- A project enters a new phase, however, interim results have not been achieved.
- Changes have arisen in the area of personnel or regarding responsibilities.
- Accountability is required.
- A case study ("good practice") should be demonstrated; experience and knowledge gained from a project should be processed and made public.

THIS SPEAKS AGAINST AN EVALUATION

- The termination of a project approaches; the effort and expenditure would not bring any yield.
- Serious conflict exists between the participants; there are shortcomings in the personnel guidance or difficulties amongst the staff, or in the team. Team support, supervision, coaching, intervention of senior management, or other support measures are recommended.
- The responsibilities are unclear. Organisational analysis, supervision, intervention by senior management, or similar actions are recommended.
- External problems complicate or hinder the realisation of projects; the project manager has no power over them: legal amendments, budget cuts, storm, riots, etc.
5 How to evaluate? Types of evaluation

Evaluation can be realised by external specialists or be carried out internally by the project participants themselves. The types of evaluation differ in the authorship, but not in the applied methods. Another important subdivision considers the timing of the evaluation: before the start of a project, during the project, or after the project. In accordance with this differentiation, the objectives applied may vary greatly; the type of evaluation most suitable for the project will depend on the purpose, the questions raised, and the stage of the project which is to be evaluated. The following characterisation will help to find the suitable evaluation type.

5.1 External or internal evaluation

Questions, methods, and learning processes are the same in external and internal evaluations. The roles and responsibilities of the participants are shaped in a differently. Information about the project and its cultural field is collected by means of suitable methods in order to be able to answer the questions that have been raised from an internal or external perspective.

The budget, know-how, staff, time restrictions, the questions raised, and purpose all play a role in deciding whether the evaluation should be carried out internally or externally. In practice, it is common for the evaluation to be executed by a third party due to time constraints. Alternatively, the evaluation may be carried out internally because the funding is unavailable for an external body. Other reasons should be more important than time and money, and these will be discussed hereafter.

The strengths and weaknesses of external evaluation

The more traditional form is the external project evaluation. External means here that those who evaluate do not work in the project under evaluation, instead the external team take the role of experts in order to follow the evaluation questions.
Distance and independence are the strengths of an external evaluation. Those that evaluate can draw comparisons on account of their experience and make observations, which those involved do not, or no longer, notice. The external evaluation is a special event that contrasts with everyday life. It thereby helps to overcome professional blindness and allows learning.

Another advantage is that external evaluators can act as support according to evaluation results when implementing the measures. Questions concerning sustainability, impact and effectiveness can be answered better by external evaluation. They are especially well suited for subject-related aspects, complicated states of affairs and overall assessments.

After all, an external observer may report with enthusiasm on a project, demonstrate successes and also appreciate aspects, which in an internal analysis would be viewed as less credible.

The weaknesses of the external evaluation lie in the vast preparation efforts and higher costs. Moreover, an external evaluation is like a snapshot in which the current events can easily overlay the correct appraisal of a long-term period. This weakness is compensated, at least partially, if the evaluation is based on the results of a monitoring process. With an external evaluation, the self-recognition process can also be reduced.

The strengths and weaknesses of internal evaluation
By means of the internal evaluation, either the participants themselves or an internal employee, are commissioned with the project analysis. If necessary, an external person can be consulted for the presentation of the process. The theory sometimes makes a distinction between an internal evaluation and a self-evaluation. With the latter, the process should analyse the person’s specific areas of responsibility, and examine their activities and position within a field of work. On the other hand, the internal evaluation looks for answers to questions that concern the course of development and the attainment of the project objectives, and to a lesser extent, the responsibilities. This subtle distinction is not considered further in the guidelines.
The **strengths** of the internal evaluation lie in the profound and specific knowledge which the evaluators have gained from the project and the involved institutions.

An internal evaluation can be flexible and, with a little effort, carried out periodically. It allows rapid course corrections, such as by analysing monitoring data periodically.

An internal evaluation is promising, provided those involved are self-critical enough. In that case, the internal evaluation, as a rule, leads to strengthened team building and better cooperation. For those involved in the process, the opportunity to self-evaluate leads to increased awareness, and a heightened sensitivity for the consideration of projected objectives and quality management. In such a case, proposals for changes can be rapidly implemented.

**Weaknesses** mainly occur when the focus is not on the wider picture or the relevance to daily business is missing. An internal evaluation requires careful preparation, which in practice is often neglected. Objectives, questions and indicators should be defined in advance. The person that defines indicators has a tendency to determine safe, i.e. successful indicators, so that the best light is cast on the project.

The weakness of internal evaluations is often the lack of neutrality based on conflicts of interest even if a professional critical attitude is expected from the project management. In addition, there is not always enough time and resources available to follow up on the results.

There is the risk that an internal evaluation either glorifies one’s own activities or depicts them too modestly. It is correct to openly and critically question activities, and in this way to legitimise them.
The members of the board of the Association of Swiss Museums (VMS) and the Swiss Section of the International Council of Museums (ICOM Switzerland) jointly launch the International Museum Day. The objectives of the day are: to publicise the Swiss Museums to a wide public audience and to launch mediation projects.

The activities scheduled for 2006 have been regarded as a test. They are evaluated so that the Museum Days for the following years are properly handled and their quality secured as a result of these experiences. The project coordinators of the two associations commission a questionnaire, which is sent to all the participating museums. The participating museums' satisfaction in respect to the quality of their in-house museum day and national coordination is researched, as well as information from quantitative data.

The evaluation is coordinated and analysed by the general secretariat of the VMS and the ICOM. On the basis of the results, members of the board predominantly make structural decisions, which facilitate the organisation and planning of the subsequent museum days. This mainly includes the introduction of a project management model, which in accordance with the capacity of the general secretariat contributes to the standardisation of processes as well as to the professionalisation of the organisation of the Museum Days.

From then, a questionnaire is submitted to the museums annually after the respective Museum Day, in order to check whether management are happy with their participation and with the coordination of events. Innovations will also be introduced according to the answers and the requirements expressed. Thus, for example, a Twitter initiative has been launched and managed by the general secretariat since 2014.

*Further internal evaluation can be carried out easily and specifically.*
Combination of an external and an internal evaluation

The external evaluation can be combined with the internal, as the two forms complement each other. Both procedures contribute to the learning process and to the understanding of the project. There are advantages to building an external evaluation on an internal evaluation. Results from an internal investigation can be important for external investigation direction and vice versa. Often a mixed form is selected; some topics are evaluated internally, others externally. For example, questions relating to the strategic alignment and the effect of the project will be handled externally, whereas the courses and work processes are dealt with internally.

The preparatory work based on the internal evaluation reduces the resources and expenditure for the external evaluation. An internal evaluation can also take place even during an external evaluation in order to analyse a specific question or a problem, or the external evaluation uses the results of the completed internal evaluation as a basis and analyses it.

An internal evaluation as a preparation for an external evaluation can reduce obstacles and can make the parties involved more confident and motivated to help with the preceding process.
In a mixed evaluation, the external expert could be in charge of the following:

* helps with the definition of project objectives and indicators
* formulates the internal evaluation design
* contributes to the formulation of the key questions
* formulates or revises the questionnaires
* conducts qualitative interviews
* analyses the quantitative data
* evaluates a particular question or a set of key questions
* offers support in areas where the project leaders feel less confident

An external expert is selectively consulted in an internal evaluation.
THIS SPEAKS FOR AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Acceptance
- Independence and impartiality are requested
- Major changes are expected
- Resistance against the evaluation is expected
- Results cannot be accepted
- Accountability for the project must be rendered

Objectivity
- Distance from the topic and the project is important
- Distance from those affected is necessary
- Conflicts of interest are possible
- An external perspective is required

Learn
- A broadening of perspective is intended
- Blind spots are uncovered
- Connections are recognised
- Lessons learned from similar projects can be incorporated
- An external perspective is considered useful
- Generalisation possibilities exist

Resources
- Time constraints prevent internal evaluation
- Insufficient understanding of the processes for an internal evaluation; special knowledge is necessary
- The budget for an external evaluation is available
Degree of complexity

- Complex questions exist
- Large data material is required
- The collection methods are elaborate
- A large number of people must be consulted or are affected by the evaluation
- Questioning of the project management is possible
- A certain tension between the participants and/or structural difficulties are present

**THIS SPEAKS FOR AN INTERNAL EVALUATION**

Acceptance

- The responsibility for decision making is shared

Learn

- An internal perspective is required
- A learning process is at the centre, such as the development of team spirit
- The project management wants to learn to carry out evaluation
- The evaluation should be designed as a permanent process

Resources

- Sufficient time is available
- Methodical know-how is available or can be learned in a reasonable period of time
- A budget for evaluation is available only to a restricted extent

Degree of complexity

- The monitoring data is collected on a continuous basis
- The collection methods are easy
- A limited circle of people is affected by the evaluation
5.2 Timing of evaluation

Evaluation can be distinguished due to the date of their implementation in the course of a project. The application purpose would vary depending on the date of the investigation. The following table shows this correlation.

This relates to theoretical distinctions, which often overlap in practice. The timing for evaluation data collection is dependent on the question raised.

EXAMPLE

VISITOR SURVEY AT THE NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM

The Museum Directorate wants to make its scientific exhibits more attractive, and increase the number of museum visitors. Before any of the measures are taken, the situation should be analysed. This requires demographical data about the visitors, information about their advertising channel usage, as well as knowledge of their attitude towards the representation of natural scientific information and the subject matter of the museum. One of the questions is what visitors take from the museum in terms of knowledge, ideas and stimulation. An employee is instructed to carry out the evaluation; a survey of visitors on the basis of a questionnaire is prepared. For a one-month period, visitors are questioned by project participants [employees and students] in the entrance area following their museum visit. Filling out the questionnaire takes approximately fifteen minutes and upon its return, the respondents receive a free entrance as a thank you. After the end of the survey, the employee commissioned with the evaluation, analyses the collected data and suggests measures for the future to the directorate.

Here, an internal and an ex-ante evaluation were successfully carried out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moment of time</th>
<th>Purpose of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before the start of a project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ex-ante evaluation</strong> (predictive evaluation) provides the basis for future alignment and project development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **During a project**           | **Accompanying evaluation**  
* **Process evaluation** relates to the implementation and progress of the project and focuses on objective achievement, quality assessment, and assurance. This type of evaluation is often implemented selectively according to certain phases of a project, in order to make adjustments to it.  
* **Formative evaluation** provides an ongoing feedback on the progress and the implementation of the project. This type of evaluation also provides suggestions for improvement and are carried out parallel to an activity. Formative evaluation has the objective of favourably influencing the progression and the achievements of a project through (usually internally used) continuous feedback to improve it. The project participants want to learn. |
| **At the completion of a project or at the end of a phase** | **Summary evaluation** assesses the results and effect of a project at the end of a phase or in retrospect. This type of evaluation aims to judge and analyse projects, and is often used for decision making, such as the continuation or the termination of an activity, and for quality assurance. |
| **After completion of a project** | **Ex-post evaluation** captures the long-term effects of a project (impact) and its sustainability. In order to be able to represent the effects, ex-post evaluation often falls back on the data that was collected before the beginning of a project. Only in this way can targeted changes be measured. |
Project planning as a precondition for successful evaluation
6 Purpose of planning

The better the planning of a project, the more useful evaluation is and the simpler its implementation will be. Evaluation compares the intended objectives in the project planning with the actual achievements. It is often found in practice that a comparison is difficult because the objectives and the desired effect of the project are not clear and are not measurably defined; in the best case, they are included in concepts and resemble declarations of intent. In this way, the analysis of the achievements of objectives and effects becomes difficult. A theoretical digression on the definition of the desired effects of a project, the definition of corresponding objectives, as well as the determination of reference values and indicators for measuring the achievement of the objective prove meaningful in these guidelines.

Evaluating shows how important it is to make the so-called result chain more precise during the planning process. By means of the services provided and the resources made available to the project, managers seek to achieve a specific effect on an audience in the hope that this direct effect has a lasting impact on the result. Good project planning provides for such a sequence of effects.

It is possible to evaluate a project in which only the operational objectives (realisation of the project) were defined. In this case, the project structure, management, organisation and financing can be examined.
There is no basis to judge whether the above project has reached the right audience, whether it has reached the audience in the desired form, whether the desired message has been conveyed, whether the situation could be changed as desired, or whether the project has helped to improve the situation of a target group. All this belongs to the sphere of the intended efficiency objectives, which are the objectives that have been defined on the level of efficacy.

If the objectives specified in the planning have not entirely been reached or exceeded, a professional — internal or external — evaluation will look for the reasons. The evaluation will be looking at explanations and to initiate improvements, and to possibly adjust the objectives and expectations of the project to this new situation.
7 Effect analysis and its application in evaluation

THE TOTALITY OF THE PROJECT RESULTS IS DESCRIBED AS EFFECT WHICH CAN BE REGISTERED AT DIFFERENT LEVELS ON THE RESULT CHAIN. THE EFFECT OF THE PROJECT ON ITS SPECIFIED TARGET GROUP AND BEYOND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS WELL AS THE DIRECT RESULTS. THE PROJECT’S SUCCESS IS ESSENTIALLY DETERMINED BY A COHERENT LINK BETWEEN THE LEVELS OF EFFECT.

An effect model is coherent if the activities and resources (input), the measures and the services provided (output), the direct effect on the target groups (outcome) and the wider reaching changes (impact), which the project elicits, form a logical sequence. The initiated activities lead to progression. The measures and services cause the realisation of the project, which in turn influences the effect. Defining this logical sequence of impacts and determining the objectives for each level during the planning encourages the success of the project.

There are, therefore, the following three levels of objectives in conjunction with the desired effects, which characterise a project:

* The **overall objectives**, which relate to the desired sustainable effect (impact)
* The **project objectives**, which relate to the direct and immediate effects of a project (outcome)
* The **operational objectives**, which relate to the implementation of the project (output)

The assessment of the results of a project is carried out at these three levels.
The table on the right is important because it represents a schematic description of this considerably complex chapter via the different levels of effect. The following pages also contain several examples of this planning logic together with corresponding explanations.

**Unexpected effects**
Projects and permanently rendered services can produce unforeseen effects — positive and negative ones. The latter should be given particular attention; at their worst, they will hinder the objective achievement. However, unexpected positive effects can occur too, for instance, when a target group develops new and unplanned activities to create enriching dynamics.
### DEPICTION OF THE RESULT CHAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational project area</th>
<th>Project effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational project area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the responsibility of the project management</td>
<td>Direct effect on the target group(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term effect on the context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Object hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1: Activities</th>
<th>Level 2: Results</th>
<th>Level 3: Project objective</th>
<th>Level 4: Overall objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions of those responsible for project planning and project organisation: implementation</td>
<td>Measures and products realised by those responsible for projects: the services rendered</td>
<td>Target groups’ reactions to output (expected and unexpected reactions)</td>
<td>Effects as permanent improvement of target groups’ situation (overall objective)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project objectives according to concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Input</strong></th>
<th><strong>Output</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actions of those responsible for project planning and project organisation: implementation</td>
<td>Measures and products realised by those responsible for projects: the services rendered</td>
<td>Target groups’ reactions to output (expected and unexpected reactions)</td>
<td>Effects as permanent improvement of target groups’ situation (overall objective)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of project strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Input</strong></th>
<th><strong>Output</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities and resources of project</td>
<td>Products and services realised by project team</td>
<td>Changes of the project’s target groups’ situation. The outcome has to target the project without fully guaranteeing the outcome.</td>
<td>Improvement of a general situation, effect on the environment in which the project is operational. The project cannot guarantee the impact; it can only aim towards it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Input</strong></th>
<th><strong>Output</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will not be measured by indicators. The only consideration is whether inputs were rendered or not. Inputs are the prerequisite for outputs.</td>
<td>Establish whether outputs can be achieved in adequate quantity and quality.</td>
<td>Establish whether planned changes were achieved.</td>
<td>Establish whether an effect on the project environment has taken place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluation aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Input</strong></th>
<th><strong>Output</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Effectiveness (efficacy)</td>
<td>Effect (impact), sustainability, relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DEPiCtion oF thE ResuLt ChAiN**
7.1. Overall objectives (Impact)

The overall objectives are defined as sustainable effects and changes for a specific context. They contain the idea of improvement: improving the quality of life of people in a region, supporting local artistic creation, dissemination of Swiss culture abroad, promoting children’s musical talents, access to art for all. These types of objectives are often derived from the mission, the mission statement or a vision of the institution concerned. They are the project’s strategic orientation and the effects of the activities intended by those responsible for them.

These objectives drive the activities and the vision to which they are aligned in keeping with the mission. The impact is usually understood as the last stage of the result chain. The desired changes with reference to a context can be achieved following the implementation of the preceding phases.

The overall objectives are difficult to evaluate because they are often arranged more on a long-term basis — time is therefore needed to prove whether the effects are effectively sustainable — and especially because it is not always possible to reconstruct what has effectively caused a change. Different elements can play a role together, and this kind of change is rarely directly causal or linked to a single cause. The evaluation of the direct effect, however, often allows you to assess whether the results are consistent with the expected sustainable effect.
DESIRABLE SUSTAINABLE EFFECTS (IMPACT)

SELECTIVE FILM PROMOTION
The Federal Office of Culture supports filmmaking from the writing of scripts to the post-production of films on request. With this support, the FOC (BAK) strives to achieve the following sustainable effects: a quality cinema in Switzerland which includes several genres and broad distribution, and the existence of a sound and independent film industry in Switzerland.

THE “KULTURLEGI” OF CARITAS
Financial hardship often results in social exclusion in Switzerland. To prevent this, Caritas has launched the KulturLegi, which enables low-income individuals and their children to easily access cultural, sporting and educational opportunities. The KulturLegi aims to promote the integration of people affected by poverty into society, to improve their health and to prevent social isolation.

“THIS IS HOW OUR WORLD SOUNDS”
The purpose of all activities of the association “Listening Switzerland” is to raise the significance of awareness of attentive listening and to develop the joy, pleasure and skill to listen. The project “This is how our world sounds” promotes the ability of children to aurally access the world and to perceive it comprehensively.

GUIDE “EVALUATION IN THE CREATIVE SECTOR. WHY, WHAT, WHEN, AND HOW?”
Through the publication of these guidelines, the Migros Culture Percentage and Pro Helvetia aim to contribute to the development of a culture of evaluation for cultural project leaders. They want to support the quality of cultural projects, programmes and strategies with the guide. The terms and explanations used in the guidelines should be a reference.
LABEL+ THÉÂTRE ROMAND
Label+ théâtre romand aims to promote professional theatre work in Western Switzerland by supporting the production and distribution of large theatre projects. Established and funded by the French-speaking cantons (districts) and the partially French-speaking Canton of Bern, Label+ théâtre romand intends to secure significant financial support for two projects which are selected in a biennial competition. The desired impact is a lively theatre scene in the Romandie, a large number of high-quality Western Swiss productions, a content audience, as well as the international aura of Western Swiss theatre culture.

ORTSMUSEUM OFTRINGEN
The management of the local Oftringen Museum wants to reposition the institution in order to secure its continued existence by good integration into the region. The overall objective is for the museum to be recognised and actively used as extracurricular place of learning. It is positively perceived by teachers and students, and also by the parents and the region’s political activists.
An important element in project development is to determine the direct efficiency objectives which should be achieved by the activities. The aim is to specify the target group(s) to be impacted and the changes to be made. The measures taken or the strategic orientation should aim towards specific target groups: to achieve certain results, change particular behaviour, and achieve a defined objective. The focus is on observable, concrete and immediate changes.

To specify the effect sought helps to focus on the essentials, to set priorities and to develop specific activities related to the desired achievements. The direct efficiency objectives are formulated as observable changes in behaviour or measurable products. They must be detectable by indicators.

This stage of the result chain is important, but it is quite often forgotten between the development of specific activities, and the discussion of the impact which is connected to a general mission. Taking action becomes the priority: to prepare for the exhibition, plan the next season, organise the tender and select the winners, make sure that the festival takes place, and make decisions relevant to the input of the artists. However, one link in the chain is missing, the link between the action and the mission. It is an indispensable link which reflects upon the relevance of the activities.
This reflection sometimes requires courage as it is still unusual in the cultural sector. It is more common to define a concrete action than a direct effect. It is easier to report on implemented activities than to measure the extent to which an effect was achieved, and the improvements that could be made in the future.

The reflection on the direct efficiency objectives leads the project managers to ask questions like: Which target group(s) are targeted by the exhibition, and which are not? Which message should be conveyed to children through cultural mediation in the field of music? Which changes need to be achieved in an independent theatre company’s policies to improve their situation? How are the evaluation seminar graduates qualified at the end of the course? Which message should be conveyed by a dance festival, and to whom?

The answers to these questions require a great deal of honesty. All those responsible for a project or an institution should ask themselves these questions, and specify the effect that they want to achieve on specific target groups.
DIRECT EFFECTS ON ONE OR MORE TARGET GROUP(S) (OUTCOME)

SELECTIVE FILM PROMOTION
The direct and immediate effects intended by the film promotion are mainly aimed at allowing the Swiss filmmakers (producers, directors, but also technicians) to practice their profession. They ensure that up-and-coming film makers have a place amongst film professionals, and that the audiences of all Swiss regions can see domestic films in their respective languages, including those that were filmed in the language of the same region.

THE “KULTURLEGI” OF CARITAS
A significant proportion of people affected by poverty use the “KulturLegi” regularly. By participating in cultural and sporting events, they have more social contact, feel more confident and are better integrated. At the same time, the implementers gain additional audiences, strengthen their image, and support people through their commitment, while gaining new perspectives.

“THAT IS HOW OUR WORLD SOUNDS”
The involved schoolchildren have been extensively engaged in listening and can report back on it. They are aware of and attentive to sounds — everyday noises and sounds they produce themselves — and music. The children and young people also learn what it means to listen to and deal respectfully with each other. The teachers are enabled to further explore the subject of listening in their classes within their own capacity and in more depth.

THE GUIDE “EVALUATION IN THE CREATIVE SECTOR. WHY, WHAT, WHEN, AND HOW?”
Cultural project leaders acquire basic knowledge of evaluation through reading the guidelines. These skills animate and encourage them to deal with the evaluation of their projects. They think about which projects should be evaluated and which should not. They mandate evaluators for external evaluations or organise internal evaluations. They consider the evaluation process in the planning phase of new projects.
The selected theatre companies have initiated not only a sophisticated production, but also mastered the new challenges of a larger-scale production. The Western Swiss theatres provide their platforms to the productions which are subsidised by Label+ théâtre romand. Organisers in the other language regions of Switzerland and abroad are interested in the Western Swiss theatre work and open their doors to it.

ORTSMUSEUM OFTRINGEN
Children, youth and school groups in the region visit the museum and perceive it as a participatory learning location. They learn new things about their community and the people who live there. The classes are proactively engaged with current issues and the development of their communities. The children and youth develop a closer relationship with the museum, and become regular visitors to it.
7.3 Operational objectives (Output)

Once the project managers have clarified the effects and the efficiency objectives they want to achieve, they define appropriate measures to achieve these objectives, and formulate operational rational objectives regarding the project implementation. They define the necessary resources. The operational objectives, therefore, relate to the implementation itself, and moreover to the tangible realisations and what it will take to implement them. The operational objectives are often well defined and are a prerequisite for the implementation of the activities.

In practice, the dialogue between the desired impact and the developed activities is often shortened! The project managers develop activities — a festival, a new exhibition, a support programme for young artists, etc. — sometimes without taking the time (or being able to take it) to wonder what effect their project will have, especially on the outcome level.

The operational objective becomes the overall objective of the project, if just operational objectives are defined. The festival must be held, the money has to be distributed, the support of artists abroad has to be organised, the exhibition must take place! The project is often implemented very well, but the desired effects have been put aside in favour of the concrete implementation of the activities.

As part of an evaluation, it may be interesting to analyse the planning stage, and not only the phases of the implementation and those of the evaluation. All stages of a project realisation can provide information.
OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES (OUTPUT)

SELECTIVE FILM FUNDING
In this concrete example, a form for the submission of dossiers has been written. Expert commissions have been organised, in which experts evaluate these dossiers and the decisions of the Federal Office of Culture will be communicated to the applicants. The accepted dossiers will be supported until the film is screened in the cinemas.

THE “KULTURLEGI” OF CARITAS
A large number of partner organisations — cultural, sports and educational institutions — take part in the project. The “KulturLegi” is distributed, the people concerned are informed and, above all, they benefit from the cultural and sports activities.

“THAT IS HOW OUR WORLD SOUNDS”
For the project “That is how our world sounds” several areas of activity have been developed: workshops in school classes with music educators, sound riddles and “sound postcards”, which are designed by schoolchildren and which can be listened to on an audio map of Switzerland on the website of the Listening in Switzerland association. Additional ideas and support material for teachers are provided for the purpose of listening. An association is established, and funding sought and secured for the organisation and implementation of activities. An accompanying external evaluation has been organised to continuously optimise the project.

THE GUIDELINE “EVALUATION IN THE CREATIVE SECTOR. WHY, WHAT, WHEN, AND HOW?”
The guide has been published, launched in three updated versions and rendered up-to-date for the fourth edition. Diverse events organised by the Migros Culture Percentage and Pro Helvetia (information days, congress, seminars and a survey) make it possible to widely publicise the guidelines.
LABEL+ THÉATRE ROMAND
A supportive structure was initiated comprising of a secretariat, an advisory group and a jury in close coordination with the professional theatre scene. The new funding measures are communicated via the media, and a website is set up. After three competitions and the nomination of six plays, an evaluation is carried out to support the future decisions regarding the appropriate form of continuation of the project.

ORTSMUSEUM OFTRINGEN
Oftringen teachers and school principals are aware of the museum’s desire for cooperation. The information is convincing. The schoolchildren and the teachers participate concretely in the museum’s work and contribute to the preparation of the next exhibitions. The theme and the concept of exhibitions are selected by the Directorate in such a way that the school children can be actively involved. For example, local schoolchildren investigate the pricing of goods and daily needs of the community in the past with residents at a retirement home, as a basis for an exhibition on the changing shopping habits and shop structures of the community.
8 Formulating objectives


The quality of objective formulation can be tested by their level of accountability. Can the objectives be measured? Are they quantifiable? Can they be questioned?

Objective indicators need to be formulated with sufficient precision when they can be found.

The easiest way to remember is that objectives have to be SMART:

* **Specific**
* **Measurable**
* **Achievable**
* **Realistic**
* **Timely**

EXAMPLE

**WINNING A YOUNG AUDIENCE FOR A MUSEUM**

A museum wants to use museum-pedagogic activities to attract young audiences, but has no money to hire a museum educator. The management decides on a series of measures: a monthly family tour is offered, an annual day of action for families is implemented, and workshops for school classes will be offered. An external education and communication specialist has been entrusted with the planning and implementation of the activities.
The activities are assessed after a year. The assessment is a sobering one from the museum management’s point of view: children and young people are still in the minority on the family tours; the day of action attracts approximately the same number of adults, children and young people; and only five out of the ten advertised workshops were carried out.

The assessment by the education and communication specialist is more positive: on the family tours, fifteen to thirty percent of participants are children and young people; the day of action draws a total of eighty people, half of which are children and young people; and half of the advertised workshops could be carried out in the intended time frame. Requests for three more workshops are in the pipeline.

After some discussions, the participants agree on the following objectives and additional measures for the next year:

**Family tours** Project objective: The proportion of children and young people on a family tour in the future will be at an average of twenty percent. Measure: The family tours will take place regularly and will be published in the relevant print media, as well as in flyers and made public on the homepage of the museum’s website.

**Day of action** Project objective: The day of action attracts at least one hundred people. The programme is designed in a way that both children and young people, as well as adults, find it appealing. Measure: The day of action will be held on the International Day of the Museum so that the museum can benefit from the public relations work carried out by the Museums Association.

**Workshops** Measure: The workshops will be held in cooperation with the municipal and cantonal coordination centre for school events. In addition, there will be inaugurations for teachers.

**Long-term objective:** The proportion of young audience members in the museum will have tripled in five years.

*The objectives will be made concrete in accordance with SMART.*
FORMAL DEVELOPMENT OF OBJECTIVES

* Conditional objectives to be achieved: “Regular guests are made aware of the situation of the female authors from Islamic states.”

* Time-specific objectives: “The demand for the works of authors from the Islamic states in the bookshops and the library of the House of Literature in XY will increase by twenty percent within a year (Reference Value).”

* Objectives are formulated in the indicative present: “The regular guests are sensitised.”

* Objectives are defined in specific terms so that they can be precisely measured. Vague phrases such as “the satisfaction should be as great as possible” are to be avoided, instead a benchmark is introduced: “The satisfaction of a target group will grow by ten percent in the next two years.”

FORMULATING OBJECTIVES: CORRECT AND INCORRECT EXAMPLES

* Note: The objectives describe a condition which is to be achieved. Correct: “The children read the text panels in the exhibition.” Incorrect: “The text panels are written by classes of older students in order to be understood.” (This is a question of method, not an objective.)

* Note: The objectives specify when this condition is to be achieved. Correct: “All text panels are redesigned by the end of the year.” Incorrect: “The text panels are redesigned immediately.”

* Note: The objectives are formulated in the indicative present tense. Correct: “The text panels are attractively designed for children.” Incorrect: “The text panels should be adjusted to awaken the interest of children.”

* Note: The objectives are worded concretely so they can be accurately evaluated. Correct: “The number of children who take notice of the text panels increases by ten percent in the next two years.” Incorrect: “The number of children who take notice of the text panels is as large as possible.”
For a formal refinement of objectives

Objectives do not indicate how they have been achieved. Achievement can be measured when the activities or the measures are defined. Thus, the sentence “As an activity, the House of Literature organises two readings by female authors from the Islamic world, a panel discussion and a media conference” is an activity to be implemented and not an objective to be achieved; this is an operational objective, at most.

### Example

**The House of Literature in XY and the Project “Female Authors from Islamic States”**

**Overall objective:** Regular guests of the House of Literature in XY are made aware of the situation of female authors from Islamic States.

**Direct and immediate efficiency objectives:** The demand for works by female authors from Islamic States in the bookshop and the library of the Literature House in XY increases by twenty percent within a year (reference value).

**Operational objectives:** The House of Literature organises biennial readings, a panel discussion and a press conference with female authors from the Islamic world.
Defining standards is not easy and time should be taken to do so. Preferably, the reference values will be discussed until all stakeholders are in agreement. The threshold should not be set too high, but also not too low: it must be realistic, reasonable and achievable. It is a process that gets easier every time.

Reference values and indicators are more and more frequently also listed in service contracts. The fear of project leaders that funders might, therefore, look at the projects more critically is understandable. If these values are jointly discussed from the outset, then they are more likely to be accepted by those involved.
As a museum director, I am satisfied with three exhibitions per year. In total, there must be ten percent more entries than were received last year.”

“As the director of the city orchestra, I am satisfied with fifteen contemporary music concerts each year. I can accept seven percent less audience in the hall, as it is more important to me that new music is played.”

“As an amateur choir conductor, I am satisfied when three new singers arrive, and none of the current singers leave during the year.”

“As the head of the Artists-in-Residence house, I am satisfied when all rooms are occupied throughout the year, and all artists can make at least ten artistically interesting contacts.”

“As the organiser of theatre festivals, I am satisfied when two-thirds of the performances are sold out.”

“As a gallery owner, I am satisfied when my turnover increases by three percent annually.”

“As a photographer, I am satisfied when my photos appear in a well-known magazine within a year.”

The measurable units for satisfaction can be determined individually.
Cultural institutions like to look for simple quantitative indicators in order to describe their projects and to be able to satisfy themselves and their donors. For the purpose of monitoring, this is legitimate and often sufficient. An evaluation, however, calls for further indicators which are closely linked to the objectives of the project; these indicators are specific and may differ between projects.

The number of visitors is often defined as an indicator of success or failure for cultural events; if the hall is full then the objective has been achieved. This is only correct when the sold-out hall has been set from the beginning as a measure for success. It may be that an institution wants to establish an exquisite concert series with contemporary composers, and for this purpose is satisfied with a half-empty hall. Here, the consciously chosen correct indicator lies elsewhere; such as changing the playing culture of the musicians, embedding contemporary music in the orchestra repertories, in exquisite CD and radio recordings, or even in the learning effect gained by musicians understanding that contemporary music is no harder to play than established music.

Consistent indicators are always in relation to the objectives of the project. They take into account the values which are valid for the respective project. Indicators allow for the plausible judgement of the extent to which objectives have been achieved and the effect of these, rather than simply an estimation. This creates transparency, and all those involved know by which factors the success of a project is measured: for example, how many projects of what nature should be realised, who should be the target audience of the project, how many visitors are expected and how many positive media reports should be sought.

Usually, a small number of indicators is sufficient. Each question, however, requires at least one indicator. It is important that those responsible for the project, as well as the evaluators, agree on the selected indicators. As a rule, the following applies: to count what is countable. It makes no sense to evaluate something which was not an aim.
The evaluation question, “Is it a suitable means in which to make young contemporary artists known?” appears in the publication “Collection Cahiers d’Artistes”. The question cannot be directly answered, which is why a number of secondary questions are formulated:

* How well is the “Collection Cahiers d’Artistes” known amongst the experts?  
  **Indicator:** Degree of awareness of the series of publications (high/medium/low)

* What do the experts think about the artists who are considered in the publication?  
  **Indicator:** The satisfaction of the experts with the selection of artists (high/medium/low)

* How many artists did the experts know prior to the publication of their booklet?  
  **Indicator:** Number of the previously known artists

* How many artists did the experts contact on the basis of the series of publications?  
  **Indicator:** Number of contacted artists

* How many of the artists had worked with the experts prior to the cahier’s publication?  
  **Indicator:** Number of artists with whom they had previously worked

The key question will be answered when the indicators to all the secondary questions are found.
Indicators correspond to the questions posed and are aligned with the project objectives. They demonstrate what is relevant in the respective project: size, quality, innovation, sustainability, or other factor(s). If, for example, the focus is on growth, the quantitative indicators are required: numbers of visitors, number of subsequent events, number of media reports. If target audience satisfaction with the development intended by the project management is also a focus, then a combination of quantitative and qualitative indicators is used.

Questions similar to those following are asked: Has the number of regular guests increased since the introduction of the measure? Have visitors been staying longer in the museum since the measure was introduced? Has the positive feedback in the guest book increased since the measure was introduced?

For an intended change to be measured, a reference size or reference value is always needed, regardless of whether it refers to a quantitative or qualitative change. Indicators only make a statement when compared to something. For example, as there is no absolute satisfaction index available, greater or lesser satisfaction can only be rated in comparison to a previous level.

In the search for indicators, orientation along the existing data on the project is helpful; the data could be numerical, which, for example, was collected in the course of the project monitoring. This data source can be very useful for the measurement of changes. In addition, statistical data, such as numbers of visitors, media reports, or number of events, is available for almost every project.
9.1 Quantitative and qualitative indicators

**Quantitative indicators** facilitate the provision of reliable information. The same indicators can simply be placed alongside one another to be compared. They show which change has been attained from one entry point to the next. They are objective, such as the number of exhibitions; number of guided tours; number of productions, including new productions; number of viewers; number of women, men, and children under the age of 16; the length of waiting queues; number of borrowed items at a non-fiction library; foreign literature or magazines; number of media reports; number of cooperative partners; number of new association members; number of publications, of which there are catalogues; number of supervised artists in a museum; utilisation numbers; revenue; opening duration.

**Qualitative indicators** provide information about evaluations, estimations and opinions, and may be subjective. They allow an insider’s view of the respondents, such as their satisfaction with the project progression. The content of procedure is addressed. The information content is often more immediate and comprehensive than that of quantitative indicators. It can be useful to quantify qualitative indicators and to show them as measurable sizes on scales. The measuring process would then be a quantitative one, whereas the judgment (the assessment) remains a qualitative one. For example, qualitative indicators can be the dynamics of the organisation, attitude, content of the press articles, change of behaviour, change of perception, behaviour, values, knowledge (change of the knowledge basis), satisfaction, and access to new resources.
A combination of quantitative and qualitative indicators is more and more becoming a standard and usually necessary and worth recommending, as data requires explanation.

For example, in the assessment of art mediation for school classes in a museum, the following quantitative indicators apply: the number of class visits, the number of distributed documents, the number of participants in children’s events. As qualitative information, a representation of the innovative measures of art mediation by the respective institution and a list of their publications and events are added. The subjective assessment of the children, concerning the tours and their newly acquired knowledge within the framework of a survey, completes the data analysis.

Thanks to the various indicators, the formation of a differentiated assessment becomes possible, which is not only defined by numerical values. The correspondingly quality of the derived measures is therefore high.

The qualitative objectives especially require a further evaluation in addition to monitoring on the basis of objective indicators. Indicators are also jointly defined and specifically collected and documented within the framework of project planning or objective agreements. Output indicators reflect the direct products of projects along which objectives within the framework of objective agreements can also be quantified.
Interpretation of data
The use of indicators alone is not sufficient for evaluation. The data received on the basis of the indicators requires interpretation. The collected quantitative values and qualitative data values can only be meaningful once they have gained their position in a larger context. Indicators never replace the careful analysis of the surrounding situation. Therefore, an evaluation differs from the continuous data collection within monitoring which belongs to the usual management tasks in a project. For example, the number of visitors could indicate whether the audience segment of the event belongs to a mainstream or insider audience. But the numbers do not explain why there was only such a small audience in the hall. It could be that the weather was good or the publicity was bad. Statistical data can only be explained through its interpretation.

All methods of social science can be used in order to determine the degree by which the objectives and results of a project have been achieved by means of the chosen measures. Qualitative methods complement the quantitative and enable an overall view on the success of measures or the achievement of objectives within the framework of objective agreements.

Benchmarking is defined as the comparison of data collected from within the framework of an evaluation with a project in a similar region.
DIFFERENT FORMATIONS OF INDICATORS

Objective: women and men of all ages in region X have access to cultural events of all genres and take advantage of this access.

Quantitative indicators
* Number of events in comparison to the period before the project
* Breakdown of visitors by sex and age groups
* Visitor figures before and during the intervention of the project relative to the potential audience
* Use of financial resources for the implementation of cultural events

Qualitative indicators
* What kind of events appeal to women or men?
* Change in the behaviour of the older generation

Objective: The production conditions of the fine artists in the City A have improved.

Quantitative indicators
* Number of places for artistic productions in comparison to the period before the project (studios, practice rooms)
* Budget for the promotion of artistic productions (City, Canton, federal, private) in comparison to the period before the project

Qualitative indicators
* Artist satisfaction has improved

Objective: The Canton of Z increases the cultural promotion of artists under forty years of age by ten percent.

Quantitative indicators
* Percentage of funding which is going to artists under the age of forty (Here, the project purpose is the quantitative indicator)

Qualitative indicators
* None
Objective: The quality of support requests at culture-promoting institutions in the region Y is better than two years ago.

Quantitative indicators
* Number of supported applications compared to the period before the project

Qualitative indicators
* Assessment of proposals according to a list of quality criteria

Objective: Reporting on cultural activities in the region B is quantitatively and qualitatively better than two years ago.

Quantitative indicators
* Number of press reports compared to the period before the project
* Audience numbers reached compared to the period before the project

Qualitative indicators
* Assessment of the report on the basis of a list of quality criteria

*Coherent indicators are always in relation to the objectives of the project.*
EXAMPLE

EFFECT MODEL OF THE PROGRAMME “GAMECULTURE”

Pro Helvetia launched a computer games programme under the title “GameCulture – from game to art”.

Level 1: [Activities and resources]

**Input**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* The programme is defined</td>
<td>* The staff and financial means have been made available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The project team is formed</td>
<td>* A timetable is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The responsibilities have been clarified</td>
<td>* Partners have been designated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 2: [Results]

**Output**

* Mediation: Exhibitions “Home” and “Play Time”
* Knowledge transfer: symposia, conferences, studies
* Promotion: call for projects, in cooperation with the Federal Office of Culture
* Promotion: travelling exhibition “Swiss Game Design,” Swiss delegations at international fairs

**Qualitative indicators**

* Attractiveness of exhibitions and events for the target groups
* Content evaluation of publications
* Assessment of the quality of the tender
* Quality and adaptability of the travelling exhibition
* Feedback of game designers regarding their participation in the festivals

**Quantitative indicators**

* Number of visitors and participants in exhibitions and events
* Number of submitted projects
* Number of realised projects
* Downloads study of the website www.gameculture.ch
* Number of requests for the travelling exhibitions
* Compliance with schedule and budget
Level 3: [Project objectives and direct effects]

**Outcome**

* Video games as an art form to be addressed by the media and accepted by science and politics. The negative image of the games is rectified
* The programme contributes to the quality development of video games
* Game developers gain recognition, and access to financing by culture funding institutions. The scene is more structured
* Pro Helvetia has a network in the video game scene at its disposal

**Qualitative indicators**

* Differentiation in media coverage
* Assessment of the reactions from politics and science
* Assessment of the quality of the games
* Quality and intensity of the use of the platforms and networks

**Quantitative indicators**

* Number of media reports
* Number of cooperating scientific, technical and cultural institutions
* Number of follow-up projects
* Increase in members of the relevant networks and platforms

Level 4: [Overall objectives or long-term effects on the context]

**Impact**

* Video games are recognised as an art form by a wide audience
* Politics and cultural promotion support this new art form
* The Swiss game developer scene is internationally known and well connected
* Pro Helvetia is prepared for further developments in the field of dematerialised culture

**Qualitative indicators**

* Changes in discussion contributions
* Political decisions, introduction of promotion measures by cultural institutions
* Reactions of the international scene
* Appraisal by experts on the contribution by Pro Helvetia for the development of the scene

**Quantitative indicators**

* Number of events, activities and publications about video games as an art form
* Number of applications to Pro Helvetia from the video game scene
* Number of Switzerland priorities and awards for the Swiss scene in international meetings
EXAMPLE

EFFECT ANALYSIS IN THE PROJECT “COLLABORATION BETWEEN ARTISTS AND SCHOOLS”

The Education and Culture of the Education Directorate of the Canton of Bern programme wants to strengthen the cultural education in schools in the region. For this purpose, different activities are developed — the competition “tête-à-tête” is one of them.

Level 1: [activities and resources]

**Input**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* The programme is defined</td>
<td>* Personnel and financial means are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The project team is formed</td>
<td>* A time schedule is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The responsibilities are clarified</td>
<td>* The partners are appointed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 2: [Results]

**Output**

* Implementation of the tête-à-tête competition
* Financing of projects

**Qualitative Indicators**

* Evaluation of the degree of tender information
* Attractiveness of the competition for the target groups (schools and artists)
* Assessment of the cooperation between the school representatives and the cultural representatives when working on the competition entry

**Quantitative indicators**

* Number of projects received according to types and school levels
* Timely implementation of the competition
* Number of projects awarded prizes
* Amount of budgeted and paid prize money
Level 3: [Project objectives and direct effects]

**Outcome**

* Cultural workers and schools jointly realise new intervention projects
* The projects have a model-like character and are based on a long-term cooperation
* There are projects from all sectors

**Qualitative indicators**
* Schools and artists are in agreement
* Both sides contribute to the success of the projects
* They benefit from the cooperation
* Evaluation of the model character of the projects
* Assessing the novelty of the projects

**Quantitative indicators**
* Number of jointly implemented projects
* Duration of the projects
* Number of participants (schools, artists, classes, pupils)

Level 4: [Overall objectives or long-term effects on the context]

**Impact**

* The school is increasingly perceived as a cultural hub
* The cultural education at schools in the Canton of Bern is strengthened

**Qualitative indicators**
* Changes in the cultural understanding amongst the participating schools (more action, less consumption)
* Shift in the perception of the positional value of culture in the participating schools (for example, cultural budget)
* Changed perception of culture and school

**Quantitative indicators**
* Number of follow-up projects with similar themes and objectives
* Number of new partners
In the field of culture, the evaluators are faced with the opinion that quality cannot be evaluated again and again. It is important to remember that the subject matter of evaluation in the guidelines is the quality of cultural promotion and its products, and not the quality of artistic production. This difference is central as it makes quality a possible object of evaluation, because the definition of quality is based on measuring the effects of cultural leaders’ promotion and dissemination of cultural services.

Quality has much to do with the norms which apply to a project. It mirrors the intentions of the people responsible for the project. Quality answers the question: “When am I happy with a project?” The project leaders determine what achievements should be gained by a project, and the quality will therefore be defined differently depending on the project.

The quality of a project can be assessed with quite simple and commonly used means. In so doing, the following aspects should to be taken into account:

**Objective achievement** The determined objectives have a mostly qualitative dimension. In this case, the evaluation of quality exists in the assessment of how the previously defined objectives were met or missed, and in the interpretation of the respective results.

**Effect on target groups** The effect on target groups is an important parameter when defining the quality of support measures and cultural activities. The target group, which should be reached with this measure, must be defined as precisely as possible. Developments and changes in the behaviour of the target groups will be investigated in a “before and after” analysis. For example, if the access to an artistic production should be improved for a certain group of artists, then this access and the real benefit of the target group is decisive for the quality of the involved support measure.
EXEMPLARY

THE MUSIC WAGON OF THE LUCERNE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

A newly built wooden carriage will become a moving stage, a listening room and a meeting place. Orchestra musicians travel to bring musical discoveries and activities into the villages and towns of central Switzerland. They organise workshops and public concerts together with schools. The following questions need to be asked about the effect of this project: Do the various activities around the music wagon awaken the delight of schoolchildren in music? Are teachers encouraged to make musical opportunities more accessible in future? Are they supported by the project to represent the concerns of the music in their school and their community? Does music as a school subject have a higher acceptance? The quality of the project bandwagon of the Lucerne Symphony Orchestra can be assessed according to the answers to these questions. Should the answers be yes, then the management of the project will be very pleased.

WORLD BOOK DAY

World Book Day is celebrated worldwide on the 23rd of April every year. The aim is to promote the book, literature and reading. In Switzerland, publishers, writers, bookshops and libraries organise various activities with the support of the World Book Day association. Through the global support of an idea, the effect should be increased, and the book and literature should be given more visibility. Organisers define the quality of the World Day in accordance with: the number of executed activities on this day; the way that Book Day is held all over Switzerland; the number of provided materials, and those ordered from libraries and bookstores; and the breadth of the media coverage, especially the background article. These figures allow the organisers to determine from which point in time the quality of events is according to expectations set. Those responsible intend to review their commitment to the World Book Day, if this quality is not achieved for a number of consecutive years.

The desired quality is different for each project, and is in response to the question: When am I satisfied with my project?
Practice

THE SECOND PART OF THE GUIDELINES FOCUS ON THE CONCRETE KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED FOR PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF AN EVALUATION. EVALUATION BASICALLY GOES THROUGH FIVE STAGES IN PRACTICE, WHETHER THE PROCESS IS EXTERNAL OR INTERNAL, PREPARATORY OR CONCLUDING: THE PREPARATION, ORGANISATION, APPLICATION, REPORTING BACK, AND FINAL IMPLEMENTATION. THE FOLLOWING FIVE CHAPTERS WILL PROVIDE THE TOOLS FOR THE STAGES OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS THROUGH TO THE FINAL IMPLEMENTATION, AFTER WHICH A NEW PROJECT CYCLE BEGINS FOR THE EVALUATED PROJECT.
Phases of an evaluation

Evaluation as part of a project cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulating objectives</th>
<th>Planning of cultural project</th>
<th>Realisation of cultural project</th>
<th>Evaluation of cultural project</th>
<th>Implement results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create prerequisites for evaluation</td>
<td>Prepare evaluation</td>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td>Analyse data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<-- <-- <-- <--
11 Phase one: preparation

PREPARATION IS CRUCIAL FOR A SUCCESSFUL EVALUATION, AND THIS IS IN THE HANDS OF THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROJECT. IF AN ORGANISATION EMPLOYEE IS FAMILIAR WITH THE EVALUATION PROCESS, THEN THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN THE TASK OF EVALUATION PREPARATION WITH THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROJECT. THE OBJECTIVE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION SHOULD BE DETERMINED INITIALLY, FOLLOWED BY THE FORMULATION OF KEY QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS TO MEASURE THESE.

Evaluation serves various purposes. Four basic purposes can be defined: checking, optimising and ensuring quality; preparing decisions; learning; accountability (Chapter 3). Initial questions for consideration are: What should the evaluation achieve? What will the evaluation results be used for? Does the evaluation concern a reorientation, modification, rethinking, or even a possible termination of a project?

Stage 1 will be completed when the parties involved have agreed on the objectives of the evaluation and have arranged them into a hierarchical sequence.
### WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR EVALUATION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To check, optimise and ensure quality</strong></td>
<td>Improve and develop the contents of a project, Describe the framework conditions that need to be adhered to for the optimal implementation of a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To prepare decisions</strong></td>
<td>Continuation or termination of a project, Modification of a project, Transfer of the project into a different context, Funding of a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To learn</strong></td>
<td>Familiarisation with interconnections, Improvement of management, Gaining insights relevant for the future, Gaining insights for similar projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be accountable</strong></td>
<td>Legitimise activities, To make activities visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key questions will help focus on the essentials. An evaluation can never explore all facets of a project; it focuses mainly on two or three aspects. Different key questions will arise depending on which aspect is central to a given scenario and the relevant participants. The following table shows possible questions regarding the five stages of an evaluation.

Key questions cannot always be answered directly. Therefore, it is important to draft a list of concrete questions for each key question. The questions are sufficiently precise if suitable indicators can be derived from them.

At the end of stage 2, the key questions and the aspects of the project to focus on in the evaluation will have been established.
WHAT ARE THE KEY QUESTIONS OF THE EVALUATION?

**Efficiency**  
(output, action)  
Are things being done properly? Are results achieved on the basis of reasonable input?

- What is the relationship between effort (input) and result (output)?
- How will the input regarding the project organisation and the implementation be judged?
- How will the project management be assessed? How do supervision and decision-making processes take place?
- Is the approach objective oriented?
- Are feasible solutions being suggested?
- Is there a monitoring system that enables the early recognition of problems during implementation?

**Effectiveness**  
(outcome, project objective) Do the results contribute as planned to the overall objectives?

- Has the project achieved the projected objectives?
- Have the achievements of the project resulted in the projected outcome?
- Is there a monitoring system that can provide timely and relevant information about the objective achievement? What are the most important findings here?

**Relevance**  
Are the correct procedures carried out in regards to the main context?

- Is the subject matter of the project (still) relevant?
- Are the strategies adequate and meaningful?
- Do the most suitable partners for the project work together?
Impact
(overall objectives, effect)
What contributions are made with reference to the higher-level objectives towards changes in the context?

What is the purpose of the project in regards to the target group following the results?
Which important changes are shown?
To what extent do the actual effects correspond to the desired ones?
Are there significant unforeseen effects?

Sustainability
Are the processes and results which were set in motion durable?

Is the project viable in the longer term?
Can the project partners independently continue the project?
Does the project have the opportunity for medium-term self-funding or sponsorship?
How well is the project connected? Are there active connections to the project's surroundings?
Which measures can increase the sustainability of the project?
Within the framework of an exchange programme, a Swiss Music Institute of Higher Education supports the master class of the music academy in an Eastern European city. Participating Swiss musicians teach students after their performances. One objective of the exchange programme is that the students include pieces by contemporary Swiss composers into their repertoire and work on them with their lecturers afterwards. The exchange programme is evaluated in view of an eventual continuation of the project. The following key questions are posed in the evaluation:

How are the master classes organised, and how are they carried out?
What effect do they have on the students?
How relevant are these for the event venue?

The evaluation concentrates on the following aspects and questions:

1 Impact (effect) and sustainability
   * How many students intend to include the work of contemporary Swiss composers into their repertoire?
   * How many lecturers intend to include works of contemporary Swiss composers into their lecture programme?
   * How many concerts including the works of contemporary Swiss composer resulted from the master classes?
   * How many community projects are lined up for the future (institutional and personal)?
2  Efficiency and effectiveness (organisation of the master classes)
* How well are the master classes prepared? Are their topics known? Are the notes distributed in advance? Are the pieces rehearsed in advance?
* Is the music academy a reliable partner? Does the course information function? Are all the instruments available?
* Is the work distribution between the Swiss musicians and the music academy clear?
* Does the course participation correspond to the objective size of two-thirds of post-graduates, two-thirds of under-graduates, all percussions teachers, two or three composition teachers, and five to ten composition students?
* Are the master courses carried out in accordance with the programme?

3  Recommendations for the future
* Should the master courses be repeated? When? What should be improved, if the master courses are to be repeated? Topic, structure, duration, organisation, partners, and communication should be considered.

Key questions and their alignment towards the aspects clarify the evaluation objectives.

EXAMPLE

THEATRE EXCHANGE FOR YOUNG THEATRE ARTISTS

A theatre organises a Theatre Exchange with different partners. The aim is to promote young theatre groups that have been so far only known regionally on a national level. After two theatre exchanges have been carried out, the organisers ask themselves whether further events will be worthwhile: The organisation is problematic and the benefits for the target groups are unclear. Before the planning of the third theatre exchange, the leaders carry out an evaluation.
The following key questions should be answered:
Have the objectives been achieved, and are the measures to achieve the objectives appropriate?
What works well, what could work better, and what does not work at all?
Which recommendations for the meaning and the effectiveness of the theatre exchanges can be formulated for the future?

The evaluation concentrates on the following aspects and questions:

1. **Analysis of the objectives (impact)**
   - Does the theatre exchange play its role as multiplier? With what success? Are the participating theatre groups invited to other cantons?
   - Is the theatre exchange an appropriate means to reach the objectives? Are there different ways?
   - Is the two-year rhythm appropriate?

2. **Reflections on the utilised means (effectiveness, efficiency)**
   - Do the means used (money, ideas, know-how, material, personnel, time) lead to the expected results?
   - What is the relationship between the costs and the results?
   - How is the organisation and implementation of the theatre exchange judged by the participating groups?
   - Which factors have particularly positive or negative effects on the project?
   - What could be the best organisational format?
   - How do the organisers of the theatre exchange and the participating institutions work together?

*Key questions and their relation to the aspects also clarify the evaluation objectives here.*
12 Phase two: Organisation and choosing the team

The next step is to clarify which resources are necessary for the implementation of an evaluation. Consider: how much money, know-how and time are available internally? What resources must be acquired externally? Decide whether to evaluate externally or internally, and which methods to use. Clarify the best time for the implementation of the evaluation, and appoint partners, determining their roles and responsibilities, especially those of the evaluation team. Finally, a type of contract is drawn up which is called the evaluation mandate, or the terms of reference (TOR).

Organisation, Stage 1

Defining the evaluation type

The criteria which speak for an external or internal evaluation have already been described (Chapter 6.1). Decide on the appropriate evaluation type based on the purpose established; if the objective is the project’s acceptance or accountability, then an external team would be preferable. An internal evaluation makes sense for an intensive learning process. The involvement of an external person can help to set optimal priorities in a favourable manner and expand perspectives in an internal evaluation. The combination of internal and external evaluation can be useful, depending on the purpose of the investigation.
The key questions of the evaluation have an influence on the timing of the evaluation process, or in which phase of a project the evaluation should be carried out (Chapter 5.2). Certain questions demand a comparison between two phases of a project, such as between the implementation phase and a later point in time, in order to ascertain possible changes. Other questions can only be provided at the end of the project, when the desired effects are visible, whereas others require the collection of information over a defined timespan.

**Procedure for the external evaluation**

An order is assigned in an external evaluation. This order is formulated for an external evaluation team and set within the budget framework. The external evaluation team prepares and presents a proposal, which outlines the methods selected to collect the required data and which services can be carried out within the planned budget framework. This proposal is discussed with possible adaptations made. Clarify whether data can be collected internally, and whether project partners are available for this purpose.

Some external evaluators stipulate an internal evaluation as a condition of the study to provide a personal contribution by those under evaluation. The project team may assess the project or aspects of it as part of this process.

**Procedure for the internal evaluation**

The internal evaluation leader has or is able to acquire the necessary methodological know-how to carry out the evaluation. Ideally, the key questions and corresponding indicators have been defined. The methods, timeframe and collectors for data acquisition should be determined. The roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team should be clarified. Usually, the project management collects project-related data within the framework of monitoring. Depending on the evaluation, it is useful to also include partner organisations in the data collection.
An internal evaluation does not only have additional extra work as a consequence for the project team; it is often associated with the fear that the work carried out, or the team itself, might be criticised. Resistance is understandable and must be taken seriously. A partnership-based approach increases the chance that all parties accept controversial or negative results.

The benefits of an evaluation should be explained to the team and partners as early in the process as possible, ideally during the project planning.

Choosing the methodology

There is no format for correct method choice, as basically all empirical social research methods are available. The chosen method is dependent on the key questions (Chapter 11, stage 2) and their indicators (Chapter 9) and adapted to the knowledge or interests of the project leader. For quantitative data, the analysis will be based on statistical data, such as information that was collected as part of the project monitoring or through standardised surveys or interviews. Qualitative data obtained from surveys, guideline interviews, content-related analyses of press articles, files, observations, focus groups and other sources would be used for the evaluation of the qualitative aspects of a project. Usually, a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods is indicated.

In smaller evaluations, the surveys are often conducted face-to-face or by telephone, using means such as guideline interviews, or thematic discussions with focus groups. Participating observation and document analysis help to understand the background. It is worth developing a standardised questionnaire for larger surveys.
## EXAMPLE

### SUITABLE METHODS TO FORMULATE QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY QUESTIONS</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation “Collection Cahiers d’Artistes”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well is the “Collection Cahiers d’Artistes” known by professionals?</td>
<td>Written questionnaire to thirty experts with closed and open questions by email, and ten interviews with experts at home or by telephone with those in foreign countries</td>
<td>External evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Indicator:</em> degree of familiarity concerning the publication series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do professionals think about the selection of the artists that are considered in the publication series?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Indicator:</em> satisfaction of professionals with the selection of artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many of the artists were known to the professionals prior to the publication series?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Indicator:</em> Approximate number of the known artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the position of the selected artists developed in the national or international art scene?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Indicator:</em> Position of the artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation “echos — Volkskultur für morgen”
(*“Echoes — Folk Culture for tomorrow”*)

#### Some exemplary evaluation topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Did the achievements of the project lead to the planned outcome? Did the culture professionals from art and folk culture develop projects together?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Indicators:</strong> Number of participating artists in the competition, number of award-winning projects, number of realised projects and implemented events, number of cantons involved.</th>
<th><strong>Quantitative survey</strong></th>
<th><strong>Project management</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did folk culture gain recognition as a sovereign form of expression due to the various reflection events?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> The number of participants and their sociological data, opinion of the participants, content analysis of media reports.</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative survey, written questionnaire for the participants, media reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project partners and project management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How were the resonance and effects of “echos — Volkskultur für morgen” received amongst the partner organisations, the cultural leaders of the cantons, and the multipliers in the culture field?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> Satisfaction and assessment of the achievements of the programme, understanding of the contents, assessment of the exchange between folk culture and contemporary art, changes in the funding policy, number of (planned) consecutive projects.</td>
<td><strong>Written questionnaires to all partner organisations and participating multipliers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Externally appointed evaluation team</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is a correspondence between key questions, indicators and methods.*
Evaluation can be absorbing and once started, there is a growing appetite for further information. Therefore, do what is important and leave the unimportant elements aside. The initially formulated evaluation objectives and key questions should be the only focus. Newly emerging interesting questions may only be pursued if the resources for their processing have been ensured.

The amount of resources needed for the implementation of the evaluation need to be clarified. How many working hours can be invested? How much money and personnel are readily available? Which know-how can be utilised?

Smaller institutions have to especially ensure that the invested resources produce a positive yield as evaluations are initially a cause of additional expenses to cultural leaders.

In the review of cultural activities, costs and benefits should balance out in the long term. The development of evaluation expertise is worthwhile because it helps to save the costs of external assessments in the long run.

It is of utmost importance that the time factor and the duration of the evaluation are discussed with all concerned. Those who will be affected by the evaluation and their availability when required must be clarified.

The cost of an evaluation
The cost of evaluation is estimated to be approximately three to ten percent of the project costs. As a consequence, there is rarely sufficient money available for a successful evaluation process from a project with a small budget. Projects with a small budget either have to plan a smaller and possibly less comprehensive evaluation or find additional funding.
If the budget is modest, the evaluation should only concentrate on one or two basic questions. Even small evaluations are worthwhile, especially when costs can be saved in the future.

Before the planning and assigning of a large evaluation, it is wise to seek advice from an independent expert on the type and the size of evaluation, so that realistic budget planning can be carried out. If the costs for an external evaluation are only budgeted in retrospect, they must be well justified.

**EXAMPLE**

**THE COSTS OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION**

* A cultural organiser has annual programme costs of around CHF 280,000. Over a period of six years, the costs add up to around CHF 1.7 million. For an evaluation which would cover all activities, and for results that would bring a yield for several years, about three percent of these costs or CHF 40,000 to CHF 50,000 would be budgeted.

* A popular music competition for young people is tendered biennially. The costs for the events and prize money have accumulated in six years to CHF 60,000. A reasonable amount for an external evaluation lies at approximately CHF 6,000, or ten percent.

* A funding foundation budgets CHF 700,000 as one-off costs for a major event, which is meant to be a pilot project in the field of contemporary dance. It would like to evaluate the project. Depending on the structure of the programme, about CHF 30,000 to CHF 40,000, or approximately four to six percent has to be reserved for the external evaluation.

* In practice, the costs of an evaluation vary depending on the project.
Organisation, Stage 4

Determining the evaluation team

Smaller internal evaluations could be performed by a single person, if necessary, with the involvement and support of a professional person who could, for example, assess the evaluation questionnaire. It is worthwhile to recruit an evaluation team for larger internal evaluation or to address complex questions. The know-how of the team members and their ability to work together is crucial for the success of the assessment. Role distribution and the competences of team members should be clarified. A good management remains calm in tense evaluation situations.

Choosing external evaluators
The profile of the evaluator for an external evaluation should be compiled by those responsible for the project. If the evaluation will focus on structural or organisational questions, then an evaluator with management background would be suitable. An evaluator with business and economic experience would be useful if the evaluation’s main focus is financial.

If questions are asked about the impact, the effects on a target audience or the effectiveness and the target objective achievement of a cultural project, then an evaluator with social-scientific knowledge should be found. An evaluator with recognised experience will help to increase the acceptance of the evaluation results for the legitimisation of a project.

The evaluator does not necessarily need to have experience in cultural project evaluation as methods are the same across all areas. However, it is advantageous for the evaluator to have knowledge of the cultural sector if the evaluation focus is on the objectives and effects of a cultural project. An evaluator who is in tune with the relevant standards established for cultural projects will find it easier to construct indicators linked to culturally specific key questions, and this should be taken into consideration when an evaluator is appointed.
It is often not easy to find the person who fulfils all the requirements of the evaluation. The option is then to set up a professionally mixed evaluation team: with someone for the corresponding methods and another with specific technical knowledge, such as an art historian, a musician, a folklorist or a marketing specialist. These evaluators should be familiar with the area of the project to be evaluated, but remain independent and impartial.

**EXAMPLE**

**MIXED TEAMS IN EXTERNAL EVALUATION**

* Evaluation “Suiza en ARCO”, Swiss participation at the world exhibition of contemporary art in Madrid
  The evaluation team consists of
  * an evaluator, who is responsible for the entire procedure, the definition of the method, the qualitative interviews, the analysis of the documents and the drafting of the final report. The evaluator answers the key questions in respect to the implementation of the project;
  * an art historian, responsible for the assessment of the artistic value of the exhibitions, of the selected artists and the ensuing projects (sustainability and effect).

  The evaluation team consists of
  * a German-speaking evaluator, who is responsible for the entire procedure, all the methodological issues, the development of the questionnaire and the analysis, definition of indicators, interviews in German and the drafting of the final report;
  * a French-speaking art historian for the interviews in the French-speaking part of Switzerland;
  * the contemporary art museum director, responsible for the assessment of the selection of the artists.

Both teams bring together experts from several professional sectors.

* The evaluation team shall be composed in accordance with the requirements of the evaluation.

* If there are different circles of people affected by the evaluation, they should all be heard on the issue of team building.

* A small team of two to four persons is ideal for the implementation.

* People who know the evaluation subject and the background of the evaluation very well should be part of the team.

* Good social interpersonal skills are required of all the people involved.

* Good method know-how exists in the team.

* The evaluation management has knowledge of the process, can conduct negotiations and deal with conflict.
Combine the key data of the external assessment evaluation and use this to formulate the order as the basis for the invitation of comparative offers.

**The order**
The order sets the objectives, the questions and the intended benefit of the evaluation. If certain questions have priority, this becomes apparent when putting the questions into a hierarchical order. The contracting side — the project management, the superiors, or if available, the specialist department for evaluation — is responsible for the formulation of the task.

The following points are included in the order:
* The objective and purpose of the project to be evaluated
* Objective and purpose of the evaluation
* The key questions of the evaluation
* The evaluation recipients
* The time frame of the evaluation
* The budget which is available for the evaluation, or the financial framework of the project to be evaluated

If the evaluation order has been defined and formulated to the satisfaction of all parties, then the search for the suitable external evaluators begins.
The invitation to tender
Projects and evaluations of the public sector must be publicly tendered in accordance with the regulations of the World Trade Organization (WTO) if a budget exceeds CHF 250,000. With a budget starting at CHF 50,000, at least three bids must be obtained. A tender is also recommended for the larger evaluations of private foundations or organisations. Smaller evaluations do not have to go to public tender. However, an invitation to tender can help find the suitable evaluators. In addition to the description of the order, an invitation to tender often contains other documents, such as important facts about the project or tips for informative internet sites.

Public tenders can be published in Switzerland via the SEVAL, in Germany via the DEGEVAL or in France via the SFE. Professional trade associations make sites for public announcements on the internet available for this purpose.

They also hold contact details of evaluators. Under certain circumstances, word of mouth publicity, and consultation with other cultural leaders with experience in evaluation might also be helpful when going to tender.

The offer
The bid is formulated in accordance with the criteria mentioned in the invitation to tender. In the case of smaller evaluations, the order dictates the framework conditions; in the case of larger ones, the TOR are added (Organisation, Stage 6: The Terms of Reference). The client placing the order should check the submitted offers for the following features: feasibility, relevance, proposed methodological approach and its suitability for the evaluation purpose. It is vital that the bid is checked to ensure that all the important issues are taken into consideration. A bid is free of charge.

2 The standards of the associations for evaluation in Switzerland and abroad aim to contribute to the professionalisation of the evaluation procedure. They define the quality requirements for evaluation. Special attention has been given to the formulation of the standards so that they are suitable for all kinds of evaluation. They are addressed to everyone involved in evaluations or who influence them, namely the evaluator or clients. The addresses of the associations can be found in the appendix.
WHAT ARE YOUR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR OFFERS?

- Is the offer clear in the objective of the evaluation and its environment?
- Is the offer described in a clear and concise manner?
- Were the occasion and purpose of the evaluation understood?
- Do the objective and the focus of the offered evaluation correspond with the requirements formulated in the order?
- Are the deviating questions appropriately justified?
- Does the chosen method correspond with the objective of the evaluation?
- Are the proposed methods of data collection reliable, practical and efficient?
- Is the evaluation design convincing? (proposal of how the evaluation would be tackled)
- Which comparison levels serve as the basis of assessment? Before/after analysis, cross comparison, objective/actual comparison?
- Is the budget transparent and inside the framework of the guideline?
- How is the evaluation team composed? Do the essential competencies exist? Are the tasks and competencies clearly administered?
The evaluation mandate or terms of reference (ToR) summarise all the relevant elements of the future employment relation. They regulate the cooperation between the client and external evaluators, especially in dealing with the unexpected. The ToR provide the basis for a good partnership and are considered as a binding contract for all involved. In the case of external evaluation, the offer is part of the ToR, especially in regards to the method. The wording of the ToR is the responsibility of the contracting side. Experience shows that it takes on average six to eight weeks until the evaluation mandate for large institutions and comprehensive evaluation is ready to sign.

For internal evaluation, the ToR provide a summary of all important points and enable all participants to have the same information about the planned enquiry.

**What to do if problems arise?**
The evaluators should notify the client if serious problems arise during the implementation of the evaluation. The client then decides on the further course of action (amendment of the ToR, change in the composition of the team, mediation or cancellation of the evaluation).
### WHAT DO TERMS OF REFERENCE GIVE INFORMATION ABOUT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The most important facts and information on the subject of the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the objective of the project to be evaluated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is involved in the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the time frame of the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the purpose of the evaluation? What is expected from the evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To improve, enhance and develop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To broaden knowledge and recognise relationships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To take stock? To prepare decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To provide accountability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To legitimise activities, or fulfil expectations from outside?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The key questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the specific questions? What are the most important questions to answer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Formulate a list of precise questions for each key question).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What information is required about the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On which aspects of the project is the evaluation concentrated? Sustainability, relevance, impact, efficiency, effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which methods are used to answer the key questions? Here, a rough description of the methods is sufficient. The method proposed in the bid applies for an external evaluation. The bid is part of the ToR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will an internal or external evaluation be implemented? What reasons are there for implementing an external evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there know-how lacking which needs to be acquired? Justification and description of the solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The evaluation team

- How is the evaluation team composed?
  * For an external evaluation: the evaluation team will be named, the particular skills and know-how of the members of the team will be mentioned.
  * For an internal evaluation: Which resources are available? Which additional resources are required? Who is responsible for what?

## Evaluation team services

- The nature and size of the proposed methodological services
- Number of reports (interim report, final report, etc.)
- Language and approximate length of the report
- Authors of the reports and the recipients of the reports
- Type and scope of the presentation of the results (debriefing, seminar, attending a meeting, etc.)
- If problems arise: inform the client

## Services provided by client

- Announcement of the evaluation, via e-mail or alternative method
- Naming the important contacts
- Release of important documents and statistical data
- Support when searching for addresses
DECISION-MAKING SUPPORT

The time frame

- When will the implementation phase start?
- When should the data collection be completed?
- Is there data that could be collected at a later point in time?
- When does the media coverage phase start?
- When would verbal feedback on the results be provided?
- When would written feedback be provided (interim report, final report)?
- When is the debriefing taking place, and in what context?
- When should the results of the evaluation be announced?
- When will the first results be presented and discussed?
- When does the transfer phase start?

The communication of the results

- Who are the recipients of the evaluation results within the institution?
- Who are the decision makers?
- Who should be informed about the evaluation results?
- Who receives the reports?
- Who has the evaluation rights?
- Will the evaluation be published, or is it confidential?

The budget

- How much money is available for the evaluation in total?
- How would the funds be used? [In the case of external evaluations, the breakdown can be attached]
- What is included in the external evaluation team fee? [Expenses, meeting fees, debriefing, number of reports, number of meetings]
13 Phase three: Implementation of the evaluation

The responsibility for the implementation of evaluation lies with the evaluation team, which organises itself. The external evaluation team should be in constant contact with the contractors and provide updates on progress and any difficulties found in the implementation of the evaluation.

Implementation, Stage 1
Setting up the work plan and refining the methodology

Allow sufficient time for the creation of a work plan and appropriate work distribution for an internal evaluation. Planning based on the terms of reference (ToR) supports team building and establishes a better understanding of the order of the work plan for external evaluation.

The evaluation team designs a detailed work plan and time frame for the implementation of the evaluation based on the ToR and the offer.

The proposed methods will then be refined, and indicators created for the questions within the key questions. Questionnaires are developed for structured interviews or for interview guidelines, depending on the form that the questions take. A list of interviewee names will be created, and contact can be made with the survey experts. Partner institutions should provide information on which data should be collected, data collection methods and relevant time frame.
The entrusted team refines the methods, often in cooperation with the contractors or the project managers in an external evaluation. For example, questionnaires will be forwarded to the contractors for the purpose of examining the contents. The names of the interviewees will be jointly determined and accompanying letters will be formulated after discussion. It makes sense and helps to open doors if the contractors announce the evaluation.

The relevant evaluation team, however, clearly appears as the recipient of both the questionnaire and the confidential information; the protection of the informants must be guaranteed. Confidentiality must be protected in internal evaluations by keeping statements consistently anonymous.

First of all, facts and information are gathered. This applies to both the external and the internal evaluation. Interviews are carried out, questionnaires are distributed, entries counted, press articles gathered, and other initial tasks. Moreover, the existing information material from the project is studied in form of documents, plans and budgets. In principle, all the documents that are useful for the evaluation, must be at the disposal of the evaluation team.

After the acquisition of the information, the available data material has to be analysed and evaluated in relation to the key questions. The data will be grouped and assessed. For example, the different assessments of the interviewed target groups can be visualised and compared by using diagrams. Specialised software is not normally needed for this purpose.
Common diagrams can be easily made using Excel, but to compare large quantities of data, for example, to highlight significant differences; the use of a statistics programme is worthwhile. Expert support may be helpful with such a programme.

**Draft Report**
The evaluation team formulates the first results, key message and recommendations for the future in the draft report. The team agrees on the contents before they are communicated.

The project managers and others involved parties now have the opportunity to take a position on the draft report, and to discuss the its preliminary conclusions. They may require that certain aspects be explored further.

For the evaluation team, this phase constitutes the last opportunity to check facts and information with the people directly involved, and to make corrections and additions. It is better to organise the consultation in form of a seminar or a meeting than in a written form.

At this point in time, the contractors could demand changes with respect to the form or the tenor of the draft report, but they can no longer have an influence on its content. The management of the evaluation team is responsible for the contents of the report.

---

**TIPS**

**THE REQUIRED AMOUNT OF DATA**

The quantity and scope of the required information is determined by the formulation of the questions. Conversely, the question should never be determined by the available information! How widely an evaluation collects and processes information depends on the following factors:

* the required information which is needed to answer the questions raised

* the availability of already existing information on the subject (other studies in similar fields or evaluations of comparable projects, annual reports and other documentations on the project)

* the extent of required additional information

* the possibility of collecting the required data within the given framework

* the amount of data which is important for the analysis

* the temporal and financial framework of the evaluation
14 Phase four: Reporting and management response

The report is one of the main products of the evaluation. It usually consists of the evaluation report and the debriefing. Both yield the highest benefit when the lessons which are learnt for the further development of a project are clearly and precisely communicated. The findings and recommendations are clearly described in a separate chapter of the evaluation report. The opinions of the contractors concerning the report are called the management response.

Evaluation reports are only useful when the findings talk to the recipients in a suitable manner and reach the contractors at the right point in time. If in the course of an evaluation a measure is ineffective, inappropriate or inefficient, the contractor has to be informed as soon as possible. This ensures that measures can be modified in time, problems and strategies can be immediately reconsidered, or the measures or project can be stopped before completion if necessary.

Conventionally, an evaluation report contains the following chapters:

1. **Management summary:** A brief summary of the most important facts and results of the evaluation

2. **Starting position, contract and formulation of questions:** The starting position and the environment of the evaluation are described. The most important key questions and the objectives of the evaluation are formulated too.

3. **Approach and method:** The procedure has been made transparent; the working method, the informants and the information materials, and the nature of the information procurement have been defined.
4. Results and analysis: The most important results have been presented and correspond to the key questions and topics formulated in the terms of reference.

5. Summary and recommendations: The most important results are grouped in a transparent manner and recommendations are clearly formulated. Depending on the situation, it may not be appropriate to formulate recommendations, but to show options to the contractor in the form of open questions with the objective to encourage deeper discussion and to facilitate decision making.

6. Annexes: Terms of reference, list of the interviewees, possibly questionnaires.

The debriefing
Frequently, the evaluation report is not sufficient to set the process of evaluation and further utilisation of an evaluation in motion. For the purpose of reporting, a combination of a verbal debriefing and a written report is usually chosen.

In the debriefing, the evaluation team verbally presents the results to the contractors and the project management and discusses the recommendations with them. Depending on the results and the scope of the evaluation, senior management is also invited. The aim is that those that have been affected by the evaluation can draw their “lessons learnt” directly from the evaluation. Depending on the target group and content presentations, seminars, workshops and other forms of oral reporting are possible. The more appropriate the form of debriefing is, such as high-quality content, and how the target audience and form correspond to each other, the more likely it is that important findings of the evaluation are observed and translated into actions.

The reporting normally signifies the completion of an external evaluation team’s work.

TIPS
FOR CORRECT FORMULATION OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

* The report is clear, formulated to be reader friendly, and is understandable.

* Interviewee statements appear anonymously.

* The tone is correct and respectful. The formulations are carefully balanced; subjective impressions and sensitive issues have not been introduced.

* The report is complete and it does not hide important information.

* If the evaluation team cannot agree on important conclusions, their deviating positions become obvious from the report.
In the case of learning-oriented internal evaluations, it is not so much the result which is in the foreground, but the evaluation process in itself — the ability of the evaluators involved. This can be reflected in the debriefing, which if well prepared and carried out, replaces the evaluation report in certain cases. The debriefing can be organised in the form of a retreat or a workshop. Depending on the question posed or the sensitivity of the subject, it is recommended that external experts are called upon. The debriefing should enable the involved parties to uncover blind spots, expand their own perspective, and realise projects in future in a more purposeful, efficient and effective way.

Management response
The contracting side is responsible for the preparation of the statements on the evaluation report and the debriefing. The contractors and project managers formulate the first reaction to the results of the evaluation in the management response. They formulate and justify deviating opinions. The comments can become part of the reporting in external evaluations. In an internal evaluation, the final conclusions can be recorded in the form of a session which has been taken to protocol.

Whom to inform?
The evaluation contractors decide who receives the report, the form in which those affected by the report receive information about its results, and whether the report will be published. Evaluation reports are often confidential and will not be publicised. A summary is sometimes placed on the homepage of the contractor's website.

All those who were involved in the evaluation should be informed. Frequently, the results only reach the contractors and managers of the evaluated projects. Important evaluation results are usually also interesting for other target groups, such as those working on the project or people affected by the project, people working in the same professional field, or persons entrusted with comparable projects.

The same results and form or presentation are not relevant for all target groups. It is best to prepare selected findings in the form of brief articles and presentations tailored to the needs of the target group.
PRESENTATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS FOR THE INTERESTED AUDIENCE

* Thematic workshops with partner organisations on similar projects in order to exchange experiences and to improve coordination.
* Thematic reports (e.g. good practices.)
* Cross-section analysis (evaluation of evaluation on a certain topic)
* Annual reports which absorb information from evaluation
* Publication of the evaluation results
* Summaries of the most important evaluation results (e.g. on the Internet)

Findings from the evaluation will be presented to meet the tailored needs of the target group.
15 Phase Five: Implementation of the evaluation results

The assumption that an evaluation is completed with the successful reporting and the formulation of the management response is erroneous. Evaluation should have an effect on the quality and the further course of the project. A new project cycle begins for the evaluated project with the realisation of the results.

It is the task of the project managers or the contractors to manage the realisation of the evaluation results. Realisation here means to use the results as a basis for decisions that will affect the future of the project. Project managers decide which measures should be taken, and when and by whom these measures should be realised.

Evaluation findings are always positioned at the beginning of a new project cycle. They cause the entrusted persons to pause, to check strategies and measures, and to plan the further development or the termination of a project. Evaluating triggers discussion.

TIPS

THE EFFECTIVE TRANSLATION OF THE EVALUATION RESULTS

* The active participation of the partners in the evaluation process increases the chances that the results are realised.
* The focus of the results of the evaluation is aligned to the specific interests and information needs of the involved parties.
* Those involved have the opportunity to read the evaluation report or obtain information on the analysis and the assessment in another form.
* Those involved can discuss the results and share their opinion.
Difficulties may be experienced in the realisation of the results, especially when the evaluation shows the inadequacies and deficits of a project. The more that the implementation of the evaluation is conducted on a partnership basis, the more an awareness of the joint “ownership” of the evaluation develops in those involved, and the greater the benefits of the investigation.

It is recommended that the planned changes be initiated by means of an action plan. Such a plan is based on the management response and lays down the individual steps of the realisation, the chronological sequence, the appropriateness, and the necessary resources. The action plan describes in detail how the evaluated project has to be adjusted.

Once the action plan has been created, it is considered as a basis for the planning of the next steps. The realisation has to be monitored continuously and reported on.

---

TIPS

FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS

* The various positions will be identified and taken into account once the evaluation has been completed.
* The evaluation comes at the correct time, and is aligned to the time frame and the decision-making process of the involved parties.
* Alternatives which meet with the expectations and financial limitations of the stakeholders and partners have to be considered if there is disagreement.
* The evaluation is realistic and is geared to the needs of the contractors.
* Sufficient time for the realisation of the evaluation has been planned.
Annex

Addresses

* Schweizerische Evaluationsgesellschaft (SEVAL), www.seval.ch
  The Schweizerische Evaluationsgesellschaft (Swiss Evaluation Society) can assist in finding a suitable person for evaluation. They have four hundred evaluators listed by name and fields of activity. SEVAL also offers further training courses and has formulated standards of evaluation which contribute to the professionalisation and quality assurance of evaluation in Switzerland. Additional information can be found on the SEVAL website.

* Deutsche Gesellschaft für Evaluation (DEGEVAL), www.degeval.de


* Associazione Italiana di Valutazione, www.valutazioneitaliana.it

* European Evaluation Society, www.europeanevaluation.org
### Glossary

VARIOUS SOURCES\(^3\) WERE CONSULTED AND EXISTING TERM DEFINITIONS USED FOR THE GLOSSARY. THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS ARE BELIEVED TO BE CORRECT, ALTHOUGH CERTAIN TERMS MAY BE USED DIFFERENTLY. THE AIM IS TO CREATE A UNIFORM BASIS FOR DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE PARTNERS AND AVOID CONFUSION REGARDING THE TERMS. THE GLOSSARY CONTAINS ALL THE RELEVANT SPECIFIC TERMS BUT DOES NOT CLAIM TO BE COMPLETE OR FINAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affected people (stakeholders)</td>
<td>People or groups of people who are involved in the project, interested in its progression or are affected by it. They have a justified interest in the success and the benefits of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>Independent, internal or external assessment to ensure compliance with valid regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>The precisely defined agreement between funding organisation and those responsible for culture. It describes the objectives set, the compensation of the funding organisation, the achievements of those responsible for culture and the manner in which the fulfilment of the agreement is monitored (e.g. list of the indicators used).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Internal organisation management system which collates data and information for decisions of control as per the respective level. (strategic controlling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect model</td>
<td>Describes explicit and implicit assumptions about the mode of action of a measure: it underlines the assumed causal relationships between conception, input, output, impacts and the outcomes of a measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\)Sources:
- Glossary/DEZA: 27 of the most frequently used terms in DEZA in the areas of evaluation and controlling.
- Evaluation, glossary of terms of evaluation, Federal Ministry of Health
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Intended or unintended, and positive or negative changes that can be traced back directly or indirectly to a measure or intervention. Impact can encompass outcome, but does not include output.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>A measure of how resources (financial, human, material, etc.) are used to produce planned results, including cost/benefit analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Systematic collection, processing and analysis of information on the different aspects of an item. Evaluation is a purposeful and time-limited appraisal to assess ongoing or finalised projects, including conception, implementation and results. An evaluation uses systematic methods and applies objective criteria to assess a project. Furthermore, an evaluation searches for explanations when a process does not perform as desired. (see also Monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-ante evaluation</td>
<td>An evaluation that is performed before the implementation of a planned measure in order to assess its foreseeable effects. Ex-ante evaluation estimates the appropriateness of a planned strategy or measure, and analyse its context in order to assess the assumed acceptance and compatibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-post evaluation</td>
<td>An evaluation which is carried out after the termination of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted during the implementation phase of a project, or similar. The process should improve the performance (relevance and efficiency of the strategies and measures and their implementation) and the effectiveness of the project to be evaluated by means of regular feedback to the people responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation conducted during the implementation phase of a project, or similar. The process should improve the performance (relevance and efficiency of the strategies and measures and their implementation) and the effectiveness of the project to be evaluated by means of regular feedback to the people responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Positive and negative, primary and secondary, medium-term and long-term effects (including side effects) of a project, which can be direct or indirect, intended or unintended, desired or undesired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>A quantitative or qualitative measure to assess a phenomenon that in itself is not directly observable or measurable. Indicators are used to observe and measure outcomes, impacts, processes and changes of the context. The impact indicators can be more difficult to determine, so that frequently indirect indicators will have to be used as best possible approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td>Financial, human and material resources necessary for the implementation of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal evaluation</strong></td>
<td>An evaluation which was systematically planned and realised with internal resources, and which is implemented by an organisation to assess its capability (quality, effect, cost/benefit ratio). There is a fluid transition towards a self-evaluation. (see also Self-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key questions</strong></td>
<td>The core questions to be evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lessons learnt</strong></td>
<td>Findings from evaluations. Conclusions and realisations from specific evaluations that can be generalised, and transferred to similar situations and contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management response</strong></td>
<td>A written abstract of the first reactions of the project managers responsible for the evaluation towards the results and recommendations of the evaluation. For an internal evaluation, the management response might also be in the form of minutes of a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandate</strong></td>
<td>See Terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>The activities and resources which are used to achieve the project objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring, monitoring data</strong></td>
<td>A continuous function that uses the systematic collection of relevant and selected data to provide management and the main stakeholders of a project with indicators concerning the extent of the progress and the achievement of objectives, processes, effects and impacts. Both monitoring and evaluation are activities connected with the steering structures of a project. Monitoring includes continued collection of information concerning the status of a project at any given point in time and answers the question: What is the actual status of the project? Evaluation analyses why and how effects were achieved or why they were not. They compare and assess the changes which have come about as a result of a project; they also analyse the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives, partial objectives</strong></td>
<td>The specific, singularly defined and operational objectives or partial objectives of a measure. Objectives of this kind are targeting superordinate objectives, which themselves can only be reached in the long run and via the achievement of intermediate partial objectives. The objectives should be SMART.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside evaluation</strong></td>
<td>See External evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td>Results of a project which were achieved by the activities (outputs) of various people when compared to the set objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>Tangible products/achievements of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall objectives</strong></td>
<td>Superordinate objectives to which a project is supposed to contribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner</strong></td>
<td>An organisation or institution collaborating with another organisation in order to jointly reach set objectives, and to share responsibilities and liabilities in relation to benefit, risks and achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>See Output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme</strong></td>
<td>A set of coordinated projects, measures and processes, focussing on a common, superordinate objective. The main elements of a programme include inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts. A programme is restricted in terms of its duration, area of objective, scope and budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
<td>Usually a specific undertaking or sets of activities, focussing on a limited objective. They are limited as to time, space and finances. Projects are often part of superordinate programmes. In the present guidelines, the term project is used in a different sense, namely as a conclusion of all activities which are to be evaluated: short-term or long-term activities, projects, processes, programmes and strategies, and even institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The publicly declared objectives of an evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which previously defined requirements are fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality management

Also Q. M. is the set of the entire management activities and procedures that an organisation carries out for the definition of its quality policy as well as for its implementation. The main instruments of a quality management are quality planning, quality control, quality assurance and quality improvement. Evaluation serves to ensure and improve quality amongst other things.

### Reference entity, point of reference

A reference entity or point of reference is necessary to be able to measure an intended quantitative or qualitative change.

### Reference values

Specifies as of which point in time the services provided or the desired effects may be considered satisfactory. A benchmark is a metric or numerical value to be adhered to and to use as a guide.

### Relevance, relevance questions

Assesses the progression of the project objectives in relation to the needs of the target group, the organisation and its priorities.

### Report account

Duty to disclose that the work has been carried out in accordance with applicable regulations and standards, or to impartially and transparently report on the results and achievements in relation to the agreed tasks and objectives.

### Results

Incidents or changes — intended or unintended — which can be traced back to the measure under evaluation.

### Self-evaluation

An evaluation in which those who carry out a project assess their own sphere of responsibility. The participants assess their own activities; they are responsible for their working area and for the evaluation at the same time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siting</td>
<td>Stocktaking the current situation; identifying and describing strengths (success factors) and weaknesses of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative evaluation</td>
<td>The retrospective, balancing evaluation of a measure at the end or after the completion of the measure (see Ex-post evaluation). Long-term measures are often subjected to a summary interim evaluation. Summary evaluation often serves the purpose of reporting to superior authorities, funding agencies and donors and/or the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>The lasting continuation of the achieved benefits and impacts of a project, including after its completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of reference</td>
<td>Also ToR. The written agreement between the contractor of the evaluation and the responsible person for the evaluation, covering the course, key questions, objectives and methods of the evaluation and the achievements expected by the evaluation team. The ToR have the form of a contract and are binding for both parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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