Fluxonomy 4D and how it can support culture in its role of reshaping the future.

Future studies reveal that the future is in great measure the outcome of dreams of the past and choices of the present. What we dream of and the choices we make have a direct correspondence with our culture, the lenses through which we perceive ourselves and the world. So, culture is the starting point of any evolution we intend to foster. Neurological studies also reveal that the brain combines previous information to make sense out of whatever it is experiencing. That partially explains one of the enormous roles of the arts: providing repertoire of needed but still non existing things, inspiring the design and choices of new possibilities.

Are we, artists, and cultural workers, aware of that evolutionary role? We have the tools of creation, language, and the ability to move and inspire people, but are we capable of designing policies, works and structures that encompass the many aspects of life and society? Fluxonomy, amongst other goals, was systematised to help this.

The 4D metrics were born out of the perception that although culture is the Matrix of society it is not properly valued because of the lack of tools capable of showing how it deals with and impacts on all the aspects of society, what we call the 4D or four dimensions.

Since culture also means cultivating, let´s adopt that metaphor to explain the 4D nature and interdependency. The cultural dimension is the seed, it is always the starting point. A seed needs a land to grow, and that ground is the environmental dimension. Now that the seed (cultural) has a ground (environmental) we have the cultivation: that is the social dimension, the one where we do things together. Since we have cultivated (social) we have the harvest, this is the financial or transactional dimension, related to results and impact. Note that we don't name this dimension as "economic" because economy results from the flow of cultural, environmental, social and transactional resources (4D) generating results also in the 4D.

Like a compass, Fluxonomy4D is structured upon two axes: intangible (cultural and social dimensions) and tangible (environmental and transactional dimensions) that are interdependent and complementary: one cannot exist without the other. The first level of the Evaluation Prototype depicts the 4 dimensions and balances the conceptual/intangible and the structural/tangible axes.

Each dimension depends on and builds upon the previous one, and what matters is the flow between them. The second level of the evaluation are the Components, designed as a framework of what is required in one step to guarantee the next one.

Also, as in the compass, we need a magnetic point orienting our choices. This magnetic point is the purpose, the desirable future we aim for. The third level of the evaluation process is related to Qualities or Forces of the Components that help achieve the purpose.

By unfolding the four dimensions in the three fractal levels, we have a road map that can be applied in every phase: design, planning, implementation, management, and evaluation. It is very unlikely that any of our creations will encompass all these fractals components. When we check them, we have a better understanding of what we are designing; what is it for (the relevance); with which resources (the viability), to whom (the reach) and what is the intended impact.

We can better understand, design, manage or measure something when we have 4D lenses that show the dynamics and interactions between those dimensions. By going through them, we gain consciousness, we better understand what is happening in the present and what is needed for the future. Probably "Sense Making" better describes what is the purpose of an evaluation. We become aware of Components that were left behind (blind spots) and others that were over stressed.

Reshape was designed to research and develop prototypes addressing five major contemporary challenges in both ways: how they impact the arts and culture and how culture and arts impacts on them. The balanced score in the four dimensions shows that the Program was well designed, and its activities covered the 4D. The qualitative part of the Evaluation reveals that the score 3.1 in 5 means that not all of the components were addressed. In those missing 1.9 reside the opportunities for amplifying the spectrum and reach of the program. For instance, the lowest score in the Transactional refers to some Components that were not essential in the original design as the financial sustainability of the prototypes or how they could impact in the communities in which Partners and Reshapers are acting.

A brief introduction on the nature of each Dimension and its Components will open the next parts of the reports followed by a fluxonomic comment on the results.

THE CULTURAL DIMENSION

The CULTURAL DIMENSION is the seed, the starting point, is what we have inside, our essence that guides perceptions and choices. It encompasses the **Symbolic** (our beliefs and values) and the **Cognitive** (knowledge and talents). This is the dimension of "KNOW HOW", here we find all the skills, knowledge, talent and that's why it's the most abundant of the dimensions. It is the realm of knowledge, creation, research and desire.

Components and its Flow: The Idea/Concept we want to seed; the Language/Format to support it; which requires Interactivity /Exchange to achieve Learning/ Awareness.

All of them have been highly valued for all participants with an average numeric impression of 3.70 out of 5.

COMMENTS ON THE CULTURAL DIMENSION

The Idea had the best (4.2) and most balanced scores regarding how important it is (relevancy- 4. 55); how it contributes to making us aware of the whole we are part of (eco conscious - 4); how it brings something needed and new (innovative – 3.91) and its ability of putting participants into action (propositive -4.36).

The adopted Formats (13.02) managed to Engage (3.36) a diversity of partners and participants; was Pertinent (2.91) to its time; Accessible (2.64) to this diverse group and with enough Aesthetic Power (3.18). The fact that this was the Component with lower score revealed the opportunity of searching for new types of support. On one hand the pandemic caused difficult changes, on the other hand it resulted in developing new formats, with more mastery of digital mediums and infrastructures.

The Interactivity / Exchange Component (3.8) had the ability to Affect (4.18) the participants, by adopting Transmediatic (3.36) means that were very Stimulating (4.27). Not a very high score in Scalable (3.36) is probably because the whole process was more internal amongst participants, not aimed to reach their communities.

Learning/ Awareness (3.77) certainly happened through Experience (3.73) developing more sense of Interdependence (3.36) resulting in (4) findings. That cab be Multiplied (3.91). Highest score in Empathy (4.18) reveals how this was at the core of Reshape.

Relevance was achieved because each prototype has broadened the Concept of the Trajectory it is addressing . They provided new Formats and Interactivity mediums that have contributed to Learning of the whole group. They pointed out that the time to Multiply those findings was not enough.

Cultural dimension not only had the higher score (3.7) but was the one with a bigger frequency of answers and longer comments. The point of attention

here is a tendency to remain in the comfort zone of the known, but to evolve and find gateways we must adventure in lesser-known terrains. The suggestion is that in every stage of a project attention is put on how to go beyond the known. Regarding cultural workers, that means attention in what is tangible, for instance the transactional dimension and what has a more collective scope, going beyond the singularities of the cultural context.

ENVIRONMENTAL DIMENSION

The environmental dimension is the ground, it is where the seeds grow. It is about everything that structures, enables and gives support to an initiative. In this dimension, the environment is understood as what surrounds us, the place we live in, the context, the tools and structures, our bodies and health, everything we rely on to realise ideas. Therefore, by "environment" we do not mean only the natural infrastructure (raw material, natural resources, health) but also the techno infrastructure (physical and virtual).

As this is the dimension of "with what", resources in all 4D that are required to implement our initiative, verifying its Viability. Thus It also includes the set of skills and talents; the tools and infrastructure (physical and digital); the criteria, tools and processes of governance allowing participation and management, and the set of financial and complementary resources constituting a multi capital generating revenue and sustaining the project or initiative.

Components and its Flow: Skills to achieve the purpose; Infrastructure to hold the activities; Coordination to manage the process; Resources to finance it.

In the case of Reshape, the respondents' numeric impressions of the dimension reaches 3.12 out of 5.

COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL DIMENSION

The general 3.12 score of this dimension reveals that the project's Viability was guaranteed, and it had what was required for its implementation.

Diversity of Skills had a 2.88 score, maybe not that high because there was a geographical diversity of players but the majority of them playing similar roles in

their institutions. The answers reveal that more educational and therapeutic skills would be welcome (2.67) as well as design and technological ones (2.67). Because of the profile of partners and reshapers, management skills had the higher score (3.17) followed by soft and communication skills (3.0). While working in the Trajectories and prototypes more specific Skills were required for instance for facilitators, or to help in structuring the sustainability of logistics for distribution of the prototypes.

Regarding Infrastructure (3.18) it was perceived as being Pertinent (3.33) and Efficient (3.00). Lower score to how Multifunctional (2.80) and reusable it was, but the higher score in Shareable (3.60) points a solution as the "sharing" aspect of the environmental dimension can bring the Viability not only through what the initiative already "possesses" but because of what it has "access to" .

Coordination or governance had the highest score in this dimension (3.22) mainly because of its Purpose (3.5) and a balance between Eco Committed (3.13), Diversity Oriented (3.13) and Impact Oriented (3.13). The diversity and integration of partners as well as their close relationship with reshapers was highly praised by the participants and appeared in many answers.

Resources and financial means had the second highest score (3.19) with a huge Intellectual and Research Capital (4.11); strong Social Capital (3.44) due to the many institutions engaged. As the funding was enough there was no need to deepen in how to access Complementary Currencies (2.78) and Techno Natural Resources (2.44) were challenged by the shift to digital due to Covid.

Although Solidarity Economies was a Trajectory, many participants were not aware of the possibilities of the new economies and complementary currencies, which are a very powerful trend for the next few years.

In this dimension we can again observe that some questions regarding Reshape as whole are solved inside the trajectories and prototypes, for instance the creation of the inner circle support group for facilitators.

Here we also verify that the shift to digital was difficult but resulted in rerouting resources to give support to all members which reinforced their possibility of dedicating more time to the project.

SOCIAL DIMENSION

Now that the seed (cultural) has a ground (environmental) we have the cultivation: that's the Social Dimension, the one where we act together. It is the realm of relationships, of what mediates, of behaviours, of the connections between ideas, people and places. Here we find everything that organises and regulates collective action so it includes the Organisational aspect (all constructs and formats of how people can organise themselves) and the Political one (legal and tax framework,

policies, and the media). Key words are "With Whom", since here we have all the players of our ecosystem, as well as the activities to convey what we have produced .

Components and its Flow: the Agreements or principles that engage and regulate the Community of players to organise a set of Activities that result in Exchanges meeting the needs of a diversity of publics.

In the case of Reshape, the numeric impression of the dimension reaches 2.57 out of 5.

COMMENTS ON THE SOCIAL DIMENSION

The Social Dimension had 2.57 as a general score and our perception is that this is partially due to the novelty of handling roles that were unusual, such as being facilitators without proper facilitation skills or the closer relationships with members from the partner institutions.

Even with the pandemics the Activities had the highest score (2.96) by promoting Learning and Creativity (3.33); with Celebrative qualities (3.17); reasonably Eco Responsible (2.83) and understandable lower score regarding Impact or Viability (2.50) since the project was more research oriented than result-oriented design.

Second highest score was on the Agreements (2.57) and the answers reveals that they reached the goals of promoting more Awareness (3.14); Abundant Flow (2.57) of collaboration and sharing which gave the whole process a Regenerative quality (2.57) particularly regarding the mutual support in facing the challenges during the pandemics. Lower score of Adaptability (2.0) was probably because some choices were made by partners while designing the project.

The Component of Exchange/ Publics (2.40) is related to which audiences Reshapes activities and prototypes could reach - and how. Cultural and Educational audiences are the most obvious, therefore with the higher score (3.17) while those related to Environmental dimension had the lowest (1.80) which reveals the need to reinforce the eco conscious aspect. It is clear that those audiences engaged in the common good as Governments and NGOs (2.80) can also be suitable for exchanging the findings and prototypes of each

trajectory while more Commercial audiences (2.0) were not considered as potential channels for them.

The component of Community (2.33) is related to the players, the ecosystem, and diversity of the participants was the core criteria, which explains the kind of low score. Numbers reveal the perception that most of the players belong to the Cultural Dimension (3.33), with less participation from Social Dimension (1.83); Financial Dimension (2.0) and Environmental Dimension (2.17).

The admiration towards the way the two leaders run the process is one proof of the efficiency of Reshape's design, balancing the unavoidable control required to manage things and the freedom needed by creative processes.. Another strong indicator of success is the general feeling that continuity will happen organically due to the profound bounds that were created.

TRANSACTIONAL DIMENSION

The transactional dimension is where we harvest and redistribute the crops , the tangible and intangible results of our initiative. It is the field of resources, sharing, exchange, investment, spending, savings and profit in both the Financial (income and equity in traditional currency) and Multivalues (complementary currencies, crypto, resources and value in 4D). This dimension focuses on the Impact, verifying the efficiency of our initiative evaluated by the wise use of its resources in 4D as well as it's efficacy evaluated by the 4D results achieved over time. It looks into the reproducibility,, the long-term effect of the initiative, and its capacity to generate change.

Components and its flow : the Reputation which brings value and credit for the initiative; the tangible and intangible Assets in all the 4D and how they are invested and provide Combined Action/ Distribution of resulting products and services which turns into Sustainability and long-term impact.

In the case of Reshape, the numeric impression of the dimension reaches 2.65 out of 5.

COMMENTS ON THE TRANSACTIONAL DIMENSION

The average score for this dimension was 2.65 which is good considering what was pointed above: the goal was to have the experiments, learnings and

prototypes of each Trajectory available so that the players could do the next round of making them available to their communities.

Again the Component related to the cultural dimensional, the Reputation, had the highest score (3.15) with Reshape having the attributes of being Coherent (4.0); Long Term (3.60); Diverse (2.80) and Regenerative (2.20).

The Lowest Score was in Sustainability (2.19) , understandable for a subsidised project that has the privilege of not suffering the more "for profit" pressures of generating Recurrent Revenue (1.50), be Time Effective (1.75) or Cost Effective (2.25). Concerning Cocreated Metrics (3.25) the high score shows that this was done democratically.

The component named as "Combined Actions" (2.44) by the evaluation group originally refers to marketing or what an initiative requires to reach its audience thus resulting both in its sustainability and impact over time. That word caused reactions and was excluded, which reveals the need – and the opportunity – of going beyond the known and amplifying the skills and repertoire of many cultural players. Even though this component was not very clear, numbers show that Reshape managed to meet the Demands (2.75) of the participants; with potential to reach Communities (2.50) with enough Management (2.50) to overcome the difficulties of available Channels (2.00).

Remarkable scores regarding Assets (2.81) reveal that the available resources had the rare quality of transparency, being Visible (3.25) ; with Ethical Use (3.00); Innovative distribution (2.75) and were Well Managed (2.25). By the compilation of the answers, we see that this last not so high score is probably related to the significant part of the budget consumed by logistics and infrastructure.

The data visualisation that synthesises the evaluation shows that the general score for the Cultural and Environmental was higher than Social and Transactional. In Layers 2 and 3 this also happens, please note that the orange (cultural) is always bigger and the purple(social) and blue (transactional) are smaller. This pattern is usually observed while working with projects and players that act mainly in the cultural dimension: they have more difficulty dealing with the Transactional Dimension. And vice versa.
We nicknamed this the abyss between "projectland" (the ones engaged in creating solutions) and "businessland" (the ones engaged in implementing and scaling up them). The moment there is an understanding that they are

not opposite to each other but complementary, the very urgent bridge between them will emerge. Considering that culture is the matrix of society it may then best reach its purpose of contributing to reshaping the future.

A FUTURE PERSPECTIVE

A few advisory perspectives.

First, I would like to congratulate RESHAPE for its design and the outcomes and innovations it produced in all of the 4D: cultural, environmental, social and transactional. And celebrate the privilege of observing, contributing and learning from the experience of this Prototype inspired by FARO[1]'s research.

Evaluation is actually sense-making: we learn while designing, applying and interpreting the data. This sense making allows us to better design next steps and choose what and how they can be implemented and which goals they intend to reach. In the case of RESHAPE this second round will happen inside the initiatives of the partners and reshapers who can benefit from this evaluation.

For an initiative to grow, it needs to jump from an operational stage, focused in materialising whatever it aims for, to a strategic one, where the focus is no longer in the "What" we do, but in "How" we do it. It will be strategic if this "How" is capable of bringing more value in all the 4D. When this happens, it opens up in a conic spiral with many rounds that can expand as a Fibonacci. An evaluation tool brings "credit" to the previous phase and points out possibilities for the next round.

One first result is the possibility of a story telling in 4D, capable of providing better and wider understanding while describing the process, its outcomes and impact in all the four dimensions. This is more effective than a non-multidimensional narrative and the traditional numbers to describe results such as how many participants, how many events, how much audience.

---

[1] Fluxonomy Applied to Redesigning Organisations, an Ibero American Learning Community from the cultural sector.

With the storytelling in hand, and the data they provide, it is easier to influence public policies, as well as contributing to their design. This is one of the main reasons for the creation of Fluxonomy, designed to attend to certain needs perceived while working for governments and multilateral organisations such as the UN.

Aside from the evaluation itself we envision many possibilities for this Prototype, for instance as a diagnosis tool that can scan and depict something in all its four dimensions. But probably a very powerful application would be as a design tool.

Some of the words and concepts that are part of it can cause some oddness in an evaluation but are certainly inspiring and provocative for creative and educational purposes. The Matrix in its three fractal levels may inspire creation while simultaneously providing the road map on how to implement, monitor and reorient processes according to the intended goals. Since 2019 the FARO community is already working on that, with the 4D "Percetometers" a set of tools for education and mediation in arts, being applied at schools and local communities, mainly in Spain.

We always use the Matrix for diagnosis and design, mainly in innovation journeys for organisations, territories, and corporations who wish to design new strategies, products or services. Which one is the most suitable, is perceived by verifying five main criteria: Viability, Impact, Relevance, Reach and Longevity. Those criteria are also the roots of Reshape's Evaluation Prototype.

Another future use of this Prototype is in the design of policies and/or applications for support that can be structured around its Dimensions and Components. This could develop candidates' broader and more inclusive perspectives, with more sustainable and impactful proposals. It would also be easier to select them and later evaluate their results.

A further strategic issue revealed by Fluxonomy lenses is the opportunity of including players from other areas than culture and arts. This brings along a diversity of skills, communities and possible partners that belong to other areas of society. We also found out that one of the most potent ways of having a thriving community is by providing continuous exchange between them, as well as the convergence of their talents and assets in common projects. But

similar groups have and need the same things, so this flow is rapidly exhausted.

Reshape's evaluation points to the need for more balance by including players with "maker skills", dealing with infrastructure and regeneration such as designers, architects, tech workers, production engineers. And a strong need for "entrepreneurial skills" such as marketing, accounting, sales, and investment. This is particularly needed to balance one of the side effects of culture and arts being usually subsidised: the risk of causing a hypotrophy of the entrepreneurial abilities.

The framework of the 4D Matrix allows us to become aware of our blind spots, since we tend to search and connect with what we like and avoid what we don't. But many times, what we like is not what we need. When we go through these blind spots, we find unseen opportunities. Daring to find those blind spots is also a step for artists and creators that want to go beyond their own biases. Especially important skill if we remember that art and culture have a strong participation in shaping the matrix of society, so narrow biases must then be avoided.

Although there is a general perception that methods may restrain creativity, they actually provide the structure for creativity to happen. To evolve every system requires a perception or "sense making" system that collects and organises data and applies them to orient better choices and self-regulation. Systemic methods, such as Fluxonomyv4D, can play that role.

During Reshapes process the fact that there were no predefined structures or methods resulted in self organisation and innovation, particularly in the relationship between partners and reshapers plus the "hows to" of the facilitators role. But this required a lot of time, and not much time was left to the sharing and spreading of the learnings and Prototypes. Maybe the use of methods designed to support without interfering could imply the optimization of time, teams and resources.

Cultural environments usually emphasise their uniqueness and singularity, so FARO and Reshape Evaluation Group did a gigantic and inspiring work in unfolding Fluxonomy original twenty-five evaluation components/criteria in three levels and 64 criteria specific for culture. Later, in the beginning of the evaluation process they were adjusted to more generic ones. We have the

feeling that the result was mid-way and it would be best to use the original one as a framework and road map to education and creativity purposes.

As for the evaluating system we originally use a simpler one, with 25 criteria organised in a 5 x 5 table that combines the four dimensions plus the axis of the desirable future aimed by the initiative. Fluxonomy intends to design tools that can help us find what we have in common, since one of our main goals is to foster collective ability of converging towards common goals. After this very rich experience we still perceive that more universal criteria, names and definitions are required, so that they can be applied to initiatives from any sector or scope. If a policy maker or city hall must decide to invest in urban design, health care or art it will require comparable criteria. And this is feasible combining definitions borrowed from different repertoires, some more "cultural/innovative" as "Affectiveness" other more "transactional/conventional" as "Marketable".

To evaluate is to give credit, to believe in. We can come back to the Latin roots "credere" shared by the words credit and create. May the 4D Matrix and its lenses allow as clear choices in which creations invest our credit so that we can build futures that are both desirable and achievable.

DATA VISUALISATION

Numeric impressions on Graph
A graphic output of an evaluation developed for the prototype has been released on 8 December and will be in constant development as the FARO group continues to reflect on data visualisation in 4 dimensions. For this evaluation it is already reflecting the quantitative numeric overall impressions from Reshape participants.
They can be seen in this interactive report:

https://socio-graph.net/outros/Reshape/v4/reshape.html

Numeric representations are taken from the respondents at two moments, once in an initial round of questions which is the trigger for first reflection on all aspects to be analysed. In the second round of attributing figures, participants are triggered for a more complex reflection for short written answers that follow, which are the most significant data for the evaluation. The figures given in the second round are the ones included in the graphic visualisation presented.

For us, non numeric graphic visualisation is preferred over the numeric, where by a scheme of circles and colours different values and components are represented in bigger or smaller parts. These four dimensions are intertwined and interdependent in such a way that any change in one of them, affects and has consequences in the other three. Each sphere of reality repeats the structure of four spheres within itself, with its cultural, environmental, social and financial aspects within each one, it is fractal.

The representation in numbers and scale are at this point merely indicative. The effectiveness of this numeric feature of the evaluation is still to be proven in the future, once the prototype starts to be used by other projects, organisations and initiatives. The development group will be able to evaluate better once many projects are analysed. Reshape is the seed experience.

The qualitative report is for us the one with more significance, which is being prepared by our group of 6 people, in collaboration with designers and developers. That will have summaries of 16 points and analytical views which will better represent the universe of participants' views, suggestions and ideas about Reshape. That will be presented in a second document with the final report.

This visualisation tool is also presenting Selected Sentences connected to each section evaluated, which help to give an insight of the main points looked at by respondents at a glance of each section.

Reshape's overall numeric impression was of 200 out of a possible maximum of 320.

The relative balance between the 4 dimensions in the Reshape's evaluation is clear in the graphs presented. Predominance of the cultural dimension in orange colour is clear, followed by the environmental dimension in green colour.

Dimensions
Each dimension can have a maximum numeric evaluation of 5, an average of all numeric impressions from its four internal dimensions:

CULTURAL: 3.70
ENVIRONMENTAL: 3.12
SOCIAL: 2.57
TRANSACTIONAL: 2.65

As mentioned the figures are not as relevant as the qualitative data, therefore they are not so visible in the Graph, but they can be seen by leaving the arrow over a section for a few seconds.

Components
There are 16 components, four for each dimension, which can have a maximum numeric evaluation of 80, they can be seen in the second circle layer and can be accessed by clicking in each dimension and diving into the fractal.

Forces or Qualities
There are 64 forces, four for each component, which can have a maximum numeric evaluation of 5, they can be seen in the third circle layer and can be accessed by clicking in each dimension and diving into the fractal.

Selected Sentences
The qualitative element of the Graph comes in the form of Selected Sentences related to each dimension and component. The methodology for arriving at the Selected Sentences still needs to be improved, with few procedures such as word clouding and AI support that could not be fully developed at this point due to the

little amount of information fed through the prototype to date. These processes can be improved in the future once a larger number of projects have been evaluated using the tool. For this evaluation most of the process was done manually and the analysers had to look for sentences for each forces, not only inside their relevant questions, but throughout the whole data.

Future possible visualisations

It is important also to mention that the tool used for this visualisation may grow in the future and incorporate new features and data connection which the Reshape evaluation may also benefit from, with new connections and ways to visualise the already existing data. That may come in newer versions of the prototype, which are being designed in response to the initial experience with Reshape.

Development of the visualisation

The development of the Graph tool for data visualisation for the prototype was developed by Tiago Pimentel, who may continue collaborating with the development group and FARO to develop further possible visualisations and connections to the data analysed.

BRIEF PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF THE PROTOPYPE

As mentioned in the introduction and methodology texts, during the process we have identified many points to improve in the prototype itself and also in the methodology applied to collect the answers.

The development process for the prototype will be fully evaluated after the final adjustments are done by the group following completion of this present evaluation of the Reshape project as a whole. The prototype's effectiveness is going to be evaluated by the group in the near future, using the experience of this present evaluation of Reshpe as well as other smaller projects to be evaluated with the tool in the first semester of 2022. The interim and final Reshape evaluations will be very important for that matter.

The analysis methodology was successfully used by FARO members prior to developing the prototype in a few tests with their own projects. They did not use

the prototype website which did not exist, but the table of dimensions, components and forces that inspired the prototype.

There are two great difference between those prior evaluations and the one we performed by Reshape:

- Many of the projects evaluated before were built using Fluxonomy as a method and parameter for evaluating;
- All respondents were totally familiarised with the Fluxonomy terminology.

Our experience with Reshape has proven that procedures made for projects not using Fluxonomy on its conception need to be revised and simplified and that most concepts and ideas arising from Fluxonomy need a great deal of explanation and contextualisation to be understood by the participants. During our process of Evaluating Reshape we encountered problems at several levels, and many adjustments were necessary to try to mitigate the two problems. Our preliminary impression is that FARO researchers still need to work on all 64 forces composing the matrix and work out ways to make all concepts introduction more attractive and welcoming, generating willingness to answer and reflection throughout the this relatively lengthy evaluation process - it may take between 2 to 3 hours to answer all questions even for people who are able to understand all and are used with the fluxonomy concepts.

The language needs to be simplified better than what we have achieved, the help system, audios and videos still need a lot of improvements. It is not accessible and attractive enough to keep the interviewees motivated to stay a long time working on the prototype.

We also noticed that in places where there are those "blind spots" regarding some of the forces and components people tend not to talk about that element, of its lacking in the project, leaving just a numeric value, which is then complicated for the analysis.

The structural design must also have some improvements in order to produce this stimulating characteristic that we value in the forces and achieve good answering results. We also must try to reduce the minimum time needed to answer all questions. In the Reshape evaluation process we were saved by the dynamics proposed with the online interviews. Had we depended only on voluntary online interviews where people evaluate alone, there would have been insufficient data.

Our group will continue to work with FARO and the technical team to improve the prototype, prepare a plan with new changes needed and look for the extra

resources for that. The goal is to produce a more accessible, attractive and stimulating version 3 of the prototype before we start collecting new data from new projects, so that the next evaluations will produce better data through the new prototype version.

We envisage to evaluate a dozen projects with this version 3, then make a final prototype analysis with recommendations of final improvements to launch it as a proper evaluation tool. The calendar for that process is still to be devised and depending on the support to be received for that.

We believe the tool will have a long life, hopefully reaching out not only to organisations currently using fluxonomy but any kind of initiatives and projects.

CREDITS

RESHAPE is a partnership of intermediary arts organisations who support the development of the arts sector in their countries or regions. It is a research and development project to jointly create innovative organisational models and reflect on concrete answers to crucial challenges related to the production, distribution and presentation of contemporary art practices by rethinking its instruments and collaborative models.

FARO is a learning community that develops tools to create, manage, train, evaluate and orient projects and institutions. An Innovation Laboratory for the search for new metrics to calculate the value of culture as an axis of social transformation based on Fluxonomy methodology, the project involves 14 Ibero-American cultural initiatives (5 cultural institutions, 2 festivals, 5 independent projects, 2 self-managed projects), from 7 different countries: Spain, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, France and Cuba.

This website is one of the five prototypes developed in the framework of RESHAPE, it was made possible with a conjunction of resources with the support of FARO, Fluxonomia 4D, RESHAPE's budget during the period 2019-20, own contributions of Reshapers and a conjunction of extra support coming from Reshape's prototyping, conference budgets and Pro Helvetia. It is a work in progress, and it will continue to be developed and improved over the next years.

Research and development by RESHAPERS and FARO members : Claire Zerhouni, Eduardo Bonito, Isabel Ferreira, Katarina Pavic, Lala Deheinzelin, and Livia Diniz

Researchers : Mónica Pérez Blanquer, Silvina Martínez, Cristina Alonso, Iara Solano, Fernando Garcia, Elena Carmona

Prototype coordination : Lívia Diniz

FARO's visual Identity : Rafael Frazão

Data VIsualizations : Tiago Pimentel

Website design : Mladen Katanić

Website programing : Slobodna domena (Marko Vuković and Stjepan Vrljičak)

FARO'S ASSOCIATED PARTNERS

Fluxonomia 4D, Brazil

BAC Biennale of Arts of the Body, Image and Movement, Madrid, Spain

Consortium of Museums Comunitat Valenciana, Valencia, Spain

Feboasoma, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Graner Artistic Residences Center, Barcelona, Spain

Invisible Pedagogies, Madrid, Spain

mARTadero project, Cochabamba, Bolivia

NAVE Artistic Residences Center, Santiago, Chile

LABEA – Art and Ecology Laboratory, Catalonia and Pamplona Spain

Salmon Festival, Barcelona, Spain

Teatre L'artesá, El Prat de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain

Teatro de la Abadia, Madrid, Spain

Uniflux, São Paulo, Brazil