EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by Eduardo Bonito, Claire Malika Zerhouni, Isabel Ferreira, Katarina Pavić and Livia Diniz
With contribution of Lala Deheinzelin

20 December 2021

INTRODUCTION AND ANALYSIS

THANKS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND CREDITS

METHODOLOGY AND OUTLOOK OF THE EVALUATION'S EVOLUTION

GRAPHIC NUMERIC IMPRESSIONS AND GRAPHIC DATA VISUALISATION

RESHAPE EVALUATION FOCUS GROUP REPORT

QUOTES BY OBJECTIVES

BRIEF PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF THE PROTOPYPE

INTRODUCTION AND ANALYSIS

••

This document is an evaluation process of the Reshape project as a whole, using the prototype of 4D Evaluation created by members of Reshape's Fair Governance Trajectory in collaboration with the FARO learning community.

We are very grateful to all the Reshape partners and communities for the opportunity of transforming the original prototype paper description into a real web based online tool that may have a life of its own, as well as the trust invested in our work, allowing us to perform this evaluation of Reshape.

We thank enormously all the people who took part in the prototype development process who have dedicated endless hours at the end of such a complicated year.

We also show our gratitude to all Reshape colleagues who participated in focus groups, interviews, workshops and answered the form online with such generosity and honesty. All their data have been kept confidential and only seen by the group of six people performing the analysis to configure this 4D fractal of opinions, thoughts and impressions.

Reshape was about experimenting and producing tools to change imbalances of the art world. So, how did it correspond with its communities? Did it facilitate certain processes? Where is it pointing to? Concentrate on Reshape as a process, we are evaluating its implementation and results and shared experiences from both, personal and general points of view.

Our evaluation process for Reshape started at its final stage, during the last four months of the whole Reshape process, starting in the month leading up to its final conference and finalising when the final report was about to be delivered to the European Commission. During this period, our group has been at the same time developing the prototype's website for evaluation and preparing the Reshape project's evaluation.

Our goal is to co-produce knowledge about the process we've been experiencing all together for the past 2 years. Evaluation is not an event or a method: it is considered as a transformative attitude towards change that is adopted as a collective state of mind. The idea is to go beyond the usual indicators to work on a 4D Fluxonomy Matrix based on fractal thinking, involving thinking about Cultural, Social, Environmental and Transactional dimensions of the project.

Main elements of the process:

- Group formats with 2 variations: Focus Group and Workshops gathering groups of main actors of Reshape Universe.
- Interviews with main actors of Reshape Universe (online tool will be used to process the interviews).
- Voluntary individual participation through the prototype's online tool, which features detailed presentation of the 4D methodology as well as questionnaire and a scalable surveying tool.

Each of these steps are described in more detail in this report at the methodology annex.

The methodology is based on 4D Fluxonomy theory developed by Lala Dehenzelin, who has contributed to the report and evaluation, and on the evaluation prototype developed by the Fair Governance Evaluation sub-group in partnership with FARO - Learning Community during the RESHAPE process as one of its main tools.

The prototype map and initial set of values were published in the final part of the text Evaluation — Actors, Values, and Metrics published by our group on Reshape's publication and website. It starts with an examination of modes, values, methods, and metrics of evaluation with an aim to develop more organic, bottom-up led evaluation practices in arts and culture. That involved a series of interviews with practitioners active in different countries of Europe and the MENA region. With the interviews we wanted to accomplish two main objectives which informed the prototype's creation: learning about participants' practices and attitudes with regard to evaluation processes, and learning about the context in which participants operate, including the nuances about the functioning of the cultural ecosystems in different geographies.

In general terms the prototype aims to value culture as a key element in our ecosystem for social transformation, through the creation of new applied metrics capable of attributing value to our cultural projects, focusing on the reformulation of future policies, public and private, towards a multidimensional paradigm shift.

Specific Objectives:

1. Create a common language for a new methodology to create, manage and evaluate cultural and artistic projects.

2. Form a research unit on metrics that articulates qualitative and quantitative parameters in their true resonance.

3. Create a template - matrix to analyse cultural projects through a shared methodology.

4. Introduce the metrics to different institutions with the intention of establishing a prototype to be applied and researched.

The prototype can be accessed by the following link, which has been available for the Reshape participants since the end of November 2021 :

https://faro.reshape.network/

During the process we have identified many points to improve in the prototype itself and also in the methodology applied to collect the answers which are summarised in the annex, but 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 Reshape 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.

We have also produced a graphic output reflecting data visualisation in 4 dimensions, with 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

As we conclude in the Graph Visualisation explanation annex, the representation in numbers and scale are at this point merely indicative. Although the qualitative report is for us the one with more significance, we will start the overall analysis looking at these values.

Reshape's overall numeric impression was 3.01 of a possible maximum of 5. The relative balance between the 4 dimensions in the Reshape's evaluation is clear in the graphs presented. Predominance of the cultural dimension with 3.70 is clear, followed by the environmental dimension with 3.12.

Each dimension had the following averages:

CULTURAL: 3.70
ENVIRONMENTAL: 3.12
SOCIAL: 2.57

TRANSACTIONAL: 2.65

The fact that certain dimensions had been evaluated with a lower numerical value in comparison to the others does not necessarily mean the actions in those fields were less effective in relation to its objectives. Many times it can be related to the fact the fluxonomy as a methodology brought a new level of complexity to the project that at times wasn't easily grasped.

In this Report Lala's contributions will appear in boxes, starting with the purpose and structure of Fluxonomy and the Evaluation Prototype plus comments on how it works.

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.

Relevance for a world in transition (idea)
The world is in a continuous process of change; we are living an unprecedented transition in human history that is producing a huge change in our society and with great speed that adds to the uncertainty. How are all these changes affecting our cultural lives, production of arts and culture and the relations between the actors in the field? In this sense, one of the most highly evaluated aspects of the idea behind Reshape´s project is its relevance, as it is clearly seen that there was a need to open spaces for reflection on the subject in an articulated way and through the convergence of different actors.

Proof of this relevance is that the desire to carry the project out finds resonance with the needs of the community to which it is addressed:

> "*The idea resonated with my own problems at the moment I applied, it also resonated with the field. It proposed other ways for us to work, to get funds, to travel and exchange.*"

> "*I've always had the feeling that the idea of Reshape grew out of the urgency that people working internationally were feeling and sharing. This sort of urgency on how we are now working and how to shift this. Maybe there is a possibility to do this on our own, but maybe we can do this together. And maybe there is a possibility of doing this within the Creative Europe program. I think it was quite idealistic.*"

Participants' general perception is that the project has been successful in creating creative, warm and safe spaces to act collectively. Its dual nature of space for reflection and actions that could lead to specific tools to improve the cultural ecosystem has also been celebrated.

Reshape is seen as a courageous and innovative initiative as it differs from other large scale projects financed in the scope of Creative Europe: "it is not focused in producing art but in building communities to discuss important topics". And the fact that the initiative financially awards these spaces for discussion has been considered as a change maker that should be standardised.

> "There are the results but there are messages that the project wants to communicate merely through its existence. We want to communicate ideas not through activities, but through the fact that it's here. The fact that we set up the project gathering certain actors that are developing tools to change the future of the sector. That conveys a message."

> "For me the most important thing about the idea of the project, and most helpful and inspiring, was the fact to give ourselves time, to reevaluate how we work in the cultural sector. (...) Many projects are not focused on this part. I found this unique, innovative, and something that was inspiring throughout the whole project."

> "Reshape is a very welcome initiative because it offers the opportunity for single initiatives, or bigger initiatives who work together in a grassroot way, to know that you're not alone, building a network of mutual understanding is very important in the concept of Reshape."

Learning on the Go: knowhow and awareness (learning)
Participants valued highly the fact that the project was designed to be learning oriented and to raise their own awareness, and of the cultural sector as a whole.

> "It was an extreme privilege to have access to all the brains and diverse experiences of the group. Knowledge, expertise, that was put on the table. Space to let the knowledge and expertise happen".

> "You're sitting somewhere in an institution that is considered unmovable, but did we create the opportunities to plant the idea into institutions' minds that they need to change? Ask themselves the questions that they never asked themselves before. Will the project inspire people in the institutions to take a closer look at the independent cultural actors?"

The participants also valued the space dedicated to imagination and creativity and the fact that "there was a very big room for experimentation". The project let "the most creative among us be creative, even the ones who are not".

Project design (format +Interactivity)
The project was created with the idea of giving to "the participants the option to be free to think about their goals and methods to achieve it". In this sense, its nature of open process has been generally well valued, but has also generated some comments on its efficiency to achieve the project's goals. For some of the people open processes and principles can also generate confusion:

> *"I appreciated in the beginning that it was a collaborative work, an open process, tackling general and practical issues. It gave perspective of the other side of the field. Good idea and bridge of communicating."*

> *"Not having designated endings in prototype development was very stimulating."*

> *"Maybe less openness and more framework could have helped slightly the process. Because we felt that we would always start from scratch, because of how wide and open the possibilities were."*

> *"... to bring 8-9 people together and open the floor to make them talk about and collaborate on a certain topic, required another format or time we did not have in the project. The participants took this time to establish a common ground, which was positive. But this took time on the time that was given to work in the workshops and make the prototypes. Some frustrations came out of this. When we came to work deeply on the ideas that we agreed on, the time was very scarce. This goes to the design of the project. It was not a total fail, but for sure it required some other formats that we did not foresee".*

On the other hand, others felt a certain lack of flexibility and adaptability of the project´s design to be able to carry out the work. Some felt they were reaching a space where many of the decisions had already been made. Partners were aware of this limitation and "tried to be as adaptable as possible. As a result, the project was a constant exercise in negotiation and reaffirmation of trust".

> *"The input of Reshapers was the core of the project, but they came into a preset design". "You had to have a pre-designed tool. This was also a way to get money from the (European) commission (...). But that part of the governance was missing. In a project like this, a massively important part of the community is coming after that. We all took a lot of time, therefore, renegotiating the framework. It was a long process and it took a lot of time".*

Other people expressed having found flexibility within their own group:

"We made agreements within our group. There was adaptability within our group. I don't think it was a rigid project".

Furthermore, the organisation of the collective actions based on the initial agreements were, logically, very affected by the appearance of a very powerful external factor such as Covid-19 pandemic.

"The project was totally different from the initial design because of COVID (…) We did the best with the conditions we had."

In terms of its geographic scope, participants, in general, appreciated the concept of being a broader European project involving people from the South Mediterranean and having a constellation of associated people coming from different organisations.

For the group that envisaged the project, a comprehensive geographic balance was a necessity for the partner institutions and an opportunity for them to go through "a learning process" that they could later replicate and emulate:

"Reshape made us gain new insights into the knowledge being produced in unsuspected places. (…) I see that as a change. For me there is huge potential in this, and there was an acknowledgement that came from this."

On the other hand, some people felt a certain imbalance in the scope that would "lean towards the Anglo-Saxon side, even though the leadership was more Eastern European". And some others expressed some confusion concerning the choice of including practitioners coming from/working in the MENA region where the context, realities, and priorities differ, sometimes drastically.

"I felt that there is a very high awareness, and a space for equal participation, and ethical management. But I felt like, why? I love the good intention, "let's have our neighbours from the Mediterranean…" But we did not talk about dictatorship, or Sissi… but the ecology and the carbon footprint. It's not that I don't care, we are aware of the ecology, but our reality for the arts is that you can risk your life. I could talk about this, and there was room open for this. But there is no relevance. Even in terms of ratio, if we have 40 Reshapers and only 3 from the MENA region, who are already «European style participants». How is this relevant to my context? Maybe I have to play a bigger role to make it relevant, to try to introduce the prototypes to art institutions, and implement it in my context ? But it was developed in a completely different socio-economic context and culture. The resources and partners are European."

"I can say that considering all these topics, and having people from different parts of Europe and MENA, this was really enriching in terms of knowledge to understand how different contexts need different solutions. Or something that seems very plausible in one organisation might be impossible in another (…) it opened my eyes on how something that might be labelled as an undesirable practice in my context, might be the only way to survive for someone in another context. This required a lot of openness. It helped me to understand how the cultural sector functions in different contexts."

COMMENTS:

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.

Multiple skills: in and out of reach (skills + Infrastructure + resources)
Most of the interviewees recognised that Reshape's main resource was its Intellectual and Research Capital, and underlined how the project gave access to knowledge, experiences, expertises, mostly from the creative sector. This Capital also includes the ability to research and document, in conjunction with the knowledge and experiences brought by the participants and actors that made up Reshape's universe. Along with this Capital comes a set of skills and competencies, identified as

belonging to the creative, artistic and cultural sectors, that is also seen as largely available, contributing to the learning and experimentation process.

The strength of Reshape seems to have indeed gathered within the same universe a large number of stakeholders and players who, thanks to the strength and the geographic diversity of its ecosystem were able to contribute with their skills: the advisors, facilitators, reshapers, partners and external people included in the Directory of the website.

However, for some of the interviewees some skills were not always easy to access. First because the connection between the different players felt sometimes difficult, as for example, with the advisors or the website Directory members. The interviewees raised the issue of the lack of connection between all different actors, and referred to it as a failure of the project, limiting the research process, experimentations, and potential innovation.

> *"I regret that I have not been in contact more with the advisors, they were from very different fields and they had those skills that could have brought the project further."*

> *"Reshape also has a catalogue/network of organisations of freelancers or artists that were interesting but we didn't have access, they could have brought more experiences, we were not encouraged to get in contact and share with them."*

In general, when asked about intellectual and research capital, some participants stated that these were the most used and accessible resources in the project, while others believe that it could have been further explored.

> *"But I don't think that we fully exploited potential available resources to fully have an impact and encourage innovation."*

Finally, and maybe as a consequence from the lack of flexibility the infrastructure is not seen by the participants as multifunctional, multimedia. The structure is overall seen as traditional, putting in question its efficiency and adaptability.

> *"The possibility of multifunctionality, multimedia maybe wasn't explored as much, we could have thought of many other ways to develop the infrastructure that wasn't so traditional."*

Mobility, a core element of the structure, a limit to eco-commitment (infrastructure)

Mobility was a core element of the Reshape project, and most of the activities were designed for different groups to work in diverse contexts. The evaluation shows that, regardless of interests of participants to travel and meet actors in different places, the fact that the project was based on mobility in a context of climate and environmental crisis does not confer a big eco-commitment to the project.

> *"The idea of commons for the project was very positive, but in the ecological context there were problems, generated through a lot of travel, etc.. I don't know how you can solve this, because this is at the core of the project."*

> *"All the logistic that was put in to the mobility of the Reshape community to meet, before covid and for the conference, I wonder if we couldn't have reused it for more sustainable purposes, maybe if the infrastructure itself had been reshaped, and we could have worked on that in the meetings."*

Digital Switch: challenges and opportunities (infrastructure + resources)
This issue around the lack of flexibility and the insufficiency of multifunctionality of the structure, can explain the difficulties caused by the digital switch, during the COVID 19 crisis forbidding mobility. The evaluation shows two main consequences of this switch. The first one, the strong impact of the digital switch on participants' motivation. One explanation that emerges from the interviews is that the infrastructure was not sufficient to enable adaptation to this switch. It resulted in the *"pure translation of the meetings from physical to online"*, while the lack of mobility and contact with the outside world transformed Reshape into *"more of a closed circle"*.

This switch is also seen as a big factor in the transformation of the work process, and the necessity for the groups themselves to come up with tools and solutions. For some of the interviewees though, it allowed more focus on the production of outcomes.

> *"Also different groups who were working separately were supposed to meet and reflect about their ideas, and it was lacking. It was left to their initiative."*

> *"It turned out as a lucky coincidence that we were not too busy organising the workshops and conference but focused on showing the results on the website and editing the book."*

To some extent, the switch was also seen as an opportunity, especially when it comes to opening conversations, or experimenting within the organisation of the project itself, that might have not been possible otherwise.

"Although it was terrible in many ways, it may have contributed to opening conversations, and maybe contributed to better infrastructure, for instance about the negotiation about remuneration that we had. Without COVID, it would have been far harder to negotiate this also with the partners. It opened opportunities that were interesting and reinforcing the sense of the community."

Participation and Decision-Making tools (coordination)

In terms of governance, the evaluation reveals a certain diversity of tools and processes defined and implemented according to the roles played by participants in Reshape.

Among the partners, *consensus* and *shared values* seem to have shaped the participation and decision-making processes, without *necessarily rules/written agreement.*

For facilitators, the participation tools and processes seemed a little more limited. First, because the framework did not allow for a completely free participation in the trajectory. This is a comment that was also brought up during the focus-group. The evaluation also seems to point to another specificity of this group: an organic and internal support and decision group, not necessarily created within the infrastructure itself, but by the participants in response to the lack of a dedicated support structure.

"How we ended up in the groups was random, that was an obstacle. Not everybody who ended up in my group did not choose the trajectory as a first choice. The framework limited what we could have shared otherwise, if everyone was more committed to the notion of the trajectory."

"It was helpful in all the mess and growing responsibilities that we had as facilitators to have the facilitators' inner circle / support group."

The evaluation also reveals that the input of Reshapers, first thought as the core of the project, could finally not be taken into account, as they were not around the table when the project was designed. The project was designed essentially by partners, who, forced by the criteria of the funding institutions, had to deliver a pre-set design. The evaluation shows that one of the consequences of this is that negotiation became a tool to establish trust, but also ensure adaptability and guarantee the openness of the process.

"There were a lot of negotiations throughout the process, we did not foresee all of them and provide in advance tools to manage it."

"We tried to be as adaptable as possible. As a result, the project was a constant exercise in negotiation and reaffirmation of trust."

Financial Support : an incentive for commitment (resources)
The financial support given to all the roles involved was highly appreciated and is considered as a means for encouragement and support to commitment.

"The fact that Reshape chose to remunerate every single role involved helped the efficiency, it is very rare for a project of this kind to offer a remuneration and the commitment was supported by that."

Resources / budget
When resources for the prototypes were discussed, participants pointed out that when travel was not possible, there was flexibility to re-interpret, work and re-use the budget and there was more money made available in the end, for the people who were engaged.

Platforms and networks of dissemination (infrastructure + coordination)
Participants say that *smaller groups and networks of synergies that were created will continue further*. However, some participants wonder if enough samples of the prototypes and the books were produced and made available. The question of reach of the physical outcomes, in countries where traditional mailing is difficult for example, was also raised.

"There are a lot of platforms for the tools that were created, and places where they can be disseminated."

"It's not a traditional financial support, but we are really committed to implement these results and continue further than the network."

"Logistically it is impossible to have someone send me anything in (country) by mail."

COMMENTS:

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.

Reshape ecosystem (community)
The participants' general perception is that Reshape succeeded in creating a strong ecosystem "building a network of mutual understanding" and the affective bonds between people that emerged from it are seen as one of its most highly valued points. These bonds were seen as "extremely effective and helpful during COVID times" and in some people´s opinion, they will last for a long time.

> *"Smaller groups and networks of synergies were created that will continue further, and I found that very important."*

> *"I have no idea in which form but I feel it has the potential to live beyond the end and make other types of collaborations, the reshape feeling will continue inhabiting us and give birth to more opportunities and possibilities".*

The project opened doors and potentials for different kind of stimulating exchanges:

> *"As a Reshaper, I was impacted a lot by the people I got to meet and interact with. I had a lot of interactions".*

> *"I find it stimulating to have so many views on the table, to experience different environments, to listen to people, be in the environment, and sample different views. There were lots of voices that I could listen to. It was very stimulating".*

The Reshape ecosystem was rich, made out of a lot of of people from many different countries but in some participant´s opinion it lacked diversity and here are some comments in this regard:

> *"… we were kind of lacking diversity. No matter how the different perspectives were broad, disciplines we're working, personal involvement, emotional things, but still a flat community. When it comes to the age, the social background, it was a pretty flat bubble."*

"Participants tended to be people from the public sector space, subsidised funding spaces, there were no cultural and creative industries, like advertising and other for profits."

But to activate the potential of the project to collaborate with other actors beyond the cultural field, to work with people outside of the independent cultural sector bubble, to gain a broader diversity, was seen by some partners as something more difficult than expected.

"COVID happened, but still even before COVID, it was hard to reach out to people who were working in and outside our sector. Whenever we tried to talk to someone outside of our networks, we ended up being in our circles. It was surprising for me, how difficult it is to not see everything through the lenses of the arts and culture".

Relationships (agreements + community)
In the realm of relationships and the capacity of doing things together, we can observe a strong ambivalence in the responses. The care policies that were put in place are extensively celebrated and very much appreciated especially when the pandemic arrived; the strong affective ties that were created and the existence of safe spaces to hear and to be heard are also highly valued aspects of the project. But, on the other hand, the difficulty of establishing more empathic relationships among all the multiple layers of the Reshape universe has been an ongoing issue throughout the project and one of its biggests challenges. This ambivalence is reflected in the following quotes:

"At the same time, some people were generous and caring, not all were negative. People would come and offer their support. There was a real sense of camaraderie when it came to finishing the prototypes".

"About the synergy among the groups involved: yes and no - people worked together and that fact was very special. On the other hand, there was a clear division between different types of collaborators and building trust among these different groups was a lot of work".

Various comments talk about the division among the different Reshape actors, especially among some reshapers and partners.

"People had their experiences with how partners dominated the processes in their countries. My point of view was that we're all in this together, but many people felt like they can't trust the partners."

"I was also devastated when I was told I couldn't participate in the groups, participate in the conversations and take part. But in the end we compensated through a lot of local engagement with the reshapers and the work we did locally. I feel that I know some of the prototypes very well now. It was a good thing that I found my place at some point. After a while, I felt connected. In the end we managed to create trust in the process but it took some time."

"Reshapers were reluctant on having the partners' opinion, defiance, even with smaller partners that have to deal with our problematics."

Some possible reasons that would explain the hostilities have been pointed out in the evaluation. One of them is that the partners "were not properly introduced at the Lublin opening event":

"Had we had more time together all as individuals (regardless of our roles) discussing issues instead of diving directly into the reshapers only groups of trajectories, perhaps that would have not happened."

Another one involves the structure of the project with three levels of decision-making capacity and remuneration that some people saw as hierarchical and dissonant in regards with a project that aimed to open spaces for reflection on more horizontal forms of governance. The following quote talks about how the existence of a preset design of the mobility part of the project - due to the commitments acquired with Creative Europe - caused anxiety on the groups:

"The choice was not made by people, why would we go there, the destination gave anxiety because it was reproducing behaviours that we want to abandon. This created an amount of work and an amount of discussion that marked the group in its functioning later on. In another universe where we didn't have to pre-define these things it would've been different. The auto-governance of the different groups was limited and they felt constrained by the activities and the decisions coming from the top."

Other comments on the subject also pointed to the need for greater care in the methodology and dynamics of the facilitation and team-building process and with facilitators with a more technical profile in this matter. Actually, this possibility had been considered by the partners but discarded due to economical reasons.

"At first, in the design of the project, we thought of two people leading the groups - one person that would take care of the cohesion of the group and help the group work together and produce, the other person being in charge

of the communication, creating the link between groups and the rest of the process".

"The amount of energy to build some levels of trust. I did not expect that. In this kind of project, you would need someone doing just this".

For their part, some facilitators felt the lack of a more clear definition of their roles and the pressure of taking the lead in a way that they didn't expect; they felt lost during the process and performed tasks that they did not expect to do:

"At times I felt lost there. Everything I was told that the facilitation job would be, it wasn't and vice versa. It was very painful."

"We became more of leaders in our groups. We had to design the workshops, whilst not getting any outside support for the workshops we were organising. The process shifted to how it was designed in the beginning and the role was greatly expanded."

Celebration, integration, Coordination (activities + exchange)
There were also comments reinforcing the importance of having spaces for collective celebration that were logically drastically reduced due to the COVID: "not having enough time and space to have fun together which is important as a political matter" might have been other of the obstacles for gaining a better cohesion.

On top of these circumstances, some people also talk on how our current socio political context could help us explain some of the group behaviours:

"It's almost like this kind of polarisation that is felt in the world, within social networks and so on. It is something that the Reshape project absorbed: the definition of the identity of the groups in relation with the others."

Regarding the relationship and collective work among the partners, all the comments have been very positive:

"I worked in a very collaborative way with other partners. The level of ease, co-creation, mutual support, fun, was nothing like any other project I worked on. Not even in the organisations I worked in, I never felt that teamwork was so smooth and so caring. The way it was co-designed with the other partners, was a unique professional experience"

It is also worth to mention that some partners expressed an enthusiast recognition of the work of the two coordinators of the project:

"They did much more than I could have asked from two people. Because the project was so management intensive, and because we as partners, because of our different engagements, were not following the process so closely all the time. They did a superhuman work, and I have absolute gratitude towards them."

COMMENTS:

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.

Producing results in spite of difficulties (combined Actions + sustainability)
This dimension brings up again some of the difficulties faced by the Reshape community during the process. First, the issue around the open-ended process and the lack of time. The interviewees underline one more time the paradox created by an open-ended process, facilitating and opening opportunities for experimentation and collective work but also the lack of time and framework to work towards the production of an outcome.

> *"(There were) with too many ambitions to be met in a short time. Lack of time to be together, to get to know the places where workshops and conferences took place, to design the workshops, to test and deliver the prototypes, etc."*

"It was really important that it was open ended. Everything is open in Reshape and it's good. On the other hand, we had these deadlines all the time, and it created a tension."

The openness and diversity also created obstacles and difficulties in the creation process.

"Creating prototypes from scratch was a generous idea. But since finding a common ground within the group was so overwhelming, this pressure to have something tangible was very high. It was so open and we could do what we wanted, but we had to produce something. That was a paradox."

Finally, the question of trust, central in Reshape, also affected the work and research process, participants having to deal with a lot of mistrust, justified and not justified in the beginning of the project.

However, the evaluation shows that in spite of these obstacles, issues and difficulties, the outcomes proved the capacity of people to deliver and respect their commitment. It led to results that were not *extractive* but the reflection of the common and internal collective process.

A variety of prototypes (sustainability)
The evaluation shows that the process led to the creation of different and diverse prototypes and formats, that are considered as inviting, thought provoking, playful, or powerful.

"This tool is a very important and powerful tool for those who don't have access to big evaluators. This could be a very powerful tool and a game changer, something we really need in the sector."

"Tarot and the solidarity game they seem to be inviting and playful enough to rethink differently."

Co-creation and experimentation (assets + reputation)
One of the results underlined by interviewees, is the importance of experimentation, co-creation and the work on practice itself. The interviewees view this opportunity quite positively in general. The process pushed the participants to try on new glasses to look at their own practices, the use of resources, and implement/experiment new tools.

"I see it as an exercise in how to be more democratic about the resources."

"A lot of people are now interested in experimenting."

"But overall, I think it definitely, and at least, pushed us (the participants of Reshape) to at least try to use new metrics/new glasses to look at our practice and implement/experiment tools."

In terms of the creation of collective intelligence as a result, a few people commented on the value of different knowledge combined, and the opportunity it opens in terms of production of knowledge and its transmission.

"Partners have gained new insights into the knowledge being produced in the unsuspected places. Maybe we should look to those places and reach out to those workers. I see that as a change. For me there is huge potential in this, and there was an acknowledgement that came from this."

An overall positive reputation (reputation)
When asked about the reputation of the project, the interviewees react rather favourably and consider that Reshape is seen positively within the arts and culture, and creative field. This is often associated with the fact that it was provoking unusual ideas and self-questioning.

"As a part of a lot of other thinking that is happening in the sector, it contributes to at least acknowledging the need for the sector to change."

"Definitely it gives a good reputation, people in the field have heard about the initiative and are interested in what it is, it gives credit."

Collaborations and dissemination (assets + distribution + sustainability)
The collaborations allowed by the project are often mentioned in the evaluation, and are very welcome by the community. The interviewees acknowledge that these collaborations are still concentrated within the Reshape community, but see the potential for further interactions and developments.

"The material produced, it's open-source so it thinks about a broader community outside of the network."

"The assets are still very concentrated within the RESHAPE community today but it did foster lots of collaborations and interactions."

Regarding the project's long term impact, it was mentioned that although it might not have a lot of resonance outside of the sector, the prototypes and personal impacts will lead to transformation and that bigger players should support and help the information flow.

"The question for me is how is it scalable, how it can grow bigger. It's easy to understand how someone else can use the cards in their context ? How to use a guideline. But the question to me is more: how do we bring it to a level where it can inform the practices? I don't have an answer, but it would be nice to know that it could have a wide impact. Yes it will have an impact, and I believe that nowadays there is so much information around, that it would be difficult for people to take the time to read and use it in their own context. Creative Europe creates so many manuals, I don't know if people take the time to read. I don't know how this one will have a different fate. But in Ljubljana policy-makers were interested in the process. They told us how their thinking was impacted and it's already much more than some other project. And a lot of learning was produced by this project. For me this is sustainable."

Potential for change (reputation + assets)

Beyond the production of the prototypes, the potential for change resulting in personal learnings and collective experiences was appreciated.

"Now I am gaining much more understanding that the point was about being there, not so much about producing a prototype."

However, the participants felt it was difficult to already measure or evaluate the long-term impact and the potential for change of the project and its outcomes. This is explained by the variety of prototypes, the timeframe - the project just ended - and the possible further developments and uses of the prototypes and other tools.

"The prototypes are very different. Some are less tangible and less inviting to make use of them immediately."

"It will be a long term effect due to all the prototypes and their further development. I think it will lead to transformation along the way. To measure the transformation is hard, but I see a capacity for outcomes."

Impact (sustainability)

The initiative is considered to have had an impact on the participants and organisations involved: the ideas, discussions and prototypes, texts, etc, circulated a lot and impacted the people involved directly in the Reshape universe, Reshapers, facilitators, coordinators, partners, etc.

"Lots of people were interested in it as an experiment. I gave away 15 books so far, and lots of people asked me about it."

In terms of the impact in the local communities involved, some reshapers felt they had no "time, space and capacity" to be beneficial for other than the direct participants and felt "pressured to make a prototype and so busy trying to find a common ground".

"It was a bit problematic how the workshops have been thought of and organised. No connection to the city, during our (name of the city) workshop there wasn't even a partner involved. Rushing to the cities by plane, rare possibility to come by train. Jumping from nowhere, out of the blue. No time and space to get into the context and to understand why we are in this context. We rushed during the workshops."

However, for the idealisers of Reshape, the focus on the internal dynamics was part of the design.

"In the majority of the project, the participants were focusing on producing things in a closed circle. (...) We got to the public at the very end, it was a part of the design, which was built in. It was a research and development project."

The final impact in the community, in the general public, is yet to be seen as "in terms of the material produced, it's open-source, so it thinks about a broader community outside of the network".

"Now it feels as each person's responsibility to take them to a broader community."

COMMENTS:

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 materializing 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.

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

---

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

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.

Evaluation Team

RESHAPE

- Katarina Pavic, Eduardo Bonito, Claire Malika Zerhouni (reshapers)

FARO

- Livia Diniz (coordinator)

- Isabel Ferreira (interviewer and analyst)

FLUXONOMY 4D

- Lala Deheinzelin (speaker, interviewer and analyst)

METHODOLOGY AND OUTLOOK OF THE EVALUATION'S EVOLUTION

••
••••••••

We managed to collect information and answers from the following groups of participants of the Reshape project:

- Partners
- Coordinators
- Advisors
- Facilitators
- Reshapers

The information was collected through different dynamics, one being open Focus Group session with 4 people during Reshape's last conference in Ljubljana at the end of September 2021, using a more fluid and open format than the rest of the dynamics, which were based on the structure of the prototype:

- 3 group workshops in Reshape's last conference in Ljubljana, where 12 participants gathered in small groups together with the evaluation's researchers and followed different parts of the prototype's questionnaire;
- 4 online interviews with 8 of the participants;
- Voluntary use of the online tool by 2 participants.

Between all the different dynamics we have managed to reach a total of 26 people.

Although the turnout for activities was on the lower part of the scale of our expectations, we gathered a relevant number of participants' inputs for the study, and the prototype generated almost 200 pages of compiled answers and numeric values.

The fact that less people participated in in-person activities than expected can be explained by the great offer of programme activities at the Reshape final conference. The amount of participants in person activities was just about the minimum for all activities to happen and for us to understand the main advantages and disadvantages of the evaluation system being developed.

Prior to the actual activities in Ljubljana, a keynote session in Zagreb with Lala Deheinzelin supported by 4 researchers from this project helped people to understand a bit better about the base of the methodology and to attract their curiosity for the project and the workshops. That included a catch-up session organised into 4 different areas / circulating groups around 4 dimensions of the

4D Fluxonomy methodology. Each station had a QR leading to short videos each explaining one dimension and how it applies on an organisational / individual level. In each area participants reflected on a different dimension also through simple questions. The idea of the questions was to understand how people's social interactions, financial situation, knowledge, bodies transformed, changed, during this 2-year period marked by the Reshape project but also the Pandemic, personal and professional lives, etc. The aim was that people could catch-up with colleagues by "leading" the conversation through Fluxonomic principles. In that session we have managed to have more than 30 people signing up to the prototype's website.

Following that, in Ljubljana we started the activities firstly with a Focus Group conversation which was recorded, transcribed and has its complete analysis already published in the interim report. Its contents will be cross-analysed with the results of all information received using the prototype, which are currently being analysed.

The material from the prototype includes answers from 11 people who participated in 3 workshop sessions. Their process started with a brief explanation about how we were constructing the tool followed by work in separate desks where participants had the opportunity to have a guided tour of the prototype and answer a few questions covering one dimension. The turnout was very diverse, covering four strands of Reshape engagement: partners, advisors, facilitators and reshapers.

These sessions were very important for the process. We realised how complicated it was for many of the people to understand the values proposed for discussion, which led us to revise the whole prototype and prepare it to be tested again at the next stages, which were slightly postponed to allow time to work on this revision.

The rest of the material from the prototype included online interviews where 4 of us interviewed two people at a time and included their answers in the prototype after their revision of the notes taken. These interviews happened between 27 October and 5 November 2021. And again, although the revision done in October simplified a great deal, during the interviews we found out that other aspects could be improved before we invited the rest of the Reshape community to participate on the voluntary online survey, which was open from 29 November to 6 December and had a small turnout.

We have closed the answering period on 7 December and we are now engaged on the overall analysis of the whole data, which has been separated into 24 files, one for each of the questions.

They were used as a base to to produce several analytical procedures:

- Tagging and highlight sentences selection;
- Cross reflection in relation to Reshape general objectives;
- Production of summaries per dimension;
- Production of the final introduction and analysis text.

Parallel to those processes, all numeric values have been included in a graphic visualisation structure prepared exclusively for the prototype which allows us to see the proportion of the 4 dimensions numeric values attributed to all 4 dimensions, which are 16 components and 64 forces. Once all selected sentences related to the 64 forces were analysed they were also included in this map.

Our analytical experience proved to be very hard, even if we all have knowledge of fluxonomy (at different levels). The complexity of the prototype model, has lead few participants managing to evaluate the whole 64 forces included, which on one hand made some of the dimensions being more evaluated than others, and in another hand allowed that answers more connected to one of the 16 component being answered at another point of the process, complicating the summaries process.

For various reasons, we ended up needing to use the information drawn from the Focus group analysis to complement and enrich the answers from the prototype, which was not our initial objective. Since the original methodology proposed was to use the focus group answers as a control tool for the sake of comparison with the prototype's answers, rather than a back up where we could find some comments that did not sprang during the answering process using the we developed.

As mentioned in the introduction text, during the process we have identified many points to improve in the prototype itself and also in the methodology applied to collect the answers which are summarised in the annex with the prototype's preliminary evaluation.

Although we managed to have a fluxonomic overview of the project using the tool, it is clear to us that the prototype needs a lot of improvement both in its dynamics of interaction with the respondents as well as in the accessibility of the language used.

One of the challenges that the evaluation team had faced in the process was the fact that Fluxonomy is a methodology in the experimental phase that comes with a considerable amount of complexity. This complexity is reflected in terminology used to determine concepts and establish the overall narrative of evaluation

(themes and motives, types of questions - more or less structured / concrete, assignment of numerical values), but also in methodology's schematic approach that forms a fractal through sequencing dimensions' aspects within the dimensions, at times causing confusion. In fact, at times participants' attention was more focused on comprehension of concepts and methodology of evaluation than the object of evaluation itself. This is one aspect of the methodology that requires careful examination to enable participants' efficient participation.

Another challenging aspect where the methodology needs further development is with regards to examination of power relations and detecting hierarchical structures within processes. This might as well be more pertinent to Reshape as a project then to the methodology as a whole. Namely, regardless of different formats and dynamics of engagement of participants in the study, all of the participants were keen to bring up the challenges of power relations and hierarchies within Reshape as a process. They would do so, regardless of the fact that the methodology did not specifically address questions related to equality and equity within the activities organised. Therefore, certain aspects of methodology could be enriched to encourage thinking about distribution of power as a resource within the realm of *social* that reflects on all other dimensions.

One last remark to be taken into account in further development of the prototype is "user friendliness" and efficiency of the online tool. The extremely low number of individual contributions to the prototype in its last testing phase is indicative (at least partly) of the tools complexity, which offers deeper understanding of processes and interconnections, especially in settings immanent for meetings and face to face workshops of tightly-knit communities. In cases of geographically scattered and diverse communities such as the one gathered through Reshape, further simplifications, or rather to say abstractions could come handy, especially for purposes of gathering diverse data for usage in the data set.

NUMERIC IMPRESSIONS AND GRAPHIC DATA VISUALISATION

●●

RESHAPE TOTAL NUMERIC IMPRESSION AVERAGE	**3.01**		
(maximum 5)			
CULTURAL DIMENSION	**3.70**		
> IDEA / CONCEPT / INTENTION		**4.20**	
RELEVANT			4.55
ECO-RESPONSABLE			4.00
PROPOSITIVE			4.36
INNOVATIVE			3.91
> FORMATS / LANGUAGE / DESIGN		**3.02**	
AESTHETIC POWER			3.18
ACCESSIBLE			2.64
PERTINENT			2.91
ENGAGING			3.36
> INTERACTIVITY / CO-CREATION / EXCHANGES		**3.80**	
STIMULATING			4.27
TRANSMIDIATIC			3.36
AFFECTIVE			4.18
LONG RANGE / SCALABLE			3.36
> LEARNING / KNOWHOW / AWARENESS		**3.77**	
EXPERIMENTAL			3.73
INTERDEPENDENT			3.36
EMPATHIC			4.09
APPLICABLE TO OTHER CONTEXTS			3.91
ENVIRONMENTAL DIMENSION	**3.12**		
> SKILLS / TALENTS / COMPETENCIES		**2.88**	
CREATIVE, EDUCATIONAL, THERAPEUTIC SKILLS			2.67
DESIGN, TECHNOLOGICAL SKILLS			2.67
ADMINISTRATIVE, COMMUNICATION AND SOFT SKILLS			3.00
FINANCE, MANAGEMENT AND MARKETING SKILLS			3.17

> INFRASTRUCTURE / SUPPORT / PLATFORMS		**3.17**	
PERTINENT, INVITING INFRASTRUCTURE			3.33
MULTIFUNCTIONAL AND REUSABLE INFRASTRUCTURE			2.80
SHAREABLE INFRASTRUCTURE			3.60
EFFICIENT INFRASTRUCTURE			3.00
> GOVERNANCE / MANAGEMENT / COORDINATION		**3.22**	
PURPOSE ORIENTED			3.50
ECO COMMITTED			3.13
DIVERSITY ORIENTED			3.13
IMPACT ORIENTED			3.13
> FINANCIAL MEANS / SHARED RESOURCES		**3.19**	
INTELLECTUAL AND RESEARCH CAPITAL (ASSETS)			4.11
TECHNO / NATURAL			2.44
SOCIAL / ORGANIZATIONAL			3.44
TRADITIONAL AND COMPLEMENTARY CURRENCIES			2.78
SOCIAL DIMENSION	**2.57**		
> AGREEMENTS / PRINCIPLES / OBJECTIVES		**2.57**	
DESIGNED FOR CONSCIOUSNESS / AWARENESS			3.14
DESIGNED FOR REGENERATION			2.57
DESIGNED FOR ADAPTABILITY			2.00
DESIGNED FOR ABUNDANT FLOW			2.57
> TEAMS / PARTNERS / COMMUNITIES		**2.33**	
CULTURAL, EDUCATIONAL, RESEARCH PLAYERS			3.33
TECHNOLOGICAL, ECOLOGICAL INFRASTRUCTURAL PLAYERS			2.17
PUBLIC, PRIVATE, THIRD SECTOR, MEDIA PLAYERS			1.83
FINANCIAL, COMMERCIAL, SPONSORS PLAYERS			2.00
> ACTIVITIES / ACTIONS / MOVEMENTS		**2.96**	
STRATEGIC AND CELEBRATIVE ORIENTED			3.17
ECO-RESPONSABLE AND EFFECTIVENESS ORIENTED			2.83
CREATIVE AND LEARNING ORIENTED			3.33
IMPACT AND VIABILITY ORIENTED			2.50
> PARTICIPANTS / PUBLIC / EXCHANGES		**2.40**	

EDUCATION, CREATIVITY, COMMUNICATION MARKETS		3.00
DESIGN, URBAN, ECO, HEALTH		1.80
MEDIA, COMPANIES, NGOS, GOVERNMENTS, CIVIL SOCIETY		2.80
COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT, DISTRIBUTION CHANNELS, INVESTORS		2.00
TRANSACTIONAL DIMENSION	**2.65**	
> TRUST / REPUTATION / CAPACITY TO TRANSFORM	**3.15**	
COHERENT		4.00
REGENERATIVE		2.20
DIVERSE		2.80
LONG TERM		3.60
> RESOURCES /MEDIUMS / ASSETS	**2.81**	
VISIBLE		3.25
WELL MANAGED		2.25
ETHICAL USE		3.00
INNOVATIVE		2.75
> COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES / COMBINED ACTIONS / COLLECTIVE INTELLIGENCE	**2.44**	
COMMUNITIES		2.50
CHANNELS		2.00
DEMANDS		2.75
MANAGEMENT		2.50
> CREDIT / SUSTAINABILITY / CONTINUITY	**2.19**	
COCREATED METRICS		3.25
COST EFFECTIVE		2.25
TIME EFFECTIVE		1.75
RECURRING REVENUE		1.50

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.

We take the opportunity to express our gratitude to all people who collaborated in the development of the prototype, prior to Reshape's evaluation process:

- Mónica Pérez Blanquer, Silvina Martínez, Cristina Alonso, Iara Solano, Fernando Garcia, Elena Carmona (researchers)

- Rafael Frazão (visual identity)

- Mladen Katanić (website design)

- Slobodna domena - Marko Vuković and Stjepan Vrljičak (website programing)

RESHAPE EVALUATION FOCUS GROUP REPORT

••

Description of Methodology

Focus group has been organised as a part of RESHAPE's closing conference in Ljubljana, taking place in the morning hours of September 25th, 2021. All conference participants were invited to take place in the activity, as a part of the general conference programme.

Focus group was chosen as a complementary format to the interviews and the questionnaire as its main strengths allow for high levels of interaction between the participants, as well as giving them the opportunity to articulate their feelings and attitudes through their own words, thus assigning new meanings and revealing new

layers of depth around questions tackled during the evaluation. A total of eight people participated in the focus groups, 4 participants and 4 researchers. Of the 4 researchers, 2 were acting as the focus group moderator / co-moderator, one was taking notes and one was observing the process. Structure of participants shall be described in the following of the report.

Prior to the event, guidelines with questions organised in thematic focuses were prepared and reviewed by the team of researchers.. Questions were formed in an open structure with aims to reflect the experiences gathered through RESHAPE as a process. Principles of Fluxonomy were used as a convergent methodology that guided the evaluation process as a whole and preparation of the questionnaire in part. Questions were organised in 4 thematic focuses, tackling: Conceptual level, Organisational level / the Process, Governance of RESHAPE as a Project and Project Outputs. Added to these 4 themes were two separate sets of intro and outro questions, posed at the beginning and at the end of the discussion. Focus group took 90 minutes in total. Audio recording of the discussion was made with all the participants giving their consent for recording and the recorded material to be used solely for the purpose of the analysis.

At the end of the discussion, a detailed transcript was prepared and anonymised to a measure, in order to omit the personal details of the participants. Transcribed material was detaily examined and analysed, thus resulting in this report. The method for analysis was a mix of simplified coding used in qualitative analysis in general and careful discourse analysis that pays mind to nuances of the spoken words, self-positioning of the participants within the process, interaction between the participants and their eagerness to address and interpret certain questions that have been posed by the researchers.

Participants that took part in the discussions joined without any additional incentives and formed a type of spontaneous aggregate within the larger group of conference guests involved in RESHAPE as a process. Hence, no measures providing equal participation by trajectory or by socio-cultural characteristics of participants were

taken beforehand. Of these four participants, two have self-identified as partners within the process, one as a reshaper and one as a facilitator. In addition to that, one of the participants emphasised on their multiple different roles, as they participated as an employee of the partner organisation within the existing project logic but also closely followed development of a single project Trajectory within RESHAPE and helped to prepare final publication within the project. By socio-cultural characteristics, 3 middle-aged men and 1 young woman participated in the focus group as participants, two of participants coming from Western Europe, one from South-West of Europe and one from South-East of Europe.

Situating themselves within the scope of RESHAPE as a project and concretely with regards to the evaluation, participants expressed their interest in "reshaping" and regaining new knowledge about what encompasses the work of evaluation and how different approach to evaluation and evaluating can be transformative for working in the realm of culture and arts:

P1: *"...in the beginning of the Reshape process, I realised that I was looking at the evaluation process in a very limited way."*

P3: *"I was very interested to see how, in terms of practice of evaluating, what it would be, how it could be. And how it could open up alternative ways, and go away from traditional evaluation practises and governance practises."*

SET OF QUESTIONS TACKLING THE CONCEPTUAL LEVEL

The first set of questions after the introduction tackled the conceptual level of RESHAPE as a process: its driving conceptions and ideas, goals and objectives, thematic focuses (also known as Trajectories within the duration of the project) and the relationship between the project's objectives and organisational formats within the project.

All participants expressed high opinion and enthusiasm in relation to the project's driving ideas and objectives. Participants thought highly about the project's ambitions, its desire to instigate change through connecting different actors and through mutual exchange and experimentation.

When it comes to identifying the challenges and the biggest contrasts within the project's main concepts, participants emphasised on several key questions: different positions of institutional and independent actors within the arts and culture field, the complexities of contexts from which different participants were coming from and the ambition for reconciling these differences throughout the duration of the project as well as the key differences between actors when it came to overall expectations from the project:

P2: *"I don't know if the expectations of the people who put the project together were the same as the expectations of the people who were participating in the process."*

P3: "*But I think while doing this, you realise that there are different contexts where people are working, different realities. And therefore, you come or look at the common goal in very different ways. At the end, it was not only working on the prototypes but also the process on how to work together, coming from these different contexts, what are the barriers and the power relations, and can you take this into account, do you want to take this into account?*"

The power relations between the various actors and the contrasting positions and needs between the institutions (who have envisaged and designed the project) and the independent actors (artists, producers, cultural workers) who have come to work as reshapers during the project duration has been an ongoing trope throughout the project as a whole:

P4: *"I believe that the institutions are the problem in the arts scene. The problems are asking the practitioners about the problems."*

This fundamental difference in actors' positioning within the wider systems of capability and power is an important dynamic of RESHAPE as a process. It had found its reflections in many different aspects, where contrasts of different geo-political and economic power relations were emphasised. This was also reflected through questioning the legitimacy of internal forces within the project to articulate themes and priorities and ways of inclusion / exclusion of different people who were able to participate in the project in the end. Participants agreed that it was important for independent cultural actors and institutions to come together and discuss mutual challenges and ways of resolving crucial issues, but did not necessarily agree with the highly contrasting interpretations of the relationship between the independents and the institutions.

P1: " ...*we are completely infiltrated by the capitalist system. We pretend that it's good but it's totally not. What can people do? What people can learn from each other but also on another level by giving time. Most of the time, the thinking is done in very precarious situations. Sometimes it comes from bigger institutions but they learn from the smaller initiatives. The good thing with Reshape is that the initiative is taken by these intermediary organisations, and not trying to control everything but give freedom to those who think already. This was the goal also, to not try in a hidden way to repeat or install expectations.*"

P2: "*These topics, regardless of their origin, seem to be, for me, very ideological. They represent a set of shared values that people were supposed to have. People were chosen, I don't know exactly the process for Reshapers, but people were chosen probably because they were related to those values, fair governance, solidarity, sustainability. There were certain expectations of a common group who would share all these, and also would have the disposition to share with others, not only their perspectives but their knowledge. It was not so immediate and not possible several times.*"

When it comes to articulation of the project's main thematic scope, all participants expressed their approval with excitement, emphasising on their relevance, as well as their versatility and adaptability.

P4: "..*and the trajectories are well defined. They are covering all the areas and they are also broad. And the most important part, I believe, is to bring together these practitioners from the field. It is important. And the decision-makers are not making the decisions in this case, but the practitioners are trying to understand and then create suggestions with prototypes or ideas. These are the good parts.*"

Another special emphasis was put on the flexibility of the process, which was open ended but had been imposed with expectations of ending with concrete results. This was seen as beneficial for the process but also somewhat methodologically confusing. While one participant saw proposed trajectory topics as imposed from top-down, the other argumented how topics were designed broadly enough for project participants to inhabit and modify the focuses of the themes.

P4: "*I said that the work of practitioners was a good thing, but still there is an authority who is asking. Who is running the project? These are actually still the institutions. And for me, what I believe is that the institutions are the problem in the arts scene. The problems are asking about the problems to the practitioners. How sincere is it ? I'm not sure. There will be some outcomes and we'll work for the institutions. The good thing is that with the COVID crisis, probably now institutions are probably not in a stable position. Corona helped with the process in a way. I don't want to be naïve. But it's still good to discuss all these.*"

P1: "*Another thing is that 5 topics were decided by a Steering Committee. So it was already co-created. But I think it was also something that was coming from somewhere, but there were enough possibilities for the groups to appropriate these themes. The choice of the themes was not methodological. The goal was to rethink on a European level, to share experiences and also to become stronger. And maybe to force what institutions and governance can learn.*"

SET OF QUESTIONS TACKLING THE ORGANISATIONAL LEVEL AND THE GOVERNANCE OF RESHAPE AS A PROCESS

In these two (here combined) clusters the organisational formats (workshops and other gatherings that led towards the prototype development) were discussed. Within these, special emphasis was put on the organisational dynamics and the relation between different actors within the process. Once again, challenges were brought up that reflected different roles organisations as well as individuals had in the process and the different expectations that at times caused mistrust and misunderstandings.

P4: "*The organisational structure of the project was also very hierarchical in a way, with the partners, facilitators and reshapers. It was formed in that hierarchy. If we were doing a theatre piece, this could happen, because other people would do the production for example. But in this project, the structure is very embedded in the question itself. So there was distrust from the beginning. How this could have been structured in a different way, I don't know.* "

P2: "*But the rhetoric was that it was a very horizontal process.*"

The need to constantly re-negotiate roles and the positions within these hierarchies impacted internal logic of the process greatly. On one hand, participants realise that the experimental nature of the project suggests that certain intentions do not necessarily result in favourable or even expected outcomes, and on the other hand it seems as if RESHAPE did not only reflect contradictions and fritions immanent to the actors gathered around this project and perhaps those of the larger art and cultural scene, but also reflected great polarisation and frictions currently visible all over the world.

P2: "*It's almost like this kind of polarisation that is felt in the world, within social networks and so on. It is something that the Reshape project absorbed : the definition of the identity of the groups in relation with the others.*"

This was visible both from the position of partners that designed the project and who had expectations to participate in the activities leading to creation of prototypes which was at times met with rejection from the reshapers, but also from the position of facilitators whose roles were unclear, at the same time turned towards the group and towards the partners, whilst both of these two different sets of actors had different and sometimes opposing expectations.

P2: "*The role of the facilitators depended on the recognition of that role of the facilitator by the group. And if the groups recognised that the people are there to bring the knowledge, they were selected out of hundreds to be the 40 chosen, they assumed that they were the guardians of the knowledge. And then, there are people to facilitate, and the others would bring the knowledge to the world, and the knowledge would be appropriated by the institutions. But it's something like this. And the role of the facilitators in the middle of that was not to bring methodology, this would be decided by the group, but to facilitate the interaction among the group, to make the group function, and among the partners.*"

Question of methodology was brought up more than once during the discussion. Participants mostly praised the fact that the methodology was open ended and flexible. But for some, that also meant that it was too unclear and confusing.

P4: "*I never understood what the methodology of the project was. How are we going to do the things that were planned to be done? (…) And the lack of methodology caused problems in our group too, at least for me. I never understood what we were doing. I'm talking for two days in (name of the city), ok, but nothing comes out of it. It doesn't go anywhere. We know each other better, that's the only thing. And then, it continued like that. It only started taking shape when the prototype started. And this prototype somehow made it concrete. We needed to create something. We forgot*"

about the ideas, and started creating things. So, it shaped the process itself a lot. Some methodology would have helped. (…)
On the other hand, it was a good experience to leave some people in a room and see what they can do. They can do something. And I learnt a lot from it. This is the other side of it."

Among the things that the participants emphasised as not greatly beneficial were the many presentations held in phases of the process where discussions and cross-fertilization of ideas might have been more useful, as well as lack of interactivity and exchange between the groups. Another expressed concern was the lack of time for groups to get together and work concretely beyond articulating to each other what they were interested in as practitioners, or what were the values that informed their work.

P4: *"After a while, some other groups or themes were more interesting for me, than what we were doing in our group. The flexibility within other groups, or transition between groups could have been much more useful."*

This was notable both in participants' reflections about the physical workshops that took place in the duration of the project as well as the time when the project undertook a digital shift due to travel restrictions caused by the pandemic.

P3: *"You can say that there was one and a half year, two years, but time when people were together was very limited. In each location, there was not only the idea of the group coming together to work on a prototype, but also the group getting to know the local context, getting inspired by other locals, so sometimes you would end up with a full program of people you were going to meet, things you were going to see. And there was limited time to really work on the prototype."*

Other participants emphasised how workshops that took place in different cities around Europe and MENA were packed with programme but how these local events served as great inspiration for development of the prototypes.

P2: "*I agree that it was a full program, and it was difficult to find free time and so on, even to be more productive and to work on the prototype. But on the other hand, the people acknowledge that it was also important these relations with the community, and they see it as a driver for the development of the prototypes also.*"

Potentially the most positive conclusion that came up with regards to organisational structure and governance tackled the already mentioned experimentality of the process, or as multiple participants stated: "It's interesting to see what happens when you put people into the room."

SET OF QUESTIONS TACKLING THE OUTPUTS AND THE DESIRABLE OUTCOMES OF RESHAPE AS A PROCESS

In this cluster of questions participants discussed potential of the prototypes for transforming culture and arts in Europe and MENA as well as other types of desirable futures in terms of collaborations and prospective connections between the actors (equally the ones that have taken part in the project but also wider communities that are relevant for RESHAPE).

Participants were not equally optimistic when it came to interpretations of prototypes as powerful game-changers in the world of artistic and cultural production, or at least useful tools for transformation of relations between the institutional and independent cultural actors.

While some of them are keen to stress how prototypes will continue developing organically through the sector (and especially emphasising the example of the Tarot cards that are being used for multiple different purposes), others warn how excluding partners from the table for the most of the prototype development resulted in missing the opportunity to make them the ambassadors for the prototypes.

P2: "*I am more optimistic in this sense than in the others. In our projects, even if it's not the Reshape community that will continue as the Reshape community, I think there are links between people, within the groups or outside the groups, or between institutions, that will allow to develop the knowledge among 2 or 3 persons or to the exterior, and to bring the prototypes to other realities. I think it's more organic now than a strategy to disseminate these. For instance, in a meeting that we had for this new project, we used the cards of the solidarity group to develop the process within the project. I think this kind of thing would happen naturally. I'm more optimistic on these than in others.*"

P3: "*... when we started there was really this idea of opening up, and how we bring in these prototypes to other partners, to other people, and really open up again as the Reshape community. I also think that somewhere along the line we missed the chance to make partners ambassadors for these prototypes. The partners who will now be ambassadors for these prototypes, are also partners who were really engaged in these topics. I think it was a naïve idea, at the beginning of the project, this idea to have a common goal as Reshapers, partners and coordinators of the project, and there would grow the alliance of, this is where we want to work together. But because of this friction, between the different roles and the hierarchies, it was not easy to be involved content-wise as a partner.* "

On a more basic level, participants were satisfied with the amount of connections that have been produced through the process, both within the community but also with external actors that have joined the process at a certain point, like FARO. However, one participant stated how this type of networking might be regarded as something expected within these projects and that it should not be contributed to RESHAPE as such. Other participants emphasised the fact that intersections and topical collaborations between the topics and the participants might not come spontaneously but takes conscious effort and engagement to reach out towards what the other groups have been working on. With that regard operative engagement in coordination of the activities gave a lot of privilege to the parts of the collective who

had the opportunity to detaily observe work of each group, sometimes even single reshapers.

All participants found prototypes as having potential for being really useful in terms of knowledge and practice. While some function as more of a blueprint or an attitude, some of them come as really concrete tools, such as the evaluation tool and the card game.

P2: " *Prototypes are very different in terms of the objectives they have. And I also agree that we don't have to produce something that is immediately useful. Even if the things are changing the mindset. (...)*
And I think it does need more work, in terms of communication. A set of things that I'm afraid will ever be done as a group, because some individuals were part of the prototype. But also, we assumed, in this trajectory, that the importance was the process. The way that it could be relevant for each person involved, to at least change the world in the everyday practice of people involved. In that sense it is useful also for the persons in the group, and for the persons in contact with the group. "

CLOSING REMARKS

In the closing set of questions participants were asked to discuss if they had noticed any interesting or relevant changes that occurred between the projects beginning and the end and how that had resonated with them. We will let the participants here speak with their own words.

P4: "*I don't know if the same group started the same project now, what would be the approach for each individual. I would not be the same. But I don't know that there is a revolution there*".

P1 (asking P4): "*Maybe we can speak for ourselves. I'm curious. If you would start now, what would you bring on the table ? How have things changed for you in the last 3 years?*"

P4: "*I don't really know. But the answers at the beginning of the project took a long time and effort in a way. Maybe this time I would be more direct. At least, even for my own way, I would go for it, I would be more direct. And instead of waiting for all the others to come up and to see the situation, before that noise… It is difficult to even guess what my attitude would be. But I would prefer to be more targeted (focused?) somehow. And because if you have a target, you can change the direction. Without a target you don't have a direction to change, everything is floating in a way. This was the process for me for a long time. This is the reason for my problem with methodology.*" (…)

P4: "*We started as a group on Solidarity. It's about many things, also to work together etc. And finally, what we had are 2 or 3 individual prototypes. What I understood is that all these big ideas like Solidarity, are hard to reach. We discussed it all together, and after 2 years of discussions, we got the prototypes of individuals. There is something that has not changed here. I am witnessing this again. And this is learning but learning in a negative way.*"

P3: "*I think the evolution for me in the mindset, what I take from Reshape is a sort of awareness of the different hats that you can be wearing as one person. And for you, it's you. But for the person who comes in and sees you with that hat, this identifies the role you are going to have in the procedure. So, to become less naïve about that, was for me an evolution. And if I would restart Reshape, then the first thing I would do would be how to take into account these roles.*"

P2: "*But on the other hand, the acknowledgement, the big thing that I take from the process, is in terms of my personal evolution, the knowledge of diversities, the diversity of perspectives, and the diversity of processes and methodologies. I think it was enriching, and the process was enriching for each person involved in the*

discussions. For instance, in the trajectory, all the contingencies of the coronavirus crisis and the pandemic, it was not seen as a contingency to the project and to the process of reflection, but as signs of what were the discussions. And this enlightened the roles and the process, to be more results oriented, that could bring. It is also very interesting."

SELECTED COMMENTS FROM THE INTERVIEWEES,
CONNECTED TO RESHAPE'S GENERAL OBJECTIVES

••

This selection is the result of our first work, coding and highlighting the material collected during the workshop in Ljubljana, and the interviews we did using the 4D methodology.

In order to make sense of this material, and put it in resonance with Reshape, we decided to associate the comments and answers with the objectives of the project.
We also decided to associate definitions, concepts and themes with the objectives, that are in relations with the main concepts and themes revealed by the interviews.

Doing this, we tried to put the material in perspective, and make it accessible in the context of the project.

The quotes presented are not the complete material : they were chosen taking into account their relevance in regards with the objectives of Reshape.

1/ Artistic and Social innovation to imagine an alternative to the European arts ecosystem by rethinking its instruments and collaborative models

Prototypes (to develop and test experimental bottom-up methods to construct new narratives and new instruments that are appropriate to the evolutions of the arts sector and the society)

- Contexts, skills and resources

Different contexts working together and it makes it innovative because it enables to connect different fields.

"It was an extreme privilege to have access to all the brains and diverse experiences of the group. Knowledge, expertise, that was put on the table. Space to let the knowledge and expertise happen." (facilitator)

57

"Especially, finding out about new tools and practises in the cultural sector. A very welcome initiative because it offers the opportunity for single initiatives, or bigger initiatives who work together in a grassroot way, to know that you're not alone, building a network of mutual understanding is very important in the concept of Reshape." (reshaper)

"There was a diverse range of competences and skills within culture and arts, it would have been interesting to have more interventions from different areas, architects, private sectors, science." (reshaper)

"Some people had much more support for development of certain ideas, than the others. Certain people's ideas were being dismissed for being "too capitalist" or "neoliberal". (facilitator)

- Covid and Digital Switch

The project is necessary especially in a context where changes occur during the pandemic, but COVID also had a direct impact on the work and the process itself.

"I think the idea behind Reshape is very relevant. Actually, if we're thinking what's happening - post and in the midst of the pandemic, in this space of change. You kind of realize how important Reshape as a project was." (facilitator)

"Of course the COVID : being behind your screen, but still, you have this time for experimentation but you have a deadline. I would rather end the project after the implementation of the prototypes in real life. There was a lot of potential in terms of practicality, and meeting in person, and trying to develop them in person : for example, the rituals for me, we could have made a pilot residency based on these rituals and senses, and get out of it. There is a common place and a role, but also in this moment of the Humanity we cannot imagine completely different things." (reshaper)

"On the pure translating of the meetings from physical to online and changed the shape of their work. It happened when we were supposed to produce things, the results, or put our ideas into forms. We were not able to meet again." (partner)

"The idea to create, share and test in a live community was kept, the intention was there in spite of the difficulties of the situation (covid) as a result, everybody tried to figure out what was to be done and sometimes it generated a sense of disconnection, but it was an exceptional moment." (reshaper)

- Open-ended process and methodology

Governance and methodology, open-ended process, interdependency amongst the participants with the prototypes.

"We would give the participants the option to be free to think about their goals and methods to achieve it." (partner)

*"Maybe less openness and more framework could have helped slightly the process. Because we felt that we would always start from scratch, because of how wide and open the possibilities were." (*facilitator)

"appreciated in the beginning, that it was a collaborative work, an open process, tackling general and practical issues. It gave perspective of the other side of the field. Good idea and bridge of communicating." (reshaper)

"Facilitators did not really have the skills required for facilitation (which requires the ability to harvest ideas and lead them to a product), they were more into research and documentation." (reshaper)

"I think that we were really impact oriented and that came from Creative Europe." (facilitator)

"Interdependency was high, but there is no team division based on roles and skills. I feel somehow, especially on the area of experimental, and it's related to the moment that all of us are living now, that there was a very big room for experimentation. But as people involved, we are stuck. It's not that we lack creativity or ideas. But we did not go much out of the box with the experimentation. Or on a practical way. Which makes me think about how replicable, and again relevant these prototypes are. It is like we have a lot of room, but we did the same all things with different interfaces." (reshaper)

"Now I am gaining much more understanding that the point was about being there, not so much about producing a prototype." (reshaper)

- Development, roles and participation

The development of the format, the methodology used and the roles of different stakeholders in the process.

"Another part that I felt was not very well thought, is this group dynamics in terms of facilitation. I don't know in other groups, how it was going. But there was not a clear understanding of the role of facilitators. All these ideas had to be synergized, harvested, and put on the track of getting something concrete about this. But this was lacking, it was not really understood. It is a little too European, that we need everything on the table otherwise we would be excluding. There is a fine line between the democratic process and open space for experimentation. Doing the work of synergizing doesn't mean that we would exclude, but at some point we need to facilitate, and put people on a certain track. This role was lacking and not understood. For me, facilitators were researchers or equal participants, playing the role of communicating with the management." (reshaper)

"Reshapers were reluctant on having the partners opinion, defiance, even with smaller partners that have to deal with our problematics." (reshaper)

"I would not put it as troubles, but there were collective choices that, in the end, had consequences that for me for instance, were not necessarily happy. But as a leader of an organisation, I am totally willing to embrace this and I understand this. There is sadness about something that, for me personally, has been lost. Probably it was contextual, how we got to this point. I did not take the energy to think on how it could have been done differently. Things happen like this and this is what we play with. Maybe in a different group it would have been perceived otherwise. Maybe my expectations were not well fitted with the whole." (partner)

"It was pretty difficult for the local communities especially the ones who were welcoming during the workshops, because we were so pressured to make a prototype and so busy trying to find a common ground, and no time to exchange with the local communities. Reshape did not have enough time, space, and capacity to be beneficial for other than the direct participants." (facilitator)

- Future and reach

The future, adaptability, regeneration of the prototypes. The responsibility for their continuation and development. The inspiration they provoke.

"I'm now thinking about the outputs. In this case, when it comes to the notion of engaging, it takes a lot for one to get engaged with some or the whole idea. Once you get hooked up, you're caught in it - the prototypes. It was my experience with the dissemination phase. When you learn about the solidarity cards, you're like ok, but once you experience it, you get the idea on how it can be useful, used within the community, your environment, it becomes much more interesting. You don't get

hooked on the first. The more engaged you are with it, the more you get from it." (partner)

"*To be fair, some of the prototypes coming out of the process are excellent. As a matter of fact, all of the prototypes I've engaged with were excellent. You can see how they can regenerate and be adaptable to different situations. As much as the process was kind of yucky (?) I think it produced a lot it initially aimed for. I enjoyed looking into the different prototypes and the way they were presented in the end. In particular the Department of civil imagination.*" (facilitator)

"All of the prototypes I've engaged with were excellent. You can see how they can regenerate and be adaptable to different situations." (partner)

"Yes, all of them worked. A lot of prototypes were super interesting to see, and in terms of experimental, yes, I could never imagine people from the ministry of culture in Greece playing with tarot cards, that is a little bit outside of the box for policy makers at least in Greece. This is something that needs extra work, money and resources. But it created knowledge that can be used by others." (partner)

"The project has a lot of capacity to affect internally but it remains to be seen if the project has the capacity to affect externally, to have a multiplication effect. In terms of potential, in terms of affecting the future, this ambition exists, but looking at the results, some prototypes failed to meet this challenge." (partner)

"This made me feel that we only go with these prototypes because all the ideas have to go there… But it took a lot of energy, resources but has no future. There is no intention of development on it. Without this knowledge collection and sharing, it will die. Who is taking care of it ?" (reshaper)

"Maybe I have to play a bigger role to make it relevant, to try to introduce the prototypes to art institutions, implement it in my context ?" (reshaper)

Formats (to develop innovative and collaborative organisational models)

- Reshape as a community to experiment collaboratively

Resonating with the need to experiment collaboratively, and to understand the broader concept of community. Also about creating communities to discuss the prototypes and discuss what was done. The exchanges with different people and different contexts, and different formats, different expressions.

"*I worked in a very collaborative way with other partners. The level of ease, co-creation, mutual support, fun, was nothing like any other project I worked on. Not even in the organisations I worked in, I never felt that teamwork was so smooth and so caring. The way it was co-designed with the other partners, was a unique professional experience.*" (partner)

"*Within our group, we adapted it according to our needs. We made agreements within our group. There was adaptability within our group. I don't think it was a rigid project. Open in scale and in being open to others. There is a certain porosity to the context where the conferences/activities take place. It was totally different from the initial design because of COVID that was an external factor. We did the best with the conditions we had.*" (workshop participant)

"*The base of the project was collaboration so the groups that we formed had interdependency, between us, as we used as tools, at the level of Reshape as a whole, maybe a little less, it feels that it has to do with the governance structure, I guess interdependency was less true between the partners, it was the case when we had workshops with the opportunities to interact, all the sectors. We met in cities so there were the cities' environment but as a whole it felt a little less in this interdependence logic.*" (reshaper)

"*We were all the same in the same bubble, you go to Germany, you just meet the same type of people as in the Netherlands. It's just the same thing being done with the same people, not meaning to be disrespectful towards them. It's not like we're engaging with something different and I feel the way it was packaged had a lot to do with it. We could've had more time having dinners with them or coffee, how we connected to people in Reshape otherwise, and we missed a lot of that in the workshops' context*". (facilitator)

- Time, interdependency and change

Time to think about what we do. Giving ourselves time to think about why we do what we do. Safe place to experiment. Sharing. Creating links. Fostering change, co-creation, imagination, etc.

"*If I think about whether the project activates the idea of interdependence, the answer is yes, that the project made us see more than ever the need to feel that each one of us is an important part of a stronger system.*" (partner)

"*I can see a long term interaction and collaboration. Reshape is a network, because we did something together and it has meaning because of the community's efforts*

to make this alive. I have no idea in which form but I feel it has the potential to live beyond the end and make other types of collaborations, the reshape feeling will continue inhabitating us and give birth to more opportunities and possibilities." (reshaper)

"What was presented to us was presented as an intention to celebrate successes. Creating warm environment with time to exchange." (partner)

"It would have helped to have some team building time. About match-making. The group-making could have been done based on interests, interpersonal skills, what role I can fulfil in the project. If there was a room for this, it would have been better. More matchmaking, but also skills, complementary. To have successful Interdependency is not about everyone doing everything. On this level of self-organisation also." (reshaper)

"But what was mainly missed for me was the interdependence. This is not my experience. I also followed different trajectories. There was a lot of knowledge produced in some trajectories that could be used by others, but there was not a lot of linking between the trajectories. We could have thought of ways for these interdependencies to happen in a more organic way. There wasn't a lot of organic exchanges between the groups, we could have thought of ways of producing this differently. Yes of course. Of course COVID did not help, as well as the distance and the lack of meetings." (partner)

Reshape made us institutionally think that there are practices that are completely under our radar. Partners have gained new insights into the knowledge being produced in the unsuspected places. Maybe we should look to those places and reach out to those workers. I see that as a change. For me there is huge potential in this, and there was an acknowledgement that came from this." (partner)

- Shapes

New shapes, playful formats, putting square into a circle, reproducing behaviours that we wanted to abandon, because we are shaped a certain way, power dynamics ending up influencing the format.

"At times I felt like some of the things we developed felt like we were trying to put the square into the circle. We needed the money but at times Creative Europe felt very constraining. We needed to have mobility in the project. And it was great to have it. But if we had limited resources, we would have done it differently. But a lot of mobility created pressure and anxiety on the groups. We had to pre-define where

activities would take place. In the beginning we had to put the people at certain places, we gave a lot of anxiety to people - the project created the amount of the discussion. The choice was not made by people." (partner)

"*why would we go there, the destination gave anxiety because it was reproducing behaviours that we want to abandon. This created an amount of work and an amount of discussion that marked the group in its functioning later on. In another universe where we didn't have to pre-define these things, it would've been different. We reduced to the minimum what we predefined. I was happy how the European Commission accepted that we defined so little the outputs. But the group still felt constrained by the activities and the decisions that we still had to provide. These points were hard to negotiate.*" (partner)

"*My personal remark is that sometimes I feel that ideas were very innovative but formats were a bit dated. For instance conferences felt a bit old d right after the signing of the agreements, but was not there from the very beginning.*" (partner)

"*The formats were super useful, the communication realised in the project, messaging in the project did not suffer from project management language and allowed for different types of expression. Each thing in the project allowed for a certain type of relevance for different groups and actors. The relative lack of accessibility emerges from the fact that many more cultural actors wanted to be a part of the trajectories and couldn't make it into the process.*" (partner)

"*Tarot and the solidarity game they seem to be inviting and playful enough to rethink differently.*" (facilitator)

"*I can comment on the type of formats we had during the intensive, conferences and online meetings during the pandemics. About the final conference or meetings online, there was a lot of sharing, it was playful, innovative. I feel really pleased with the effort and the delivery of these formats.*" (reshaper)

"*The possibility of multifunctionality, multimedia maybe wasn't explored as much we could have though if many other ways to develop the infrastructure that wasn't so traditional.*" (reshaper)

2/ Fairness

Equality of opportunities

- Perceptions around the differences in contexts, and the perceptions of equalities-inequalities within project

"Mediterranean region, the fact that they don't have access to public funding, the way they navigate the art world is very different in comparison to Europe." (facilitator)

"As we're spending these long hours on Zoom, we're highlighting a lot of harsh inequalities between different people in the process. We're highlighting how people in our worlds, our communities roll up their sleeves in order to support their neighbours. All of this made me think more about the idea of Reshape and that's why I scored very high on relevance." (facilitator)

- Creating equal opportunities through redistribution of financial resource

"An effort from the management team, to re-interpret, work and re-use of the budget, i.e when we could not travel. I could see a lot of innovation in the way we could use the resources when we could not travel, or some people lost contracts." (partner)

The fact that reshape chose to remunerate every single role involved helped the efficiency, it is very rare for a project of this kind to offer a remuneration and the commitment was supported by that." (reshaper)

Accessibility / Inclusion

"Regarding engagement, the concept, the language and the format are motivating and are capable of attracting the attention of those who are aware of these concepts." (partner)

"Regarding accessibility, both the project and its results are complex to understand and for this reason they are sometimes inaccessible for certain segments of the population when there is no contextualization." (reshaper)

"Also it was limited to a small number of people. In the very idea, throughout the project we had the idea to reach beyond the 40 + / 60+ people who were the part of the process, people whose information we gathered in the inventory of practitioners. But then, the inventory was left quite basic, we didn't fill out our ambitions with that. This could have enlarged the process and made it more accessible. There were a lot of responses to the initial call for people to share their innovative / experimental practises. Besides these initial contacts we didn't gather them into the larger

community. There are a whole lot of explanations why and Covid certainly didn't help. But with more resources and different ways of working it could've been more accessible to more people." (partner)

"I felt like some of the communities that were supposed to be included, weren't at all. I was constantly bringing up the disabled people.I felt I wasn't able to keep up with the pace." (facilitator)

"But why am I chosen ? I can speak English and it is a privilege that I have. How can someone from Southern Egypt, who only speaks Arabic, access this type of project if they need translation?" (reshaper)

"There are fundamental flaws in how the project was communicated. We're evaluating it and using words we don't commonly understand. Language is always so important. I always try to convey ideas as if I were talking to a 13 year old. There is a challenge of communication in this project." (reshaper)

"It also affected the motivation of people, and the infrastructure was not sufficient for the development of the ideas. Also different groups who were working separately were supposed to meet and reflect about their ideas, and it was lacking. It was left to their initiative. When you meet in a space this kind of thing happens spontaneously." (partner)

Participation in decision making

"There was not enough co-creation, I think it was because Reshapers were not around the table at that moment. The input of Reshapers was the core of the project, but they came into the preset design." (partner)

"This was also a way to get money from the commission - we needed to provide the design to the European commission." (partner)

"There were a lot of negotiations throughout the process that we did not foresee all of them and provide in advance tools to manage it. We were at least open enough to not dismiss any question, doubt, critique... " (partner)

"We and partners took the liberty to work on the design, because we are very active in our environments and we did it with the best intentions, but we got real people coming from such a diverse environment, we could not foresee this." (partner)

"In general, we did not have any specific structures. We were meeting as partners and trying to make decisions by consensus." (partner)

"There was a way of doing things consensually, without necessarily rules/written agreement. We had a set of shared values of what we thought would be a suitable management for such a project" (partner)

"How we ended up in the groups was random, that was an obstacle. Not everybody who ended up in my group did not choose transnational as a first choice. The framework limited what we could have shared otherwise, if everyone was more committed to the notion of transnational." (facilitator)

"I see it as an exercise into how to be more democratic about the resources." (reshaper)

Diversity / representativity

"I'm struggling because we were kind of lacking diversity. No matter how the different perspectives were broad, disciplines we're working, personal involvement, emotional things, but still a flat community. When it comes to the age, the social background, it was a pretty flat bubble" (partner)

"We did not manage to reach out to the knowledge that was generated outside of our bubble. We hoped to be able to reach out towards people from other sectors, people who were thinking along our lines. Covid happened, but still even before Covid, it was hard to reach out to people who were working in and outside our sector. Whenever we tried to talk to someone outside of our networks, we ended up being in our circles. It was surprising for me, how difficult it is to not see everything through the lenses of the arts and culture. At some point we had someone in Cluj who was not in our sector, and there was resistance to the style of the person. It made us realise how we are formatted to our opinions. We want to be open, but being open is hard work. This is a part that we did not manage to make happen, to open up to other practises. You also have a time limit on these things. Again, in a parallel universe, we would have taken more time for the groups to know themselves before introducing people outside the circle. But we did not have time to concentrate on this". (partner)

"Apart from Anastasia, who's a black person living in Russia, there was no representation of the Indian community, the people with disabilities, black people, travelling communities, the refugees, how to bring in other perspectives, other

realities. All of that was a miss. There were a lot of people from different countries, that's diverse - but it was all the same type of people." (facilitator)

"It was diverse with people coming from different fields of knowledge, and we realised we could collaborate and produce something. I wonder if in terms of inputs and connections outside of reshape, if we could not have invited more inputs = more people from the research and the educational fields. More artists? After COVID when we started using zoom, I could see it. The system worked. It was not what we had wished for. But it fulfilled the purpose. (...) We still stayed a lot within our field. As an ambition it could be broad, and reach people beyond the cultural field. We could have focused more on the media players. Creative Europe support + partners supporting the project. There were external players. Even contribution in-kind receiving us, spending time with us. My understanding of the project is to create communication between different players. But it would not make sense to create links with people who play a role in the financial / commercial world. The way the project happened in different cities made it possible". (partner)

"*With so many people with so many different characteristics, it's difficult to work together. I am not great at collaboration. Why would we expect if we put 8 random people, with random backgrounds, together it's going to work great, it's a gamble. For me, it was part of the process that it would not necessarily go through. There was a pressure from having to be present at all times and how to make things together all the time. Also, in the end i think there were more problems with expectations than with real production."* (reshaper)

"The power of having all these different contexts working together set the scene for something very interesting to happen. Having to negotiate what you can do together across these different realities, sometimes led to these processes being much more encompassing, or focusing on one reality, all of it was revealing (...) The process led them to consider realities that they would not consider normally. I also liked that some convictions are a given in certain contexts, are not a given in another one. In this other group there was a conflict between people who thought culture is a common group, public profile of culture needs to be defended, where public institutions have to be reclaimed - mainly in eastern europe - while the people from the arab world were adamantly against that view and felt it was naive." (partner)

Eco-responsibility

"The idea of commons of the project was very positive, but in the ecological context there were problems, generated through a lot of travel, etc..." (partner)

"Finally, the fact that the project was also built on groups of 10 people who would travel 6 times in the course of 2 years, did not confer to the project a big eco-commitment." (reshaper)

"Eco-responsible: after a certain point, not always. After a certain point, people did not go by train for example. The project itself did not allow us to even consider taking a train for example, or did not allow raising awareness on this topic" (partner)

3/ Solidarity (affectivity)

"*The design of the project created space for listening and being heard*". (partner)

"For the first time I worked in a professional context with too many people. There was time and a safe space to express discomfort. On a partner level it's rare. Usually when you represent institutions, it's quite different. I really appreciate that there were space to express the discomfort, even if it can create delay". (partner)

"Even with the management, the participants, you could feel that a very safe environment was created. I can send messages asking for help. There were certain bounds created, and it came from the selection. There were common values, something that speak to me on an individual level. To me it goes on the affective. But (…) on the long-range, I doubt". (reshaper)

"*This was one of the strongest points of the project. That there were these affective bonds between people. It was extremely effective and helpful during COVID times. It helped our group to continue standing during these uncertain times. This applies to the long range. Some connections that were created will last for a long time. But it doesn't apply to everyone in the project. It will be different constellations but not applying to everyone*". (partner)

"*The project was designed from the desire to place ourselves in a place of empathy having in count that we all have different places of privilege so that we can build a model of solidarity. Sometimes, this construction failed because it's difficult to put ourselves in someone else's shoes. At the time of the pandemic, the different places of privilege became more evident and this was not always treated with total empathy*". (partner)

"*With covid the community showed to be Very Affective (caring and solidary and understanding) at many levels the coordination was reorienting the funding to redistribute it to its members because the time frames were difficult, support from different people / support and care emotional and work*". (reshaper)

"This took away the joy that could have been within the project. Not enough time and space to have fun together, which is important as a political matter". (facilitator)

"At the same time, some people were generous and caring, not all were negative. There was a real sense of camaraderie when it came to finishing the prototypes". (partner)

"We tried to be as adaptable as possible. As a result, the project was a constant exercise in negotiation and reaffirmation of trust." (partner)

"We lacked the therapeutic skills, somebody more dedicated to think about how the communities are evolving and how it feels being in the process. We took on this role in the team, but it is not beneficial to the project". (partner)

4/ To facilitate the geographic balance

To promote collaboration, mobility and equal opportunities so that diverse artistic voices and practises may reach potential audiences across Europe.

"I guess the idea of this term transnational was to get rid of the pattern of thinking within the grid of a nation state. But this grid does have an impact on our lives, personally and politically. This is very tricky. and this is why we could not get rid of it. In this group we weren't able to get rid of this point, or apply it. So rather than trying to define transnational we decided to build the common grounds between ourselves. But the idea of building alliances, collaborations across the borders, is one of the key issues at the moment." (partner)

"There was a fair amount of leaning towards the Anglo-Saxon side, even though the leadership was more Eastern European". (facilitator)

"Why MENA gets included in this? We are coming from completely different contexts. Do we represent anything? Mediterranean region, the fact that they don't have access to public funding, the way they navigate the art world is very different in comparison to Europe. No time and space to get into the context and to understand why we are in this context. (…) How are the outcomes relevant for this part of the world (MENA). Workshops happened in Hammana or Tangiers. And I appreciate this part of the project. But the core of discussions and the project don't come from here (this context). (In this Geography) we are talking about dictatorship and military rules, zero funding, no registration, and no mobility. The discussions would be completely different. There is a space for discussion, but it didn't seem relevant to the

project itself. (…) Even in terms of ratio, if we have 40 Reshapers and only 3 from the MENA region, who are already « European style participants ». What is the relevance ?" (reshaper)

"I can say that considering all these topics, and having people from different parts of Europe and MENA, this was really enriching in terms of knowledge to understand how different contexts need different solutions. Or something that seems very plausible in one organisation might be impossible in another. I saw a lot of empathy among the participants. It provoked some ha-ha moments. People facing some realities, and feedbacking me how one solution might not work in their context. It opened my eyes on how something that might be labelled as an undesirable practice in my context, might be the only way to survive for someone in another context. This required a lot of openness. It helped me to understand how the cultural sector functions in different contexts". (partner)

5/ Sustainability

To influence public policies and integrate future policy instrument

"It (Reshape) may have contributed to opening conversations, and maybe contributed to better infrastructure, for instance about the negotiation about remuneration that we had. (…) It opened opportunities that were interesting and reinforcing the sense of the community." (partner)

"There are the results but there are messages that the project wants to communicate merely through its existence. We want to communicate ideas not through activities, but through the fact that it's here. The fact that we set up the project gathering certain actors that are developing tools to change the future of the sector. That conveys a message. It's not only about the layer of the outputs, it's more that we planted these different ideas about the change in the cultural institution in the mind of certain people. You're sitting somewhere in an institution that is considered unmovable, but did we create the opportunities to plant the idea into institutions' minds that they need to change? Ask themselves the questions that they never asked themselves before. Will the project inspire people in the institutions to take a closer look at the independent cultural actors? I don't think she'll ever read the book. I don't think it will influence them on a practical level, but it will influence them in, hey let's talk about this topic. It's this sort of thinking that we want to open up. And you don't open up by the results, but by the process and the methodology." (partner)

"Lots of people are interested in Reshape as an experiment. I gave away 15 books so far, and lots of people asked me about it. You can see the Flemish Art Institute doing their own mini Reshape and lessons learned. A lot of people are talking about it". (facilitator)

"The material produced, it's open-source so it thinks about a broader community outside of the network." (partner)

To increase the knowledge, competences and reactivity of intermediary organisations in relation to today's artistic experimentations.

"Smaller groups and networks of synergies were created that will continue further, and I found that very important." (partner)

"…the initiative to award people financially for participation was a change maker that should be standardised." (partner)

"Personally, this has a long lasting effect on me, but if I look at what comes from it, I don't see a long term effect of the idea. (…) It was interesting for me to see how these players interact but I have no projection for the future". (reshaper)

"The question for me is how is it scalable, how it can grow bigger. It's easy to understand how someone else can use the cards in their context ? How to use a guideline. But the question to me is more: how do we bring it to a level where it can inform the practices? I don't have an answer, but it would be nice to know that it could have a wide impact. Yes it will have an impact, and I believe that nowadays there is so much information around, that it would be difficult for people to take the time to read and use it in their own context. Creative Europe creates so many manuals, I don't know if people take the time to read. I don't know how this one will have a different fate. But in Ljubljana policy-makers were interested in the process. They told us how their thinking was impacted and it's already much more than some other project. And a lot of learning was produced by this project. For me this is sustainable." (partner)

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.