

MAKE
A MOVE

Make a Move Evaluation Report

by Cristina Da Milano and Darko Lukić

February 2020

Photo credit / Dražen Šokčević



Co-funded by the
Creative Europe Programme
of the European Union

Make a Move Evaluation Report

by Cristina Da Milano and Darko Lukić

February 2020

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."



Co-funded by the
Creative Europe Programme
of the European Union

Introduction

Evaluation is the systematic collection of information about a program/project that enables stakeholders to better understand it, improve its effectiveness, and/or make decisions about future programming.

It has to start necessarily from the aim and objectives of the project itself. In the case of MaM, they are expressed as such:

“the Make a Move project will execute and test an innovative Art Incubator program, designed particularly for non-institutionalised theatre practitioners and small independent cultural operators primarily from the field of contemporary movement-based theatre with the first group of 10 full-time participants and 30 auditing participants from at least 5 European countries who will have the opportunity to develop their artistic and professional skills and grow their production proposals through co-creation processes in collaboration with the international group of artists.

The Art Incubator will be implemented in 2019 in three cities: Galway (April-May), Rijeka (September) and Targu-Mures (December). The project will produce to various stages of development at least 10 new contemporary theatre productions that will be presented as work-in-progress to audiences in three project partners' countries. The project will identify at least 5 new cooperation opportunities and initiate applications to sources of funding producing a target of theatre productions for display at European Capital of Culture occasions in Rijeka (Croatia) and Galway (Ireland)”.

The leader of the project is the Creative Laboratory of Contemporary Theatre KRILA from Rijeka. **The main partners** of the project are the Galway Theater Festival - GTF (Ireland), the Institute of Arts Barcelona - IAB (Spain), the University of Arts Targu-Mures - UAT (Romania). **The associate partners** are ACTS (Oslo, Norway), MOVEO (Barcelona, Spain) Platform 88 (Montpellier, France), Poulpe Electrique (Arcueil, France), ToTum TeaTre (Barcelona, Spain) and Workinglifebalance Ltd. (Graz, Austria).

The evaluation will focus on the following activities:

- Implementing the art incubator model (Labs)
- Developing participants artistic and professional skills
- Identifying new cooperation opportunities/applications to sources of funding

It will also assess the quality of activities, which was meant to be assured through:

- Clear and detailed planning, sharing;
- Sharing and agreeing among partners on the overall objectives and on the objectives to be achieved at each stage;
- The identification of the institution responsible for the completion of each stage;
- A clear definition of tasks and responsibilities;
- The autonomous conduction of the agreed activities, under the responsibility of the designated partner;
- The joint evaluation of the achievements, the re-shaping of the objectives and further planning;
- The linking and joining together of all the sub-products by the coordinating institution.

The most common data collection strategies used, fall into the following broad categories:

1. Review documents

Analysis of printed material including program records, research reports, budgets. Document review is a common method of collecting data about activities and outputs for implementation evaluation.

2. Observe

Observe situations, behaviours and activities in a formalized and systematic way, usually using observational checklists and trained observers. This is a good method to use in settings where experiencing actual events or settings (rather than hearing about them) is an important part of the evaluation.

3. Talk to people

Collect verbal responses from participants and other stakeholders through interviews (in-person or phone) or focus groups. This method is helpful when it is important to hear complex or highly individual thoughts of a certain group of individuals.

The tools used have been interviews (in person and via Skype) and behavioural observation and the main outputs have been 7 reports, 2 about the Conference organised in IAB (1a and 1b), 3 about the Labs (2, 3, 4), 1 related to the final partners' meeting in Rijeka in February 2020 (5) and 1 related to the 2 sets of interviews realised in 2019 and 2020 (6).

Reports

1a. IAB, Sitges, January 2019

This first evaluation activity was meant to evaluate MAM desk research and preparations for the Conference in February.

With Armando Rotondi, Valentina Temussi and Dasha Lavrennikov, the evaluator spent two whole working days visiting the Institute venues, meeting academic, administrative and technical staff and especially discussing the desk research and preparation activities for the future Conference.

The situation looked as such:

1. Venue:

The IAB has a rather large and well-equipped stage with many rehearsal/ educational/working studios. As the City of Sitges is supporting the Institute as well as the MaM project, additional venues in the city performing spaces and theatre venues are offered for the Conference.

2. Human resources:

Professors Rotondi, Temussi and Lavrennikov are very well experienced researchers with experience in artistic and scientific projects and researches. As project leaders in their part of the research, they looked qualified and capable to meet the expected and planned MaM tasks and goals. Their engagement within the Institute, however, requires quite a lot of working hours in the education process and academic administration, and including the MaM project into such already intensive regular educational activities during full working time requires additional commitment in terms of time, energy and efforts.

3. Process:

The IAB desk research paper helped in defining aesthetics, ethics and politics of the whole MAM research project. The Barcelona Conference will contribute in capacity building, team organization, planning, project development and research goals definition.

In the area of the cross-cutting issues, the IAB team is fairly gender-balanced, international and multicultural based and visibly sensitive to social and community issues. A very high level of environmental consciousness and ecological efforts in recycling has been noticed.

4. Recommendation:

The first draft of the Conference plan is however still somewhat generic and the contribution to the MaM project is not visible enough. In the final draft working groups, topics and clear division between MaM team meetings and general audience events should be defined.

The first draft of the paper (book) delivered by IAB is very well structured. It is now required to further detail the concept of the proposed research and a clear segmentation of theoretical-scientific and practical

research segments. Mapping and profiling all participants in all the MaM partner organizations would also be an asset.

The organisational structure of MaM is expected to be presented - preferable in the organigram - after the Barcelona Conference. The engagement of the variety of international artists is the strength of the project. The further development of the project planning would be strongly supported by defining the impacts to local artistic communities in the partner countries.

1b. IAB, Sitges, February 2019

The second evaluation activity was meant to evaluate the Conference held in February in IAB, Sitges.

Day 1

Round tables

1) What is independent theatre?

The discussion focused on the notion of independence (economic, artistic) and artistic excellence, which is obviously quite controversial. Overall, the topic was quite slippery and it was very difficult to come to some meaningful conclusions.

2) Audience Development

The discussion in this case focused on business models and audience development. Terms were clearly defined and the session was quite fruitful, although it envisaged some substantial differences in the visions of the discussants (which is normal, considering the topic).

3) Digital tools and audiences

A very interesting discussion took place, based on the use of digital tools as means to foster:

- instant communication
- time poverty
- justified use in the artistic/creative concepts
- innovative use of imagination
- new communication
- digital education
- archive function
- destruction of intermediate bodies

Overall, there round tables were very interesting, although in some cases (especially in the first one) it would have been better to settle more strict conceptual framework and to have in place a more effective moderation.

Day 2

A quite long restricted session among partners and associated partners took place on day 2.

The main topic of the session was the design of the curriculum to be delivered during the 3 labs (in Galway, Rijeka and Targu Mures).

Objectives of the labs are:

- revitalization European theatre (non-institutionalised, independent theatre)
- develop artistic and professional skills through art incubator, producing performances

- co-creation will be the basis of the labs, in order to achieve 5 co-operation projects which could be used for applications; then, at the end of each lab participants will also produce some small performances.

The structure of the 3 labs is designed as such:

- Day 1: Business models
- Day 2-8: artistic activities/co-creation
- Day 9-10: AD and evaluation; presentations (on the 9th day)

Participants will be 10 resident artists selected in the 3 partners' countries plus 10 more local and regional artists. The labs will see the participation of 31 people:

- 10 residential artists (middle-career artists)
- 10 regional artists (no age limit)
- 2 scientists from IAB
- 2 scientists from UAT (action research, to evaluate the pilot incubator)
- 1 artistic director
- 2 external evaluators
- 4 experts for the modules (artistic module; business module; AD module; public space and outreach).

The partner felt the strong need to discuss some issues, which in the application have been express in a quite vague manner (at least, they were not clear to all the partners):

- The evaluation methods have also been discussed among the partners, who identified different tools to be used, such as questionnaires, interviews, portfolios and blogs;
- The selection process: the 10 local and regional artists should come to the labs ready to co-operate and not just to realize their own projects/ideas;
- Involvement of experts: 10 days might be a much too long period for experts to be away from their job, they will find an internal solution.

Final remarks

Generally speaking, the programme was very articulated and well planned.

There was a great deal of involvement of local community (IAB student and local stakeholders), as well as obviously the presence of all partners and associated partners.

The organisational and logistic aspects were very well managed.

The meeting ended up by identifying each partner's tasks for the first lab in Galway.

Overall, it was a very effective meeting which started with some evident tensions/difficulties among the partners which were then smoothed out throughout the meeting.

2. Lab at O'Donoghue Centre for Drama, Theatre and Performance, Galway, May 2019

Day 1

In Galway the Lab has been attended by 10 local artists and 10 European ones, who were selected to participate in the first Lab of the MaM project. The intention of the Lab was the organic connection between the artistic practices, artistic education and artistic research.

The group was well balanced since participants are coming from very different background, artistic schools and methods, different generations and performative cultures.

They worked on the production of a collective performance, which was very much about physical contacts and audience engagement. Overall, the whole presentation, articulated in two parts, was a shift from isolated individual experience to the community participation. Visible results were the exploring of the different ways and models of expression, storytelling, body and space conceptualising and experimenting

with the new technologies as the media of the new performing language and additional/parallel system of signs. The group expressed high level of motivation and productive group dynamics, and notable success in the continuity of the collective creative energy building and developing.

The discussion after the first part unfortunately lost its focus and collapsed in not moderated, random, personal witnessing about very local problems of the independent performing arts production, which cannot support research goals of MaM in any significant way.

Too many issues were tackled (such as the role of technology in performances; how it can change the relationship with audiences and among artists; how and if can technology remove, or set, barriers; the international dimension of the experience they made in Ireland and the differences among artists form different contexts in using non-verbal and technological languages; the role and challenges of independent theatre in the different contexts, such as lack of funding, lack of spaces, scarcity of residential opportunities). Overall, the discussion included too many topics and it was neither structured nor guided and so it all ended up with a number of personal experiences, interesting and valuable in themselves but absolutely useless in order to frame a common perspective or at least to identify common elements/features. The only concrete and useful information in that rather chaotic discussion for the MaM project goals were the discussion about contributions of ECoC to the independent productions and addressing the problem of financing the residence programme by the Arts Council.

As far as exercises and trainings were concerned, the group was on the upper level of sustainability, still not too big that each and every participant could not get enough time, space and attention needed for such a process. For the discussions and Q&A, however, the whole group was far too big, which inevitably makes evaluations ineffective and discussions rather unfocused and dispersed.

The afternoon workshop about artistic practice and the use of VR and technology was in fact a lecture with a case study presentation, unfortunately not very carefully prepared both from a technical and from a “philosophical” point of view. Participants were somehow engaged but unfortunately they could not confront themselves with real experts on the topic.

Day 2

It started with a presentation of the Creative Europe Programme by a representative of the Creative Europe Desk Ireland. It was an excellent session, which provided participants with useful information and insights about EU funding for culture and Creative Europe and i-Portunus in particular, in the light of future participation in European projects.

Final remarks

The most important outcome in the project progress after Barcelona meeting was the visible and tangible sense of partnership in the team, enabling learning from each other and intensively sharing of the knowledge, experiences and ideas across the group.

The University of Galway O'Donoghue Centre for Drama, Theatre and Performance is quite obviously offering significant support and highly professional contribution in resources: nice and modern space, high technology, friendly and supportive atmosphere, very good logistic and first of all excellent human resources for the high level of research lab practice for such a complex and demanding project as MaM. They also made an excellent use of social media (particularly FB) in order to communicate the aim and results of the Galway Lab.

3. Lab at Filodrammatici and Ri Hub, Rijeka, September 2019

Day 1

Team building activity among international artists who arrived a week ago and local ones. The atmosphere is quite relaxed and we noticed an improvement in the relationships among the international artists, who also showed a better attitude towards the local ones.

Day 2

It was dedicated to the issue of Audience Development, intended as something which is conceived in different ways by artists, according to artistic content, places, co-creation issues, as well as by institutions.

Participants shared their own experiences about AD in non-conventional spaces, talking about:

- Experiences which are mostly about the rather small groups of audience
- Open spaces experience and random passers-by
- Experiences of aggressive (even violent) reactions to some topics (such as queer) and of some extreme situations
- Experience of community art
- Unexpected reactions of the audience
- The importance of knowing expected audiences
- The importance of understanding cultural differences of the audiences
- The role of the social media and local media on communication with the audience

Then they focused on very concrete Rijeka performances/presentations related to audience engagement. The whole discussion has been much more about personal experiences about audience engagement than about the strategic planning of audience development practices.

Day 3

It was dedicated to the rehearsals of the site-specific performances realised by participants during the Lab and to the actual implementation of them. The performances were very well received by the audience and the artists expressed very positive feelings about the Lab and its result: there has been also this time – as in Galway – the feeling of a long period spent together but this time the whole process seems to have been better managed and went on quite smoothly.

Day 4

It was dedicated to the capacity building of participants. Barbara Rovere and Adam Jeanes led a workshop about how to write projects and grant applications. The workshop included a plenary session, two parallel sessions and individual (one-to-one) sessions.

Plenary session by Barbara Rovere

The business module was focused on practical advice and instructions on a project designing and development in terms of the formal application creation and financial construction. The module was organized combining theoretical approach in the form of lecturing and practical (mentoring) work in the form of the workshop. The lecturing provided the basic and most important information about the project design, project planning and project management, and about the financing and budgeting the projects. For most of the participants, it was rather a new area of knowledge and they expressed interest mostly in concrete and particular aspect they could use in their future applications. However, it seemed to be somewhat redundant and *deja vu* for the participants with previous experience in creating and developing projects. The direct instructions how to present the project design were for sure the most useful concerning the fact that most of the participants in previous meetings and sessions expressed the tendency of too extended and too detailed descriptions of their artistic and collaborative activities. Their questions were focused mainly on the structure of planning and project design. The most useful (as an applicable experience) were the reflections of the very particular example and case study of this ongoing project Make a Move from the perspective of project design and budgeting and the difficulties faced through the realization. The first Q&A session after Barbara Rovere's presentation suffered from the lack of structure so the questions were frequently completely out of the topic of the presentation. The discussion (not only this one, but also other discussion sessions within MaM) would benefit from the support of academic partners in moderation and facilitation. Overall, the session was very well received by participants and it was very effective.

Adam Jeanes's session

The budgeting and financing workshop was based on Adam's experience with the projects in the UK and EU. The first part consisted in the overview of different projects from his experience in of fundraising, budgeting and financing. A detailed explanation of the European context, its criteria, rules, values and financing policy was useful for the participants. Adam gave specific explanations within the broader framework about the topics what is expected and what could be accepted as the project acceptable for financing from different EU funds. Adam also left enough space for the questions and answers and was very precise and concrete in answering. Very important for this particular MaM project was Adam's explanation of usually faced difficulties because of many different expectations, goals and interests among the participants in the complex projects. As such a problem appeared to be an issue in our interviews, this explanation of general common agreement about the particular differences was very helpful in our opinion.

Barbara Rovere's session

Sharing her experience, Barbara gave strict and direct instructions about the most important facts related to the project writing. The rules and advices she talked about are applicable to all types of projects and can be used in participants' future applications. She gave examples of different scale grant mechanisms, from very small grants to very big ones such as Creative Europe, pointing to common rules and underlying the most frequent mistakes. She also gave some specific case studies examples to stress and underline the importance of rules and principles in the process of writing an application. She did it using the framework of her PowerPoint presentation for open dialogue with the participants.

Individual sessions

The day finished with the individual sessions, a very good way of providing participants appropriate and tailored-made information and support and of pushing them to present some concrete ideas, with the aim of gathering at least 5 co-operation projects. Individual sessions continued also on the following day and the aim of gathering at least 5 co-operation projects was achieved, although the projects are obviously quite different.

Final remarks

The most important outcome in the project progress was the more and more visible and tangible sense of partnership in the team, enabling learning from each other and intensively sharing of the knowledge, experiences and ideas across the group. The Rijeka Lab was a powerful experience, in which both the artistic production and the capacity building programme achieved their objectives.

4. Lab at UAT, Targu Mures, December 2019

Day 1

The presentations in Targu Mures were very well elaborated and distributed in 3 different spaces in Studio 2.1, offering the insight in artistic research development.

They were longer, more complex structured and more elaborate than in Galway and Rijeka, and they also were focused on different goals. While the first two explored techniques and skills and made connections between different working processes, this one used performance to address "big questions" like a social and personal loss, loneliness, war conflicts, intercultural understanding, human communication or sense of everyday routines. The reaction of the audience showed that it was a good choice. All the presentations succeeded in reaching emotion touch with the audience.

Through the presentation it was possible to notice:

- Elaboration of the working process through the time
- Exchange of the knowledge, skills and experiences between the participants
- Team building results reached in last year
- Sense of the community and partnership between the participants

- Collaboration, mutual support and trust between them

After the presentation, a public discussion was organized and the participants stressed some of the key aspects of the MaM project:

- Intercultural aspect
- New methods reached through common research
- Exchange of knowledge and experience
- Learning through the research
- Communication

The theoretical focus of this lab was on the relation between the independent artists and their audience; communication and presentation to the audience; taking it into account. For that purpose, the lab engaged professors and lecturers from the university with their theoretical approaches, as well as successful practitioners with their experiences and case studies.

The practical focus was on the workshop of application to the EU funds process and learning how to write a successful application. Stressing the importance of the added value of interculturality, Targu Mures lab presented the city's multicultural and bilingual experience and cultural interdependence model.

Day 2

The focus of the Grant Writing Boot Camp is about moving from theory of grant applications (tackled in Rijeka) to practice, namely the writing process. Barbara Rovere elaborated and developed her lecturing from Rijeka lab into the practical training for the participants in Targu Mures.

Participants had to present their ideas for future projects and then started writing a draft of the project proposal, facilitated by Barbara.

The process has been based on 3 steps:

- Ideation (day 1)
- Idea formulation and presentation (day 2)
- Grant writing (day 3)

The theoretical framework of the whole Lab has been carefully designed by Barbara starting from:

1. The creative cycle:

- research
- ideation
- development
- revision

2. Innovation management (open innovation):

The basic principle is that a single organisation does not possess all the knowledge, competences and skills: co-creation and collaboration are needed.

3. Writing skills

Final remarks

The core group of permanent participants is visibly more relaxed, they know each other, they collaborate and share, and the tensions from the beginning of the lab are almost invisible.

The newcomers, local artists, seems to be welcomed, but on this stage of the project, they could not be more included and integrated with their experiences into the ongoing project. But they for sure had benefited from the joining and learning through the lab. They expressed great enthusiasm and openness during the lab.

Comparing to labs in Galway and Rijeka, the working process here was much more flexible. It was not so punctual and plans and time-oriented, as the participants felt more comfortable to renegotiate and reorganize the plans during the process. But in the more elevated and more developed phases of the project, it was productive and did not affect the goal-oriented process.

At this point of the process, the mixture of very different methods, schools and systems which all the participants brought in the project finally started to cooperate easily and to lead to new experiences and new skills for each of them. Exchange of the experiences and knowledge between the participants seems to be natural, planned and organized.

During the collaborative process, the engagement and contribution between the participants are well balanced so each of them can feel included.

The space of the theatre Studio 2.1 is well equipped for workshops and suitable for the lab. There are several completely independent and isolated rooms and enough space for daytime work.

Space is clean and well maintained, suitable for long term rehearsals and research process.

Technical staff is very supportive and helpful all the time.

Accommodation, transport and meals are organized in a way that meets the participant needs and previously expressed wishes (single rooms, some special diets etc.) so all the participants expressed satisfaction and there were no major objections on living and working conditions.

5. Final partners' meeting in Rijeka (February 2019)

The meeting was completely dedicated to technical reporting and internal evaluation. The project leader reported about the meeting with Mrs. Danijela Jovic from the Creative Europe desk in Zagreb.

The partners went "step by step" through the final technical report, included the statistic part of it. They reviewed all the aspects of the project, discussing the details about budget, technical production, goals, funding, double-checking the documents and data, and seriously preparing the final documentation to be sent to the Commission.

By discussing all the goals, objectives, impacts and activities, the partners openly addressed the positive and negative aspects and experiences and evaluated the whole experience as useful and successful.

The partners also discussed the two publications planned to be edited and published as a result of the MaM project, the Handbook and the theoretical research book: in discussing this last aspect, we -as external evaluator – noticed that the problem of the differences and discrepancies between the two worlds of the academia and of the practitioners came up again, as a sort of "original sin" of the project which has not been fully overcome. During the second day of the meeting, a solution was found by taking the decision of publishing two different publications, one in a more academic style and the other one in the form of a Handbook, addressing practitioners and policy makers.

The second day also saw the participation via Skype of all the associated partners, who answered a set of question about the positive and negative impacts of the projects and their expectations at the beginning and at the end of MaM, for evaluation purposes.

6. Report about 2 sets of interviews (July 2019 and February 2020)

Introduction

In the framework of the evaluation activity related to the Make a Move (MaM) project, interviews to partners and associate partners were carried out in Galway on the 4th of May and via Skype during the month of June 2019 and in Rijeka in February 2020.

All the partners and associate partners have been interviewed.

Galway, 4th of May 2019

- Sebastián Loesener (Platform 88, associate partner)
- Mairead Ní Chróinín (GTF, partner):
- Ivana Peranic (KRILA, leading partner)
- Traian Penciu (UAT, partner)

Skype (May-June 2019)

- Sophie Kasser (Moveo, associate partner)
- Valentina Temussi and Armando Rotondi (IAB, partner)
- Fernanda Branco (ACTS, Laboratory for performance practices, associate partner)
- Christina Lederhaas (Workinglifebalance Ltd., associate partner)

- Nicole Pschetz (Poulpe Electrique, associate partner)
- Oscar Valsecchi (Totum Theatre, associate partner)

Interviews were organized according to the following questions:

- Is MaM the first EU funded project you are involved in? If not, how do you conceive the role of EU fundings for your organization in particular and for the sector in general?
- Why did you decide to take part in it?
- What are your expectations?
- Have you already worked with the partners of MaM?
- What do you find most difficult in this collaboration?
- What do you think will be the impact of MaM as a collaborative experience on your organization?
- And on you personally?

Rijeka, 19th of February 2020

- Ivana Peranic (KRILA, leading partner)
- Valentina Temussi and Mireilla Vazquez (IAB, partner)
- Mairead Ní Chróinín (GTF, partner):
- Eugen Pasareanu (UAT, partner)

Email (February 2020)

- Sebastián Loesener (Platform 88, associate partner)
- Sophie Kasser (Moveo, associate partner)
- Fernanda Branco (ACTS, Laboratory for performance practices, associate partner)
- Christina Lederhaas (Workinglifebalance Ltd., associate partner)
- Nicole Pschetz (Poulpe Electrique, associate partner)
- Oscar Valsecchi (Totum Theatre, associate partner)

Interviews were organized according to the following questions:

- Did the project meet your expectations?
- What did you find most difficult in this collaboration?
- What did you find most inspirational in this collaboration?
- What do you think will be the impact of MaM as a collaborative experience on your organization?
- And on you personally?

Analysis of the interviews

The answers have been gathered individually and are presented in this report in an anonymous form, clustered according to the questions:

QUESTIONS	a.ANSWERS Initial evaluation	b.ANSWERS Final evaluation
Is MaM the first EU funded project you are involved in? If not, how do you conceive the role of EU fundings for your organization in particular and for the sector in general?	<p><i>For most of the partners and associate partners MaM is the first EU funded project. Only UAT has already had previous experiences in that sense: EU projects are strategic for them and they have a good level of continuity in participating in this sort of projects.</i></p> <p><i>For all the others, it is perceived as an opportunity, although in most cases they lack a strategic vision of why and how EU funding could be part of their planning.</i></p>	NA
Why did you decide to take part in it?	<p><i>For most of them the invitation came directly from Ivana Peranic, the project manager, who personally knew most of the organisations and people involved in the project. Only GTF and UAT have been involved through the Creative Europe Desks. Those who are new to EU funded projects decided to participate in order to strengthen/to initiate their international dimension.</i></p>	NA
<p>a.What are your expectations?</p> <p>b.Did the project meet your expectations?</p>	<p><i>To expose artists - and to be exposed as artists - to an international context/environment and to think more strategically. MaM will be a big HUB for the development of European independent theatre.</i></p>	<p><i>Most of the interviewed people said that MaM has achieved the results which were foreseen, but also some interesting unexpected results: for example, Mam was extremely meaningful for most artists beyond the partners' expectations, to the extent that it changed the professional life of many artists. It also proved to be an extraordinary experience in terms of: networking with colleagues in Europe; broader and deeper knowledge of the sector; understanding that it is facing similar difficulties all over Europe. The methodology of the Labs proved to be very effective and also their generative power - the new projects/collaborations - has been highly appreciated.</i></p> <p><i>As for the negative issues, some partners faced unexpected difficulties in getting co-funding, which they thought it would have been easier. Another un-expected result was the scarce interest of some of the associate partners in the co-creation process.</i></p>

Have you already worked with the partners of MaM?	<i>As stated above, most of the partners and associate partners knew each other. The original idea of the project came as a collective, horizontal planning process based on the role of independent theatre in contemporary society. This original idea changed completely when they had to write a project fitting into the Creative Europe scheme, but most of the partners understood that perfectly and are more or less fine with it, although they think the whole process should have been clearer and more transparent.</i>	NA
---	--	----

<p>What do you find most difficult in this collaboration?</p>	<p><i>The main problematic issues underlined by all partners are the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The gap between the academic and the artistic sector, in terms of methodology, language, objectives;</i> • <i>Serious communication problems: all of them underlined lack of clarity in terms of timing, methodology, roles (hierarchy, competences), responsibility, tasks and content (of the labs and of the internal evaluation activity, particularly);</i> • <i>Some ambiguity in the proposal in terms of outcomes and selection of artists for the labs;</i> • <i>Evaluation activity: it is mostly not understood by participants and poorly managed according to them;</i> • <i>Trust: in some cases, partners feel a lack of trust among each other, mainly due to the fact that they belong to different sectors and work with different methodologies.</i> <p><i>In terms of EU funded project, administrative tasks and the co-funding are an issue for most of the partners.</i></p>	<p><i>The main problematic issues underlined at the end of the projects are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lack of experience in such a complex project as well as the workload which was generated by it was considered as the main critical issue lamented by many partners;</i> • <i>Lack of clear rules, roles and procedures was also an issue according to the majority of partners. This is something which has been registered also at the beginning of the project and it has not been solved during the months, although there were some improvements;</i> • <i>Co-creation process was in some case difficult to be approached by partners and by participant artists, as it was something new for many of them;</i> • <i>At the beginning there were also some mistrust problems, but during the project a growing feeling of respect has been registered by all the partners;</i> • <i>There is still a sort of misconception of the awareness of the situation of the practitioners from the side of the academics and vice-versa, as it was noticed at the beginning of the project. Mistrust and misunderstandings were due to different backgrounds, in the next generations there will be more contacts between the two worlds, because there are more contacts between them;</i> • <i>The whole process would have benefitted of more time to get to know each other, to understand differences (for example, cultural ones), to work together (sometimes, the programme was felt to be too tight). Some of the partners felt that they could not keep the pace and they would have appreciated a better understanding of it from the project leader.</i>
---	--	--

<p>What did you find most inspirational in this collaboration?</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p><i>The most inspirational aspects identified by partners have been:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The chance of turning an abstract idea into reality, creating a very specific structure to support independent theatre;</i> • <i>To see how things can be interpreted in different ways in the artistic practices, as it happened through the Labs. They also proved to be a great demonstration of collective intelligence, since the final productions reached a very high and sophisticated level in terms of artistic quality, considering that the starting point was a group of artists who did not know each other and came from very different backgrounds in terms of aesthetic, methodological and political practices;</i> • <i>The overall learning process through the capacity building experiences and the development of personal and professional skills;</i> • <i>The networking process.</i>
<p>a. What do you think will be the impact of MaM as a collaborative experience on your organization? b. What has been the impact of MaM on your organization?</p>	<p><i>Most of them have underestimated the impact of logistic and organizational aspects, they are learning a lot in terms of management; networking is strengthening and this is a great added value for all the partners, especially for artists/artistic organisations.</i></p>	<p><i>Most of the partners claimed that the MaM experience has changed them profoundly and in an irreversible way, both in their internal approach (more interest in physical theatre, for example) as well as in the external one (openness to local and international contexts). A great deal of learning took place in every organisation, from the point of view of project and financial management, of networking and collaboration, of co-creation and artistic research/production. All of them gained a great deal of visibility, thanks to MaM.</i></p>

And on you personally?	<i>They all consider it as a learning and awareness raising experience.</i>	<i>People who were personally engaged in MaM as representatives of the partner organizations underlined again, as they did at the beginning, the powerful learning experience they made through MaM (for example, by learning the potential of technology in the performing art sector, the role of co-creation, the management of collaborative processes, the better understanding of the independent sector). Also the discovery of an inter-disciplinary approach has been highly appreciated, as well as the gain of new inter-relational skills.</i>
Other comments	<p><i>Most of the associate partners complained about the fact that the nature of the project has profoundly changed from the initial idea and are worried about the final outputs, which are not clear to all of them and seem to be also unrealistic. For them, the main concern is that the project at the beginning was based on a clear and effective co-creation process (horizontal), then it became much more hierarchical: they do understand the reasons behind it, but still it is not very clear to them what MaM has become and what its outputs/impact will be.</i></p> <p><i>Partners are worried about the poor communication because the process keeps on being not fluid, notwithstanding the attempts made to improve it.</i></p>	<p><i>Some recommendations for the EU Commission also emerged in the end:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The need for a mentorship scheme for small organizations, tackling EU funded project for the first time;</i> <i>• The need for a change in the reporting methodology and tools, which should be simplified and more based on qualitative indicators rather than quantitative ones;</i> <i>• The need for more freedom from the side of organizations and artists in relationship to the possible outputs of funded projects (be more innovative).</i>

Conclusion

The evaluation activity was meant to analyze the MaM project in its initial and final phase.

The main results of the evaluation show that there have been some communication/trust-building problems among the partners, while the associate partners felt more at ease within the project, although their main concern was about the outputs of MaM: since the project changed drastically from its initial form, they initially did not really understand what kind of results it would have achieved. These initial problems have been almost completely solved during the project.

Our suggestion as external evaluator was to try hard to smooth and improve the communication process at all level and to engage in a more active way all the partners and associate partners in the different phases of the project, avoiding a top-down approach, which had been perceived as frustrating and limiting the potential contribution of all partners to the project. We also suggested that it would have been useful to establish clear models of communication (permanent exchange of information in the mailing group, periodical Skype conferences...) and use the rest of the meetings (Rijeka and Targu Mures) to empower the mutual trust, communication and transparency of the process. The partners partially managed to do that.

Since according to the partners during the first round of internal evaluation most of the interviewed artists expressed their concerns about the evaluation process, we suggested to circulate the explanation about the methodology, techniques, values and goals of the evaluation process. The suggestion was accepted and the internal evaluation process went on in a much smoother way.

Concerning the discrepancy between academic and artistic practitioner approaches mentioned in the first round of interviews, it seemed important to us to underline the fact that the figures of the artist/practitioner and that of the researcher-theoretician could co-exist and generate the so-called "theoretician-practitioner" or "practitioner-theoretician" model, which could have been applied to some niches/parts of the projects. This result unfortunately has not been achieved by the partners, the juxtaposition between the two figures/models still remains.

It has been also important to underline the importance of the administrative and organizational framework. Such framework has different, more strict and more bureaucratic rules than usual independent projects, and naturally may seem hard to participants. However, concerning the level of financing, organizational requests and transparency needed, it must be accepted, however hard or irritating may seem. In the end, partners accepted it and learned how to manage that level of complexity.

The evaluation findings

- a) **Relevance** - the extent to which project design is coherent with objectives and the priorities of the programme Creative Europe. In MaM case, the relevance lied mainly in the capacity building activities and artists' mobility: the Labs supported the professional and personal development of all participants.
- b) **Effectiveness** - the timely provision of activities, the quality of monitoring procedures and practices and their progress toward the achievement of expected outputs. MaM proved to managed in a very effective way, meeting all the deadlines and establishing high quality managerial procedures.
- c) **Efficiency** - the degree of implemented activities and delivered outputs in achieving project objectives. MaM activities were implemented in a very focussed and efficient way: this was the strength of the project, as universally recognised by all the partners and the participants.
- d) **Impact** - assesses the changes that can be attributed to a particular intervention, such as a project, program or policy, both the intended ones, as well as ideally the unintended ones. Impact evaluation helps us to answer key questions for evidence-based policy making: what works, what doesn't, where, why and for how much? It has received increasing attention in policy making in recent years in both Western and developing country contexts. It is an important component of the evaluation tools and approaches and integral to global efforts to improve the effectiveness of aid delivery and public

spending more generally in improving living standards. The impact on the independent theatre sector can be demonstrated through the engagement of the partners, of local artists in every Lab, including students and volunteers in Galway, Barcelona and Targu Mures. Indirectly, there was also a strong impact on general stakeholders through the media coverage of the Labs in each country; this includes also policy makers and decision makers, although it was different in each country.

- e) **Sustainability** - like probability of continuance of positive outcomes after the end of the project. The sustainability of a project like that is obviously problematic for its nature and also due to the fragility of the sector itself. Notwithstanding that, a certain degree of sustainability will most probably be guaranteed by: the network which has been created/strengthened through MaM; the professional collaborations generated (new projects), involving international and local artists; to the knowledge and skills acquired by all partners and participants; the potential that this kind of physical, independent theatre might have in involving audiences, promoting access and participation to cultural activities, as well as the representation of contemporary societal issues.