UNCHARTED

Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture

The UNCHARTED project received funding under the Horizon 2020 Programme of the European Union

Grant Agreement number: 870793

Deliverable number	D3.11
Title	Synthetic summary of the debates at the central event

Due date	Month 36
Actual date of delivery to EC	28th February 2023

Included (indicate as appropriate)	Executive Summary	☐	Abstract	☐	Table of Contents	☒

Project Coordinator:

Prof. Arturo Rodriguez Morató

Universitat de Barcelona

Email: rodriguez.morato@ub.edu

Technical Coordinator:

Antonella Fresa

Promoter S.r.l.

Email:

Project WEB site address:

http://www.Uncharted-culture.eu

Context:

Partner responsible for deliverable	University of Bologna
Deliverable author(s)	Paolo Ferri, Simone Napolitano, Andrea Carlo Lo Verso, Chiara Giulia De Leo
Deliverable version number	1
Dissemination Level	Public

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EVENT RATIONALE

The Central Event was a 2-day, in presence gathering (12th and 13th January, 2023) in the Professor Stuart Hall Building at Goldsmiths', University of London. Titled "Tensions in societal values of culture: can value conflicts be managed or mitigated?", included a workshop and an 'open debates' event.

During the event, the findings of the UNCHARTED project have been presented to a broad audience, allowing the collection of additional feedbacks and reflections on the conceptual findings produced by the Consortium during Work Package 3.

WP3 addresses the central challenge of understanding the tensions relating to how different actors in the cultural field (i.e. citizens, professionals, public administrators) construct, measure, compare and rank the values they attribute to culture. Specifically, the objectives of WP3 are:

- To analyse the grammar of valuation and evaluation in cultural practices of consumption;
- To analyse the practices of evaluation in cultural production and heritage management;
- To understand how do public administration evaluation methodologies influence cultural production and heritage management;
- To investigate the representations of cultural value in cultural information systems.

Through an extended dialogue between the whole consortium, members of the project advisory board, invited stakeholders and professionals from cultural institutions, the symposium and the workshop developed an examination of the tensions showcased by WP3 research outputs and a comparison of the different ways these tensions can be solved or managed.

A symposium open to the public took place during the 1st day of the event; the symposium included a poster exhibition illustrating empirical findings from primary case studies undertaken by the Consortium partners during WP3, a retrospective account of previous work packages and a highly interactive discussion on the tensions in social values of culture. Other sessions of the symposium included an overview of Work package 4 and the launch of Work package 5.

A workshop was held during the 2nd day of the event. The workshop featured a consortium-wise discussion on the work done on WP3 cases inspired by feedbacks from advisory board members, the discussion of the work done in WP5 and a co-working session for WP4, followed by a general discussion.

PARTICIPANTS

Consortium

1. **Universitat de Barcelona (Coordination)**: Arturo Rodriguez Morato, Matias Zarlenga, Mariano Martin Zamorano, Victoria Sanchez Belando, Uxio Novo Rey, Alain Quemin, Clara Levy
2. **Eötvös Loránd Tudomanyegyetem:** Gabor Olah, Eszter Gyorgy
3. **University of Coimbra:** Nancy Duxbury, Claudia Pato Carvalho
4. **University of Bologna**: Cristina Boari, Simone Napolitano, Paolo Ferri, Luca Zan
5. **Telemark Research Institute:** Ole Marius Hylland, Ola K. Berge, Asne Dahl Haugsevje
6. **CNRS:** Felix Dupin-Meynard, Emmanuel Negrier, Julien Audemard
7. **University of Porto:** Joao Teixeira Lopes, Ligia Ferro, José Ricardo
8. **Goldsmiths', University of London:** Victoria D. Alexander, Oliver Peterson Gilbert
9. **Promoter S.r.l:** Antonella Fresa.

Advisory board

- Michael Hutter – WZB Berlin Social Science Center
- Ulrike Meinhof – School of Humanities, University of Southampton
- Kate Oakley – School of Culture and Creative Arts, Centre for Cultural Policy Research, University of Glasgow
- Philip Schlesinger - Centre for Cultural Policy Research and CREATe, University of Glasgow

Invited stakeholders

- Jordi Alomar, Museu de la Musica, Barcelona
  Tere Badia - Culture Action Europe
- Marco Berni - VAST
- Marta Bogna-Drew Associates
- Ana Maria Carabelea - Ars Electronica
- Geoff Crossick - University of London
- Dario Danti Volterra
- Gábor Erőss - Deputy-mayor 8th district of Budapest
- Amarílis Felizes – ESCH - Plateia
- Susanne Janssen - INVENT
- Patrycja Kaszynska - University of Arts London
- Dora Katsamori - Software and Knowledge Engineering Laboratory, National Center for Scientific Research "Demokritos"
- Niamh Kelly – Reimagine Remake Replay
- Hye-Kyung Lee – Kings' College London
- Sylvia Lahav - Institute for Creative and Cultural Entrepreneurship, Goldsmiths', University of London
- Andrew McDowell – National Museums Northern Ireland
  Emma McDowell - Centre for Cultural Values
- Stefan McKee   - National Museums Northern Ireland
- Jonathan Meth - Institute for Creative and Cultural Entrepreneurship, Goldsmiths', University of London
- Verena Niepal – Newcastle University
- Manuela Paixão - Cultural Strategy, Planning and Assessment Bureau – Ministry of Culture-Portugal
- Mirko Petric - INVENT

- Anne Torreggiani - The Audience Agency
- Fred Truyen Photo Consortium
- Dea Vidović Kultura Nova
- Ben Walmsley – Centre for Cultural Values
- Eleanor Wemyss – Winchester School of Arts
- Sarah Whatley- CDARE
- John Williams - Renasi
- John Wright - Centre for Cultural Values
- Neta Yodovich - INVENT

Sister projects

INVENT
- Susan Janssen, Erasmus University Rotterdam

MESOC
- Pau Raussel Köster, University of Valencia

SYMPOSIUM SESSIONS

THURSDAY 12 January

Welcome Message

(Victoria Alexander, Professor of Sociology and Arts Management – Goldsmiths', University of London and Arturo Rodríguez Morató, University of Barcelona)

The opening session began with a welcome message of Victoria Alexander (Goldsmiths' lead representative in the UNCHARTED project), and an introduction by Arturo Rodríguez Morató (coordinator of the project). Victoria and Arturo highlighted the importance of the various sessions of the event and the time allocated for discussions, hopefully spurred by presentations and co-working sessions. The main wish addressed by the speakers to the audience concerned the possibility of having a collective reflection about the Project and the values of culture in Europe, given that many stakeholders and professionals from cultural institutions took part at the event, allowing the UNCHARTED consortium to see how research findings from the project resonate with views coming from the general public.

Interactive Poster Session

UNCHARTED teams have conducted significant empirical work on cultural values. The interactive poster session showcased the work done through a series of posters showing methods, data and results from all WP3 18 case studies. Posters were ordered according to the areas (or topics) of investigation of WP3, namely the grammars of valuation and evaluation in cultural practices of consumption, the practices of evaluation in cultural production and heritage management, the influence of public administration evaluation methodologies on cultural production and heritage management, and the representations of cultural value in cultural information systems. Similarly, UNCHARTED's two sister projects, INVENT and MESOC, have been invited to showcase their key findings via posters.

During the session, team members have discussed the cases with stakeholders and other members of the consortium. Posters remained in the public area for the duration of the event and are now placed as a permanent record on the UNCHARTED webpage.

'Looking Back': UNCHARTED WP1, WP2, and WP3

(Arturo Rodríguez Morató, University of Barcelona; Matias Zarlenga, University of Barcelona; Nancy Duxbury, University of Coimbra; Paolo Ferri, University of Bologna; Ole Marius Hylland, Telemark Research Institute)

The goal of this session was to highlight and discuss the contribution made by the UNCHARTED project to inspire a new vision on the values of culture. At the heart of the project there is the idea of a plurality of values of culture that manifests in the diverse valuation and evaluation practices of different actors involved in cultural life. Interventions were facilitated by the presence of the sister project representatives, spurring a lively debate with the audience.

Matias Zarlenga synthesized the abundant evidence produced on the (e)valuation dynamics during the first three work packages of the project. Partners have investigated the context of macro-sociological factors and circumstances influencing the valuation of culture by actors (WP1), the plural configurations of values that emerge from actors' valuations in their characteristic areas of practice (WP2), and the tensions relating to how actors construct, measure, compare and rank the values they attribute to culture (WP3).

In the following speeches, speakers introduced the most relevant findings, while stimulating an open debate. Findings were presented according to the basic typology used throughout the project to study the different aspects involved in the evaluative dynamics. The typology features three main areas, namely the fields of cultural participation, cultural production and heritage, and cultural administration.

Nancy Duxbury introduced the area of cultural participation that came out of the cases of the Work Packages. Susan Janssen acted as discussant, underlining the number of connections and shared interests existing between the UNCHARTED and the INVENT projects. The following debate centered upon the contextual diversity of the cases where findings were induced from and the practices used for participation at the individual level and at the context level. Another point of interest was the engagement spurred by participation in the values orientation of people, and what actions can stimulate more inclusive grammars of participation from the individual to the meso-level.

Paolo Ferri presented the results from cases belonging to the second area, i.e. cultural production and heritage. His speech was followed by a discussion fueled by Jordi Alomar on production issues at the meso-level of organizations, such as the operationalization of challenging themes such as authenticity, diversity, sustainability and participation of under-represented categories in cultural institutions into practices.

Ole Marius Hylland introduced the results from the cultural administration area. As a discussant, Pau Rassel Köster compared the UNCHARTED results with the methodological features of the MESSOC project, which investigates a comprehensive array of values spurred by culture in the European Union.

The following discussion involved the audience, and was centered upon the importance of identifying the underlying tensions and conflicts taking place after the evaluation has occurred and the methodological underpinnings articulated during WP1, WP2 and WP3 cases, and then discussed in comparison with the analytic methodologies applied in the sister projects INVENTT and MESOC.

Discussion: Tensions in Social Values of Culture

(Victoria Alexander– Goldsmiths', University of London)

This session was designed to generate and support discussion around selected aspects of the UNCHARTED project. Symposium participants were divided among four groups, and each group was assigned a "provocation" to talk about for about 10 minutes. Each group had one member selected to be in charge for stimulating the discussion and report a short summary back to the plenary.

Provocation #1 was "Value tensions *cannot* be managed or mitigated". Luca Zan reported for the group that during the discussion various aspects spurred by the provocation were questioned, such as the very nature of what is a tension, who is responsible for managing or mitigating, and whether makes sense at all to think that all tensions can be negotiable. More generally the group discussed about the fact that social and organizational life is in fact an issue of negotiating, although often times this is overshadowed by more simple interactions and actions was realization departs significantly from what was intended. The issue of whether tensions can or should be managed and reduced was then linked to the role of values in education and then stretched to contexts in Europe and outside Europe where less democratic regimes are in place.

Provocation #2 stated "Value tensions *are* useful and productive". Often times the idea of tensions being bad can emerge, so that tensions have to be managed, and this provocation upheaves such idea. Simone Napolitano reported the discussion, sharing that the group agreed upon the idea that value tensions are productive as they can challenge the status quo and trigger change. Another topic was then related to the issue of understanding ways and moments that can be favorable to stimulate change. The discussion linked

this issue to the findings of WP3 cases such as Mudec or the cases of Venice and Liverpool. The discussion was further ignited by the interventions brought by some invited stakeholders emphasizing the productivity of value tensions; in the corporate world, and especially when dealing with clients, tensions are latent, and must be solved before they can come to the surface, similar to a risk analysis. This debate underlined that there can be conditions in society where value tensions are not useful and productive because the conditions that allow for them to be usefully and safely discussed are not there, unless you're in a broadly open, pluralistic situation. Here they can be productive because they bring new challenges and new understandings.

Provocation #3 stated that "There are different kind of value tensions and these must be distinguished; not all value tensions are alike", thus challenging the idea that value tensions are talked about as if they are of one kind. Felix Dupin-Maynard reported that the group first discussed about the different kind of tensions: tensions between values and tensions within the same value; tensions between opposed values or incommunicable values; tensions between exclusive values or compatible values; then the discussion focused on tensions where the negotiation is impossible and the only solution is the fight, and tensions where you can negotiate. The group recognized that there are different ways on how to negotiate tensions.

Provocation #4 stated that "Cultural policy should aim to solve value tensions in society", and the group reported the idea that cultural policy should aim at addressing this issue, rather than resolving it. The group recognized that most of the tensions are within institutions, and between policy makers and practitioners, and that the issue of how much the audience perceive these tensions was addressed in reference to WP3 cases.

The four provocations stimulated a lively debate on how much audience, citizens, and the broader society, recognize the existence of value tensions between different notions of the same value, such as, for example, economic value. Another theme developed was that cultural values are often more controversial than others, as exemplified by debates and tensions related to contested heritage in Netherlands and more generally in Europe. The discussion highlighted the need to overcome the term tension, as too negative and broad to capture all the nuances related to controversies (and possible ways of negotiating) related to cultural values.

'Looking Forward': The launch of UNCHARTED WP5

(Gàbor Olah, Eszter Gyorgy - Eötvös Loránd Tudomanyegyetem)

During this session Gàbor Olah and Eszter Gyorgy (ELTE) introduced to the Consortium and the audience Work Package 5; the aim of WP5 is to validate the results of the research tasks carried out by the Consortium during the project. The validation will be performed through a number of experiments and demonstrations carried out by citizens, professionals, administrators and policy makers, while covering three areas, or *axes*, of study: cultural strategic planning, culture-led urban regeneration, cultural information systems. Experiments and demonstrations will contribute to assess how the research outcomes from previous WPs are reflected in real-life experiences. Thus, WP5 has a practice-based objective, that is to create a critical methodology for cultural planning and innovation in a multi-level and multi-sectorial context.

Each of the three axes of study is led by a main case leader (PROMOTER, UB, UPORTO), whose task will be to set up in different contexts and with different methods an experimental and demonstrative process. Each axis includes one main case (Volterra, Italy – Barcelona, Spain – Portugal) and two "control" cases.

During the session Eszter and Gàbor introduced the action plan and methodologies for WP5. The implementation phase of WP5 will start on March, while concluding by the end of November with the

delivery of an Assessment Report. In the Report two levels of comparative analysis will be discussed: one at the axis level and another between axes. The methodologies and interactions experienced with key stakeholders during the first phase of WP5 were then introduced by each axis leader.

For Axis 1, concerning Cultural Strategic Planning, Antonella Fresa (PROMOTER) introduced the case of Volterra (Italy), along with the two control cases: European Capitals of Culture in Portugal (carried out by UPorto) and the case of the evaluation of city and cultural policies performed by UCLG (United Cities and Local Government) in Portugal, which will be carried out by the Centre for Social Studies (University of Coimbra). For Axis 2, related to culture-led urban regeneration, Mariano Zamorano (UB) introduced the case of Fabriques de Creaciò (Barcelona, Spain), along with the two control cases: the cultural based touristification evaluation practices in Oporto (Portugal) and the Budapest 8th district cultural policy (Hungary). For Axis 3, related to Cultural information system, Lígia Ferro (UPORTO) presented the case of co-construction of new instruments: Mapping cultural practices in a co-creation process and survey on Portuguese Cultural Practices, along with the two control cases: the case of Information systems in French national cultural administration, carried out by CNRS, and the process of accreditation of regional museums in Emilia Romagna, carried out by UNIBO. The presentation was complemented by the speeches of two stakeholders: Manuela Paixão (Ministry of Culture of Portugal) introduced the new variables, indicators and methodologies used by the Ministry of Culture to assess various kinds of cultural participation in Portugal; Amarílis Felizes (ESCH) explained the results, the underpinnings and challenges related to these innovations when deployed during the most recent workshop on cultural participation organized by the Ministry.

The presentations stimulated a lively discussion on the cases, inspired by the intervention of the invited stakeholders; Gábor Erőss (Budapest 8th district) underlined that Axis 3 is interesting because of issues related to phenomena such as post-truth. This doubles the difficulties for stakeholders implementing policies in an informed and sound way, because the link between culture and data collection seems weak; some say that culture cannot be quantified in this regard. Another difficulty is that there are political forces questioning the whole idea of policies or politics on the basis of facts, data and truth, and as a stakeholder both type of critics have to be confronted while as administrators there is a strong need of co-creation. Another theme of discussion was related to the fact that policy makers often try to self-evaluate in terms of target groups reached. Two target groups that are difficult to reach were suggested as particularly important: elderly people with difficulties walking, connected to a practical issue such as accessibility; second, working class kids are often hard to catch in terms of attention.

Another point of discussion concerned a dialogue geared to make clear the process of co-creation of the methodologies proposed for each axis. It was considered that each axis will be autonomous in terms of methodology. Axis leaders explained that the operationalization will be different depending on the axis, broadly referring to phases related to a comprehensive analysis of the methods and practices as performed by case actors, followed by a validation of such analysis through focus groups and then a giving back process to stakeholders with the presentation of the novel methodological underpinnings developed during the work. Co-creation was stressed as a key concern for all three axes, given the focus on participation on the first two phases, while Key Performance Indicators were debated as an element of utmost importance in the final, restitution-oriented phase. A final issue was related to a dilemma underlined several times by invited stakeholders, that is the challenge of going beyond the collection of data, which is good but not sufficient to attain social change.

Presentation – 'Looking Forward': Overview of UNCHARTED WP4

(Emmanuel Négrier - CNRS)

In this session, Emmanuel Négrier presented the main aspects of Work Package 4, which will take place during year 2023, divided in strand 1 and 2. The general objective of WP4 is to assess the coherence, the governance, the relevance, and the impacts of cultural policies and institutions in terms of value, and the WP will conclude with the provision of policy guidelines.

Strand 1: Policy Coherence will focus on the internal consistency, that is the correspondence between the values officially defended by cultural policies and their place within the organization charts and budgets. Public bodies will be studied at the state, regional, urban level in three countries. This strand will try to answer questions such as: are the cultural policies faithful with their promises? What are the values animating cultural policies, and how are they effectively implemented? Another focus of Strand 1 will be on the external coherence, studying the way in which the values displayed by public authorities correspond to those highlighted during previous work packages. This analysis will be done through a comparative methodology, with case studies from four different European areas: The Nordic, Anglo-Saxon, south-Europe, East Europe. An inter-territorial comparison will be performed at the metropolitan, regional, and national levels in France, Spain and Norway.

This Strand will also examine governance issues, i.e., the way in which values are implemented by the various public actors within each level and between levels, and how they envisage their adaptation to valuation changes within social groups.

Strand 2 complements this general perspective of value production within Cultural Policies, with a more pronounced emphasis on the impacts provoked by cultural institutions' actions, distinguishing between direct (voluntary, expected, and measurable impact contained in public action program) and indirect (not imagined by the institution, but achieved in the course of implementation, may it be desirable or not) impact. Aiming at analyzing cultural institutions in terms of promotion of the plurality of values, also in comparison with Strand 1, the work will be performed also on a more specific block of values, i.e. inclusiveness, cultural diversity, and equality. Object of analysis will be public or publicly funded institutions that aim to have direct impact on their territory. The evaluation of this impact will be appreciated either at micro level (what is impact in people lives) and meso-level (collective level). In short, it is a matter of confronting the dynamics of valorization on the side of the supply side of cultural policies, and those which affect the demand side of such policies.

Discussion: Can Value Conflicts be Managed or Mitigated?

(Antonella Fresa – Promoter; Lìgia Ferro – University of Porto)

The goal of this session was to review the work produced by the UNCHARTED consortium in terms of value conflicts and practical reccomendations produced for policy makers and cultural practitioners. At the same time, the discussion considered a broad array of challenges, threats and opportunities posed by the continuous re-configuration of the values of culture in Europe.

The session was started by Antonella Fresa (Promoter), who introduced the two policy briefs produced so far, to be intended as practical instruments to help policy makers and cultural practitioners in addressing value conflicts. A third policy brief is expected for the next year, to reflect the outcomes of the studies about measurement and ranking of valuation practices (WP3) as well as the feedbacks gathered during the experimental demonstrations. Overall, the policy briefs are the outputs of the research work carried out during WP1 and WP2. A desk research conducted during WP1 produced a critical review of research literature

and existing data. A set of key factors and circumstances were identified in the configuration of the social values of culture: gender and rising diversity, urbanisation and social and spatial segregation in cities, globalization and digitisation, neo-liberalism, and the European historical and political experience. Various studies were then conducted during WP2 in four fundamental arenas of cultural practice: cultural participation in live arts and culture, cultural participation through media, cultural production and heritage management, and cultural administration. Antonella's intervention ended underlining the shift at the forefront of the consortium's work from the recommendations and policy implications produced so far to the UNCHARTED roadmap for cultural policy actions.

Lìgia Ferro (University of Porto) proposed a set of questions related to actors' understanding about cultural evaluation and exploring repertoires of evaluation, such as the possibility of reducing power imbalances to spur cultural democracy, the possibility of managing conflicts finding a balance or trading off between values, and the creation of public cultural spheres to present, discuss and settle arguments in order to frame new relations and agendas.

The following discussion focused on the role of policy briefs within the consortium's work; audience members reflected on the role of policy briefs as tools that can bridge the distance and "translate" research work into ideas for action for policy makers. Suggestions were done over the possibility of involving policy makers in that work of translation. The discussion connected also to the questions addressed to the audience to the discussions previously held, considering that the trade-off between economic value and cultural value may be conceptually flawed. The idea of producing a roadmap was discussed and enriched with insights coming from the research work discussed, along with recommendations of incorporating into the next policy briefs the complex and various nuances of cultural value as assessed by the Consortium work.

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

FRIDAY 13TH January

Morning session, WP5

Chair: Gàbor Olah

The first part of this session featured the presentation and discussion of WP5 main case owners' methodologies and action plans. Each presentation was followed by advisory members' feedbacks. The second part of the session focused specifically on promotional and stakeholder engagement strategies.

The first presentation of the session was done by Antonella Fresa (Promoter) on Axis 1: main case "Volterra". The following discussion debated various themes connected to the Axis and the whole WP5. Audience members reflected on the possibility of comparing, or using a shared basis of knowledge, to compare the Volterra case with the Barcelona and Porto case on European Capitals of Culture. Consortium partners considered the risk of WP5 appearing as not moving forward the project, while recognizing that WP5 is characterized by the liaisons and deep relationships established with stakeholders, while previous work was based on research outputs and punctuated by studies rather than interactions with stakeholders.

On a methodological stance, consortium members agreed upon the idea of giving autonomy to each axis in terms of "treatment" of the control cases. In axis 2 for example members don't plan to co-create but to use other contexts as control cases, a less ambitious strategy which requires adaptations to be done.

The issue of the impact/validation, that is the second goal of WP5, was discussed: a proposal was done to specify what kind of impact to investigate: some impact at the local level and some impact that the consortium aims at producing generally. It was considered that it is up to the researcher of each axis to say what can be relevant, because the WP5 second goal, if taken literally, would be overwhelming and with no effect in practice. The consortium discussed about the possibility of just pinpointing some aspects, few findings selected from the context and the case. An option would be to include 3 pages for the deliverable of end of February, perhaps inspired by D3.10 that can be a starting point to select these findings.

Morning Session WP3 – Cases

Chair: Paolo Ferri, University of Bologna

This session was designed to collect advisors' feedbacks on the cases done during Work Package 3. The feedbacks were provided by advisory board members following the 4 topics in which WP3 cases were organized, while cases authors replied on these feedbacks and stimulate a fruitful discussion.

Topic 1

Ulrike Meinhof and Alain Quemin acted as discussants and gave feedbacks on cases of Topic 1, whose focus is on the grammars of evaluation.

Ulrike appreciated:

- the research design and methodology (semi-structured interviews and observation), producing relatively interesting data which would then be usefully analyzed according to an "evaluation triangle".

- three points: first, the field data shows that there's a need to adjust the categories; evaluations were originally framed in the triangle as distinctive, or complementary, but instead what come out are more fluid and more cross-cutting values. Second, the finding about the tension that appeared

between each of these valuation grammars but also within them, and the perception that valuations are not static, but change according to habitus, content and context. Finally, the perception that the time factor has implication in longitudinal studies, so in these cases the adjustments are made possible in different stages.

Ulrike underlined:

- the significance of the findings related to the dynamics of valuation, the outcomes, tensions and dilemmas and compromises in the implementation practice, suggesting that this needs absolutely to be foregrounded.
- the nice completion of the work on data and on the field, and the implementation of the feedbacks provided during the Barcelona meeting about the risk of overgeneralizing results based on a very limited set of informants. Now there's a much clearer description of the interview data to recognize the categories of individuals, and the qualitative data sets give now very convincing insights.

Ulrike highlighted:

- the overlap between the traditional as against contemporary innovative practices; traditional and contemporary challenge the participant evaluation, and give rise to a kind of definitional tension: what is actually traditional? what is conventional? what is innovative? An example is given in the case of wind bands, and the clash between the historical legacy and the individual who decided to experiment and innovate, in a re-interpretation of a tradition. Overall, all four case studies posed questions over definitions, what is art? what is craft? what is a hobby? what is economically viable? These were all interesting debates that were merged by case authors.
- Alain appreciated:
- the clarity of explanation in all cases in presenting the background and the methodology that was used. How practices of evaluation are carried out by individuals really is a sort of question that underlines all these case studies: what grammars do they mobilize? How do these grammars differ, according to type of practices, and what kind of tensions.
- the nice presentation of the background for the cases and the tension between tradition and innovation.

Alain also noted:

- that sociology of culture has given more attention to the analysis of taste, than values, and maybe this distinction could necessitate to be taken more explicitly because then, after underscoring distinction there is a shift from habitus and taste to values. It should be explained how the three poles of the triangle constitute the poles of the evaluation triangle, and the potential value tensions that can be added.
- weaknesses in the small number of respondents, and the implied necessity of diversifying the characteristics of the respondents.
- an interesting insight, that is the typology to organize the values, which is different between the cases: such shift is interesting but needs to be more clearly explained, and a similar remark was done on other cases of Topic 1.

A final remark was on the possibility of homogenizing the typology used in the topic in order to be assess its validity also in other contexts or projects.

Replies by authors:

- Categorization of interviewees was done a-priori, perhaps underestimating the complexity of the case contexts, and probably had to be refined during the Covid-19 pandemic, but this was falling short of expectations and additional interviewees were hard to find.
- As per the evaluation triangle, a strong conditionality on values was found in the cases. particularly challenging in the evaluation triangle is the content pole, because content is somewhat peculiar. Sociology of taste is not sufficient to understand evaluation. Habitus is a social trajectory.
- Generalization: hard to find common categories in 4 cases, and we run the risk of overgeneralizing.

Topic 2

Paolo Ferri introduces the two discussants of Topic 2 cases, Michael Hutter and Ulrike Meinhof. Kate Oakley was also discussant for this topic, and her feedbacks were reported by Arturo Rodriguez Moratò.

Michael highlighted:

- the complexity and variety of the cases and how this complexity makes it difficult to briefly summarize them all.
- the practice of writing the "e" of evaluation in brackets, he is not convinced by it. He thinks that this could be an analytical distinction between valuation and evaluation which means is not but helpful to order the messiness of the data.

Michael noted that:

- evaluation as is assessment, is a mutual activity taking stock of the valuation expressed by people out there, and that achieve its own agency privileging some valuations over others.
- technology is a too big, all-encompassing term.
- there is an attention on the process of attributing values, marginalized in package 2
- the oscillation between valuation and evaluation is interesting, but the documents need to pay closer attention to the difference between the two.

Ulrike appreciated:

- the clear introduction and agrees with Michael that the various elements are difficult to summarize.
- the MUDEC and RRR cases, and the focus on valuation of participation.
- the analysis of power interplays for the Spanish cases.

Ulrike noted that:

- the UNESCO cases focus on the interface between agencies of power with different outcomes and different levels of government agencies, so that tensions arise between value regimes. The values are both intrinsic and instrumental.
- technology only works in the case of RRR in all the others is practices, and this should be just put upfront saying it only worked in one case

Ulrike highlighted that:

- there is the need of a more nuanced analysis on level of engagement of higher up political agencies and UNESCO demands.
- the civic society here is not in focus, but it has a big role because the opinion of the public can be mobilized to achieve results, so this is something that needs to be considered.

In her feedback, Kate underlined that:

- There is the risk that analysis flattens the differences in searching for commonalities.

- The city cases are the most complex because there are two three primary actors and this raises questions of legitimacy of who is entitled to speak for the city .
- Neoliberalism is doing a lot of heavy lifting, could this be more nuanced?
- At the organization level art institutions are those that work best with business logics. Can they reflect on weather this approach works with other types of organization?
- The documents are hard to read because there are too many acronyms, also they are too descriptive need to be more narrative.

Authors replied stating that:

- valuation is indeed different from evaluation.
- there is the risk of sidelining the richness of the data in the final wrap up, they kind of pretend that the categories are real. but is difficult to trace the complexity. According to Luca Zan the risk is to simplify such complexity that is instead one of the main findings, while Arturo questions whether are these differences truly valuable or is better to imagine a different way to present them in a more general way.
- the ambiguity and complexity became suppressed/were managed by ignoring them in the case of Venice but in Liverpool this did not happen.
- One other finding is to see longitudinally how actors can come together and then move apart.
- Regimes of valuation and evaluation clearly two aspects that are important to distinguish and mixed in many ways but in the different areas that analysed what is recognized is a relevant difference in terms of the key in which the system of evaluating is organized and explicit.

Topic 3

Paolo Ferri introduces the discussants for Topic 3 cases, Michael Hutter and Philip Schlesinger.

Michael appreciated:

- the distinction of the three pairs and the specificity of the time dimension pre-during-post and the different levels you see when you look at the programs.
- the wonderful definition of evaluation developed by Oliver and Victoria "Prioritization of something that is important to whoever values….and is more than the distinction of polar vs integrative"

Michael highlighted:

- the concept of UNESCO and the outstanding universal value, considering amazing that there is such a discussion of worldwide legitimate value, since 1972.
- that valuation and evaluation take place between values and within a value.
- that there is a need to focus on the constraints both financial and administrative. However, on the evaluation that happens within a value he found only bits and pieces in the materials, ex. four levels of satisfaction but these techniques deserve more attention.

Philip noted that:

- 3.10 moves towards what this project should be moving.
- the distinction between bureaucratic vs institutional decision making doesn't stand up, because all cultural judgement presume expertise so the location of it and where is enacted and legitimized is more important. It is worth revisiting this.
- Questions of power have been ignored in the document, who are the stakeholders in the game? Also, politics is missing in in a lot of the work.

- What is the purpose of the evaluation? Economic value for money? Economic side gets dissolved into everything else, but he is not convinced.
- The difference between evaluation for value's sake vs evaluation for public accounting needs to be more explicit.
- Neoliberalism does too much work, writers should focus on what are the different regimes of evaluation.
- Evaluation is contested and negotiated in the context of power relations in a wide variety of forms, giving rise to questions such as: how the different levels articulate? How to make sense of it within the EU context? What are the consequences of these forms of valuation and evaluation?
- Lurking on the side-lines of the cases are diversity, equality and inclusion and maybe there should be more attention to that.

Topic 4

Paolo Ferri introduces the discussant for Topic 4 cases, Alain Quemin.

Alain appreciated the attention towards the Construction of cultural information systems and implementation and noted that:
- in the first two cases he sees an exploration of quality and availability of the information and their categorization that determines what values are mobilised. He praises the good methodological choices.
- In the case Cultural Statistic in Norway: what sort of values are quantified and measured? Consumption, participation and what else?
- In the Regional Observatories case: he likes the focus on 4 cases and the highlighted ambiguity inherent in defining the boundaries of the cultural sector. The typology developed is interesting.
- the important part of the economic dimension and values is not always present in other studies. Also, there is the need justified and discussed a bit more to explain the action of public intervention.
- In the Cultural Index Norway case: he likes the reflexive dimension on an instrument they created some years ago assisting the government. And the exploration of how to measure and what to measure.
- As In the LUQ case he likes the exploration of the quality of museum, what is good enough. The evaluation wants to be neutral but often are based on values that are blurred and implicit – opening the box. And that gives rise to the need for negotiation on new categories and new values mobilization.

Paolo wraps up the discussion saying that even when we have quantification there is uncertainty. And highlights the need to specify what the common perspective is to contextualize the complexity and possibly make a step forwards towards generalizability.

Discussion on D3.10

During this session consortium partners introduced to the audience the progress achieved on D3.10. Arturo Rodriguez Morató introduced the presentation by Matias Zarlenga by framing the work done so far as an attempt to synthesize through a general view the different regimes of evaluation and how they correspond to the different areas in the various work packages; the view develops a double perspective, corresponding to two different parts of the document, that are a synthesis of the findings and a part devoted to reflection on potential links to assess the external validity of the findings. The following discussion was chaired by Paolo Ferri and was articulated around three threads across case studies, that are Participation, Neoliberalism,

competition and economic value, and Urban Regeneration. Speeches for each of these threads were given by Claudia Pato Carvalho, Paolo Ferri and Nancy Duxbury, and the following discussion highlighted the threads as follows:

Michael Hutter:

- There is the need of deciding what is important and not. It seems like you are trying to force everything you found into large tables that are unreadable to me. What is have seen is synthesis, it's just a different format; you have to make selections and prioritize the major vs. the minor finding. This document as it is I'm afraid it will not fulfil the function of the project.

Ulrike Meinhof:

- much work has gone into these tables, but I think narrativizing this could be helpful rather than reducing everything to tables. Tables do not work as communication devices. Better narratively make some examples and highlight the key factors, rather than try to fit everything into tables. Tables can be a valuable internal device but narrating can work better than exposing through tables.

Ole Marius Hylland:

- is it possible to have some test readings of the draft? Aside from the advisors as they are knowledgeable of the project. We need someone external to read them to see if the documents make sense.

Antonella Fresa:

- we often involve externals in giving peer evaluations. Also, giving a cartography of the cases can be general for all the WP.

Victoria Alexander:

- One point of weakness highlighted by the review was that we were not making enough connections between the work packages; can this document do this? Maybe building these connections can help draft a better synthesis.

Luca Zan:

- in the UNESCO case, the whole procedure was started with grassroots associations, and the whole debate is embedded in the conflict within grassroots associations. That is really part of the process. Moreover, in the case of neoliberalism, Venice is much more than a policy agenda. The terminology is not convincing, I guess it is more an issue of levels that get lost in the synthesis. We need to generalize more modestly.

Arturo Rodriguez Moratò:

- very useful remarks. It is useful to highlight some points though: this is just the first step in crafting this draft, but as everybody it can be agreed for sure that we need to synthesize and prioritize. Attempts to progress in this way is a road taken, although I'm not sure it is the only one or the best one.

Afternoon session on WP4

(Chair: Felix Dupin-Maynard, Julien Audemard)

This session was designed to develop discussions among consortium members about Work Package 4. In the first part of the session Philip Schlesinger acted as discussant and gave feedbacks on the WP launch and inspired a plenary discussion on WP4.

Philip highlighted:

- The tension between the particularity of the cases and the overall logic of the project.
- Great diversity of cases / levels / contexts, which are also difficult to compare. The explicit institutional approach is a common point.
- There is an important "Value Gap" as Values officially promoted failed in practice. This is important, along with consequences and impacts.
- The latent difference between States and other frameworks, if these have not the same stability / fragility. Also, institutions might not survive, and State is a special category.

During the discussion, Luca Zan highlighted that:

- From case levels to global levels. What kind of policy recommendations are possible? We should be forced to do that, to provide policy implications.

Oliver Peterson asked:

- What values does "not EU" states have, if we consider that UK is not part of the club?

The discussion concerning Strand 1 of WP4 featured a debate on the main focus of the strand. According to the project, strand 1 investigates cultural policy coherence in relation with the promotion of the values of culture both in an internal inter-territorial perspective and with respect to value configurations in society. Consortium members debated around some indicators and whether these are apt to address the specific strand goal; in particular, coherence can be studied with a specific focus on the contradictions between promoted values and "negotiated" norms in the policy field. Partners discussed about the most effective ways to build common analytic tools allowing for comparability, whether identifying a set of common values that can be consistent across cases can be affordable, and how to transcribe criteria of evaluation into indicators.

The main focus of strand 2 was then discussed. According to the project, strand 2 deals with the impact of cultural policies fostering the values of cultural diversity, inclusiveness, equality. After some considerations on whether the impact has to be detected at the level of the policy or at the level of the organizations implementing them, the partners agreed for the second interpretation: strand 2 will focus upon actual institutions and organizations that, through the implementation of policy, aim to generate impactful outcomes on the themes related to cultural diversity, inclusiveness, and equality.

Having this clarified, the partners articulated the discussion, by expressing the different dimensions on which the selected cases may vary:

- The selected institutions may or may not be implementing their own evaluation methodologies to measure such impact.
- Relatedly to the idea of inclusiveness, this may regard several aspects (gender, ethnicity, religion, disabilities) and it would be important if most of these aspects are captured by the variety of selected cases.
- Cases may be variable in term of size: there may be both big institutions and smaller projects.

As a conclusion, Luca Zan and Ulriche Meinhof warned on the riskiness of imposing authors' own interpretations on the values that are evaluated by the cultural institutions. They underlined that in many

cases there may be a rhetoric of inclusiveness, which is not concretely pursued by institutions (e.g., Biennale). In any case, these processes will allow us to deconstruct how the values are implemented to achieve an impact.

CONCLUDING SESSIONS

During this session Victoria Alexander expressed the appreciation of the whole UNCHARTED Consortium for the insights discussed during the various sessions of the event. Consortium members replied sharing a deep sense of gratitude to Victoria and to Goldsmiths' College for brilliantly hosting the event.