
Festival d'Aix-en- Provence

Summary of the
European symposium
on Culture and
Education

Third edition

*«Evaluating artistic
and education
projects»*

15th & 16th July 2011



For the third year running and in partnership with RESEO (*European Network for Opera and Dance Education*), l'AFO (*French association of orchestras*) and l'IMPGT (*Institute for public management and territorial governance – Paul Cézanne University*), the Festival d'Aix en Provence organised a European symposium on Culture and Education on 15th and 16th July 2011.

This edition was dedicated to the very delicate but urgent question of evaluation.

Why, for whom, how to evaluate, how to measure, how to gauge quality, significance, effects or “possible” effects of artistic projects run by cultural operators for the public and in particular school children and associations.

The panel of speakers was composed of professionals from the artistic and cultural field and from the field of education and research.¹ Speeches and debates highlighted the fact that evaluation is becoming more and more, either from choice or necessity, a key question in artistic and/or education projects. The debate brought to the fore the many different approaches and methods adopted as well as the concerns and converging ambitions of those present, such as the desire to build up evaluations that have meaning for the institutions that request them – either internally or externally – and that produce added value in the long-term on capacity and knowledge building².

This meeting took place alongside the public presentation of *Con Fuoco*. This performance marks the end of a vocal, creative and interdisciplinary residency project run by Passerelles, the social and artistic department of the Aix-en-Provence festival, with artistic director Mark Withers from London Symphony Orchestra and staging by Sybille Wilson.³

Bernard Focroulle used this context to remind us that evaluating is a long standing concern of those that run artistic and education projects and in this matter as in many others, it is necessary to find time and space to share and discuss concepts, practices and methods adopted by each and everyone of us.

This summary will highlight the most important aspects of the debate and list the shared values and findings as well as the perspectives that were opened up.

¹ Speakers during the debate were: **Jean-Pierre Saez**, Director of the French Observatory for Cultural Policies, **Vincent Maestracci**, General Inspector of National Education in France and Dean of the Group on artistic Learning and musical education, **Nathalie Montoya**, Lecturer at the University Paris-Diderot, Associate researcher at Cerlis (Centre for research on social ties) as presenter of the evaluation study of the Kaleidoscope project by the Opera of Lyon, **Helena Rodrigues**, Artistic Director of the *Companhia de Música Teatral* (Portugal), Director of the research lab on Music and Communication in infancy of CESEM – FCSH, **Olivier Keramidas**, Deputy-Director - IMPGT, Centre of Research and Management of Aix-Marseille, in charge of culture, Paul Cézanne University Aix-Marseille III. **Edina Soldo**, IMPTG, Lecturer in Management sciences, specialised in evaluation of publically funded events and projects. **Amy Bere**, Glyndebourne Festival - Head of Education Services and **Freya Wynn-Jones**, who presented the evaluation on participatory actions in the “Knight Crew” Opera, **Kathryn McDowell**, Managing Director - London Symphony Orchestra and **Alain Kerlan**, Doctor in Philosophy, Professor of Universities in Education sciences of the Lumière University Lyon 2.

² At the end of the text, there is a summary of the subjects in each presentation.

³ Collective and creative vocal project based on the work *La Clemenza di Tito*, that took shape over a three month span with fifty participants of all ages, of all walks of life, all living in the Aix-Marseille region. The project was artistically directed by **Mark Withers**, Artistic and education coordinator, London Symphony Orchestra-LSO Discovery and **Sybille Wilson**, stage director, with four musicians of the London **Symphony Orchestra** and five other professional artists in slam, traditional singing, vocals, video and sound work.

Amateur groups present were: the Ibn Zaydoun choir, with **Moneim Adwan**, singer, composer and ûditist, The Video Decor Workshop, with Agnès Quillet for **Anonymal**, Gospel Singers, with the **Sound Musical School**, Radio Workshop of la Savine, with **Aline Soler**, Sound Designer, High School pupils from the Boarding School for excellence of Luynes, with **Frédéric Nevchehirlian**, slammer, Classical and vocal singers, some notably from the “Prévert Vocal Workshop”, of the Training Centre of Musicians taking part in the workshops of the Cité de la Musique, with **Benjamin Lunetta**, Graffiti artists of **Project 21**.

1. A theme that embodies current concerns

Introducing the first session, Philippe Fanjas highlighted the current context's contribution to the growing awareness of the importance of evaluation. The economic and financial crisis has resulted in a significant reduction of publically funded initiatives in the artistic and cultural sectors, a growing caution from public and private funding bodies and stronger requirements on the reasons for the use of the funds involved. Evaluating projects has become a key concern and thus a key obligation when allocating financial support to artistic and education projects. There is a real risk that evaluations may in time bear strong resemblance to audits and the specific logic involved in this approach.

It is therefore vital to question in a very imaginative and free way the challenges at stake in the evaluating process, the methods adopted, the actors involved and those for whom the evaluations are made. What do we evaluate, why, how, with whom and for whom?

Two speeches, one at the opening and the other at the end of the session, served as useful guideposts in this meeting.

Jean-Pierre Saez gave some historic reference points and marked out the challenges involved in observing and evaluating cultural policy. He reminded the participants that the first analyses were built up in the 60s and 70s adopting a wide variety of concepts, aims or methods and the actors or commissioners involved were also very different. He underlined how over the years through successive movements, this need of observation and cultural evaluation unfurled, within various organisations linked or not to universities and research centres. The main focus of observation was given to questions linked to employment, training, funding culture, regeneration, planning and even cultural habits and the audience. There are very few reports on the psychological, symbolic and intellectual effects of participation in activities or artistic practices or of getting to know works of art.

Observing culture and cultural practice is confronted today with two difficulties, at national and international level. The first concerns the variety of representations of culture, therefore a difficulty in comparing figures: although the current tendency is to try to harmonise.

The second is the great difficulty to analyse and transform into an evaluation the *"dialogue between imaginations that is at work in any relationship with art or culture. How can indicators, even if they are considered "qualitative" indicators be capable of evaluating the precise impact of "sharing sense and sensibility"?*

These two questions are actually at the heart of the debate: how to overcome the challenge of coherence in the diversity of representations and practices that emerge today and how to observe and evaluate "sensibility"?

Alain Kerlan believes that this question lies in the realms of political philosophy. It is clear that the very strong demand on evaluation is a symptom of a society that is increasingly governed by the conviction that all is "measurable" and that everything has a "price"; a strong signal of the growing merchandization of our world, even our cultural and artistic world; a symptom of a society governed by evaluation, even a governance by evaluation. The question is: how do we maintain a critical stance between the notion of transparency or accountability and instrumentalization? Given this constraint, how can we usefully maintain the singularity of an artistic experience and measure it objectively? How can we invent and elaborate a method of evaluation that can measure this singularity?

2. Evaluation: what exactly does this encompass?

The aim of this summary is not to develop a theory on evaluation. Jean-Pierre Saez reminded us of the definition of evaluation which is to “*measure the difference between the aims and the results, as a way of understanding what is involved in a given project, event or action undertaken*” and this indeed is a good way of summarizing the discussions that were led on the observation and evaluation of artistic projects during this meeting. All the speeches expressed the desire, internally, externally or both, to clarify the artistic and cultural actions put in place, to observe them and to measure their nature, the results and if possible, clarify their meaning as precisely as possible.

The speeches also brought to the fore from the very start, the aim of being objective. This is a characteristic common to all the evaluation mechanisms presented but is based on a subjective understanding of an action. Defining the aims of the process of observation and evaluation, the object, the steps to be taken, the methods to be adopted, the conclusions that will be drawn and the options that will have to be decided on are all very subjective stages that require fresh ideas and innovation skills. Observing and evaluating requires precision but at the same time is necessarily subjected to critical debate and confrontation, which after all, is what makes it so interesting.

3. The challenges in observing cultural action and evaluating it

The challenges listed by Jean-Pierre Saez and mentioned in regard to cultural policy, proved to be effective when applied to projects and artistic actions presented in Aix-en-Provence:

- *Challenges of understanding/knowledge*

This dimension is clearly an important one in the processes of evaluation that were presented. For all those that gave an account of their work, the idea was to collect information and to use the data accumulated to build up knowledge on the projects that were led. It is only on the basis of the insight and notions considered that conclusions and choices could emerge. The speeches addressing - only to cite two of them - the study led on the Kaleidoscope project on the cultural season Picasso–Aix 2009 in the Pays of Aix⁴ and the study led on the project of the Opera “Knight Crew” in Glyndebourne that involved the participation of the public both illustrated the ambitions and the extreme attention paid to observing the actions that took place and collecting information about their implementation. The presentations made clearly indicated the importance of prior question and answer sessions between the various actors of the evaluation, whatever their role in the project, in order to establish the contents on which to base the hypotheses of evaluation. Edina Soldo and Olivier Keramidas gave an account of how they managed to include the question of governance into their evaluation because as researchers they considered this information essential, despite the fact that it had not been specified by the commissioners of the study in the evaluation protocol of the year Picasso-Aix 2009. However, and the participants questioned several speakers on this topic, the knowledge built up on cultural, artistic and education projects, relates more often to the extrinsic benefits in terms of education, cultural (practice), relationship, social factors, institutional aspects than to the specifically artistic benefits of the projects observed.

Moreover, the speeches showed how the work of observing and evaluating led to the development of knowledge, not only on the projects examined but also on the institution itself. This is one of the lessons learnt during this meeting: careful examination of one or several projects led by a cultural institution with its audience, leads to the acquisition of knowledge that goes beyond the mere projects. The institution as a whole is clarified in its mechanisms and its operational mode and it is also subject to change. Kathryn McDowell enthusiastically acclaimed the “institutional plasticity” acquired by LSO following the evaluation protocols and the progressive acquisition in all the teams, of the competence to undergo reflexive criticism and evaluation. At Glyndebourne as well the question of evaluation has for some time now, gradually evolved from a specific knowledge-based approach of the examination and evaluation of a specific project to an institutional capacity to lead reflexive criticism, over and beyond the event or performances, involving all the staff.

⁴ Sub-regional intermediary governing level recently created in France to encompass a territory that has a common geographical, historic or cultural reality.

- *the challenge of sharing and discussing, the challenge of addressing the full scope of the information obtained, confronting and comparing data: diversity and convergence*

The meeting underlined the importance of confronting representations, expectations, each others practices in terms of evaluation of artistic and education projects and showed that there was a variety of scales of implementation at work, a variety of concerns and a variety of strategies adopted in terms of observation and evaluation:

Diversity

- *Diversity of points of view:* representations, expectations and concerns proved to be highly specific depending on whether they were those of cultural operators, academics, politicians or economists. While cultural operators such as the Festival d'Aix-en-Provence, the LSO or Glyndebourne questioned the significance of activities in relation to their own institutional challenges, the representatives of the French National Education system or the partners of the season Picasso-Aix2009 adopted a more specific approach in line with their schedule of conditions on which they were dependant.
- *Diversity of scale:* the meeting allowed everyone to learn about the different methods adopted for evaluation on a variety of different scales – some on a very large scale – in terms of time taken, human resources involved and therefore budgets used. The information delivered from the study lead by Cerlis for the Opera of Lyon or the study on the Knight Crew project by Glyndebourne gave an idea of the importance of the means and resources at work. It would have been useful to extend the discussion further on this issue that was, as it turned out, not sufficiently dealt with.
- *Diversity of approaches:* Deciding on an observation and evaluation project sometimes results from the decisions of the actors themselves, at other times from the funders, be they private or public. In the latter case, an evaluation becomes necessary to justify expenditure, sometimes going as far as initiating an audit where a quantitative analysis is prioritized. In some cases the initiative to evaluate is taken by all the actors involved; operators, subsidising bodies, decision makers, academics, economic actors and the general public, which is the case for example of CERGAM - Paul Cézanne University, Aix-Marseille III for the Pays of Aix. The aim in this case is to develop a protocol that allows for the concerns of all these entities to be examined. Small projects can give time to a qualitative approach as well. The diversity of the experiences presented in Aix-en-Provence clearly bears witness to the variety of practices involved.
- *Diversity in the strategies:* there are many different strategies to adopt, from internal evaluations lead by the institutions themselves with their own resources, to external evaluations most frequently referred to and - depending on the cases - confided to private evaluators or to specialised institutional departments. Quantitative or qualitative evaluations; most often these two are combined. This diversity is for the most part, linked to the question of the human and financial means available.

Convergences

Diversity is accompanied by convergences. There was a wide consensus on the need to lead a critical analysis on practices, on the limits of satisfaction surveys that are too often considered as evaluations, on the need to build specific models of evaluation for artistic projects, on the importance of confiding the work of observation and interpretation to external actors – on the condition that there is an open and critical dialogue –, on the urgency to develop research on this issue more actively than today and to put researchers in touch at European level, on the necessity of distributing the findings without worrying about exposing oneself to foreign opinions. Jean-Pierre Saez made this remark concerning cultural policy: confronting different points of view and the effort to harmonize representations and concepts is fundamental in order to establish joint projects and research. The same can be said for protocols in observing artistic and education projects.

- the challenge of adjusting action and activities

This challenge is at the heart of the evaluation mechanisms put in place: we evaluate in order to understand what we are doing in a better way and with this renewed understanding we can continue to work and alter or improve some or part of the action. This challenge is of course closely linked to the other challenges mentioned above: the nature and precision of the information collected, the quality of the ideas and innovative approaches, the value of the decisions made.

In the case of artistic and education projects, this challenge has particular undertones.

Evaluations of this nature have been lead for a number of years in the British or American cultural institutions and only in more recent years on the continent where they had to be imposed within the cultural institutions themselves and in relation to the academic or political administering authorities and even to the general public. This specific situation has had decisive effects on the first steps to evaluating. The idea was to justify the actions undertaken by multiplying quantitative data (for the most part flattering) and satisfaction surveys (invariably positive). The idea was to group together all the elements that could justify the pursuit of projects towards those who disagreed with them or funding bodies.

This period has passed. Projects such as those lead for a number of years by the Festival d'Aix-en Provence and the majority of cultural institutions in Europe have sufficient legitimacy to take on all kinds of evaluations whatever their level of complexity or overt criticism.

Thus, the challenge of adjusting was evoked in almost all the speeches revealing a wide autonomy of thought in all cases, even for those whose external funders made evaluation a condition *de facto*. Even if we could sense, rightfully so, the desire to shed more light on what works rather than on what doesn't, cultural operators present in Aix strongly expressed their interest in pursuing this type of work, as it enabled them to correct weaknesses or functional errors that could jeopardize the pursuit of the aims they had established.

The Opera of Lyon presented an interesting example concerning the Kaleidoscope project. The study made revealed the extent of the difficulties certain categories of the public that took part in the project had in understanding the rules, despite the precautions taken, and that this had been underestimated. The study also revealed that only those who were guided were able to overcome these difficulties. This information is precious and can be used in the framework of the follow-up to the project.

Some speakers used the expression of steering strategies by evoking the logic that is behind their evaluation work. This type of vocabulary inherited from the world of management is not banal and leads us to investigate with Alain Kerlan the value of this type of approach in the field of aesthetic experiences.

4. Who takes part in evaluations? Initiatives and implementation

- Initiatives

We explained earlier, how the initiative of observing and evaluating artistic and education projects has come from a variety of sources.

It can come from the actors of the project themselves. It becomes obvious as a form of explicit external constraint or else it can develop as part of an opportunity or an interest aiming to shed light on the reasons for undertaking such and such a project, to improve it or consolidate the aims depending on what is necessary. Sometimes the evaluation is lead by cultural institutions or departments that have an innate approach to evaluation as a way of progressing or analysing their work in a prospective fashion. This movement of auto-evaluation, although it may seem independent⁵ – stems from the approach underlined by Alain Kerlan; there is a need to respond to the permanent demand for measuring, be it internal or external.

A second case: the request rather than the initiative comes from the public or private funding body that wishes to measure the impact of its investment. The evaluation is thus more a method of justification or legitimacy or even an audit. The participants mentioned that these protocols were gaining in importance as a means to obtain the funding of a project and presupposed evaluating mechanisms included from the start in the project. Whilst recognising that it was of interest to include evaluation into the process from the start, within the aims and as a means of observing and controlling the implementation, many regretted the relatively rigid framework adopted in most cases that tended to limit the projects' potential.

In other cases still, the initiative to evaluate was adopted collectively by all those taking part in the project – operators, funders, decision makers and academics, economic actors, the public who were all interested for

⁵ We are referring to the speeches by Kathryn McDowell (LSO), Helena Rodriguez (Porto –BebéBabà project), Amy Bere (Glyndebourne – Knight Krew) and Nathalie Montoya (Kaleidoscope – Lyon) .

their own specific reasons in learning from the work undertaken. The very important survey – that was of use to a wide range of actors – led by CERGAM – Paul Cézanne University, Aix-Marseille III for the Pays of Aix, illustrates this scenario.

There are also processes provoked from external factors. For example governing bodies in charge of education that wish to gauge, following their own criteria, the interest that school children may have in experiencing an artistic process, conducted by or on the initiative of external operators. Vincent Maestracci, General Inspector within the French national Education system, spoke at length of the necessity to build up new models of observation and analysis from grassroots level.

- Implementation

This is undertaken either by internal or external agents.

In the framework of an auto-evaluation, the heads of department involved in the artistic project lead the observation and evaluation study using internal competences. They invariably begin by a process of collecting and interpreting quantitative data, often not very time consuming. This process, which is less well lead in terms of critical appreciation, is generally adopted when it is not possible for financial reasons to employ external evaluators. Even if this experience internally can be rewarding for the staff, the risk, as evoked earlier, is to mix up the desire to evaluate with an exercise in valorisation.

In the majority of experiences related during the meeting, the work of observation and evaluation was conferred to external experts. This can take place within a longstanding process of internal evaluation as in the case of Glyndebourne. Ideally, the process should be lead as a constant critical dialogue between the external experts and the staff, before, during and after the project. This dialogue was repeatedly underlined as being an essential component. Without it evaluations have no meaning for project operators. Dialogue allows for a permanent and necessary adaptation in a spirit of consultation so that the evaluation doesn't become a control mechanism. It is instead a permanent process of collective construction and reconstruction. This was underlined by a number of speakers – Nathalie Montoya for the Opera of Lyon, Kathryn McDowell for the LSO, Olivier Keramidas and Edina Solo for the study commissioned on the Picasso-Aix 2009 season. Redefining aims was common and decided on collectively and turned out to be very valuable to the overall evaluation. But in the end, and on this point the participants were for the most part unanimous, if the experts formulate the useful recommendations; it is the cultural operators, those in charge of the projects that must freely invent the next stage of the project. An evaluation must maintain its ground as a proposal.

5. How much time to evaluate?

- Time is money

The time taken to conduct the evaluation is of course variable depending on the aims and the scale.

The researchers present evoked and criticised the growing tension between the aims assigned for an evaluation and the strict deadlines imposed that were less and less compatible with the increasingly constraining requirements. This pressure – clearly financial – can damage the quality of the critical approach that must be given adequate time to collect valid information, analyse it and interpret it. Kathryn McDowell from LSO underlined the amount of time needed to construct a fundamentally necessary relationship of trust between the cultural operator and the expert with whom the evaluation is implemented. The survey run by the team of Cerlis on the project of the Opera of Lyon took much more time than anticipated in the official contracts. On the other hand, Helena Rodrigues illustrated how interesting it was to have no time constraints in terms of evaluation for the BébéBabà project. This project was given the time – several years – and the space for introspection with complete freedom. The project took shape before being submitted for a well thought out evaluation.

The question of time can also influence the methods adopted to collect information. Depending on the time available or that one can give to the evaluation, different processes can be adopted that are more or less time consuming and even if the cases presented in Aix were impressive due to their quality, the current pressure placed on rapid evaluations could lead to the adoption of certain methods that are less time consuming and which could take precedence over other concerns.

- long-term perspectives

Cultural operators expressed the fundamentally progress nature of their work on evaluation and the fact that it was inscribed in the long-term evolution of their institutions. They showed how, from one project to another, be it in Lyon, Glyndebourne, London or Porto, the critical analysis of practices has reshaped and deepened their approaches, and how this has refined the aims and methods adopted. They showed – as has already been mentioned – how they were able within their institutions to develop a permanent culture of reflexive criticism. And it is within this long-term process that the examination of temporary projects takes place.

- the time span for some and the time span of others

The question of time was also evoked in the context of the French National Education System. How do we match long-term training for youngsters, the rhythm of that training and the short-term interventions and artistic experiences in schools? The participants stressed, with some anxiety, the need for a closer dialogue and more cooperation between the National Education System and cultural institutions.

6. What do we evaluate and how?

These two questions are intertwined and essential to the debate. This is the heart of the matter and central to our meeting. What do we evaluate in the programmes and artistic projects run by cultural institutions with their audiences and more specifically, with audiences from the education system and with associations?

Can creativity be investigated with methods that are approved in other spheres of activity? Is it really about checking if the arts are effective for social, professional or cultural inclusion? As far as the audiences from schools are concerned, is it important to highlight, as the conference in Beaubourg did (Paris – 2007), the effects of artistic and cultural education, the extrinsic effects the arts have on all the other scholastic capacities?

Emmanuelle Taurines, when talking about the *Con Fuoco* project, suggested a limit to respect: not everything can be clarified, objectified, enlightened because not everything is within our remit. In the sphere of art, the liberty of collecting information stops where the individual's own liberty intervenes. Everyone is free to explain or not; deciding to express the effects of an artistic experience is a personal choice. This becomes even more critical when referring to audiences who are known as "fragile".

Freya Wynn-Jones recalled a decision taken by the teams at Glyndebourne to never allow observers into projects dealing with psychologically fragile people. This issue is also relevant when collecting information from videos or photographs, as was the case in Porto during the *BebéBabà*. The approach to this project was very professional and there is no doubt that the means used throughout to implement this very "sensitive" project were well thought through and adapted.

We have already spoken about one of the major conclusions of this meeting i.e. that the extrinsic effects of a project are more often illustrated than the intrinsic effects. This is because the interest expressed in the former and the difficulty to measure the latter appropriately.

- Extrinsic effects

The cultural operators that initiate these artistic projects have specific aims regarding social, professional, cultural or scholar inclusion and the need to measure the success of this is real. Measuring these effects is also of interest to their partners either as public or private funders of the initiative or as public authorities in charge of education. Such information allows them to decide if their investment was of interest and if they should continue the adventure or not.

Finally researchers in human sciences, counsellors, teachers, sociologists, artistic and cultural specialists explore, for many good reasons; the results of the projects in terms of social, scholastic or personal transformations on the institutions and the public concerned.

However rigorous and even compelling these studies may be, it is important to understand that they measure competences of cultural operators in areas that are not the cultural operators' primary competence and in doing so contribute to obliging cultural operators to prove their efficiency in areas beyond their primary concerns.

- *Intrinsic effects*

The most fundamental issue, as many speakers and members of the public underlined, is to observe, clarify and analyse the effects of artistic projects and to emphasise their distinctive characteristics compared with other projects of the same amplitude, addressing similar audiences with similar aims of social, professional and scholastic generalisation but external to the artistic sphere. Not that this dimension is totally absent from the experience presented, but none of them seemed to present the artistic results of the projects lead as the central element of the protocol of evaluation.

So how can we give an objective account of the creative adventure – be it personal or collective – that seems to resist any form of objectivity? How can we give a quantitative and qualitative value to something which resists measurement and which as Helena Rodrigues put it so well: “isn’t countable yet counts so much”. How, using Jean-Pierre Saez’s expression that was borrowed from Jacques Rancière “can we measure the sharing of sensibility”?

Some suggestions were made that could contribute to elaborating a specific model for the observation and evaluation of artistic projects.

Nathalie Montoya spoke of the research she had lead, and that she wishes to further, on the project Kaleidoscope: studying amateur practice, the issue of the aesthetic, the topic of donation and counter-donation in a project such as this, our relationship with beauty and our relationship with heritage.

What is the significance for example for the public as diverse as those who participated in this project, of discovering or rediscovering the work of the Odyssey during the course of the project? Addressing the fact that adequate tools were to some extent absent, Nathalie Montoya underlined the necessity of building new tools that would enable her to work on these topics using the information collected during the surveys.

Helena Rodrigues gave an account of the attention given, during the study she lead on the project BebéBabà, to the non-verbal language of the participants. Illustrating the close relationship between the object of the evaluation and her methodology; she stressed the use of video to this end. She insisted on the necessity of observing over a long period of time – for the full length of the project and beyond – and to give preference to a method of research that was more qualitative than quantitative. She also pointed out that it was important to pay attention to the strictly musical skills acquired by the participants and their capacity or not to use this after the project in their own personal context.

For Alain Kerlan, an aesthetic experience is a unique experience and its effects are also unique. The relationship that links the artists and the public – be they adults, youngsters or children – in a creative adventure, is at the same time singular and multiple. An aesthetic experience is at the same time a personal and intimate experience and a collective adventure. It can be experienced both as a vertical and horizontal relationship: vertical through the authority bestowed on the one who knows and conferred to the one that is learning, but at the same time horizontal through the research undertaken which is an experience shared by all.

It is important therefore to imagine an enlarged model for observation and evaluation that goes beyond the models developed from concepts linked to management and “reaches for a cultural and political anthropology that gives to art and the aesthetic their legitimate place in the psychology and culture of democratic humanity”. To move from “what works” to “how it works”. Alain Kerlan spoke of the work undertaken by Pierre Gosselin, specialist in the didactics of art at the University of Quebec in Montreal, or by Joëlle Zask, lecturer at the University of Provence and Richard Deasy, Director of *Arts Education Partnership* in the United States. The challenge that is of the utmost importance and that is so compelling is to provide sense and legitimacy to artistic and cultural projects, no longer on what they produce that is adjusted to common order but on the contrary on what makes them so irreducibly unique and for this reason indispensable.

7. The question of communication: for whom are we evaluating?

Raised by each speaker, this topic was presented as an essential component. Whatever the tools used, – and these were the most recent and effective – whatever type they were, – and in this sphere diversity and invention were ever present – whoever the recipients were, the distribution of the results of the observation and evaluation is the culmination of the process and opens up further possibilities.

Who do we communicate to? To all those who took part in the project, to those who initiated it and participated in it, the staff of the cultural institution, the artists and external personnel, the partners as well as those who had no position in the project, through ignorance, indifference or even rejection. Where the question of justification is central, the distribution is of course crucial. Beyond this, distribution of results can be part of the communication policy of the cultural institution, as a way of asserting the position that these projects occupy in the programming and general activity.

Broadcasting results is a way of promoting our willingness to favour debate: as many speakers mentioned, beyond the apprehension of exposing oneself to the appreciation of our peers and public opinion – in a situation of success or in the case of set-backs – the benefits of communicating openly are evident: it is only through exchange and an open debate that cultural operators and researchers can progress in their work of observation and evaluation of artistic and education projects.

Conclusion

The European Symposium Culture and Education initiated by the Festival d'Aix-en-Provence in partnership with RESEO (*European Network for Opera and Dance Education*), l'AFO (*French association of orchestras*) and l'IMPGT (*Institute for public management and territorial governance – Paul Cézanne University*), kept its promise. It grouped together a large number of experienced and creative participants on the question of evaluation. It gave us the opportunity to measure the interest and the possible progress in the field of observation and evaluation of artistic and educational projects set up by cultural institutions.

This meeting confirmed the necessity of critical analysis in this field.

It has opened possibilities for research at national level or better still at European level. It invites us to explore beyond the remarkably well-measured effects of artistic and education projects in terms of social, economic, cultural and scholarly inclusion lead by cultural operators. What do they produce in terms of our relationship to beauty, to aesthetic experiences, to our appropriation of cultural heritage both personally and collectively, our desire and pleasure to create, the acquisition of artistic capacities?

Ideas and new approaches have been opened up during the meeting that have still to be explored. This should be our ambition, a vital, - even political in the broadest sense - ambition that should be rapidly responded to in order to resist against the current ever-growing temptation to only measure an artistic adventure on the basis of its economic, social or scholarly efficiency.

Speakers

Amy Bere, Festival of Glyndebourne, in charge of the education service and **Freya Wynn-Jones**.

They presented a very impressive evaluation method for the Opera project "Knight Crew" involving the public. Methods, challenges, results.

Olivier Keramidas, Deputy-Director - IMPGT Centre for research and management of Aix-Marseille, in charge of culture, Paul Cézanne University Aix-Marseille III and **Edina Soldo**, IMPTG, Lecturer in management sciences, specialised in the field of evaluation and publically funded initiatives

They presented an evaluation of the impacts of major cultural events: a challenge for a region and for those involved. Case study: "Picasso-Aix 2009" cultural season in the region of Pays d'Aix: methodology, challenges, results.

Alain Kerlan, Doctor in philosophy, *Professeur des universités* in Education sciences at the Lumière University, Lyon 2.

He exposed his ideas and thoughts on the request for evaluation in the field of art and culture and suggested some approaches that addressed this issue without imposing limits.

Kathryn McDowell, Managing Director - London Symphony Orchestra.

She presented strategies to evaluate LSO and in particular LSO Discovery. She gave an historical account of their work, the developments made and the current challenges. She addressed the issue of the impact of the methods adopted on the culture of the institution.

Vincent Maestracci, General Inspector of National Education in France and Dean of the Group on artistic Learning and musical education. He explained the dialogue that existed at territorial level between the education sector and cultural actors. He developed the idea that it was necessary to articulate the methods of the education sector with those of the cultural sector in terms of evaluation.

Nathalie Montoya, Lecturer at Paris-Diderot University, Associate researcher for Cerlis, Centre of research on social ties.

She provided a summary of the evaluation report on the Kaleidoscope project – Act II run by the Opera of Lyon, a participatory project, open to the general public and focusing on three neighbourhoods in the suburbs of Lyon. The study was run from October 2009 to January 2011 with CERLIS, Paris Descartes University.

Helena Rodrigues, Artistic Director of the *Companhia de Música Teatral* (Portugal). Director of the Music and Communication in Infancy Research Laboratory of CESEM – FCSH.

She presented the evaluation of the BebéBabà project; a musical project in a prison context for mothers and their children. How to evaluate art: are smiling faces sufficient? "*People defending art often use photos of smiling faces to illustrate the experience. (...) But in a society that valorises measures and analytical figures to guide the decisions for allocating resources, photos of smiling faces are not sufficient to convince or even to keep a partner.*" Richard Riley in *Champions of change – the impact of the arts on learning*.

Jean-Pierre Saez, Director of the French Observatory of cultural policies

Can cultural observation measure the "sharing of sensibility"? On the topic of cultural observation, he provided chronological references, expounded theories and methodologies as well as challenges.

Emmanuelle Taurines, in charge of the social and artistic department of the Festival d'Aix-en-Provence and **Sybille Wilson**, stage director of the Con Fuoco project.

Following the performance of Con Fuoco the evening before, they provided ideas and comments on this participatory opera project lead by the Festival d'Aix-en-Provence that spanned three months with fifty participants of all ages and walks of life, that all came from the Aix-Marseille region.