



Because all people cross borders.



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

www.globalgrandcentral.net/author/EuropeGrandCentral/

Assessment of results on objectives

Analysis written by EGC Project Manager Marcus Haraldsson with Lead Developer Christo de Klerk. Input from Erin Cory, Malmö University, and data from all partners, legacy partners, and artists

EGC had three objectives:

1. To transform perceptions of border crossings from suspicion into curiosity.
2. To empower under- and misrepresented individuals and groups through storytelling.
3. To learn and develop methods of local audience development, inclusion, interaction, mobility and outreach, and to spread these methods to interested culture actors across Europe and beyond.

The project aimed to address three core audiences:

1. Audiences of local partner projects.
2. Partners and residency artists using artistic practices and methods for social inclusion.
3. External organizations interested in using artistic practices and methods for social inclusion, and their audiences.

As relates prioritization between objectives, these were reversed early on in the project cycle, at the project meeting in Budapest in the fall of 2015. From then on, we worked under the assumption that our objectives built on each other and that objective 3 was the fundament for fulfilling the other two objectives. Learning and developing methods of local audience development, inclusion, interaction, mobility and outreach, and the spreading of these methods to interested culture actors across Europe and beyond became the basis for all our work. The empowerment of under- and misrepresented individuals and groups through storytelling became the overarching method, and the transformation of perceptions from suspicion into curiosity became the ultimate vision of the project.

Objective 1 (suspicion turned into curiosity) - vision



Objective 2 (empowerment through storytelling) - method



Objective 3 (mixing and learning methods of audience inclusion) – basis

Consequently, the bulk of evaluation resources have been spent on making a qualitative impact and analysis on objective 3. This work is detailed under ANALYSIS 6, below.

To assess the quantitative and qualitative impacts of all objectives the following summary can be made:

Objective/Method	Quantitative	Qualitative
Objective 1 (turn suspicion into curiosity) Main audience: group 1 and 3	ANALYSIS 1 Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web traffic relating the Stories and Bordr sections of the page Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 609 Bordr Stories posted 3,384 page views of the Bordr page 	ANALYSIS 2 Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theoretical analysis of curiosity creation and fieldwork Analysis of “curious” behaviour on the page Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curiosity dossier Book chapter More research needed
Objective 2 (empowerment through storytelling) Main audience: group 1, 2 and 3	ANALYSIS 3 Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Activities aiming to reach the objective Number of workshops Audience reached Online activity assessments and statistics Quantitative self-evaluations by partners Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34 Activities (involving 12 countries) aimed to reach the objective At least 276 workshops and lectures held Total audience at least 26.130 people 32 Activity reports posted on web platform with 2,772 page views 84% overall self-assessed local project success rate 	ANALYSIS 4 Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative self-evaluations by partners Interviews and on location observations Interviews with audiences Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Varying quality of self – assessments More research needed to assess full qualitative impact of local projects

Objective 3 (method learning and sharing) Main audience: group 2 and 3	ANALYSIS 5 Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of methods described • Cross-user citations • User engagement with the platform such as comments • Number of new users of the platform • Countries concretely engaged by the project Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 22 methods described - 0 cross-user citations - 85 comments from 13 users - 57 Hubs registered from outside the EGC partnership - Active engagement from users in 29 countries on 5 continents 	ANALYSIS 6 Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of method descriptions • Quality assessment of user interactions and comments • Quality of usage extended beyond EGC partnership • Usage extended beyond project period • Legacy potentials Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Varying quality of method descriptions (more iterations and research needed) - Varying quality of user interactions, some substantial and very meaningful Main research deliverable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legacy organisation founded with a three-year plan based on research and pool of legacy partners.
---	--	---

A detailed analysis on the fulfillment of EGC objectives as below.

ANALYSIS 1

Quantitative analysis of objective 1

Indicators

- Web traffic relating the Stories and Bordr sections of the page

Objective 1 originally related largely to the Bordr database that is based on an idea of triggering curiosity by an algorithm designed to break social bubbles. However, as the project got started, Bordr became a lesser prioritized tool in favour of the method and experience sharing www.europegrandcentral.net.

It was also soon deemed that objective nr 1 was more of a vision for the project than a truly measurable concrete outcome. Especially if attempting to measure how suspicion of border crossings turned into curiosity on a continental level in Europe. Seriously measuring this simply lay beyond the scope and possibilities of the project.

Nevertheless a few things can be said as relates to a quantitative analysis of objective 1:

609 Bordr Stories were posted on the www.europegrandcentral.net integrated Wordpress platform from November 2016, through July 31st, 2017. Of the six project partners that produced activities, four were involved in activities that published Bordr Stories. 382 Bordr Stories were published after the platform launch on February 18th, 2017. Of those stories only 4 came from unattributed users supposedly from a “general public”.

In reviewing the number of Bordrs posted to the platform, we see that the vast majority of stories were posted by Europe Grand Central’s associate partner, Bordr, and from projects of the beneficiary, Not Quite. While project partners were involved in the co-design process for implementing Bordr as a methodology on the platform, interest in submitting Bordr Stories fell far below expectations.

Bordr stories were posted as follows:

Bordr Stories	Activity	Principal Hub Involved
398	Bordr Stories Tool (219), Borders of Franserud Middle School (55), Across African Borders (43), Vandring Vittring (28), Stateless in Jordan (25), World in a Block (23), Project Borders Vision (5)	Associate partner (Bordr)
287	Dreams in Bengtsfors (21), Not Quite Station (266).	Beneficiary (Not Quite)
42	Refugee Crisis Participatory Media Project (11), Home is Where Mom Is (16), Collecting Stories (9), Riding the Donkey in Stockholm (3)	Legacy partners (Riding the Donkey Backwards, Burak Sayin, Valletta European Capital of Culture 2018)
27	100 Stories – 100 Faces (20), Interzona-Outerzona (5), Urban Residencies (1), Mental Health Noise Orchestra (1)	Project Partners (Kulturzentrum Schlachthof, , and European Foundation for Urban Culture)
4	<i>Posted anonymously through website by general public.</i>	Unattributed

In the time period between February 18, and July 31, the Bordr Stories archive received 3,384 page views while individual Bordrs were viewed 1,194 times. The five stories that were seen the most between February 18, and July 31, were as follows:

1. 102 views: *“Feeling Restricted By The Physically Handicapped Shell » Being A Vice Chairman Of A Football Fanclub”* from Activity 8 Kulturzentrum Schlachthof
2. 22 views: *“Not Having Friends » Make Real Friends”* from Activity 8 by Kulturzentrum Schlachthof
3. 20 views: *“Not German Speaking » Being Able To Pass The Abitur Exams And Study In Germany”* from Activity 8 by Kulturzentrum Schlachthof
4. 19 views: *“Not Daring To Have Children » Become A Father”* from Activity 8 by Kulturzentrum Schlachthof
5. 18 views: *“Being A Man » Being A Woman”* from Activity 8 by Kulturzentrum Schlachthof

The five stories may be the most popular for several reasons. Kulturzentrum Schlachthof produced an Activity that included more partner based production and promotion and distribution of outcomes than the average activity in the project. While story number five was featured on the front page of the website, story number one benefited from shares on social media. 75 of the 102 views came from Facebook posts shared by the partner, not promoted by EGC or communications partner TEH.

However, what the data really shows is that the Bordr section of www.globalgrandcentral.net had relatively little traffic. Our originally drafted measurement methodology of seeing how users would navigate disparate stories, potentially fuelled by curiosity, fell through. The lack of traffic made it impossible to make a serious quantitative analysis of how the project may have contributed to turning suspicion into curiosity.

ANALYSIS 2

Qualitative analysis of objective 1

Indicators

- Theoretical analysis of curiosity creation and fieldwork
- Analysis of “curious” behaviour on the page

Before giving up on measuring curiosity altogether, we did some homework trying to pin down potentially useful methods to use for qualitative measurements. The analysis began with an effort to try to better understand the general concept of curiosity. The result was a curiosity dossier, a research overview gathering design implications of curiosity creation and concluding that our aim in the project was to mobilize the cycle of perceptual curiosity to support long term epistemic curiosity. That is, a deeper kind of curiosity that deals with understanding and complexity rather than simple click measurements.

As proposed measures on the site the following categories was established:

Activity filterer – someone that has applied a filter on the activity pages.

Story filterer – someone that has applied a filter on the bordr story pages.

Lingerer – someone that has spent 20 minutes or more on the website.

Explorer – someone that has visited 10 or more pages anywhere on the site

Guest story teller – someone without an account that has posted a story

User story teller – someone with an account on the site that has posted a story

However, with the low user turnout on the page the measurements went largely unused.

Also, we developed a related theorem called “Bordr-theory” based in behavioural economics, social psychology, and game theory. It pinned down a theoretical basis for curiosity creation using the Bordr method and was presented in workshops in Vienna and a Swedish book chapter in university literature in pedagogy co-written by the Lead Developer and Project Manager.

However, at the end of it, a qualitative assessment of curiosity creation in Europe was deemed as too big a concept to capture within the limited confines of the EGC project. Although, as a continued research project, and to establish new standards and measurements based on growing amounts of users, and clearer understandings on the possibilities for “nudging” curiosity, the field seems extremely interesting.

ANALYSIS 3

Quantitative analysis of objective 2

Indicators

- Number of activities aiming to reach the objective
- Number of workshops
- Audience reached
- Online activity assessments and statistics
- Quantitative self-evaluations by partners

How did EGC succeed in our ambition to empower under- and misrepresented individuals and groups through storytelling?

Within the project, partners carried out 34 Activities. All of these aimed in one way or another to empower under and misrepresented individuals and groups through storytelling. The Activities were carried out in, or with artists based in 12 countries. The project hosted at least 276 workshops and lectures and our projects reached an audience of more than 26.130 people.

It is hard to make a valuable assessment of empowerment based on web traffic, but we could use the term “online empowerment”, as partner projects and audience engagements were shown for external audiences. A total of 32 Activity reports were made publicly accessible from the 34 activities in the project. The Activity pages of www.globalgrandcentral.net received 2,772 page views between February and July 2017, while individual Activities were viewed 1,775 times.

However, to find more valuable numbers of actual empowerment we soon realized that more qualitative understandings would need to be built on local, and even personal levels with the audience of each project.

An ideal way of capturing this would have been to have had standardized questionnaires handed out to audience participants in local activities across the project. However, this approach was deemed too intrusive into local practices, it would have required a lot of logistics, and taken focus away from partners attempts at developing and sharing new methods of audience engagement, and instead have them possibly overthink how they would capture numerical measures from participants, or prompt reporting fatigue.

Instead we focused one level up, on the project partners and artists carrying out local socially engaged and inclusive artistic projects. When building the www.europegrandcentral.net platform we created forms that directly ask partners about the results and lessons of their projects. After a couple of iterations and user discussions, the forms showed up with a somewhat provocative simple question asking users how successful their projects had been on a scale from 1 to 100. The idea was that this numeric provocation, seeking to reduce extremely complex processes down to a simple number, would spark debates on what it meant for a cultural project to “succeed” (or in this case, possibly, what it meant for an audience to be empowered through storytelling). Who would decide, and what would be the appropriate measurements?

Today the “success – failure slider” is a front-page feature on www.globalgrandcentral.net, and the ambition is to make users feel safe enough to also report what they would themselves conceive as complete “failures”.

Of the 34 project activities reported by partners on the project platform 31 ended up using the success – failure slider in their Activity reports. The lowest value was 62% and the highest 100%. Based on the

Assessment of results on objectives

answers we can calculate a mean success rate of local EGC projects of 84%. That sounds reasonably good, but what does it mean?

Below is a graph of all the EGC funded projects and their perceived success rates, lessons, and inspirations (also used for ANALYSIS 5 below)

Activity	Self-evaluated "success"	Main lessons – type of comment	Inspirations – type and source	Global Grand Central URL
By Not Quite				
Lagalabbet	-	-	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/lagalabbet/
Dreams in Bengtsfors	66%	Constructive, reflective, critical	Own projects	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/dreams-in-bengtsfors/
Don't stop motion	76%	Constructive, critical	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/dont-stop-motion/
Borders of Franserud Middle School	79%	Reflective, critical	Own projects	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/borders-of-bengtsfors/
Not Quite Station	69%	Constructive, critical	Own projects	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/not-quite-station/
Hind Oudhriri	70%	-	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/concomitant-singularity/
Charbel Samuel Auon	91%	-	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/pareidolia/
By Fonds Roberto Cimetta				
Border Mobility	100%	Constructive, reflective	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/463/
Reuben Yemoh Odoi	-	-	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/undocumented-migrant-his-stateless-family/
Majdal Nadeel	-	-	Internal	Not public
By Kulturzentrum Schlachthof				
100 Stories – 100 Faces	92%	-	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/495/
Exhibition 100 Stories – 100 Faces Bremen	90%	Reflective	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/exhibition-100-faces-100-stories/

Assessment of results on objectives

Exhibition 100 Stories – 100 Faces Sylt	79%	-	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/exhibition-on-tour-in-sylt-germany/
By ODC theatre company				
Across borders with borderline children	88%	Comprehensive, constructive, critical	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/across-borders-with-borderline-children/
Louissette stage play	96%	-	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/louissette-the-backstage-of-revolution-performance-by-elli-papakonstantinouodc-ensemble/
Stories of borderline	85%	Evaluation of content	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/stories-of-the-borderline/
Workshops Green Planet	80%	-	-	
Workshop Tilemachos Moussas	81%	Reflective	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/award-winning-program-by-the-greek-minister-of-culture-to-vyrsodepseiodcensemble/
By Assoziatione Laminarie				
Midollo/Marrow	93%	Reflective, constructive, critical	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/midollo/
Community Digital Archive	86%	Reflective, critical	Own projects	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/community-digital-archive/
Cento di questi giorni! And many more!	90%	Reflective	Own projects	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/cento-di-questi-giorni-and-many-more/
Hecuba - Bologna	86%	Reflective	Own projects	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/hecuba-ports-and-suburb-of-the-mediterranean-sea-bologna/
Hecuba - Palermo	85%	Ibid	Ibid	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/hecuba-ports-and-suburb-of-the-mediterranean-sea-palermo/
Hecuba – Bologna 2	88%	Ibid	Ibid	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/hecuba-ports-and-suburb-of-the-mediterranean-sea-bologna-second-action/
Hecuba - Naples	86%	Ibid	Ibid	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/hecuba-ports-and-suburb-of-the-mediterranean-sea-naples/
Hecuba - Marseille	91%	Ibid	Ibid	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/hecuba-ports-and-suburb-of-the-mediterranean-sea-marseille-france/
Hecuba - Barcelona	84%	Ibid	Ibid	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/hecuba-ports-and-suburb-of-the-mediterranean-sea-granollers-barcelona-spain/
By Europejska				

Fundacja Kultury Miejskiej				
Aron Rossman-Kiss	80%	-	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/from-under-the-city/
Dina Kobrosly	70%	-	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/921/
Ryo Ikeshiro	90%	Constructive, critical	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/the-mental-health-noise-orchestra/
Taisiya Melnyk	86%	Reflective, critical, constructive	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/body-of-the-country-poland/
Radhouan Fiddini	94%	-	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/crossing-borders-from-tunisia-to-poland/
Alexey Salmanov	-	-	-	-
Viktoria Khomenko	62%	Reflective	-	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/follow-me/
Yulia Laschuk	89%	Reflective, constructive, critical	Internal	http://www.globalgrandcentral.net/activity/borders/
Total mean	84%			

Erin Cory, a postdoc researcher specializing in Refugees and Migration at the School of Arts & Communication, Faculty of Culture & Society at Malmö University, Sweden, was hired by EGC as an external researcher in the spring of 2017 to better understand the meaning of the above self-assessments. She was tasked with trying to understand what lessons we could make to improve this seemingly arbitrary numeric measurement for the future. Because the provocation of a numeric value prompted much discussions, both among partners and practitioners, and when working on legacy activities of the project (see Activity 5 above), the sliders drew a lot of attention from both policy organizations and researchers. Erin Cory set up a plan to interview all the partner project leaders, and as many local workshop leaders as practically possible, to ask the following questions:

1. On the spectrum of the given (sliding) assessment tool, was your project closer to a 'success' or closer to a 'failure'?
2. Who was involved in discussions about the relative success or failure of the project?
3. What were the criteria you considered in assigning this evaluation to your project? (Please be as specific as possible)
4. What sort of process did you use to determine how successful the project was? (ie, did you regularly dedicate time to evaluation while the was in progress? Did you save these discussions until the end? Did you use a survey? Have group discussions? Decide alone, as project coordinator? Please be as specific and descriptive as possible.)
5. Does the tool give you a sense of how successful your project was in relation to other projects? Why or why not?
6. Do you think the process of self-evaluation changed your project in any way? Why or why not?
7. What are your overall impressions of the sliding scale evaluation tool?

8. Are there modes of evaluation other than the sliding scale that you would have found valuable to your project? What are they, and how would they have been helpful?
9. Are there other modes that you would find valuable going forward? What are they, and how would they be helpful?

This track of research would no doubt have been extremely interesting to pursue, and it is high on the list of future research projects within the framework of Global Grand Central non-profit. However, within the constraints of EGC, and given the wider type of questions we got from potential legacy partners and funders interested in the legacy of the project, it was soon decided that our external research budget would instead best be spent looking at potential legacy prospects of EGC. Erin Cory came to contribute to widening the focus of our questions into ANALYSIS 6 below.

As a consequence, the local projects of EGC now stands with a largely unexplained and somewhat arbitrary combined quantitative success rate of 84%. Much further research will be needed to judge what such a measure really means, and how to build on, and learn from it in a constructive way.

ANALYSIS 4

Qualitative analysis of objective 2

Indicators

- Interviews and on location observations
- Interviews with audiences
- Qualitative self-evaluations by partners

What can be said about empowerment through storytelling by using a more qualitative approach?

As discussed above, the best qualitative assessment of impact would need to be made on the level of individual audience members. Using e.g. refined interviewing techniques, aiming at tracing the process of empowerment through storytelling.

To arrive at a conclusion as to the qualitative impact of our projects relating empowerment through storytelling, EGC made two attempts at engaging specialized external researchers.

A first attempt to evaluate the qualitative impact on objective 2 intended to use last year master students at the MA program in Journalism at the University of Southern Denmark. Students were offered to work with local project partners and their audiences to evaluate empowerment impacts of inclusive storytelling methods as parts of their final thesis work at the university. The attempt was strongly inspired by the anthropological journalism methods of the department. Full suggestions and academic point requirements were considered. However, in the end no students signed on to the offer.

Another attempt was made to send Anne Kirstine Hermann, a PhD in Ethnographic Journalism at the University of Southern Denmark to visit, interact, and partake in local activities, and make a qualitative analysis of project impacts as relates objective 2. Anne Kirstine Hermann was to travel to and visit partners and audiences in Athens, Lublin, and Bologna. She drafted and budgeted an ambitious travel and writing schedule. However, these plans fell through in early 2017 largely due to other commitments for the researcher.

With the lack of time and resources to carry out these assessments ourselves, we were left with analyzing partners own assessments of their audiences and projects. We did this primarily by analyzing online submissions to www.globalgrandcentral.net reporting forms. Sepcifically under the online form question: "Main lessons learned"

Partners have given 17 different answers to this question, many of these are of high quality, and some have gone to lengths at discussing impacts of their projects. For example, the write-up on www.globalgrandcentral.net from the "Across borders with borderline children" activity by the ODC non-profit theatre company in Greece includes the following passage:

"The success of this series of workshops can be depicted with indicators and long lasting outcomes like the following:

a) some pupils that had no previous musical training were taught to play instruments (guitar, percussion, piano, base and vocals). The workshops were spread in time and were organised in artistic visits of the choreographer Athanasia Kanelopoulou, theatre director Elli Papakonstantinou, music composer Tilemachos Moussas and visual artist Malvina Pountzikoglou. The children were very positively affected by the workshops and could release emotion, develop their movement skills and also speech abilities and express themselves freely. This resulted to an overall improvement of their hole being, behavioral and learning ability. Their marks at school improved dramatically. Dramatic improvement was achieved with dyslectic kids and autistic children in terms of speech and movement skills improvement."

This seems like a solid qualification of the self-assessed 88% success rate of the activity, and does seem to suggest real empowerment of under- and misrepresented individuals and groups through storytelling.

Another www.globalgrandcentral.net write-up is in another end of a spectra, this one from artist collective FELT that ran workshops on the theme of Dreams in Bengtsfors with Not Quite ekonomisk förening. The artists had the following lessons to share:

"It is much easier to get participants if meeting them directly in their context. Newspaper ads did not work at all, the county website gave a few participants, and social media gained some traction, but going to the participant contexts directly and present the project was by far the most effective.

In the next round of workshops, we will not rent a space (with accordion classes) but have been invited directly to their already existing classes at the town language café.

The concept with mixed classes was very successful, the gender and age differences contributed to an open and relaxed atmosphere. When working creatively participants are oftentimes wary of making something "ugly", but in a mixed group this fear lessens. The adults are allowed to be more "childish" and the children become less competitive.

Another lesson was that we met only every second Thursday, this was a little too far between to gain any routine for participants, so every time we had different people to work with. This was nice, but we had originally thought that we would work with one group over a whole season. This changed as we worked onwards – and people did not return but told their friends to come."

This series of workshops had a self-assessed success rate of 66% but it is hard to know if this value relates to the empowerment of the participants through storytelling, or if it is a reflection of practical limitations of e.g. the space and outreach methods that were used to promote the activity.

As with the above objectives and analyses we lack enough data to state an answer to whether or not audiences and participants in our projects were qualitatively empowered through storytelling. However, as all partner activities focused on methods to this end, and most of them reported a high level of success, and we reached more than 26.000 people, it is highly likely that we did make an empowering difference with our local audiences.

ANALYSIS 5

Quantitative analysis of objective 3

Indicators

- Number of methods described
- Cross-user citations
- User engagement with the platform such as comments
- Number and spread of new users of the platform

How well did EGC succeed with our objective to “learn and develop methods of local audience development, inclusion, interaction, mobility and outreach, and to spread these methods to interested culture actors across Europe and beyond”?

It is notoriously hard to develop numeric values of learning. However, assessments need to start with something to learn, in this case descriptions of methods and assessments of experiences using them. The project website, built on reporting iteration by partners, currently includes 22 methods that can be tagged to any activity, ranging from “exhibitions” over “mapping”, “Bordr”, “performance”, “public art”, “workshops”, “textile” and “theatre” to “sound”, “coding”, “photography” and “writing”. These have been added as needs to add them has been voiced. Many of the methods described, such as Stop Motion filmmaking in Åmål, Sweden, and neighbourhood activation in Bologna, Italy, are highly innovative. In fact, most of the methods, and approaches by partners have at least one and often several aspects of fundamental innovation. EGC really seems to have been a place where artists and practitioners have dared to try new ideas, iterate and test concepts, and sometimes also fail a little bit, but repeat and build on new lessons.

As for the spread of lessons, the best quantitative measure would be if users on the website started quoting each other as inspirations for new approaches. This has not yet been seen on the site. The site does ask for “inspirations”, but (as seen in the graph above) these so far mostly refer to previous projects by the artist, or internal or external inspirations by artists and practitioners outside of the www.globalgrandcentral.net platform. However, potentialities for sharing and exchange, as the site now continues, is large.

Another measure of the level of exchange of methods is the discussions and comments on the page. Users can comment each line on any of the Activity reports. Until the end of the project 85 such comments had been logged by 13 users.

For quantitative measures of the “spread of methods to interested culture actors across Europe and beyond” the math is quite straightforward.

During the course of the project 13 organizations and individuals from outside of the EGC partnership published public Hub profile pages on www.globalgrandcentral.net. These “legacy” Hubs include:

- Valletta European Capital of Culture 2018

- Border Crossings, theatre, London
- Deema Shahin, photographer, Jordan
- Paul Geday, film maker, Egypt
- Queens Library, library organization, USA
- Riding the Donkey Backwards, media producers, Belgium
- Katja Simoncic, researcher, Slovenia
- Rishu Yadav, tennis and graffiti artist, Sweden
- SACBTA, regional trader and human rights organization, Southern Africa (based in Zambia)
- Talking Syria, heritage and storytelling organization, Syria/London
- Teatro dell'Argine, theatre, Bologna
- Burak Sayin, journalist, Sweden
- Unlabel, Creative Europe project, Germany

The legacy partners have so far logged a total of 19 Activity reports on www.globalgrandcentral.net, most of them of very high quality. Several, such as Queens Library, Deema Shahin, Talking Syria, and Border Crossings, have also taken active roles in the legacy process of the project.

Organizations external to the EGC partnership that have signed on to www.globalgrandcentral.net but not yet published a public Hub profile on the platform account to 44. They represent a variety of networks, individuals, and organisations across art forms, research, policy, and social change organisations. They are based in as varied places as San Francisco, Trinidad and Tobago, New York City, Algeria, Spain, Greece, Italy, London, Northern Ireland, St Petersburg, and South Korea.

We see these legacy users – in total numbering 57 – who have come along with no financial stake only to report projects on our platform, and their extended communities and networks, as strong indicators that we are on to something and that the www.globalgrandcentral.net type of experience sharing is relevant.

A total run-down of the geographic spread of the project looks as follows:

- EGC has financed project activities in twelve countries in Europe and North America (Sweden, Italy, France, Germany, Poland, Greece, Hungary, Austria, Croatia, USA, Ukraine, and Belgium)
- Our residencies have added direct relevance to artists from an additional nine countries (Morocco, Lebanon, Tunisia, Palestine, Switzerland, UK, Jordan, Egypt, and Algeria)
- Legacy partners and their reported activities add at least another eight countries to the list of direct relevance for EGC (Malta, Syria, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Trinidad and Tobago, Spain, Russia, and South Korea).

Based on this EGC has had direct relevance across at least 29 countries on five continents. The www.globalgrandcentral.net mutual reporting and sharing website today has active hubs registered in 19 countries.

ANALYSIS 6

Qualitative analysis of objective 3

Indicators

- Quality of method descriptions
- Quality assessment of user interactions and comments
- Quality of usage extended beyond EGC partnership
- Usage extended beyond project period

- Legacy potentials

What was the qualitative outcomes of EGC ambitions to learn and develop methods of local audience development, inclusion, interaction, mobility and outreach, and to spread these methods to interested culture actors across Europe and beyond?

Assessing the quality of method descriptions: As described in Activity 3, above, this part of the online form development saw the most iteration, and is still an area where much research will have to be conducted. It proved hard to make artists describe and share their methods (even if they stated real interest in doing just that), and results varied considerably from just writing “exhibition” to detailed descriptions of the exhibition setup, history, materials, and audience interactions. Some partners, like Assoziazione Laminarie, Not Quite, and Kulturzentrum Schlachthof succeeded very well.

As for the quality of user interactions most comments on the site were posted by the Project Manager attempting to start using the page as a communication tool in itself. Some of the discussions, however, are qualitative deep dives into method sharing. Such as the comment by Deema Shahin on January 8, relating her project “Home is Where Mom is”:

“It did go well! I think that I related to Gozitan and Maltese mothers deeply...They also related to me...and perhaps this is my indicator for success...perhaps my sole indicator! I understand that in “projects” or how we define “projects” there is no such thing as 100% success...I also think that based on the different indicators adopted, success is always relative...What I learned from the previous editions of “Home is Where Mom is” is that it is important to share part of me just as I ask people to share part of their lives with me, also I learned that being flexible is important as long as one can still see the essence of what he’s doing...the essence that represents the “why”...why do I do this...”

As for the last three points above, time is too short to make a valuable assessment of the quality of the legacy work. However, some things can be said about the legacy of EGC.

First, EGC partners have been given a rare opportunity to experiment with new models of audience engagement, inclusion and empowerment. They have built on previous knowledge and experiences to mix new ideas into new formats. The project has also expanded horizons of possibilities for international collaborations and innovations. Where this may lead in terms of future collaborations, projects, audience engagement techniques and local and global understandings, is impossible to foresee, but it is not unlikely that the project has had profound impacts.

Second, EGC started not as a project that was supposed to end on August 31, 2017, but in response to a continuous need for knowledge and method exchange of inclusive methodologies among our partners. As decided during the third EGC project meeting in Verona in November 2016, partners have since pursued an organized continuation of the project beyond the end of EU funding.

To support this goal, a range of activities was maintained. The main evaluation report of the project, “Mobilising networks through web-based archival practice”, laid the theoretical foundations of an EGC legacy, and dozens of conceptual partnerships have been built. A legal legacy organization, “Global Grand Central non-profit” was founded at the last project meeting in Pula, Croatia, in June, 2017

The organization was registered as a non-profit, “idéell förening” in Sweden on June 14, under the presidentship of Ferdinand Richard from partner Fonds Roberto Cimetta. It took responsibility for the GGC

platform from September 1, 2017. Three board meetings has been held between September 1st and November 1st, 2017.

The first board of Global Grand Central non-profit was selected as

President: **Ferdinand Richard**, president of the board of EGC partner Fonds Roberto Cimetta, France

Member of board: **Natalie Milbrodt**, EGC legacy partner Queens Library, USA

Member of board: **Agata Will**, EGC associate partner Workshops of Culture, Poland

Member of board: **Valeria la Corte**, EGC partner Laminarie DOM, Italy

Member of board: **Marcus Haraldsson**, EGC partner Not Quite ekonomisk förening, Sweden

Member of board: **Christo de Klerk**, EGC Lead Developer, USA

Global Grand Central non-profit is now in a bridge period between EU-funding and full implementation of governance, technology, and long-term financial plan. The organisation functions under a three-year plan consisting of three phases: “research”, “iteration”, and “implementation”.

A summary of the strategic three-year plan reads:

Global Grand Central provides an open platform and living archives for learning and exchange amongst artistic, social and cultural activists worldwide.

Local projects and global relevance

Around the world practitioners in the form of educators, artists, community leaders, sports clubs and culture institutions work hard to make people understand each other. Through ambitious inclusive projects they engage with communities to perform a delicate inter-human art built on empathy, creativity, openness, adaptability, and experience. These local initiatives are the backbone of our connected local and global societies, the primary guarantors of human development, social justice, and peace. In an ideal world, these projects should work together for the same ends, plan projects based on previous knowledge, act, evaluate, spread lessons, and contribute to a constantly evolving impact cycle.

Reporting systems are dead

However, five factors currently isolate creators from lessons:

- **The database hugging disorder:** Lessons from projects are kept instead of shared. Funder archives are closed and practitioners encouraged to compete instead of collaborating.
- **Reporting fatigue:** When projects end, practitioners are too exhausted to share valuable lessons.
- **Positive bias:** Results that are spread are usually only positive, excluding lessons from “failures”.
- **Siloed networking:** Exchange happens in bubbles of known practitioners, excluding knowledge sharing across disciplines, social and geographical contexts.
- **Sorry this page is not available:** Websites dedicated to projects and methods almost always die when funding ends.

Long live reporting

We believe these challenges are best addressed by building a mutual and dynamic reporting system for openly accessed and continuously updated project sharing.

To be effective the system should become:

- An open, accountable, and highly trustworthy international reporting standard.
- Feasible as a social networking and portfolio building website for professional exchange.
- Controlled by practitioners while incorporating needs of funders, policymakers and researchers.

- Adhere to archival standards, while applying efficient systems for integrity protection and publishing ethics.
- Have a solid long-term financial plan, on par with libraries and archives.

Timeline ahead

2017- **Securing bridge period:** establish governance, initiate coordination and funding.

2018- **Research and iterative testing** of governance, technology and funding models. Soft launch.

2019- **Iteration and implementation** of long-term governance, technology, and funding model.

2020- Platform **financially self-sufficient, transparently governed, with evolving tech/community**.

Technology & Community

Global Grand Central is developed through an iterative evolving process working very closely with users to ask, apply, observe, evaluate, and constantly rebuild and improve the tools of the service.

The bulk of tech development is carried out as decentralized contributions to Open Source.

- The platform is built on **Wordpress**, the world's most common web development software
- Google's translation tools are used across the page, allowing inputs in **103 languages**
- The code is **Open Source**, hosted on GitHub
- Texts and images are uploaded under **Creative Commons** Attribution Share Alike License

Priorities between 2017-2020 include:

Community	User services	Systems	Research
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep being fully open to new users, no matter the funding model - Effective user service and feedback systems - Establish direct and meaningful community agency as part of the governance model - Adhere to publisher responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve accessibility and language tools - Hubs page development - Develop levels of access and security - Iterate method forms - Develop activity calls and application functions - Customization of forms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build complements to existing standards, aligning with e.g. the Europeana Data Model, EDM, with focus on modes of production - Find effective ways to combine archival proof demands, and personal integrity, relating e.g. the EU General Data Protection Regulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish evaluation research forum - Develop metrics for attributions (measuring trust and cooperation between levels of hubs) - Improve metrics for curiosity engagement - Data validation

Governance

From September 1, 2017, Global Grand Central is governed by the Sweden registered association "Global Grand Central non-profit". A coordination office is now established to research, iterate, and implement the

three-year bridge period. Final governance model is likely mixed and decentralized with a small organizational core and self-managing clusters of contribution. It may be legally incorporated in several locations and forms.

The first page of the current organisations statutes read:

“Global Grand Central non-profit

Global Grand Central non profit is the governing body of the Global Grand Central online platform.

§ 1 The name of the association

The name of the association is: “Global Grand Central non-profit”

§ 2 Objectives

In full respect of cultural rights, and in order to reinforce a vibrant civil society, it is our objective to provide an open platform and living archives for learning and exchange amongst artistic, social and cultural activists worldwide.*

**Convention 2005 UNESCO, Articles 1 and 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

§ 3 Principles

- **Openness and co-creation:** *Global Grand Central is built for lessons, methods, and processes to be shared and freely reused for the common good. The platform is continuously co-created by its users within an open and transparent structure.*
- **Accountability:** *The platform operates in legal spaces with full respect to fundamental human rights, adheres to best practices of intellectual property, and employs efficient systems to comply with privacy praxis.*

§ 4 Scope

- Geographies: **Local and Global**
- Perspectives: **Practice, Research, and Policy**
- Stakeholders: **Public, Private, Organizations, and Individuals**

§ 5 Organizational Development

To achieve our objective, abide by our principles and serve our stakeholders; the association works to secure and develop:

- **Technology solutions**
- **Community participation**
- **Governance model**
- **Sustainable funding model**

§ 6 Location of the board

The board is located in Stockholm, Sweden.”

Financing

Model is based on a fee for service model based on adding value to reporting, evaluation, and application processes towards a pool of project funders. The absolute goal of the funding model is to be self-sustaining, and not dependent on cyclical project funds.

Practitioners use the service free, funders pay for reporting by grantees. Researchers pay per agreement.

Projected revenue types and importance after 2020:

Premium memberships: 18%

Reporting fees: 36%

Application fees: 15%

Overhead fees: 15%

Project funding: 10%

Private contributions and crowdfunding: 6%

The rationale for Global Grand Central non-profit is further explained on the last page of the research paper “Mobilising networks through web-based archival practice”:

“Arts and culture fills an absolutely crucial role in society as no other means of interaction has the same potential to bridge spaces between people. In a time when the value of individual humans seems more and more questioned, when “fake news” is top news, and when xenophobia and fear grips parts of our societies, it is hard to think of anything more important than knowledge mobilisation in the arts. The learning processes in this part of society must not be broken. We must talk to each other, and we must take issues of peer-to-peer learning, research, policy, practice and cross sectoral learning very seriously. For our audiences, for ourselves, and for the future of society. This is what evaluation and mobilisation of knowledge is all about.

Grounded on the acute awareness that action is needed, Global Grand Central non-profit was founded in June 2017. It now governs the GGC knowledge sharing platform. The organisation was formed explicitly to fill the void detailed on the pages of this research paper. GGC now has a unique opportunity to act as a foundation for practitioner centred knowledge exchange on a journey towards a more vibrant society.”