



RESHAPE

INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by Eduardo Bonito, Claire Malika Zerhouni, Isabel Ferreira, Katarina Pavic and Livia Diniz

10 December 2021

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

OUTLOOK OF THE EVALUATION'S EVOLUTION AND CURRENT STATUS

GRAPHIC DATA VISUALISATION

RESHAPE EVALUATION FOCUS GROUP REPORT

.....

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

A final report will be presented with much more depth analysis.

In the interim report we are delivering:

- An outlook of the evaluation's evolution and current status;
- Graphic visualisation that illustrates the numerical values attributed throughout the interviews;
- Selected comments from the interviewees, connected with the general objectives of Reshape;

- The focus group's finalised analysis.

In the final report, additional information will be included:

- Fluxonomic analysis of the whole project, covering all the 4 dimensions and its 16 components
- Graphic visualisation of comments, tags and ideas

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

Our evaluation process for Reshape started at its final stage - since September 2021 the group has been at the same time developing the website for evaluation and preparing the project's evaluation.

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

Main elements of the process:

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

Each of these steps are described in more detail in this report.

The methodology is based on 4D Fluxonomy theory developed by [Lala Dehenzelin](#) and on the evaluation prototype developed by the Fair Governance

Evaluation sub-group in partnership with FARO - Learning Community during the RESHAPE process as one of its main tools.

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

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

Specific Objectives:

1. Create a common language for a new methodology to create, manage and evaluate cultural and artistic projects.
2. Form a research unit on metrics that articulates qualitative and quantitative parameters in their true resonance.
3. Create a template - matrix to analyse cultural projects through a shared methodology.
4. Introduce the metrics to different institutions with the intention of establishing a prototype to be applied and researched.

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

<https://faro.reshape.network/>

The development process for the prototype will be evaluated after the final adjustments are done by the group following completion of this present evaluation of the Reshape project as a whole.

The prototype's effectiveness is going to be evaluated by the group in the near future, using the experience of this present evaluation of Reshpe as well as other smaller projects to be evaluated with the tool in the first semester of 2022. The interim and final Reshape evaluations will be very important for that matter.

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

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

We also show our gratitude to all Reshape colleagues who participated in the focus groups, interviews, workshops and answered the form online with such generosity and honesty. All their data have been kept confidential to the group of 6 people performing the analysis to configure this 4D fractal of opinions, thoughts and impressions.

Evaluation Team

Reshape :

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

FARO :

- Livia Diniz (coordinator)

- Isabel Ferreira (interviewer and analyst)

- Lala Deheinzelin (speaker, interviewer and analyst)

OUTLOOK OF THE EVALUATION'S EVOLUTION AND CURRENT STATUS

We managed to collect information and answers from several kinds of participants of the Reshape project:

- Partners
- Coordinators
- Advisors
- Facilitators
- Reshapers

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

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

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

Although the turnout for all activities was a bit lower than the expected, we achieved a significant number of participants, and the prototype generated almost 200 pages of compiled answers and numeric values.

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

Prior to the actual activities in Ljubljana, a keynote session in Zagreb with Lala Dehenzelin supported by 4 researchers from this project helped people to understand a bit better about the base of the methodology and to attract their

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

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

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

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

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

We have closed the answering period on 7 December and we are now engaged on the overall analysis of the whole data, which has been separated into 24 files, one for each of the questions. They are being read and analysed using several procedures of tagging and cross reflection in relation to Reshape general objectives.

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

Next week we will work to finalise the analysis, comparing the Focus group analysis with the answers from the prototype, we will prepare summaries of all answers for the 24 questions and prepare the final fluxonomic analysis.

GRAPHIC DATA VISUALISATION

.....

Numeric impressions

A graphic output of an evaluation developed for the prototype has been released on 8 December and is already reflecting the quantitative numeric overall impressions from Reshape participants.

They can be seen in this interactive report:

https://socio-graph.net/outros/Reshape/v2/reshape_zoom_color.html

Numeric representations are taken from the respondents at two moments, one in an initial round of questions which is the trigger for first reflection on all aspects to be analysed. In the second round of attributing figures, participants are triggered for a more criterious reflection for short written answers that follow, which are the most significant data for the evaluation. The figures given in the second round are the ones included in the graphic visualisation presented.

For us, non numeric graphic visualisation is preferred over the numeric, where by a scheme of circles and colours different values and components are represented

in bigger or smaller parts. These four dimensions are intertwined and interdependent in such a way that any change in one of them, affects and has consequences in the other three. Each sphere of reality repeats the structure of four spheres within itself, with its cultural, environmental, social and financial aspects within each one, it is fractal.

The representation in numbers and scale are at this point merely indicative. The effectiveness of this numeric feature of the evaluation is still to be proven in the future, once the prototype starts to be used by other projects, organisations and initiatives. The development group will be able to evaluate better once many projects are analysed. Reshape is the seed experience.

The qualitative report is for us the one with more significance, which is being prepared by our group of 6 people, in collaboration with designers and developers. That will have summaries of 16 points and analytical views which will better represent the universe of participants' views, suggestions and ideas about Reshape. That will be presented in a second document with the final report.

This visualisation tool will also present Tags connected to each section evaluated, which are being selected at the present moment of the analysis process, and will be incorporated in the final report.

Reshape's overall numeric impression was of 200 out of a possible maximum of 320.

The relative balance between the 4 dimensions in the Reshape's evaluation is clear in the graphs presented. Predominance of the cultural dimension in orange colour is clear, followed by the environmental dimension in green colour.

Dimensions

Each dimension can have a maximum numeric evaluation of 80, adding all numeric impressions from its four internal dimensions:

CULTURAL:	59
ENVIRONMENTAL:	52
SOCIAL:	46
TRANSACTIONAL:	42

As mentioned the figures are not as relevant as the qualitative data, therefore they are not so visible in the Graph, but they can be seen by leaving the arrow over a section for a few seconds.

Components

There are 16 components, four for each dimension, which can have a maximum numeric evaluation of 80, they can be seen in the second circle layer and can be accessed by clicking in each dimension and diving into the fractal.

Forces

There are 64 forces, four for each component, which can have a maximum numeric evaluation of 5, they can be seen in the third circle layer and can be accessed by clicking in each dimension and diving into the fractal.

Other features of the Graph Data Visualisation

The qualitative element of the Graph will come in the form of **Tags** related to each dimension and component. The tags are being carefully selected by the analysts and compared with word clouds of the data.

Future possible visualisations

It is important also to mention that the tool used for this visualisation may grow in the future and incorporate new features and data connection which the Reshape evaluation may also benefit from, with new connections and ways to visualise the already existing data. That may come in newer versions of the prototype, which are being thought in response to the initial experience with Reshape.

Development of the visualisation

The development of the Graph tool for data visualisation for the prototype was developed by Tiago Pimentel, who may continue collaborating with the development group and FARO to develop further possible visualisations and connections to the data analysed.

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

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

- Rafael Frazão (visual identity)
- Mladen Katanić (website design)
- Slobodna domena - Marko Vuković and Stjepan Vrljičak (website programming)

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

.....

EVALUATION ORGANISED BY RESHAPE GOALS

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

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

- Contexts, skills and resources

Different contexts working together makes it innovative because enables connections among different fields.

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

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

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

- Covid and Digital Switch

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

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

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

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

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

- Open-ended process and methodology

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Development, roles and participation

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

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

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

“I would not put it as troubles, but there were collective choices that, in the end, had consequences that for me for instance, were not necessarily happy. But as a leader

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

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

- Future and reach

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

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

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

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

“Yes, all of them worked. A lot of prototypes were super interesting to see, and in terms of experimental, yes, I could never imagine people from the ministry of culture in Greece playing with tarot cards, that is a little bit outside of the box for policy

makers at least in Greece. This is something that needs extra work, money and resources. But it created knowledge that can be used by others.” (partner)

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

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

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

Formats (To develop innovative and collaborative organisational models)

- Reshape as a community to experiment collaboratively

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

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

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

“The base of the project was collaboration so the groups that we formed had interdependency, between us, as we used as tools, at the level of Reshape as a

whole, maybe a little less, it feels that it has to do with the governance structure, I guess interdependency was less true between the partners, it was the case when we had workshops with the opportunities to interact, all the sectors. We met in cities so there were the cities' environment but as a whole it felt a little less in this interdependence logic.” (reshaper)

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

- Time, interdependency and change

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

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

“I can see a long term interaction and collaboration. Reshape is a network, because we did something together and it has meaning because of the community's efforts to make this alive. I have no idea in which form but I feel it has the potential to live beyond the end and make other types of collaborations, the reshape feeling will continue inhabiting us and give birth to more opportunities and possibilities.” (reshaper)

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

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

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

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

- Shapes

“At times I felt like some of the things we developed felt like we were trying to put the square into the circle. We needed the money but at times Creative Europe felt very constraining. We needed to have mobility in the project. And it was great to have it. But if we had limited resources, we would have done it differently. But a lot of mobility created pressure and anxiety on the groups. We had to pre-define where activities would take place. In the beginning we had to put the people at certain places, we gave a lot of anxiety to people - the project created the amount of the discussion. The choice was not made by people.” (partner)

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

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

“The formats were super useful, the communication realised in the project, messaging in the project did not suffer from project management language and

allowed for different types of expression. Each thing in the project allowed for a certain type of relevance for different groups and actors. The relative lack of accessibility emerges from the fact that many more cultural actors wanted to be a part of the trajectories and couldn't make it into the process.” (partner)

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

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

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

2/ Fairness :

Equality of opportunities

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

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

- Creating equal opportunities through redistribution of financial resource

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

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

Accessibility / Inclusion

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

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

“Also it was limited to a small number of people. In the very idea, throughout the project we had the idea to reach beyond the 40 + / 60+ people who were the part of the process, people whose information we gathered in the inventory of practitioners. But then, the inventory was left quite basic, we didn’t fill out our ambitions with that. This could have enlarged the process and made it more accessible. There were a lot of responses to the initial call for people to share their innovative / experimental practices. Besides these initial contacts we didn’t gather them into the larger community. There are a whole lot of explanations why and Covid certainly didn’t help. But with more resources and different ways of working it could’ve been more accessible to more people.” (partner)

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

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

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

“It also affected the motivation of people, and the infrastructure was not sufficient for the development of the ideas. Also different groups who were working separately were supposed to meet and reflect about their ideas, and it was lacking. It was left

to their initiative. When you meet in a space this kind of thing happens spontaneously.” (partner)

Participation in decision making

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Diversity / representativity

“I’m struggling because we were kind of lacking diversity. No matter how the different perspectives were broad, disciplines we’re working, personal involvement,

emotional things, but still a flat community. When it comes to the age, the social background, it was a pretty flat bubble” (partner)

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

“Apart from Anastasia, who’s a black person living in Russia, there was no representation of the Indian community, the people with disabilities, black people, traveling communities, the refugees, how to bring in other perspectives, other realities. All of that was a miss. There were a lot of people from different countries, that’s diverse - but it was all the same type of people.” (facilitator)

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

“With so many people with so many different characteristics, it’s difficult to work together. I am not great at collaboration. Why would we expect if we put 8 random people, with random backgrounds, together it’s going to work great, it’s a gamble.

For me, it was part of the process that it would not necessarily go through. There was a pressure from having to be present at all times and how to make things together all the time. Also, in the end i think there were more problems with expectations than with real production.” (reshaper)

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

Eco-responsibility

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

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

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

3/ Solidarity (affectivity)

“Solidarity, for example, should not be one of the topics, it should be a given. But if it is given as a topic, there is a need. The solution cannot be solidarity but the solution should be the other aspects of the problem. Probably the other topics are related somehow, but they are probably from the perspective of the institutions. This is one thing. The other thing is that they are all broad. They can be taken in different directions. But for example, solidarity, the team or the trajectory, limited the possibility to work on. After a while, some other groups or themes were more interesting for me, than what we were doing in our group. The flexibility within other

groups, or transition between groups could have been much more useful.”
(reshaper)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4/ To facilitate the geographic balance

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

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

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

“Why MENA gets included in this? We are coming from completely different contexts. Do we represent anything? Mediterranean region, the fact that they don’t have access to public funding, the way they navigate the art world is very different in comparison to Europe. No time and space to get into the context and to understand why we are in this context. (...) How are the outcomes relevant for this part of the world (MENA). Workshops happened in Hammama or Tangiers. And I appreciate this part of the project. But the core of discussions and the project don’t come from here (this context). (In this Geography) we are talking about dictatorship and military rules, zero funding, no registration, and no mobility. The discussions would be completely different. There is a space for discussion, but it didn’t seem relevant to the project itself. (...) Even in terms of ratio, if we have 40 Reshapers and only 3 from the MENA region, who are already « European style participants ». What is the relevance ?” (reshaper)

“I can say that considering all these topics, and having people from different parts of Europe and MENA, this was really enriching in terms of knowledge to understand

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

5/ Sustainability

To influence public policies and integrate future policy instruments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESHAPE EVALUATION FOCUS GROUP REPORT

.....

RESHAPE EVALUATION FOCUS GROUP REPORT

Description of Methodology

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

Focus group was chosen as a complementary format to the interviews and the questionnaire as its main strengths allow for high levels of interaction between the participants, as well as giving them the opportunity to articulate their feelings and attitudes through their own words, thus assigning new meanings and revealing new layers of depth around questions tackled during the evaluation. A total of eight people participated in the focus groups, 4 participants and 4 researchers. Of the 4 researchers, 2 were acting as the focus group moderator / co-moderator, one was taking notes and one was observing the process. Structure of participants shall be described in the following of the report.

Prior to the event, guidelines with questions organised in thematic focuses were prepared and reviewed by the team of researchers (see Ad. 1.). Questions were formed in an open structure with aims to reflect the experiences gathered through RESHAPE as a process. Principles of Fluxonomy were used as a convergent methodology that guided the evaluation process as a whole and preparation of the questionnaire in part. Questions were organised in 4 thematic focuses, tackling: Conceptual level, Organisational level / the Process, Governance of RESHAPE as a Project and Project Outputs. Added to these 4 themes were two separate sets of intro and outro questions, posed at the beginning and at the end of the discussion. Focus group took 90 minutes in total. Audio recording of the discussion was made

with all the participants giving their consent for recording and the recorded material to be used solely for the purpose of the analysis.

At the end of the discussion, a detailed transcript was prepared and anonymised to a measure, in order to omit the personal details of the participants (See Ad. 2.). Transcribed material was detailly examined and analyzed, thus resulting in this report. The method for analysis was a mix of simplified coding used in qualitative analysis in general and careful discourse analysis that pays mind to nuances of the spoken words, self-positioning of the participants within the process, interaction between the participants and their eagerness to address and interpret certain questions that have been posed by the researchers.

Participants that took part in the discussions joined without any additional incentives and formed a type of spontaneous aggregate within the larger group of conference guests involved in RESHAPE as a process. Hence, no measures providing equal participation by trajectory or by socio-cultural characteristics of participants were taken beforehand. Of these four participants, two have self-identified as partners within the process, one as a reshaper and one as a facilitator. In addition to that, one of the participants emphasized on their multiple different roles, as they participated as an employee of the partner organisation within the existing project logic but also closely followed development of a single project Trajectory within RESHAPE and helped to prepare final publication within the project. By socio-cultural characteristics, 3 middle-aged men and 1 young woman participated in the focus group as participants, two of participants coming from Western Europe, one from South-West of Europe and one from South-East of Europe.

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

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

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

SET OF QUESTIONS TACKLING THE CONCEPTUAL LEVEL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

P1: *"...we are completely infiltrated by the capitalist system. We pretend that it's good but it's totally not. What can people do? What people can learn from each other but also on another level by giving time. Most of the time, the thinking is done in very precarious situations. Sometimes it comes from bigger institutions but they*

learn from the smaller initiatives. The good thing with Reshape is that the initiative is taken by these intermediary organisations, and not trying to control everything but give freedom to those who think already. This was the goal also, to not try in a hidden way to repeat or install expectations."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

P4: *"The organisational structure of the project was also very hierarchical in a way, with the partners, facilitators and reshapers. It was formed in that hierarchy. If we were doing a theater piece, this could happen, because other people would do the production for example. But in this project, the structure is very embedded in the*

question itself. So there was distrust from the beginning. How this could have been structured in a different way, I don't know."

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

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

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

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

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

this would be decided by the group, but to facilitate the interaction among the group, to make the group function, and among the partners."

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

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

On the other hand, it was a good experience to leave some people in a room and see what they can do. They can do something. And I learnt a lot from it. This is the other side of it."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In this cluster of questions participants discussed potential of the prototypes for transforming culture and arts in Europe and MENA as well as other types of desirable futures in terms of collaborations and prospective connections between the actors

(equally the ones that have taken part in the project but also wider communities that are relevant for RESHAPE)

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

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

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

P3: "... when we started there was really this idea of opening up, and how we bring in these prototypes to other partners, to other people, and really open up again as the Reshape community. I also think that somewhere along the line we missed the chance to make partners ambassadors for these prototypes. The partners who will now be ambassadors for these prototypes, are also partners who were really engaged in these topics. I think it was a naïve idea, at the beginning of the project, this idea to have a common goal as Reshapers, partners and coordinators of the

project, and there would grow the alliance of, this is where we want to work together. But because of this friction, between the different roles and the hierarchies, it was not easy to be involved content-wise as a partner.”

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

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

P2: “ Prototypes are very different in terms of the objectives they have. And I also agree that we don’t have to produce something that is immediately useful. Even if the things are changing the mindset. (...)

And I think it does need more work, in terms of communication. A set of things that I’m afraid will ever be done as a group, because some individuals were part of the prototype. But also, we assumed, in this trajectory, that the importance was the process. The way that it could be relevant for each person involved, to at least change the world in the everyday practice of people involved. In that sense it is useful also for the persons in the group, and for the persons in contact with the group.”

CLOSING REMARKS

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

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

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

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

P4: *"We started as a group on Solidarity. It's about many things, also to work together etc. And finally, what we had are 2 or 3 individual prototypes. What I understood is that all these big ideas like Solidarity, are hard to reach. We discussed it all together, and after 2 years of discussions, we got the prototypes of individuals.*

There is something that has not changed here. I am witnessing this again. And this is learning but learning in a negative way."

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

P2: "But on the other hand, the acknowledgement, the big thing that I take from the process, is in terms of my personal evolution, the knowledge of diversities, the diversity of perspectives, and the diversity of processes and methodologies. I think it was enriching, and the process was enriching for each person involved in the discussions. For instance, in the trajectory, all the contingencies of the coronavirus crisis and the pandemic, it was not seen as a contingency to the project and to the process of reflection, but as signs of what were the discussions. And this enlightened the roles and the process, to be more results oriented, that could bring. It is also very interesting."

Ad. 1. Guidelines for conducting the focus group

Ad. 2. Detailed anonymised transcript of the focus group