

Global Cultural Leadership Programme

Second Edition – Athens, June 18-23, 2017

Evaluation Questionnaire

Preliminary remarks

- We received **32 responses to the evaluation survey online**, out of 40 participants (80% response rate).
- **Overall, the evaluations are very positive.** For instance, the average note to the question “To what extent do you feel you have learned from the Global Cultural Leadership Programme?” is **3,94/5**, which is a good indicator that the GCLP was rich in content, and a great learning opportunity for the participants.
- **Participants were generally very interested and curious to learn more** about the new framework created by the Joint Communication “Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations”, as well as about the Cultural Diplomacy Platform, its objectives, its structure and its functioning.
- **As in 2016, very few of the participants have already been in contact with the EU Delegations** in their country. Out of the 23 evaluations received from third countries, only 4 have been in contact with the EU Delegation in their country. However, all respondents expressed a strong interest in being introduced and connected to the EU Delegations and more generally with representatives of organisations from EU Member States in their home country.

Main figures

Questions	Average note
all the following questions were asking respondents to rate their experience from 0/not at all to 5/a lot	
To what extent do you feel you have learned from the Global Cultural Leadership Programme?	3,94
To what extent has your understanding of cultural leadership improved or increased as a result of the programme?	3,58
To what extent has your understanding of skills that are required in the field of intercultural communication and collaboration improved or increased as a result of the programme?	3,29
To what extent has the programme provided you with insights to new international collaboration practices?	3,81
To what extent has the programme helped to enhance your appreciation of challenges and development perspectives of your job as a cultural manager working in a global context?	4,03
To what extent has the programme helped to enhance your (your organisation's) network?	4,2

Given the feedback received after the 2016 edition, it had been decided to extend the programme to five days (instead of four). This proved a good decision as this year **72% of the respondents found the length of the programme “just right”**.

Also following the suggestions collected through the evaluation questionnaire after the 2016 edition, three guest speakers have been invited to address the participants, for two sessions on “Geopolitics & cultural collaboration” and “Discussion on leadership 'burning issues'”. **These sessions were among the best rated, respectively 4,18/5 and 4,55/5.**

The **sessions connected to the local context of Athens were also highly appreciated** – 4,52/5 for the “My Athens, visits to key players of local cultural life in Athens” and 4,71/5 for the “Group excursion to the Acropolis” – with the notable exception, however, of the “Group excursion to document14” (2,93/5). Many of the participants called for even more connection to the local/neighbourhood/community/grassroots level of the hosting city.

Feedback from the participants

What have participants learned?

- As in 2016, participants highlighted how the GCLP allowed them to meet and connect with a **global community of like-minded people working in the field of arts and culture**. This, they emphasised, is of great value to their everyday work. They greatly appreciated the opportunity to discuss similarities in the challenges they face, the ideas, project and questions they explore and the opportunities they have for collaboration.
- Participants also emphasised that the GCLP gave them a **greater understanding of cultural diplomacy and its complexities, including in terms of ethical challenges**. Learning about issues and power dynamics to be aware of while engaging in international cultural collaboration is

mentioned as a major highlight of the programme by most participants. They valued immensely the opportunities to consider the challenges of intercultural collaboration, which will inform how they go about building international partnerships in the future. Ethical dilemmas were felt as an issue and a priority for all participants, and they warmly welcomed the reflection around it.

- Participants underlined how **learning and reflecting about the variety of leadership models/strategies** (e.g. the specificities of leadership in the cultural sector, if any; how the concept of leadership is perceived in other cultures and countries; how leadership strengths/weaknesses can both work together or clash during the life cycle of a project/organisation, etc.) helps them understand their own practices. They also welcomed the tools that have been presented during the programme, and hope to apply those with their teams.
- Participants also stressed that they **learnt about the cultural policies and the working environment of the cultural sector in other countries**, something they believe will be very useful in their future collaboration projects with those countries. In general, exchanging with colleagues from all over the globe gave the participants a better understanding of the international context and the place of their own projects and programmes in it.

Are there future collaboration projects, which emerged from the GCLP?

Participants explored and shared many ideas, which now need to be followed up on. Potential collaboration projects include, among others:

- Creating a (digital) platform to exchange good (and unsuccessful) practices,
- Mapping funding opportunities in/for the BRICS countries, and creating a network of participants from the BRICS,
- Residencies and festivals exchanges.

Overall, participants truly wish to continue engaging with one another and maintaining this new network alive, be it through visits, inviting each other and taking part in each others' events. Some visits are already planned and concrete proposals, such as connecting archival material internationally or organising group tours of students or art experts, are already being discussed.

Contacts with EU Delegations

Only 30% of the respondents have already been in contact with the EU Delegations in their country. Many participants would be interested to engage with the EU Delegation and local offices of EU cultural organisations (such as cultural institutes or foundations) and collaborate in promoting intercultural dialogues and relations on the ground.

They underline, however, that if the EU Delegations are to engage in the field of culture, they should do so by **running projects together with local partners** from different fields of arts/ culture, in order to better respond to the needs and expectations of the local audiences.

Some respondents called the EU Delegations to organise **training programmes similar to the GCLP** (e.g. coaching for cultural activities development, annual meetings with civic cultural actors, etc.) but **at**

local/country level. These could be prepared in cooperation with the European cultural institutes in each country and/or the EUNIC cluster(s).

Overall, they call for support for (ethical) international cultural collaborative projects/partnerships, such as residencies, exhibitions, staff exchange programmes, *etc.*

Did participants suggest follow-up activities or concrete ideas for global initiatives to be implemented by the Cultural Diplomacy Platform?

Many of the follow-up activities called for by the participants from GCLP 2017 are similar to those made by the participants of GCLP 2016:

- **A structured alumni network**, something participants from the 2016 edition also called for:
 - Organising the 4th edition of the GCLP as a reunion of (interested) participants of the three other editions, to evaluate progress and enhance further development and cooperation;
 - Arranging annual meetings of participants.
- **Support for some selected collaboration projects and partnerships** born from the GCLP, including through coaching, skills, advice, publicity, connections, *etc.*
- **Further (online) resources:**
 - MOOC(s) on cultural diplomacy,
 - Research in what sort of inter-cultural partnerships are happening, what the challenges are, what the successful models are, *etc.*
- **Support for advocacy work towards national governments**, in order to push for more international collaborations and funding.

Feedback from the experts

The experts group felt satisfied with the high ratings participants have given to the second GCLP, despite the fact that most of the evaluation scores are slightly lower than the feedback received from the 2016 edition. The experts observed a number of reasons for these good, yet slightly lower ratings:

- The low ranking of the study visit of *documenta14*, is an expression of the participants' dissatisfaction (shared by the experts) with the non-persuasive and non-inspirational experience of *documenta's* educational department and format. Nevertheless, this could serve participants as an interesting learning experience on how *not* to carry out an international flagship project in contemporary arts.
- The 'magic' of Malta (including aspects of the 2016 location and venue overlooking the sea), the excitement of being part of a pilot edition of a brand-new programme, as well as the opportunity of taking part in something much bigger such as the IFACCA Summit (despite the criticism of the GCLP 2016 for this global event) was hard to replicate after the widespread attention and good reputation the GCLP has quickly gained for its target group.

- This widespread attention and good reputation the GCLP gained after its first edition resulted in a second group of participants who had an understanding of actually already operating as ‘true leaders’. **They therefore favoured discussing issues of international cultural collaboration and its practices over unpacking different notions of leadership.**

⇒ In this context, all experts agree that there is a distinction to be made between a development programme *for* those who self-define as 'cultural leaders' (a notion that encouraged participants to apply), and a programme which is *about* 'cultural leadership' and all that it entails. Most participants seemed to expect the first rather than the second.

- Based on recent training experiences in other contexts, the experts group observes that a new generation of learners seems to feel comfortable again with more classic (frontal) teaching styles, while also being more demanding when it comes to be served with tangible knowledge take-aways (and less with self-learned insights). Nevertheless, participants have shown a high level of satisfaction with their self-organised and practical group learning sessions (e.g. Open Space).

All experts felt that although ‘cultural leadership’ as a core concept of the programme worked, but was less thought-provoking for participants than during the first edition. **The GCLP 2017 group found questions of cultural diplomacy and critiquing its concepts much more interesting.** This explains the high scores for the sessions with external speakers who provided input and reflections from local to global cultural-political issues that were discussed in groups afterwards. Experts felt that **discussing political and ethical questions of culture, geopolitics and international collaboration** was already highly in demand with the 2016 participants (to some extent at odds with the initial leadership focus of the programme), and even substantially higher appreciated by the 2017 group. Future editions should seriously recognise this shift in expectations.

Understanding different cultural policy and working contexts for cultural operators around the world seems to be among the most important learning results for participants. This exchange on different working realities and their opportunities and challenges predominately took place in the framework of unstructured working time and direct interaction among participants. Considering it is fully in line with the overall objective of the Platform, future GCLP editions should further support this need in a more structured way (e.g. by providing cultural policy info resources in advance, in handouts, etc.).

Interestingly, a significant number of participants placed value on the sessions focusing on personal and professional development. According to the experts, this demand stems from the isolating nature of cultural management, the more responsibility one assumes or acquires and the greater the risks one takes. The interconnection between the geopolitical, sectoral, organisational and personal/professional sides of any cultural management activity is clearly important: it is also a point at which it would make sense to consider constructions and practices of (cultural) leadership again, but from a different perspective.

Possible adaptations for the 3rd edition

- Revisit the balance between learning input and experiences on cultural leadership on one hand, and (geo)political cultural questions of international collaboration on the other. The GCLP and the experts should clearly acknowledge future participants' needs (as well as the Platform's focus) for knowledge development in the second field (e.g. by means of analysing real cases/dilemmas participants can then translate in hands-on practical skills);
- Define, formulate and share more explicitly the learning goals of each session with the participants (and accompany each session with more tailor-made handouts);
- Consider how to challenge and push participants more – e.g. by inviting them to contribute to the programme design in advance;
- Improve the experts' mentoring framework for participants' follow-up project ideas or practical dilemmas (e.g. by counselling/co-counselling formats such as case clinics, etc.);
- Build on positive experiences such as the introduction of the CD Platform's objectives via practical group discussions, while simplifying some of the key messaging such as for instance the complex structure of the Platform and its implementing consortium.

