**LARKIN: NEEY PROJECT DEBRIEF TEMPLATE**

Use this form to capture what went well, what could have gone better and what is useful for other teams to know for future projects. Not all areas will be relevant, so leave blank where appropriate.

**Complete it as soon as you can**, as we all forget quickly when we move on to the next project. Make sure to get input from **everyone who was involved**. You can use it as a prompt sheet in a project team debrief or circulate it by email, but ensure there is eventually only **one form** that captures everything.

Fill in as much detail as possible, even if something has already been resolved or didn’t cause major problems this time. **If in doubt, write it down.**

**Highlight anything that you think would be useful for future projects.**

|  | **What went well?***Why, and can we apply this elsewhere?* | **What could have gone better?***How can we improve this? What could we do differently? What assumptions did we make that were wrong? What areas need more support?* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ARTISTIC PROGRAMME** |  |  |
| Artists & commissioning | The size of the partnership was right, not too big allowing it to be effective – PLS, UoH and H2017.Conversations started early but research and fundraising delayed things until additional producing capacity was brought in.Appointment of curator enacted thingsSecuring UoH £50k and securing H2017 £50k from programming budget made it happen.Significant research into designers led to the appointment of an excellent and affordable designer in Oldham.Exhibition did achieve raising awareness of the existence of the archive being a public resource. BBC documentary resulting from existence of exhibition assisted raising this awareness.PLS profile was raised but not necessarily impacted on membership of the organisation.The assets the exhibition produced will aid archive and PLS promote their offer in future, better.PLS objective was to raise awareness of Larkin in the city and the exhibition achieved that. Social media increased on their patforms too,Appetite amongst volunteers to learn more about larkin was impressive for PLS. They particularly enjoyed and over 100 attended p pullens induction lecture on larkin.Archives hope to build on volunteer interest next year in archive programme around Larkin.An unexpected benefit to PLS was the gathering together of all the unarchived artefacts. Everything is in one place now.Laura was excellent. Library staff were excellent.Media response was excellent.Security of artefacts and library was a concern but ended up being managed well. Nothing was damaged or lost.Great step towards centenary of larkin 2022.Music over the exhibition really changed the dynamic of exhibition experience, allowing people to talk, be discursive.Letters to Philip as a new archive. | Decisions were made by curator and partners were more removed from partners.Partners wanted more involvement in the process of production and deeper creative involvement. Would have preferred being more involved in the creative decision-making and contributing.Time to have a broader recruitment of a curator.Anna’s time and distance from Hull impacted on communication. Lack of experience in Uni for managing new commissioned work in their gallery – not identifying services costs in planning and charging after the fact.Archive hoped to produce a guide to the archive but workload prevented it.Comms planning between partners was a bit slapdash. Unplanned and not following H2017 plan.The associated programme was not as expansive as hoped. Uni’s Larkin Reflections misled about its ambition.University marketing didn’t brand campus early enough or for long enough.The learning and engagement offer was reduced because of timing of exhibition in summer but also H2017 learning programme not being able to introduce a larkin programme in schools due to larkin not being on curriculum anymore. It could have happened as a unique offer to teachers if planned over a year in advance possibly.No bookMore coherent comms or marketing planning across partnership. |
| Programme & scheduling |  |  |
| AV content |  |  |
| Learning & Participation |  |  |
| **PROJECT MANAGEMENT** |  |  |
| Contracts & legal |  |  |
| Procurement |  |  |
| Risk management |  |  |
| Timeline |  |  |
| Event Safety Management, RAMS, ESAG etc |  |  |
| **AUDIENCES** |  |  |
| Facts & figures |  |  |
| Marketing |  |  |
| PR |  |  |
| Digital |  |  |
| Ticketing (inc on-site box office) |  |  |
| Audience information (inc programmes) |  |  |
| Participant briefings |  |  |
| Travel & accommodation |  |  |
| Artist liaison |  |  |
| Resident engagement |  |  |
| Business engagement |  |  |
| Community engagement |  |  |
| Partner liaison & recognition |  |  |
| **EVENTS & VENUES** |  |  |
| Venues & sites |  |  |
| Licensing (inc music) |  |  |
| Event dressing, wayfinding & interpretation |  |  |
| Accreditation |  |  |
| Guest list management |  |  |
| Catering |  |  |
| Access |  |  |
| Technical presentation |  |  |
| Production/event management |  |  |
| VIP & stakeholder receptions |  |  |
| **RESOURCES** |  |  |
| Project team & Hull 2017 staff |  |  |
| Contractors & suppliers | Archive and PLS didn’t have resources to produce an exhibition so H2017 production lead helped realise the project with expertise. |  |
| Volunteering |  |  |
| Artist Liaison |  |  |
| Photography & filming/ archive |  |  |
| Budget |  |  |
| Finance ops |  |  |
| **REPORTING & POST-EVENT** |  |  |
| Monitoring & evaluation |  |  |
| Accidents/near misses |  |  |
| Safeguarding issues |  |  |
| Volunteer concerns |  |  |
| Show reports |  |  |
| Audience feedback |  |  |