Executive Summary

* 1. Introduction
		1. Background to <Project Name>

<Project Name> was <description of project>

The vision for the project was <insert vision>

<Project Name> was <production/coproduction/programme/venue>. Its concept development and narrative were the responsibility of <#> strong Core Project Team (CPT) of specialist creative professionals, recruited by Hull 2017. <adapt> The CPT commissioned selected artists to respond to individual creative briefs. They also developed partnerships with <insert>. These partners <roles>.

* + 1. Aims, Objectives and Purpose

The <Project Name> Evaluation Report provides objective analysis and evaluation of how the project delivered against its own vision, aims and objectives (see Figure 1); and the extent to which <Project Name> contributed to Hull 2017’s overarching strategic aims and objectives (see Figure 2)[[1]](#footnote-1).

The insights from this report will be used to improve and enhance future project planning and delivery for the company which will continue from Hull 2017, as well as future UK City of Culture title holders.

In addition, there are plans to share key findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations with other cultural organisations (both locally and nationally), so they can benefit from knowledge transfer.

Figure 1: Project-specific Aims and Objectives

<insert project specific Aims and Objectives>

Figure 2: Hull 2017 Overarching Aims and Objectives

* + 1. Methodology

The evaluation included a small amount of desk research, supplemented by primary data collection with a range of project stakeholders at different points within the project lifecycle. This enabled expectations and intentions for <Project Name> to be measured, as well as the outputs and outcomes of the project. Mixed methods were used, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Methods used to evaluate the <Project Name> project

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholders consulted  | Research methodology applied | Sample size |
| Creative Core Team (CCT) | Pre-event online surveyPost-event online surveyPost-event depth interviews |  |
| Artists | Pre-event online surveyPost-event online surveyPost-event depth interviews |  |
| Peer Assessors | Pre-event online surveyPost-event online survey |  |
| Audiences | Post-event CATI[[2]](#footnote-2) surveyWalk and talk groups (at event)Focus groups |  |
| Delivery Partners | Post-event online survey |  |
| Local Businesses | Post-event online survey |  |
| Media  | Media Coverage Analysis | N/A |

The evaluation focuses on both process and outcomes, measuring impact, capturing learning, and building understanding of what worked well and where improvements can be made.

* 1. Key Findings

Sections 1.2.1. to 1.2.x. highlight key findings from the <Project Name> Evaluation Report. At the end of each section the Project Aims and Objectives (Figure 1) and Hull 2017 Aims and Objectives (Figure 2), to which these findings contribute are highlighted.

* + 1. Contribution to the Overall Hull 2017 Programme
* X days of activity
* X commissions.

***Hull 2017 Aim X, Objective X***

* + 1. Audiences
* A total audience of XXXXX came to <Project Name>, with XXXXX believed to be unique audience members.
	+ XXXXX unique audience members were Hull residents, XX% of the city’s total population.
	+ XXXXX unique audience members came from the neighbouring East Riding of Yorkshire, XX% of the local authority’s total population.
* X% of <Project Name> audiences had not attended or participated in arts, culture and heritage in the previous 12 months, suggesting audiences have been newly or re-engaged by these events.
* Compared to baseline figures captured at Place des Anges in 2016, <Project Name> diversified audience profile, with increases in:
	+ <insert increases>
* There were high levels of audience satisfaction, with XX% very likely to recommend the event to others.

***Project Aim X
Hull 2017 Aim X***

* + 1. Participants
* XXXXX participants took part in <Project Name>.
	+ XXXXX participants were Hull residents.
	+ XXXXX participants came from the neighbouring East Riding of Yorkshire.
* X% of <Project Name> participants had not attended or participated in arts, culture and heritage in the previous 12 months.

***Project Aim X
Hull 2017 Aim X***

* + 1. Creative, Cultural and Community Professionals
* <Project Name> engaged a broad range of creative, cultural and community professionals from across the UK, including:
	+ X Core Project Team members, each a specialist in their own field
	+ X Artists/Artistic Companies - X commissioned directly by CPT
	+ X partners (individuals and organisations), including<insert examples>.
* A key motivation for individuals and organisations to take part in <Project Name> was <insert>. Other significant motivations included <insert>.
* <insert> were all professional benefits experienced by most CPT members and Artists because of working in <Project Name>:
	+ <insert examples>

***Project Aim X***

***Hull 2017 Aim X***

* + 1. The City as a Stage

<insert details>

***Project Aim X
Hull 2017 Aim X***

* + 1. The City’s Past Interpreted in New Ways <if applicable>

<insert details>

***Project Aim X
Hull 2017 Aim 1***

* + 1. People Have Learnt About Hull’s Past <if applicable>

In giving a score out of 10 for how much they had learnt about history and heritage as a result of working on, or attending the event:

* CPT members averaged more than X out of 10
* Artists averaged more than X out of 10
* Peer Assessors averaged more than X out of 10
* Audiences averaged more than X out of 10.

*‘<Quotation>.’* (<role>)

***Project Aim X
Hull 2017 Aim 1***

* + 1. Quality and the Creative Case for Diversity
* <insert comments on diversity>
* <Project Name> was of <low/Mid/high quality>, with most Quality Metrics[[3]](#footnote-3) scored at a minimum of X out of 10, and a most frequent score of X out of 10 across the CPT, Peer Assessors and audiences.

Peer assessors felt the strongest quality metric was <insert> and the weakest quality metric was <insert and rationale>.

***Hull 2017 Aim 1***

* + 1. Generation of National Media Interest

<Project Name> achieved total media coverage volume of XXXX across print, online and broadcast. This represented a total readership of XX million and Advertising Value Equivalent (AVE) of £XX billion. Coverage included:

* <examples>

The value of such media coverage was reflected in the findings that XX% of audiences became aware of the event via TV; XX% by printed media; and XX% by radio.

***Project Aim X
Hull 2017 Aim 2
Hull 2017 Aim 4***

* + 1. Improving Perceptions of Hull

By the end of the <Project Name> project, X CPT members and X artists responding to the survey said that they would speak more positively about the city. Where positive changes occurred this was primarily because:

* + <reasons>
* XX% of audiences agreed the event showed them there was more to Hull than they expected.
* <examples from qual and quant data>

***Hull 2017 Aim 2
Hull 2017 Aim 4***

* + 1. Economic Impact
* XX% of people coming into city centre on the day they attended <Project Name> cited the event as their main reason visiting
* XX% of audience members were first time visitor to Hull.
* Visitor satisfaction <insert findings>
* Compared with the baseline figures collected at Place des Anges there was an increase in the average:
	+ <examples>
* Total spend was <insert>.
* As an initial estimate, the audience of XXXXXX people and XXXXXX individuals had an estimated total spend of nearly £XX. Considering substitution (spend that would have occurred on activities instead of attending ‘<Project Name>’), the results show additional spend (additionality) of just over £XX for the week-long event.

***Hull 2017 Aim 4
Hull 2017 Aim 5
Hull 2017 Aim 9***

* + 1. Bringing People Together
* XX% of audiences agreed <Project Name> gave everyone the chance to share and celebrate together.
* XX% of audiences agreed <Project Name> had placed the community at the centre.
* XX% of audiences agreed <Project Name> had made them feel more connected to the stories and people of Hull.
* XX% of audiences agreed <Project Name> had given them the opportunity to interact with people who they wouldn’t have normally interacted with.
* XX% of audiences agreed <Project Name> had made them think positively about people from other generations.
* XX% of audiences stated they had talked to people from other generations about the stories presented.

***Hull 2017 Aim 7***

* + 1. Emotional Response <if applicable>

<Project Name> was most commonly described as a highly emotive experience, with the most commonly cited emotions felt by audiences being:

1. <examples>

***Hull 2017 Aim 4
Hull 2017 Aim 7***

* 1. Key Learnings
		1. <insert learning 1>

<insert description of learning>

*‘Quotation.’* (Role)

* + 1. <insert learning 2>

<insert description of learning>

*‘Quotation.’* (Role)

* + 1. <insert learning 3>

<insert description of learning>

*‘Quotation.’* (Role)

* + 1. <insert learning 4>

<insert description of learning>

*‘Quotation.’* (Role)

* + 1. <insert learning 5>

<insert description of learning>

*‘Quotation.’* (Role)

* 1. Conclusions

Overall, <Project Name> achieved XXX of the project aims and objectives; and made a significant contribution towards the broader aims and objectives of Hull 2017. This is down to the combined efforts of all the individual involved in developing and delivering the project, working collaboratively, and being open to change; as well as audiences unrivalled enthusiasm for supporting the year. <Adapt>

* 1. Recommendations

The experience of <Project Name> highlights several recommendations linked to the delivery of future UK City of Culture and largescale outdoor arts events, whether in Hull or elsewhere.

* + 1. Project Conception <if applicable>
* <details>
	+ 1. Audience Development and Engagement <if applicable>
* <details>
	+ 1. Accessibility <if applicable>
* <details>
	+ 1. Marketing & Communications <if applicable>
* <details>
	+ 1. Project Management <if applicable>
* <details>
	+ 1. City Partnerships <if applicable>
* <details>
	+ 1. Other Recommendation 1 <if applicable>
* <details>
1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Computer Aided Telephone Interview [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Quality Metrics are a set of statements, developed by arts and cultural organisations that aim to help understanding about what people value about the work. There are nine metrics tested by the project delivery team, peer assessors and public - Concept: it was an interesting idea; Presentation: it was well produced and presented; Distinctiveness: it was different from things I’ve experienced before; Challenge: it was thought-provoking; Captivation: it was absorbing and held my attention; Enthusiasm: I would come to something like this again; Local impact: it is important that it's happening here; Relevance: it has something to say about the world in which we live; Rigour: it was well thought through and put together. A further three are just asked of the project delivery team and peer assessors - Originality: it was ground-breaking; Risk: the artists/curators really challenged themselves; Excellence: it is one of the best examples of its type that I have seen. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)