

Culture³ Handouts

People | Prosperity | Planet

Measuring and managing the impact of cultural projects or services on People, Prosperity & Planet

These handouts are part of a free resource co-created by [MB Associates](#) and arts organisations in Kent: [Folkestone Fringe](#), [Future Foundry](#), [Ideas Test](#), [Moving Memory](#), and [Living Words](#), in partnership with Kent County Council.

We would really appreciate it if you could credit us if you share these.

Download the overview and ask for the full pack or further support at <http://culturecubed.org/>

Or contact info@MBAssociates.org



1

Scoping & planning

- 1 Story of Change
- 2 Scope
- 3 Review methods

2

Evaluation framework

- 4 Key questions
- 5 Framework
- 6 New methods

6

Managing change

- 17 Action
- 18 Improvement

3

Gathering evidence

- 7 Holistic approaches
- 8 Menu of methods
- 9 Tool Rules

5

Communicating learning

- 14 Validation
- 15 Recommendations
- 16 Reporting

4

Analysing evidence

- 10 Record-keeping
- 11 Analysis
- 12 Adjustments
- 13 Valuation

Culture³ For a toe in the water to test a more impact focused approach ...

People | Prosperity | Planet

Scoping & planning	Evaluation Framework	Gathering Evidence	Analysing Evidence	Communicating Learning	Managing Change
<p>1. Story of Change - Decide what <i>difference</i> you want to make with your service and to whom.</p> <p>2. Scope – Decide who your evaluation is for and what will convince them.</p> <p>3. Review methods – Re-read previous evaluations.</p>	<p>4. Key questions – Decide two or three questions that describe what you want to find out.</p> <p>5. Framework – Cross check your Story of Change against your evidence plans.</p> <p>6. New methods – Check your evidence will answer your key questions.</p>	<p>7. Tool rules – Try to collect ‘baseline’ information and avoid leading questions.</p> <p>8. Holistic approaches – Embed evidence collection in delivery where possible.</p> <p>9. Menu of methods – Use methods for open questions (narrative) and closed questions (numbers).</p>	<p>10. Record-keeping – Keep data in one place and follow GDPR principles.</p> <p>11. Analysis – Combine some numbers with some narrative for a more complete story.</p> <p>12. Adjustments – Ask people ‘what would have happened anyway?’</p> <p>13. Valuation – Consult to prioritise outcomes and consider what else could have been funded.</p>	<p>14. Validation – Check your draft with the people to whom it matters.</p> <p>15. Recommendations – Conclude with a recommendation for what happens next time.</p> <p>16. Reporting – Share a summary with the people identified in your scope.</p>	<p>17. Action – Use your normal planning processes to schedule action on recommendations.</p> <p>18. Improvement – Think about heads, hearts and minds when planning action on recommendations.</p>

Culture³ Story of Change

People | Prosperity | Planet

How?	What?	Who?	Why?

Culture³ Scope

People | Prosperity | Planet

	Motivating and empowering	Learning and improving	Advocacy or accountability
Who and what is it for?			
So what should it be like?			

Culture³ Review resources

People | Prosperity | Planet

	Would this be Convincing?	Would it be On message?	Is it Realistic?	Is it (good) Enough?
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				

Culture³ Evaluation Framework

People | Prosperity | Planet

	How?	What?	Who?	Why?
Story of Change:				
Research questions:				
Survey questions:				
Indicators:				
Methods				

Culture³ Evidence action plan

People | Prosperity | Planet

Method	What's it for?	When collected?	Who is responsible?

Culture³ Tool Rule checklist

People | Prosperity | Planet

	Robust set up
	Are the techniques robust and creative enough? Which may require compromise.
	Can we collect a baseline before we start? Asking afterwards can bias answers as people mis-remember or are keen to please.
	Have we combined approaches for narratives and numbers? (Qualitative and Quantitative)
	Will we have both subjective and objective information?
	Have we got anonymous information, and group information? Which will give different results in terms of honesty and discussion/depth.
	Have we at least one method for all the important elements so we can double check findings?
	Are sample or group sizes big enough?
	Are we going to compare groups before and after or compare an individual before and after?
	Are we considering how we scale answers? Scales that can go down as well as up, and thinking about an odd scale which allows a middle ground, or an even scale which forces the issue.
	Have we made it clear how to answer? Eg which score is high.
	Are we asking open and/or closed or defined questions?
	Have we thought about how to keep confidential data?
	Have we considered the ease of data input, and ease of use, so we don't fall at the first hurdle?

	Robust collection
	Have we considered a trade-off between embedding evidence collection in delivery and making it more explicitly independent? Either to be interactive and appealing, or more arms length.
	Will people be fully informed about the study? Especially vulnerable people, including the purpose and their rights.
	Will people give their consent to take part?
	Are we sure we are not asking leading questions? Like, do you feel more happy?
	Are we sure we don't conflate issues? Like, has your happiness changed because you've been involved?
	Have we considered the order of questions? As the first discussion is likely to influence the next?
	Are people genuinely able to remain anonymous?
	Are the people gathering information independent so respondents can be honest?
	If we are using samples, are they properly random, or if not are we transparent about our selection?

Transformational cycle

