**Managing Art Projects with Societal Impact – MAPSI**
**Project Number: 540176-LLP-1-2013-1-EE-ERASMUS-**
**EQR**

MAPSI QUALITY REPORT 2013-2016

**EVENTS:** 2 Conferences
**PILOTING:** Summer School, Internship, E-course
**DELIVERABLES:** Study Book, Guide Book
**PROCESS:** Project Performance and Value

March 2016

# Contents[1]

---

[1] This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## INTRODUCTION

The aim of the current report is to describe and analyse MAPSI project outcomes and events delivered and the internal process during the 3 years of project´s life cycle. There are three sub-chapters in the report: events, piloting, deliverables and internal process.

Estonian Business School was responsible for developing and implementing the quality report to assess the overall quality of the project, its processes and outcomes.

## 1. MAPSI EVENTS

## 1.1 MAPSI CONFERENCE in TALLINN (2015)

| TARGET GROUP | Academics, practitioners and students internationally |
|---|---|
| TIME | 6-7th July 2015 |
| RESPONDENTS | 90 participants representing 12 countries<br>21 respondents to participants questionnaires<br>General satisfaction rate – 90.5% |
| BEST PRACTICE | Selection of the keynotes and conference topic |
| LEARNING MOMENT | Creating the ground for establishment of new partnerships/networks for follow-up activities |
| FORM OF FEEDBACK | - anonymous feedback questionnaire for participants;<br>- opinion overview of the organizers´ gathered from a feedback meeting;<br>- anonymous questionnaire distributed among the personnel. |

### 1.1.1 Participants´ Feedback

There were 90 participants attending the conference „*Insights and Tools for Managing Arts Projects with Societal Impact*". Among the 21 participants answering the written questionnaire, there were 15 presenters and 6 participants. The questionnaire consisted of 16 questions – 11 of them were structured and 5 were open questions/comments. There were 9,5% answers about not agreeing or „not quite agreeing" with the neutral statements. No significant difference between the answers of presenters and the participants could be detected.

### 1.1.2 Practicalities Related to the Conference

Most of the respondents considered the *onsite organizing related to the conference* (coffee brakes, accommodation, local transportation) being excellent – 60% of the respondents agreed with that statement. Also the *"Local organizing related to the conference (registration, guidance)"* received high score – all respondents found it was more or less pleasant and professional.

95,2% of the respondents agreed that the preliminary information about the conference (requirements, due dates, travelling, accommodation) was adequate and sufficient. As a result

it can be concluded the preparations for the conference and the local organization went very well.

### 1.1.3 Conference Format

Evan thou 85,7% of the respondents found the duration of the conference appropriate; there were 20% of the presenters who could not quite agree with that. 72% of the open comments under current subchapter concerned the timing of the conference – mainly suggesting to have the program next time divided into 1,5-2 days. Some respondents expressed their displeasure that few parallel sessions were missed while the program consisted of very many interesting presentations. Few respondents found that the day felt interesting but a bit long.

The other 3 open comments concerned other components of the conference beside the presentations – the musical interventions and exhibition. One of the respondents wrote that he/she loved the musical interludes (as inevitable part of the conference program) and the mixture of workshops & lectures. 2 others were more critical – one of them found that the particular workshop that he/she attended was poor. In general the conference was perceived as professional and balanced between practice and theory.

### 1.1.4 Conference Content and Set-Up

*"Conference content and set up"* received the most positive feedback. As one of the most positive aspects the *conference theme* was seen – it was evaluated as compelling, interesting and relevant by the majority of the respondents (57,1% found it is true while 42,9% agreed it is mostly true). Also the conference *keynote presentations* were evaluated highly – all respondents found them to be more or less appropriate, convincing and proposing new ideas and further discussion on the topic. 95,2% of the respondents agreed with the fact that conference presentations, workshops and exhibition contributed to the overall understanding of managing arts projects with societal impact. 90,5% of the respondents agreed that the *conference materials* were more or less appropriate, professionally made and interesting while 2 of the respondents could not agree with that.

Based on the previous one could conclude the conference offered variety of perspectives and angles of arts projects with societal impact and this is why everybody attending could find something relevant the their topic/interests.

### 1.1.5 Follow-Up Activities

Follow-up activities were not as highly appreciated as the conference itself. Among this sub-section there could be found the highest disagreement score – 33,33% of respondents were not sure if the conference helped to establish new partnerships/networks for follow-up activities in the future. On the other hand 85,7% respondents agreed more or less that the conference stimulated the flow of new ideas and motivated to conduct further research on the topic.

### 1.1.6 Open Comments

Additionally to the official conference program, different study visits were offered to the participants already a day before the conference. It was possible to add the comments concerning the additional program under the sub-unit "Open comments".

As one of the open comments it was stated that after filling in the online registration form, no confirmation of the registration followed - the lesson has been noted and next time online form will be created. 2 comments concerned the timings of the study visits. Other open comments were mostly very positive and the respondents often used this section to express their gratitude to the organizers for great events. Especially the Seaplane Harbour received very positive feedback.

### 1.1.2 Organizers´ Feedback

The organizers gathered in September 2015 in Helsinki to discuss among the other issues, their opinions of the conference. All of the organizers present agreed the conference was a success – content wise, in terms of the participants' numbers and of the represented countries – 12 in total.  Since the meeting started with small presentation about the participants´ feedback many of the organizers´ comments addressed the participants´ feedback. What all the organizers agreed with was the fact the conference filled it´s goal. The whole team also seemed to be enjoyed both, the organizing and participating on the conference.

Even though many of the participants stated in their written feedback, the conference could have been longer, few of them had mentioned in private conversations that they were able to attend especially because it was a short conference.

Majority of the organizers were satisfied with the selection of the keynotes. Also the high quality of abstracts and presentations was mentioned. It is important to emphasize that the participants' numbers exceeded the plans by 3-4 times.

The organizers agreed that in technical level of the conference there were few shortcoming (especially answering automatically/personally to e-mails). This will be solved next time by automatic reply system. Therefore pre-registration to sessions will be organized next time – currently there were few workshops/sessions with less than 10 people participating. Another option would have been accepting fewer papers and/or arranging less parallel session. This on the other hand would have had impact on the academic quality of the conference.

It was discussed that perhaps there should be a symbolic fee for the participation in the future – paying for the event might engage the persons more and the drop-out number could be less. The potential symbolic participation fee could also be used to arrange the dinner and/or study visits and technical support.

Some of the team members expressed the opinion that it might be good idea to put more effort to connect academics with practitioners in more explicit way in the future. As final note it was discussed if there is any need to arrange one more conference on similar topic in the future and concluded it would be great idea in case there are some resources available for that purpose.

## 1.2 MAPSI CONFERENCE 2016

| TARGET GROUP | Practitioners, academics and students (mainly from Spain) |
|---|---|
| TIME | 14th January 2016 |
| RESPONDENTS | 50 participants<br>8 respondents to participants´ questionnaires<br>General satisfaction rate – 91.2% |

| BEST PRACTICE | Selection of the keynotes |
|---|---|
| LEARNING MOMENT | Create the ground to establish new partnerships and networks for follow-up activities in the future or to stimulate any flow of new ideas. |
| FORM OF FEEDBACK | participants´ feedback questionnaire |

## 1.2.1 Participants´ Feedback

The MAPSI conference „*Arts Projects as Drivers and Users of Innovation" for* experts and professionals was fully organized by the UPV/EHU. There were 35 registered participants and 16 MAPSI team members attending the conference. As the activity was streamed (http://ehutb.ehu.es/) virtual participation was possible (though, unfortunately, no chances to interact directly were provided, only on social networks by twitter).

The feedback questionnaire consisted of 15 questions – 11 of them were structured and 4 were open questions/comments. In general the feedback was very positive. There were just 7,8% of the total answers about not being able to say or „not quite agreeing" with the neutral statements. None of the respondents found any statement in the questionnaire not to be true.

## 1.2.2 Practicalities Related to the Conference

All respondents found all practicalities related to the conference more or less successful. *"Local organizing related to the conference was pleasant and professional"* received the highest score – 87,5 % of all respondents agreed with that statement. "*Preliminary information about the conference"* was not evaluated that positively – 62,5% of the respondents agreed it was mostly true. 2 respondents added additional comments to current sub-section – 1 saying that the conference was well done – *small but proper*! And other one reflecting on the very nice and warm atmosphere of the conference. As a result it can be concluded the preparations for the conference and the local organization were appreciated by the participants.

### 1.2.3 Conference Format

All respondents found the duration of the conference more or less appropriate – 50% agreeing fully and 50% mostly. Therefore it can be concluded the conference format was well chosen and corresponded to the needs of the participants.

### 1.2.4 Conference Content and Set-Up

The "Conference content and set up" subdivision of the questionnaire did not receive as positive feedback as the previous ones. As one of the negative aspects the *conference presentations* were seen – 50% found they were fully compelling, interesting and relevant, 37,5% found it mostly true while 12,5% could not quite agree with the statement. On the other hand the conference keynote presentation were evaluated highly – all respondents found it more or less appropriate. 75% of the respondents agreed that the conference materials were more or less appropriate, while 2 of the respondents could not say that. Based on the previous it is possible to conclude the conference fulfilled the expectations of the participants.

### 1.2.5 Follow-Up Activities

Follow-up activities were not as highly appreciated as the conference in general. Among this sub-section the highest disagreement score could be found – 25% of respondents were not sure if the conference helped to establish new partnerships/networks for follow-up activities in the future or to stimulate any flow of new ideas.

### 1.2.6 Feedback of MAPSI team

Members of the MAPSI team filled in the same questionnaire as the regular participants with one exception – in their questionnaire there was 1 additional question concerning the seminar in San Sebastian. The event was considered to be useful and it was said it provided new ideas. As highlights the Cultural Capital plans were mentioned. 1 respondent mentioned that the seminar could have provided more of the San Sebastian issues and more external knowledge.

## 2. MAPSI PILOTING

### 2.1 Helsinki summer school

| TARGET GROUP | Students of participating institutions |
|---|---|
| TIME | 25-30th August 2014 |
| RESPONDENTS | all team members, 12-13 participants<br>general satisfaction rate – 84.86% |
| BEST PRACTICE | very effective form of learning |
| LEARNING MOMENT | e-learning platform did not correspond fully to the needs of the students or teachers |
| FORM OF FEEDBACK | –    oral feedback session of the project team;<br>–    oral feedback session with students during the summer school;<br>–    on-line feedback survey by summer school participants. |

MAPSI summer school in Helsinki was the first major jointly arranged event during the life cycle of the project. The e-learning platform Edutizer was first time tested during the summer school by the teachers and students. In following first the opinions of organisers and then by participants are presented.

### 2.1.1 Organizers´ feedback

The organizers from all partner institutions analysed the event in a common feedback circle a month after the event had taken place. All of them were happy about the success of the summer school and expressed their willingness to continue with the same format. Organizers agreed that the summer school was a very effective form of learning and it covered and combined well cultural, business and art aspects. It was also decided that e-learning, internship and a study-book should form a complex set for the curricula, adding value to each other while not overlapping.

However, there were some lessons learnt. For instance, it would be wise to engage the students and create the groups earlier – this will be done in January 2017 when the next Winter school will take place. In that way the intensity and the workload of the summer school would be less stressful - the students tried to experience cultural- and studying-life at the same time and ended up exhausted. Even so, the learning process cannot be too easy and therefore a balance between the studies and the cultural program needs to be found.  It emerged in discussions that the cultural life could be an integral part of the study process.

Also, the cooperation among the staff was briefly discussed and it was found out that the improvisational way of working during the summer school worked out very well and created the atmosphere that the students and project team itself appreciated highly.

## 2.1.2 Participants´ feedback

### 2.1.2.1 Oral feedback circle

Participants agreed that most of the study visits were case-relevant and it was very important that the organizations were introduced by the right persons. As a general conclusion the students reflected that they know something about all concerned fields now and would like to know even more. A lot of people mentioned that the artists´ viewpoints are very important and therefore should be presented before (not only on the last day). As regards practicalities, participants generally agreed that being provided with articles to read was positive in itself, but admitted that they did not have enough time to read them because of group work and long days etc. When arranging the next similar event, both comments will be taken into account when planning the event.

The methodology of the summer school was generally considered great. It was also appreciated that groups were divided beforehand because it did not waste time and ensured a good mix of people. It was decided that there is a need to define to whom the learning materials are targeted and keep on moving to the direction that there would be exercises and materials for different levels of study – for BA, MA and PhD students different approach are needed. One of the solutions could be coming up with materials for different levels: basic information about the subject and more detailed materials that give something extra for advanced level. When e-course was developed, it was planned accordingly and received positive feedback from the students.

### 2.1.2.2 Written feedback

12-13 participants answered the on-line feedback questionnaires and the general satisfaction rate with the summer school was very high – 84.86%. The subtopic *"Local organizing"* received the most positive feedback – 96.15% of respondents found it pleasant and professional. The feedback towards the summer school *"theme"* was also very positive –

95.83% considered it to be compelling, interesting and relevant. Other topics that the participants evaluated very highly were the content (lectures, seminars, cases, etc), onsite organizing (food, accommodation, and local transportation), summer school events and the preliminary information about the event.

The most unsatisfactory issue related to the summer school concerned the e-learning platform – only 61.54% of the participants found the platform was clearly structured and the materials easily accessible. On the other hand 75% of the respondents found the e-learning platform aesthetically pleasing and user-friendly. Both comments were analysed profoundly and this was one of the reasons why the e-course was transferred to Moodle instead of the original location in Edutizer.

In addition to closed questions, students could express their opinions in open comments format. This form of feedback, too, provided highly positive assessments and showed support for the idea to continue with similar summer school format in the future. Students also came up with a number of ideas to improve things. The majority of the comments concerned the e-learning platform – some respondents only commented on or described the confusion they felt when using the system. Still majority of the criticism concerned the reading materials. Many of the students expressed their willingness to participate in the forthcoming MAPSI activities, for instance, in internships and e-learning modules. This gives the signals that the summer school raised the interest towards societal impact and therefore fulfilled its purpose.

## 2.2 Internship

The pedagogical approach adopted for the MAPSI internship pilot is based on Learning by Developing Model developed and widely used by Laurea University of Applied Sciences, Finland.  The general aim concerning the MAPSI Internships was to pilot a specific MAPSI internship model developed by Laurea. Following overview presents the feedback gathered both from the students and their supervisors/ mentors at work places.

During the MAPSI project, altogether eight internships were piloted, thus MAPSI team succeeded in almost doubling the set minimum goal. On the other hand, only three

universities out of five organized MAPSI internships for their students: Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre, University of the Arts/Sibelius Academy and Laurea University of Applied Sciences.

It can be concluded that the interns had very good opportunities to get hands-on experience on a wide range of duties. It can also be concluded (based on the written reports by interns) that all the internship places were willing to let the interns to decide how to execute the tasks assigned to them. The internship tutors trusted on the competences of the interns.

The main conclusion is the following: the MAPSI internship clearly supported achieving the learning outcomes of the Master of Arts Management Programme. However, it is less evident whether the tasks and outcomes covered the main topic in MAPSI project, managing art projects with societal impact. Therefore it is important to decide on the specific tasks already before the internship starts. It seems that the students had duties related to gathering feedback from the audience, the participants of the events or festivals but none of them actually tried to evaluate the societal impact of the festival or the art project in question – or to make a plan for evaluating societal impact.

### 2.2.1 Feedback from the students

A feedback questionnaire was sent to all interns. Seven out of eight filled in the questionnaire.

The feedback indicates that more attention should be paid to the information on the internships before the actual internship period begins. Three students considered the information adequate and sufficient, and four students found the preliminary information slightly unsatisfactory. The comments and reflection written by the interns in their internship reports reveal that the discussions with the internship provider should start weeks or even months before the actual internship period and this will be done next time when the internships will be arranged. In some cases, it could have been better if the internship collaboration was started with a series of meetings in order to familiarize the intern with the future task or project. None of the students explicitly replied that the generic information on the internship was insufficient.

As was already mentioned above, the internships provided versatile learning spaces and learning outcomes which are in-line with the curricula of Master Programmes in Arts Management. Interestingly, two interns acknowledged that the societal impact point of view was missing in their internship.

### 2.2.2 Feedback from the internship supervisors

A feedback questionnaire was sent to all the six internship providers, five of whom filled in the questionnaire. Three internship providers out of five were very satisfied with the internships: they totally agreed with the item arguing that the internship was useful and practical for their organisation. One of them chose the option "It's mostly true", and one couldn't say.

Likewise three supervisors had found the experience mutually pleasant and they would be willing to organize the internships in the future. One of the supervisors chose the option "It's almost true". However, one of the respondents couldn't quite agree with the item, meaning that he or she was at least partly unsatisfied with the experience.

Although the supervisors felt that the preliminary information about the internship was adequate and sufficient, it seems that more time should be reserved for discussions on the responsibilities of the intern and the goals of the internship.

### 2.2.3 Lessons learnt from the internship experience

The supervisors were asked to describe in their own words what they learnt from the internship experience. In the general instructions for MAPSI internship, the tasks of the supervisor are described as follows:

- familiarising the student with the institution/organisation where the internship is being conducted.
- helping the student to specify his or her goals and plans for the internship.
- guiding, monitoring and supporting the completion of the internship.
- providing the student with feedback on the internship.
- issuing a written assessment of the internship and conducting an assessment discussion.

In the future, more attention should be paid on the thorough discussions between the student, the work place supervisor, and the representative of the university both before and during the internship. The timing of the discussion, or discussions, is very important: they should take place well ahead of the actualization of the internship.

All the supervisors replied that they are open for negotiations to take new interns in the future. Thus, all in all, the MAPSI internship pilots can be considered very promising openings as they aroused willingness to continue collaboration.


### 2.2.4 Summary

The feedback on the MAPSI internship pilots clearly indicate that the piloted MAPSI internship model has great potential in supporting the students' identity building processes to become professional Cultural Managers. When we aim to support the students' identity building processes to become Change Makers capable of planning, executing, and evaluating art projects with societal impact, we have to re-think and revise the model. One of the most important improvements is that, more attention should be paid on combining theoretical and practical knowledge in the context of internships.

The report called "Developing the pedagogical model for MAPSI internship" suggests the so called Rotation model as an option for MAPSI internships. In this model the periods of internships at the work place and studies at the university rotate. Based on the feedback and the internship reports we suggest piloting the rotation model. It could solve some of the problems related to the lack of thorough discussions in the early phases of the internship.

If we would like to put even more emphasis on the research and development orientation of the internship, we could frame the whole exercise as an action research project. In the action research project we start observing ("what is happening?") followed by reflection ("what does it mean?"). Next we plan what we want to change, and after planning we act. The circle "observe-reflect-plan-act" goes on and on.

In one of the MAPSI pilots there were three interns at the same work place. The experience was very encouraging. It is very important that in the future, internships could be carried out individually, pairwise or as a small group. When internships are carried out individually, we suggest that peer group sessions are organized by the university after the internships to share experiences and knowledge.

Based on the experiences of the pilots, the idea of an e-portfolio is useful. The first one – Description of the orientation of the student –is very important, and it should be openly discussed with the supervisor/mentor at the work place and the university teacher. The question raised in the first section "Learning as becoming" is very relevant in the discussion on the student's orientation.

The instructions for the second element – Description of the environment of the internship – need to be slightly rewritten to put more emphasis on the theoretical framework point of view of the research and development task at hand. As words matter, the second element could be retitled as follows: Description of the practical and theoretical framework of the internship.

We propose that the instructions for the third element – Report on the development task – could be slightly rewritten as well. The reports on the pilots responded very well on the questions given in the present instructions (what, why, how, what was the time frame, what kind of resources, needs or ideas for further development). As there is only one "why?" question in the list, the reports were rather descriptive, the critical analyses and reflection on the chosen activities was mostly missing – therefore it should be re-designed for future use. It seems that new questions guiding for a more analytical approach are needed, for example: why the certain actions were chosen, what were the options, reflection on the execution process: reasons for success, reasons for failure, reflection on the skills and competences needed, analyses of the outputs from different stakeholders' points of view, anticipation of the longer-term societal impacts of the actions. Additionally, the students could be asked to reflect on the tasks and responsibilities as an intern from the Cultural/Arts Manager's profession's standpoint.

All in all it can be concluded that the MAPSI internships were a very successful pilot: we gained valuable experiences and feedback based on which it is possible to develop the approach further, and to nurture the fruitful collaboration between universities and work places.

## 2.2 Edutizer e-courses

The e-course "Perspectives of Art and Societal Impact" consisted of 7 distance learning lectures and was first placed in Edutizer study platform. For each lecture different teacher was responsible for. All lectures had a voice presentation, some video presentations, reading materials and few written home tasks. The whole course in Edutizer was organized in a flexible way. When it occurred that the testing time-schedule is too tight for the students, the deadlines were prolonged taking into account the students´ needs. It resulted 6 students completing the e-course. It is important to pay attention to the fact that testing the e-course was planned for a shorter period than the real e-course.

Since all following aspects were tested simultaneously: the course content, teaching methods and the study platform, the feedback consists of the analyses of all elements. The students´ opinions (about the content and the platform of the e-course) were gathered in written format, while the team members feedback was gathered from 2 meetings orally. Also the experts were interviewed orally. First, the students´ perspectives will be introduced.

### 2.3.1 Students´ Feedback

2/3 of the students answering the feedback questionnaire had attended e-courses prior the current course. Based on the participated students´ written feedback, students coped quite well with Edutizer after becoming more familiar with it. 66,7% of the respondents found the e-learning platform Edutizer to be a practical and useful tool for their specific interests. Same amount of students also found the e-learning platform to be aesthetically pleasing and user-friendly (concerning the design, user interface, simplicity).

The responding students could not fully agree if the e-learning platform was clearly structured and if accessing the materials was easy. This problem has been solved already since the structure in Moodle is more clear. Ca 40% of the participants of the summer-school found the platform was not clearly structured and the materials easily accessible. Some respondents only commented on or described the confusion they felt when using the system ("It wasn't clear for me how to find this feedback."; "The location of the lecture materials was rather confusing. The most logical place would be the section Study Materials on the main page, but they were not there. Instead they were in two other locations - under Manuals or within the course specific details. Still, I would prefer that the material would only be under Study Materials to be clear."). Some students found the system a bit too confusing, mainly

because there were few technical issues that needed to overcome, both study platform specific and based on the study materials.

One student commented that some Power Point voice lectures did not open and the teacher had to be contacted in order to get access. In Moodle there are no this kind of problems. Also next issue concerned the technical limitations of the system. Based on the students´ opinions it was in the beginning difficult to find the materials and submit the homework and after submitting the homework, Edutizer did not confirm it. Also the fact that just one lecture was available at the time while working was seen by the students as a shortcoming of the system.

Concerning the content of the e-course, the feedback of the students was 100% positive – the respondents agreed the content of the e-course was relevant. Less students – 66,7% found the workload of the e-course acceptable.

Few students found the time was a bit short in the beginning but the extra time helped to finish the assignments. One student wrote following in her feedback: *"The schedule was too tight for me and I would have needed more flexibility to do all the home works. But I think that one month is very tight to finish everything in time and keep up with your group, because everyone has a different place doing the assignments."*

Also another student´s comment is most valuable and needs definitely to be taken into account in the future: *"Sometimes it was a bit hard to get answers from teachers if there was something to ask about the homework and since the time available for the assignments was short, it was sometimes a bit stressful if you didn't get the answer right way. Perhaps there could be some sort of a chat in the very beginning of the course with the teachers and the student, where you would go through the home works and if there is something unclear, it could be asked during the chat. I had this sort of beginning of one e-course I did the other summer and I think it was helpful. There was a video connection to the teacher who talked about each homework and the students could write answers to the chat if there was something unclear."* This feedback is most relevant and based on that in Moodle 2 types of forums were created.

66,6% students considered the quality of the different lectures within the e-course more or less equal. And a positive concluding remark could be that based on the current e-course experience, 100% of students would like to follow an e-course in the future.

### 2.3.2 Teachers´ Feedback concerning the Edutizer e-courses

Teachers found both, positive and negative aspects while using Edutizer. Based on their feedback Edutizer found positive feedback, especially the grading traffic lights system was considered simple and good for grading. On the other hand, 2 teachers mentioned that it is visually not attractive and could be more flexible. It was agreed that the fact that there is no communication platform (also highlighted by the students) and no joint calendar is very disappointing while both options exist in Moodle. The system would also need an e-mail notification if new materials are uploaded.

As a result of the students´ and teachers´ feedback, a price offer from Edutizer web developer was asked to develop the suggested improvements. Teachers had previous experiences with other more flexible study systems and in a joint meeting it was decided that since most of the needed adjustments for Edutizer are already available in Moodle, the price of 1860 EUR plus VAT was too expensive. Thus instead of Edutizer in the future the Moodle platform (as free and accessible software) will be used.

### 2.3.3 Experts´ Feedback concerning the Edutizer e-courses

1 external expert working as senior lecturer for EBS and combining very well regular lecturing and e-lecturing, was asked to comment the e-course that existed in Edutizer. She was rather critical and suggested many improvements to raise the attractiveness and study quality of the e-course (platform).

She considered the way the materials were presented in Edutizer very fragmented (1 study week forms 1 study block) and the same concerns the deadlines – you cannot really see the whole picture or amount of homework required. The lay-out should be more compact and take users´ convenience into consideration. The way the students receive the feedback is

rather complicated – it should be user-friendlier. Nowadays it is a rule to have a forum built into the e-learning platforms. In Edutizer there is no forum but since it is built for an e-course that foresees no face-to-face meetings, the system should provide a convenient way for interaction. All mentioned possibilities exist and will be used in Moodle.

The expert doubted in the existence of inter-linkages between the different lectures. The general frame of the course should be understandable and agreed by all teachers. The expert stressed the messages of the separate lectures should be jointly developed, and all lectures need to be put on a logical relationship.

The expert expressed an opinion that the voice presentations are not the best form for an e-course – instead of that the videos should be used and they should be much shorter than 15 minutes. For instance in COURSERA the duration of the clips is usually few minutes – the courses are well-coordinated, structured and the main points are clear. In there also some opinion leaders are involved. Involving them would be especially efficient if they originate from different countries.

The expert appreciated the fact that the BA and MA students were supposed to follow the same materials and the threshold for passing the examination was the same. Still when preparing the study materials, it is important to keep in mind that both, their motivation and attractiveness criteria are quite different.

The expert also agreed that the study process should be made easy for the students but this does not necessarily mean that everything has to be done for the students – when they have to search for any kind of information, they might learn at least critical evaluation of different available sources. The existing study materials should be targeted on analytic thinking and understanding the materials deeply – for instance non-graded tests could contribute a lot to learning process. Based on that kind of test the students have the joy to explore themselves if a new knowledge has been achieved or not.

Concerning the deadlines for testing period, the expert expressed the opinion that the testing deadlines for testing-period were too short and should in real life be much longer. As a

general comments she concluded that giving feedback to students on time is very important – there should be rules that everybody has agreed with in beforehand.

### 2.3.4 Experts´ Feedback concerning the Moodle e-courses

Independent evaluator with long-time e-course development experience gave feedback to all courses that were developed during the MAPSI project and transferred from Edutizer environment to Moodle. The general impression of the evaluator was that the course structure is logical, the tasks and study materials are visually well-placed but some small developments would improve the lay-out (and through that the user-friendliness) tremendously.

Most of the comments concerned the technical structure of the e-course and the focus was on improving the user-friendliness. The only exception was that the evaluator highly appreciated the fact that all lectures have tutors to encourage and inform the students. The general statement of the evaluator was that using Moodle free version provides limited functionality. Therefore she recommended to integrate other free software possibilities like Skype into the study environment in order to make the interaction between the students and teachers livelier. This change will be implemented since Moodle is flexible to integrate html-code to the platform to enable popup texts.

Concerning the specific courses (Summer Academy, Virtual Summer School), most of the evaluator´s comments concerned the potential improvements to avoid long scrolling.

**WINTER ACADEMY**

Winter Academy (take place instead of Summer Academy) consists of both – virtual and real participants and has not been tested yet – the first winter academy supposed to take place in January 2017 with study materials developed during the MAPSI project. All the materials are already placed to Moodle environment.

The evaluator suggested to replace the long text introductions with structured display – therefore she recommended to use TAB DISPLAY function to minimize the scrolling or start using the BOOK-function. BOOK option helps to structure the information and creates the logical brakes between the chapters/units and it´s main advantages is that the whole text is not fully displayed and therefore long scrolling is not needed.

The MAPSI team was looking for ways to have the whole course structure displayed on left sidebar and the evaluator promised to help with html-code. Some of the discussed details concerned the access to other students home works and how it could be displayed, still needs to be tested how to integrate on-spot and virtual students.

**E-COURSE**

E-Course lasts during the whole semester and is only provided in virtual environment. Technically it is more challenging than the e-academy because it consists of both, individual and group works. Since the student groups supposed to discuss the home works, it was recommended to use Skype chat that needs to be initiated by the moderator/tutor. It was found out that Moodle environment allows only 1 student to submit home work and all students will be graded based on the submitted group home work. The evaluator recommended to use Book-format similarly to the Academy.

## 3. MAPSI DELIVERABLES

### 3.1 STUDY BOOK

The Study Book *"Managing Art Projects with Societal Impact. Study Book for Students, Stakeholders and Researchers"* has been published as a result of whole team´s joint writing efforts. Before the final version was issued, the book was tested on experts and students in Estonia, Finland and Spain. Also the members of the Steering Group expressed their opinions and minor changes were introduced based on them.

Most positive comments concerned the structure and the content of the Study Book. It was said the structure is quite clear and logical. The content was perceived as relevant, concrete and specific enough. As a big advantage of the book the mini-cases were mentioned (still

there was also 1 comment paying attention to uneven geographical balance concerning the mini-cases – most of the examples game from North-Europe).

The commentators also suggested some ideas for improvement. For instance it was suggested to dedicate less space and volume for project management. 1 of the mentioned shortcomings concerned the volume of following sections - brief definitions of many key concepts, impact indicators, mini-cases and sub-chapter "Evaluating the societal impact". All commentators concluded it was worth reading and saw the Study Book as useful tool for managing art projects with societal impact. One of the experts proposed to translate the book into Estonian in order to achieve broader dissemination among local readers.

## 3.2 GUIDE BOOK

### 3.2.1 Experts´ Reviews

The Guide Book "Managing Art Projects with Societal Impact in a nutshell" was commented by 4 experts from Estonia and Finland; among them were a Cultural Director, Production-Marketing Manager and Principal Lecturer.

The experts considered the Guide Book to be a practical tool – one of them had said "The overall idea to make a very handy guide to the MAPSI–world is very good." It was also said that the tables and figures are well chosen and give added value to the book. One of the experts found that the figures and tables open up the text well.

One of the experts appreciated that in the booklet the issues like ethics were pointed out – "it's important, especially in projects with societal impacts." The policy topic was considered to be interesting for the cultural managers/leaders/bosses but perhaps not that much for the practitioners. As a conclusion of the comments concerning the content, the sections of "Ethics", "The role of manager in projects with societal impact" and "Evaluation" were considered to be practically written and therefore useful. One of the experts wrote that the crucial parts of achieving the wanted outcomes/impacts of the project are careful planning and evaluating.

### 3.2.2 Practical value

All experts agreed that the Guide Book is more or less useful. It was said the Guide Book can be used in many different ways: while negotiating coming projects, briefing stakeholders both in cultural and social sector. One very important use for the Guide Book is explaining and reassuring the political leaders of the possibilities of art projects with societal impact. It was also mentioned that the guide gives the vocabulary needed in discussion, not only in local plan but also internationally. It was still stressed that the usefulness of the guide book depends on readers´ earlier experience on the subject (as it always does).

One of the experts said that her expectations of the booklet were pretty high, since she had a quite a good knowledge about managing art projects with societal impacts. She admitted of missing so far at her work the practical tools to cope with those issues. It was said that the overall shape of the complex and multi-faceted and multi-manager roles of art managers will come out well from the Guide Book.

### 3.2.3 Critical Aspects

One of the experts had an impression that the term "Guide book" is a bit misleading since there is not much guidelines in the book – the commentator saw it more like an introduction or summary to societal impact that would lead to reading the study book. One expert expressed some doubts that it's practicality in every day work is pretty much referential. She/he asked a rhetorical question if the writer knows well enough the target group's (art managers) needs, managerial skills and abilities for using the information that were given in the guide book?

There were also some comments that concerned the technical details. One of them suggested that the guide book would have benefited from the index, references and more dos and don'ts. The expert expressed an opinion that a guide book should be handy with lots of examples, practical guides and touch of real life in art manager's work. She also missed an explanation to whom it was written – quite often there is no one single project manager but the producer and artistic director are leading the project together. In the booklet it was pointed out many times that art managers need certain kind of skills but the explanation was very narrow.

About the "Impacts" chapter – there should have been mentioned that not all impacts are positive or wanted. "People on the arts field are having often high hopes and beliefs about the good-making power of arts, that some reality check is sometimes needed" was suggested by one of the experts.

### 3.2.4 Conclusion

Based on the experts´ opinions the guidebook fills it's task well and once it's out, the experts have agreed among the others, that the booklet is worth to disseminate widely, for instance to the Art and Cultural Professionals' Trade Unions, the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities and the Association of Finnish Symphony Orchestras.

One of the experts paid attention to the fact that on page 17 of the Guide Book there is following phrase: *The general objective of societally influential art projects is to do good: to reduce poverty and suffering, bring change and development to society and help people and society art can be seen as a kind of nest building, a process of taking over a space as an individual or a community with a dialogical approach*. He commented it with following words "I got this kind of feeling, that this sentence serves the very beginning. That is, straight to the point".

## 4. MAPSI INTERNAL PROCESSES

During the project´s life cycle it´s personnel assessed regularly the quality of different internal processes. First the focus was on working process, communication, satisfaction and motivation. The described analyses covered the period of October 2013 – December 2014. By the end of 2015 all partners were asked to fill-in a questionnaire focusing on the project outcomes. Both times the opinions were expressed in written format using the anonymous questionnaires. Based on the detected shortcomings, needed changes have been introduced to improve the quality of the project.

## 4.1 Working process, communication, satisfaction and motivation of MAPSI project team members

The collected feedback of 10 MAPSI team members´ satisfaction and motivation was described and analysed based on a special questionnaire distributed to all partners. The aim of the analysis was to assess project performance (e.g., feedback from the project team members that reflects the quality of the working process, communication, satisfaction and motivation among the WPs' team members). In following the analysis is divided content wise into different sub-sections based on the questionnaire.

### 4.1.1 Communication

In general the *"overall organization and clarity of communication between respondents´ team members"* received high score – 70% respondents agreed more or less with the statement and 10% couldn't quite agree.  Majority of the respondents (70%) also agreed the information about MAPSI events (seminars, meetings, travels) was communicated clearly. 30% of the respondents agreed the statement is almost true.

20% of the respondents could not quite agree the overall organization and clarity of communication between different WP teams was excellent and 10% respondent could not answer to that question. On the same time 70% of positive answers shows the majority agreed with the statement more or less.

### 4.1.2 Responsibilities and Obligations

Everybody agreed that the project management process was more or less constructive, efficient and productive. The general rotation within the WP team members was 34-66%, while in 2 WPs there was no rotation and in 3 of them 1-33% of the personnel changed.

Most of the answers concerning the understanding and following the obligations and responsibilities were positive. Still respondents´ own teams were considered to follow and carry out the obligations within the MAPSI project more punctually, consistently and in professional manner (70% of respondents) than the rest of the teams. While 50% of the respondents found that other MAPSI teams followed and carried out their obligations within the MAPSI project punctually, consistently and in professional manner. 80% of the respondents agreed with following statement *"Negotiations and (potential) disagreements within WP team members and between WP both were settled in a constructive manner".* It could be seen as a sign of a strong and effective team work.

**<u>MOTIVATION</u>**

Both the team´s general and the respondents´ own motivations were evaluated positively – the scores were over the average score. 60% of the respondents agreed their personal motivation was as high as in the beginning of the project, 30% agreed it was almost as high as in the beginning and 10% respondent could not say. All 10 respondents agreed more or less their own team was positive and highly motivated.

**<u>PROJECT MEETINGS</u>**

It was 100% agreed that the activities carried out during the MAPSI project (meetings, seminars, etc) were more or less meaningful and helped to achieve the project's overall goals. MAPSI meetings were considered to be constructive, efficient and productive by 60% respondents. None of the respondents suggested any improvements concerning the constructiveness, efficiency or productivity of the meetings.

### 4.1.3 Conclusion

The average satisfaction with the working process, communication and motivation of MAPSI project team members was high and therefore there are not many recommendations to improve any of the mentioned activities. The weakest link of the project, still not critical,

seems to be the overall organization and clarity of communication between different WP teams.

The general notification is that there was no remarkable rotation in the project and the satisfaction with the project was very high. The project team did appreciate and enjoy the cooperation with other WPs and was also satisfied with the general project management related issues.

## 4.2 MAPSI project´s performance and project value

In order to evaluate the overall quality of the MAPSI project, 4 questionnaires (based on the WPs) were drafted from October 2013 until August 2014. The purpose of the questionnaires was to measure the WP's designated tasks of the project against the actually completed tasks between October 2013 and August 2014. All partner-institutions were asked to specify their status of correspondent WP's tasks and if not on-time, add expected time of completion and additional comments / remarks.

## FINDINGS

The findings are presented in following according to the activities defined in the Quality Plan for MAPSI Appendices 1-4.

### 4.2.1. Project management

The sub-activity "Creating a virtual joint space" was seen as the most effective activity of Project Management - all partners agreed it has been fully completed. Based on the information received from the project manager, the information in the chosen virtual platform Google Drive is presented in a well structured way and has many advantages compared to just sending documents by e-mails, for instance. The system enables to change documents and follow the changes on-line. „Meetings"-activity seems to be rather effective as well, since all the planned meetings have taken place in the planned timeframe.

### 4.2.2. Developing and testing MAPSI

The current WP consisted of responsibilities of Laurea University of Applied Sciences (responsible for sharing the insights and principles of LbD approach with the MAPSI

partners), Sibelius Academy (focus on the summer school) and Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre (responsible for academic quality of the whole project and also WP2).

Developing and testing were continuous processes and difficult to evaluate since it was not clear at what point something is ready and when additional testing is needed. Another issue concerns the user-friendliness of the technical tools – sometimes only time shows if a program/system corresponds to the needs of the users or further modifications are needed.

Concerning the Internship, few partners reflected on activities that still need to be finished. The E-learning platform was tested during the Helsinki summer school and was still in process (supposed to be completed in May 2015).

### 4.2.4. Quality plan and evaluation

Current activity was the responsibility of EBS. However, the activities could only be implemented with input from all partners.

Three bids for quality plan creation were collected and one of them was selected. By mid-July the first draft of the quality plan was provided by external supplier and circulated between partners for feedback and recommendations. The effectiveness of the provided plan was tested during forthcoming activities and the plan was subject to modification to correspond to real needs.

### 4.2.5. Dissemination

The general coordination of the dissemination WP was the responsibility of the University of the Basque Country. Still, it is important to bear in mind that all universities were responsible for the dissemination in their respective universities and countries. Feedback from project partners revealed that stronger leading role from the side of the responsible partner was expected (dividing responsibilities, following time-line etc). In order to avoid overlapping and learn from each other's work, the communication system on that issue should have been built in.

Sending out the first newsletter was more complex as partners need to make a campaign to get subcriblers to the list of MAPSI newsletter. According to some partners, dissemination of the newsletter needs further attention. In August the number of subscribers of the newsletter

was 26. Since the result is rather modest, further input from all partners was asked and after receiving that the newsletter was disseminated to the audience of ca 100 people.

The only fully completed activity in this WP was the development of dissemination plan – all partners agreed that the activity was completed. The first seminar on Service Design was organized with success - 25 people participated. The Project manager collected the feedback by e-mail and based on that it can be concluded that the majority of the participants were very satisfied with the content of the seminar.

The project web site was launched in May. Therefore three bids for web page development were collected and an agreement with the selected developer was signed. During April and early May information from partners was collected in order to create content for the web page. The Website was updated regularly.

### 4.2.6 Conclusions and recommendations

Based on the analyses it can be concluded the project team seems to cooperate effectively. Still, the expectations of the target groups are not clear – therefor more attention should be devoted to not just asking for feedback from participants, but also to learning about the expectations of potential stakeholders. It is rather critical to meet the needs of the target groups.

The general notification is that there have been a few slight changes in the project, otherwise the planned route has been followed very well. The team has been working together effectively in most cases and the best indicator of that is the high motivation of the project partners to contribute to the project - the members have agreed to take more responsibilities than first agreed all for the sake of the success of the project.

### 4.3 PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND VALUE

6 team members answered the questionnaire by the end of 2015 about the project outcomes and all of them agreed that there has been true JOINT new knowledge development inside the

MAPSI project. The MAPSI internship, summer school, study book and e-course as well as other common deliverables made the team really work jointly. It was agreed that the aim of the project has been achieved very well so far since everything that was promised in the project plan has been almost completed. *"We have mapped some experiences of stakeholders and we have included students´ experiences. The new specialization module is almost fully developed and in process of piloting."*

### 4.3.1. Success Factors

Different respondents considered different factors to contribute to the success of the project. Human capital was seen mostly as the most important success factor. 40% of the respondents expressed their opinions that especially the commitment, enthusiasm and motivation of the people played the central role in achieving the goals. Other 40% of the respondents found that the key was the precise project management - the mid-deadlines and internal little step stones helped to keep the team on track. Also the regular Skype meetings and concrete timeline with reminders from the project manager were mentioned as the success factors.

Also the properly documented communication, concrete outcomes such as course modules (Summer School, E-course) and publications (Study Book, Guide Book) and international and openness (case from several fields and countries) were considered to contribute to the success of the project.

### 4.3.2. Improvements

It was also asked what could be improved to achieve the designated goal of the project more effectively? As it was open-ended question, some answers concerned the organizational and some the ideological aspects of the project. Few answers concerned specific tasks and their time table (suggesting that the finalizing of the study book should have been half a year earlier, which would have enabled an earlier piloting of the e-course).

One of the respondents expressed the opinion that there was too much of technical work for the researchers and some of it should have been spread better with project assistant since it would have left more time for content work to researcher. This will definitely an issue to address in the future. Currently among MAPSI personnel there was only one assistant –

project manager´s assistant and therefore it was foreseen that all researchers involved need to do both – technical and content work.

Also the issue that not all people could attend all meetings all the time was raised. Naturally, it would help to raise effectiveness if everybody would participate 100% all the time, still the project related tasks were in most cases not the only obligations of the team members. Luckily the issue was more or less solved by the effective way of composing and disseminating the minutes of the meetings by the project managers. More face-to-face meeting would most probably have made the deciding process running more smoothly and therefor it is important to use this kind of approach in the future.

One respondent assumed that less partners but on the same time wider selections of fields and countries could help to achieve the designated goal of the project more effectively. As the time for answering the questionnaire was the final phase of the project, also building the stronger relationships with relevant stakeholders was considered relevant.

### 4.3.3. Outcomes compared to Contribution

The most important outcomes of the project were considered to be the Study Book (mentioned 5 times), piloting the E-course (4 times) and the Summer School (2). Twice the successful conference was mentioned - the event itself, its publicity and the international network that it created. Also the different templates/instructions for organizing different course modules were brought up as valuable outcome of the project so far.

5 respondents agreed that the final outcome of the project was worth doing it since the outcomes will fit the learning and development needs of the sector. The given answers focused on the piloting nature and curriculum development nature of the project - first pieces and pilots of deliverables will show a direction where to move and give ready materials to use in each university separately and jointly and/or serve as references also. It was also stressed that now there is new content in the curricula, new specific focus for the joint programme.

### 4.3.4. Project Priorities

One question in the questionnaire was targeted to a hypothetic situation if the project priorities would have been the same if the leading partner would have been the institution of

the respondent. All respondents answered "no" to that question. 2 answers considered timing – first stating that setting earlier deadline for a Study Book to be ready (for spring 2015) would have let the piloting of the e-course not done in a hurry.

The nature of most of the comments was directly oriented to the future and therefore they were analysed profoundly and taken into consideration when planning the follow-up project for the MAPSI project. There was also one response targeted towards the teaching – suggesting that *"I would have paid more effort to develop more shared pedagogical approach."* As concluding remark following comment would be most relevant – *"I had paid less effort to including so much into one project maybe."*

### 4.3.5. Emotions concerning the Joint Work

All respondents agreed they have enjoyed their work in MAPSI. The most popular reason for that was the fact that the topic is interesting and necessary for cultural management curricula (mentioned 4 times). Often also good project network and good partners were mentioned. 2 respondents emphasized on the new knowledge and the new insights that have been jointly created. One respondent mentioned that it has been stimulating time and it is really interesting to get exposed to other learning-teaching and practice environments. The only critical comment concerned the time available for the project - it was suggested that it could have been used more evenly so that piloting the e-course had not to be done in hurry. It is important to emphasize that in the beginning of the project all partners had the possibility to introduce the changes to the preliminary time table, still it was accepted by all participants as it was first planned. As already mentioned earlier, the more demanding editing work of the Study Book caused the delay of publishing it and influenced the activities that were planned to happen afterwards. Also that comment has been discussed and taken into consideration when planning the follow-up project for the MAPSI project – more buffer time was planned to that project.

### 4.3.6. Future Horizons

One open-ended question in the questionnaire concerned the follow-up activities after MAPSI project. 4 respondents assured they are interested in the broader cooperation in the same field with the same partners within the potential MAPSI-2 projects.

It was also specified why there is need for further cooperation - because the international cooperation and research and development project work are in the core of universities and their continuation both in teaching as well as regional development broader. The cooperation was also seen as a great opportunity to develop new learning tools.

One respondent emphasized that in the next project the workload has to be balanced better than in the current project. *If the goals and outcomes require as much work and energy within the same limit of working hours and with same fee, then the person answering to that question would have to reconsider his/her participation.*

## SUMMARY

In general the activities were implemented as planned, still there were some lessons to learn. The biggest change introduced already during MAPSI life cycle concerned transferring the e-courses from Edutizer on-line study platform to Moodle. It was caused by the relatively significant amount of not-satisfactory comments from students and teachers. The rest of the improvements needed less time and effort but were in no means less important. All of the needed changes and potential solutions have been discussed in team level and are accepted by the MAPSI team.

Concerning the students, they wish to be engaged as soon as possible both to prepare for the e-courses and internship. Students appreciate the supervisors/tutors/lecturers support very highly and therefore it is critical that all of them are available and share common understanding of the study/internship goals.

When planning a conference it is important to create a supportive environment to exchange ideas and contacts between the participants. Both conferences arranged in the framework of MAPSI were highly appreciated by the visitors but the participants wished there were more follow-up activities in order to connect the participants in more explicit way in the future. It would also be wise to use electronic registering and answering systems when registering the applicants no matter of the number of the participants.

The content of study materials and e-courses should be tested well-advance in order to find out about the target groups´ real needs. Currently most valuable comments were received but the project would have benefitted more when they would have been there earlier.

From project management perspective in the future more attention could be paid to communication between different teams – it could be done already by planning team-building events in the beginning of the projects. Because of the same reason more face-to-face meetings should be planned during the project in order to make the decision-taking process more smoothly.

All best practices and learning points have been transferred to MAPSI follow-up project application and in case the project will be approved, will be implemented soon.