

AFRICA ■ ■ CENTRE

Evaluation Model - Artist in Residency Application

Background

Founded in 2005, as a not-for-profit organisation, the Africa Centre provides a platform for exploring contemporary Pan-African arts and cultural practice as a catalyst for social change. The vision of the Africa Centre is brought to life with a number of projects that either play out through the calendar year, or online. Our current projects include:

- **Badilisha Poetry Exchange** – an online radio station that celebrates the languages, cultures and styles of presenting Pan-African poetry;
- **Infecting the City** - an annual public art Festival held in the central business district of Cape Town;
- **Talking Heads** - a multi-layered, knowledge-sharing platform conceived to profile the ideas, visions and manifestations of the extraordinary people living on this continent;
- **WikiAfrica** – an international collaboration that, through a range of interventions, redresses the critical imbalance of factual information about Africa on Wikipedia; and
- **Artist in Residency Programme** – in partnership with multiple residencies from around the world, this project awards, across artistic discipline, 10 residencies each year.

For more information visit www.africacentre.net.

As a multiple disciplinary organisation with a focus on socially innovative work, we deemed it critical to define an approach to understanding our impact. As such, the following is the methodology we have designed to evaluating our work within the context of social innovation. This document defines our evaluation protocol, principles, toolbox and explores our Artist in Residency Programme as a case study in how this methodology is applied.

Introduction

Socially innovative work as a discipline can engage with various publics, from assorted points of entry and via a spectrum of actors (public sector, social entrepreneurs and NGOs). Independent of who initiates it or how, we believe there is a common framework that can be used to define, implement and evaluate any intervention. That framework is relatively straight forward: What is the social need which requires a solution; what is the solution; is the solution the most cost effective and can it be scaled; who is best suited to implement the solution; and finally, how will success be measured.

To the last point, measuring/evaluating success can be tricky, time consuming and expensive. At the heart of any evaluation challenge however, is being able to define, what is valuable in understanding success and who decides if success has been reached. Once this is clear, factors such as time, money and resources can be introduced to devise the most effective evaluation process.

Lead organisations, project partners, funders, beneficiaries and other stakeholders often have different views on what is valuable within a project, thereby muddying the parameters and focus of an evaluation hypothesis and protocol. The Africa Centre (AC) uses a consistent evaluation protocol to help unravel the, “what is of value determined by whom?” challenge and to create a flexible evaluation process that can be applied across projects within our organisation.

Africa Centre Evaluation Protocol

This list reflects the evaluation protocol used by the Africa Centre.

1. Define the need to be addressed, solution proposed, and the team to implement.
2. Document the objectives of the project, ensuring that they are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and timely.
3. Overlay the project’s objectives on the organisation’s objectives to ensure synergy. 80% or more of the project’s objectives must progress the organisation’s, otherwise the project objectives need to be restated or the project reconsidered.
4. Test the objectives defined with representative stakeholders within the project and adjust per their collective input.
5. Weight project objectives according to importance.
6. Create methodologies for measuring each objective using the AC Evaluation Toolbox, guided by the AC’s Evaluation Principles.
7. Define the timeframe for evaluation within the project lifecycle.
8. Evaluate project objectives, review and report evaluation results, and apply lessons.

Evaluation Principles

The following evaluation principles define the beliefs that underpin the AC Evaluation Protocol.

1. **Understanding Success:** The motivation for and intentions of any given project must be clearly articulated before success can be defined. Once success is clear, a formal process of evaluation using multiple tools and perspectives is the only genuine way of measuring it.
2. **Feasibility:** Ensure that an evaluation is possible, in terms of the skills base, time and financial resources available to the organisation. In addition, ensure that the resources available are utilised effectively and efficiently.
3. **Practicality:** Evaluation procedures should be practical and responsive to the way the programme operates and should keep disruption to a minimum.
4. **Stakeholder Intimacy:** Seek to ensure that an evaluation will serve the information needs of the intended users by understanding and aligning expectations.
5. **Formal Agreement:** The obligations of each party involved in a project must agree in writing to the intentions of the evaluation and with the conduct required to achieve results.
6. **Transparency:** The reason for the evaluation, the criteria of the evaluation and the purposes to which the findings will be applied to be made available to all stakeholders.
7. **Conflict of Interest:** Should be dealt with openly and honestly so it does not compromise the evaluation processes and results.

8. **Information Management:** Evaluations should use methodical information gathering, review, verification, and storage methods.
9. **Fairness:** Evaluations should recognize, monitor, and balance the cultural and political interests and needs of individuals and groups.
10. **Respect:** Evaluation processes must respect the security, dignity and self-worth of the respondents, program participants, partners and other stakeholders. This is particularly pertinent with regards to those who will be impacted upon by the evaluation findings.
11. **Evaluator Credibility:** Persons conducting the evaluation should be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation so that its findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance.
12. **Balance:** Ensure a good mix of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methodologies to develop a holistic view of the projects achievements. In addition, the balance between evaluating process and outcomes must be well considered.
13. **Time:** Where possible and appropriate the project should be evaluated over multiple time periods. The time periods to consider are: Pre-Project (before a project begins); In-Project (during the project); and Post-Project (1 year after the end of the project or later if any results are affected by length of time).
14. **Report Clarity:** Evaluation reports should clearly describe the programme being evaluated, including its context, purposes, procedures, and findings so that essential information is provided and easily understood so as to increase the likelihood of the findings in the report being used.

Evaluation Toolbox

The toolbox detailed below is dynamic and expected to change as new methodologies are discovered and tested. The following are some of the tools that we use:

1. Interviews
2. Focus Groups
3. Questionnaires/surveys: online, electronic, paper based
4. Checklist Analysis
5. Team Member Reports
6. Mystery Shopper
7. External Documentation/Evaluation: media reviews and other online and printed coverage

Evaluation Case Study: Artist in Residency Programme – AIR

What is the need - Why AIR?

In comparison to artists from Europe, North America, Asia and even Latin America, artists in Africa have limited opportunities to participate in artist in residency programmes. This occurs for a variety of reasons, but most prominently because: there are very few residency programmes in Africa; African artists are often not well known in contemporary art circles throughout the world; and when accepted to residency programmes there are limited funding sources within their country of origin or from other sources to support the costs of getting them to the residency and those incurred during participation. These factors deny the global artist in residency community access to

the many exceptional artists practising on the African Continent, and in turn denies these artists the unique growth opportunity residencies afford.

Solution - AIR Mechanics

To address this issue, the Africa Centre birthed the Artist in Residency (AIR) programme in 2011. The programme runs on an annual basis: each year, AIR partners with artist in residency programmes from around the globe.

Each residency selects one artist from a short list provided by the Africa Centre. The list is compiled from a Continental call for submissions. Selection is determined by three core factors:

- The artist's potential to become extraordinary;
- Their interest, accomplishments to-date and ability to make a social contribution through their work; and
- What benefit a residency would offer to their growth and development.

The costs of the residency and return airfare are included in each award. These costs are shared between the Africa Centre and the participating residency.

Step 1: AIR Objectives

1. Create a global network of artist in residency organisations willing to partner with the AIR programme by offering funded, high quality residency experiences that are professionally operated, have well established programmes with clearly defined goals and objectives, and that sensitively accommodate their guests.
2. Provide career development opportunities through artist in residency experiences for African artists, who are provocative, innovative, relevant and highly engaged with both social issues and their art forms.
3. Evolve the AIR residency programme to push the boundaries of the traditional ideas and practice associated with residencies while adapting to the changing needs of artists and the programme's partners.
4. Increase the number, quality and diversity of AIR applications year on year.
5. Implement a systematic and rigorous evaluation process utilising the meticulous application of methods to assess the design, implementation, improvement and outcomes of the AIR programme.

Step 2: Africa Centre Objectives related to AIR Objectives

1. Create and support artistic, intellectual and cultural initiatives that explore and develop the full melange and variety within the 'African' perspective and approach. We seek to create opportunities for both Africans and the rest of the world to reshape their understanding of who and what contemporary Africa is, and is capable of; (AIR objectives 1 through 4 apply)
2. Formulate innovative models for presenting, debating and encouraging the cultural production and the pursuit of knowledge; (AIR objectives 1 through 4 apply)
3. Enhance access to the creative work and ideas of historical and contemporary African thought leaders; (AIR objective 4 applies)
4. Develop and implement projects that are either a model for, or can from inception function on a local, national, continental and global scale; (AIR objectives 1 through 5 apply)

5. Maintain the organisational flexibility and fluidity to function as the implementing agent, collaborator and/or funder of the initiatives and projects in which we engage; (N/A)
6. Consistently evaluate the nature of our work, goals that shape it, accomplishments and failures to inform the social change that we seek to effect. (AIR objective 5)

Step 3: AIR Objectives expanded and weighted

The scale below measures how important each of the AIR objectives are in defining success.

- 3 = Critical to success
- 2 = Important to success
- 1 = Enhances success

1. Create a global network of artist in residency organisations willing to partner with the AIR programme by offering funded, high quality residency experiences that are professionally operated, have well established programmes with clearly defined goals and objectives, and that sensitively accommodate their guests.
 - a. The number of residencies awarded each year is dependent on the number of round trips the AIR budget allows. The target for partner residencies in year 1 was 8, for year 2 the target is 10 and for year 3, the aim is to partner with 12 residencies. *(rating 1)*
 - b. Our intention is to offer residency programmes across the full gamut of artistic disciplines divided into the categories of Visual Arts which includes photography, video, new media, mixed media, sculpture, painting, drawing, sound, landscape & installations; Performing Arts which includes dance, music, theatre and spoken word; and Literature which includes poetry and prose. *(rating 2)*
 - c. Deliver high quality residency experiences determined by residency and artist expectations. *(rating 3)*
 - d. Understand and manage the expectations and objectives of each residency partner. *(rating 2)*
 - e. Improve the residency partner quality and funding acquired per residency partner year on year. *(rating 2)*
 - f. Increase the number of residency partners in Africa and support their growth and development. *(rating 2)*
2. Provide career development opportunities through artist in residency experiences for African artists, who are provocative, innovative, relevant and highly engaged with both social issues and their art forms.
 - a. The number of artists awarded each year is dependent on the number of round trips the AIR budget allows. The target for artists awarded in year 1 was 8, for year 2 the target is 10 and for year 3, the aim is to award 12 artists. *(rating 2)*
 - b. Understand and manage the expectations and objectives of each artist awarded. *(rating 3)*
 - c. Track the effect of the residency on the awarded artist's career development. *(rating 3)*
 - d. Track the relevancy of the artist's work in relation to social issues into the future. *(rating 1)*
 - e. Place artists into residency programmes that align the artist's interest in a residency experience with those residencies that share a common expectation and that can fulfil it. *(rating 3)*

3. Evolve the AIR residency programme to push the boundaries of the traditional ideas and practice associated with residencies while adapting to the changing needs of artists and the programme's partners.
 - a. Integrate a residency programme into the new "Everyday Urbanism" project either as a collaboration with another residency or create our own. *(rating 3)*
 - b. Test 3 new theories about residency programmes per residency. *(rating 2)*
4. Increase the number, quality and diversity of AIR applications by 25% per annum.
 - a. Develop a continental network of partners across media who can relay AIR calls to their networks of artists.
 - Target 2 partners per African country for year 2. Target 4 partners per African country at the end of year three. *(rating 2)*
 - Track the quality and power of partner networks. *(rating 2)*
 - Target an equal split of network partners by medium. *(rating 1)*
 - b. Track artists by quantity, quality, medium, age, career level and nationality. *(rating 3)*
 - c. Increase the African artist awareness of the AIR programme by 25% per annum. *(rating 2)*
5. Implement a systematic and rigorous evaluation process utilising the meticulous application of logical methods to assess the design, implementation, improvement and outcomes of the AIR program. *(rating 3)*

Step 4: Methodologies for measuring each objective using the AC Evaluation Toolbox, guided by AC's Evaluation Principles.

Objective 1:

Create a global network of artist in residency organisations willing to partner with the AIR programme by offering funded, high quality residency experiences that are professionally operated, have well established programmes with clearly defined goals and objectives, and that sensitively accommodate their guests.

Objective 1a:

The number of residencies awarded each year is dependent on the number of round trips the AIR budget allows. The target for partner residencies in year 1 was 8, for year 2 the target is 10 and for year 3, the aim is to partner with 12 residencies. *(rating 1)*

Evaluation Method 1a:

Team member report: Ability to secure the budget required to support the residencies targeted. Review applications submitted and residency partners secure and document effort made.

Objective 1b:

Our intention is to offer residency programmes across the full gamut of artistic disciplines divided into the categories of Visual Arts which includes photography, video, new media, mixed media, sculpture, painting, drawing, sound, landscape & installations; Performing Arts which includes dance, music, theatre and spoken word; and Literature which includes poetry and prose. *(rating 2)*

Evaluation Method 1b:

Team Member Report: Record artistic discipline splits offered. Review process of researching and soliciting and actual number of residencies approached for participation

Objective 1c:

Deliver high quality residency experiences determined by residency and artist expectations. *(rating 3)*

Evaluation Method 1c:

Interview & Questionnaires: Create a matrix of key residency performance indicators based on hospitality, administration, access to markets, inspiration.

Interview (Telephonic, Skype or Face to Face): Participants include a residency representative and the participating artist.

Team Member Report and Questionnaire: Filled in by Residency.

Team Member Report and Questionnaire: Filled in by Artist.

Note: the evaluation will include performance indicators related to AC factors contributing to this objective. Review Africa Centre role in facilitating the engagement between the two: timeliness of correspondence, completion of our tasks (flight arrangements etc)

Objective 1d:

Understand and manage the expectations and objectives of each residency partner. *(rating 2)*

Evaluation Method 1d:

Team Member Report and Questionnaire: Filled in by Residency.

Interview: (Telephonic, Skype or Face to Face): Participants include a residency representative and the participating artist.

Note: the evaluation will include performance indicators related to AC factors contributing to this objective.

Objective 1e:

Improve the residency partner quality and funding acquired per residency partner year on year. *(rating 2)*

Evaluation Method 1e:

Check list analysis: Create a year on year Funding Matrix per residencies contracted to measure the increase or decrease in, “in-kind” funding and sponsorships.

Team member report: Quality improvement scoring based on the results of 1c and 1d evaluation results.

Objective 1f:

Increase the number of residency partners in Africa and support their growth and development. *(rating 2)*

Evaluation Method 1f:

External Documentation/Evaluation: Track the increase of African residency partners participating in the AIR programme. Track the increase in website hits, phone calls, applications, e-mails etc to measure growth in awareness around the residency.

Interviews & Surveys: Track the residency organisation's development based on artist comments over time and on the organisation's feedback.

Team member reports: Review recruitment methodology used by AC – how many residencies were discovered, how many were solicited, what was the conversion rate, what were the barriers to participation.

Objective 2:

Provide career development opportunities through artist in residency experiences for African artists, who are provocative, innovative, relevant and highly engaged with both social issues and their art forms.

Objective 2a:

The number of artists awarded each year is dependent on the number of round trips the AIR budget allows. The target for contracted residencies in year 1 was 8, for year 2 the target is 10 and for year 3, the aim is to contract 12 residencies. *(rating 2)*

Evaluation method 2a:

Checklist Analysis: Count number of artists awarded

Team Member Report: Ability to secure the budget required to support the residencies targeted.

Review applications submitted and document effort made.

Objective 2b:

Understand and manage the expectations and objectives of each artist awarded. *(rating 3)*

Evaluation method 2b:

Interview: Participants include AC representative and artist. Interview to be conducted Pre, In and Post Project.

Team Member Reports and Questionnaire: Completed by the Artist: Pre, In and Post Project.

Note: The evaluation will include performance indicators related to AC factors contributing to this objective.

Objective 2c:

Track the effect of the residency on the awarded artist's career development. *(rating 3)*

Evaluation Method 2c:

Questionnaire and Interview: Pre, during and post residency with Artist. (The questionnaire will support quantitative data while the interview offers layered qualitative information.)

Objective 2d:

Track the relevancy of the artist's work in relation to social issues into the future. *(rating 1)*

Evaluation Method 2d:

External Documentation: Google Tracker, Media Reviews other coverage / reports.
Interviews: Bi-yearly updates.

Objective 2e:

Place artists into residency programmes that align the artist's interest in a residency experience with those residencies that share a common expectation and that can fulfil it. *(rating 3)*

Evaluation Method 2e:

Focus Groups: Skype meeting with Artist, Residency & AC - pre, during and post residency.
Questionnaire: Artist, Residency and AC to complete - pre, during and post residency.

Objective 3:

Evolve the AIR residency programme to push the boundaries of the traditional ideas and practice associated with residencies while adapting to the changing needs of artists and the programme's partners.

Objective 3a:

Integrate a residency programme into the new "Everyday Urbanism" project either as a collaboration with another residency or create our own. *(rating 3)*

Evaluation Method 3a:

Team Member Reports: Reports to include data on the following: was a residency produced, review budget.
Note: Use the same evaluation methods as used on Residency Partners and Artists but applied to the AC residency.

Objective 3b:

Test 3 new theories about residency programmes per residency. *(rating 2)*

Evaluation Method 3b:

Team Member Reports: Based on key performance indicators outlined for testing new theories.

Objective 4:

Increase the number, quality and diversity of AIR applications by 25% per annum.

Objective 4a:

Develop a continental network of partners across media who can relay AIR calls to their networks of artists.

- Target 2 partners per African country for year 2. Target 4 partners per African country at the end of year three. *(rating 2)*
- Track the quality and power of partner networks. *(rating 2)*
- Target an equal split of network partners by medium. *(rating 1)*

Evaluation Method 4a:

Team Member Report: Track the required metrics e.g. Google analytics and applicants referred.

- Review what steps were used to identify and recruit partners;
- Review the methods that had the greatest effects in so doing understand the motivation for partners to disseminate the call; and
- Review the balance of partner types (music, visual arts, other) in relationship to the applicants received.

Objective 4b:

Increase the number, quality and diversity of AIR applications by 25% per annum. *(rating 3)*

Evaluation Method 4b:

Team Member Report:

- Track artists by quantity, quality, medium, age, career level and nationality;
- Create opinion poll on AIR webpage for all users measuring user friendliness of AIR webpage;
- Survey all AIR applicants to measure the quality of their application experience;
- Measure number and region of hits on AIR webpage;
- Review what steps were used to recruit artists; and
- Review the methods that had the greatest effect on driving application.

Objective 4c:

Increase the African artist awareness of the AIR programme year on year by 25% *(rating 2)*

Evaluation Method 4c:

External Documentation: Google analytics to measure web traffic, location of users, Analyse Facebook metrics e.g. number of likes, quality and quantity of comments, increase/decrease in number of friends.

Step 5: Evaluate project objectives, review and report evaluation results, and apply lessons.