

THE URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME: FINAL EVALUATION REPORT



Sandy Craig, Leisure Futures Ltd.

**THE URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME:
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	8
Methodology	10
Finance	13
Organisation and Structures	18
Programmes	20
Outputs	24
Outcomes	33
Themes and Issues	43
Appendix	48

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Urban Cultural Programme (UCP) was announced in 2004 and funded by Arts Council England (ACE) (£6 million) and the Millennium Commission (MC) (£13.5 million). Programmes were funded in Belfast, Birmingham, Blackburn with Darwen, Bradford (for five Yorkshire cities including Hull, Leeds, Sheffield and York), Brighton and Hove, Bristol, Canterbury and East Kent, Cardiff, Inverness and the Highlands, Liverpool, London Leaside (Hackney, Newham and Tower Hamlets), London South East (Lewisham, Greenwich), Manchester, NewcastleGateshead, Norwich, Oxford, South Lanarkshire, Swansea and the Three Cities (Derby, Leicester, Nottingham).

Bids were invited for cultural programmes that addressed a very wide range of aims and issues including regeneration, developing community capacity and social cohesion.

Evaluation

The DCMS commissioned this National Evaluation from Leisure Futures. The aim of the evaluation is to assess the success of the UCP programme, the effect it has had in repositioning cultural services in the 19 city/regions, and lessons to be learnt for future funding of such festivals with particular consideration for events which might be held around the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

The evaluation was carried out in two stages. The first stage, based on desk research, focussed on mapping what has been achieved by the UCPs. The second stage supplemented this with qualitative information derived from interviewing the Lead Officers at the UCPs and a selection of partners and deliverers.

This evaluation is reliant on the monitoring and evaluation carried out and commissioned by the individual UCPs and by the returns they provided to the MC and ACE. There are gaps and inconsistencies in the information supplied, and relatively little robust quantitative research on impacts and outcomes. These difficulties have hampered this evaluation and mean that a number of the conclusions must be viewed with caution.

Funding

UCP grants of £19.5 million levered in Partnership Income of £38.9 million – that is, every £1 of UCP funding levered in £2 from other sources. Total income was recorded at just over £58 million. Income from the private sector was recorded as amounting to £6.3 million or 11% of the total income. The largest single source of Partnership Income, at over £13 million (23% of the total), came from the local authorities hosting the UCP programmes.

Expenditure

Based on the returns of 10 UCPs, direct artistic / cultural expenditure accounted for around three quarters (75%) of total expenditure. Marketing costs were estimated at around 9%, with other costs (core costs, overheads, etc.) amounting to 16%. Total costs may be greater than the funding income shown because some local authorities may have over-run on their partnership funding. In addition, many of the events and activities of UCPs were delivered by existing, revenue-funded clients of ACE, some of whom will not have apportioned their core costs and charged this to the UCP. It is impossible to estimate this additional expenditure. There are no concerns about financial irregularity.

Varieties of Organisation

UCPs were organised through a variety of organisational structures. These included management in-house by the local authority, management by a partnership of local authorities (often with other agencies, e.g. regional ACE), and management by a range of 'arms-length' and independent voluntary organisations. In nearly all UCPs, these organisational structures were underpinned by a web of partnerships with funders and deliverers.

The rationales for these structures were to help build partnerships, make best use of the expertise of different organisations, build capacity in the arts and cultural sectors and ensure that local communities were engaged.

No one organisational structure was better at managing their UCP programme. What appeared to work best were UCPs working with the grain of the existing ways of working of the local authority / authorities leading the process. Working in partnership, engaging the existing arts and cultural infrastructure and the commitment of the local authority appear to have been some of the keys to the success of the UCP.

Programmes

There was a wide range of programming across the UCPs. In the 15 UCPs analysed, 37% of events and activities were categorised as Western Arts, 12% as Non-Western Arts, 12% as Participatory activities, 9% as Festivals and celebratory events, 7% as Creative Industries, 5% as Sport, 3% as Crafts, Design and Applied Arts, 3% as Heritage/Museum based work and 1% as Libraries based. The 11% of events and activities categorised as 'Other' included a wide range of environmental, science, horticultural, children's play, culinary and tourist-related events and activities.

Key programming themes included large-scale, outdoor celebratory events and festivals; a host of usually smaller-scale participatory activities; international events and links; programmes focussing on hard-to-reach groups; and the commissioning of new work. There were fewer events which could be termed 'youth culture', comparatively few collaborations between UCPs and little that was directly challenging politically.

Outputs

UCPs supplied information on outputs including Audience Numbers, Participant Numbers, Artists, Numbers of performances and exhibitions, Workshops and Total days' employment for artists. These are set out in the left hand column of the table overleaf and are known as 'gross outputs'.

Some of these events may have happened without the UCP, while arts organisations used by UCPs would have produced shows and events anyway. The *additional* audience numbers, etc, known as 'net outputs' generated by the UCPs are set out in the right hand column of the table below.

Outputs - Quantitative	Gross	Net
Audience Numbers	14 million	9 million
Audience Profile: Numbers from Neighbourhood Renewal Areas	No evidence	No evidence
Audience Profile: Numbers from Hard-to-Reach Groups	Insufficient evidence	Insufficient evidence
Audience Profile: Numbers from BME communities	Insufficient evidence	Insufficient evidence
Audience Profile: Numbers of disabled people	No evidence	No evidence
Participant Numbers	475,000	350,000
Individual Participants	70,000	56,000
Artists	46,000	46,000
Days' Employment for Artists	65,000	30,000
Payments to Artists	£44 million	£20 million
New Commissions	5,800	5,800

There were almost 14 million 'gross audience numbers' and an estimated 9 million 'net audience numbers'. In terms of participant numbers, there were 475,000 'gross participant numbers' and an estimated 350,000 'net participant numbers'. These are very significant numbers: audience numbers compare with West End theatre audiences of 12 million in 2005.

From the evidence of media reports, audience feedback and the views of independent assessors, the quality of events and activities was generally good, and in some cases excellent.

Value for Money

Subsidy per Head from the UCP for audiences was estimated at £1.95 and for participants at £5.57. Taking outputs like Payment to Artists, the quality of the UCPs, the Sustainability gains of the UCPs, plus limited evidence on outcomes such as economic and social impacts) into consideration, my view is that the Value for Money from the UCPs was good.

Outcomes

The main aims for the UCPs were – to demonstrate that they could deliver large-scale projects to time and budget; to build partnerships; to increase participation; to increase the capacity of the arts sector; to impact positively on cultural tourism and regeneration; and to increase community capacity and help social cohesion.

UCPs have been successful in showing that they can deliver large-scale projects. They have built good partnerships. The outputs demonstrate that participation was increased, while the views of UCP lead officers, partners and deliverers is that the capacity of the arts sector has been increased.

The perceptions of UCP lead officers is that the UCP has made a difference in terms of cultural tourism and regeneration. However, there is limited quantitative evidence to establish exactly how much the UCPs have achieved in these terms.

Similarly, there is insufficient evidence to quantify how much UCPs have increased community capacity and helped social cohesion. Though many activities, often participatory activities, were programmed, there is little available evidence on the demographic profiles of audiences or participants and the impacts of the UCP activities on them.

Overall, UCP Lead Officers are positive about the achievements of their UCP rating it, on average, 4.23 out of a maximum of 5. Deliverers and partners were also positive about whether the UCP had helped to achieve their aims – on average, 4.43 out of a maximum of 5.

Sustainability and Development

The sustainability records of the UCPs are good, particularly given that the nature of festivals is to be 'here today, gone tomorrow'. Partly, this is because some UCPs are part of a much longer cultural process or were designed as pilots for future festivals or where future funding for culture was already in the pipeline. But there are many other examples of sustainability – programme-streams continuing, arts organisations developing and becoming more sustainable, capacity increases in the community sector, stronger more effective partnerships, ways of working that have been adopted by other Council departments, other funding streams being tapped into, capital projects being progressed and last, but by no means least, the on-going development of the Cultural Cities Network.

UCP Lead Officers were positive in their rating of the impact of the UCP on sustainability of the cultural sector in their city as a whole. On average, they rated it as 3.84, that is, getting on for 'more sustainable'. Deliverers and partners gave a lower average rating of 3.58 – not unexpected, given that a number of individuals interviewed were from well-established, funded, sustainable organisations. In terms of their development, arts organisations and others were significantly more positive about the impact of the UCP, rating it on average at 4.29 out of 5.

Overall, the UCPs' record in terms of sustainability and development has been greater than expected.

Impact on the Local Authority

UCP Lead Officers are positive about the impact of the UCP on their local authority. They believe it has raised the profile of culture though perhaps not to a great extent. On average, they rated the impact at 3.88 – between having

a minimal and a positive impact. Partners and deliverers were a little less positive, with a average rating of 3.54.

Legacy

The legacy of the UCP is three-fold. First, the example of the UCPs themselves shows that local authorities can deliver large-scale, complex, innovative festivals to time, on budget. Second, there are many gains in sustainability. Third, the UCPs have had a small impact in raising the profile of culture in their local authorities.

Themes and Issues

There were a number of themes and issues.

The lead-in time was insufficient and impacted negatively in terms of marketing, sponsorship, building new partnerships, failing to embed monitoring and evaluation systems, hindering cross-UCP programming and in legacy planning. It is recommended that Government Departments and National Funding Agencies ensure that they give sufficient lead-in times for future cultural programmes.

The lack of serious thinking about Monitoring and Evaluation and of any agency taking the lead on this has meant that a golden opportunity to conduct robust quantitative evidence for the economic and social impacts of culture has been missed. It is recommended that a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, with the appropriate resources, is put in place at the start of any planning for future cultural programmes of this scale.

Most UCPs commented favourably on the flexibility and hands-off approach of the DCMS, MC and ACE. The UCP acts as instructive lesson in the benefits of such an approach.

There are specific difficulties about counting the outputs of large-scale, free public events and a view in some quarters that these outputs are somehow not so 'real' as outputs from arts events in theatres, galleries and concert halls. It is recommended therefore, as a means for overcoming the present practical difficulties in estimating these outputs, that the DCMS and its cultural partners look to resolve this particular issue.

There were few differences between City-based and City & Region UCPs. City & Region UCPs had to work hard to ensure that their programmes were perceived by residents and other local authorities as being for both the city and the wider region. Plus, the existing arts and cultural infrastructure in some cities may not have sufficient capacity to serve the wider region.

The Cultural Cities Network was widely praised by UCP Lead Officers and others. It is a network which embodies a wealth of learning and practical experience in managing large-scale cultural programmes. It is important that it is sustained and its expertise disseminated to other cities, the development and funding agencies and, in particular, to LOCOG and the 2012 Olympics

and Paralympics. It should be viewed as a resource for everyone to use rather than as competition.

Introduction

The Urban Cultural Programme (UCP) was announced in 2004 and funded by Arts Council England (ACE) (£6 million) and the Millennium Commission (MC) (£13.5 million). It emerged as a response to the two-year selection process for the 2008 European Capital of Culture, which was awarded to Liverpool, and the development of the Cultural Cities Network amongst those cities bidding for the European Capital of Culture. The Cultural Cities Network comprises Belfast, Birmingham, Bradford (for five Yorkshire cities including Hull, Leeds, Sheffield and York), Brighton and Hove, Bristol, Canterbury and East Kent, Cardiff, Inverness and the Highlands, Liverpool, NewcastleGateshead, Norwich and Oxford. In addition to these 13 cities, a further six were successful in their bids to the UCP – Blackburn with Darwen, London Leaside, London South East (Lewisham, Greenwich), Manchester, South Lanarkshire, Swansea and the Three Cities (Derby, Leicester, Nottingham).

Bids were invited for:

- Cultural programmes - festivals, events, exhibitions and showcases - demonstrating that culture and the arts are central to the life of the area, contributing towards its regeneration
- Cultural programmes of excellence for all residents and visitors in the area
- Cultural programmes with clearly defined objectives around one or more of the following:
 - Uniting communities
 - Cultural diversity
 - Opportunities among young people and community groups
 - Creative learning and development - presenting new opportunities for individuals and communities
 - International co-operation - promoting the area's cultural profile in Europe
 - Protecting and sustaining the environment
- Cultural programmes with a legacy value, demonstrating long-term community or other lasting public benefits
- Projects that are millennial in nature - in that they celebrate in some way the start of the new millennium
- Cultural programmes with strong public support

The Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) commissioned Leisure Futures to provide an overview evaluation of the national UCP programme.

The aim of the evaluation is:

- To assess the success of the UCP programme, the effect it has had in repositioning cultural services in the 19 city/regions both strategically and in relation to other services, and lessons to be learnt for future

funding of such festivals with particular consideration for events which might be held around the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

The objectives are:

- To map what has been achieved with the UCP funding/impact of individual festivals
- Did the UCPs achieve what they set out to do?
- What have been the lessons learned? What works and what doesn't?
- Has the UCP led to a long term change in cultural arrangements in the cities?
- Has the UCP established new partnerships, levered in new money etc?
- What, if any, has been the legacy value of the UCP?

Methodology

The evaluation was carried out in two stages. The first stage focussed on the first two objectives of the evaluation – to map what has been achieved and to assess the extent to which the UCPs have achieved what they set out to do. This first stage was based on secondary and desk research. The DCMS provided any reports and information sent to them by individual UCPs. UCPs were requested to supply information on:

- Their programme of events and activities
- Funding and finance
- Key Outputs – numbers of visits, audience profile, participants, performances, etc.
- Key Outcomes – the key aims for each UCP, how programme strands aimed to impact on these aims and evidence of achievement (including impacts on legacy)

Information was also collected from the MC and ACE, including final returns and independent evaluations where available. Further information was requested from individual UCPs – for instance, existing evaluations, research reports.

An Interim Report was produced as background information for the DCMS at the Great Expectations conference at Canterbury on 13th October 2006 preparatory to the second stage of the evaluation.

In addition to the continuing collection of information from UCPs, the second stage involved devising, piloting and then implementing two sets of semi-structured interviews – one for Lead Officers, another for deliverers, partners and others involved with the UCP. The interviews were designed to gather information and views on a range of topics including the organisation and structure of the UCP and any attendant advantages and disadvantages; aims and achievement of aims; the perceived impacts of the UCP (cultural, economic, social); issues around sustainability, development, the impact of the UCP in terms of raising the profile of culture in the local authority, and legacy; and other issues around the process of the UCP generally, the Cultural Cities Network and views on any future developments.

In addition to exploring and testing their views, interviewees were also asked, where appropriate, to rate various aspects of their UCP.

Lead officers were asked to rate –

- how well partnerships had worked in delivering the UCP;
- the sustainability of these partnerships;
- whether the UCP had helped to change the profile of culture in their local authority;
- whether the UCP had increased the sustainability of the cultural sector in their city / region; and

- how they rated the performance of the UCP overall.

Deliverers and partners were asked to rate –

- the achievement of the UCP in terms of their organisation's aims;
- how well their partnership / involvement with the local authority had worked in delivering the UCP;
- the extent to which the UCP had helped their organisation's development;
- the extent to which the UCP had helped make their organisation more sustainable; and
- (where appropriate), their view on whether the UCP has helped to change the profile of culture in their local authority.

Six UCPs were visited – Birmingham, Blackburn with Darwen, Bradford / Leeds / Sheffield / York / Hull, Cardiff, Inverness and Highlands, and London Leaside. These were selected because (a) they covered a number of regions of the country; (b) were different sizes in terms of UCP programme and of local authority; (c) used differing organisational structures for developing and delivering the UCP; and (d) covered some UCPs which were arts-focused and others which also included sports, heritage and other cultural sectors. Interviews were held with the lead officers / managers at the UCP and a range of partners, deliverers and others involved.

Telephone interviews were held with the lead officers / managers in the other 13 UCPs. Shorter telephone interviews were also held with deliverers, partners, community organisations and others involved in the UCP.

In total 88 individuals were interviewed across all 19 UCPs.

Limitations of the National Evaluation

Despite the primary research in stage two, this evaluation is mainly reliant on the monitoring and evaluation carried out or commissioned by the individual UCPs, and the returns provided by the UCPs to MC and ACE. For a variety of reasons, these individual evaluations do not provide sufficient or robust enough information on the impacts, particularly the economic and social impacts, of the UCPs.

This is because –

- Some UCPs have not completed their programme, or the programme had been only recently completed and final returns were not available
- Some UCPs are part of a longer process of cultural renewal and there are difficulties in differentiating between where the UCP starts and stops within this longer process
- Some evaluations and research conducted were unavailable (because of time pressures, difficulties with retrieving the information, views on

confidentiality of evaluations, not being given priority amongst other tasks, etc.)

- Some evaluations were still in draft form
- There was an almost complete lack of consistency in the methodologies and formats adopted for evaluation across UCPs, compounded by some evaluations being independent, some in-house, and some focussing on individual programme-strands and activities rather than the UCP as a whole
- Many evaluations were based on qualitative assessments and anecdotal evidence rather than on robust quantitative research

There are gaps in the information, inconsistencies and vagaries in some of the reporting, some figures are challengeable, and a number of the conclusions of individual UCP evaluations lack rigour.

These difficulties have seriously hampered this evaluation and mean that a number of the conclusions drawn from the findings must be viewed with caution and, in some cases, as provisional. This relative lack of evidence of the UCPs is deeply disappointing: This report will return to this later under 'Themes and Issues'.

Finance

Funding & Income

The information in Tables One (below) and Two (next page) set out the funding and income sources for all 19 UCPs in summary and detail. Figures were derived from (a) final returns given to MC / ACE, (b) the financial information given by UCPs in the conference pack to the Great Expectations Conference, (c) financial information given by UCPs for the purposes of this evaluation and (d) final reports from independent evaluators.

It should be noted that, in some cases, there are significant variations between these sources. Some figures are clearly rounded estimates, some figures given to the Conference are lower than in the final returns, some returns are incomplete, and there may also be some unrecorded over-runs in expenditure matched by unrecorded increases in local authority funding. For these reasons there is an in-built margin of error in the figures given.

Table One shows that, nationally, UCP grants of £19,500,000 levered in Total Partnership Income recorded at £39,368,012 – that is, every £1 of UCP funding levered in £2 from other sources. Total Income nationally was recorded at £58,868,012. These figures, which will increase when final returns are received emphasises the significance of the Programme.

Table One

URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME INCOME - SUMMARY		
	Totals	Percentage of Total Funding
<u>UCP Funding</u>	<u>£ 19,500,000</u>	<u>33%</u>
<u>Partnership Funding</u>		
Local Authority Funding	£ 13,323,989	23%
Private Sector	£ 6,285,500	11%
Other Income	£ 19,758,523	34%
<u>Total Partnership Income</u>	<u>£ 39,368,012</u>	<u>67%</u>
TOTAL INCOME	£ 58,868,012	

Table Two, overleaf, analyses funding by UCP.

Urban Cultural Programme: National Evaluation

Table Two - Income

City / Region	UCP grant	LA	Private sector	Other Income	TOTAL INCOME	UCP: %AGE	PRIVATE SECTOR: %AGE
Belfast	1,350,000	1,230,000	32,500	509,300	3,121,800	43%	1%
Birmingham	2,100,000	578,368	1,502,459	1,901,935	6,082,762	35%	25%
Blackburn with Darwen	500,000	702,781	39,720	14,000	1,256,501	40%	3%
Bradford (Leeds, Sheffield, York Hull)	1,750,000	900,422	202,640	313,696	3,166,758	55%	6%
Brighton & Hove	750,000	65,000	599,500	663,675	2,078,175	36%	29%
Bristol	1,550,000	215,190	395,895	3,520,369	5,681,454	27%	7%
Canterbury & East Kent	750,000	223,250	272,250	695,931	1,941,431	39%	14%
Cardiff	1,300,000	1,415,408	33,896		2,749,304	47%	1%
Inverness & Highlands	500,000	460,454	48,089	38,400	1,046,943	48%	5%
Liverpool	1,200,000	263,621	2,109,263	3,069,316	6,642,200	18%	32%
London Leaside (Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets)	750,000	750,000		750,000	2,250,000	33%	0%
London South East (Lewisham, Greenwich)	500,000	914,000			1,414,000	35%	0%
Manchester	500,000			260,000	760,000	66%	0%
NewcastleGateshead	2,750,000	2,400,000	846,000	6,940,000	12,936,000	21%	7%
Norwich	500,000	170,000	0	130,000	800,000	63%	0%
Oxford	600,000	166,350	163,063	782,401	1,711,814	35%	10%
South Lanarkshire	700,000	851,045	40,225	94,500	1,685,770	42%	2%
Swansea	650,000				650,000		
Three Cities (Derby, Leicester, Nottingham)	800,000	2,018,100		75,000	2,893,100	28%	0%
TOTALS	£ 19,500,000	£ 13,323,989	£ 6,285,500	19,758,523	£ 58,868,012	33%	11%

Private Sector income is recorded, nationally, at £6,285,500 or 11% of Total Income. UCPs appear to have allocated income in different ways and this figure will also include some Box Office and Fees Income. In the main, though, this refers to Business Sponsorship and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) funds.

While this is a reasonable total for sponsorship (particularly given the innovative nature of some of the events and the short lead-in time), much more sponsorship and buy-in generally from the Private Sector will be needed for the programmes to be sustainable, particularly those programmes associated with cultural tourism, place marketing and large-scale urban renewal.

Apart from 'Other Income' (which includes income from a variety of sources including other public sector agencies, box office and fees, and in-kind support), the largest source of partnership funding came from the local authorities hosting the UCP programme - £13,323,989 or 23%. This shows the commitment of the UCP cities to their programmes.

Table Two gives some of the detail to the national picture. It shows that UCP grants varied from £500,000 (for Blackburn with Darwen, Inverness & Highlands, London South East, Manchester and Norwich) to £2.1 million for Birmingham and £2.75 million for NewcastleGateshead.

Recorded overall income varied from £760,000 for Manchester to £12,936,000 for NewcastleGateshead. This disparity is explained by the different purposes of the UCP programmes. Manchester's programme is for a series of three trailblazing artistic events to the 2007 Manchester International Festival. NewcastleGateshead's programme, managed by NewcastleGateshead Initiative, was a major part of a much longer programme, the culture¹⁰ programme, extended across 2004 and 2005, included major sports and tourism events and took place across the wider region. In turn, this programme was part of a much longer process of cultural renewal for the cities of Newcastle and Gateshead and the wider region.

UCP funding as a percentage of the total recorded income varies from 18% for Liverpool and 21% for NewcastleGateshead to a recorded 63% for Brighton and Hove and 66% for Manchester. (Returns were not received from Swansea.)

Income from the Private Sector, as recorded by UCPs, varied from 0% in London Leaside, London South East, Manchester and Swansea to 20% in Brighton, 25% in Birmingham and 32% in Liverpool. At least some of these figures are likely to be under-estimates. The higher levels of Private Sector income from Liverpool can be accounted for by the fact that it is European Capital of Culture in 2008 and the UCP is only part of a much longer process of cultural renewal. Birmingham and Brighton, similarly, have an established tradition of using culture as part of their renewal. Plus, programmes in these UCPs may have been more attractive to private sector sponsorship or these

UCPs may have been organisationally better equipped to gain funding from this sector.

In terms of funding from the cities themselves, Blackburn with Darwen, Cardiff, and South Lanarkshire all more than matched the UCP funding while the partnerships in London South East (Lewisham and Greenwich) and the Three Cities (Derby, Leicester and Nottingham) also more than matched their UCP funding.

Expenditure

There is less information available in terms of expenditure. What information is available is presented in different formats with different interpretations for allocating expenditure. Most reports analyse expenditure in terms of individual projects, programme-streams and activities rather than by type of expenditure (e.g. Artistic / Cultural Expenditure, Marketing, Staffing and Other Costs) and it is unclear whether individual Project Expenditure includes allocations for Marketing, etc. Finally, some expenditure figures given are draft and provisional.

For these reasons only, the analysis of expenditure for the UCP nationally must be viewed as giving a broad indication only.

Table Three

URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME EXPENDITURE		
	Expenditure	Percentage of Total Expenditure
Direct artistic / cultural expenditure	£ 28,837,619	75%
Marketing Expenditure	£ 3,268,677	9%
Other (Core Costs, Overheads, etc.)	£ 6,298,813	16%
Total	£ 38,405,109	

Based on 10 UCPs representing 66% of national expenditure

From this information, it appears that Direct artistic / cultural expenditure accounts for around three quarters (75%) of all expenditure. Given the variety of UCPs and, within each UCP the variety of types and scales of projects, this is a reasonable proportion of expenditure, though it should be noted that in some cases these costs are allocated to organisations rather than projects and, therefore, may include an apportionment to that organisation's core costs (staffing, overheads, etc.).

Marketing Expenditure averages 9% of total expenditure. For most of the UCPs analysed this appears to refer to 'central marketing expenditure'. Given

the one-off nature of much of the programming, the very wide spread of programming and the different audiences aimed at, this is a reasonable level of expenditure on marketing.

The remaining expenditure went on the Core Costs of managing the programme and Overheads. In some cases, these appear to include the staffing costs of the lead UCP; in other cases an overhead charge has been made by the local authority. All these factors make it difficult to get to a reasonable approximation of these costs. Nevertheless, UCP staffing costs (not including any staffing costs in organisations funded, commissioned or contracted) would in general appear to be around 10% of total costs.

In addition, to these recorded expenditures, there will be other costs. First, and as noted above, some of the lead local authorities will have overspent on their funding but not declared this in their returns to the MC and ACE. This will largely be because they do not see the necessity of so doing – they have, after all, fulfilled their partnership funding commitment to the UCP.

The second set of unrecorded expenditure is likely to be more significant. Many of the programmes of the UCPs were delivered by existing revenue-funded clients of ACE and the local authorities. These organisations will have charged for their additional costs in delivering these programmes and these will be recorded in the figures above. But it is likely that some will not have apportioned their core costs (core salaries, administration, overheads, etc.) and charged the correct amount to the UCP. It is impossible at this stage to come to any view of the extent to which this happened, though it should be noted that it is standard practice for many charitable trusts and public sector funding streams not to allow a proportion of core costs for specific, additional project-work.

Organisation & Structures

Varieties of Organisation

UCPs were organised through a variety of organisational structures, in some cases driven by the award of UCP funding, in other cases built on existing models. These organisational structures included, the UCP being managed –

- In-house by the local authority, often with a temporary increase in staff. Sometimes the UCP was managed by the Arts or Culture department, (e.g. Belfast, Blackburn with Darwen, Swansea) sometimes by a broader, cross-departmental group in the local authority (e.g. Cardiff).
- By a partnership of local authorities, sometimes with other partners including regional ACE and the Regional Cultural Consortium, though usually with one local authority taking the lead (e.g. Bradford with Leeds, Sheffield, York and Hull Councils, Yorkshire Culture and ACE Yorkshire; or London Leaside UCP led by Leaside Regeneration, with the Cultural Industries Development Agency (CIDA) and the London Boroughs of Hackney, Newham and Tower Hamlets).
- Through 'arms-length' arrangements with a voluntary / third sector / social enterprise organisation set up sometimes initially to lead the Capital of Culture bid or for the UCP programme itself. These arms-length arrangements take a variety of forms and have greater or lesser independence from the local authority. Some third sector organisations are responsible for developing and managing the whole UCP programme (e.g. the Brighton and Hove Arts Commission in Brighton, Oxford Inspires in Oxford, the Manchester International Festival in Manchester, others for single programme-strands (e.g. in Inverness and Highlands where the Council worked closely with existing third sector organisations and promoters).
- Others have formed 'pan-local authority' arrangements (for instance, Newcastle and Gateshead Councils, had already formed NewcastleGateshead Initiative (NGI) as a Marketing Destination Agency, and after the decision to give the European Capital of Culture to Liverpool, the Councils passed the responsibility to NGI to manage its culture¹⁰ programme as a regional programme across the North East

In nearly all UCPs, these organisational structures were underpinned by a web of partnerships – with other funders but also, particularly, with a range of deliverers drawn mainly from the existing arts sector (and, for those UCPs with programmes embracing libraries, heritage and sport, from those sectors as well). Often UCP management has been supplemented by Arts Forums / Consortia / Commissions which have advised, or had effective authority, on policy and funding decisions, and Steering Groups to ensure the success of particular programmes and events.

The main rationales for the different organisational structures were –

- To develop and build strong partnerships between a variety of agencies across the public and voluntary sectors (and, occasionally, the private sector)
- To make best use of the expertise, know-how, networks and contacts within the different organisations
- To help build capacity in the existing arts (and cultural) sectors
- To ensure that local communities were engaged in the UCP

In addition, those UCPs which set up independent voluntary organisations to manage the UCP did so in the belief that these would –

- Ensure more creative, effective and timely delivery of arts and culture programmes
- Attract increased funding from the private sector
- Help ensure the sustainability of the arts and culture ‘offer’ in their city after the end of the UCP itself.

Is one organisational structure better than the others at managing a creative, inclusive UCP programme which achieves its aims and has maximum impacts (cultural, economic and social)?

The short answer is ‘No’. All organisations were ‘fit for purpose’ in that – despite some upsets over individual activities – they delivered a relatively large-scale and usually complex project to time and, mostly, within budget. The views of lead officers / managers, partners, deliverers, the media, audiences and independent assessors are generally positive, indicating that quality and creativity met expectations.

What appears to work best is developing structures which work with the grain of the existing ethos and ways of working of the local authority or local authorities leading the process. Working in partnership, and making the most of different organisations’ skills, networks and strengths, appears to be key, as does engaging the existing arts and cultural sector. The commitment and backing of the local authority, not just in terms of funding, is also important. These were some of the keys to the success of the UCP.

Plus, most if not all UCPs found internal ways of working, and of delegating decision-making which minimised the bureaucracy and eased delays in decision-making.

On the evidence of the UCP, the stereotype of the local authority arts service as worthy but dull should be put to rest – at least for UCP local authorities.

Programmes

Introduction

From the evidence of the secondary material available – brochures, programme notes, audience feedback, DVDs of events and activities, media coverage – the UCP programmes appear to be creative, innovative, inclusive and exciting. There is both an art and a science to good artistic programming on this scale, an intelligence, planning, creativity and risk-taking in constructing programmes that appeal to a wide range of tastes but not to the lowest common denominator, that are neither hidebound by an out-of-date idea of ‘high culture’ on the one hand nor a populist dumbing-down on the other, but are genuinely creative.

It appears that the UCP programmes, in large part, have achieved this ideal.

Range of Events and Activities

A provisional classification of 15 UCPs was made in terms of the range of events and activities. It should be noted that (a) many of these classifications are very broad (‘Western Arts’, for instance, includes everything from opera and ballet to rock, pop and indie music), (b) a large number of events and activities could have been allocated to more than one category (for instance ‘Western Arts’ or ‘participatory’) and (c) where full programme details were not available, some programme-strands were not allocated any category and others which were may have been mis-categorised. Table Four sets out the findings.

Table Four
URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME
RANGE OF PROGRAMMES

Cultural Activity	Numbers of Programme Strands	Percentage	Numbers of UCPs
Western Arts	221	37%	15
Participatory Activities	73	12%	9
Non-Western Arts	72	12%	10
Festivals	56	9%	10
Creative Industries	42	7%	9
Sport	32	5%	3
Crafts, Design and Applied Arts	17	3%	6
Heritage / Museum- based work	16	3%	6
Libraries	5	1%	3
Other	68	11%	9
TOTAL	602		

Base: 15 UCPs

Although there is a wide margin of error, Table Four gives a broad idea of the cultural programming of UCPs. It shows that the focus in nearly all UCPs was on Arts programmes – with over one-third (37%) categorised as Western Arts and a further 12% as Non-Western Arts. Western Arts programme streams featured in all 15 UCPs analysed. Non-Western Arts programmes featured in 10 of the 15 UCPs.

Participatory activities (including western arts, non-western arts and other participatory activities, but not sports participatory events) were also central to UCPs. They account for around 12% of all programme strands and feature in some 9 of the 15 UCPs analysed. In fact, participatory activities are even more prevalent than appears from Table Four because some participatory activities have been categorised elsewhere (for instance, under western arts).

Festivals and celebratory events generally also featured in 10 of the 15 UCPs and accounted for 9% of the programme streams. Many of these Festivals were Western Arts orientated. These figures downplay the actual impact of Festivals and celebratory events firstly because some have been categorised under other categories (Western Arts, Non-Western Arts, Other) and secondly because many of these events have been centrepieces to the UCP. For these reasons, celebratory events were both more prevalent across UCPs and had more impact than appears from Table Four.

Creative Industries – including media, film, DJing, fashion, etc – is also widely programmed across UCPs accounting for around 7% of all programme strands and featuring in nine of the 15 UCPs analysed.

While Sport appears to be fairly significant, with around 5% of all programme strands, only three of the 15 UCPs analysed featured sport at all. However, when they did – as, for instance, with NewcastleGateshead – they were an important part of the programme.

Crafts, Design and Applied Arts (3% of programme strands) and Heritage / Museum-based work (3% of programme strands) both featured in six out of the 15 UCPs analysed.

Other cultural sectors were less important or prevalent across the UCPs nationally, but did make an impact in individual programmes –

- Oxford had a strong Heritage / Museum-based strand and featured a number of science projects
- Brighton had a strong environmental theme to its programme
- South Lanarkshire had an emphasis on programming for children and young people
- Liverpool had strong horticultural, children's play and culinary arts themes
- Bristol had an extensive library-based project
- NewcastleGateshead featured both international sport events (e.g. the Seve Trophy) and the heritage / tourism appeal of the Tall Ships

Common Programming: Large-Scale Celebratory Events, Participatory Activities, International Events, 'Social Inclusion' Programmes

Two of the key programming themes are the large-scale, outdoor celebratory events and festivals on the one hand, and the host of usually smaller-scale participatory activities on the other. While both these elements are present in existing festivals and the arts sector generally, they have been given a much-welcome, greater focus and prominence in the UCPs.

Festivities, celebrations, spectacles, large-scale participatory work and work that takes place in the public realm give a buzz and excitement to any festival programme. Because they take place in the public realm and are free, they are more accessible to a wider cross-section of the population than most arts events and activities and, potentially, through living on in the public memory, have a greater impact. Much of this work in the UCPs has been innovative and spectacular, for instance Canterbury's public art commissions, Bradford's lighting of the Town Hall.

Participatory work also extends the boundaries of art, changes the relationship of individuals and groups to the making of art and helps to break down the boundaries between professionals and non-professionals. Participatory work can also extend people's skills, increase their self-confidence and help foster new social networks – all to the benefit both of the individual and community. For many years, participatory work has been seen by some in the arts world as a poor relation and, through its emphasis on

process as well as product, as producing poor quality art. Improving the practice of participatory work and shifting this perception may be two of the most valuable legacies of the UCP.

A third key theme has been the international element in many UCPs, helping to widen and inspire British artists' and audiences' thinking with the latest developments happening across the world, and making Britain a much less insular island. The most striking example of this is Blackburn's showcasing of the Third Fukuoka Asian Art Triennale with contemporary Asian artists from around 20 countries including Japan, China, Korea and Thailand as well as India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, and helping to create both artistic and cultural links between Blackburn and East Asia. But there are many other notable examples of international links – in Belfast, Birmingham, Canterbury, Cardiff, Inverness and Highlands, NewcastleGateshead and elsewhere.

A final theme was the number of programmes and activities which focussed on hard-to-reach groups including asylum seekers, refugees, prisoners, groups on housing estates in renewal areas and BME communities including Somalis, Yemenis, Congolese, etc. Many of these were also genuinely innovative – Swansea's 'Incredible Journeys', a creative therapeutic project for asylum seekers and refugees which has become a referral pathway for individual therapeutic work, or Bristol's Fragrant Bristol project involving local people as growers and arrangers of flowers and bringing together groups including the ladies of the Portishead Horticultural Society, the Malcolm X Elders and the inmates of Leyhill Prison. Though perhaps not so typical of hard to reach groups, Brighton's programme celebrating the artistic achievements of older people is also noteworthy.

Central to all this range of programming – whether large-scale celebratory work, smaller-scale participatory work, international work or work with hard-to-reach groups – was the commissioning of new work across a wide range of art-forms.

These different programming elements emphasise the range of different audiences that have been targeted by the UCPs – from excluded hard-to-reach groups, to local communities, to 'communities of interest', to city wide and regional audiences, to events aimed at a national or even international audience (for instance, Manchester International Festival's Gorillaz premiere, Birmingham's four year project to perform the complete works of Stravinsky, Bradford's Hockney, Bronte and Delius programmes).

However, there appear to be some gaps in UCP programmes generally – there were few events which could be termed 'youth culture' or 'club culture' and which appeal directly to a large section of urban youth. And while many UCPs made international links, bringing over exhibitions, writers, poets from Europe and further afield, there were – apart from the Friendship Project – comparatively few collaborations between UCPs. (The lack of lead-in time is one reason for this.)

Perhaps surprisingly, although there are many examples of innovative programming there has been little which has been controversial. Perhaps more surprising, there has been little which has been directly challenging politically (though perhaps Steve McQueen's exhibition on Iraq as the final UCP event leading up to the Manchester International Festival will change that a little).

Outputs

Outputs, in terms of Audience Numbers, Participant Numbers, Artists, Number of Performances and Exhibitions, and Total Days' Employment for Artists, are based on estimates given by UCPs and have been taken either from their final returns to the MC / ACE or are from independent evaluations. Table Five summarises these outputs for the UCP nationally.

Table Five

URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME		
OUTPUTS	Numbers	Nos. of UCPs reporting
Audience Numbers	13,766,581	19
Participant Numbers	448,387	16
Artists	42,071	14
Numbers of performances and exhibitions	15,785	16
Workshops	42,375	15
Total days' employment for artists	50,656	11

Gross Audience Numbers

Audience numbers (i.e. Total Visits or Throughput) to date are estimated at 13,766,581 by the individual UCPs. NewcastleGateshead, Birmingham, Cardiff, Belfast and Liverpool each have estimated Audience Numbers of over 1.5 million each, while only London South East and Manchester, with their very specific and targeted programmes, have estimated Audience Numbers of less than 100,000. (Full details of Outputs are given on the next page in Table Six.) These overall audience numbers compare well with West End theatre audiences of 12 million in 2005.

The Audience Numbers at NewcastleGateshead, Birmingham, Cardiff, Belfast and Liverpool can be explained by the number of large-scale (and very large-scale) free, public events and by the fact that these were, with Bristol, the largest UCP programmes. These large scale celebratory public events are akin to the fireworks displays and other celebrations that inaugurated the millennium – estimating numbers for such events is fraught with difficulties. As with the financial inputs and other of the outputs, different UCPs appear to have used different methods of estimating audience numbers, some using police estimates, some using commercial footfall figures (e.g. in shopping malls and precincts), others using their own estimates.

Urban Cultural Programme: National Evaluation

Table Six

URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME: OUTPUTS	Audience Numbers	Participant Numbers	Artists	Numbers of performances and exhibitions	Numbers of new commissions / works	Workshops	Total days' employment for artists
Belfast	1,600,000	30,000	5,000				
Birmingham	1,937,694	16,054	2,824	1,200	513	5,259	5,348
Blackburn with Darwen	158,902	150,000	95	355		776	388
Bradford, Leeds, Sheffield, York, Hull	496,773	5,617	2,277	1,344	351	18,111	4,175
Brighton & Hove	121,283	6,011	2,146	925	36	478	
Bristol	342,000	2,398	375	1,288	141	537	
Canterbury & East Kent	307,483	5,085	440	205		328	
Cardiff	1,848,529	78,497	18,049	2,339	72	98	7,496
Highland	148,294	30,078		1,123		810	10,490
Liverpool	1,539,828	50,639	4,324	2,423	1,145	8,829	10,708
London Leaside (Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets)	351,486	3,792	1,643	119	57	352	538
London South East (Lewisham, Greenwich)	62,097	3,303	939	264	33	156	617
Manchester	9,575						
Newcastle & Gateshead	3,687,468	23,033	2,827	1,348	331	1,383	6,850
Norwich	125,188						
Oxford	125,000	30,000		1,100	505	1,322	1,521
South Lanarkshire	250,000			679	175	1,700	
Swansea	254,981	11,880	932	1,029	1,446	2,236	2,525
Three Cities (Derby, Leicester, Nottingham)	400,000	2,000	200	44	200		
TOTALS	13,766,581	448,387	42,071	15,785	5,005	42,375	50,656

While some of the estimates given by some UCPs may be considered optimistic, these can be balanced by other UCPs (for instance, Bradford, Blackburn) which have not included any estimates of their large-scale public events in the figures set out in Table Six. Neither do these audience numbers take into account the numbers who have witnessed events on television or radio, on the web, or through book loans.

There is a view that, however one bases one's estimate, audiences to free, outdoor events should be viewed differently from audiences to paying, usually indoor events where ticket receipts can give a much more accurate idea of audience numbers and where, importantly, individual audience members have chosen to give up their time and money to view or participate in arts and cultural events. There are a number of counter-arguments to this view. The first states that what is important is the artistic and creative thinking and work and the production values that have gone into making the show – whether it is free or not, or outdoors or indoors, is neither here nor there. Supporting this argument is the fact that many non-Western cultural traditions are outdoor, public and free – the Carnival traditions of Latin America and the Caribbean are the best-known of these. Excluding these and, with them, all public art-forms is, at best, narrow-minded. A second counter-argument points out that the democratic nature of such events means that they are much more accessible to a much wider range of the community than cultural events which take place in theatres, art galleries, concert halls or even free-at-entry museums. Free public art- or culture-led events are one of the main ways in which we can broaden the appeal of culture and ensure that its benefits are enjoyed by all.

This report considers that audience numbers to such events are legitimate outputs. However work is needed on standardising the methodology of collection, and a decision is required on whom to count: Everyone? Those who stay and watch? Those who came specifically for the event?

Net Audience Numbers

There is a more serious difficulty with claiming audience numbers of around 14 million for the UCP. It extends well beyond any logistical difficulties in estimating audience numbers for outdoor events and across the programmes as a whole.

This is the problem of additionality. In other words, if the UCP had not gone ahead, would some of these events have gone ahead anyway (perhaps with less marketing, or with a smaller production budget)? How many 'additional' audience numbers nationally can the UCP claim? Given that UCPs used the existing arts and cultural infrastructure in their cities and regional to help deliver their programme, how many audience numbers would these organisations and institutions have attracted anyway? And would some events have gone ahead anyway with funding from other sources? Have some events merely been 'badged' as UCP?

Establishing additionality would have been technically possible (though it would have been a complex and onerous task) if Baseline Research had been undertaken to establish audience numbers (and numbers of participants, etc.) in the UCP cities for their arts and cultural organisations' 'normal' annual programme in the year before the UCP. These could then have been compared with numbers during the period of the UCP with the additional numbers allocated to the UCP.

The difference between 'Gross Audience Numbers' and 'Net Audience Numbers' will vary from UCP to UCP. It will depend partly on the extent of arts infrastructure of individual UCP cities, their fit with the UCP programme and the extent to which the UCP wished to support and develop these third sector organisations – an aim of many UCPs for at least some of their programme. It will depend also on the type of activities in the UCP. Here, although there was some 'badging' many of the large-scale outdoor events were new and one-off. This report considers that many of the participatory activities are also additional. The difficulty, instead, lies with the mainstream of the programming where the likelihood is that better quality, more innovative events and activities and new commissions (plus better marketing) have *substituted* for existing programmes.

Based on available knowledge of the UCP programmes, and the organisations delivering those events and activities, this report suggests a broad-brush estimate of around nine million 'Net Audience Numbers' for the UCP nationally. This includes audience numbers at free, outdoor public events, including those at UCPs such as Bradford and Blackburn whose attendances at these events are not included in the figures in Tables Five and Six.

Participant Numbers

As noted previously, the programming of participatory workshops, activities and events is one of the defining characteristics of the UCPs. These range from workshops and sessions in schools and youth clubs (though linked to the themes of the UCP, for instance Blackburn's 'Asian Week' in all schools in Blackburn including an extensive Fashion Residency programme with an Asian fashion designer) through innovative work with hard-to-reach groups involving them in developing their skills and helping to include them in society (for instance, Birmingham's ArtSites project on renewal estates) to large-scale participatory events, (for instance, Canterbury's Community Opera) and celebrations (for instance, the Lantern Festivals, Carnivals and Parades in Cardiff, Swansea and Belfast).

Participatory work has been a real achievement of UCPs with 42,375 Workshop Sessions (recorded at 15 UCPs) and Participant Numbers of 448,387 (recorded at 16 UCPs). Based on these reported numbers and allowing for the scale of UCPs reporting, in total there were of the order of 475,000 Participant Numbers nationally in the UCP.

Not all of these participants will have gone to workshop sessions (some may have participated in activities at local festivals or large-scale celebrations or events like the Spencer Tunick exhibition in NewcastleGateshead. Many individuals are likely to have participated at a series of workshops or sessions. A broad-brush estimate is that somewhere around 70,000 individuals participated in UCP programmes, that is around 3,500 on average at each UCP.

These participants will have learned new skills, gained confidence, improved their social skills and developed new networks. Many will have been school-children in sessions in schools, youth clubs, libraries and elsewhere – raising their aspirations and attainment levels. Participatory work for some of the adults involved will have improved their chances of economic inclusion through their ‘volunteering’ onto these activities.

As with Audience Numbers, these are Gross Participant Numbers. How many participation opportunities would there have been if there had been no UCP? What is the net impact of the UCP in terms of participant numbers? Here, because participatory workshops and events was one of the key programming strands of UCPs, whereas these are not central to most arts or cultural programmes, the view of this report is that the numbers of Net Participant Numbers is proportionately larger than with Net Audience Numbers. A broad estimation is that there were around 350,000 Net Participant Numbers.

Audience and Participant Profiles

While there is reasonable information about the numbers of audiences and participants, the information on audience and participant profiles that we have received from UCPs is patchy.

There are a small number of audience research studies (for instance, from Bradford and NewcastleGateshead) whose main interest is in identifying the economic impact of the major events in their programmes. These are more interested in cultural tourism and, therefore, the proportion of individuals from outside the city or region attending the events. Unsurprisingly, these show audiences for these events as predominantly existing audiences for culture and predominantly from social classes ABC1. A similar study from London Leaside, for a large-scale event in Newham does not give profile by social class, but does by ethnicity: this indicates that the profile at the event is reasonably representative of Newham in terms of ethnicity.

Part of the rationale for free, large-scale celebrations is that they are accessible to all sections of the population and that audiences are made up as much by individuals from social classes C2DE as by individuals from ABC1. But no evidence has been presented to this evaluation to substantiate that claim.

Social inclusion was part of the rationale for many of the participatory activities – but no records have been made available giving a profile of participants to these activities.

Overall, no household surveys of UCP cities appear to have been conducted (none have been presented to this evaluation) which give a profile of audiences and participants or identify, for instance, the numbers of audiences and participants who are resident in Neighbourhood Renewal Areas.

The lack of quantitative evidence about the Audience and Participant Profiles for the UCP programmes, in terms of social class, BME, disabled audiences / participants, hard-to-reach and socially excluded groups is deeply disappointing. Given the scale of the UCP programme, it would be a serious omission if some robust form of quantitative evidence on Audience and Participants Profiles was not a condition of the MC and ACE awards. But this, indeed, appears to be the case. The questions and question design in the funders' 'Activity report forms' do not allow any such quantitative analysis. Only a very few, independent, robust research studies appear to have been carried out which could give this information. And, with hardly an exception, this information is not set out in any of the independent or in-house evaluations seen.

This is a serious omission and represents a real opportunity missed.

Artists, Total days' employment for artists

A total of 42,071 artists are reported as having taken part in the programmes of 14 UCPs, while 16 UCPs report 15,785 performances and exhibitions (defined as part-days of exhibitions). Based on these reported figures and allowing for the scale of UCPs reporting (which included nearly all of the largest UCPs), across the UCP nationally there are likely to have been round 46,000 artists taking part and some 17,000 performances and exhibitions. Again, these are impressive numbers.

11 UCPs reported information on the Total Days' Employment for artists: this was 50,656 days. Based on these reported figures and allowing for the scale of UCPs reporting (which included nearly all of the largest UCPs), across the UCP nationally there are likely to have been around 65,000 Total Days' Employment for artists. There is no commonly accepted salary level for artists, but assuming that these artists were paid at the Equity minimum (approx £335 per week) this would give an indicative payment to artists of around £44 million across the UCP nationally. This is around 75% of the total costs of the UCP and is line with the findings reported above.

However, these figures are the Gross Days' Employment for Artists. Some of these artists would have been otherwise employed if there had been no UCP. Given that many would have been employed within existing arts and cultural organisations where these are producing organisations, Net Days' Employment for Artists is likely to be considerably less. A broad-brush

estimate of around half this total is probably reasonable – in other words around 30,000 Net Days Employment for artists with an additional £20 million Net Payment to Artists.

New Commissions / Works

As Table Six shows, 13 UCPs reported 5,005 new commissions and works. Based on these reported figures and allowing for the scale of UCPs reporting, across the UCP nationally this amounts to around 5,800 new commissions and works. On average, this amounts to around 300 new commissions and works for each UCP.

This is a huge total and shows the extent to which the UCPs generated new commissions and art-works. It is very significantly larger than would have been the case without the UCP, since one of the main things that the UCP enabled cities to do was to take risks and be innovative. Indeed, it is doubtful if more than a very few new works would have been commissioned without the UCP.

Summary of Quantitative Outputs

A summary of the quantitative outputs, estimated across all 19 UCPs and giving gross and net outputs, is set out in Table Seven.

Table Seven
Urban Cultural Programme
Estimated Quantitative Outputs – Nationally

Output	Gross	Net
Audience Numbers	14 million	9 million
Audience Profile: Numbers from Neighbourhood Renewal Areas	Insufficient evidence	Insufficient evidence
Audience Profile: Numbers from Hard-to-Reach Groups	Insufficient evidence	Insufficient evidence
Audience Profile: Numbers from BME communities	Insufficient evidence	Insufficient evidence
Audience Profile: Numbers of disabled people	No evidence	No evidence
Participant Numbers	475,000	350,000
Individual Participants	70,000	56,000
Artists	46,000	46,000
Days' Employment for Artists	65,000	30,000
Payments to Artists	£44 million	£20 million
New Commissions	5,800	5,800

Though there is insufficient evidence to estimate some net outputs, Table Seven shows the significant level of outputs of the UCP nationally.

Quality

Any assessment of the value for money of cultural programmes, judged purely on cultural outputs, must take into account not only the quantitative outputs but also the qualitative of the events and activities.

There are a number of ways of judging quality –

- Self-assessment by the lead UCP organisations
- Self-assessment by partner and delivery UCP organisations
- Media coverage and assessment
- Audience feedback
- Peer and independent assessment

There is sufficient evidence for most UCPs through one or more of these ways (usually more than one way, often in terms of the views of the local and regional media and in terms of audience feedback) to rate the quality of the UCPs. This can be summarised as follows.

Table Eight:
Urban Cultural Programme – Assessment of Quality

Means of Judging Quality	Assessment
Lead UCP	Some reported poor quality events and activities, but overall quality viewed as good.
Delivery and Partner Organisations	Overall quality viewed as good.
Local and Regional Media	Almost universally, positive responses.
Audience Feedback	Reported audience feedback positive.
Peer and Independent Assessment	Independent Assessors generally favourable.

Here, the most persuasive evidence comes from local and regional media and from audience feedback. While much of this has been reported at second hand by those involved in the UCPs, a number of UCPs have provided collections of press cuttings and media reports and selections of comments from audiences and participants. A few audience surveys have also been made available to this evaluation: these also show very positive responses. Independent assessors, though sometimes veering towards advocacy, are also generally favourable in their assessments of programme quality.

Inevitably in programmes of this scale and variety, some events and activities will be best forgotten. But, even allowing for this, it appears that by and large the quality of the programmes of the UCPs was good and, that some events were excellent.

Value for Money

The Value for Money of the UCP, judged purely on Net Audience and Net Participant Numbers, is set out in Table Nine.

Table Nine

URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME: VALUE FOR MONEY	Subsidy per Head (Net Audiences)	Subsidy per Head (Net Participants)
UCP Funding	£ 1.95	£ 5.57
Total Funding	£ 5.89	£ 16.82

The figures are based on the assumption that a notional 90% of UCP and Total Funding went towards Audience Numbers and the remaining 10% towards Participant Numbers.

Table Nine shows that Subsidy per Head for Audiences (using Net Audience Numbers) was £1.95 for UCP funding, and £5.89 for Total Funding. Subsidy per Head for Participants (using Net Participant Numbers) was £5.57 for UCP funding, and £16.82 for Total Funding.

Given the wide variety of UCP programmes, and the wide variety of events and activities within each programme, it is not possible to benchmark these figures against other artistic and cultural Subsidy per Head indicators. Plus, these indicators are based on net audience and participant numbers, i.e. additional numbers. Nevertheless, the indicators indicate reasonable value for money.

Of course, Value for Money should also be judged on the package of outputs and on the outcomes of the UCPs. In terms of the former, the amount of Employment for Artists (30,000 days net) and Payments to Artists (£20 million net); the New Commissions (5,800) and the perceived quality of the UCPs generally need to be borne in mind. Because of poor monitoring it is not possible to quantify the economic and social outcomes of the UCP nationally, except to note that there have been some of these outcomes (See Outcomes below). Similarly, the greater than expected Sustainability gains must be taken into account in terms of Value for Money (See Outcomes below).

Taken these into consideration, this report considers that the Value for Money from the UCPs was good.

Outcomes

Introduction

Cultural programmes of the scale of the UCP need to be judged not only in terms of their outputs but also in terms of their outcomes – the extent to which they have achieved their aims; the cultural, economic and social impacts and differences they have made to their city and region; and their legacy values.

Aims

The aims of the MC and ACE Lottery Funds (see Introduction) when seeking bids for UCP funding were so extensive and widely framed that, apart from cultural programmes that were ‘more of the same’, it is difficult to imagine many programmes which would not be eligible for funding. Of course, there were reasons for this in terms of the previous history of the selection process for the European Capital of Culture. And the wide framing for eligibility for funding did also have the singular virtue that it enabled all the successful bidders to be creative and innovative.

To varying degrees, UCPs have achieved most of the MC and ACE’s aims. Some have shown that culture can contribute towards regeneration. Most have delivered good, sometimes excellent, programmes. Some events and activities have helped to unite communities. The programmes have, generally, been culturally diverse and given opportunities for community groups. There are examples of international co-operation, some promoting the area’s cultural profile in Europe. The UCPs have had some legacy value and a good number of the events have been well supported by the public.

But from the review of the UCPs, analysis of the information provided and discussion with lead UCP officers / managers and delivery and partner organisations, few direct links were found between the MC / ACE aims and the overall aims for individual UCPs, far less any links with individual activities, events and programme-streams.

In reality, most UCPs appear to have organised their programmes around themes and strands or, in some cases, around the desire to develop partnerships and evolve joint initiatives. Only afterwards did some then develop criteria which were retro-fitted to link in with the original aims. The personal and organisational aims of UCPs were probably different from the MC / ACE aims and, as is usual, were expressed differently and in different language. Plus, aims shift with the benefit of hindsight.

In the review of programmes and subsequent discussions with lead officers and managers, the main aims for UCP programmes were expressed as follows:

1. To demonstrate (to other Council departments, partners, the sector) that the arts or culture department / Council could deliver a complex, large-scale project to time and within budget
2. To develop and build partnerships with a variety of funding, development and delivery organisations
3. To increase participation in arts and, for some UCPs, in other cultural sectors
4. To increase the capacity of the arts sector and, for some UCPs, for other cultural sectors
5. To impact positively on cultural tourism, place marketing and improve the profile of the City / Region and internal and external perceptions of the City / Region and thereby to help with the regeneration of the City / Region
6. To increase community capacity and help social cohesion

Achievement of Aims

To demonstrate (to other Council departments, partners, the sector) that the arts or culture department / Council could deliver a complex, large-scale project to time and within budget

In terms of achievement of aims, local authority and lead agencies were positive that they had achieved the first of these aims. The comments of one Director of Leisure are typical: "It was important that we delivered a big project on time and to budget. By the end of the project the whole Finance Department was pleased by our performance. The Press took it on board. It helped us to be seen as a more professional set-up. That's useful when you are at the bidding table. The UCP also justified spending that amount of funding."

To develop and build partnerships with a variety of funding, development and delivery organisations

It was clear from all UCPs that the success of their programmes had been, to a large extent, built on a web of partnerships involving other Council departments, other local authorities (where the UCPs were regional), other funding partners (including some Regional ACE offices and Regional Cultural Consortia), and a plethora of arts and cultural organisations, mainly in the voluntary sector. In some UCPs, there were also partnerships with local universities and higher education colleges, cathedrals, partners from the health sector "Having a talking shop with money focussed minds. It was a real project. Previously we've had loads of formal partnerships, but with this programme we could formalise our relationships and get partners on board. Everyone could see the end game."

However, there were fewer partnerships with private sector organisations, though some Chambers of Commerce and Town Centre Partnerships were brought on board, while Blackburn's partnership with Blackburn Rovers was cemented by the UCP. Partnerships with Regional Development Agencies

varied from region to region and, apart from NewcastleGateshead, Bradford/Hull/Leeds/Sheffield/York and Birmingham, funding from the RDAs were relatively insignificant.

Bradford and other lead partners on the regional Bradford/Hull/Leeds/Sheffield/York UCP noted: “The UCP helped because it showed other sectors that partnership could work. We can always improve the relationship between the five cities. The relationship before varied between co-operative and collaborative to competitive depending on the area. And it still is all these; has to be. But the UCP demonstrated that there is real value in testing whether working together could be of greater benefit than going alone.”

Another benefit of working in partnerships with other local authorities was noted by the London Leaside UCP (a partnership of Hackney, Tower Hamlets and Newham with Leaside Regeneration [as the lead] and the Cultural Industries Development Agency): “It gives us more clout. While, with Leaside Regeneration leading, it means we are not tied to one local authority, and the way we relate to arts organisations is different.”

There was also a widespread concern amongst UCPs that, while they had been able to build on existing partnerships with established arts and cultural organisations, the short lead-in time for the UCP had meant that they hadn't been able to develop partnerships with newer and less well-established organisations. As one lead officer put it, “It tended to be ‘the usual suspects’.” The bureaucracy of delivering the UCP through many partnerships, despite the flexibility and hands-off nature of the MC and ACE generally, was seen as a challenge to some of the smaller and less well-established groups.

In general, though, the development of partnerships and their delivery of the programme was positive. Lead Officers of UCPs were asked to rate how effective overall their partnerships had been in terms of ‘getting the job done’. On a scale of 1 to 5, the average rating was 3.94 – very nearly ‘good’. Sustainability of partnerships was rated even better at 4.3, between ‘more sustainable’ and ‘much more sustainable’. Deliverers and partners were equally positive. They rated their partnership or involvement with the UCP at 4.01. (See Tables Ten and Eleven in the Appendix for average ratings for all questions put to Lead Officers and to Deliverers and Partners.)

To increase participation in arts and, for some UCPs, in other cultural sectors

The outputs – in terms of 9 million Net Audience Numbers and 350,000 Net Participant Numbers – demonstrate that participation in arts and other cultural sectors was increased, at least for the duration of the UCP. However anecdotal evidence suggests that the experience of most UCP Cities, where the UCP was not a part of a longer process of cultural renewal, is that Audience Numbers and Participant Numbers have fallen some way back towards the audience and participation levels before the UCP.

To increase the capacity of the arts sector and, for some UCPs, for other cultural sectors

This was an important aim for all UCPs. The increase in capacity has taken a number of forms – it has increased skills of arts organisations; arts and cultural networks have been developed and built; independent arts fora or consortia have been established or strengthened; production values improved; marketing improved; quality and innovation improved; and, perhaps most importantly, aspirations and ambitions were raised. “It really stretched us,” was a typical comment from an arts organisation.

The increase in performances and exhibitions, the great number of new commissions, the work with hard-to-reach groups, the focus on participatory work and large-scale work in the public realm have all had a positive impact in increasing the capacity of the arts and other cultural sectors.

There is also evidence in terms of a number of individual organisations (for instance, both Fèisean nan Gàidheal and Arts in Motion in Inverness and the Highlands, Taliesin in Swansea, East London Design Show in London Leaside, the Black Box in Belfast, Ikon in Birmingham) whose economic capacity has increased in terms of an increased number of jobs or larger contracts as a result, or partly as a result, of the UCP.

Most UCPs also had a ‘Small Grants’ Fund or similar which, in general, was distributed to smaller arts or cultural organisations or to community organisations to put on arts events and activities. These will also have had an impact, albeit unquantified, in increasing the capacity of the sector.

To impact positively on cultural tourism, place marketing and improve the profile of the City / Region and internal and external perceptions of the City / Region and thereby to help with the regeneration of the City / Region

This was the single most important aim for a number of UCPs. However, very few robust assessments appear to have been conducted to establish the extent to which this has been achieved.

SQW’s independent evaluation of the NewcastleGateshead Initiative’s Culture¹⁰ programme (with funding from the UCP) calculates that it attracted 263,000 visitors from outside the region, £24 million visitor expenditure, £8.4 million direct Gross Value Added (GVA), £13 million GVA supported by visitor expenditure and 960 full-time equivalent (fte) jobs. In terms of image and perceptions, the programme attracted £14 million coverage within and outside the North East.

Research conducted for Bradford shows that many of the audiences to their UCP came from outside the region and estimates the visitor spend per head.

But the actual economic impact has still to be calculated. In terms of image and perceptions, it calculates that the programme attracted some £600,000 in terms of coverage.

Research for the single trailblazer event at Manchester, Gorillaz, indicates that its economic impact was of the order of £0.75 million, while 80% of respondents to their survey who attended the event agreed with the statement that it “increased Manchester’s status as a city of cultural significance”. (Even 70% of those who did not attend, mainly because they couldn’t get tickets, agreed with that statement.) Post-code analysis showed that attenders came from across Britain, mainly from the main urban centres.

We understand that other similar research has been conducted for other UCPs, but this has not been made available to this evaluation.

Though it has a different, and not specifically cultural tourism, focus research conducted for the Three Cities estimates the economic impact to the region of the UCP at £2.55 million. Similarly, the independent evaluation of the London South East UCP estimated that there was additional leverage of £20.67 million to projects in the area at least partly as a result of the UCP.

In addition to this limited quantitative evidence, the perceptions of UCP lead officers is that the UCP has made a difference in terms of cultural tourism, place marketing and perceptions. One UCP Lead Officer commented, “The success of the UCP has helped secure the future.”

Despite the limitations of this research, its partial coverage, and the inconsistencies between the differing methodologies adopted, there are grounds for stating that UCPs have achieved this aim, at least in part. Once again, though, it is disappointing to record that there is not greater, less limited, more consistent research evidence on which to base this view.

To increase community capacity and help social cohesion

This also was an important aim for a number of UCPs. There is evidence in nearly all UCPs of specific programme-strands that have been developed and targeted at specific hard-to-reach and disadvantaged communities. These have clearly been designed to achieve the aims of increasing community capacity and aiding social cohesion.

Many of these programmes were participatory projects and, as such, designed to increase participants’ skills and confidence, to develop social networks and to increase trust – all necessary to community capacity and social cohesion. “The programme made groups more cohesive and, because the product was very good, it increased their confidence. And it was really exciting for the group leaders,” one Arts Director said. A comment from a Lead Officer: “We stretched the cultural agenda into other areas – and we stretched cultural organisations’ understanding of the Council’s agenda.”

There is insufficient evidence available to this evaluation to make a reasonable estimation of the number of 'Net Individual Participants' from renewal areas and hard-to-reach groups. However, making the tentative assumption that around a quarter of the 'Net Individual Participants' so come from these areas and groups, suggests that some 14,000 individuals from these areas participated in UCP programmes.

This would appear to be a considerable achievement, except that models of intervention in the youth work, community development and sports sectors suggest that the programmes should be regular and continue over many months if they are to achieve the desired social outcomes. Apart from the minority of activities which have been sustained since the UCP, it appears unlikely that the social outcomes from these programmes have been significant – though it should be noted that the perceptions of UCP lead officers and others is that the UCP has made a difference in terms of community capacity and social cohesion.

Nevertheless, I consider the evidence is insufficient on which to base a view about the extent to which this aim has been achieved.

Summary of Achievements

Lead Officers are positive about the achievement of their UCP. They were asked to rate their overall achievement, taking everything into consideration, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was very poor, 3 satisfactory and 5 very good. The average rating was 4.23, somewhat better than 'good'. (See Tables Ten and Eleven in the Appendix.)

Deliverers and partners were asked a similar question – how the UCP rated in terms of it helping their organisation to achieve their aims. Here, deliverers and partners rated the achievement of the UCP on their organisation as, on average, 4.43 out of a maximum of 5 – that is, almost midway between 'good' and 'very good'.

While it is to be expected that organisations would rate their own achievements, and those of partners, above average or more than satisfactory, these ratings do show the positive perceptions of most of those involved in the UCPs nationally.

The findings of this report are also positive. In summary, the UCPs -

- Have successfully demonstrated that they can deliver a complex, large-scale project to time and mainly within budget.
- Have increased participation in the arts and, for those UCPs which had sport, heritage or library programmes in those sectors as well, as evidenced by an estimated increase in Net Audience Numbers of around 9 million and an estimated increase in Net Participant Numbers of 350,000.

- Have developed partnerships with funding, development and delivery organisations though UCPs have tended to build on existing partnerships rather than developing new ones.
- Have increased the capacity of the arts sector and, for some UCPs, for other cultural sectors.
- Where one of the main aims of the UCP has been to impact positively on cultural tourism, place marketing, etc. this has been helped to an extent, but that more quantitative evidence is required to gauge the degree of achievement. It takes a long term process and a long term commitment for a city or region to be successful in fully achieving this aim: the UCP is only a small part of this process.
- Where one of the main aims of the UCP has been to increase community capacity and help social cohesion, there is insufficient evidence on which to base a view about the extent to which this aim has been achieved. Partly this is because programmes designed to increase community capacity and help social cohesion are more successful when continued over a period of time while the UCPs were, by their very nature, time-limited.

Sustainability and Development

UCPs were designed as festivals which, of their very nature, stage shows and events which are out of the ordinary, which are not run-of-the-mill or everyday, which are 'here today , gone tomorrow'. For this reason one should not expect too much in the way of sustainability. Nevertheless, the sustainability record of the UCPs is good. Partly this is because some UCPs are part of a much longer cultural process (for instance, Canterbury, Liverpool, NewcastleGateshead) or were specifically designed as pilots or trail-blazers for future festivals (for instance, Manchester, Norwich) or where future funding for culture was already in the pipeline (for instance, Inverness and Highlands which will benefit from the Scottish Executive's Highland 2007 celebrations).

But there are also many other examples of sustainability. For instance, to take a few examples –

- some programme-streams have been continued, for instance in South Lanarkshire 30% of the festival programme is being sustained, the NewcastleGateshead Initiative continues with around 50% of the original UCP events continuing, and in Birmingham, both the Igor Festival (where the complete works of Stravinsky are being performed) and the Ikon programme were programmed over three years
- some organisations are more sustainable, for instance, Taliesin in Swansea has, at least partly as a result of its UCP, has been

designated as a Regional Centre by Arts Council Wales which has resulted in significant additional funding and the ability to produce and curate tours, Strange Cargo have attracted new business as a result of their involvement in Canterbury's UCP

- the work that the Eden Court Theatre did with its outreach programme for Inverness and Highlands UCPs has resulted in many of the venues in towns and villages across the Highlands having better technical and front-of-house skills – increasing the production-values of the touring shows they present
- partnerships are stronger, for instance, the Three Cities (Derby, Leicester and Nottingham) have established a close working relationship with the Arts Council and will be continuing their collaboration with funding from the European Regional Development Fund
- Bristol's original reading programme of Jules Verne's '20,000 Leagues Under The Sea' was so successful that it is being followed up in partnership with Liverpool, Hull and Glasgow, and with £75,000 new funding, focussing on Andrea Levy's 'Small Island'
- individual UCP Festival brands have become established, for instance the 'Make it Real' brand in Canterbury
- in Cardiff, the way of project working on the UCP has been adopted by the local authority and used across all Council departments
- other funding streams have been found, for instance, in Bristol where an additional £400,000 has been levered in from the private sector, in Oxford where both the City and County Councils are contributing £100,000 each to continue the UCP programme and extend it across the County, in the Three Cities where the East Midlands Development Agency is funding an additional £75,000 to support capacity building of local arts organisations, in Newcastle Gateshead where the Northern Rock Foundation has committed £3 million to continue the culture¹⁰ programme beyond its original term.
- local authorities have progressed capital projects which they may not have done, for instance the feasibility study and potential future development of Blackburn's Museum; the development of the Cardiff Museum; and the development of the Gateside Creative Campus Centre in the London South East UCP
- the development of 'Arts Fora', 'Arts Consortia' and similar in a number of the UCP cities to lobby and advocate the arts to the Council
- the development of links between UCPs, for instance, the two London UCP partnerships have put in a joint application to the Heritage Lottery fund

- the on-going development of the Cultural Cities Network itself

The views on sustainability of those involved in the UCP are also encouraging. UCP Lead Officers were asked to rate the sustainability of the partnerships developed during the UCP on a scale of one to five, where three = perhaps a little more sustainable, four = more sustainable and five = much more sustainable. The average rating was 4.3. In terms of the sustainability of the cultural sector as a whole, the average rating was 3.84, that is, getting on for 'more sustainable'.

At first sight, deliverers and partners are less enthusiastic about their sustainability with an average rating of 3.58, that is, midway between 'a little more sustainable' and 'more sustainable'. However a number of individuals interviewed were from large, well-established, regularly-funded arts organisations where one would expect the impacts of a programme like the UCP on their sustainability to be minimal. One commented: "In terms of our development, the UCP expanded the possibilities, but I couldn't say it has increased our sustainability." Another was more encouraging: "Internationally, we are thinking of ourselves more as a transmitter of arts projects. The UCP has catalysed that and has helped with that process and that understanding."

The impact of the UCP on, at least some, newer and less established organisations is greater. "Before we were 'plate spinners', going from one source of project funding to the next, trying to keep all the plates spinning. The UCP gave us a period of grace and helped us to establish the evidence for our effectiveness. UCP seedcorn funding has worked." Another noted: "We feel more secure as an organisation. We have consolidated our relationships with community groups. The local authority see us more positively now, they don't view us so narrowly and they invite us into the process at an earlier stage."

In terms of their development, deliverers are significantly more positive about the impact of the UCP on their organisation's development, giving this an average rating of 4.29, that is the UCP has definitely helped them with their development. As noted previously, skills have been increased, networks widened and made more effective, aspirations and ambitions have been raised.

The findings suggest that the UCPs' record in terms of sustainability and development has been greater than expected, particularly given the nature of festivals. However, the key as always is ensuring continuity of funding.

Impact on the Local Authority

UCP Lead Officers are positive about the impact of the UCP on their local authority in terms of raising the profile of culture – though not so positive as they are about the sustainability of partnerships or the achievement of the UCP overall. The average rating for impact on the local authority is 3.88 –

where three = UCP has had some minimal positive impacts / shows that we can deliver a large-scale festival and four = UCP has had a positive impact.

Those partners and deliverers who had an opinion on this were a little less positive, with an average rating of 3.54.

Clearly these are average ratings. Nevertheless, only three out of 16 UCP lead officers responding to this question rated the impact as five (has had a great positive impact / has changed the way culture is viewed and done).

These findings are not unexpected – the UCP programme was not (except for libraries) part of the local authority's statutory services, the funding for it was external not mainstream, and the UCP itself was of limited duration. As such it was unlikely to have a great impact on cities, particularly those which had previously bid for European Capital of Culture and which already had a long-term commitment to culture.

Legacy

The legacy of the UCP is three-fold. First, in the examples of the UCPs themselves – proving that local authorities, sometimes on their own, sometimes in partnership, sometimes through independent or arms-length organisations, can put on large-scale complex projects to time and budget. Festivals which were, in the main, the antithesis of what many in the arts and cultural sectors outside local authorities would have expected – festivals which were innovative, risk-taking and of high quality. For many local authorities, the UCP was the first time they had attempted such an undertaking. The UCP has, in the main, increased those local authorities' capacity, it has "raised our game" as one UCP Lead Officer noted. It will undoubtedly be easier for those authorities to undertake a similar festival in the future. It may also prompt some other local authorities to develop their own cultural programmes.

Second, in the many gains in sustainability – in terms of programmes, organisations, partnership working, the capacity of arts and cultural organisations and the cultural sector generally, and in the development of the Cultural Cities Network. This sustainability is probably the single most important legacy of the UCP. There is now a large group of cities, and partnerships of cities, across the United Kingdom which are now better equipped, and with greater aspirations, to develop and deliver cultural programmes. And they are backed up by a stronger and more sustainable cultural sector.

Third, in the small and incremental impact the UCPs have had in increasing the profile of culture in their local authorities. Here it was always unlikely that the UCP would have a transformational impact. Some local authorities were already embedding culture, particularly because of its economic impacts through cultural tourism and place marketing. For other local authorities, the

UCP gave them the opportunity to pilot a large-scale cultural intervention and the right to take risks which otherwise would not have been possible.

For these reasons alone, if not for the cultural quality of the UCPs – and despite the fact that much of the economic and social impacts have not been quantified – the UCP nationally must be considered a success.

Issues and Themes

There were a number of issues with the UCP nationally which will need to be addressed for future cultural programmes of this scale and complexity. Some of these will have specific relevance to the Cultural Olympiad leading up to the 2012 Games.

Lead-in Time

There was a consensus amongst the UCPs that there was insufficient lead-in time (a) for the preparation of bids, and (b) from notification of success of the bids to the start of delivery. This was exacerbated both by awards being less than bids, forcing the UCPs to review their programmes, and by the closure of the Millennium Commission (MC) in November 2006 with the requirement for UCPs funded through the MC to produce final accounts and returns before this date.

The short lead-in time had a number of negative impacts on –

- **marketing and branding**, leading to less awareness of UCPs by residents and visitors and less perceived coherence in some of the programmes themselves
- **sponsorship**, and the engagement of the private sector generally. Sponsorship requires both relationship building and tailoring programmes and events so that the ‘sponsorship offer’ is attractive to potential sponsors. All this takes time. A longer lead-in would have helped to secure more private sector funding
- **partnerships** The short lead-in time meant that many UCPs developed existing partnerships at the expense of building new partnerships: it was difficult to ‘go outside the usual suspects’
- **monitoring and evaluation** Few, if any, UCPs embedded robust monitoring and evaluation systems from the start of their programme. This has had particular impacts in terms of evidencing the success of the UCPs and their economic and social impacts
- **the programme itself** There has been little cross-UCP programming mainly because such programmes require much longer to develop
- **the legacy** because the UCPs have had to be focussed on ‘getting it right on the night’ rather than planning for long-term sustainability

In general, this meant that UCPs focussed on the development and delivery of the programme itself: “We were heads-down, engrossed in delivering,” reported one UCP lead. Despite, or perhaps because of this, many reported that they got a ‘buzz’ out of responding to the tight deadline. This focus was not helped by the scale, extent and variety of events and activities in most UCPs. Many UCP leads, reflecting on the experience, would have had fewer events and a shorter programme. This would have helped organisationally and in terms of marketing. Focussing on fewer, higher profile events may also have helped in terms of cultural tourism and place marketing. However, few

UCPs felt what is a common tension between the aims of cultural tourism (large-scale events, attractive to visitors and higher spenders) and social cohesion (generally smaller scale activities, targeted at renewal areas and hard-to-reach groups with few resources): in general, they thought that their UCP straddled this divide with little loss to either aim.

Nevertheless, the overall impact of the short lead-in time has been negative; a more extended period of planning and preparation is likely to have attracted increased audience and participant numbers, levered in some more private sector funding, helped develop more and newer partnerships and enabled UCPs to ensure a greater legacy to their programmes.

It is vital for any future cultural programmes that adequate lead-in times are built in before the start. Ideally, this should be two years before the opening event.

The findings suggest that Government Departments and National Funding Agencies ensure that they give sufficient lead-in time from the notification of award to the start of the cultural programme. The exact lead-in time will vary depending on the scale, type and diversity of cultural programme.

Monitoring and Evaluation

This report has noted at length the lack of a consistent Monitoring and Evaluation Framework across the UCPs, the patchy nature of some monitoring, the advocacy masquerading as evaluation in some UCP evaluations, the draft nature of some of these evaluations, the lack of rigorous quantitative research, the difficulties with establishing even basic information such as amounts of partnership funding and some of the outputs and the low priority accorded to this evaluation by some individual UCP officers.

This last observation will strike many UCPs as strange. In discussion with UCP officers, there was a fair degree of consensus that monitoring and evaluation was weak, that it should have been built-in at the start, that they had advocated this to the DCMS asking that the DCMS take the lead in this, and volunteering to 'top-slice' their funding to ensure robust monitoring and evaluation which would provide the evidence of the value of the UCP (and, by extension, arts and culture generally) both culturally and for its economic and social impacts. "The DCMS missed an opportunity," stated one UCP. Certainly, an opportunity has been lost – there is comparatively little robust quantitative evidence for the economic impacts of culture, very little robust evidence for the social impacts of culture and it is not possible to benchmark the different UCPs. But the responsibility for monitoring and evaluation, or the relative lack and inconsistency of it, must also, in part, be shared by the UCPs: the local authorities and organisations who hosted UCPs should have been responsible for data collection and, at the local level, analysis, while the DCMS (or ACE and MC in partnership with the DCMS) should have set a

common monitoring and evaluation framework and co-ordinated this in order to track the progress of all Programmes and the UCP nationally.

It is crucial that monitoring and evaluation is built-in from the start of any future cultural programme. Central to this is the development of a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework so that different programmes can be effectively and consistently monitored, the impacts of the programme (cultural, economic and social) capable of robust assessment, research needs identified, and programmes benchmarked. And, through continuous monitoring and reporting, lessons can be quickly learned and disseminated.

At the very least, for programmes of the scale of the UCP, the numbers and demographic profile of beneficiaries – audiences, participants and artists – should be collected, through box office and market research studies. Demographic profile should include how many individuals have disabilities, how many come from Renewal Areas and how many from BME communities and hard-to-reach groups.

It is recommended that a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, with the appropriate resources, be put in place at the start of any planning for future cultural programmes of this scale.

Flexibility and Aims

Most of the UCPs commented favourably on the process of award administration, with the MC gaining most praise. Lead Officers welcomed the 'light touch', the relatively straight-forward and unbureaucratic systems of the MC and ACE in administering the awards, the speed with which decisions were made relating to programme-strands and allowable expenditure, the relatively simple reporting systems and the overall flexibility of the funders. UCPs found the process a "relief" compared with administering funding from Europe or their RDA.

Part of the flexibility of the UCP was in the very widely framed aims set out by the MC and ACE in the original announcement of the Programme and the lack of direct links between those aims, the aims that individual UCPs may have had for their Programmes overall, the development of Programmes generally under 'themes' rather than aims, the differing aims that UCPs had for individual programme-strands and events, and then the different aims of the arts and cultural organisations delivering the events.

Given the particular circumstances surrounding the UCP, this approach was probably a reasonable one to take, despite the consequent difficulties in accountability (Exactly what criteria were used to winnow unsuccessful from successful bids and decide individual UCP allocations?) and evaluation. It allowed different UCPs to develop their programmes to suit local circumstances and needs, and for the organisers to work to their own aims and themes. And it certainly helped UCPs to think creatively.

It is unlikely that future funding programmes from ACE Lottery Fund and other Lottery and Government funds will be quite so expansive in their aims. However, the UCP acts as an instructive lesson in the benefits of flexibility of programme administration, and a more general 'hands-off' and non-bureaucratic approach to future funding of cultural programmes.

Large-scale Public Events

There is a specific issue around large-scale, free, open-air public events. This arises from the difficulties in (a) coming to approximate estimations of the numbers present and (b) defining what proportion of those numbers should be counted as actually consuming or participating in the event. As considered earlier, these are legitimate outputs and, as such, should be included in the overall outputs of festivals. Not including these events, skews and underestimates the overall outputs and ignores the participatory work which is integral to events such as Carnivals and Parades.

Rationally, the outputs of these events should be included in the overall outputs of festivals. The task is to get agreement over the two issues of approximation and definition of audience numbers. The first would involve agreeing an accepted methodology for approximating audience numbers or following police estimates where these are available. The second would involve commissioning independent market research to identify what proportion of audience numbers should not be counted because their engagement with the event was minimal (e.g. they stayed less than quarter of an hour or 25% of the duration of the event).

It is recommend that the DCMS other partners come forward with an accepted methodology and definition for counting audience numbers for such events.

City and Regional UCPs

There were relatively few differences between City-based and City & Region UCPs. There were different organisational structures within both City-based and City & Region UCPs. Generally partnerships both with other local authorities and regional cultural development and funding agencies were more numerous and stronger in City & Region UCPs, though this was as much to do with the regional agencies as with the UCP. There was a similar range of aims, and variation in aims, within City & Region UCPs as there was within City UCPs.

The main difference for the City & Regional UCPs was in ensuring a region-wide programme and in being seen to be programming region-wide. There are immediate difficulties here in that larger cultural organisations and venues

are almost invariably based in the cities and economies of scale, transport links and supporting infrastructure mean that the majority of cultural events, particularly those of medium and large-scale, take place in the cities.

For NewcastleGateshead, where the programme was extended across the North East, there were some reported perception problems, at least early on, in terms of the focus of the UCP being in NewcastleGateshead. But it would appear that the cultural infrastructure in the two cities has sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the wider region. For cities like Birmingham, a City UCP, this may not be the case – though Birmingham has an excellent and expanding cultural infrastructure this may not have sufficient capacity to serve the wider region.

For Bradford/Hull/Leeds/Sheffield/York and the Three Cities (Derby, Leicester, Nottingham), the UCPs were, essentially, city-based programmes. Inverness and the Highlands, on the other hand, made a determined effort to spread its UCP geographically very wide. While Inverness is the natural focus of the region, innovative and popular events were programmed elsewhere: the UCP was pleased that some events attracted people travelling out of Inverness! The UCP reflected the Council's traditions and ethos in aiming to ensure as fair and wide a distribution of services across the region.

The Cultural Cities Network

The final issue – if it can be called an issue – is the development of the Cultural Cities Network. From initially competing for the European Capital of Culture, this network – supplemented by the new UCP cities – has grown into a supportive, collaborative network which embodies a wealth of learning and experience in culture and in the practical experience of managing large-scale cultural programmes.

Everyone who is part of the Network stated that they had benefited from it – in terms of practical learning and expertise, support, the early political and funding intelligence and the contacts that the Network brings. The Network is one of the most valuable legacies of the UCP programme. It is important that it is sustained, nurtured and its expertise and learning disseminated to other cities, to the development and funding agencies and, in particular, to LOCOG and the 2012 Games. It should be seen as a resource for everyone to use rather than as competition.

The issue is, how best to sustain the Network and in what ways can it be of most use to others? The most urgent concern is how to tap into this wealth of expertise not just for the Cultural Olympiad but for the mass of other events being organised in the lead up to the 2012 Games – the Annual UK School Games hosted by Glasgow in 2006 and other cities around Britain through to 2012, the Greater London Authority's Summers of Sport, etc. How can the Network's expertise in developing participation in the arts and in volunteering be extended to sport? In terms of the Cultural Olympiad itself this is clearly up to Bill Morris and his team.

However there are clear lessons that can be learnt. First, there needs to be longer lead-in times, hands-off and flexible funding, and a monitoring and evaluation framework built-in from the start. Second, there need to be mechanisms to ensure that the expertise and learning of the UCPs is imparted to the Cultural Olympiad team. This could be, for instance, through a one-day round-table seminar or through a fact-finding tour of UCPs. Finally, most UCPs will be continuing within some of their programmes: could these be used by the Cultural Olympiad team to ensure that the cultural sector throughout the country is engaged in 2012?

Many of these proposals could be organised directly by the Network but this report considers it would be better if the DCMS took the lead in continuing to broker the relationship between the Network and LOCOG so that the learning of the UCP and the Network is used to the maximum benefit.

Appendix

The appendix gives the average ratings for UCP Lead Officers (Table Ten) and Deliverers and Partners of UCPs (Table Eleven).

Lead Officers were asked to rate

- the achievement of their UCP overall, taking everything into consideration
- the effectiveness of partnerships in 'getting the job done'
- the sustainability of partnerships
- the change in the profile of culture in their local authority as a result of the UCP, and
- the performance of the UCP in helping to increase the sustainability of the cultural sector in their city / region.

All ratings were on a scale of one to five (plus don't know/no opinion). For most ratings, one = very poor, three = satisfactory and five = very good. For the sustainability questions, one = less sustainable, two = neither more nor less sustainable, three = perhaps a little more sustainable, four = more sustainable, five = much more sustainable.

For impact on the local authority, one = had a negative impact, two = was a one-off / has had no lasting impact, three = has had some minimal positive impacts / shows that we can deliver a large-scale festival or programme, four = has had a positive impact, five = has had a great positive impact / has changed the way culture is viewed and done.

Table Ten
URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME

Achievement, Partnerships, Sustainability, Impact Ratings: Lead Agency	Average Rating	Nos. Responding
Achievement of UCP Overall	4.23	15
Partnerships: Delivery	3.94	16
Partnerships: Sustainability	4.30	15
Change in Profile of Culture in Local Authority	3.88	16
Sustainability of Cultural Sector	3.84	16

Deliverers and partners were asked to rate

- the achievement of their UCP in helping them achieve their aims
- their involvement / partnership with the UCP in 'getting the job done'
- the extent to which the UCP helped with their organisation's development

- the extent to which the UCP helped make their organisation more sustainable
- the change in the profile of culture in their local authority as a result of the UCP, and
- the performance of the UCP in helping to increase the sustainability of the cultural sector in their city / region.

All ratings were on a scale of one to five (plus don't know/no opinion). For the questions on achievement of aims and partnership / involvement with the local authority, one = very poor, three = satisfactory and five = very good.

For the question on development, one = hindered our development, two = neither helped nor hindered our development, three = helped marginally with our development, four = definitely helped with our development, five = taken us on to a completely new level of development.

For the question on sustainability, one = less sustainable, two = neither more nor less sustainable, three = perhaps a little more sustainable, four = more sustainable, five = a great improvement in sustainability / organisation much more sustainable.

For impact on the local authority, one = had a negative impact, two = was a one-off / has had no lasting impact, three = has had some minimal positive impacts / shows that we can deliver a large-scale festival or programme, four = has had a positive impact, five = has had a great positive impact / has changed the way culture is viewed and done.

Table Eleven

URBAN CULTURAL PROGRAMME

Achievement, Partnerships, Sustainability, Impact Ratings: Partners, Deliverers	Average Rating	Nos. Responding
Achievement of your Aims	4.43	42
Involvement / partnership with UCP	4.01	43
Impact on your organisation's development	4.29	31
Extent to which UCP has helped your organisation's sustainability	3.58	38
Change in Profile of Culture In Local Authority	3.54	25

