



# **Evaluation of national cultural policies**

## **Guidelines for the preparation of national reports**

by Robert Wangermée



Strasbourg 4 August 1992  
ADECSC5.92  
0405-22/6/92-2-E

DECS-Cult/CP (93) 3

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION

CULTURE

**EVALUATION OF NATIONAL CULTURAL POLICIES**

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION  
OF NATIONAL REPORTS

by

Robert WANGERMEE

---

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	4
<b>I. THE EVALUATION OF CULTURAL POLICIES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1. The authority responsible for the evaluation .....	7
2. The responsibilities of the public authorities in the cultural sphere .....	8
3. Cultural responsibilities in countries with a federal structure or where there is considerable decentralisation in regard to culture .....	9
4. The expert appraisal .....	11
5. The cultural field and its structure .....	13
6. The national evaluation report .....	15
<b>II. METHODOLOGICAL AND PRACTICAL ADVICE FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION REPORT .....</b>	<b>18</b>
1. Aims, objectives and programmes .....	18
2. Resources .....	19
3. Results and effects .....	22
<b>III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>24</b>
1. Measures relating to creation and production .....	24
1.1 Assistance to creators.....	25
1.2 Assistance to institutions and organisations ...	26
1.3 Support to the cultural industries and to the commercial sector.....	27
2. Measures relating to the decentralisation of infrastructures, cultural activities and responsibilities .....	28
3. Measures to attract larger sections of the public and to democratise culture .....	29
4. Measures relating to the preservation of the heritage .....	30

5.	Measures relating to international cultural policy .....	32
6.	Measures relating to multiculturalism .....	33
<b>IV.</b>	<b>THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE .....</b>	<b>34</b>

## Introduction

In June 1985 the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe decided to launch a European programme for the evaluation of national cultural policies in interested member countries. A model already existed in the form of that applied for many years by OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) for the study of national education policies. The model provides for:

- the drafting of a report, known as the "national report", by the countries reviewed, setting out the official views of the national authorities regarding the matter under study (the review may cover the whole of the education system, a particular sector or a reform being tried out);
- the setting up of an international team of "examiners" who act in their individual capacity and not as representatives of their government or institutions; the examiners go to the country studied, conduct hearings, visit establishments and supplement their information by appropriate documentation;
- the examiners draft a report with due regard for the "national report" and their own experience;
- publication of the two reports, together with a report of the summing-up meeting.

After careful review at a seminar held in Stockholm in June 1985 of the specific characteristics of the cultural field and the methods already tried out in various countries for the evaluation of public policies, the Council for Cultural Co-operation adopted the OECD procedure for its initial experiments in evaluation, adjusting it to take into account the particular features of culture.

As the Council for Cultural Co-operation sees it, the national evaluations should make it possible

### for each member state:

- to gather information on the objectives and practices of foreign countries, particularly with regard to innovations;
- to analyse the successes and failures of the measures implemented and to make international comparisons on that basis;
- to improve evaluation methods;

for the Council of Europe:

- through this international evaluation, to give assistance to states willing to be reviewed;
- to develop measurement tools and guidance facilitating international comparison of cultural policies;
- to give impetus to further joint action in respect of cultural co-operation.

Since then an evaluation has been made of France's cultural policy (1987-1988) and of Sweden's (1988-1990). Evaluation procedures for Austria, the Netherlands and Spain are at different stages of completion.

After a critical review of past and ongoing evaluation exercises and after noting the various difficulties that have made it impossible to maintain the anticipated annual rate for the evaluations, the directorate of the Council of Europe concerned felt it useful, on the basis of the opinion of the Panel of Advisors for the Evaluation Programme, for a brief study to be carried out in order to highlight the problems to be solved in the preparation of a national report, the methodological requirements of the analytical work and the practical commitments that should be entailed by implementation of the entire evaluation procedure with the international experts.

This study endeavours to meet these objectives. It takes into account the proceedings of the Stockholm seminar (1985), the comments and remarks made by the experts involved in the evaluations already completed or in progress, the opinions of the Panel of Advisors for the Programme and the conclusions of

the working party which made an assessment of the methods used by UNESCO and the Council of Europe to evaluate cultural policies (Vienna, February 1991)<sup>1</sup>.

## **I. THE EVALUATION OF CULTURAL POLICIES**

The kind of evaluation contemplated by the Council of Europe should not relate to a country's cultural life but to the public authorities' cultural policy. Evaluating a policy means determining its objectives, defining its programmes of action, measuring its results and monitoring whether the means employed produce the expected results. Many European countries (after Canada) now recognise the value of such an evaluation but still hesitate to have it applied to their cultural policy. The reason is that culture cannot be circumscribed as easily as other sectors of public policy (like education for instance). A further reason is that, at different times, criteria of judgment in the cultural sphere turn around the concept of "value" which cannot be measured in accordance with quantifiable criteria. This accounts for the wariness of some creative artists and of some institutions

---

<sup>1</sup> In preparing this text I have also benefited from the important research done in France by the Interministerial Committee for the Development of Public Policy Assessment and, in respect of the cultural aspects, from the work of the Département des Etudes et de la Prospective of the Ministry of Culture; I would mention in particular the vade mecum for the evaluation of regional cultural policies produced by Pierre Moulinier. I should also like to thank Charles Vallerand who brought to my attention several interesting studies by the Ottawa International Comparative Policy Group, Ritva Mitchell, Chair, and the members of the Council of Europe's Panel of Experts responsible for the evaluation of the cultural policy of Austria, Andreas J Wiesland, Director of the Zentrum für Kulturforschung in Bonn, Maria Angeles Guttierrez, Director General of International Co-operation at the Spanish Ministry of Culture, and Maria Contente, responsible for co-ordinating the preparation of the national report on Spain, Eduardo Delgado i Clavera, in charge of the study and research services of the Delegation of Barcelona, and especially Geneviève Gentil who, with unfailing skill and courtesy, enabled me to take advantage of the studies of CIRCLE and of all the documentation of the Département des Etudes et de la Prospective (Paris). Augustin Girard, Director of that Department, and Carl-Johan Kleberg, Deputy Director of the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs, are at the origin of the studies undertaken in the Council of Europe on the methodology for evaluating cultural policies; their writings and their advice, given in the course of many discussions, were particularly helpful to me. I am grateful to them for having read over this text and for having communicated to me a number of observations.



involved in cultural action, and also of some public officials, who are averse to any calling into question of their power to influence or to decide on the choices they have made.

However, the increase in cultural expenditure, at a time when budgetary constraints often make it necessary to freeze or indeed to cut back on financial resources, the unreasonable rise in certain production costs in response to a call for innovation in the creative field, and the gap that may exist between the supply of culture and how it is actually received by the public have generated an awareness of the importance of evaluation and have led various countries to participate in the Council of Europe's programme.

It is however necessary to know what such participation entails. Preparing the national report, receiving the international experts, providing them with the necessary additional information, discussing the matter at the Council of Europe and publishing the two reports involve human, administrative and financial expenses which extend over a period of time and which it is important to measure precisely before starting the procedure.

1. The authority responsible for the evaluation

The success of the evaluation procedure hinges primarily on the responsible authorities' willingness to submit their policy to a procedure which, as envisaged by the Council of Europe, is meant to serve the interests of clarity. Evaluation provides a country with the opportunity to spell out its cultural policy in the light of its history, its political and administrative structures and the values to which it is attached and which underpin its actions; it should lead the responsible authorities to consider in the light of the results achieved whether the means employed are commensurate with the objectives pursued. The national report should accordingly not only bring together useful data and provide indicators of results but also give guidance in understanding them; it should also reveal the particular problems encountered in the country and the solutions adopted, which could be useful to others. The report, while highlighting the successes of a policy, should be able to acknowledge its shortcomings or failures. Evaluation will not be meaningful unless the responsible authority agrees to have all the relevant facts available to him recorded in the report, to undertake a critical appraisal of those facts and then to have them submitted to the judgment of international experts and, through the ensuing publication, brought to the knowledge of those actively concerned with his policy, his public opinion and other countries. Evaluation should enable the responsible authority to make adjustments to his policy, amend certain objectives and reappportion the resources allocated to attain them.

It is thus clear that the preparation of the national report cannot be the exclusive responsibility of a research team. The authority responsible for cultural policy must assume political responsibility for the evaluation in the report that he submits.

2. The responsibility of the public authorities in the cultural sphere

Cultural policy affects a number of very different fields. In various countries a minister of culture - or at least a minister responsible for cultural affairs - has for some time now been included in the government of the state. However, even in countries that have traditionally gone in for centralisation, the ministry of culture does not necessarily assume responsibility for all cultural matters but assigns some functions (eg training or extension work, international relations or communication) to other central authorities. Sometimes cultural affairs are attached to a department with broader responsibilities; sometimes the main cultural functions are divided between two or three ministries, without this excluding the assignment of lesser functions to other authorities. In other cases cultural responsibilities seem to be scattered among various ministerial departments.

Clearly also, public responsibilities and related expenditure in the field of culture are nowhere in the hands of central government alone. They are distributed in ways that can vary considerably between the central level, an intermediate level which can be called regional and which may include a number of entities -regions, Länder, departments, provinces, cantons - and a local level, represented by towns and municipalities.

The purpose of the Council of Europe's evaluation programme is to study the cultural policy applied by the national authorities in the various countries. It is however obvious, in the light of the foregoing considerations, that it cannot be enough to study the policy applied at the central level alone, or indeed by the ministry of culture alone. The action of regional and local authorities should also be taken into consideration, without it being necessarily subjected to such searching analysis. We also know that public support for culture can be given either through the direct agency of a particular public authority or through the blanket assignment of responsibilities and financial resources to independent bodies, subject to operating rules of varying degrees of strictness.

The overall system of public action should be covered by the national evaluation report. The central authority (or one of the central authorities) should collect - or arrange to have collected - significant information from other authorities (regional or local), consult with them, bring out areas of complementarity, instances of subsidiarity (where appropriate, duplication and conflicts) between the various

levels of power, and, lastly, assume responsibility for the content of the report, its preparation and follow-up.

3. Cultural responsibilities in countries with a federal structure or where there is considerable decentralisation in regard to culture

In principle, in countries with a federal structure, culture is included among the responsibilities of the federate entities (Länder in Germany, provinces in Austria, cantons in Switzerland, communities in Belgium). The central state retains - under arrangements that vary from one country to another - only a part of the responsibilities, namely: international cultural relations, in so far as they come under foreign policy, copyright legislation, social and fiscal legislation, the subsidisation and management (or supervision) of some prestigious artistic institutions (museums, theatres, opera houses), the preservation of historic monuments, support for certain major cultural industries like the film industry, and the management of certain technological facilities (radio broadcasting, cable, and radio and television satellite). For the rest, the federal state usually intervenes only in accordance with the subsidiarity principle, in other words, in order to provide additional assistance for projects under the responsibility of regional entities or local authorities, but which they could not carry out alone.

Owing to the large degree of autonomy enjoyed by the federate entities, problems may arise in the collection and standardisation of quantitative data. The federal authority does not always have the power to have statistics and quantitative data compiled in the various regions. Fortunately the need for such data has been felt fairly generally for some years. In Switzerland, for example, following the Clottu report (ex ante evaluation of the possibilities of a confederal cultural policy), a report for the year 1981 was carried out by the Federal Office of Statistics on the distribution of cultural expenditure between communes, cantons and the confederation. When, however, a true evaluation has had to be undertaken, it has up to now seemed preferable to start from the bottom, to study in detail the cultural policy of a number of cities, to extract data in highly selective samples and to incorporate them into a description of the application of public policy measures at the three levels of power (communes, cantons and the confederation)<sup>2</sup>.

In Austria, where the evaluation is in progress, responsibility for the national report has been assumed by the Division of International and Multilateral Cultural Affairs of the Federal Ministry of Culture and Art (Bundesministerium für

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Louis BASTERRECHEA and Michel BASSAND, Analyse et évaluation des politiques culturelles en Suisse. Quatre villes moyennes dans le canton de Vaud, Paris, UNESCO, 1988.

Unterricht und Kunst). The Division in question has made the necessary contacts with the other federal ministries responsible for cultural tasks (Federal Ministry of Science and Research, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and has secured the co-operation of the cultural authorities at provincial level through the Conference of Provincial Cultural Authorities (Landeskultur-referentenkonferenz). By drawing attention to the importance retained by the state in matters of culture and to the variety of policies applied in this regard by the provinces, the report could not but bring out certain problems that might usefully be solved.

In Germany, each of the 16 Länder has its own Minister of Culture. Some co-ordination is ensured by the "Standing Conference of Ministers of Culture", but for the sole purpose of serving the common interest of the Länder in their dealings with the Federal Government and not in order to co-ordinate cultural policy from one Land to another. At the federal level, limited cultural responsibilities are assumed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Education and Science and the Ministry of the Economy. Statistics are not systematically established for the whole of the cultural field. However, the Federal Ministry of Statistics does a limited amount of work in the way of publishing figures and analyses for the whole of the country, collecting those supplied to it by the Länder, towns, institutions and professional organisations. On the initiative of one of the federal ministries, a number of cross-surveys and studies have been carried out by research institutions and specialised university centres to meet the needs for international harmonisation and in response to requests from the Conference of Ministers of Culture or the Arts Council (an independent body representing the common interests of artists' associations and cultural organisations in their relations with the federal government and the Länder). Such studies (on music, for instance, or radio and television) show that, despite the difficulties bound up with a federal structure, sufficient material could be assembled for it to be possible to undertake an evaluation along the lines recommended by the Council of Europe. The Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs could no doubt assume responsibility for the evaluation, with the agreement of the Standing Conference of Ministers of Culture of the Länder and with the participation of other ministries.

In a country like Belgium which has for some 20 years been moving towards federalisation, culture is, with the exception of some subjects, entirely under the responsibility of the different language "communities" (French, Flemish and German). Here, the evaluation of the country's cultural policy could not be conducted by the national state authorities. It would have to be taken over by the communities themselves, with the agreement of the national state, which has no more than theoretical responsibility in the Council of Europe where the real roles are played by the

representatives of the communities who, moreover, take an active part in the work.

Some states that are considered to form single units have likewise become so decentralised in the past few years that their situation hardly differs from that of states with a federal structure.

In Spain, under the 1978 Constitution, the parliaments of the autonomous regions have undivided responsibility for cultural affairs. However, decentralisation is taking place at rates that vary from one region to another; it is being brought in faster and more comprehensively in regions like Catalonia, the Basque Country and Galicia which are based on separate language areas, because the need is felt there to assert a particular cultural identity. The Ministry of Culture, which is a national ministry, administers the central cultural services, encourages communication and exchanges between the various regions and represents the country internationally. It took responsibility for the Council of Europe's evaluation, but it has considerable practical problems as the information available both nationally and regionally is incomplete; there are no continuous statistical series in time and for all sectors of cultural activity; and lastly, there is not always a clear desire for co-operation in every region.

It is thus seen that, at the cultural level, federalism does not offer a single model. Moreover, the decentralisation of responsibilities, resources and powers is still an ongoing process, both in those countries regarded as federations and in those that have remained unitarian. Whether or not the issue is federalism, cultural decentralisation has now become a major and necessary topic for discussion.

For some countries with a federal structure or divided into regions marked by strong cultural autonomy, the question must be raised whether, in future, responsibility for evaluation - with the objective of an overall description of the three levels of authority still being maintained- should not rest initially with one or more regional entities acting in co-ordination with one another and with the national state.

#### 4. The expert appraisal

The political authority that assumes responsibility for the evaluation needs "technical assistance".

For the preparation of the national report on France, recourse was had to an academic, a lecturer at the Paris Institute of Political Studies, who was also a senior adviser to the Government Accounting Office; he was able to use the considerable mass of documentation assembled by the Department of Studies and Futures Research of the Ministry of Culture and Communication; his report was approved by the Minister who assumed responsibility for it.

In Sweden a working party chaired by the Assistant Secretary of state at the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs and composed of cabinet members and civil servants assumed responsibility for the report; the working party requested the National Council for Cultural Affairs and its various departments to prepare the report collectively, in consultation with other authorities and institutions concerned with cultural affairs. However, it fell to the ministerial working party and the minister himself to intervene in the process and, at the end, to set forth its opinions and conclusions.

In Austria, in order to meet the requirements arising out of the preparation of the report, a "Cultural Documentation Centre" (Osterreichische Kulturdokumentation) was set up on the initiative of the Federal Ministry of Education and Art; it was assigned the task of collecting and processing all information and data obtained from the central, regional and local authorities, and from any other cultural institutions; the importance of this documentation centre has been so clearly recognised that it has become a permanent research body for the ministry and other public authorities. Subsequently, an "Austrian Centre for Cultural Documentation, Research and Mediation" (Osterreichisches Zentrum für Kulturdokumentation, -forschung und -vermittlung) was established specially for the purpose of preparing the national report, with the participation of researchers and specialists in the different fields of art and culture.

In Spain, the Ministry of Culture took responsibility for preparing the national report. A working group was set up in the ministry and, with the help of sociologists, drew up a work plan to cover the period 1978-1979. It collected together the existing documentation, which was frequently skimpy; it commissioned various general and sectoral studies and arranged for a major survey to be conducted of facilities and practices.

Particular difficulties lie in the fact that responsibility for cultural matters is not vested exclusively in the national authorities but is shared in varying degrees with the 17 autonomous regions and municipalities. The ministry has already carried out a survey on cultural facilities in the municipalities and co-ordination will be established with the regions in order to draw up the final version of the national report under the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture.

In the Netherlands, the Cultural Policy Department of the Ministry of Welfare, Public Health and Culture (Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur) assumes responsibility for the report. It has entrusted the preparation of it to the Broekman Foundation, an institution specialising in cultural research, which is able to draw, in particular, on the work of the Social and Cultural Planning Office, which publishes every

year a large amount of statistical documentation on cultural and social life.

As is seen, the expert appraisal can be made by an individual researcher, a research centre or a consulting firm, but in all cases its role must be clearly separated from that of the authority that assumes political responsibility for the report. The expert's tasks and his responsibilities vis-à-vis the commissioning authority should be clearly determined, possibly in a convention, before the work begins.

From the mass of documents relating to cultural life the expert must extract those of use for evaluating policy decisions. Starting from concrete programmes, he must identify the objectives pursued, analyse the means used, and note the results; he must pay special attention to quantifiable data, seek or establish indicators that make it possible to achieve an objective appraisal, make use of surveys on cultural practices and note among the general public (without adopting them as his own) the possible contradictory opinions formed of the measures taken and their effects.

To guide and follow-up the work of the expert, it is advisable that, on the pattern of what has been done in Sweden, a working group be set up by, and under the authority of, the commissioning body. The working group would have the task of making regular contacts with the representatives of the central ministries concerned by the evaluation and the representatives of other levels of power; it would also be required to demarcate the areas to be evaluated and to monitor regularly the progress of the expert's report.

The evaluation should thus result from a constant interaction between the expert and the political authority who commissions and takes charge of the report. It is for the latter to make the final appraisal which should also include his verdict on the policy applied, for he is the one who has to assume responsibility for the report.

##### 5. The cultural field and its structure

Culture is an area which cannot easily be circumscribed. Sociologists, ethnologists and philosophers have talked at length about the more or less wide-ranging definitions to be given to the term. Here we need to be pragmatic. To define the framework of the evaluation, the national report will take into consideration the areas that the public authorities of the country consider to be cultural and in which they intervene directly or indirectly by way of legislative or statutory provisions and funding.

This approach will inevitably lead to differences between countries which may complicate the international comparisons sought by the Council of Europe, but they will also enhance them by highlighting national specificities and priorities, and they may provide examples of action.

The Council of Europe has already undertaken such comparisons, but in limited sectors: for example, in respect of the role of the public authorities vis-a-vis cultural industries, regional cultural policies or private support for culture and its relations with public sources of financing. The "European Programme of Evaluation" currently being carried out aims to assess the overall policies applied by the public authorities in the cultural field. No doubt the scale of the project will inevitably have the effect of preventing it from being implemented in full. If all sectors and all types of action cannot be studied in detail, it is desirable that they should at least be surveyed and that any choices should be spelled out and justified.

In most countries, the cultural field comprises primarily those areas of artistic endeavour that have generally benefited throughout history from princely patronage and, subsequently, from public support: music, dance, theatre, the visual arts and literature constitute what the sociologists call "legitimate culture", "high culture", and sometimes, not without a tinge of irony, "cultured culture".

In many countries cultural policy remains true to tradition and focuses on support for the arts, ie on assistance to creative artists and the bodies that produce and disseminate cultural products.

Since the 19th century there has been an increasingly clear division between, on the one hand, the art of "high culture" with its complex and constantly changing languages, an art which aspires to have its value symbolically recognised at the purely aesthetic level (on the grounds of creative originality and quality of performance), accessible only to a relatively limited public, and, on the other, an art belonging to what can be described as "mass culture" - songs, serialised novels, comic strips, etc - which sets no store by aesthetic ambitions and avails itself of simplified language structures in order through its expressive content to reach the widest possible public and thereby to make itself pay by fitting into the communication network through the technologies whereby it is purveyed. The production and distribution of these mass arts are now organised on a truly industrial scale.

In principle, in the cultural industries, the law of the market should prevail; however, since the 1960s, the public authorities have often been led to incorporate them into their policies either by granting them direct support or by adopting legislative and statutory measures to assist them.

The traditional concept of culture is thus tending to become broader. Alongside the major artistic fields, it also embraces sectors long scorned or considered marginal, such as essentially urban and often youth-related popular cultures, essentially rural traditional popular cultures and the cultures of immigrant groups.



Special attention needs to be given to the situation of cultural minorities in the country and to the cultural and socio-cultural initiatives taken on behalf of minority groups with due regard for the specific problems affecting their access to cultural life and their participation in cultural expression.

There is then frequently a tendency to go from a unitary to a pluralist and relativistic conception of culture, but not in the same way from one country to another. The national report should therefore highlight in this heterogeneous aggregate the sectors regarded as cultural in the country and which, on that account, lead to intervention by the public authorities; all such interventions constitute an implicit or explicit policy.

Before proceeding with the evaluations, the boundaries of the areas into which the cultural field is divided should be determined in order to make it possible to produce and record data. Work towards the international co-ordination of cultural accounting has been carried out over the past 20 years by the Council of Europe and UNESCO. In 1980, after lengthy preparatory work, UNESCO adopted a "recommendation" (not binding) to member states for the harmonisation of cultural statistics; the recommendation was followed in various countries without, however, true standardisation being achieved. The framework proposed by UNESCO is based essentially on the different modes of expression; it distinguishes 10 categories (cultural heritage, the written word, music, performing arts, visual arts, film and photography, broadcasting, socio-cultural activities, sports and games, nature and the environment), to which it adds the general administration of culture and multi-purpose activities. However, depending on the country, these areas take in sectors whose importance varies, particularly from one period of time to another; one area may overlap with another.

There would be no point in proposing here binding rules of classification so as to enable all possible international comparisons to be made. The different modes of expression will inevitably be structured in ways that will vary from one country to another. However that may be, the modes of expression must serve as a basis for structuring the cultural field in order to make evaluation measures possible; but of course the national report must clearly define the components of the various areas.

#### 6. The national evaluation report

The evaluation of a cultural policy requires clarification of its objectives, analysis of the means used to attain them by way of concrete projects and study of the impact of the action taken.

It is necessary, first and foremost, to define the scope of the evaluation and to determine the areas to be

investigated in the light of the country's past, its traditions, the values it wishes to assert, its priorities during the period under review and the distinctive nature of its achievements or of the problems facing it.

The evaluation report should therefore begin by describing the political and administrative context of the country considered and specify where decision-making power lies according to the field involved, having regard to specific features of countries having a federal structure or highly autonomous regions. This introduction should in any event show the distribution of responsibilities within the state and the autonomy, joint responsibility or ranking of the various levels of power (country, region, municipality). The environment in which decisions are taken in the cultural field should be described with particular emphasis on how the media are organised. Special attention should also be given to the European level, taking into account the conventions of the Council of Europe that contain binding provisions for those that are party to them and especially the directives and regulations of the European Community which require member countries and those that enter with them into reciprocity agreements to amend their legislative or statutory texts.

The evaluation should cover a given period; it should start from the time, which will vary from one country to another, when a cultural policy started to assume an overall pattern or at least, and this is the most frequent case, when programmes tailored to certain objectives were launched. It should include an estimate of the resources earmarked during the given period to achieve the objectives and endeavour to measure the results obtained; the period will extend up to the year nearest to the time of preparing the report for which useable data are available with, where appropriate, intermediate dates to mark the various stages.

The report should then devote a chapter to the methods for working out the purposes, objectives and programmes of cultural policy; another chapter should provide a general survey of the means employed to implement the objectives and programmes.

The study of the results and of the effects resulting from the measures taken constitutes the evaluation proper. One approach might be to consider in turn the various modes of expression (books, music, theatre, etc), having regard to the objectives pursued, the programmes decided upon, the means used and the results obtained. However, in an evaluation designed to be comprehensive, such an approach might well prove tiresome owing to the repetitions entailed.

A more comprehensive method is to apply the evaluation crosswise to the various stages at which the public authorities may intervene throughout the process leading from the design and creation of cultural "products" to their being put on to the market and being consumed by the public.

In view of the fact that cultural works are always prototypes, it is advisable to distinguish among the various modes of expression between those works that cannot be reproduced (or only to a limited extent and in part) and those that can easily be reproduced. The former (writing, painting, musical composition) are generally the work of a lone creator; in the performing arts (music, dance, theatre) the work produced is the result of the efforts of a number of performers and can be repeated but is in each instance unique. The latter, in order for them to be made available to a large number of consumers, rely on techniques that are at least those of craftsmen and often involve a whole industrial set-up.

For each mode of expression, the process leading from creation to consumption varies according to the product. The evaluation must take the specific characteristics of each product into account, bringing out in each case the nature of the public intervention.

The analytical grid adopted for the evaluation of cultural policies in France and Sweden focused on only three functions throughout the process: creation, which also includes production and, where appropriate, dissemination, the decentralisation of activities and responsibilities and the widening of public participation in cultural life.

These three stages are important and should appear in all evaluation reports, with variants being introduced to take into account different national situations. They are covered as well in the reports on Austria and the Netherlands, but there they are supplemented by a review of other functions. Preservation of the heritage (cultural or natural), international cultural policy and multiculturalism (possibly also the theme of the country's cultural identity, provided that it is not covered in most of the other chapters) merit special attention in all cases.

It should perhaps be said, finally, that the term evaluation is sometimes over-ambitious for this project: in most cases the national report will be at best no more than the most structured and systematic possible description of the cultural policy of the public authorities which will incorporate an evaluative dimension. Moreover, previous reports in English have used not the word "evaluation" but the more modest term of "review".

The report should set out verifiable facts and figures but also make judgments. It should not hesitate to draw attention to achievements considered to be particularly original or balk at self-criticism. It should provide the group of foreign experts with material that will enable them to obtain from those involved in the country's cultural life further opinions and judgments on what is being done and what is not being done. It should also enable the experts both to make useful international comparisons and to highlight the

special features of the policy followed and original experiments that might serve as a model elsewhere.

## II. METHODOLOGICAL AND PRACTICAL ADVICE FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION REPORT

We should consider in turn the methods whose use may be recommended to evaluate successively:

- the aims, objectives and programmes;
- the means employed;
- the results and effects recorded.

### 1. Aims, objectives and programmes

The aims refer to the fundamental values underlying action in a given society. They are not always clearly expressed because they are felt to be natural and self-evident. Traces at least can be found of them in parliamentary documents, ministerial statements and the programmes of political parties.

Analysis of practical schemes and specific programmes offers the best way of highlighting the objectives that reflect these aims and that may at this stage be no more than declarations of intent. Moreover, the general objectives may be modified and adjusted in the course of time on account of changes in the environment or the desired colouring to be given to them by a new political majority. They may be expressed in reports drawn up by planning committees, in outline laws on particular subjects, in the explanations provided by the officials concerned when presenting their budget, in the programmes of political parties, in press conferences and in isolated statements by policy-makers.

In democratic societies the most usual general objectives concern:

- the democratisation of culture, ie the widest possible dissemination of works that have stood up to the judgment of experts and of history, and consolidation of the practices of those with access to culture;
- the safeguarding of the heritage;
- support for creative work in more or less radically new directions;
- freedom of expression and of creation.

Other objectives, which may vary from one country to another, may also be set out:

- assertion of cultural identity;

- promotion of popular culture, either of a traditional kind, linked to the persistence or revival of bygone practices, especially in rural areas, or of a modern kind, pertaining to what is known as mass culture, in particular youth culture;
- receptiveness to multiculturalism, particularly through an open attitude to the cultures of immigrant groups;
- encouragement to cultural democratisation fostering independent expression on the part of every individual;
- support for "counter-culture", characterised by the calling into question of what has been referred to as "legitimate culture".

The general objectives, like the aims, may also remain implicit.

The general objectives can only be evaluated when the public authority translates them into operational objectives, expressed through specific programmes, to which resources and means are allocated so that they can be achieved within a particular time-frame.

It is desirable that the national evaluation report should not make do with identifying and spelling out objectives and programmes. Many programmes are renewed from year to year with certain budgetary adjustments either because they cater to needs considered to be permanent or as a matter of routine. It should be shown how decisions are taken, particularly for the launching of new projects. At what level of responsibility are they taken (state, region, municipality)? Do they form part of an overall plan? Are projects selected on account of the pressure exercised by groups particularly concerned (creators, institutions, industries) or by public opinion as expressed through the media? Are decisions taken by a deliberative democratic body or by the executive; through the agency of an "Arts Council" or similar institution; following expert appraisal; following consultation of an advisory board; on the basis of expert study and ex ante estimates; through imitation of efficient models from elsewhere? Where appropriate, the real originality of a project should be especially emphasised in comparison with the great mass of projects already under way.

Since there can be no objective assessment of cultural needs, it would be useful to seek to determine how, in the light of available resources, priorities are established among schemes already existing and new projects.

## 2. Resources

It is necessary to distinguish normative and organisational measures, financial measures, human resources and information about policy.

Normative measures are taken by laws, decrees or regulations. These may be texts that have a direct effect on a major cultural sector or on particular area. These may also be texts that have an indirect impact on certain cultural activities (VAT rates, taxation, social legislation, special levies, etc); mention may be made in particular of fiscal and other measures taken to develop private and corporate patronage of cultural activities. Normative measures are particularly important for cultural industries. They also concern the distribution of responsibilities between the various levels of power (state, regions, municipalities), which may vary according to the field involved. The report should specify in particular whether co-operation between decision-makers is governed by conventions and agreements or whether unrestricted overlapping action is allowed. It should also show how the public authorities exercise their action: through direct management of certain institutions, through the granting of independence to certain bodies subject to certain checks, or through the delegation of responsibilities and decision-making power to decentralised levels of administrative management or private bodies bound by convention or some other means to the public authority. Special attention should be paid to the distribution of responsibilities and funding between the various levels of public authority.

Financial measures relate primarily to the grants awarded to institutions under public authority to ensure their operation and their investment expenses. They may also take the form of grants, assistance or commissions to individuals (creative artists, performers, researchers, etc) and of assistance to non-profit-making associations or to enterprises in various forms (purchase of products, participation in productions, loans or guarantees for loans, and regular support for production and distribution in the case of some branches).

It is desirable that indicators be developed to establish tables showing:

- the percentage of the cultural budget in relation to the total budget;
- the distribution of cultural expenditure between the central level, the regions and the municipalities;
- the varieties of financial intervention in the different regions and towns (according to their size, whether big, medium-sized or small);
- the percentage of public cultural expenditure in relation to the national income and to the per capita income;
- budgetary allocations by level of authority in the various fields (theatre, music, cinema, etc);

- budgetary allocations according to the various functions (preservation of the heritage, artistic production, dissemination, etc), without overlooking certain functions not directly linked to the production process, such as arts training, research or administration,
- the distribution between operating budgets and investment budgets.

When indicators are intended to show the progression through the years of budgetary allocations and expenditure, it will of course be necessary to offset the effects of annual inflation rates in the country; all figures should therefore be expressed in a constant money of account, taking as reference the last year quoted. For convenience of judgment between countries, it is also desirable that, in addition to overall figures, mention be made of per capita expenditure.

Human resources relate to the individual and institutional efforts made to attain operational objectives. It should be made clear, in particular, what importance is assigned to scientific research for the purpose of rationalising policy in either area.

It is desirable that quantitative data be provided on a yearly basis or, at least, that they relate to a few non-consecutive years during the period under consideration so that curves can show, on the evidence of the figures, progress, immobilisation and decline in respect of the efforts made as well as the different degrees of importance assigned to the various sectors.

The difficulty of the task should not be underestimated. Many countries have but incomplete statistical data and cannot contemplate compiling satisfactory historical series. A report to the Council of Europe parallel to this study will address the problems involved in the development of indicators; it will specify the minimum data needed for an evaluation study to be made credible.

The national report should also show the origin of the financial resources used by the various levels of power: allocations out of specific items in the budget of the state, the regions or the towns, financial transfers from the state to the regions or towns, recourse to special taxes for certain cultural budgets, establishment of funds drawing on the economic flows of a particular cultural sector, etc.

#### Information about cultural policy

Because cultural needs are linked to values, they are not recognised as clearly as economic and social needs. Often they are perceived only by small groups in the population. When the authorities cater to them in their policy measures it is important that the new possibilities be brought to the notice of all those who might benefit from them. It is not

enough for a policy to be implemented; there must also be knowledge of it. Publicity on behalf of the actions taken is an integral part of the actual policy.

It is true that the institutions and bodies concerned normally look after the promotional side of their activities, but it is up to policy-makers to act through the media or in other ways and to develop public awareness of the importance of culture in society, to bring out the coherence of overall policy, to engage periodically in comprehensive or sectoral stocktaking exercises and to "launch" fresh initiatives. The evaluation must also highlight what is being done in this respect.

### 3. Results and effects

Evaluating means determining to what extent the objectives set by decision-makers have been attained. It should be stated anew here the evaluation cannot be validly carried out:

- unless the general objectives have been spelled out in operational objectives translated into programmes, to which means of action have been granted;
- unless it concerns changes that have occurred since the programme was put into effect or least within a given period;
- unless it does more than simply record changes but seeks to interpret them taking into account modifications in the environment that may have been beneficial or detrimental to action.

The analysis calls for the use of indicators of the resources envisaged and of the resources actually used (not only with regard to financial measures but also for all the other means employed) and indicators of results which make it possible to measure the quantitative changes that have occurred (increased infrastructure, frequentation of institutions, etc).

On the basis of these indicators, the evaluation of results first establishes the relationship between the criteria of success initially set for the operational objectives and the results actually achieved.

It is supplemented by an evaluation of the effectiveness of the means used which establishes the relationship between the efforts of every kind made to achieve the objectives and the results and effects observed. One might think readily of applying here the methods of cost-benefit analysis for the purpose of bringing in a planning-programming-budgeting system. But an analysis of this kind is based essentially on the available financial data into which an attempt is made to incorporate the other components expressed in monetary terms.



Such a reduction to a purely economic calculation is not applicable to the cultural field (nor indeed to education or health, for instance) since not all the elements to be taken into consideration are quantifiable.

The aim is not just to assess the number of active creative workers but also the originality of the works they create; not their success with the public at large having regard to their amount of their royalties, but the recognition of their value by their peers and that part of the public, small though it may be, likely to be interested in their productions. Account must be taken not only of the number of institutions and the audiences they draw, but of the quality of the services they provide in the eyes of qualified experts and of the resulting prestige. If the symbolic value of artists, institutions and associations dedicated to high culture is to be assessed, the evaluation cannot be confined to a purely economic measurement of results.

Moreover, in addition to the expected results, many programmes have positive or negative side-effects, possibly the opposite of what was intended, which need to be identified, even if there is no hope of bringing them fully under control. The evaluation must also take into account the environment and the role played by all the factors extraneous to the programme itself. It must therefore take care not to establish one-to-one relationships between the measures taken in a particular area and the results achieved since many uncontrolled variables may also come into play. The evaluation must create an awareness of the changes that may have affected society during the period under consideration: changes in socio-occupational structure (growth of the tertiary sector, reduction in the number of labourers and farmers, place taken by women and young people), development of leisure time and school enrolment ratios, lowering of retirement age, intensive urbanisation, changes in audio-visual facilities, etc. Obviously the national evaluation cannot aim to encompass fully the role played by all these factors external to public action itself, but it must endeavour to take it into account.

It is certain that value judgments linked to aims and general objectives in a cultural policy are decisive for assessing the effectiveness of the means used in programmes and their effects. The fact none the less remains that the analysis of what is measurable must be conducted with the necessary stringency so as to provide an indisputable basis for value judgments and, where appropriate, to permit reappraisal through adjustments to the operational objectives, reconsideration of the resources allocated for their attainment and verification of the general coherence of programmes.

It should not be forgotten indeed that an evaluation is not an intellectual exercise; it is a diagnosis which should make it possible to identify the problems to be solved and, at a later stage, to propose solutions.

### III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION

After describing the country's institutional, administrative and political context, after pinpointing the aims and general objectives of cultural policy, after identifying the programmes and the means used to carry them out, the evaluation proper will endeavour to apply the methods outlined above to a review of the results achieved in the various fields by specific programmes and to measure their effects.

The evaluation can be conducted through each of the various stages in the process leading from creation to consumption, taking successively into consideration creation and production, dissemination (and particularly decentralisation policy), consumption (paying special attention to the increase in the public for culture) and preservation of the heritage. Other topics such as cultural action in the direction of other countries, multiculturalism, cultural identity, the training of artists and cultural administrators and media policy may be the subject of separate chapters or be tackled in evaluations relating to the various stages in the production-dissemination-consumption process<sup>3</sup>. The importance attached to each of them may vary according to the degree of emphasis that each country wishes to place on any particular aspect of its policy.

At the end of the individual analyses the report should assess the overall coherence of the actions carried out and thus form a judgment of the policy as a whole.

The examples of public action set out below are proposed merely by way of reminders and illustrations.

#### 1. Measures relating to creation and production

It is generally agreed that it is not suitable in democratic societies for the state and the public authorities to determine the direction taken by creativity, which should be free. For it to blossom, however, it often needs to be supported.

In some fields the artist seeks first and foremost to gain possession of a symbolic asset - recognition of the value of what he has created - irrespective of the market which

---

<sup>3</sup> The Austrian national report currently being prepared also devotes special chapters to objectivisation, accessibility and policy effectiveness.

provides a financial reward for his production. Society should not maintain him, however, but takes it upon itself to place him in an environment that will foster his creativity, to help him to prove himself in the eyes of experts and to find an audience.

In principle, what is called the market sector obtains its resources from the sale of its products to the public. However, it is accepted in many countries that the state's assistance should not benefit creative artists and non-profit-making institutions alone, but also industries. The principle is given especially good application in that the traditional concept of culture is tending to become broader: areas long excluded from the field of cultural legitimation now frequently find a place there.

Another aim of providing support for cultural industries is to combat the threat of international standardisation and to maintain in the wide public reached by the products of that industry a feeling of allegiance towards a country, a region, a language or Europe.

Public assistance does not take the same form when extended towards unique works of art, usually produced by a lone creative artist, performing arts (music, theatre, dance), drawing on the talents of a number of performers for a production that can be repeated but which remains distinctive each time, and reproducible works of art, ranging from the craftwork of decorative arts to a full-scale industrial set-up (books, records, film and audio-visual media).

Under these circumstances, such assistance is given directly to the creators or to the bodies that produce works or to cultural industries.

#### 1.1 Assistance to creators

Such assistance is generally provided from the time of training. The evaluation report should provide answers to such questions as the following: How is arts education financed? What disciplines are covered? Are arts pertaining to mass culture (jazz, song, comic strips, etc, or traditional folk cultures) taken into account? Is there training for craftwork and for work in the cultural industries (photography, cinema, audio-visual media, graphic arts)?

Legislative and statutory measures. It should be specified whether copyright law has kept up with changes in modes of dissemination and practices; whether there is payment for the exploitation of works at the different stages of audio-visual communication (performance, recording, broadcasting by radio, television, cable, satellite, etc); whether new categories of artists (photographers, graphic artists, etc) are protected by copyright; whether, in accordance with the Rome Convention, a "neighbouring right" has been established for those professions which participate

in production alongside authors (artists, performers, producers); whether payment is made for private copying and the loan of books, records and audio-visual cassettes; whether there exists a "droit de suite" or residual right for works of plastic art.

Social and fiscal protection. Is there a special socialsecurity scheme for authors and performers? Do special provisions exist for unemployed artists? Is there a special tax system for artists (lump-sum deduction for professional expenses, possible staggering of copyright revenue over several years)?

Direct support for artists. This support may take the form of commissions, the purchase of works, fellowships, "sabbatical years", prizes, etc. What categories of artists can benefit from it: writers, musicians, plastic artists, scriptwriters, theatre producers, etc? Is the support reserved for artists producing works of high culture or is it extended to other categories? Is it given primarily for innovation? How are criteria of quality taken into consideration? Do resources derive essentially from the budget of the state or of another public authority? Do they also derive from special funds set up for each cultural sector drawing on the economic flows of the sector itself? How is the support administered?

Do the public authorities make do with determining standards or do they themselves take ad hoc decisions to suit particular circumstances? Are they assisted by advisory committees in which artists are represented, possibly through the agency of professional organisations? Do they entrust responsibility for the awarding of grants to para-administrative bodies enjoying some degree of independence?

## 1.2 Assistance to institutions and organisations

- a. In most countries the public authorities establish and play a direct part in the management of a number of bodies. What bodies are involved (theatres, opera houses, radio and television organisations)? What degree of independence do they enjoy? What is the relative share of public funding in this sector?
- b. Public assistance can also be provided in the form of grants to non-commercial bodies which, in the performing arts, are responsible for the production (and often also at the same time for the dissemination) of works (new and old): theatres, orchestras, concert-organising companies, festivals. Outside the performing arts, is assistance granted in related sectors such as research centres concerned with new technologies (electronic music and images)? Are operating standards laid down in agreements or in schedules of conditions? Do the beneficiary bodies have themselves to provide part of the revenue? Are they affected by the "Baumol law" whereby

their expenditure constantly rises at a fast rate while their production stays the same or declines and they then attract an increasingly large grant?

### 1.3 Support to the cultural industries and to the commercial sector

A study conducted on this subject in 17 countries on the initiative of the Council of Europe<sup>4</sup> covered among cultural industries books, phonograms, newspapers, cinema, videograms and radio and television. It provides a structure which can serve as a model for national evaluations.

The analysis should highlight the objectives pursued and show in each field whether the assistance is extended to the product, the enterprise or the industrial branch or whether, exceptionally, it covers all cultural industries.

Direct assistance: this consists in financial transfers from the public authorities to a cultural industry with immediate compensation (purchases and pre-purchases), with partial or total compensation (advance repayable from income, guarantee in the event of loss, by loan or loan guarantee) or without any compensation. Is the assistance targeted? It is automatic and inclusive? Can it be given to all the products or all the enterprises of a branch without distinction? It is on the contrary reserved for a definite category in accordance with objective criteria known in advance or is it granted at the giver's discretion? Is a selection made from among all those to which such assistance might be extended (product or enterprise)? How is it made? Does the political authority get help from committees composed of professionals?

#### Normative and statutory measures

These may take the form of measures to lower the price of products by tax relief (eg application of a reduced VAT rate in some sectors) or by tariff reductions on certain components of the cost price of products. They made on the contrary take the form of additional taxes and special levies payable for certain transactions or by certain users in order to serve as a source of funds for sectoral support.

---

<sup>4</sup> An initial survey undertaken from 1983 to 1985 in the Council for Cultural Co-operation's Project Group No. 11 gave rise to a publication: François ROUET, Des aides à la culture: Le soutien public aux industries de la culture en Europe et au Québec, Brussels, éd. Mardaga, 1987; the results of the second survey carried out in 1988-1989 and updating the data previously collected were published by François ROUET and Xavier DUPIN, Le soutien public aux industries culturelles, Paris, La Documentation française, February 1991.

Measures specific to television. Specific measures in support of audio-visual and cinematographic production or for other artistic sectors may be imposed by law or in schedules of conditions on state television organisations and sometimes on private organisations; quotas for the transmission of the company's own productions and national or European productions as well as operating rules to restrict the extent to which they enter into competition with other industries may also be imposed on those organisations. What is the situation in the country concerned?

Measures in relation with Europe. Through its directives and regulations, the European Community seeks to ensure the free flow of cultural products; it ensures in particular that national supporting measures or productions do not give rise to unfair competition. What are the consequences of the application of such measures? Conversely, has the country availed itself of the increased opportunities for international co-productions provided by the Council of Europe's Eurimages fund or the European Community's Media plan or Audio-visual Eureka?

2. Measures relating to the decentralisation of infrastructures, cultural activities and responsibilities

In most of the European countries in the last 25 years there has been a trend towards decentralisation and regionalisation which has had an effect, in particular, on cultural policies. The report should show:

The distribution of public expenditure on culture between the state, the regions and the towns

Changes that have occurred during the period under consideration should be shown first of all.

Modes of intervention in financing and decision-making

Types of decentralisation in the various cultural fields should be analysed:

- regional siting of cultural facilities on the initiative and under the responsibility of the central authority;
- administrative and budgetary devolution of activities and resources, responsibility for which remains at the central level;
- selective transfer (by field of activity) of resources to the regional and municipal authorities;
- possibility for the regions and municipalities to cover cultural expenditure in particular by means of direct and indirect taxes;

- maintenance or discarding of common operating rules among the regions;
- co-ordination between autonomous authorities at the regional level.

It should be ascertained whether there is overlapping responsibility between the state, the regions and the towns and whether, for some activities, there can be joint financing and forms of collaborative management. In addition, have transfers of authority led to changes of attitude towards culture on the part of regional and municipal administrators? Are the latter concerned to develop their own cultural policy? Have there been any changes of priority in the provision of support for the various cultural sectors?

### The results

Indicator tables should show to what extent the objective has been achieved of improving the country-wide distribution of specialised schools and cultural facilities and institutions: orchestras, opera houses, festivals, theatres, libraries, museums, exhibitions, auditoria, regional or local radios and televisions, associations and cultural centres combining organisational and promotional functions in a variety of fields.

Changes in the rates of frequentation of the various cultural facilities should also be estimated, showing where possible the relation by institution between operating costs and frequentation by the public.

### 3. Measures to attract larger sections of the public and to democratise culture

To evaluate the extent to which larger sections of the public have been attracted to cultural events it is not enough to count up the number of people frequenting institutions. It must also be ascertained whether greater facilities of access have led to greater participation by groups already won over to "legitimate" culture or whether new sections of the public have been reached. Here, surveys on cultural practices are very useful. They are fairly difficult to carry out but fortunately they are now becoming more common in many countries, as was shown by a colloquium organised in Moscow by CIRCLE in April 1991<sup>5</sup>. In order to command sufficient information it is desirable for several surveys to be conducted

---

<sup>5</sup> See Participation in cultural life. Papers presented to the European Round Table on Cultural Research, Moscow, April 1991, Zentrum für Kulturforschung (Bonn), in cooperation with C.I.R.C.L.E. Cf. also La participation à la vie culturelle en Europe. Essai de comparaison des pratiques culturelles des Européens (one of the studies resulting from the Moscow colloquium, in the process of being published).

some years apart. Trend indicators are thus obtained which are as "eloquent" as a panoramic film shot.

Surveys provide a means in particular of verifying the generally observed correlation between social background, educational attainment and the frequentation of cultural institutions and of checking whether a consistent polarisation is thus established between interested and uninterested groups in the various cultural fields.

If this is so, it is clearly not enough to provide facilities for them to be actually used by certain categories of the public. In the attempts to attract a wider social spectrum differences may however be seen according to the cultural field. Whether they result from effective mediation by cultural enterprises or from special measures taken by the public authorities themselves or from yet other factors, the successes should be analysed so that, where appropriate, they may serve as a model.

The report should also show whether specific action is being taken for the benefit of groups not reached satisfactorily by the general policy of cultural democratisation: workers in enterprises, immigrants, country-dwellers, people suffering from various disabilities, servicemen and prisoners; are young people, in particular, who often have the same tastes, practices and behaviour, taken into account? And with social just as much as cultural objectives? In this sector too, it is necessary to show the approaches used, the resources allocated and the results obtained.

It is true that the school is not an ideal means of democratisation since, owing to social differences affecting enrolments in the various establishments and the resources available to them, it tends to reproduce certain cultural assumptions. It may nevertheless play an important role in developing a taste for culture and making pupils more receptive. The evaluation should therefore provide information about enrolment trends, the place given to culture in general education, the supply of culture available to young people and adolescents, the grounding in audio-visual expression given to them and the facilities of access granted to young people in specialised schools and cultural institutions.

#### 4. Measures relating to the preservation of the heritage

In the policy for the preservation of the heritage a distinction needs to be drawn between specific measures to preserve and restore that heritage and measures to present it to the public. The latter aspect may be covered, in connection with libraries and museums for instance, in the chapter on measures to attract larger sections of the public.



For the evaluation to be exhaustive, the following must be taken into consideration:

Widening of the fields covered by the policy of preservation: over and above the traditional fields (fine arts, history, archaeological excavations, libraries, archives, historic sites and monuments, etc), various other fields are now recognised, such as:

- new subject-matter for museums (photography, film, comic strips, advertising, furniture, industrial design, fashion, science and technology, transport, folklore and folk tradition);
- the industrial heritage (factories, plant, objects, housing estates, etc);
- architecture;
- town planning;
- housing and the minor rural heritage;
- the environment.

Operational objectives and practical measures for:

- listing for the purpose of protecting monuments and sites;
- the purchase of works;
- the restoration of monuments, works of art, books, etc;
- preservation;
- presentation;
- opening to the public.

The means used may include:

- legislative and statutory measures for the protection of the various fields;
- tax incentives for individuals and firms to assume at least partial responsibility for the preservation of the heritage;
- patronage;
- administrative measures (criteria for the selection of priorities, proficiency of personnel, drawing up of inventories, etc);

- ways and means of ensuring that (partial or total) responsibility is assumed for safeguarding operations;
- the financial resources earmarked for the various tasks;
- modes of action of the various levels of authority;
- training of scientific personnel and mediators;
- modernisation of display methods;
- practical arrangements for receiving the public (hours, admission prices);
- consciousness-raising and promotional measures ("open days", "archaeology year", etc);
- efforts to attract new sections of the public (cultural tourism, documents, specially designed exhibitions, etc).

The results and effects should be subjected to evaluations by field on the basis of quantitative data and explanatory commentaries and to an overall evaluation.

#### 5. Measures relating to international cultural policy

Starting from general objectives (defence of cultural identity, ensuring national representation abroad, international co-operation, accommodation of foreign products, etc), operational objectives and practical programmes of action should be noted.

Among the means employed, the following should be taken into consideration:

- distribution of international tasks between various ministries and sharing of responsibilities between the various levels of public authority (state, regions);
- direct intervention by ministries, possible recourse to a public office for international cultural relations, to agencies specialising in the international promotion and marketing of cultural products, and to professional associations;
- bilateral exchanges, co-operation between linguistically or geographically homogeneous cultural groups, and co-operation in international organisations (UNESCO, Council of Europe, European Community);
- financial or operational support for the presence abroad of creative artists, performers, works, products, enterprises; selection procedures for artists or enterprises receiving support; composition of possible advisory bodies;

- preferential tariffs to support certain exports; measures to attract foreign artists and products; or on the contrary, protective measures (by quotas or other methods) against certain foreign products;
- use of radio and television;
- vocational training of qualified staff.

In the evaluation of results special attention should be paid to the effects of binding provisions resulting from conventions adopted under the auspices of international organisations like the Council of Europe and the European Community. These, particularly when they take the form of "directives" or "regulations", may make it necessary to adjust the national laws of member countries and abolish obstacles to the free flow of products, services and persons. The evaluation should endeavour to measure the resulting advantages, but also the difficulties that may be created by the establishment of a greater market for cultural products (with the limitations now imposed on national assistance).

#### 6. Measures relating to multiculturalism

In view of the importance in various countries of problems linked to the existence of minority ethnic groups or the mass arrival of immigrants in a context of economic crisis, it is desirable that multiculturalism be taken into account in the report. A distinction should be drawn between ethnic groups regarded as nationals owing to their historical presence in some regions of the country and communities that have immigrated in the more or less recent past.

Among the objectives of cultural policy, the following should be given prominence in the various cases and with the necessary qualifications:

- respect for the identity of ethnic groups as expressed in their language, their religion and their ways of life;
- concern to achieve more or less rapid integration into the majority norms of the population;
- concern to limit the inflow of new immigrants.

Among the means employed, it should be shown:

- whether in certain regional or local districts the law contains special provisions guaranteeing for some ethnic groups administrative and financial self-management in the cultural sphere, taken in the broadest sense;
- whether advisory bodies allow foreign groups to make their social and cultural requirements known;

- under what conditions throughout the country certain ethnic or linguistic minorities may receive special assistance at the educational, religious, social and cultural levels;
- what special measures have been taken on behalf of immigrant youth.

Evaluation of results should make it possible to measure:

- whether progress has been achieved in securing acceptance of multiculturalism in public opinion;
- whether, notwithstanding the measures taken, the feeling exists in part of the population that their cultural identity is threatened by the presence of foreign ethnic or linguistic groups, particularly ones that have immigrated recently.

#### IV. THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Considerable work is needed to prepare the national report, but the primary justification for the effort demanded is no doubt that, with the help of the international expertise of the Council of Europe, it should lead the public authorities of a country to introduce or improve the methods, instruments and bodies that should enhance their ability to analyse the cultural policy measures they are implementing and to draw the proper conclusions.

The Council of Europe would like the evaluation to be as comprehensive as possible for the sake of maximum comparability between member countries. It is aware however that variants may be introduced to take into account the individual situations of the various countries. The evaluation may be of a broader scope than in the case of France and Sweden; it may also be more limited. It might even, as proposed by the OECD model for the evaluation of education policies, be confined to a review of a particular sector or reform. The reasons for such a decision may be linked to a concern to consider on a priority basis original or indeed experimental initiatives. They may also stem from the impossibility of commanding in several fields sufficient information for the evaluation to be fully relevant.

This study has set out in detail what is considered to be desirable in respect of the material to be taken into consideration to determine aims, practical objectives and the means employed and to assess the results achieved. But a national report does not necessarily have to meet all these requirements. What matters first and foremost is that it be rigorous in its treatment of data. A study parallel to the present one will endeavour to identify the indicators required as a minimum for the validity of the evaluation not be open to question; it will also advise on their elaboration.

As the evaluation should, in principle, cover a period extending over several years, a real difficulty may arise from a lack of data concerning the past in certain fields or from the magnitude of the effort needed to collect such data. This should not however be a reason for desisting.

A critical review of the situation existing at the time of writing the report with plunges into the past whenever possible is, in any case, not without its use; such a study may mark the stage ex ante, essential for the carrying out of a future ex post evaluation, which will more effectively meet the requirements of a future evaluation.

When the national report is being prepared, the political authority concerned will find it necessary to have recourse to one of its own internal departments or to outside research services for the collection and presentation of the required quantitative and other data. The services of experts will therefore entail administrative costs and expenses that will be particularly high if special work needs to be carried out.

From the outset, a co-ordinating team has to be set up with the task of establishing the terms of reference of the experts, to be approved by the commissioning authority, to provide assistance for data collection by facilitating liaison between the experts and the administrations and bodies concerned, to check that the answers provided by the experts match those laid down in the terms of reference, to establish co-ordination between the experts and the authority responsible for the evaluation and to ensure that the authority forms judgments to supplement the quantitative data and opinions gathered by the experts.

The national report should be prepared in the two languages of the Council of Europe (English and French), and normally also in the language of the country. It will be submitted in the first instance to the international experts designated by the Council of Europe so that they can request any further information they consider useful.

The co-ordinating team should then establish liaison between the international examiners and the drafters of the report. It should take into consideration the wishes of the examiners and propose to them the names of persons who can help them to check the judgments expressed in the national report; it should then establish the timetable for meetings and organise the meetings, which should in principle take place over a period of two weeks and be held in different towns in the country.

The co-ordinating team should also arrange meetings between the examiners and the responsible authorities and take steps to receive the examiners when they are preparing their report. It is understood that hospitality expenses are to be borne by the country undergoing the evaluation, the costs of international travel being defrayed by the Council of Europe.

It also falls to the co-ordinating team to ensure the publication in English or French of the report of the international examiners; first in a version intended for the meeting of the Council for Cultural Co-operation at which the policy-makers agree to answer the questions of the Council, and later in a final version for the public, still in English and French<sup>6</sup>. This last version, for which a lump sum will be provided by the Council of Europe, should be distributed as rapidly as possible both in the country, to all those who are concerned by the policy evaluated, and abroad, in all the member countries of the Council of Europe.

Owing to the variety of national situations, it is not appropriate to make here even a rough estimate of the costs and expenses that can be expected to be assumed by the country wishing to undergo the evaluation procedure. However, it is possible to sum up the tasks to be carried out, it being understood that each of them entails expenditure, both in money and in working time.

1. Drafting of the national report

- Operation of the working party set up by the commissioning authority and responsible for co-ordinating the drafting of the report;
- Gathering of information and provisional drafting of the report by an expert of a research team. The cost of this study may vary considerably according to whether recourse is had to a department linked to the ministry concerned or to a specialised research centre, and also according to the documentation already available to the ministry for some sectors; this work may extend over a period of 12 to 24 months;
- Approval by the political authority of the report prepared in the language of the country.

2. Publication of the national report

- Translation of the report in the two official languages of the Council of Europe;
- Publication in the form of pre-reports for the meeting of the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Co-operation (300 copies);
- Publication of the final report in the two languages of the Council of Europe (against lump-sum payment by the Council of Europe) (1500 copies).

---

<sup>6</sup> Translation into the second language is ensured by the Council of Europe; it might in future be ensured by the country itself against a lump-sum payment from the Council of Europe.

3. Collaboration in the preparation of the report of the European experts

- Contacts with the Council of Europe;
- Meetings with the experts:
- Preparation of the programme of meetings with leaders and protagonists in cultural life and with the country's ministerial authorities;
- Documentary support for the experts;
- Hospitality for the experts and travel inside the country (in principle, two weeks of contacts and two further meetings for discussion);
- Simultaneous translation during the meetings;
- The cost of publishing the experts' report is borne by the Council of Europe, but the report may be published by the country concerned against payment by the Council of Europe of a lump sum to cover the costs. Publication of the report in the language of the country undergoing the evaluation is desirable, but is the responsibility of that country;
- Participation in the discussion of the experts' report at a meeting of the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Co-operation;
- Organisation of a press conference to present the report.

\*\*\*

In future the following procedure will be necessary before the Council of Europe can involve itself in international evaluation in respect of a particular country:

1. Filing of application by the country defining the scope of the evaluation envisaged (overall or sectoral evaluation) accompanied by a work plan.
2. Agreement concerning the project by the Council of Europe's Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport.
3. Delivery to that Directorate of a provisional version of the national report within a period of time to be determined.
4. Undertaking by the authorities of the country concerned to assume responsibility for the international experts' review in the manner described above and to bring it to completion.

5. Favourable opinion by the president and rapporteur of the group of international experts appointed by the Council of Europe noting that satisfactory progress has been made in gathering information and drafting the text for the national report.
6. Within a period of 12 months, conduct of the evaluation by the experts of the Council of Europe.
7. Drafting and publication within the six months following the report of the experts of the Council of Europe.
8. Submission of the national report and report by the experts to the CDCC.