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Report
The background and context
The need for this working group

- Heritage policies and management have a noteworthy impact on the quality of life and well-being of people, and there is a clear interconnection between the social and economic aspects related to heritage.
- In the cultural heritage policy domain a focus is emerging on the quantitative and qualitative assessment of the economic and social value of heritage, aimed at providing evidence to policy makers of the advantages brought by cultural heritage policies to social cohesion and to quality of life and of living environment.
- While several initiatives in the field of economic impact are already underway at international level, social impact, a traditional priority of the Council of Europe, is not yet being duly addressed.
- The European Heritage Network is a de-facto intergovernmental body dealing with national heritage policies across Europe, based at the Council of Europe and ready to deal with megatrends in cultural heritage. The Network raised the need for a working group aimed at dealing with the emerging issue of heritage values assessment.

The approach
The challenge and the added value

The approach chosen in setting up the Working Group was to directly involve cultural heritage professionals, experts working in the field of cultural heritage policies, programmes and projects within national ministries or heritage agencies, already active as members of the European Heritage Network. They would be focusing on the new issue of social values pursued by cultural heritage policies with the support and the guide of an expert in the field of impact measurement in the cultural field.

The direct involvement of the national heritage policy makers and implementers in this activity, aimed at introducing and consolidating innovative ways for orienting and evaluating the cultural heritage policies, presents two-fold added value:

- It roots the activity of the Working Group in the real world of the actual heritage policies, with their real problems and specificities;
- It contributes to raising awareness of the new approach across engaged heritage professionals.

Although dealing from the outset with only experts from the research field might have seemed easier and quicker, this could have led to a risk of “disembodiment” of the work from the actual heritage field.

The Working Group is currently composed of:

- 9 members from the European Heritage Network;
- One expert in the field of impact analysis of cultural policies and projects;
- Representatives of the Secretariat of the Council of Europe.

The mission
Aims and objectives

- The Working Group engages, in the first instance, with the identification of social values related to cultural heritage;
- The Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Heritage for Society (the so-called 'Faro Convention') and related documents and experiences are taken as references;
- The group identifies, analyses and shares the qualitative and quantitative approaches carried out in the different countries in order to ascertain heritage-related values and to measure social impacts;
- On this basis, the main outcomes and the related indicators for the measurement of the social values will be identified.
The role of the Faro Convention
The CoE framework for social values of heritage

The Faro Convention is an innovative and far-sighted tool promoting an innovative approach that puts people and human values at the core of a cross-disciplinary concept of cultural heritage, thus helping to frame today’s complex social challenges.

The Convention highlights principles and criteria for the democratic participation in heritage policy development and identifies a set of main benefits of heritage for society.

The Council of Europe is currently promoting the Faro Convention, entered into force in 2011. As a main promotional initiative, the Marseille Forum on the social value of heritage was organised in September 2013. The final report of Forum (currently under draft) will contribute to the interpretation and implementation of Faro principles.

First emerging results
Main outcome of the first working group meeting

1. Brainstorming
   During the brainstorming session, the following shared acknowledgments emerged:
   - Raising the question of social values related to cultural heritage lessens the risk of having a reductive approach to heritage measurement based only on economic indicators;
   - It should be stressed how interconnected and intertwined the economic and social effects of specific cultural initiatives are;
   - The Faro Convention provides a strategic platform for experimentation, because social values and social impacts are at the core of its aim and are embedded in key statements referring to rights and responsibilities;
   - The concept of heritage should be widely understood as never static. Over time, it expanded its scope encompassing new categories (including for example intangible and symbolic assets) and continues evolving;
   - There is a shared acknowledgment that measuring and evaluating social impacts means focusing on the results of an activity, and not on the activity itself;
   - There is as a consequence a shared acknowledgement that social impact assessments should focus on the outcomes of an activity (for example, changes in people’s attitudes deriving from a heritage-led community initiative) and not on the processes or outputs that form an activity (number of people engaged, workshops carried out, etc.);
   - The model of value creation chain was considered as a workable conceptual path for achieving the main tasks of the working group;

   - The value creation chain can be “read” and interpreted in a twofold way: from inputs to impacts (diagnostic approach) and from impacts to inputs (predictive approach). In the latter case, once the ultimate goals that stakeholders would like to achieve (the expected impacts) have been defined, it is possible to delineate a reverse process starting from the establishment of a set of desired outcomes. The remaining part of the process that moves from outputs to activities and to inputs will be then well defined and articulated in accordance with every specific socio-economic and political framework (both on a central level and on a local level).
2. Structured discussion

- Basing on the value creation chain model, the group attempted to identify cultural heritage social impacts in the light of the Faro Convention through discussion held in two sub-groups;
- A first tentative list of objectives was prepared. The list of objectives shall be revised and refined by every single WG member also through an internal discussion with national experts and policy makers. The new revised list should be at the basis of a further discussion across the Working Group, aimed at perfecting and refining the list of main objectives that embed specific social values whose achievements have to be measured and proved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First tentative list of objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ensuring that member States improve their regulatory framework in order to enforce individual and collective rights in the decision making process on heritage policies (Faro Art. 1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing and enlarging communities/individual participation and responsibility towards cultural heritage (Faro Art. 1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing and enlarging human development and quality of life through heritage related activities (Faro Art. 1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing and promoting the equal importance of all heritage values for the European societies (Faro Art. 3);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognizing as common heritage of Europe the heritage of all those living in Europe (Art. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reinforcing European citizenship based on understanding of the common values as a basis for the European identity (Faro Art.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoting a peaceful and stable society by increasing understanding of heritage related social values in Europe (Faro Art. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Embedding cultural heritage protection in policies and programmes for sustainable development (Faro Art. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fostering mutual respect and understanding of different cultures and different interpretation of heritage on the basis of knowledge and dialogue (Faro Art.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensuring the sustainable use and management of Heritage (Faro Art. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging the mutual cooperation of all needed agents to vital conservation of cultural heritage (Faro Art. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging all kinds of access to heritage through the enlargement of the social composition of persons benefitting from the cultural heritage and contributing towards its enrichment (Faro Art. 12 and 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lessons learned
Difficulties met, solutions found

The WG members recognised that defining social outcomes and identifying quanti-qualitative indicators were difficult tasks to achieve for several reasons:

- The WG members demonstrated heterogeneous levels of knowledge about social impacts and related methodological issues;
- A shared vision about the Faro Convention's ultimate goals has yet to be developed and consolidated;
- Crucial issues such as the “Common Heritage of Europe” and the formal definition of “Heritage Community” require discussion;
- There is a need to clarify the dimension where the impacts can be detected, distinguishing between the macro level (central and governmental policies), the meso level (heritage communities) and the micro level (individuals and individual stakeholders);
- Considering outputs and outcomes as two separate but entangled aspects of the same process presents a conceptual difficulty;
- Identifying proper indicators for the expected outcomes is a complex process;
- There is therefore a general need to have some basic knowledge about the methodological steps that are required for the implementation of an evaluation process;
- The expert played a key role and was successful in avoiding losing the focus of the discussion due to the above-mentioned difficulties and complexities. Thanks to his methodological support and clarifications, the group was able to build on its own multifaceted background.
Methodological and operational roadmap

What we are going to do, how and in which time framework?

In conclusion of the structured discussion, the group agreed on a possible methodological path enabling pursue of the original tasks within a defined time span:

- Finalisation of the work undertaken on the identification of heritage-related social values and related outcomes, in the light of the Faro Convention;
- Definition of proper indicators;
- Recognition of methodological approaches aimed at gathering data corresponding to the identified indicators.

The above identified points can correspond to the following workflow:

1. Goals and ultimate objects definition
   a. Identifying key targets
   b. Focusing on the perspective to adopt (i.e. more or less instrumental, addressed to specific targets or to the community as a whole, short or long term)
2. Methodological framework and outcomes definition
   a. Identifying social impacts framework (i.e. GSO - Generic Social Outcomes, GLO Generic Learning Outcomes)
   b. Enlarging, enriching and prioritizing the spectrum of possible outcomes to measure
3. Listing and testing of quantitative and qualitative indicators
4. Data gathering definition (tools and techniques)

The described workflow can be visualised as follows:

Short-term plan

What happens next?

- Steps 1 and 2
  - Two further working group meetings are required in order to pursue steps 1 and 2 (goals refinement and outcomes identification). The working structure can be the same working group supported by an expert in measurement of socio-economic impacts as facilitator.
- Steps 3 and 4
  - These steps require a much more profound knowledge of methodological issues, also due to the complexity of measuring and evaluating social impacts in the cultural field. An expert, or an interdisciplinary group of experts with different backgrounds, can interact with the
working group members. The technical expert/s will be providing a list of indicators to be checked and approved by the European Heritage Network.

- **Time frame:** a reasonable time span could be of **12-15 months** for the entire process.
- **Expected output:** A comprehensive list of outcomes and the related indicators, ready to be implemented in a systematic survey.

**Further steps**

*What happens afterwards?*

1. Data are gathered based on the indicators and the methodology agreed.
2. An evidence-based study is drafted on the basis of the scientific data gathered, in order to demonstrate social impact of heritage policies (this is the expected final outcome according to the mandate of the working group).
3. This first outcome will feed into other initiatives, such as:
   - A Recommendation to the member States on social impact focus in cultural heritage policies;
   - The establishment of a thematic network aimed at measuring key social values-oriented policy achievements.

**Documents enclosed:**

- Alessandro BOLLO, *Measuring social values: some definitions and methodological introduction*
- Erminia SCIACCHITANO, *The Faro Convention and heritage-related values*
- Sergiu MUSTEAȚĂ, *Social oriented cultural heritage initiatives. National experiences in Moldova*
- Zvezda KOŽELJ, *Ethnology and the protection of natural and cultural heritage* (summary of a MA thesis, contains a list of heritage related values);
### Annex 1

**List of references** (updated with the suggestions emerged during the brainstorming)

Work in progress

#### Social values of heritage


  URL: [http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/][junker_2011_knowing_20your_20pace/]

#### Social impact of heritage

- François Matarasso, *Use or Ornament? The social impact of participation in the arts*, Stroud, Comedia 1997
  URL: [http://mediation-danse.ch/fileadmin/dokumente/Vermittlung_resources/Matarasso_Use_or_Ornament.pdf](http://mediation-danse.ch/fileadmin/dokumente/Vermittlung_resources/Matarasso_Use_or_Ornament.pdf)


  URL: [http://www.lemproject.eu/][junker_2013_measuring_museum_impacts/]


  URL: [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/cdpatep/Plenary_Session/3_2010_May/CDPATEP_2010_4_EN.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/cdpatep/Plenary_Session/3_2010_May/CDPATEP_2010_4_EN.pdf)
  URL Addendum: [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/cdpatep/Plenary_Session/3_2010_May/CDPATEP_2010_4_EN_ADDENDUM.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/cdpatep/Plenary_Session/3_2010_May/CDPATEP_2010_4_EN_ADDENDUM.pdf)

- ISTAT and CNEL, *BES 2013: il benessere equo e sostenibile in Italia*, 2013 (in particular chapter 9, *Paesaggio e patrimonio culturale*)
  URL: [http://www.istat.it/it/files/2013/03/bes_2013.pdf](http://www.istat.it/it/files/2013/03/bes_2013.pdf)

#### Economic values of culture and heritage


- ICOMOS bibliography on economic values of heritage
  URL: [http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J03.html](http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J03.html)


- Hasan Bakhshi and David Throsby, *Culture of Innovation. An economic analysis of innovation in arts and cultural organisations*, NESTA 2010 (notice Appendix 1: A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic impact of heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- ICOMOS bibliography on economic impact of heritage: <a href="http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J02.html">http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J02.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ICOMOS bibliography on tourism impact: <a href="http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J05.html">http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J05.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- ICOMOS bibliography on heritage and sustainable development <a href="http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J05.html">URL: http://openarchive.icomos.org/view/subjects/J05.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodologies of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators for measuring impacts in neighbouring fields to culture and heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>