

“MUSEUM COMMUNICATOR” (MU.COM.)

INTERIM MONITORING REPORT

**Leonardo Da Vinci Programme
Project MU.COM. –
LLP-LDV-TOI-10-IT- 489**

Responsible author:

Printed on:

Project Partnership:

0. Sapienza University of Rome - CIDEM
1. Regional History Museum "Academician Jordan Ivanov" in Kyustendil
2. EURO INNOVANET SRL
3. Province of Ragusa
4. The International Museum of Ceramics in Faenza
5. The University Lucian Blaga, Sibiu
6. The Brukenthal National Museum
7. OAKE Associates

Titolo: Interim Monitoring Report

Status

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Draft | <input type="checkbox"/> Public – for public use |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deliverable | <input type="checkbox"/> IST – for IST programme participants only |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Report | <input type="checkbox"/> Restricted |

Introduction.

The intermediate report of monitoring has been carried out through a desk analysis involving the filling in of the attached questionnaire by the members of the partnership. The aim is to examine and evaluate:

- the effectiveness of the sharing of processes and objectives in the project planning;
- the functionality of the communication among the members of the partnership not only as a support to the actions taken, but also as a stimulus to the implementation of the results (the partial ones included) related to the single steps scheduled by the project planning;
- the active involvement of each member of the partnership and the qualitative evaluation of the first results.

The internal check includes the steps scheduled by the workprogramme of the first year (WP 1- 5) with particular reference to:

- participation to the first partnership meeting,
- modalities of communication among partners,
- evaluation of the First Transnational Report,
- evaluation of the quality of the results in the construction of national networks (beneficiaries and other local actors),
- evaluation of the results of the national peer reviews.

Partners have been proposed a scale level from min. 0 (not satisfying) to max 5 (very efficacious/very good) and the possibility of using short descriptive indicators.

1. Evaluation of the participation to the first partnership meeting

The evaluation of the first partnership meeting (February 2011) is extremely positive, as for the organizational aspects, the content and the achievement of the expected goals. Only one of the partners, though considering the organizational aspects and the content satisfying, is partially satisfied with the achievement of the expected goals (with reference, in particular, to the administrative and financial ones) as a consequence of a lack of time. However, the same partner underlines both the importance of the meeting:

“as a fundamental opportunity to meet all the partners, understand each level of involvement and find opportunity to share goals”

and the possibility of deepening and clarifying these aspects through a rich and efficacious communication among partners:

“it was possible to deepen these aspects in the relations and contacts which followed the meeting”.

2. Effectiveness of the communication among partners

The evaluation (4,5) is extremely positive: the partners have appreciated the constant support of the partners leaders and the opportunity to create further premises for an active cooperation. We consider this result relevant for the carrying out of the project, its implementation and its spreading.

3. Evaluation of the First Transnational Report

The question was about both the active involvement in the project and an evaluation of the results.

Level of active involvement	4,7
Quality of results/outcomes	5,0

The evaluation is close and equal to *optimum*. The slight difference between one's own active involvement and the quality of results is due to an initial difficulty or uncertainty shown by some partners in the start-up phase, as a consequence of both the complex mechanism of making different realities work together and the strong innovation represented by the new professional figure introduced by the "MU.Com".

"[We] found some difficulties in the starting the collaboration to the report, we did not face immediately the strategy and it caused us a loss of time".

The result is anyway welcome by the maximum score and some relevant remarks about the quality of results and the level of cooperation among partners:

" It's been a well managed project and everything has been clear and concise. This includes information coming from partners and the project coordinators"

"The Transnational Report is developed accurately summarising and including the information provided by the project partners".

4. Evaluation of the quality of results in the construction of local networks and identification of the beneficiaries of the project.

The construction of local networks and the identification of the beneficiaries of the project represent the main step in the planning of the first year of activities. Even in this case, the activities carried out by the partners are more than satisfying: their evaluation is in fact very good (4,7). Besides, they seem to have started up processes that may result extremely positive for the continuation and the implementation of the project, representing a meeting point between the innovative supply introduced by the project and the needs- not always explicit- of local medium/ small sized museums that are the starting target of "MU.Com".

"Once we started to engage with the smaller "peoples" museums they were very interested in the project".

5. Evaluation of the results of the national peer reviews.

At last, in strict connection with the previous survey, the national meetings with groups of beneficiaries, museum operators and cultural and tourist sectors of local development have been monitored. The monitoring has focused – through the peer review method– on the screening of suggestions related to the profile and professional role of the “museum communicator” and the consequent formative proposal. Partners have been asked to give an objective and clear evaluation, on which the future steps of the project may be built.

Level of participation	4,7
Quality of suggestions	4,3

In this case too, the evaluation has been very good. The slight difference between the level of participation and the quality of observations and suggestions can be explained by considering the phase of transition in which museums are nowadays operating. This phase has been described by the Transnational Report as follows: a phase in which a more professional and incisive capacity to relate and communicate with the public and the territory is felt, though some museum operators still seem to be uncertain about how to choose the most efficacious strategies to define an innovative mission. Considering this, it is to be said that partners have different opinions and only one of them is not satisfied with the contribution of his own network, this due to expectations that are maybe too high.

6. Conclusions

The monitoring of the first year of activities of the project reports a positive trend of the goals achieved, as proved by the good and sometimes excellent scores registered. In conclusion, we mean to underline an element which needs a further implementation in the prosecution of the project.

The efficiency and the effectiveness of the internal communication among the members of the partnership has permitted the circulation of information and supports, thanks to which possible *impasses* have been overcome. This has also highlighted a certain willingness to cooperate, which will obviously facilitate the following steps of the project. The importance of communication and its preservation- as already mentioned- are the foundations of an efficient partnership; thanks to them the sharing of objectives, tools and strategies can become a common patrimony, essential to achieve the expected aims.