

# HOW TO ASSESS STRATEGIES OF PUBLIC CULTURAL BODIES: THE CASE OF THE CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IN SPAIN

COMO AVALIAR AS ESTRATÉGIAS DE INSTITUIÇÕES CULTURAIS PÚBLICAS:  
o caso da estratégia da cultura e desenvolvimento em Espanha

COMO EVALUAR ESTRATEGIAS DE INSTITUCIONES CULTURALES PÚBLI-  
CAS: el caso de la estrategia de cultura y desarrollo en España

Olga Blasco-Blasco

Professora Doutora da Universitat de València.  
[olga.blasco@uv.es](mailto:olga.blasco@uv.es)

Cristina Pardo-Garcia

Professora Doutora da Universitat de València.  
[cristina.pardo-garcia@uv.es](mailto:cristina.pardo-garcia@uv.es)

Vicente Coll-Serrano

Professor Doutor da Universitat de València.  
[vicente.coll@uv.es](mailto:vicente.coll@uv.es)

**ABSTRACT:** Culture has significantly evolved in its consideration as a key factor in development. This has been due to the progressive incorporation of the cultural component in the development strategies. This has made necessary the measurement of the impact of such policies, through monitoring and assessment of programs that are made. In this context it is essential to construct basic assessment tools for implementing these processes and, more specifically, to build a system of indicators that supports future decision making processes. In this paper we consider two strategic lines of action in the Spanish Cooperation Strategy for Culture and Development: Human capital training for cultural management and Education and Culture. The main actions that lead to the design of an indicators system for their follow-up and evaluation are shown for both strategic lines. With this aim, an initial list of indicators was submitted to an experts' panel opinion by using the Delphi technique. The indicators system is built from the analysis of the experts' evaluations and it can be subdivided into a Basic System and a Strategic System.

**KEYWORDS:** Education. Human capital training. Culture and development strategy. Indicators system. Follow-up and evaluation.

**RESUMO:** A cultura evoluiu significativamente na sua consideração como fator chave no desenvolvimento, resultando na incorporação progressiva do componente cultural nas estratégias de desenvolvimento. Tudo isto tornou necessária a medição do impacto destas políticas através do acompanhamento e avaliação dos programas realizados. A construção da avaliação de instrumentos é essencial para implementar esses processos e, mais especificamente, sistemas de indicadores que irão facilitar a tomada de decisões futuras. Neste trabalho são consideradas duas linhas estratégicas que articulam a Estratégia de Cultura e Desenvolvimento de Cooperação espanhola: a Formação do capital humano para gestão cultural e Educação e Cultura. Para ambas as linhas descrevem-se atividades principais, levando à concepção de um sistema de indicadores que permitem a sua monitorização e avaliação. Com este objetivo, uma lista inicial de indicadores foi submetida ao parecer de um grupo de especialistas, utilizando a técnica de Delphi. Com base na análise das avaliações estrutura-se um sistema de indicadores, que por sua vez podem subdividir-se num Sistema Básico e um Sistema Estratégico.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Educação. Formação de capital humano. Cultura e desenvolvimento da estratégia. Indicadores do sistema. Acompanhamento e avaliação.

**RESUMEN:** La cultura ha evolucionado notablemente en su consideración como factor clave en el desarrollo, resultando trascendental la progresiva incorporación del componente cultural en las estrategias de desarrollo. Todo ello ha hecho necesaria la medición del impacto de estas políticas, a través del seguimiento y evaluación de los programas que se realizan. Se hace imprescindible la construcción de instrumentos de evaluación para implementar estos procesos y, más concretamente, de sistemas de indicadores que faciliten la toma de decisiones futuras. En este trabajo se aborda cómo evaluar dos de las líneas estratégicas en que se articula la Estrategia de Cultura y Desarrollo de la Cooperación Española: la Formación de capital humano para la gestión cultural y Educación y Cultura. Para ambas líneas se describen las principales acciones desarrolladas conducentes al diseño de un sistema de indicadores que permita su seguimiento y evaluación. Con este fin se ha sometido un catálogo inicial de indicadores a la opinión de un conjunto de expertos mediante la técnica Delphi. A partir del análisis de las evaluaciones realizadas se estructura el sistema de indicadores, que a su vez puede subdividirse en un Sistema Básico y un Sistema Estratégico.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Educación. Formación de capital humano. Estrategia de cultura y desarrollo. Sistema de indicadores. Seguimiento y evaluación.

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

The national view for Development Cooperation is established in the Master Plan (MP) of Spanish Cooperation. It is the framework in which the public policy is established, in order to set the objectives to achieve through different sectorial and geographic cooperation strategies. The cultural cooperation aim and the role of the agents involved are also defined in the MP. Besides, it remarks the sectorial policies coherence, the harmonization between partner countries and the alignment with public policies engaged in development processes. Among other aspects, the MP tries to reconcile, unify and take advantage of the potential of culture and cooperation synergies with the Development objectives. To implement this public policy is necessary to develop a strategy that organizes the action mechanisms in this issue. Because of that reason, the Culture and Development Strategy<sup>1</sup> (CDS) was created (AECID, 2007), which is a framework document of cultural action of Spanish Cooperation that considers all the efforts for Development cultural cooperation.

This work describes how to assess the CDS of Spanish Cooperation through the definition and construction of an indicators system. This is an answer to the process initiated by the International Cooperation for Development Spanish Agency (AECID in Spanish) in 2007 about the thinking and definition of assessment indicators to help both, the technicians in charge of the strategy implementation and also the promoters of cultural cooperation projects that look for referents for the design, follow-up and evaluation of their proposals.

The process followed to construct the indicators system proposed in this work is applied over two strategic lines of the CDS: *Human capital training for cultural management with focus on culture and development projects* and *Complementarity and relationship between Education and Culture* (from now on, *Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture*, respectively). The starting point to obtain this indicators system is a catalog of cultural indicators which will be evaluated by an experts' panel with the Delphi Technique. A Relative Operability Index (ROI) is defined from the analysis of the experts' evaluations. Then, the basic and/or strategic dimension of the system is settled according to the typology of the chosen indicators (resource, process, product, effect and impact). The following sections of this work explain in detail the main steps to design a Basic and Strategic indicators system that allows the monitoring of both strategic lines of the CDS considered.

## 2 | CULTURAL INDICATORS RELATED WITH HUMAN CAPITAL TRAINING FOR CULTURAL MANAGEMENT AND EDUCATION AND CULTURE IN THE CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Some international organizations, such as United Nations (UN) and its United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank (WB) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), insist on the need of a monitoring and evaluation of development projects that are implemented. In Spain, the 23/1998 law (7/7/1998) of International Cooperation for Development establishes that cooperation policies

---

<sup>1</sup> Culture and Development Strategy is formed by 7 strategic lines: Human capital training for cultural management with focus on culture and development projects (Strategic line 1); Political dimension of culture in its contribution to development (Strategic line 2); Economic dimension of culture in its contribution to development (Strategic line 3); Complementarity and relationship between Education and Culture (Strategic line 4); Sustainable management of cultural heritage for development (Strategic line 5); Relationships between communication and culture with impact in development (Strategic line 6) and Boosting to cultural rights recognition processes (Strategic line 7).

for development should be evaluated as well as programmes and projects funded with public funds. According to this law, “the evaluation will take into account the relevance of the objectives and their level of attainment, also the efficiency and efficacy achieved, the impact reached and the checked viability in programmes and projects already finished”.

In 2005 Paris Declaration about aid effectiveness is stated the need to build progress indicators that allow to measure the donor countries’ performance. In the 2008 Accra Action Program an additional effort is suggested to the work team to improve the methodology and progress indicators. In the culture area, the collection of indicators by national (Statistics National Institute, Ministry of Culture, etc.) and international (Eurostat, UNESCO, etc.) authorities have yield aggregated information about culture state of the art in the world, but not sufficient for the management of specific programmes and projects (AECID, 2011).

In this context, AECID has promoted an indicators construction process to evaluate the implementation of the CDS since 2008 (AECID, 2009, 2011). With this purpose, a work team was created formed by (a) employees from AECID Cultural and Scientific Relationships Direction and Development Policies Planning and Assessment General Direction (DGPOLDE in Spanish); (b) an experts’ board, including cultural managers, sociocultural intervention professionals, cultural projects design and implementation professionals, etc. and (c) a consultancy firm specialized in cultural cooperation. The final result of this first project was the design of a methodology to create cultural indicators and the definition of a catalog for the evaluation of culture and development actions implemented inside the CDS, according to the specific and operational objectives of each strategic line.

This work is focused on two strategic lines of the CDS, and their specific objectives are:

- a) *Human capital training for cultural management*: facilitating and promoting the processes that help to human resources creation, enhancing their autonomy in the management of cultural life different dimensions with incidence in Development.
- b) *Education and Culture*: reinforcing the cultural structures and contents in the formal and not formal education processes, searching for a better understanding and participation of students in contemporary cultural and artistic phenomena.

Considering these objectives, the AECID initial catalog of cultural indicators is formed by 46 indicators related to the *Human capital training for cultural management* strategic line and 48 related to the *Education and culture* one (AECID, 2009). This first list of indicators was widen with (a) indicators from published statistics by Statistics Boards and Culture Ministries of the partner countries of Spanish cooperation and (b) indicators created from relevant variables taken from the Activities summary by the AECID Cultural and Scientific Relationships Direction. Therefore, the indicators catalog that is finally submitted to the evaluation of an experts’ panel is formed by a total of 49 and 84 indicators, distributed according to the strategic line and the priority action<sup>2</sup> (PA). This can be seen in table 1. See appendix 1 for the priority actions of *Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture* strategic lines.

To identify the optimal indicators for the system oriented to the follow-up and evaluation of *Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture* in the CDS of the Spanish Cooperation, each one of the cultural indicators in the catalog is evaluated with respect to the criteria of Relevance, Specificity and Feasibility (COLL-SERRANO et al., 2012). Besides, the experts evaluate the relative importance of these criteria in the Delphi technique (see next section) (YONG; WENHAO, 2012).

---

<sup>2</sup> The CDS is structured in strategic lines, which are in turn developed in different priority actions aimed to obtain the objectives detailed in those strategic lines.

Table 1 – Indicators distribution according to strategic line and priority action

Strategic Line	Indicators in each Priority Action (PA)		Total indicators
<b>Human capital training for cultural management</b>	PA-1	8	49
	PA-2	6	
	PA-3	10	
	PA-4	7	
	PA-5	11	
	PA-6	7	
<b>Education and culture</b>	PA-1	24	84
	PA-2	15	
	PA-3	8	
	PA-4	8	
	PA-5	7	
	PA-6	22	

Source: Own elaboration.

### 3 | INDICATORS EVALUATION METHODOLOGY: an application of the Delphi Technique

Linston and Turoff (1975) define Delphi technique as “a method for structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem”. Among the main characteristics of the Delphi Method are (DALKEY; BROWN; COCHAN, 1969; LINSTON; TUROFF, 1975; LANDETA, 2002; LOO, 2002): (a) participants’ anonymity, (b) controlled iteration and feedback and (c) group response in statistic terms. As Powell points out (2003, p. 376), the Delphi methodology is indeed “a series of sequential questionnaires or ‘rounds’, interspersed by controlled feedback, that seek to gain the most reliable consensus of opinion of a group of experts”. In our investigation the Delphi method was structured in three phases: Initial, Exploratory and Final Phase.

The initial phase of the process consisted first in the composition of the team in charge of the coordination and supervision of the Delphi Methodology. The objective and the background of the investigation were clearly stated, as well as the indicators catalog to be evaluated and the selection of the experts.

Given the investigation aim, it was considered that the Delphi participants’ panel was formed by experts from groups related to the programs to develop in the Abroad Spanish Cultural Centers – such as managerial personnel, administration employees and specialist technicians of the Centers – potential direct users of the final product (LINSTON; TUROFF, 1975; JONES; HUNTER, 1995). It was also convenient to contact with experts familiar with the CDS and outsiders from the involved institutions. In that way, the expert panel was composed by project managers, directors and technicians of both the Abroad Spanish Cultural Centers and the culture DRCC, technicians from the General Directory of Planning and Evaluation of Development Policies, experts engaged in the first step of the project, independent consultants and universities. Initially, the project had the participation of 18 experts in Human capital training for cultural management and 19 in Education and culture. Although there is no consensus in the optimal number of experts for a Delphi study, the theoretical minimum number (LANDETA, 2002) can be approximately around 7 experts, although the incorporation of more experts to the team reduces considerably the error (DALKEY; BROWN, COCHAN, 1969). In relative terms, the number of experts involved in the Delphi of each strategic line can be considered to be quite high, given that the number of experts related to the analysis object is low in absolute terms.

The exploratory phase consisted in the design of the different questionnaires to implement in the successive rounds, the follow-up of their filling by the participants and the analysis of the results obtained in each round. The data collection was carried out through the filling of the on-line questionnaires that were designed using LimeSurvey. A pre-test was conducted to determine the appropriate functioning of the website from which the information was going to be administrated in the first fortnight of December of 2009, and the checking of the questionnaires fits well the requirements of the study (POWELL, 2003; JAIRATH; WEINSTEIN, 1994).

The decision of implementing two rounds was due to a couple of reasons. On the one hand, most of the changes occur in the transition from the first to the second round, Zolingen and Klaasen (2003) cited by Hanafin et al. (2007). On the other hand, the indicators evaluation based on three criteria is a heavy task and maybe a greater number of rounds would imply the loss of interest and/or resignation of the experts (LOO, 2002). The first evaluation round started in the middle of January of 2010, with a three-week planned length. Questionnaires of the second round, customized for each expert, must (a) keep the evaluation conducted in the previous round, (b) show the main statistic measures (median and interquartile range) of global results and (c) allow the expert to maintain or modify his initial valuation when it was compared with the statistical information extracted from the response of the experts' panel. The participation in this round was limited to the experts who have completed the indicators' evaluation in the previous round.

In the second round, the information was collected between the second fortnight of February and the corresponding one of March of 2010. Eleven questionnaires were correctly filled in the *Human capital training for cultural management* line and ten questionnaires in the *Education and culture* line, which correspond to response rates of 61,11% and 52,63% respectively. Dispersion measures of the experts' answers between both rounds were computed to analyze the consensus or stability in their answers (HANAFIN et al., 2007). Specifically, the Relative Interquartile Range (RIR) for each of the three assessed criteria and each indicator in the catalog were computed to evaluate the Delphi effectiveness. Then, the following decision rule was adopted (COLL-SERRANO et al., 2012): the second round is considered effective if indicators are Effective (second round RIR greater than first round RIR) or Neutral (second round RIR equal to first round RIR) in at least 2 of the 3 criteria that are evaluated for each indicator. Otherwise, the second round is considered no effective. Table 2 shows a summary of the effectiveness by criteria of the Delphi second round.

Table 2 – Delphi effectiveness

<b>CDS strategic line</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>No effective</b>
<i>Human capital training for cultural management</i>	Relevance	10 (20,41%)	29 (59,18%)	10 (20,41%)
	Specificity	9 (18,37%)	25 (51,02%)	15 (30,61%)
	Feasibility	15 (30,61%)	23 (46,94%)	11 (22,45%)
<i>Education and culture</i>	Relevance	42 (50,00%)	31 (36,90%)	11 (13,10%)
	Specificity	48 (57,14%)	23 (27,38%)	13 (15,48%)
	Feasibility	37 (44,05%)	23 (27,38%)	24 (28,57%)

Source: Own elaboration.

Generally speaking, experts' evaluation was Effective for 39 indicators in Human capital training for cultural management, which is 79.59%, and for 76 indicators in Education and culture, which is 85.39%. Therefore, as these percentages are quite high, we can assure that the Delphi was

effective since it reached stable answers regarding the evaluation of indicators with respect to the criteria of relevance, specificity and feasibility (COLL-SERRANO et al., 2012).

Lastly, the final phase was oriented to the statistics treatment and analysis of the collected information (see the section of results analysis) and the summary of the process in a final report.

#### 4 | RESULTS ANALYSIS: indicators selection to evaluate the strategy

The indicators system to evaluate the CDS has been structured in two parts. The first part, called the Basic System, will be composed by simple indicators that allow getting information about activities, beneficiaries and results of the cultural action, given the planning already stated. Mainly, the Basic System will be formed by short-run indicators of resources, processes and products. The second part, called the Strategic System, is directly linked with the achievement of the expected successes in contrast with the proposed goals in the middle and long run. In that sense, the Strategic System will be formed by indicators related to the strategy and the results to be achieved in the middle and long run, with a principal relation with their effects and impacts.

The methodology approach to the Delphi results analysis for the selection of indicators that will define the system of indicators has been based on (a) the definition of a synthetic index of relative operability, and (b) its typology – resource, process, product, effect and impact – (BONEFOY; ARMIJO, 2005, p. 27; AECID, 2007, p. 49).

The indicators selection process that has been conducted is described in the following section.

##### 4.1 The indicators selection process

It seems reasonable to define and construct a synthetic Relative Operability Index (ROI) departing from the punctuations of relevance, specificity and feasibility given by the experts for the indicators in the catalog. The indicators with a better global behavior in each priority action, as they reach a higher ROI, will be selected to be part of the Basic System and/or the Strategic System of the monitoring and evaluation indicators, according to their typology.

In order to elaborate a ROI of the indicators for the different priority actions for the lines of *Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture*, we need to assign weighting coefficients to the three variables involved. In this way, we will have a unique measure of relative operability for each indicator, fact that will help the selection process and will guarantee that the synthetic index obtained has information about the three criteria evaluated by the experts. For any indicator in the system, denoted by  $I_j$ , the general formulation for the ROI ( $I_j$ ) can be written as (COLL-SERRANO et al., 2012, 2013):

$$ROI (I_j) = (w_R R_j + w_E E_j + w_F F_j) \quad (1)$$

where  $R_j$ ,  $E_j$  and  $F_j$  represent the median punctuations obtained by indicator  $j$  with respect to the criteria of relevance, specificity and feasibility. Weights of each criterion in the index are denoted by  $w_R$ ,  $w_E$  and  $w_F$  (GRANZOL; GERSHON, 1994; TAGUE, 2004). The weights used to compute the ROI of each indicator have been initially set at the modal values of the punctuations given by the experts ( $w_R = 0,5$ ,  $w_E = 0,25$  and  $w_F = 0,25$ ). See appendix 2 for the ROI of the indicators of priority action 1 in the strategic line of *Human capital training for cultural management*<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> The ROI's of every indicator considered are available upon request from the authors by email.

For the indicators selection to be representative of the multiple actions that are inside the CDS, it seems appropriate to impose the restriction that every priority action included in every strategic line has indicators in the selection, to be well represented in the Basic System of monitoring and evaluation indicators. For that reason, the selection process considers the indicators grouped according to the priority action to which they are referred to. Under these conditions, it seems desirable to obtain a selection of indicators based not only in the ROI value but also on the punctuations assigned by the experts with respect to the feasibility criterion. Although the three criteria are important, since they define the global operability of the indicator, the feasibility (the possibility of specifying objective numerical values for the indicator) appears as the logic pre-requirement to include an indicator in the Basic System of monitoring and evaluation indicators.

In this sense, for example, if an indicator is valued by experts as very relevant and specific but hardly ever feasible, it does not seem appropriate to choose it, since there are doubts with respect to the possibility of being able to observe or compute in real life its corresponding numerical values; thus having chosen it would be useless. With this reasoning, the indicators selection is carried out through the establishment of a minimum value or feasibility threshold for each priority action, and this determines which are the most feasible indicators, according to the experts' judgment.

The feasibility threshold, which is specific for each priority action, is defined in a way that allows retaining at least two indicators among the available ones for each priority action. In this way, the retained indicators are scaled in decreasing order according to their ROI value under the condition that they reach the feasibility threshold set for that particular priority action. Table 3 and Table 4 show the feasibility thresholds used to retain indicators in the lines of *Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture* respectively.

Table 3 – Feasibility thresholds in the strategic line of *Human capital training for cultural management*

Priority action	Average feasibility		Feasibility threshold	Number of indicators
	Maximum	Minimum		
PA-1	5,7	4,9	5,6	2
PA-1	5,5	4,4	5,5	2
PA-1	5	3,6	4,9	4
PA-1	5	4	4,7	2
PA-1	5,8	3,9	5,4	2
PA-1	5,5	4,1	5,2	2

Source: Own elaboration.

Table 4 – Feasibility thresholds in the strategic line of *Education and culture*

Priority action	Average feasibility		Feasibility threshold	Number of indicators
	Maximum	Minimum		
PA-1	4,7	3,4	4,5	3
PA-1	4,7	3,9	4,6	2
PA-1	4,5	3,1	4,3	2
PA-1	4,8	3,2	4,5	2
PA-1	4,5	3,3	4,4	4
PA-1	4,5	3	4,4	2

Source: Own elaboration.

The implementation of the detailed evaluation process – the two indicators with higher ROI are selected from those which exceed the feasibility threshold computed for that priority action – resulted in a final selection of 12 indicators in *Human capital training for cultural management* and 13 in Education and culture. Table 5 and table 6 show the selected indicators and their corresponding ROI's.

Table 5 – Selected indicators of *Human capital training for cultural management*

<b>Code</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>ROI</b>
<b>F1</b>	Number of participants in culture training actions.	5,275
<b>F2</b>	Percentage of managers that evaluate positively their participation in culture training actions.	5,45
<b>F3</b>	Budget assigned to exchanges of cultural managers in the countries with which a cooperation is established.	5,275
<b>F4</b>	Percentage of exchanges beneficiaries that evaluates positively their participation.	5,475
<b>F5</b>	Budget assigned to training programs promoted from the capacitation of cultural agents.	5,325
<b>F6</b>	Number of programs of specific training that use the capacitation of local cultural agents.	5,35
<b>F7</b>	Number of directories of cultural managers.	4,825
<b>F8</b>	Number of directories of cultural trainers and experts.	4,65
<b>F9</b>	Budget assigned to enhance the ICT use in the training of cultural managers.	5,325
<b>F10</b>	Number of webs related with cultural management with domain in the countries with which a cooperation is established or in their own languages.	5,375
<b>F11</b>	Number of people producing educational material, methodologies and research systems for the training in cultural management and policies.	5
<b>F12</b>	Budget assigned to develop educational material, methodologies and research systems for the training in cultural management and policies.	5,325

Source: Own elaboration.

Table 6 – Selected indicators of *Education and culture*

<b>Code</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>ROI</b>
<b>E1</b>	Number of participants in actions to promote youth creativity.	4,9
<b>E2</b>	Budget assigned to actions to promote youth creativity.	4,9
<b>E3</b>	Number of university graduate students.	5,25
<b>E4</b>	Budget assigned to awareness actions of the cultural diversity value in scholar programs.	5,2
<b>E5</b>	Number of beneficiaries of awareness actions of the cultural diversity value in scholar programs.	5,15
<b>E6</b>	Number of agents participating in approaching actions of formal education to cultural reality.	4,775
<b>E7</b>	Budget assigned to approaching actions of formal education to cultural reality.	5,075
<b>E8</b>	Budget assigned to artistic education programs for young people in risk of social exclusion.	5,15
<b>E9</b>	Number of artistic education programs for young people in risk of social exclusion.	5,1

Code	Indicator	ROI
E10	Number of actions to promote the access to information technologies in education, access to reading and cultural services.	4,925
E11	Number of beneficiaries of actions to promote the access to information technologies in education, access to reading and cultural services.	4,95
E12	Typology variation in bibliographic material borrowed from libraries.	4,875
E13	Number of participants in social activities of reading enhancing or beneficiaries of programs for culture access through public reading.	5

Source: Own elaboration.

#### 4.2 Indicators system basic and strategic system

The selection methodology based on indicators relative operability and feasibility thresholds for each priority action, which are obtained from the experts' opinion, provides an indicators reduced pre-selection that covers in a balanced way every priority action of the two strategic lines of Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture.

The indicators whose typology belongs to resource, process and/or product indicators are selected to be part of the Basic System, among the retained indicators (table 5 and table 6). In this way, the Basic System of monitoring and evaluation indicators for *Human capital training for cultural management* and *Education and culture* is formed by the indicators in table 7.

Table 7 – Selected indicators to integrate the Basic System

Strategic line of Human capital training for cultural management	
Code	Indicator
B-F1	Number of participants in culture training actions.
B-F3	Budget assigned to exchanges of cultural managers in the countries with which a cooperation is established.
B-F5	Budget assigned to training programs promoted from the capacitation of cultural agents.
B-F9	Budget assigned to enhance the ICT use in the training of cultural managers.
B-F11	Number of people producing educational material, methodologies and research systems for the training in cultural management and policies.
B-F12	Budget assigned to develop educational material, methodologies and research systems for the training in cultural management and policies.
Strategic line of Education and culture	
Code	Indicator
B-E1	Number of participants in actions to promote youth creativity.
B-E2	Budget assigned to actions to promote youth creativity.
B-E4	Budget assigned to awareness actions of the cultural diversity value in scholar programs.
B-E6	Number of agents participating in approaching actions of formal education to cultural reality.
B-E7	Budget assigned to approaching actions of formal education to cultural reality.
B-E8	Budget assigned to artistic education programs for young people in risk of social exclusion.
B-E9	Number of artistic education programs for young people in risk of social exclusion.
B-E10	Number of actions to promote the access to information technologies in education, access to reading and cultural services.

Source: Own elaboration.

However, the system strategic dimension implies that it must be necessarily oriented to facilitate and help the decision making by people in charge of the design and implementation of cooperation policies, in order to obtain a higher effectivity of Spanish cooperation in Culture and Development. Therefore, in the construction of the Strategic System, the need to consider which are the specific objectives that guide the actions and the application of policies in the strategic lines of *Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture* is highlighted. Moreover, it also deals with the relationships between those specific objectives and the horizontal priorities (fight against poverty and social exclusion, human rights defense, gender equality, environmental sustainability and respect to cultural diversity), which are in the II Master Plan and also assumed in the third one.

Thus, the proposed indicators for the Strategic System must have the capacity to point out the moving forward degree with respect to the achievement of the different specific objectives of the strategic lines involved, to be appropriate for their purpose. In this sense, in the CDS, the specific objectives of the line about Human capital training for cultural management are referred to elements that correspond to directly observable magnitudes. The boosting of *Human capital training for cultural management* processes must entail the presence of more and better cultural agents and culture professionals (HARTOG, 2001; VILA; PÉREZ; MORILLAS, 2012; DAVILA; MORA; VILA, 2014). Therefore, the observation of the specific objective can be approximated through (a) the training actions carried out, in both the number and also the kind of those actions, the volume and relevant characteristics of people involved in those actions and (b) the evaluation of those actions effectivity. In the objective of diffusion of internationally shared values and cultural contents that yields profits, its observation can be approximated through the number and kind of actions taken, the volume and characteristics of the participants and the evaluation of the effectivity of those actions.

Regarding the specific objectives in the line of *Education and culture*, these are the complementarity relationships between Education and Culture. Its observation can be approximated through the actions that connect the formal education with culture, in terms of cultural contents in educational programs or in cultural values diffusion in the education field. In case we need to assess the contribution of Education, Culture and the relationships between them to the material welfare generation through a more dynamic economic growth, this would imply to discuss several theoretical models of endogenous growth.

The list of proposed indicators aspires to facilitate the evaluation of the achieved goals through the implementation of the CDS of Spanish cooperation for obtaining the specific objectives mentioned above, taking into account the steps forward with respect to diverse horizontal priorities. Table 8 shows the selected indicators, all of them effect and/or impact indicators.

Table 8 – Selected indicators to integrate the Strategic System

<b>Strategic line of Human capital training for cultural management</b>	
<b>Code</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<b>E-F2</b>	Percentage increase of managers that evaluate positively their participation in culture training actions.
<b>E-F4</b>	Percentage increase of exchanges beneficiaries that evaluates positively their participation.
<b>E-F6</b>	Increase in the number of programs of specific training that use the capacitation of local cultural agents.
<b>E-F7</b>	Increase in the number of directories of cultural managers.
<b>E-F8</b>	Increase in the number of directories of cultural trainers and experts.
<b>E-F10</b>	Increase in the number of webs related with cultural management with domain in the countries with which a cooperation is established or in their own languages.

Strategic line of Education and culture	
Code	Indicator
E-E3	Increase in the number of university graduate students.
E-E5	Increase in the number of beneficiaries of awareness actions of the cultural diversity value in scholar programs.
E-E11	Increase in the number of beneficiaries of actions to promote the access to information technologies in education, access to reading and cultural services.
E-E12	Typology variation in bibliographic material borrowed from libraries.
E-E13	Increase in the number of participants in social activities of reading enhancing or beneficiaries of programs for culture access through public reading.

Source: Own elaboration.

Table 9 contains the Strategic System structure, the correspondence of the proposed indicators with the diverse specific objectives of the different strategic lines and their relation with the horizontal priorities in the master plan.

Table 9 – Strategic System indicators structure

Line	Specific objective	Indicator	Horizontal priorities				
			Fight against poverty	Human rights	Gender equality	Environmental sustainability	Cultural diversity
<i>Human capital training for cultural management</i>	Formed agents	E-F2	x	x	x	x	x
		E-F3	x	x	x	x	x
	Values and contents	E-F4	x	x	x	x	x
		E-F5	x	x	x	x	x
		E-F6	x		x		x
		E-F7	x		x		x
<i>Education and culture</i>	Presence	E-E2	x	x	x	x	x
		E-E5	x	x	x	x	x
		E-E11	x	x	x	x	x
		E-E12	x	x	x	x	x
		E-E13	x	x	x	x	x

Source: Own elaboration.

The structure of the Strategic System makes clear that some of the proposed indicators can be related with more than one priority objective, although the criterion of relating them with the objective with which they have a more direct relationship has been followed. While some indicators have in their own definition a direct reference to some horizontal priorities, others are related to them implicitly, and sometimes, the link between indicator and horizontal priorities can be only established with certain disaggregation degree of the magnitude involved in the definition of the indicator.

Finally, the Strategic System must help the high level decision makers to conduct a monitoring and evaluation of the CDS in a way that both aspects are covered: first, the strategic lines of *Human capital training for cultural management and Education and culture*; and second, the different dimensions of the evaluation: pertinence, efficacy, efficiency, impact and viability. Table 10 shows the proposed indicators oriented specifically to the evaluation. To obtain these indicators we need to use four sources of information:

- a) Culture satellite accounts in partner countries and their base statistics (firm statistics, cultural management administrative statistics and households' expenditure surveys).

- b) Cultural administrative statistics of partner countries, such as cultural equipment stock, intellectual property registers, etc.
- c) AECID administrative registers, particularly in activities and budgets (activities costs).
- d) Surveys to beneficiaries of AECID Culture and Development actions.

Table 10 – Evaluation indicators

<b>Strategic line of Human capital training for cultural management</b>	
<b>Code</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<b>V-F1</b>	Number of cultural agents participating in training and capacitation actions in Culture and Development of AECID.
<b>V-F2</b>	Average training cost of cultural agents.
<b>V-F3</b>	Percentage of cultural agents participating in training and capacitation actions in Culture and Development of AECID who are satisfied about the improvement in their capacities.
<b>Strategic line of Education and culture</b>	
<b>Code</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<b>V-E1</b>	Number of beneficiaries in activities from AECID oriented to the complementarity of Education and Culture.
<b>V-E2</b>	Cost of AECID activities to help the educational sector of partner countries.
<b>V-E3</b>	Year-on-year increase of the number of students in educational programs about culture issues.
<b>V-E4</b>	Increase of educational programs about culture issues in the partner country.

Source: Own elaboration.

## 5 | CONCLUSIONS

The indicators system proposed in this article was created as a response to an initiative from AECID following the perpetual suggestions about the need of measuring and evaluating policies in the area of cooperation for development. International organizations as the United Nations (UN), with its United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) or the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the World Bank (WB) and the Latin American States Organization (OEI in Spanish) agree to insist on the need of a monitoring of cooperation cultural actions and the evaluation of public policies as improvement mechanisms in decision making. This work has presented the main actions carried out to obtain a Basic System and a Strategic System of indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of the CDS in the lines of *Human capital training for cultural management* (strategic line 1) and *Education and culture* (strategic line 4).

There are several reasons such as the formulation complexity of a system to globally evaluate the CDS, and also the scarce and disperse information and the lack of consensus regarding obtaining cultural sector indicators, which determine the need to apply appropriate methodologies that are time-consuming to obtain the system itself. In this sense, the indicators system specifies some considerations and aims oriented to limit its nature, purpose and scope, as well as the information that can be potentially generated.

This work presents the elaboration of an indicators system. An indicators catalog (formed by 49 and 84 indicators related to *Human capital training for cultural management* and *Education and culture* respectively) was submitted to evaluation by an experts' panel through the Delphi Technique. This Delphi methodology was conducted in two rounds and final answer rates were 61.11% in Human capital training for cultural management and 52.63% in Education and culture. The

effectiveness of the Delphi process can be analyzed considering the Relative Interquartile Range (RIR) as a dispersion measure of the experts' answers. Thus, the conducted Delphi method can be considered effective since a high stability in the experts' answers was obtained. The effectiveness of indicators in *Human capital training for cultural management* was 79.59% while in *Education and culture* was 85.39%. Once the Delphi method effectiveness is assessed, a Relative Operability Index (ROI) is obtained for each available indicator based on the median punctuations decided by the experts' panel in the criteria of relevance, specificity and feasibility. The indicators which will be finally in the indicators system are those with higher ROI, as long as they satisfy a prearranged feasibility threshold that guarantees a minimum number of indicators for each priority action. Thus, the indicators system to evaluate *Human capital training for cultural management* is formed by 12 indicators, while the one for *Education and culture* is formed by 13 indicators.

Afterwards, the chosen indicators whose typologies are resources, processes and/or products indicators are selected to be part of the indicators Basic System. Those indicators which are effect and/or impact indicators will be part of the Strategic System. Table 7 and Table 8 show the specific indicators for the Basic System and the Strategic System respectively, differentiating between both strategic lines.

The Basic and Strategic Systems proposed for the monitoring and evaluation of the strategic lines *Human capital training for cultural management* and *Education and culture* of the CDS presents a high degree of adaptability. The system users --managers in charge of designing the strategy and agents in charge of its implementation-- can widen or limit the number of indicators that are included in the system by modifying the feasibility thresholds considered.

However, this work has some limitations. Before the potential implementation of the system a pilot trial must be needed in one or several Abroad Cultural Centers or Cooperation Technical Offices. This trial should be used to detect possible deficiencies in the definition and/or selection of indicators and also to adequate the capturing information tools with the intention to obtain homogeneous and comparable information. Although this is a decision that falls in the politics area, the pilot trial of the system is itself one of the main actions to face in the future. Other future research line will be to transform the monitoring and evaluation system in a cooperation quality evaluation system. With that purpose, some qualitative indicators could be incorporated, which will give information about the perception of different groups participating in the CDS, agents and beneficiaries. Finally, a third research line we are currently exploring consists in applying the fuzzy methodology to deal with uncertainty and imprecision in the criteria for the evaluation of indicators that are finally submitted to a selection process in order to build the indicators system.

## Referências

- AECID. *Estrategia de cultura y desarrollo de la cooperación española*. Madrid: AECID, 2007.
- AECID. *Cómo evaluar proyectos de cultura para el desarrollo: una aproximación metodológica a la construcción de indicadores*. Madrid: AECID, 2009.
- AECID. *Cómo evaluar proyectos de cultura para el desarrollo II: una propuesta de sistemas de indicadores*. Madrid: AECID, 2011.
- BONEFOY, J. C.; ARMIJO, M. *Indicadores de desempeño en el sector público. Santiago de Chile*: Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social, 2005. (Series Manuales, n. 45).
- COLL-SERRANO, V., CARRASCO-ARROYO, S., BLASCO-BLASCO, O. y VILA-LLADOSA, L.. *Design of a basic system of indicators for monitoring and evaluating spanish cooperation's culture and development strategy*. *Evaluation Review*, v. 36, n. 4, p. 271-300, 2012.
- COLL-SERRANO, V., BLASCO-BLASCO, O., CARRASCO-ARROYO, S. y VILA-LLADOSA, L. *Un sistema de indicadores para el seguimiento y evaluación de la gestión sostenible del patrimonio cultural*. *Transinformação*, v. 25, n. 1, p. 55-63, 2013.
- DALKEY, N.; BROWN, B.; COCHAN, S. *The Delphi method III: use of self-rating to improve group estimates*. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corp, 1969. Research Memorandum, RM-6115-PR.
- DAVILA, C. D.; MORA, J. G.; VILA, L. E. Competencies which shape leadership. *International Journal of Manpower*, v. 35, n. 4, p. 514-535, 2014.
- GRANDZOL, J.; GERSHON, M. Multiple criteria decision making. *Quality Progress*, v. 27, p. 69-73, 1994.
- GREEN, K.; ARMSTRONG, J. S.; GRAEFE, A. Methods to elicit forecasts from groups: Delphi and prediction markets compared. *Foresight: The International Journal of Applied Forecasting*, v.8, p. 17-20, 2007.
- HANAFIN, S.; BROOKS, A-M.; CARROLL, E.; FITZGERALD, E.; GABHAINN, S. and SIXSMITH, J. Achieving consensus in developing a national set of child well-being indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, v. 80, n. 1, p. 79-104, 2007.
- HARTOG, J. On human capital and individual capabilities. *Review of Income and Wealth*, v. 47, n. 4, p. 515-540, 2001.
- JAIRATH, N.; WEINSTEIN, J. The Delphi methodology: a useful administrative approach. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Administration*, v. 7, p. 29-42, 1994.
- JONES, J.; HUNTER, D. Consensus methods for medical and health services research, *Journal of British Medical*, v. 311, p. 376-380, 1995.
- LANDETA, J. *El método Delphi: una técnica de previsión del futuro*. Barcelona: Ariel, 2002.
- LINSTONE, H.; TUROFF, M. *The Delphi method: techniques and applications*. Reading (EE.UU.): Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- LOO, R. The Delphi method: a powerful tool for strategic management. *Policing, An international journal of Police Strategies and Management*, v. 25, n. 4, p. 762-769, 2002.
- POWELL, C. *The Delphi technique: myths and realities*. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, v. 41, n. 4, p. 376-382, 2003.
- TAGUE, N. R. *The quality toolbox*. [S. l.]: ASQ Quality Press, 2004.
- VILA, L. E.; PÉREZ, P. J.; MORILLAS, F. G. Higher education and the development of competencies for innovation in the workplace. *Management Decision*, v. 59, n. 9, p. 1634-1648, 2012.
- YONG, G.; WENHAO, C. Developing a city governance index: based on surveys in five major chinese cities. *Social Indicators review*, v. 109, n. 2, p. 305-316, 2012.
- ZOLINGEN, S. J.; KLAASEN, C. A. Selection process in a Delphi study about key qualifications in senior secondary vocational education. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, v. 70, p. 317-340, 2003.