SCIRES it
SCIentific RESearch and Information Technology
*Ricerca Scientifica e Tecnologie dell'Informazione*
Vol 9, Issue 1 (2019), 69-78
e-ISSN 2239-4303, DOI 10.2423/i22394303v9n1p69


# EMBEDDING ENGAGEMENT: PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES TO CULTURAL HERITAGE

*Neil Forbes*, Silvana Colella***

*Coventry University - Coventry, UK.
**University of Macerata - Macerata, Italy and Coventry University - Coventry, UK.

**Abstract**

This article presents the work of the REACH project and its contribution to the EYCH Initiative #9 'Heritage for All'. It reflects on the issue of participatory approaches to cultural heritage, focusing in particular on: 1) the REACH repository of good practices, a dataset comprising over 100 examples, European and extra European, of social participation in cultural heritage; 2) the REACH Participatory Framework, developed to provide a protocol of participatory procedures and to support the organisation of local encounters; 3) the future of heritage research, in the light of current discussions about the constitution of a new coordination structure for European heritage research.

**Keywords**

Participation, good practice, cultural heritage, heritage research,

## 1. *'Where the past meets the future': the EYCH and the REACH project*

Over the course of 2018, thousands of initiatives were organised across Europe to celebrate the richness and diversity of European cultural heritage. An estimated total of 10 million people took part in these events, further confirming the pivotal role cultural heritage plays in the lives of European citizens. The aim of the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) was "to encourage more people to discover and engage with Europe's cultural heritage, and to reinforce a sense of belonging to a common European space"[1].

The activities carried out under the auspicies of the project *REACH: RE-designing Access to Cultural Heritage for a wider participation in preservation, (re-)use and management of European culture* (https://www.reach-culture.eu/)[2] articulate directly with the aim of the EYCH, as indicated in the European Commission's factsheet 'Heritage for All'[3]. Funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme for the period 2017-20, the REACH project is based on the proposition that cultural heritage plays an important role in contributing to social integration in Europe, and that a fuller and more detailed picture of the range, type and impact of research and participatory research methodologies, current and future, associated with these subjects, will further enhance their potential for social good.

Bringing citizens closer to the diverse heritages of Europe entails a dual temporal and affective orientation: care for the past is interlaced with care for the future. As Sciacchitano (2018) remarks, the EYCH 'is more than just a nostalgic, year-long celebration of the past'. Rather, it is "an opportunity to test new, integrated, holistic and participatory approaches to safeguarding and management of cultural heritage...triggering real change in the way we enjoy, protect, and promote cultural heritage in Europe". To ensure the creation of meaningful connections between the past and the future, much emphasis is placed on initiatives involving younger generations, school children, and students across Europe, as well as on activities directly aimed at encouraging the engagement of local communities. With a view to building the lasting legacy of the EYCH, the European

[1] https://europa.eu/cultural-heritage/about_en
[2] REACH is coordinated by Coventry University (UK); grant agreement No. 769827.
[3] https://ec.europa.eu/culture/content/all-heritage_en

Commission has launched ten crossover 'Initiatives', clustered around four pillars (engagement, sustainability, protection and innovation), which are expected to produce policy recommendations, toolkits and culture-based development strategies to maximise the benefits of cultural heritage for society[4].

These European initiatives cover a vast area, ranging from 'Heritage at School' to 'Heritage at Risk', 'Tourism and Heritage' and 'Science for Heritage'. Initiative #9, 'Heritage for All', is inspired by the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for the Society (Faro Convention, 2005) and promotes an understanding of heritage that places people and communities at the centre, fostering engagement and civic participation. One of the components of this Initiative is devoted to improving the evidence base and exchange of best practices in the area of participatory governance.

As the social platform for participatory approaches and social innovation in culture, REACH contributes to the aims of the EYCH in various ways; this includes, for example, establishing a network that aggregates a wide range of stakeholders and audiences, and implementing a rich programme of public encounters (workshops, conferences and meetings with local stakeholders) focusing on participatory approaches to preservation, (re)use, and management of cultural heritage. For the purposes of this article, three components of the work performed by the REACH partners are most pertinent: 1) the REACH repository of good practices in social participation; 2) the REACH Participatory Framework; 3) the Symposium 'Horizons for Heritage Research' (March 2019), which initiated the process of setting up a new coordination structure, permanent and sustainable, comprising researchers, civil society, and practitioners in the cultural heritage field, and promoting a synergistic approach to heritage research. The following three paragraphs illustrate the results of this work in more detail.

## 2. *Social participation in cultural heritage: the REACH repository of good practices*

Participation comes in many shades. It takes different forms in different contexts; it may originate in institutional initiatives or community actions, and involve a variety of beneficiaries, from large, undefined audiences to small and specific groups of citizens and stakeholders. Not all modes of participation in cultural heritage entail the sharing of responsibility and power that defines participatory governance[5]. But they all bear witness to the increasing interest, especially in the twenty-first century, in democratising access to culture, and opening up the fruition, management and preservation of heritage to ensure the active and effective collaboration of communities, neighbourhoods and individuals (Roued-Cunliffe & Copeland, 2017). Achieving a level of participation that is truly transformative requires both short- and long-term processes, whereby participatory approaches are tested and experiments are conducted which facilitate the transition from 'rhetoric' to 'practice'; from the theoretical consensus about the importance of participation, to the realisation of sustainable initiatives that verify, in the field, what works and what doesn't. For this reason, mapping exercises such as the one undertaken by REACH are relevant, as they gather a variety of examples of participation in action. With over a hundred records of good practices, European and extra European, on a large or a small scale, the REACH repository provides ample material for a qualitative investigation of the modalities according to which social participation in cultural heritage is imagined and implemented.

The literature on participation – Arnstein (1969) and Wilcox (1994), in particular – distinguishes between degrees of participation measured against an eight-step 'ladder' (Arnstein) or five 'stances' (Wilcox). The spectrum of positions Wilcox and Arnstein identify runs the gamut from minimal to optimal participation, the latter being achieved when citizens fully share control, power and responsibilities. Rather than simply classifying the entries in the REACH repository according to these yardsticks, it is more useful to highlight how participation is interpreted by the various actors involved in any given practice, what strategies and approaches are adopted (some more frequently than others), what social groups are involved in targeted actions (large audiences, minorities, Indigenous communities, women, disadvantaged groups of citizens) and how

[4] https://ec.europa.eu/culture/content/overview_en

[5] For a discussion of the notion of participatory governance in cultural heritage see the report of the OMC working group of Member States' experts (2018).

participation is evolving. As Wilcox rightly argues, "different levels [of participation] are appropriate at different times to meet the expectations of different interests" (Wilcox, 1994: 4). In other words, no one-fits-all model can apply to every case, hence the need to be observant and open-minded when it comes to assessing good practices. Each one of them contains valuable lessons. The records collected in the REACH repository of good practices are diverse, but some common trends or patterns can be detected that show the nuances of participation in relation to recurrent strategies or approaches. In what follows, five constellations of participatory practices will be presented in more detail, to emphasise commonalities across different projects and to flag innovative approaches[6].

### *2.1. Participation, minorities, and Indigenous communities*

The Roma community is the single largest ethnic minority group in Europe. It has suffered several forms of discrimination throughout history, which have caused situations of exclusion in different social areas, from work and education to housing and political rights. The REACH project, with its specific minority focussed pilot on Hungarian Roma cultural heritage, is committed to tracing good practices of participation that involve Roma groups at various levels. So far the archive contains 8 records, which range from recent initiatives (*Cloudfactory*) to long-standing projects (*Gandhi Institutes*), aimed at safeguarding both tangible (*First Roma Country House*) and intangible aspects of Roma heritage (*Rajko Method; RomaInterbellum*). Interactive participatory approaches characterise nearly all these practices. *The First Roma Country House*, for example, created by a civic initiative in 2001, has worked closely with the local community ever since, organising programmes for children, teenagers and the elderly, which help to forge a stronger connection with the past. Similarly, though with an orientation towards the future, the *Cloudfactory* social design workshop, in the Bódva Valley, brings together children living in extreme poverty and young designers to co-produce not only objects but also, most importantly, 'perspectives' to help children imagine future career plans. Through oral history, Roma families were directly involved in creating the *Romani local collection in Újpest*, while the COST project *RomaInterbellum* relies on crowdsourcing modalities to compile a comprehensive multilingual bibliographical record of the Roma and their culture. While these and other activities illustrate how participation can drive heritage preservation, the question of increasing the visibility (and sustainability) of marginalised cultural heritage sites remains problematic.

Good practices that foster the participation of Indigenous communities such as the *Cuddie Spring project* (in New South Wales, Australia) are of particular relevance as they openly address intercultural issues, seeking sustainable solutions. The model of participation adopted by researchers and archaeologists at Cuddie Spring entails the involvement of Aboriginal people not just during fieldwork or excavations, but also in the process of investigating culture and history, as well as in disseminating information to the general public. This is achieved by providing employment and training to Indigenous people, subject to availability of funds, and by gaining the trust of local communities through repeated consultations, negotiations with land-owners, regular visits to the area, and the production of documents (reports) in 'plain English'. The traditional knowledge of Indigenous and rural communities (their intangible heritage) can best be safeguarded by encouraging participatory forms of collaborations as the *CONECT-e* (Spain)**,** *Anta-Cusco* (Perù) and *Vale de Copán* (Honduras) projects testify. The *Anta-Cusco* project taps into the local knowledge of medicinal plants, agriculture and natural heritage, which elderly people still possess, to activate forms of intergenerational exchange and learning that can ensure the effective transmission of valuable expertise and the valorisation of existing biodiversity. In this case, protecting and re-activating forms of intangible heritage about to disappear can *only* be warranted by engaging the local Indigenous communities in collaborative and participatory activities.

When actions are undertaken that address minority heritage and Indigenous communities, participatory approaches are not just advisable, they are necessary, whether to preserve marginalised heritage sites, re-activate local knowledge that would otherwise be lost, or

[6] Herein, the names of the good practice cases recorded in the REACH repository will be highlighted in bold. Full records are available at www.open-heritgae.eu.

engage Indigenous people in projects located in their own territory. The REACH dataset contains unequivocal evidence of the validity of participatory strategies in this respect.

### *2.2. Participation and gender*

Women are not a minority. Yet their presence as producers and transmitters of cultural heritage has often remained in the shadow, as several scholars in the field of heritage studies have been arguing for quite some time (Grahn & Wilson, 2018; Smith, 2008; Colella, 2018). It is therefore important to flag good practices that encourage the participation of women or manifest a high degree of gender awareness. The REACH repository contains several examples of projects notable for their sensitivity to gender dynamics in the cultural heritage field. These projects differ in terms of scale and approaches, but they all place strong emphasis on a gendered notion of participation, whether highlighting women's contribution to the creation of heritage (*MoMoWo, e-xiliad@***s**), their specific knowledge and expertise (*Bobbin Lace Tradition, The Çatalhöyük CPBR project, Mayan-Achi Food System*), or the entrepreneurial possibilities arising from a combination of tradition and innovation (*Rural Heritage and Creative Female Entrepreneurs, The Umm-el-Jimal Women's Empowerment Project*).

Some projects are specifically designed to tap into the knowledge and experience of mothers. To preserve the *Mayan-Achi food system*, in Guatemala, the Mother Earth Association has devised a programme based on mother-to-mother participatory workshops, which promote the exchange of knowledge about nutrition, local plants and seeds with a view to marketing organic products thus providing women with an additional source of income. Museums too are showing some interest in promoting initiatives targeted to a specific sector of the public, migrant women, as in the project *Mothers* supported by the Civic Museums of Reggio Emilia, Italy. Based on storytelling sessions and interviews conducted with a group of 40 adult women of different nationalities, this initiative aimed to create transcultural bridges between migrants' experiences and the representations of motherhood celebrated in the arts. Though this practice follows a top-down approach to participation, its value resides in fostering integration through heritage interpretation.

Bottom-up approaches are not lacking as testified, for instance, by the *e-xiliad@s* initiative – which aims to collect online information about the Spanish republican exile, and openly solicits women to contribute to the collection by sharing their experience of exile – and the *Umm-el-Jimal Women's Empowerment Project* in Northern Jordan, run by women's associations and designed to increase the active participation of local women in the provision of hospitality and cultural education services in an area of high heritage value. Finally, the desire to keep alive the memory of both female craft – the *Bobbin Lace Tradition* in Balatonendréd, Hungary – and women's professional contribution to the creation of tangible heritage (*MoMoWo*) has inspired good practices of participation, involving younger generations and helping to disseminate knowledge about women's creativity.

Some might object that singling out good practices solely for their focus on women may have the unintended effect of further demarcating marginalisation. This objection would be valid if the cultural heritage sector were already fully attuned to the importance of recognising gender as a central component in the creation, management, interpretation and transmission of heritage. However, this is not the case, even when it comes to gathering and assessing best practices in participation and participatory governance, which ought to be understood as truly inclusive processes.

By highlighting examples of women's inclusion, REACH aims to encourage further research along similar lines, advancing an idea of participation that eschews the gender blindness still prevailing in many heritage contexts.

### *2.3. The role of the arts in participatory approaches*

A sizable percentage of good practices in the REACH dataset rely on participatory approaches that capitalise on the impact of the arts – the theatre, street and public art, creative sessions – in order to expand the reach of participatory actions. This finding is of relevance as it illuminates the social function the arts can successfully perform in heritage projects, as catalysts of public interest. The arts are usefully deployed in a variety of initiatives, whether small or large, local, regional or international, as strategic tools to enhance people's participation and involvement.

In some cases, the arts provide both the object and the method: the *Independent Theatre* in Budapest not only performs Roma plays thus preserving intangible heritage, it also offers non-formal art education and support to young prospective professionals by organising art-based participatory programmes. In other cases, local artists have launched bottom-up initiatives to safeguard intangible traditions (*Puppetry in Chrudim*, Czech Republic) or tangible remains (*Stained Glass, Libyně; Luková Revitalization*) that have then attracted the attention and collaboration of municipalities, civic organisations and volunteers, giving rise to successful participatory actions in small towns. In other cases still, deploying the arts is an integral part of innovative methods devised to engage people in reflective activities: the Horizon 2020 project *TRACES* explicitly leverages the potential of artistic expression to address painful and difficult aspects of a divisive historical legacy, by organising creative co-production experiments involving heritage professionals, stakeholders, researchers and artists. Along similar lines, the Horizon 2020 project *UnREST* mobilises the power of theatrical performances to provoke ethical and political questions about modes of remembrance. Paired with qualitative reception analysis of audiences' experience, impressions and feelings, the staging of a play can trigger participatory processes.

Collaborative street art is also central in municipal projects, as in the case of *Almócita* in Spain, that are undertaken with the full participation of citizens, aiming to reverse the decline and rural depopulation of the area. The bottom-up collective initiative, *Percurso do Negro* in Porto Alegro (Brasil), uses public spaces to exhibit, and render more visible, the semi-hidden heritage of the Afro-Brazilian community, with public art playing no marginal role in creating tangible signs of the presence of this community throughout history. Other initiatives are designed to increase accessibility to culture, specifically addressing the needs of people with sensory disabilities: the *Opera Festival* in Macerata, Italy, has a programme of activities (touch tours, audio descriptions, assistive listening) that allow visually impaired and deaf citizens to enjoy the performances. The involvement of active spectators in decision-making processes is the aim of the European project *BeSpectACTive!* Focused on audience engagement with artistic creation and cultural organisations, the project illustrates how participatory governance in the performing arts can be implemented. The vital role the arts play in participatory approaches to culture and heritage can hardly be underestimated. The traditional form of participation – attending arts performances – is not what is at stake here; rather, several good practices in the REACH repository demonstrate that, through the arts, a widening of participation can be achieved, in local contexts as well as in larger transnational ones.

### *2.4. Participation and digital platforms*

In addition to the promotion and dissemination of existing heritage knowledge to wider audiences, digital platforms also allow people to create their own shared heritage or to shape the content of online collections. Several initiatives in the REACH dataset perform this function, soliciting the direct contribution of participants through custom-made online platforms, apps and games. A distinction can be drawn between place-specific projects (*Historic Graves, LabIN, WomenOfIreland, Hetor, People's Republic of Stoke Croft*) and global or distributed online initiatives (*LandMark, Museum of Broken Relationships*), but they share similar strategies.

Participation is often activated in the shape of an online crowdsourcing of ideas, memories, personal stories, and other data (Ridge, 2014) according to the thematic focus of each initiative. The *LabIN* project, based in Granada, adopts the user-centred, open-innovation system of the living lab to gather citizens' ideas about improvements to the city environment, including the cultural heritage dimension. This method is supplemented with in-situ activities such as workshops, or seminars with volunteers in order to scale up the participatory component. Similarly, the Irish *Historic Graves* initiative has an online platform for the transcription of memorial epitaphs open to all registered users. Training workshops are also offered to local communities interested in contributing to surveying historic graveyards. The combination of online interaction with local workshops and meetings works best in terms of ensuring meaningful participation.

As for global initiatives that capitalise on bottom-up approaches, tapping into the resources of digital technology allows for a considerable expansion of participation in content creation, as

exemplified by the community mapping exercise of the *LandMark* project (aimed at quantifying the lands collectively held and used by Indigenous Peoples), or the collection of personal stories about heart breaks, launched by the *Museum of Broken Relationships*, which confers the status of heritage to a multiplicity of experiences across the world. The value of this participatory approach resides in the opportunity thus created for shaping and sharing forms of heritage that are collectively deemed important.

Digital technology is also instrumental in enabling citizens to act as skilled storytellers and curators, as in the activities planned by the *PLUGGY* project which test the collaborative practice of 'distributed curation' of heritage content, emphasising everyday competence rather than formal artistic education. Users are thus allowed to create virtual exhibitions, which are then hosted on the PLUGGY social platform. Targeting all sectors of the creative industries, the *Europeana Space* project has facilitated the creative re-use of digital cultural content with a view to increasing opportunities for employment and economic growth. In this case, though participatory practices are addressed to a specific professional sector, it is the link between participation, creativity and economic impact that is deserving of attention. That digital instruments have the potential to enhance participation is by now a self-evident truth. As the REACH dataset demonstrates, nearly all dissemination activities make extensive use of digital and social media platforms; but the most interesting experiments pertain to the intelligent application of digital tools in order to shift the emphasis from users-consumers to active creators or 'active partners' (Lynch 2011: 7), in line with the 3.0 model of culture theorized by Sacco (2011).

### *2.5. Participatory archaeology*

A rich set of data in the REACH repository points to the pivotal role archaeology can play in encouraging long-lasting forms of participation. Several designations are in use – public archaeology, community archaeology, archaeology from below, experimental and reconstructive archaeology – which testify to the long tradition of public engagement inscribed in the history of this disciplinary field. That in the REACH repository archaeology-driven participatory practices are numerous should come as no surprise. A variety of approaches are adopted, ranging from research partnerships with local communities to educational games and role-playing. One project tests the method of *Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR)* in a well-known archaeological site, *Çatalhöyük*, in Turkey. Based on the assumption that research too can be democratised, the team of archaeologists working in the area have devised a series of long-term capacity-building activities to educate Indigenous communities and ensure their involvement in the process of knowledge production. Engaged in all aspects of the research project as partners, community members effectively contribute to the sustainability of the project itself. The *recovery of traditional irrigation channels* in Spain, carried out under the auspices of the MEMOLA project, is the result of a participatory and collaborative set of initiatives that brought together researchers, students, volunteers, local farmers and irrigators, involved not only in the recovery work but also in management and decision-making processes. It is a telling example of social participation for the sake of preserving and re-activating rural heritage.

Historical reconstruction and experimental archaeology are the main channels through which social participation is achieved in the *Gilena Museographic Collection* and the *Historical Vlahos Dwelling* project. In the former, over 120 volunteers are involved in the development of research, educational and dissemination activities aimed at 'socialising' heritage in entertaining ways. Several good practices in the archaeological field have a marked educational orientation, placing children, teenagers, students, teachers and schools at the centre of participatory processes. The *Heritage Education Programme* in Uruguay has reached over 500 students in rural areas via a series of initiatives carried out in collaboration with local schools. Based on the principles of inclusive archaeology, the *Heritage for All* project in Poland is addressed to students with learning and cognitive problems, and aims to tackle fundamental questions about the perception of history and heritage by taking into account the perspectives of young people with cognitive disabilities. To raise awareness about archaeological heritage and its conservation, the MEMOLA team has built an *Archaeodrome* (an artificial archaeological site), which allows primary-school pupils to practice excavation techniques and to discover the history of their

city via hands-on experimentations.

Finally, devising novel ways to expand the reach of public participation in contemporary archaeology is the main objective of the large collaborative project *NEARCH*, funded by the European Commission Culture Programme. Their public engagement strategies include a virtual 'European Day of Archaeology' (which encourages collaboration between professionals and amateurs), a mobile app (to allow the public to interact with historical records and resources) and a call for projects aimed at gauging public perceptions of archaeology. These and other initiatives confirm the propensity of archaeology to inspire participatory practices, collaborative and inclusive, capable of raising the awareness of communities as regards their local heritage. The examples included in the REACH archive show that engaging the public yields mutual benefits if participation is not limited to excavation work, but is instead understood as an opportunity to share knowledge about the past and to involve local communities in making decisions that affect the development of their territory.

### *2.6. Preliminary conclusions*

This overview has identified five areas of commonality across the sample of good practices collected in the REACH dataset. The five constellations of participatory approaches have been classified either in relation to groups of beneficiaries (2.1 and 2.2) or according to modalities of social participation (2.3, 2.4 and 2.5). This classification has the advantage of highlighting two fundamental aspects: who is involved and how. An exact assessment of degrees of participation would have necessitated more detailed information about the final results of each project, with specific data not only about numbers of participants but also about arrangements put in place to implement participatory actions. This information is hard to come by, also considering the fact that several activities are still ongoing. The conclusions one can draw at this stage, therefore, are provisional, based on the information that is now available in the REACH repository, which is expected to grow further with the addition of other examples and more specific evidence about existing records.

- Social participation is not just a catchphrase; it is a global occurrence in the cultural heritage field. Mapping out good practices extensively, though still partially, as the REACH repository does, serves the purpose of pinpointing a diverse range of concrete situations in which participation has happened and is happening. Put differently, the transition from rhetoric to praxis is well underway. Pure forms of participatory governance may still be infrequent, but the orientation towards modalities of participation that blur the distinction between professionals and amateurs or facilitate the release of control and power, in tentative ways, to communities and citizens is unmistakable.
- The value of incentivising social participation in cultural heritage is linked to the need for higher inclusivity, felt all the more keenly in troubled times by citizens as well as institutions. The REACH repository shows that widening participation in culture and heritage, by addressing the interests of minorities, Indigenous communities, disadvantaged groups of citizens, is a socially responsible commitment that many are willing to undertake. The sustainability of these initiatives is inextricably bound up with the ceding of responsibility and decision-making power to the very communities or groups involved in any given action.
- While commitments to mainstreaming gender in the development sector have a long history, in cultural heritage gender issues tend to hover on the margins. Hence the need to render women's participation more explicit, to flag initiatives that raise gender awareness and to collect examples of good practices that tap into the resources and capabilities of women, across the world. This is a necessary first step in the broader process of sensitising individuals and institutions to the gender dynamics at work in the heritage field. Unlike other datasets, the REACH repository charts specific activities that illustrate how gender awareness can make a difference. More evidence is needed in this respect, as well as more incentives to integrate gender issues in the theory and practice of heritage.
- As for modes of participation, the findings confirm the crucial role of digital platforms in providing a virtual space for participatory interactions as well as content creation shared by many. The preeminence of the digital, however, should not be understood as a replacement for other types of activities –

workshops, meetings, seminars – which remain valuable forms of engagement. The arts too emerge as a powerful catalyst of participation; the high incidence of art-related initiatives in the REACH repository suggests that creativity can be successfully harnessed to encourage models of participation that combine reflectivity and entertainment. With its proven record of community participation, archaeology provides several examples of effective involvement of different groups of citizens in activities that concern the management of heritage resources, whether cultural or natural.

## 3. *The REACH Participatory Framework*

Testing participatory approaches is also an integral part of the activities planned in the context of the REACH pilots, which focus on different heritage milieux: minority (Roma), rural, institutional and small towns. To facilitate the organisation of local encounters and the gathering of data, the REACH team has developed a protocol of participatory procedures, tentatively called the REACH Participatory Framework. This Framework is expected to be refined and modified over the course of the project, capitalising on the insights gained from pilot activities. For the time being, the structure of the Framework is as follows:

| **Name the local encounter** |
|---|
| **General Introduction** |
| DATE |
| LOCATION |
| LOCAL ENCOUNTER DESCRIPTION<br>*Please specify the format of the local encounter (workshop, individual discussion, common field activity, joint visit to heritage site etc.). Describe the key themes of the present encounter with special regard to cultural heritage practices that relate specifically to the local context.* |
| ORGANIZER(S)<br>*Please list all associates, institutions, networks who are part of the Participatory Project Group (PPG).* |
| ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS<br>*IPR, confidentiality, ethics, legal frameworks* |
| **Social Assessment 1:** |
| **Identification of stakeholders** |
| NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS |
| AGE GROUPS<br>*18-30*<br>*30-49*<br>*50-65*<br>*65-* |
| GENDER |
| AFFILIATION<br>*Are they affiliated to an institution, network or social organization? What are the roles of the participants in the community?* |
| **Social assessment 2: Contextualization** |
| TYPE OF PARTICIPATION: TOP-DOWN AND/OR BOTTOM-UP APPROACH.<br>*Describe the approach you have adopted and the reasons why you chose it. Please be specific.* |
| RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL, REGIONAL, NATIONAL, EUROPEAN AUTHORITIES<br>*How do the participants relate to the local, regional, national authorities? Are the authorities cooperative, supportive, passive, adverse etc.?* |
| RELATIONSHIP WITH NGOS AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR<br>*Have NGOs and/or private companies participated in this activity?* |
| BENEFICIARIES/ETHICS<br>*Which groups are the beneficiaries? Is any vulnerable group represented?* |
| STAKEHOLDERS' CAPACITIES, INFLUENCE, IMPORTANCE AND POWER RELATIONSHIPS<br>*Can you identify any dominant group that has used participation as a means to forward their own interest? Can you classify stakeholders according to their influence? Do all participants have the same knowledge on preservation use/re-use and management of cultural heritage?* |
| **Participatory design** |
| TARGETS, OBJECTIVES, ESTIMATED RESULTS<br>*What are the targets, objectives and estimated results of the local encounter?* |
| METHODS, TECHNIQUES, TOOLKITS<br>*Please describe the participatory methods and toolkits to be used during the local encounter.* |

| |
|---|
| ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES<br>*Please provide details on the schedule of the event (timing, length etc.), structure of the activities (introduction, main sections, summary), suitable physical environment for the local encounter (room, technical equipment, audio-visual kit), documenting, recording the event (special attention to ethical dimensions should be paid, including descriptions of the event, consent forms, etc.)* |
| **Results and impacts** |
| GENDER ASPECTS<br>*Have gender-related issues been addressed during the local encounter? How?* |
| TRANSFERABLE ELEMENTS<br>*Good practices, recurrent themes, adaptable, resilient methods* |
| GAPS AND OBSTACLES<br>*Have the participants identified gaps? What are these gaps?* |
| IMPACT<br>*Please provide details about estimated, measurable, unmeasurable short- and long-term impacts, including dissemination and further collaborations.* |
| FUTURE<br>*Was any action plan created during the event? Do the participants plan to continue and develop this public action? Are they planning to involve more stakeholders?* |
| **Feedback** |
| FEEDBACK GATHERED FROM PARTICIPANTS<br>*Are the participants still willing to take part in this process? Do they have any ideas for improvements? Do they feel as equal contributors in the participatory action? Do the participants consent to be quoted in project reports/publicity?* |
| FEEDBACK FROM THE PPG<br>*Have you identified any difficulties and good solutions in the course of the local encounter? How would you assess the local encounter as participatory method?* |
| REMARKS ON THE REACH PARTICIPATORY FRAMEWORK<br>*Please fill in this box with your suggestions about how, based on your experience, this framework could be improved. This feedback is fundamental for the continuous development of the REACH participatory framework. Were all the sections useful? Is there any missing element? Would you like to suggest changes to the structure of the framework?* |

Following the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) management cycle (Johnson, 2016), this Framework is sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptations and changes according to the specifics of each pilot action. The data collected during the implementation of pilot activities as well as in the repository of good practices will serve as evidence base to delineate the REACH proposal for a resilient European cultural heritage, one of the outcomes of the project. This proposal will also be informed by recent developments in heritage research, taking into account the results of previous projects and the inputs deriving from the REACH network of stakeholders.

## 4. *Horizon for Europe's Cultural Heritage Research: towards a new co-ordination structure*

Since its inception, the REACH social platform has enabled debate, dialogue and interaction among heritage professionals, academic experts, arts practitioners, creative industries, policy makers, associations and interest groups representative of non-professionals and local societies – in short, all those with a stake in the field of cultural heritage. As emphasised by several speakers and attendees at the symposium 'Horizons for Heritage Research' – co-organised by REACH, Coventry University and the European Commission in Brussels, 20 March 2019 – the momentum for heritage research created by the EYCH should be carried forward (Vahtikari, 2019). One way of doing this is by bringing together more effectively the various voices of heritage stakeholders through the constitution of a new coordination structure. The REACH project has welcomed this new mandate: under its auspices, a participatory process is already underway to facilitate a higher level of integration and collaboration among all those with a research interest in cultural heritage.

A *Joint Statement*, entitled 'Horizon for Europe's Cultural Heritage Research', on the proposal to establish a stable coordination structure and create an important asset at the European level, has now been brought forward for adoption and promulgation. In the various methods and approaches outlined in this article, it is clearly possible to see the considerable impact the EYCH has had on accelerating change and innovation in the cultural heritage sector.

REFERENCES

Arnstein, S. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35 (4), 216-224. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225

Colella, S. (2018). 'Not a mere tangential outbreak': gender, feminism and cultural heritage. *Il Capitale Culturale*, 18, 251-275. Retrieved from http://riviste.unimc.it/index.php/cap-cult/article/view/1897

Grahn, W., & Wilson, R. (Eds). (2018). *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Places and Politics*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Johnson. C.N. (2016). The Benefits of PDCA. *Quality Progress*, 49(1), 48.

Lync, B. (2011). *Whose cake is it anyway? A collaborative investigation into engagement and participation in 12 museums and galleries in the UK*. London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.phf.org.uk/publications/whose-cake-anyway/

OMC Working Group (2018). *Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage. Report of the OMC working group of Member States' experts*. Luxemburg: Publication Office of the European Union. Retrieved from https://europa.eu/cultural-heritage/toolkits/participatory-governance-cultural-heritage_en

Ridge, M. (Ed) (2014). *Crowdsourcing our Cultural Heritage.* Farnham: Ashgate

Roued-Cunliffe, H., & Copeland, A. (Eds) (2017). *Participatory heritage*. London: Facet Publising

Sacco, P. L. (2011). *Culture 3.0: A new perspective for the EU 2014-2020 structural funding programme*. EENC Paper.

Sciacchitano, E. (2018). Building the Legacy of the European year of Cultural heritage. *DigitCult: Scientific Journal on Digital Cultures*, 3(1), 25-30.

Smith, L. (2008). Heritage, Gender and Identity. In B. Graham, P. Howard (Eds.) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 159-178.

Vahtikari, T. (2019). *Report on the Symposium Horizon for Heritage Research – Towards a Cluster on Cultural Heritage*. Retrieved from https://www.reach-culture.eu/.

Wilcox, D. (1994). *The Practical Guide to Effective Participation*. Brighton: Delta Press.