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Why ‘legacy’?

1. Gigantism

2. Accountability

3. Sustainability
The aspects related to the legacy should be considered from the first steps of the bid process in the organisation of the Games. The possible long-term effects, the benefits for the community and the possible contribution of each bid to the continuity of the Olympic Movement should be considered as key aspects of the evaluation of bids (JS/OSC, 2003, p 1).
Two concepts

**Legacy**
1. Bequest or gift for the benefit of future generations
2. ‘Something’ we leave behind

**Impact**
1. Answers the question ‘did it make a difference’?
2. The ‘it’ is an intervention - a program, a policy, an event
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Planning for impact

Theory
- Rationale

Inputs
- Resources

Activities
- Interventions

Outputs
- Products
- Intermediate results

Outcomes
- Long term changes

Evaluation

Planning

Meta evaluation overarching questions

What difference did the Olympics make? Did it achieve the intended results? To what degree?

**Sport:** What have been the impacts of the Games on sport and physical activity and in particular the development of mass participation, competitive school and elite sport?

**Economics:** What have been the economic impacts of the Games, particularly in terms of employment and gross value added (GVA)?

**Social and cultural:** What have been the social impacts of the Games, particularly in terms of volunteering, the cultural sector and community engagement?

**Regeneration:** What have been the impacts of the Games on East London, and in particular socio-economic and organisational change?
## Result areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>East London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in competitive school sport</td>
<td>GVA</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Land and property values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in sport and physical activity by adults and young people</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Participation in volunteering</td>
<td>Regional GVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable sports infrastructure</td>
<td>Inward investment into the UK</td>
<td>Participation in culture</td>
<td>Resident satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medals won in major championships</td>
<td>Exports from the UK</td>
<td>Subjective well-being*</td>
<td>Economic structure/profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well-being*</td>
<td>Tourism visitor numbers and spend per visitor</td>
<td>Attitudes towards disability*</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible* transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Sustainable* lifestyles</td>
<td>Socio-economic convergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable approaches to construction and event management*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Disability, sustainability and well-being are cross-cutting across the four legacy themes
ISSUE 1- Attribution, Causality, Counterfactuals

- **Attribution**: difficulties in distinguishing Games-related impacts from those of other interventions.

- **Causality**: how can one trace impact directly back to the Games?

- **Counterfactuals**: uncertainty about the extent to which evaluations fully explore the counterfactual scenario, ie whether similar interventions and investments would have gone ahead in the absence of the Games (to the same scale, timetable and level of quality)
ISSUE 2- Methodology

- **Aggregation**: being able to aggregate data meaningfully from a range of programme and project evaluations

- **Disaggregation**: the ability to disaggregate specific issues from surveys developed for another purpose

- **Data gaps**: absence of baseline data due to the cancellation of surveys
  - Citizenship Survey
  - PE and School Sport Survey
  - DEFRA's Public Attitudes and Behaviours
  - Place Survey

- **Limits**: logic models (a) unintended consequences including negatives (b) can oversimplify the complexity of interactions

- **Indicators**: though intended results have been identified, indicators to measure the extent to which results have been achieved lack specificity in many cases

- **Consistency and comparability**: in spite of the development of a common framework, policing this may encounter problems and a diversity of evaluation activity may have implications for comparability.

- **Intangibles**: how to measure outcomes and impacts such as civic pride and confidence

- **Displacement**: including this in evaluations ie effects amongst local population

- **Spatial distribution issues**: inclusion of regional findings may be patchy
ISSUE 3- Changes in context

• Changes in government and resulting changes in policy and strategy and the evolving nature of legacy

• Whether economic imperatives effect evaluation activities especially the assessment of long term legacies which will not be apparent until after 2013
ISSUE 4- Strategic added value

• The degree to which lessons learned around partnership working between relevant public, private and third sector organisations is captured. This is important as legacy objectives cannot often be achieved by any one body working alone.
Table 1: Six models of the Cultural Olympiad 1896-2012 (Scott, C.A., 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No arts component</th>
<th>Arts competition</th>
<th>Arts/culture exhibitions and festivals</th>
<th>4- year Cultural Olympiad</th>
<th>6 annual Cultural Festivals</th>
<th>9 official projects incl Inspire+ 2012 Festival + Legacy UK +festivals and programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900 Paris</td>
<td>1916 Berlin</td>
<td>1960 Rome</td>
<td>1996 Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904 St Louis</td>
<td>1920 Antwerp</td>
<td>1964 Tokyo</td>
<td>2000 Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908 London</td>
<td>1924 Paris</td>
<td>1972 Munich</td>
<td>2004 Athens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1928 Amsterdam</td>
<td>1976 Montreal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1932 Los Angeles</td>
<td>1980 Moscow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936 Berlin</td>
<td>1984 Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1948 London</td>
<td>1988 Seoul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952 Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes

2. Scope of the CO as an intervention has changed over time.
   - Started as 10 official delivery partners +Inspire Mark.
   - Then, fewer official delivery partners + Inspire mark + Festival 2012.
   - Now- London 2012 Festival + Inspire + some of the initial delivery partners
     (SOW, Unlimited, Artists Taking the Lead, Film Nation Shorts, Music 20x12) +
     Discovering Places + the Legacy Trust UK’s 16 funded programmes + numerous
     festivals and commissioned works

Festivals: Create in east London, Lakes Alive in the Lake District, Happy Days Samuel Beckett festival in
Enniskillen and Abandon Normal Devices in the North West.
Other new programmes: Big Dance UK wide; Busk on the Usk Newport; Lakes Alive Cumbria; Imove
Yorkshire; Conflux and their Surge Festival Scotland; Human Race Scotland; Speed of Light, Scotland;
Screen Team East and East Midlands; Abandon Normal Devices Manchester & Liverpool; The Olympic
Journey exhibition (with The Olympic Museum)
Methodology

1. Aggregation: being able to aggregate data meaningfully from a range of programme and project evaluations

   Common evaluation reporting format required built into funding

2. Disaggregation: the ability to disaggregate specific issues from surveys developed for another purpose

   Taking part: individual well being, community capital building but also new questions tracking ongoing cultural participation as the result of CO
Taking Part

1. Do you think that the UK hosting the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games has motivated you to do more cultural activities?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

2. In what ways has the UK hosting the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games motivated you to do more cultural activities?
   - I’m more interested in cultural activities in general
   - It introduced me to new cultural activities
   - It encouraged me to participate in cultural activities more often
   - It encouraged me to participate in new cultural activities
   - I intend to participate in cultural activities more often
   - I intend to take up a new cultural activity
   - Other (specify)
   - None of these
Figure 6-1: Community engagement and participation summary logic model

**Rationale**
- To get people setting up their own Games-inspired activities and more people giving time to their communities. Also to create new volunteering opportunities.

**Objectives**
- To get people setting up their own Games-inspired activities and more people giving time to their communities. Also to create new volunteering opportunities.

**Activity**
- New volunteering opportunities created.
- Volunteers recruiting young people and hard to reach groups such as low income, BME and disabled.

**Outputs**
- New volunteering opportunities created.
- Volunteers recruiting young people and hard to reach groups such as low income, BME and disabled.

**Results**
- More organisations, groups and people set up community activities offering volunteering opportunities.
- Increased access to cultural opportunities, especially for hard to reach groups including disabled people.
- More people volunteer their time.
- Volunteers gain new knowledge and skills.

**Outcomes/Impacts**
- Increased participation in volunteering and involvement in community activity among people who are hard to reach groups including disabled people.
- Increased happiness and well-being among disabled people.
- Increased satisfaction with neighbours/local area.
- More cohesive and inclusive communities.

**Culture**
- Cultural events, commissions and projects.
- Increased access to cultural opportunities, especially for hard to reach groups including disabled people.

**Sustainable Living**
- People engaged with projects.
- Reductions in individual resource and energy use and development of more sustainable travel patterns.

**Influencing Attitudes Towards Disabled People**
- Paralympic Games coverage.
- Increased audiences for Paralympic events.
- Increased awareness of Paralympic disability sport and other 2012 activities involving disabled people and their achievements.

**Values**
- Paralympic values.
- Increased awareness of Paralympic disability sport and other 2012 activities involving disabled people and their achievements.

- Behavioural change amongst participants resulting in reductions in individual resource and energy use and development of more sustainable travel patterns. Increased awareness of environmental impacts and how to live more sustainably.

- Increased feelings of pride and well-being among disabled people.
- Improved educational attainment.
- Improved nutrition.
- Increased participation in sporting amongst children and young people.

- Increased interest in Paralympics among young people.
- Increased awareness of Paralympic values and Paralympic disability sport.

- Improved health and well-being among children and young people.
- Improved educational attainment.
- Improved nutrition.
- Increased participation in sporting amongst children and young people.

- More cohesive and inclusive communities.
- Improved satisfaction with neighbours/local area.
- More cohesive and inclusive communities.

- Increased interest in Paralympics among young people.
- Increased awareness of Paralympic values and Paralympic disability sport.

- Improved health and well-being among children and young people.
- Improved educational attainment.
- Improved nutrition.
- Increased participation in sporting amongst children and young people.

- More cohesive and inclusive communities.
- Improved satisfaction with neighbours/local area.
- More cohesive and inclusive communities.
Methodology

3. Indicators

*Participation figure of 3 million with 500,000 representing new audiences; 300,000 email addresses captured; number of new commissioned works; number of co-productions involving youth organisations; number of new works commissioned with disabled people; number of young people receiving training and employment as the result of CO programmes.*

4. Logic model limits: unintended consequences including negatives

*CO brand has not resonated or been understood by the general public. Choice of a distributed model of programmes has diffused the brand rather than consolidated it.*
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Strategic added value

• The degree to which lessons learned around partnership working between relevant public, private and third sector organisations is a potential gap. This is important as legacy objectives cannot often be achieved by any one body working alone.

• Number of co-productions. Number of new partnerships. Lessons learned for planned collaborations with Glasgow 2014, Londonderry 2013, Rio 2016 (Provision of a Cultural Olympiad blueprint to pass on to the 2016 Games in Rio).
Attribution, Causality, Counterfactuals

1. Causality: how can one trace direct impact to the Games?
2. Attribution: to what extent did the intervention make the difference?
3. Counterfactuals: would similar interventions and investments would have gone ahead in the absence of the Games?
Taking Part

7.2 per cent of adults reported that the UK winning the bid had motivated them to do more sport or recreational physical activity, 3.9 per cent reported that they were motivated to do more cultural activities and 5.6 per cent reported that they were motivated to do more voluntary work.
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