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INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND ON THE PROGRAMME

The British Museum established the International Training Programme in 2006. The programme was initiated two years previously, as a result of a contact from the Supreme Council for Antiquities of Egypt, now the Ministry of Antiquities, who then sent seven curators for six weeks in London. Recruitment is through government bodies, individual museums and academic bodies, or sometimes from other collaborative programmes. In 2006 the programme was funded by the British Museum, and, from 2007 to date, has been funded externally through donations and sponsorship.

There are three elements to the main programme: a training programme at the BM which includes presentations, workshops and visits; a placement in a BM department based on participants’ specific area of interest; and a ten day placement at a partner museum. The partner museums in 2018 were:

- Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, Oxford
- Bristol Museums, Galleries and Archives
- The Collection: Art and Archaeology in Lincolnshire & Nottingham University Museum
- Glasgow Museums
- Manchester Museum, Manchester Art Gallery and Whitworth Art Gallery
- National Museums Northern Ireland
- Norfolk Museums Service
- Tyne & Wear Archives & Museums, Newcastle

In 2015 the Marie-Louise von Motesiczky Charitable Trust pledged a challenge fund to support the continued development and delivery of the ITP. The gift was made in honour of the directorship of Neil MacGregor (2002–2015) and recognised the tenth anniversary of programme. Through additional successful appeals to the British Museum Members and Patrons, and with gifts from the American Friends of the British Museum, as well as legacies and renewed grants from trusts and foundations, the ITP has been able to develop further post-fellowship opportunities for its global network. The extended programme includes:

- ITP+ short courses.
- ITP collaborative awards.
- Object in focus projects.
- Research fellowships.
- Other professional and personal development.

Each of these is being evaluated as they develop.
METHODOLOGY

Our methodology is to analyse the feedback forms from participants, departmental representatives, speakers and partners.
ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK AFTER THE BM PROGRAMME

INTRODUCTION

We have responses from all 23 participants across six hosting departments. One respondent also spent time in Conservation.

FIGURE 1: HOSTING DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa, Oceania and Americas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Egypt and Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARATION

Views on BM introductory information were positive. Respondents all said it was clear, helpful, sufficiently detailed and relevant to them.
FIGURE 2: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE BM INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION SENT BEFORE YOU TRAVELLED TO THE UK?

Only four respondents said there was other information they needed. Comments were that participants might have liked more information on living in Britain and what to bring.

FIGURE 3: WAS THERE OTHER INFORMATION YOU NEEDED BEFORE YOU ARRIVED?

*"There were some questions that popped into my mind when I read the ITP course information we were given before coming to the UK. Information about the program is more or less complete, but I was also concerned about the essential things we needed to know, such as the weather, bank notes, transportation and the like. It was easy for me to look it up on the Internet, but I thought if it was a fellow who is not well versed with technology, then it would be a problem. Later on, this important information (about the Schafer house and vicinities, how to ride buses, trains and bikes, coins and notes, places to eat, etcetera) contained in a booklet was given upon arrival or after the first day, along with all the*
additional course information (blogs, 2017 ITP annual reports, schedules, emergency contacts) so we had to squeeze in a lot of information in between our first few sessions. I was hoping that this essential information about living in the UK would have been given prior to our arrival.”

“All the required information was there. It was well thought through; I was even sent the photo of the person who was meeting me at the airport.”

“The introductory information was very detailed and I got a good overview of the summer programme. But the length and breadth of the programme is experienced only once we are here.”

“It was very informative for all the whole training not only about training but also for our personal affair.”

“Since the beginning, all the information provided was incredible detailed, we got the blog, documentation about ITP nature, museums web page in order to learn more and find out about our interests during our time here, we got documentation about sponsors, practical details about our staying, the apartment, the person picking us up at airport, even their photographs in order to be able to recognise them, everything we could need. And there was always the possibility of asking more information if needed.”

“All the information was send to me about 6months early.”

GROUP SESSIONS AND SEMINARS

All respondents described the group sessions and seminars as well-organised, clear, inspiring. All except one participant described them as useful, relevant to them and sufficiently detailed. Three described the practicality as ‘mixed’. Comments emphasised the depth and value of the content and varied formats. One respondent asked whether it would be possible to have subjects taught one at a time, which is presumably not feasible given speakers’ other commitments. One respondent commented that their museum didn’t have the resources to implement some of the subjects, but didn’t suggest changing the course to reflect this.

“All the group sessions were fantastic. The sessions were full of fun. It will be great if all the group members pushed to say something about the group work they have been working on. It would have at least pushed timid and shy people, it would have helped them a lot.”

“In terms of content, everything was perfect. The schedule however, was quite disjointed. I understand that it is indeed better to have a variety of things to do each week, like sometimes there are day trips in the middle of the sessions. The balance must be maintained however, that the lessons learned in one day continues on to the trips and department times on the following days. Sometimes I come home thinking about collections care, which was our session for the day, and the next day I have to reorient myself for a trip that does not
talk much about collections care and instead focuses on community engagement. Maybe it is more effective to schedule exhibition planning first, followed by collection management-related sessions including inventory, photo documentation, conservation, then exhibition layout and design, then audience engagement and educational programs, and finally leadership, as if following a certain flow.”

FIGURE 4: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE GROUP SESSIONS AND SEMINARS IN THE BM?

“An engaging part of ITP was the opportunity to work with different groups and individuals during seminars and workshops. Instead of partnering with someone we are familiar with, this approach allowed us to step out of our comfort zones. This created the right sets of circumstances to engage with new ideas, differing opinions and diverse cultural contexts. I believe the point of the exercise was to rethink our appreciation of tolerance and democratic ideals.”

“Some of the seminars and workshops were covering certain aspects of museum work I am not dealing with. Thus, they were not particularly relevant to me but I have to point out that they were nonetheless still interesting and well presented.”

“Every presentation, every workshop, every practical exercise was so well organised and was so helpful, but there are some topics that will be somehow difficult to implement in our institute for example the scientific research, storage of collections in a proper way as the BM or partner museum do; our stores are so small, we have limited budget to buy materials for proper handling and storage of collections.”

“I found the sessions, workshops and seminars really interesting. I think that due to the limited time each session had, it is normal that there was no possibility to have lots of details about some topics that are much more complicated or complex that what you can explain in an hour, but in all cases, it was enough information to have a general idea of the topic and to think about it and have the possibility of asking via email and other spaces if needed. In some cases, there was not enough time to have both practical and theoretical experience. I
found most of the speakers quite enthusiastic about presenting, really interested in what they do - and that’s inspiring - but also in what we do and willing to share with us.”

All participants except one said there was enough time for questions and discussions. Comments were that keeping to the schedule meant limiting time for questions, but that in any case questions specific to the individual were better asked through email rather than keeping the whole group.

**FIGURE 5: WAS THERE ENOUGH TIME FOR QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSIONS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There was almost no break between sessions so no enough time for Q&A. Maybe some sessions can have more discussion.”

“After presentations, but because sometimes we were on a tight schedule there wasn’t much time for it.”

“It would have been quite relevant if we would have given more choices to spend our time as per our interest also so that we could have got deeper insights in my own area of work/field as even two days would have been enough for this kind of adjustment. A few sessions were not relevant to me so I would have swapped them instead of putting my time in them.”

“Sessions had limited time in order to keep the programme to time. In some sessions there was not enough time, but there was the possibility of keeping asking through email or making an appointment, but in such cases, the general group won’t benefit from other people questions.”

Respondents were asked what subjects were most useful to them. Almost every subject was the most useful to at least one participant. The responses were:
Respondents were also asked which subjects were least useful to them. Responses were: funding, loans, security, marketing, and libraries. Generally respondents emphasised the value of having a broad understanding of a museum.

“All subjects were good. I did not find a subject less important to me than the other.

I don’t want to distinguish the facts that it is useful or not suitable for me, because all information given is very important for my future.”

“All sessions were useful for me in one way or another, but probably the less useful sessions were those related to UK particular reality, as heritage, but even there it was an opportunity to think about my own reality from other point of view. Sessions about topics unrelated to
my current main activity were even useful because gave me an idea of other possible areas
of development for me, and to think about how similar things are being done in my country
or even if these things are being done at all.”

DAY TRIPS TO OTHER MUSEUMS

The day trips were generally described as clear, inspiring, well-organised, useful, sufficiently
detailed, sufficiently practical and relevant. Comments emphasised the personal and
intellectual value of the visits, although a couple of respondents wanted the visits to be
more practical.

FIGURE 6: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE DAY TRIPS TO THE OTHER MUSEUMS?

“It was one of the best element that we had within our program, it allowed us to re-energize
and get refreshed from the daily 9 to 5 boardroom programme.”

“For me it was very interesting and joyful. I got to see more beautiful and interesting places /
objects AND learned more about UK heritage.”

“I love the day trips! It is one of the best parts of the programme! I wish we could have done
more and spent more time (especially in Kingston Lacy, which was huge but we had too little
time), but then again it will be difficult for the scheduling.”

“I would have not got the chance to visit few places if ITP would have not taken us to the
places during day trips. Especially trip to Sutton Hoo which was very interesting.”

“It would have been nice to do some practical things onsite time permitting.”

“We came from different museums but some time we found mutual things between us and
the museums that we visited.”
“They were useful because I got networks, all my questions were answered, and I looked at different kinds displays and mountings.”

“Some trips were quite good in learning about heritage sites of UK but a few were uninteresting that would have been avoided as we are seeing too many house heritage properties/houses that would have been less relevant.”

“They were so inspiring, because I got many ideas from those day trips of what I can suggest the government to implement to develop tourism industry in my country and heritage sites as well.”

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMME IN THE BM

The departmental programme was described as inspiring and mainly well-organised and relevant. Answers suggest that a couple of respondents didn’t understand that the question was asking about the BM, so this section should be treated tentatively.

FIGURE 7: WHAT DID YOU THINK ABOUT YOUR DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMME?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organised</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to you</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Department visits and the gallery walk were one of the best part: I enjoyed, it allowed me to understand the object also why and how it reached the display area. The story, the journey, the curators research method, panels, captions writing. It was something I could easy related with what I do and also it gave me a huge number of ideas how I can polish up my own display in my museum.”

“I felt like we missed out a lot in our departmental experience. I love the fact that we went to different sites, but the engagement between us and the departmental staff is quite small.”
“I wanted to look at some objects from my hometown but unfortunately those objects were offsite so did not get a chance to see them.”

“It was so useful because I found many books in library not available in my country and got information about objects.”

“We got to know more about the managing system of their department closely.”

“A few sessions were relevant but not all. As a common interest could not be seen in various participants but more or less it was less time for me as I wanted to see other storage systems with my mentors or department representatives which I did not get time to do.”

“People in our department were so kind, and they helped us so much, we could tell them the problems we face in our museums and because some of them have been to Africa they could suggest how to solve them.”

The strengths of the Departmental programme were described as:

- **Content.** “It was very informative and was really good to see how the department duties were carried out. It was a great opportunity to walk with the department curators and understand their vision, curatorial plan, research method and text writing.” “Touring to the storage and discussion about our respective objects, knowing the idea for object acquisition.”

- **Collections.** “We get to see collections that we are quite familiar with, so we really feel that connection and inclusivity.” “The feeling that you are close to your surroundings despite the distance and the interest of the British Museum in the interest of other countries.” “Looking at objects which are familiar to us as we belong to the region.”

- **Expertise.** “There are very valuable experts who are knowledgeable about them works area. This is a very great change for me.” “All the people are very professional and dedicated to their works.”

- **Small group discussions.** “Having a more engaging discussion with the curators as were in a smaller group.” “Great tours and discussions with staff about their projects. The trips organized by the mentor were an added plus as we got to discuss various forms of presentations is a very small group and got to see additional places we might not have otherwise in the big group.”

- **Networking.** “We get a chance to build a relation with the curators in the department where we can think of a future collaboration to work on projects of similar background.” “Direct contact with colleagues who work in the same field, exchanging ideas and experiences with them.”

- **Professionalism.** “Time management. Welcoming people. Hardworking people. The people love their jobs. They are very strict people who keep to their words.”

- **Practicality.** “For me the practical sessions we had working with objects similar to objects we do have in our museums were so important.” “We had the opportunity to
work more closely with the museum’s data base, and the record criteria, in many ways, work in the Department let us work in a more practical way with some topics that were explained in other sessions theoretically.”

“Time spent with people of our department gave us the chance to discuss and talk about these matters, exchange opinions, learn more about museums way of work, so it gives you to have a focused work, very useful. I felt a real interest in sharing practical knowledge with us from all the people in our department, and interest in our job.”

- **Breadth.** “It was really well organized, interesting and can provide you with a great experience in the whole filed although you are specialist in such a branch. So it provides me with many information related to the whole curating work.”

Participants were asked if ITP should change anything in the Departmental programme. Answers were that participants would have liked:

- **A chance to see another department.** “I think it will be really good for the ITPers to spend a whole day in one of the department they really want to work.”

- **More practical sessions.** Maybe it would be more interesting to make it a bit practical, for example I would like to take part in entering information about object to the database. And this experience could stick in my mind better than theory.

- **More time.** “Maybe it is good to make sure that each Department will have enough time or can allot staff to conduct in-depth sessions and hands-on workshops to the fellows.” “There was not enough time to visit more thoroughly the galleries run by the Department. In general, I would have enjoyed spending more time in the Department.”

**THE COURSE BOOK**

As with previous years, participants had very positive views of the course book. All thought it was clear, well structured, useful, sufficiently detailed and sufficiently practical. Respondents were also asked how the course book could be improved. The only responses were that the handbook should be on soft copy so that it is not so heavy to carry and that it should have a longer bibliography.

“The ITP course book is programmed step by step. Amazing. I did not have any difficulties thanks to my course book. Thanks.”

“It was excellent to read about all the detailed aspects in course book whenever we got bit free time as this way we were prepared to ask questions from the correct person and clear doubts nicely.”
ACCOMMODATION

As for previous years, views of the accommodation were less positive than for the programme. All respondents said the location was convenient. Scores for cleanliness, comfort and noise were more mixed. However, comments were quite philosophical about the difficulties.

“The best part about Schafer house is that it is centrally located and nearby to the tube and bus stations. Coming to the British museum was very convenient as it is walkable distance.”

“At weekend nights, it’s quite noisy sometimes. But on one or two occasions, we were the noise makers. You can’t avoid noise when living in a big city.”

“It is not very comfortable but it does make a great space for bonding with other fellows and keeps the costs down so it is an understandable choice.”

“I may have been simply unlucky to be placed in a room beside the street so I hear loads of people every night drinking and shouting and talking. I think there is a pub nearby. My first night in my room, there was a row. Bottles were smashed, people were shouting, and the police came. It is also quite hot! But this is all well and good - these unique experiences will be well remembered!”
OBJECT IN FOCUS PROJECT

Respondents said the Object in Focus project developed their team working and presentation skills. The ‘other’ refers to research skills and working cross culturally.

FIGURE 10: WHAT SKILLS DID YOU DEVELOP FROM THE OBJECT IN FOCUS PROJECT?

"Applying all we had learned from the previous sessions was great but also given certain restrictions to work within were good challenges."

"This was a good hands on session for people who are not curators but they wish to know the aspects of displaying an object and the things that should be prepared beforehand to put a good display in stipulated time frame."
All except one of the respondents was happy with the quality of their Object in Focus project.

**FIGURE 11: WERE YOU HAPPY WITH THE QUALITY OF YOUR OBJECT IN FOCUS PROJECT?**

"I was very happy. I love this project so much. I got many ideas from this project for my museum. I got to know about can do everything such as exhibition, education, publication, and so on."

"I was very happy with the final result. I worked very well with my partner, I think that having both of us background in art exhibition gave us the chance to understand our objective and to have similar ideas in the way we wanted to display it. I think we explained and showed all the information we wanted to."

"At first I wasn’t that excited with it but while working and getting closer to the object and its history, region and purpose I loved it."

The main challenges were:

- **Lack of time.** “We could have done so much more. I could only give myself a few hours after sessions to do the project.”

- **Working with a real object.** “I would have been happy having the real object on display. But then again having the model canopic chest made us touch the object and show the inner part of the box. This would have not been possible with the real object.”

- **Team work.** “It can be better if the teamwork is more effective.” “My partner hardly participated in the whole process so it was difficult to deliver the final project.”

- **Lack of clarity.** “We were not clear what it would look like and what we can be offered, like mounts for objects, labels and panels. Maybe we focused too much on the text of
label and panel. Sometimes the department couldn’t answer our questions (not their fault). Fellows were confused about the template of poster. Some said we would be given the template to fill in all elements we need. Some said we can do it on PPT or word. Then it turned out in the end that we need to use photoshop without template (only instruction on BM poster instead). There could be a small session introducing how it would be like so.”

FIGURE 12: IF NOT, WHAT STOPPED YOU GIVING YOUR BEST?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not working well with co-worker/fellow</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear about what to do</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked what advice they would you give other fellows on designing their Object in Focus projects. Answers were:

- **Choosing the object.** “Choose an object with an interesting story behind.” “When choosing an object, focus on its rareness and uniqueness to help you widen your thinking.” “I would suggest them to choose an object which is not fragile.” “In my opinion, they should choose something which is not familiar to them. By exploring such objects they will discover a new culture and will enjoy it as I have enjoyed.” “I am glad that we took the initiative to choose an object out of our area of specialization.” “Choose the object you never know and never see before! It’s fun to explore into the new world!” But also: “Avoid object selection from a different area.”

- **Researching the object.** “I would advise them to spend bit more time in the department so that it will allow them to learn more about the object.” “Exchange ideas with the curator in charge and rely on her/his feedback and input.”

- **Clarifying responsibilities.** “Early discussions about choosing/agreeing on a theme and how it should be presented and deciding on what responsibilities each partner should have would make the process easier and much more enjoyable.”

- **Clarifying key messages.** “Reading the materials provided and find out the key words to explain the object and woven a story around it.” “Ensure design is not overcrowded and focus on the object itself.”
OVERALL VIEWS

Respondents were asked about the most enjoyable parts of the programme. Answers were:

▪ All of it.
▪ Department visits.
▪ Partner museums.
▪ Collection storage, visits, photo studio visit and other museum trips.
▪ Object in Focus.
▪ Day trips.
▪ Workshops and lectures with enthusiastic lecturers.
▪ Hands-on practical sessions.

“I think it will be more interesting to increase the practical sessions because they are more useful and interesting and a good way to learn faster.”

▪ Evening visits.
▪ Making new friends.

“The spirit of camaraderie which pervaded every moment we spent together.”

The least enjoyable parts of the programme were described as:

▪ Nothing.

“I don’t think any of the lectures or the programmes were least enjoyable. They all were great because from every sessions I learned quite a bit.”

▪ Feeling time pressure.

“Too jampacked schedule? But then every aspect of the program was important - nothing can be left out. Maybe if the six weeks can be extended to two months it would be better? But it will cost more though. It was very tiring but it was all so worth it.”

▪ Working in another language.

“Back to back presentations. Some days were a bit too long with presentations. It would be good to break it up a bit. Also the presenters should be reminded that they are speaking to a foreign audience with different levels of English and they should simplify their speeches (not dumb down just speak in more straight forward terms, not use jargon etc) and speak slowly and clearly. This would help fellows whose English skills are not as good to feel better engaged.”
Accommodation.

“Lack of sleep due to unbearable nights in hot rooms whose windows could not be opened.”

21 participants thought the overall balance on the programme was right.

**FIGURE 13: WE TRY AND MEET THE NEEDS OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANTS AS FAR AS IS PRACTICAL ON A GROUP PROGRAMME. WAS THE OVERALL BALANCE BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMME RIGHT?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Striking the right balance is not an easy task in a group composed of so many museum professionals with different specialities. I believe that the ITP team did an excellent job considering how disparate the interests of the fellows may be.”

Asked specifically about possible changes, the most popular change was the same as for previous years: more time with the BM department.
FIGURE 14: IF NOT, HOW WOULD YOU CHANGE THE BALANCE BETWEEN THE ELEMENTS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have more group sessions and seminars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have fewer group sessions and seminars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more day trips to other museums</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have fewer day trips to other museums</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more time with the BM Department</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have less time with the BM Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more time to carry out research in the library</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have less time for research in the library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more optional weekend and evening events</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more free time</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have less free time</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE SENIOR FELLOW ROLE

All respondents who expressed a view said the Senior Fellow role was useful.

“I found her role very helpful, supportive and knowledge-sharing for ITP team.”

“The Senior Fellow is important to solve the problems and convey the experiences to us.”

“It was great to have someone who had recently been on course who you could talk to informally and who could relate to you.”

“She tried very hard to show us a good example and she was available whenever I needed her.”

“Although ITP organisers are available and very accessible, the Senior Fellow is someone close to fellows, who is also foreign and who has lived what you are now living, so it’s someone to whom you can relate with and who can give you useful advice.”
FIGURE 15: WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE SENIOR FELLOW ROLE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very useful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL VIEWS

All except one respondent said the ITP surpassed or met all their expectations, which is a very positive result.

FIGURE 16: DID THE ITP PROGRAMME MEET YOUR EXPECTATIONS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It surpassed my expectations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met all of my expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met most of my expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met only met a few of my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It did not meet any of my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents said they felt that the BM genuinely cared for their wellbeing.
FIGURE 17: DID YOU FEEL THAT THE BM GENUINELY CARED ABOUT YOU AND YOUR WELLBEING?

“I was surrounded with care, attention and help, and I felt myself very happy to be part of BM. I am grateful to BM and its staff for their care about us.”

“Honestly the ITP team are wonderful: they are personally caring about every fellow and practically they so professional to deal and organize such a fantastic programme.”

All participants said they felt they have a relationship with the BM. This view is expressed strongly.

FIGURE 18: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU HAVE A RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BRITISH MUSEUM?
“I feel myself as a part of British Museum and I am already preparing a project for further collaboration.”

When I came here, I was not at all hoping that my country can be relevant in the British Museum because I knew that we were quite a small country that no one probably knew or cares much about. But after my first few days here, I was inspired by many people, especially with the saying, "a museum of the world for the world." I started hoping to find any connection to my country in the museums that we’ve been to all over the UK. I stated pondering if my country has a place in this international museum network. I sincerely hope I can continue this collaboration.”

“Now the BM it’s part of me. I spent inside BM six weeks, I have new families.”

“Absolutely. Every morning to enter the main entrance as a staff (♡) of the museum. Excellent!”

“It has been really pleasurable in my first experience internationally. I felt like a second home with managers, coordinators and fellow participants. Really gonna miss these guys as they are lifelong friends now.”

“All need to at least give an impact to my country Uganda through British Museum assistance and to work with the British Museum which everything concerning Uganda where they need help.”

All participants said it was useful to have curators from other countries on the ITP programme. Comments emphasised the emotional, intellectual benefits from this diversity.

**FIGURE 19: WAS IT USEFUL FOR YOU TO HAVE CURATORS FROM OTHER COUNTRIES ON THE BM ITP PROGRAMME?**
“The best networking I ever created within a six months period.”

“Such a diverse group makes me learn about a variety of cultures. I’ve listened to stories I’ve never heard about before. The vastness of the world and its diversity becomes more tangible to me as I interacted with them. It makes me inspired to hear their stories. They gave me confidence and added to my passion to be better in my field.”

“This helps in knowing what is going around the world and also the inner aspects of collections or histories in their countries. Their limitations and coping strategies are worth learning as future is unpredictable.”

“I learned a lot about how things are done in museums around the world, other cultures but above all, I learned a lot about topics far away of my comfort zone, which is priceless.”

All respondents plan to keep in touch with other participants.

“They are my family so I will ask about them every day or week and inquire about their conditions and work.”

“This enables to ask and know more about collections that may move from one country to other in context of temporary exhibitions or loans. Also any future projects or research allows us to have deeper connections with help of the fellow participants.”

**FIGURE 20: DO YOU PLAN TO KEEP IN CONTACT WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of them</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most popular methods of contact were the blog and Facebook page. Comments also suggested Instagram and WeChat.

“It is up to us to keep on looking to maintain these connections. BM can only be a mediator.”
FIGURE 21: WHAT SHOULD THE BM DO TO HELP YOU STAY IN CONTACT WITH YOUR ITP COLLEAGUES AND DIALOGUE WITH PREVIOUS YEARS’ PARTICIPANTS? WHICH OF THESE WOULD YOU USE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM ITP Blog</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM ITP Facebook page</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkedin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK AFTER THE PARTNER MUSEUM PROGRAMME

INTRODUCTION

We have replies from all 23 participants.

FIGURE 22: UK PARTNER MUSEUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, Oxford</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Museums, Galleries and Archives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Collection: Art and Archaeology in Lincolnshire &amp; Nottingham University...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Museums</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Museum, Manchester Art Gallery and Whitworth Art Gallery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museums Northern Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Museums Service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne &amp; Wear Archives &amp; Museums, Newcastle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARATION

Respondents mainly said the paperwork was clear, helpful, sufficiently detailed, and relevant to them. Comments were that the information was complete but naturally couldn’t capture the richness of the experience.

“The information was sufficient and accurate and made me think of where I would be.”

“It was general information. The actual experience was a lot deeper than what was written in the given materials.”
All respondents said the introductory information told them everything they needed to know before they arrived.

All respondents were happy with the UK partner museum allocated to them, which is a positive given the challenges of this aspect in the past.
“I felt that I was with my family, and I met many wonderful people. In addition to being acquainted with the culture of the region, I was very happy to sit with my friends and eat cakes and tea.”

“100% satisfied with the allocated museum. For me it was just what I needed. My expectation and needs were fulfilled. I learned so much from them, it just went beyond expectation. I would love to go and work with the staffs for a week or so, especially at the GMRC. I could benefit so much and I believe that experience will help me to transform my institution.”

“By visiting several archaeological sites I have seen how to develop these sites.”

“I had the chance to learn about art programmes that were interesting for me, as well as learn that they are working in projects on which I have information to share with them. Also it was particularly interesting for me the work they are doing with social and political history exhibitions.”

“Visiting a place makes your experience altogether very different. I am glad they have community museums reflecting their history and culture. The museums were very engaging. But I was also expecting a little more hands-on in the sessions rather than just talking about its display and narrative.”

“I have realized that we have a lot in common in terms of the history of our countries, the museums with small budget, and a lack of professionals in some areas.”

“They gave us a warm reception and treated us like friends.”
Only one participant said they didn’t understand why this museum had been selected for them.

**FIGURE 26: WAS IT CLEAR TO YOU WHY THIS MUSEUM HAD BEEN SELECTED FOR YOU?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
<th>Yes, probably</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Norfolk has many archaeological sites so I think I was chosen to be here. I’m an archaeologist and work in the museum section.”

“I selected Ashmolean Museum but I was sent to Glasgow. And I never asked why I was selected for Glasgow. Now when I look back interest I shared before my visit, that kind of clarifies it all to me, I think my criteria matched more with the Glasgow museums.”

“Because this institution oversees several sites and museum, and also I work in an organization oversees many of the sites and museums.”

“It was clear for me that these museums have fine and applied arts collection, and that this related with my main activity, although some other parts of museums activities usually not related with my field were as well very relevant for my learning.”

“Probably mine is a memorial museum and the museums in Belfast have also similar sites where there are houses and people talking about them. I was also interested in seeing a storage in other regions of UK museums and this visit was fruitful.”

“In the beginning I did not realize it, but then introduction to Textile Collection made it obvious for me.”

“It was clear because all the activities and programmes we do are almost closer to all Glasgow museums. I related them to our museums in Uganda. I explored, networked and shared information which the Glasgow team.”
“I had put down on my application I was interested in archive collections associated with the museum but I didn’t quite get the access I was expecting but didn’t know that ahead of time. On the other hand the archives of the Griffith Institute were a great unexpected surprise in the schedule.”

**TRAINING PROGRAMME AT THE UK PARTNER MUSEUM**

Participants generally described the partner museums’ training programmes as inspiring, clear, well-organised and useful, sufficiently detailed, sufficiently practical and relevant. Scores are slightly higher than last year.

**FIGURE 27: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMME AT THE UK PARTNER MUSEUM?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
<th>Yes, probably</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organised</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently detailed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently practical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to you</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The program was comprehensive and included many important lectures as well as practical work and field visits.”

“Overall it was a very productive 10 days. There were more visits than the room lectures and that kind of gave a better understanding about how things were done there and how the staffs and curator works with projects, exhibitions, educational programme and visitor services.”

“Visiting any community museum is never a waste. The techniques and methods used in those museums are different from London museums. They have mentioned about funds and few challenges they face which we can relate to our museums.”

“It was more than I expected from a small museum: the training was very useful and inspired me a lot of my own projects.”
“Not everything that I learned here can be practical in China. It is a much more complicated country compared with the UK anyway.”

“This was very perfectly opted place as it suited every aspect that was required in order to know the behind the scenes working of museums with smaller team, budget constraints and optimum workforce.”

Participants were asked which parts of the programme were most useful to them. Responses were:

- Visits to archives.
- Visits to archaeological sites.
- Gallery tours and insights into interpretation.
- Discussions about museum management and strategy.
- Seeing systems such as objects documentation, marking and labelling.
- Understanding visitor studies and education programmes.
- Seeing ways to work with limitations of staff and space.

Participants were asked which parts of the programme were least useful to them. Nine said nothing. Answers were:

- Photography.
- Activities that were outside their responsibility, but still useful for general interest.

Respondents were asked how, if at all, the UK Partner Museum should change its programme for next year. Responses were:

- Have more practical sessions.
- Have more time.
- Ensure information on ITP is spread across the organisation.
- Meet curators from other museums in the area, in part to make up for curators in the host museum being away over the summer.

**ACCOMMODATION**

Participants thought the accommodation was clean and comfortable, convenient and mainly quiet. Scores were higher than for London.
FIGURE 28: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF YOUR ACCOMMODATION?

"The house was spacious, quiet and clean, overlooking the river bank and was close to the study center."

"I bet no one ever complains about staying in Fraser Suites. It was brilliant and the hotel staffs were also very welcoming."

"Accommodation was very comfortable. I loved every bit of it."

All participants thought the accommodation should be used again.

FIGURE 29: SHOULD THE PARTNER MUSEUM USE THIS ACCOMMODATION FOR FUTURE STUDENTS?
OVERALL VIEWS

The partner museum programme met or exceeded the expectations of 13 participants, which is a higher score than last year.

FIGURE 30: DID THE PROGRAMME AT THE PARTNER MUSEUM MEET YOUR EXPECTATIONS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It surpassed my expectations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met all of my expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met most of my expectations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met only met a few of my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It did not meet any of my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All except one of the respondents said the programme used their time well. Comments suggest some need to improve coordination and avoid repetition.

FIGURE 31: OVERALL, DID THE PROGRAMME AT THE PARTNER MUSEUM USE YOUR TIME WELL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“They started the lectures on time in the program and also finished in time and there was enough time to ask questions and rest.”

All participants said they have a relationship with the partner museum.

**FIGURE 32: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU HAVE A RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PARTNER MUSEUM?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All participants felt that the partner museum genuinely cared about them and their wellbeing.

**FIGURE 33: DID YOU FEEL THAT THE PARTNER MUSEUM GENUINELY CARED ABOUT YOU AND YOUR WELLBEING?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I was surrounded with care, attention and help with two lovely and very friendly ladies, to whom I am deeply grateful.”
ANALYSIS OF FEEDBACK FROM PARTNERS

INTRODUCTION

We have nine responses from seven places (missing Glasgow and Oxford).

ORGANISATION

All respondents said the objectives of ITP are important and relevant. One said that: “We struggled to find an easily accessible list of objectives for the ITP.”

FIGURE 34: WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE OBJECTIVES OF ITP?

“The ITP programme has been important to Manchester Museum since our first involvement in 2008. It is increasingly so, with our work on a major BM Partnership gallery on South Asia, due to open in 2021.”

“International networks are very important for our collections, so this gives us an easy route to networks.”

“I think I understand the scope of the programme but it's both broad and very focussed in certain areas so I hesitate to say yes definitely. I think the objectives and my understanding of them is very important, particularly in respect of the way I work with the fellows and communicate with my colleagues about the programme.”

All respondent said the paperwork was clear, helpful and relevant.
“As this was our first year partnering with the ITP, paperwork and associated timelines were challenging, however, as planning for the programme commenced and further meetings were had with the ITP Team, clarity ensued.”

“The paperwork is clear and relevant, and easy to share with colleagues.”

“We use the personal forms to try and match the programme to the Fellows’ interests, so the clearer the forms can be, the better we can plan the programme.”

All respondents who answered said they were happy with the choice of participant.
Comments suggested this was because of the level of enthusiasm and strong group feeling.

“Yes - the delegates were engaged and engaging from the start.”

“As always, this was a great group that really gelled together and each individual was a pleasure to work with.”

“Very good team, they seemed to get on well and work together well. All joined in with the programme and worked hard.”

All respondents said the rationale for the choice was clear.

FIGURE 37: WAS IT CLEAR TO YOU WHY THIS PARTICIPANT HAD BEEN SELECTED FOR YOU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Yes - it was clear that the delegates had interesting, relevant experiences to share with us and us with them.”

All respondents said the BM gave them enough support.
FIGURE 38: DID YOU THINK THAT THE SUPPORT THE BM GAVE YOUR ORGANISATION TO PREPARE THE PARTNER PROGRAMME WAS SUFFICIENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I thought having lunch with the Fellows visiting the Museum on the introductory day was a great idea.”

“The ITP were very helpful with broad brushstrokes and the minutiae also.”

“We are old-timers at the ITP programme now but that did not mean that we took the BM support for granted - it was prompt and useful at every stage of the programme.”

“The ITP team are always willing to answer questions. It helps me that my day job involves asking colleagues to deliver training for me so this is just more of the same.”

“Always comprehensive and the ITP crew are so adept at creating the right spirit of learning and sharing between fellows and hosts.”

All respondents said the introductory day was well organised, useful, enjoyable and relevant.

“I think it could be less formal and perhaps each Fellow could be positioned at a stall and people are then free to go round and meet them and talk about their work and interests?”

“This was a great day and an excellent way to get 'a feel' for the fellows, especially those we were hosting. Lots of additional information and context was given by the fellows in their presentations also, in comparison to what they had put on the personal/professional interests form.”

“Meeting for the first time is always important, and it was great that me and my two partner colleagues were able all to meet our fellows and have an initial chat over lunch. Seeing the presentations gives a really valuable background to discussions with all participants.”
“It’s always hard to take in so many presentations but I knew what to expect this year and sitting down with my fellows was helpful in that we could talk through the programme. There is limited scope for changes to be made at this stage but that hasn’t been a problem so far, they all seemed satisfied with the programme I had put together.”

FIGURE 39: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE INTRODUCTORY DAY AT THE BM, WHERE YOU MET THE PARTICIPANTS?

ENGAGEMENT

Seven respondents said the participants contacted them before coming to the partner museum. All respondents said the participants engaged fully with the programme, even more than for previous years.

FIGURE 40: DID PARTICIPANTS ENGAGE FULLY WITH THE PROGRAMME?
“Staff leading sessions with the fellows detail that from the offset and at every session they were engaged and participatory.”

“Yes, on average I would say even slightly more than usual.”

All respondents said that participants seemed able to absorb the information given, although there was some concern about participants’ English skills.

**FIGURE 41: DID YOU FEEL PARTICIPANTS WERE ABLE TO ABSORB ALL THE INFORMATION GIVEN?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents said there was a good working relationship between participants and staff.

**FIGURE 42: WAS THERE A GOOD WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS AND STAFF?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“We noticed Fellows this year did not express as much fatigue from previous programme as has been evident in previous years. This was reflected in their energy and enthusiasm throughout the day.”

“The fellows all had quick minds and an ability to ask questions to clarify areas.”

OVERALL VIEWS

Respondents said the strengths of the ITP this year were:

- **The objectives.** “The strength is always in the overall aims of the programme and the commitment from all to learn together.”

- **Mix of participants.** “A broad mix of individuals, including fellows from 'new' countries; the cross-cultural organisation of this is now, I think, optimal.” but also: “For our Fellows, maybe that they were close geographically and in their interests, giving a tight group through food, language and religion.”

- **Engagement of fellows.** “I was very impressed by their levels of engagement and enthusiasm.” “The fact that the fellows wanted to see and do everything. I think much of it came down to personalities. The group I worked with got along very well and they were all just keen to experience whatever we had to offer. We had fellows from national institutions with larger and more ‘valuable’ collections but there was no sense of competition.”

- **Matching of fellows to partners.** “Selection of Fellows - personal interests tied in very well with our site's activities and collections.”

- **Relationship with the ITP team.** “Good to have Rebecca with us for several days; felt that that strengthened our relationship with ITP.”

- **Organisation.** “Excellent organisation and clear sense that fellows knew what was expected of them regarding the Object in Focus display.” “The energy brought to the programme by the ITP team is huge. This helps to keep fellows and host partners on board, engaged and enthusiastic. I understand this and appreciate it!”

- **Internal interest.** “The strengths for our first year were the number of people who offered to be involved without having previous experience of the ITP. The was useful as well for the one-to-one sessions we were able to organise in the fellows area of interest. As such we were able to showcase and invite the fellows to explore the diversity of our multiples sites, collections, themes and staff and invite our staff to make connections.”

The only weaknesses mentioned were timing and accommodation.

“There was insufficient time to show them the collections.”

“Although the accommodation was satisfactory it was not as good as previous years, and perhaps there is an opportunity to book this further in advance on future occasions.”
All partners said ITP exceeded or met all their expectations.

**FIGURE 43: DID THE ITP PROGRAMME MEET YOUR EXPECTATIONS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It surpassed my expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met all of my expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met most of my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It met only met a few of my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It did not meet any of my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All partners definitely feel they have a relationship with the BM.

**FIGURE 44: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU AND YOUR INSTITUTION HAVE A RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BRITISH MUSEUM?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partners were asked about the meaning of ITP for their organisation. Answers emphasise strategic alignment and reciprocity.

“It really means so much including: meeting new national and international colleagues; finding out about the Fellows work; it makes you review your own work with fresh eyes and ears.”
“The Programme is inspiring and thought provoking- you move forward thinking anything is possible!”

“There is a real team feeling along with a network of support and encouragement.”

“The ITP is an important part of our annual calendar. We value being a part of such a prestigious national programme. It enables us to create and build on links with Fellows from across the globe, an opportunity that would be more difficult to achieve without the ITP. The informal nature of conversations with Fellows is often more valuable than formal conferences. It is also an excellent opportunity to forge a stronger relationship with the BM."

“One of our main aims as an organisation is to build relationships at local, national and particularly international levels. The ITP as such exactly meets this aim and is a means by which to engage others with the organisation and inspire staff to make connections, explore themes with a different perspective and be a part of a richer, wider cultural heritage sector.”

“ITP is an international conversation. It has grown increasingly into a mutually beneficial dialogue and is not simply The Brits telling other countries ‘how it is done’ in museums. This is especially striking in my own profession, working with colleagues in Egypt in the run up to major developments there; but the value of international dialogue gets to the heart of Manchester Museum’s mission to promote understanding between cultures.” DITTO

“Opportunity to join and create networks that we couldn’t do on our own, with colleagues around the world that we can talk to and call on, and help in turn.”

“Being linked to the BM and the other partner museums, giving a network that we could make ourselves but get broader links than those we would make individually.”

LEGACY

Two respondents have been involved in legacy projects in the last 12 months. One mentioned a website (no details given) and one: Armenia - Lori Summer School 2018.

Four respondents said they have been in contact with ITP alumni outside the Summer Programme. Comments suggest the contact was informal rather than project based.
ANALYSIS OF FEEDBACK FROM DEPARTMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES

INTRODUCTION

There were nine representatives, six of whom responded to our survey: one from Asia, two from AES, one from Greece and Rome, one from AOA, and one from the Middle East department.

MONTHLY MEETINGS

Scores as positive as for previous years. All respondents said monthly meetings were well-organised, necessary, and a good use of their time.

FIGURE 45: WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE MONTHLY MEETINGS?

“Some meetings were longer than necessary, but most were prompt and all were well organised.”

ROLE

The role is clear and a reasonable amount of time.
The responses on ease of getting people involved were mixed although no one said it was difficult. Comments were that willingness and ability to help depended on the workload of the individual.

Respondents were asked whether ITP could do anything to make it easier to get other people in the department to help deliver the placement. Comments were that ITP could specify what department are expected to deliver and communicate the pressures, especially on small departments.

**FIGURE 47: IS IT EASY OR DIFFICULT TO GET OTHER PEOPLE TO HELP DELIVER THE PARTICIPANT’S PLACEMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT?**
“By being more specific about what each department should deliver.”

“Difficult to say if ITP could do more to help as it is very dependent on the workload of the individual who is required.”

“In our department, it is administrators rather than curators who work with ITP so more curatorial involvement REP-wise, could help.”

STRUCTURE

This year there is a striking desire for programmes to be structured in advance, presumably because of the work pressures on the departments.

FIGURE 48: DO YOU THINK THE DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMMES WORK BETTER IF THEY ARE TIGHTLY OR LOOSELY STRUCTURED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The programme works definitely works better if planned and structured in advance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme probably works better if planned and structured in advance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme probably works better if fluid and put together when the participants are there</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme definitely works better if fluid and put together when the participants are there</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“If not organised in advanced people in the department would be too busy to schedule the sessions in.”

Views on the Object in Focus projects were more positive than last year.
FIGURE 49: DID THE FORMAT FOR OBJECT IN FOCUS PROJECTS WORK FOR YOU?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

“The best structure I have experienced yet. The delegates all seemed less stressed.”

“It was well timetabled, participants had plenty of time to research and plan, objectives were clear and the final event was a huge success.”

“I think this was a great project and the right amount of work but it was a bit different this year in terms of getting used to working with other departments’ ITPs rather than our own - this is not a negative comment as it was very interesting to meet people from other countries but does change the programme quite a lot.”

“While I feel that having the participants work in pairs on an object they are not familiar with is a very good concept, the fact of not having much communication with participants within our department about their respective projects was something we feel was lacking. I would prefer it if we had some input into our participants’ work so that they feel fully supported by the department they were assigned to.”

OUTCOMES

Respondents were asked if they or their department had any plans for future projects or contact with former ITP participants. Most were able to give examples of planned collaborations.

Respondents were asked whether the experience of being a Departmental Rep had been of any use to them in any other way. Comments were about networking, learning, contact across the BM and visits.
“Always interesting, but also useful for contacts that have enabled fieldwork and research projects. Useful to know what recent discoveries are being made in Croatia and Turkey. It is also useful to hear more about archives that relate to projects we are involved in.”

“I have learnt a huge amount about how museum’s work, about partnerships and more besides.”

“It has been great to work with another department and with objects and exhibition related material/objects.”

All respondents said the ITP is beneficial to their department.

FIGURE 50: IS THE ITP BENEFICIAL TO YOUR DEPARTMENT?

All respondents said they were proud of the ITP, although not everyone was comfortable with the word ‘proud’.

“We become less insular.”

“For research projects and also networking/ contacts with international institutions and other museums.”

“It brings fresh enthusiasm and ideas making people think outside the box!”

“It is beneficial in many ways but mainly to meet people from the countries we work with learn more about them/their museums and culture and is generally a fun, interesting project for the department to work on.”

“Mainly through enlarging our network of colleagues and collaborators, and facilitating the exchange of information and expertise.”
“Pride is not the sort of emotion that I think about at work - it is something helpful and should be done.”

“I think it is a great asset and allows us to discuss complicated issues with delegates from source countries who may otherwise be unfairly critical of the British Museum. This enables us to move beyond ahistorical post-colonial narratives of collections and towards a better understanding of our collections and past societies within an atmosphere of international collegiality.”

“It is an amazing programme that is likely unrivalled and is testament to the hard work of the ITP team and the enthusiasm of staff to support.”

“Maintaining and creating relationships with other countries and museums is vital, as is creating these learning opportunities and I feel proud to be a part of that.”

THE FUTURE

Five said they would consider being a Departmental Rep next year. One was expecting to be away next summer for family reasons.
ANALYSIS OF FEEDBACK FROM SPEAKERS AND FACILITATORS

INTRODUCTION

We had 26 respondents, which is roughly half of the speakers/facilitators.

BACKGROUND

Respondents come from 18 departments.

FIGURE 52: DEPARTMENT

38% of respondents had not previously run a session for ITP, which is more than last year (22%).
All except one respondent said they enjoyed running the session, with one ‘mixed’ reply.

**FIGURE 54: DID YOU ENJOY RUNNING THIS SESSION?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANISATION**

All respondents said they knew enough about participants and ITP in advance. A couple commented that they would have liked to know more about participants’ skills levels.
FIGURE 55: DID YOU KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THE PARTICIPANTS AND THE ITP IN ADVANCE?

All except one of the respondents said they knew what was expected of them.

FIGURE 56: DID YOU KNOW WHAT WAS EXPECTED OF YOU AND YOUR SESSION?

All except two of the respondents said the location worked. Two respondents commented about challenges with IT.
“The only glitch was we couldn’t connect to the internet and therefore play a film I had wanted to on the big screen.”

“Due to the exercise in the stores and the time constraints, it would have been handy to be closer to the stores saving on time, however I realise this couldn’t be avoided.”

“The room was okay for the size of the group. However, it took quite a while to get the IT equipment to work, which was a concern.”

23 of the 26 respondents said the participants seemed easy to engage, although comments were that engagement varied in the group.

“Variety of engagement levels. Some fantastic engagement.”

“The group seemed very tired. I think it was the end of a long day/week.”
23 of the 26 said they had enough time for the session.

All respondents said that ITP provided everything they needed.
FIGURE 60: DID THE ITP PROVIDE YOU WITH EVERYTHING YOU NEEDED TO RUN THIS SESSION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POTENTIAL CHANGES

77% of respondents were happy with the level of interaction they were able to provide in their session. 81% described the session as including interaction, which is much higher than last year (55%). Interaction was partly limited by the available time, the space and the willingness of the participants to engage.

FIGURE 61: WAS YOUR SESSION PURELY A PRESENTATION, OR WERE THERE INTERACTIVE ELEMENTS I.E., TOURS, PRACTICALS, GROUP SESSIONS? WERE YOU HAPPY WITH HOW THIS WORKED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purely presentation and happy with it</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purely presentation and would have more interaction next time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included interaction and happy with it</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included interaction and would include more or different interaction next time</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I think this is dependent on the particular participants and the level of detail that would be appreciated.”

“I think as the group was tired it would have been helpful to have a more interactive.”

“Facilitated discussion worked better than group work, so need to think through how to adapt this for next year.”

“I had planned to include more interaction and ran out of time at the end. I didn't anticipate the fellows to be so engaged and ask so many questions. If I was to do this in future I would adapt my presentation so its shorter and leaves more time for interactive elements.”

“I think I want to tweak the interactive session, but not too much. That said, some of this group wanted to reflect on their management skills. So, if that's what is needed next time then I will need to do a different session.”

Speakers were asked what they would do differently. Comments were:

- **More group work.** “I felt it worked well as an introductory session to our work, it was well pitched and included lots of conversation and questions. If there was more time I would get them to do small group work focusing on their own local audiences.”

- **Same room.** “Reserve the same room every year to improve the consistency of delivering the session.”

- **Adapt to ITPers.** “It's not so much a question of what I would do differently. Rather I'm never quite sure whether I pitch my session at the appropriate level which means that I'm never entirely sure whether they find it useful or not. That's primarily why I do it as more of a "show and tell" session where participants can see things in action, so to speak.” “Work on a longer and perhaps more focused presentation or workshop that could address specific interests of certain ITPers.” “The changes will depend on the size and composition of the group. This year, I decided not to use a workshop format (which was suitable in 2016 for example) because of a small group size.”

- **Have more time.** “Perhaps just more time so we could really encourage more creative thinking by the participants. But otherwise no change - I loved being a part of the course again this year.” “More follow up, it was just the one off session.” “If possible, I think the session would benefit from a whole afternoon-it felt a bit rushed, I'm not sure the session could have been cut down anymore without losing vital information.”

- **Get feedback from participants.** “Feedback from the participants would influence my answer here. I am unsure how successful or relevant it was for each of them.”

- **More interaction.** “Have a more interactive element and find out a little more from the group how they work in partnership in their respective nations. I am sure this would have been very interesting for the group.” “I am keen to think through a more coherent activity at the end so the trainees can demonstrate what they have learnt.” “Due to
time, I left out an optional activity I’d planned. I would make more time for this were I to repeat the session.” “I wouldn’t do the sessions differently, but maybe it would be worth including a session for them on how to use Photoshop/Gimp so that they can work on their panels and posters more by themselves. And for some of the reps it would be worth to include them as well I think.” “I would adapt the presentation part so its shorter so we have more time for interactive demonstrations and perhaps a case study where people share their points of view. Now that I know the fellows are very engaged, I know what other kind of activities can work.” “Maybe allow more time for questions and discussion.”

- **More preparation.** The ITP unfortunately coincided with a particularly busy period for the department with a heavily reduced team, which meant I had much less time to fully prepare prior to delivery. Now I’ve given the presentation once I can easily review, update and make it much more engaging for the participants.

- **Give handouts.** “Circulate a glossary of scientific terms beforehand; I have already prepared one for the Iraq Heritage Scheme that could be used for ITP.”

- **Nothing.** “I felt it worked well in its current format. The use of headphones and microphone in the gallery tour was especially useful as the gallery can get busy during regular hours and it enabled the participants to explore the gallery while I spoke.”

Respondents were asked what, if anything, is special about presenting to ITP. Responses had these themes:

- **Diversity of participants.** “Such a great programme, well done Claire, so well organised and such lovely delegates.” “Meeting such a diverse group of museum professionals from around the world who are keen to learn and share their own experiences and knowledge of their museums. It an important reminder of the need to share work and knowledge and learn from one another.” “Being able to engage with such a diverse group of people.” “The enthusiasm of the participants is really special.” “They are a very diverse exciting group ranging from Directors to museum workers.”

- **Relationship with participants.** “Wonderful interaction with participants.”

- **Shared learning.** “The ability to share my area of expertise and interests. The insight gained by to understanding how ITPers view and engage with this topic as museum professionals.” “Feeling of genuinely imparting useful skills and knowledge that can be applied to their home institutions.” “The little stories you get to hear which make you realise some of the challenges the participants can face back in their home countries.” “And the team at the BM who run the ITP are so dynamic and kind - I think we all learn from each other.” “I enjoyed meeting the delegates and hearing about their own work and how the health and wellbeing agenda fitted into their current and future provision.” “It was a lovely opportunity to share knowledge and skills and hear about their own practices and ideas.” “It was fantastic to hear from colleagues in very different situations, with different resources, and hear their perspectives. I feel it can be a two-way learning opportunity.”
- **International coverage.** “It is very rare that you get to talk about your programme with so many nations represented in the audience.” “Great opportunity to spread the expertise at the BM around the world.” “Keeping in mind how international engagement may be understood in different countries and making the discussion relevant to all participants.”

“It is a fantastic opportunity to be able to share what I do with passionate museum professionals from around the world. It also gave me an opportunity to learn from them and how heritage is cared for in their countries. What was truly rewarding is they were all so engaged and clearly passionate about heritage. It is a wonderful example that caring for cultural heritage is a global endeavour, and we are all in it together.”

The respondents generally feel proud of the ITP, although some are not comfortable with the word ‘proud’.

**FIGURE 62: DO YOU FEEL PROUD THAT THE BRITISH MUSEUM HAS THE ITP?**

The value mentioned in comments included:

- **Meeting BM’s responsibilities.** “Not sure if ‘proud’ is the word I would use. I feel the museum has a great responsibility to engage in this type of knowledge sharing, exchange and training with regards to having a ‘world’ collection and the history of this collection.” “I feel it is right and proper that the Museum shares its considerable expertise globally. Being a ‘museum of the world for the world’ should not just refer to the collections in our building, but our approach to colleagues, collections and museums across the globe.”

- **Feeling of community.** “I am very proud to be part of a global network of museum professionals who love what they do and enjoy their field.”
▪ **Uniqueness.** “It is a unique programme in the UK and it means a lot to the partner museums that participate, whether hosting placements or being part of the wider programme. It is very important that the BM continue to help connect UK colleagues with global contacts.”

▪ **Time for reflection.** “I’m proud to be able to share what SYA have achieved and deliver as we often overlook what we have done due to being constantly focused on looking and planning for the future.”

▪ **Reinforcement of BM’s role.** “Yes, it helps cement and recognise the position of the British Museum in the world.”

▪ **Feeling of satisfaction.** “It made me feel proud to work at the BM being able to pass on my skills and experiences and share this with others.” “I think it is a brilliant scheme and I am happy I was able to participate. I would love to take part in future years.”
CONCLUSION

ITP has many strengths:

▪ **Comprehensive and carefully designed lecture and workshop programme at the BM.** This was particularly interactive this year, which is more consistent with participants’ learning styles, who consistently ask for session to be practical. In terms of enjoyment, visits always rate highly,

▪ **Connection with BM departments.** The BM departmental programme was particularly well organised this year, after some personality issues last year. However, feedback from departmental reps shows increasing stresses because of workload which means they need to structure provision in advance and have lower ability to be flexible.

▪ **Shadowing and mentoring programme at partner museums.** This provides another context in which to see museum practice, a context perhaps more comparable to that of participants in terms of resources. The programme worked well this year, which suggests a need to have a group workshop to capture good practice principles for the partner role.

▪ **Strong relationship with participants.** The feeling of genuine caring is exceptionally strong in ITP and is an important element in ensuring participants become part of the BM family and maintain connections long into the future.

▪ **Senior participant.** This is a clever element in the design that helps sessions run smoothly but also gives participants additional pastoral support.

Some of the challenges from previous years were resolved this year:

▪ Ensuring speakers engage with participants rather than using a purely lecture format.

▪ Choosing partner museums carefully and communicating the reasons for the choice to the participant.

▪ Making the best of the time in the BM department. Participants always say they want more time.

One possible change that came up this year would be to use a baseline skill questionnaire. Distributing this might help speakers tailor their content to the participant group, while acknowledging that the needs in any group of trainees are always varied. Repeating the tool at the end of the programme might also give a picture of which subjects have been well received.