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Welcome to the evaluation report for the 2021 Cambridge Festival. This year was unique in many ways - not least in being the very first Cambridge Festival, combining a cross-disciplinary approach across four themes; Health, Society, Environment and Explore! It was also, of course, a year shaped by the Covid-19 Pandemic - bringing with it the necessity to work remotely, and to deliver public engagement activities digitally.

The demands of digital engaging were largely new to all. It is clear that many of the methods of evaluation for live, in-person, public engagement do not fit well, or work best, for digital activities. It is also clear that the amount of feedback for events varies across delivery platforms - with some events accruing many responses and others very little. That said, we believe the data and feedback provided here enables event organisers to learn important lessons, develop digital engagement platforms further, and to re-look at how we can share our research with the public in the future.

What we do know beyond doubt is that the reach of the festival online was far greater than ever before. We had visitors from over 170 Countries (six of the seven continents). The total viewing numbers across the 364 events is well over 100,000 people. To try to translate that into an in-person comparison, the Cambridge Festival in 2021 would have filled the Babbage Lecture Theatre two hundred and twenty-two times over. Finally on the numbers front, we know that people viewed around eighteen thousand-hours of festival content - which put another way is screen time for seven hundred and sixty-three days!

Numbers only tell us so much - and what you and our audience shared is in many ways more important. We have taken note of your feedback on event submission dates, online formats and training, and looked to how we can incorporate other suggestions into how we deliver in the future.

Like many of you, we are all looking forward to having the ability to return to live, in-person events in the future while being equally mindful of the reach and the impact of digital engagement. One of the key learnings from the audience feedback is that people want us to maintain and expand digital events. It clearly enables a new, and a broadly younger, audience to engage with the University.
Whilst 52% of the surveyed attendees had been to a public event at the University previously, 48% were attending for the first time. What’s more, 23% of people had never engaged with the University in any way before. The data also shows an estimated 19% of attendees were international, and approximately 45% of those surveyed were under the age of 45.

Digital engagement provides greater accesses to events for people with a disability, and others with caring responsibilities (most notably those with children). Having an on-demand, watch again, offer was key to people’s wish lists for the future. Having started, often for the first time, to engage with these new groups of people, we do not want to risk losing them from our audience. It is important to note that 66% of people stated that they would like the Cambridge Festival to maintain digital engagement activities in the future, with 9% stating that we should return to only engaging with in-person events.

We hope that there is much of interest to you in this report. Whether for planning future in-person events, or to enable the development of digital engagements. We do not have any previous data for a cross-disciplinary Cambridge Festival, nor for an on-line delivery model. In this regard, the data and report from this year will enable us to set a benchmark to compare our progress as we move forwards.

Please do drop us a line if you would like us to review and share any received feedback specific to your own events.

CambridgeFestival@admin.cam.ac.uk

David & Naomi & the Festival team.
364 events in the Festival programme

- Contributors identified with more than 115 different affiliations (including departments, colleges, research institutes, and external organisations)**
  - Earth Optimism was the largest contributor to the Festival with 45 events
  - The next biggest contributors to the Festival were the Public Engagement team and colleagues in the Office for External Affairs and Communications (25 events), Cambridge University Press (12 Events) and the Faculty of Divinity (12 Events), followed by CRASSH (10 events) and Department of Pathology (10 events)
- 59 events (16%) were affiliated with external organisations (Including Anglia Ruskin University, Babraham Institute, Cambridge Junction, and our Festival Sponsors Astra Zeneca and Rand Europe.
- 19 events (5%) were affiliated with Cambridge colleges (Churchill, Jesus, Lucy Cavendish, Murray Edwards, Queen’s, St Johns, Trinity and Wolfson).

**Note that this figure only accounts for contributors who entered data into EMS. It is very likely that there were contributors in the Festival who had additional/other affiliations.

Mix of timing, themes formats, and intended audiences

### Event timing

- Livestream only, 34%
- On-demand AND Livestream, 34%
- On-demand only, 32%

### Coordinator-identified themes

- **Health**: 127 events
- **Society**: 160 events
- **Environment**: 126 events
- **Explore**: 168 events
CONTRIBUTOR EVALUATION

Pre-Festival Survey

This survey was about better understanding who was involved in delivering the Festival.

The link was sent to everyone on the Festival coordinators email list from 3 March 2021. Recipients were asked to also share this survey with anyone who helped or contributed to their events or activities for the Festival.

- 99 responses were received

Who was taking part?

- Mix of roles

![Pie chart showing distribution of positions]

- Respondents reported affiliations with 51 different departments, colleges, and other groups
- Mix of number of years at Cambridge, with the majority being at Cambridge for 3+ years.

![Bar chart showing number of responses by duration of being based at Cambridge]
- 38% had previously contributed to FOI, 58% had previously contributed to CSF
  - Average number of years respondents had contributed to either Festival was about 3
  - 19% had not contributed to CFI or CSF before, 26% had contributed to both before
- 43% had organised something totally new for the Cambridge Festival
- 48% had delivered or helped deliver a public engagement project or activity online before.

- **New research** - 16% shared research at the Festival that had not been shared with public audiences before

- **Aims** - Respondents were allowed to choose up to three options to this question, with ‘Inform and inspire/raise awareness’ being the most popular selection – more than 2x as many respondents chose ‘inform and inspire’ compared to the next most popular option (‘personal reward and enjoyment’). It would be interesting to see whether in future years (when face-to-face interactions are possible) contributor aims shift to suggest a more dialogical approach to public engagement (e.g. ‘Improve our research quality’ (only 1 response in 2021) and ‘Learn from public groups’ (only 5 responses in 2021)).

Which of the following outcomes are your primary aims?

![chart showing responses to primary aims](chart.png)
Notable quotes

- I think online and in-person events do different things and engage audiences differently - and moving forward we should probably think about using them alongside each other to achieve different aims and reach different audiences.
- The timings of your deadlines do not work at all well for researchers.
- The deadlines for this year have been unhelpful, meaning that we have had to put pressure on academic staff to plan events months in advance (and at the very start of a challenging term) in a constantly changing situation. If the festival is online then operating to print deadlines from previous years is not sensible.
- Moving our talk online means we may lose some of our "drop in" audience so we expect that more attending it will have an existing interest in the subject. Against this, holding the event online means that our participants will be from further afield, indeed from countries around the world.
This survey was attempting to understand Festival engagement and track how it was going in roughly ‘real time’.

This survey was sent to all recipients on the Festival coordinators email list in from 3 March 2021. Recipients were asked to ensure that the main organiser/coordinator involved in their events/activities completed the snapshot survey within 1 working day of the end of each event/activity. For events running over multiple days, it only needed to be completed once, after the last day.

- **129 activities were reported** in the snapshot survey, out of 363 listed in the Festival programme. The mixture of formats of the events reported in the snapshot roughly matches the mixture of formats of events across the whole festival programme.

- **Roughly 640 people were reported to be involved in producing and delivering these 129 events**
  - 16% of events involved someone who would not have been able to participate in the Festival, had the event been in-person (even with no pandemic restrictions).

- **The total number of people reached by these 129 activities is estimated to be 17,483** (this is a sum of the reported number of views/attendees for all events reported).
  - 10,683 views (61%) were reported via YouTube
    - 67 events (52%) were reported to be on YouTube
    - Of the events reported on YouTube, the average of the reported average view durations was approx. 11 minutes
    - The maximum average view duration was ~38 minutes and the minimum reported average view duration was ~1 minute
  - 6,800 views (39%) were reported via other platforms
  - The true number of views may be higher for a few reasons:
    - A single device logged in to an event may be viewed by multiple people in the household but would only be counted as one ‘view’ by the online platform
    - These figures were reported shortly after each event took place. Videos on YouTube may have accumulated more views since these figures were reported.
    - Some events which were not originally on YouTube were recorded and added to YouTube so could accumulate more views later.

- The top three themes for what organisers thought **went well**, are as follows, with a few illustrative quotes for each:
  - **The technology worked smoothly or was easy to use**
    - The Spotlight feature on Zoom worked well as this simulates what a panel discussion would look like. We had two panels of four speakers each and a Q&A featuring all 8 speakers, and the spotlight feature meant that the audience could see all speakers at all times.
    - Having a welcome PowerPoint with music as suggested by Jamie Gallagher in his great online engagement session. His YouTube channel was very useful for me, but I only discovered it a few days before the event. I wish the Festival Team had told us about it and scheduled his Q&A session weeks in advance.
  - **The online format worked well and/or the audience was engaged**
    - People understood it and got really into it - and transcribed specimens far more quickly than I expected.
    - Having one presentation and then showing some specimens and books on a separate camera, and the two presenters discussing them, and asking questions from the audience (fielded by another person, from the chat)
    - The workshop was very engaging, it worked well giving the opportunity of the audience to show their piece, as well as they actively participated in icebreaking exercises.
The digital format meant a broader audience was able engage with their content – including people from around the world and those unable to attend usual in-person for various reasons.

- Quite a lot of views, and more viewers than we could ever hold in the museum gallery.
- On demand meant it was accessible to people who generally cannot attend 'prime time' events.
- I was also happy with how many people played the game. 147 is more people than we would usually engage in a one-day in-person festival (e.g. science festival or festival of plants). We also engaged people from all over the world, which hasn't been possible before!

The top three themes for what organisers thought went less well, are as follows, with illustrative quotes for each:

- **Not getting the audience/attendance/engagement they had hoped for**
  - The timing for an online event was probably not the best - families were look to get their kids away from screens, especially as this coincided with a relaxation of lockdown.
  - Because we didn't put a specific date on the event (the game was available throughout the festival), it didn't feature in the calendar on the festival website, and was quite difficult to find. We obtained extremely few players of the game via the Festival website - nearly all came via our social media.
  - Trying to get people engaged for a free live event - of 30 signups, only 10 attended. We had no questions in advance and had to adlib the whole way through.
  - There really was not that much engagement with the padlet / activity space.
  - People had issues finding the talk, and way less interest (by an order of magnitude) than our usual in person talks. Software to run talks is extortionately priced, especially for engagement. Youtube chat moderation abilities are not up to scratch, so we instead ran without chat.
  - Needed better promotion to reach a wider audience (my failure).
  - It's a little surprising how much the nice weather impacted attendance at an online event.

- **Requiring more support from the Festival Team** (NOTE: in sections below, others said they were very happy with the help provided by the Festival Team).
  - Obviously, with it being the first year I feel that the support such as branding pack and evaluation information came a bit too late.
  - Advertising of the events by the Cambridge Festival didn't seem as powerful as usual, though I appreciate that this was probably due to the greatly reduced print advertising due to the pandemic.
  - More tech advice from the central festival team to help with planning the platform for delivery.
  - More platform guidance needed from central team.
  - Cambridge Festival didn't retweet events on twitter or help with the running of Eventbrite.

- **Experiencing technical difficulties/hiccups**
  - The link was emailed to participants rather than included in the eventbrite ticket and then had to be emailed out.
  - Problems with technology (all overcome at the time - contingency plans and general planning - but initially nervewracking).
Top themes of advice to future online event organisers

- Practice and run tech-checks well before the event and have plenty of help on-hand on the day
  - You can’t prepare and rehearse enough. Make sure you’re technically comfortable. Make sure the presenters are technically comfortable and confident in what they’re doing. And try to think about the audience, and what will keep them engaged while staring at a screen.
  - Preparation always takes longer than expected, so try to have everything ready far in advance so that you can do enough practice run-throughs. As well as making sure everyone knows what they’re doing, you’ll also identify problems that you didn’t expect. Also, get some help with chat moderation.
  - Have a third co-host to help. Make sure your co-host really has got the technology up and running okay in advance of the event. Make sure you know how to contact the audience in the waiting room!

- Leave plenty of time for organising pre-recorded materials
  - Get the videos pre-recorded in plenty of time as some of the academics struggled with the logistics of recording and transferring files
  - Give yourself more time to edit than you think you will need.

- Think in advance about how materials might be re-used later
  - Putting together an online activity is a huge amount of work! Think about how you can continue to use your resources after the event (e.g. for remote school “visits” - this was out of motivation).
  - We only seem to get about a 50% attendance rate from the registrations. In hindsight, I should have set up automatic emails to go out after the event to signpots people to the recording which is available on demand through our website.
  - Find out in advance if the panel will try and answer outstanding questions afterwards to publicise on the website so we can communicate this with the audience at the event.

- Targeted advertising is important
  - Give your talk a good title
  - Target your advertising - in this case using a heritage engagement list provided a very engaged audience

Other relevant comments:

- Lots of requests for lots more of this kind of activity in the future! Really positive.
- It would be great to have some sort of Festival pre-Festival meeting with all of us and have a sense of community and of support that is more in person than just emails and a website.
- It would be really beneficial if this happens in a digital sphere again, to provide a tick list of guidance as to how best to run live Q&As and what things to consider (to help people like me who didn't have time to think about everything fully!).
- Quite a few of our researchers/speakers have commented that the timing of the new festival is not ideal - the first week of the Festival is the week straight after the end of Full Term which is exceptionally busy for anyone who was involved in teaching. Also, overlapping with the Easter weekend is not really fair on researchers/staff/students that are involved in the Festival - they deserve a break. Can the Festival timings be addressed for next year?
- I think the festival should do some more research into what made for kids means and its implication for children’s events delivered through youtube. It would be good to have some clarity here. I appreciate this is really hard though as youtube itself is pretty hazy on what they mean
Post-Festival Contributors Survey

This survey was about better understanding contributors’ experiences of the Festival.

The link was sent to everyone on the Festival coordinators email list after the Festival from 6 April 2021. Recipients were asked to also share this survey with anyone who helped or contributed to their events or activities for the Festival.

- 39 responses were received
- **Fostering collaboration through the Festival**
  - Respondents identified a mixture of other roles involved in delivering the their events and activities
    - 10 reported collaborating with people from outside their specialist fields. For example:
      - I collaborated with a policy stakeholder involved with the research being shared, we had never worked on an event like this before. It was good to hear her speak and share more of the broader policy perspective on the research project. I think the development of ideas remotely wasn't quite as dynamic as it would've been in real life. But we were able to involve overseas partners in our panel and reach audiences in the local research setting beyond Cambridge and the UK.
      - We collaborated with industry partners in Bristol whom I'd never met, and it was great to involve overseas partners in our panel and reach audiences in the local research setting beyond Cambridge and the UK.
    - 11 reported working with people who they had never worked with on research or engagement before
    - 6 said they anticipated new collaborative opportunities as a result of collaborating for the Festival

- 21 respondents said they anticipate using content developed for the Festival for other engagement opportunities

- Comparing results of pre- and post- surveys indicated little change in perceived confidence and competence in delivering online events and activities, which were relatively low in both pre- and post- surveys. The highest rating selected for competence or confidence on both pre-and post- surveys was 5 (on a 0 to 10-point scale).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Festival</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-Festival</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- And respondents still feel that online events make public engagement more challenging and that it is harder to have ‘meaningful’ engagement online

- However, they are still keen to deliver both in-person events and online events
And participating in the Festival encouraged many to have interdisciplinary conversations about research and reach new audiences

Participating in the Cambridge Festival encouraged me to have interdisciplinary conversations about my research
Many reported that the online format changed the way they think about the delivery of PE

And many felt supported by the Festival team

Things the festival team could have done to better support participation in the Festival
  - Provide more technical on choosing/using different online platforms AND/OR providing a central platform for all events
    - More information about the online platforms available would have been useful (and their pros/cons etc), especially prior to the deadline to decide what platform we would be using.
    - I think I would've found it much easier if there had been a single platform for the events that we could’ve be provided access to rather than having to organise that ourselves and worry about safety/safeguarding/risks etc.
    - Our event was extremely well attended and I was very happy with how it went. I was very sorry that we had issues with hackers and have been thinking about how this could have been avoided. Had the Festival provided the online platform we would have been spared
this happening. I just wonder if in the future there should be fewer events that are properly
resourced and supported.

- **Reducing competition between events/making event discovery easier**
  - The categories for events on the EMS was a problem. A search for my Department turned up 23 events, of which 10 (approximately) were actually linked to us. For a live event with printed brochure, this doesn't matter so much but it did matter online. Our events were hard to find.
  - I think it might have been useful to limit the number of events as I think there were too many for a virtual offering so events were competing for audiences. People have a lot less capacity for digital events with zoom fatigue. I had a lot less people view my event than when I listed my own online events separately.
  - It would be great if the registration system allowed people to pencil their proposed events into an electronic diary for all other event organisers to see what else is being proposed and when, to try to reduce clashes and conflicts, and to space themes out a bit - so there aren't four events on very closely related themes all within a short space of time, for instance. Clashes potentially split audiences, makes promotion of related events more difficult, and prevents those involved in one event being able to attend colleagues’ events.

- **Communication was not getting through to coordinators**
  - My research program manager mainly interacted with the Festival team, perhaps an email directly to me would have been appreciated with a link to tips or advice for the development of ideas for online events of this nature.
  - I felt that we had lots of information early on but there was a big gap before the final run up. I would have appreciated having a bit more notice that there was going to be a final session with the marvellous, confidence inspiring Jamie Gallagher! Found the slack channel a bit unwieldy - Teams might have been better
  - I think once the Festival was really close, communication became clearer, but I would have appreciated a bit more guidance on how to set up the ticketing. It was not 100% clear to me when things would be launching. I also had no clue how the Festival team advertised my event (beyond the website)? Was there any outreach in that way? I would have liked to control and/or change the branding of the advertisement.

- **Feeling unsure about safeguarding/online safety**
  - I also felt a bit unsure on safeguarding and security with the events, so a clearer steer on what interaction was ok and what was definitely not, would have been helpful. We had one event on Zoom that used breakout rooms and I'm still not clear if that was ok or not. We had no incidents, but I didn't feel comfortable with the arrangement and didn't get much advice from the festival team.
  - I thought the risk assessments for online events were hard to complete (although I appreciated the samples that you gave us). Also, it would have been good if you’d provided more support for the departmental Safety Officers who were being asked to sign off these risk assessments - ours was very reluctant to do it as she felt that it was outside her experience/competence, and she would have preferred someone else to be responsible for it.

- **Festival timing**
  - The Festival dates were a bit tricky. This year, I didn't run a hands-on event and I didn't need loads of undergrad volunteers but post-covid, I will. Please can the date shift back to the end of Lent term?
  - The timing of the Festival was rather odd, continuing over Easter weekend. Many of the people involved in our events were reluctant to take part in activities towards the end of the Festival, so we ended up with three activities squished into a very short period, which was very draining for me!
  - We worked with teams of school students. The Spring Term generally ended on Friday 26 March, so it was difficult to programme sessions after this date.
- The timing of the Festival is really not ideal. Overlapping with the first week post-Lent Term puts a lot of pressure on any research staff who are involved in teaching (that week is apparently extremely busy for them). Overlapping with the Easter weekend is unfair on staff and researchers who deserve a break (note that many engagement professionals won't receive time off in lieu or overtime payments for work outside of core hours, so it's particularly unfair on them to have to work over Easter). Ending so close to the end of the financial year (the 4th in the case of this year) will make budgeting very difficult in future years where hands-on activities are involved - it will be almost impossible to get all the expenses forms complete and signed off etc. on time to ensure that the expenditure goes into the correct grant task.

- **Coordinators feeling isolated**
  - One of the main challenges I feel like I encountered was that I hadn't done this before but as such, it was a case of you don't know what you don't know so it's hard to ask for assistance.
  - I did feel quite isolated while organising my event this year but I think that's more to do with the situation we're in at the moment rather than any lack of help from the team.
  - A few more opportunities to idea share between contributors.
  - I think the Festival team are great, and all lovely people, but I always feel quite unsupported with University events - I have virtually no support from my Department (administrative, logistical, technical, specialist, or moral) and so it is all pretty much entirely off my own back

- What the Festival team did that really helped support participation in the Festival.
  - **Providing training (particularly the sessions with Jamie Gallagher)**
    - The support the team provided in terms of training was superb. I really enjoyed all the training sessions I went on. I went from feeling not-at-all-confident about running an online event to thinking, yes, we can do this.
    - I also found the training that you organised beforehand really useful and inspiring, and it encouraged me to try some things that I might not have done (e.g. simultaneous streaming to YouTube to increase our audience).
    - The session with Jamie Gallagher was fab, especially his tip on video sharing via OBS - I was going to screen share pre-recorded presentations which would have been awful, instead I used OBS which was great

  - **Responsiveness to queries and last-minute changes**
    - The team is always hugely supportive and quick to respond. I'm always glad to work with them and thankful for their continued desire to work with me!
    - Hannah was a delight and super helpful - and patient - regarding tweaks to the Festival pages - thank you!
    - The support team was very responsive to questions and professional and understanding in their guidance.
    - All emails responded to promptly, even if fixing the issue was out of the teams' hands. Things they could fix, e.g. tweaks to the websites themselves, were done very quickly. The team were friendly at all times, grace under pressure is tough, so well done.

  - **Provided useful tools and information**
    - Lots of useful information on how to make events accessible.
    - Excellent framework for promotion and delivery. (see also separate e-mail)
    - I liked that you sent regular bulletins/updates (although they contained so much to do, I found them a bit overwhelming and anxiety-provoking!).
    - All stages of the process were well managed by the team and communications were clear (and appreciated!) throughout.
    - At the beginning when it was decided it would all be virtual I panicked slightly, with no idea what to do or what platform to use etc. The team sent out examples of virtual events and reassured us that it was new for everyone and made sure there was help available of we needed it. I was very grateful for that!
• The scripted emails and access to the pre- and post-surveys was extremely helpful. The branding for the festival materials was also great.
• Having conversations with Naomi to discuss event ideas and hear a different perspective on them was really helpful to avoid tunnel vision (especially with less chances to bounce ideas off people whilst working virtually!)

● Notable comments (when asked for any other information)
  o I truly enjoyed taking part in two events at the Cambridge Festival this year and I hope the online delivery continues after the pandemic is over so people from overseas can continue to attend also.
  o Can't wait to go back to in-person events! Online really didn't work for us at all.
  o We always do a very hands on, face to face event for the festival and were sad not to be able to do it this year. But it was a nice change in the end and I think we have learnt a lot from it and will do more virtual events in the future now that we've done it once!

MEDIA COVERAGE

Traditional media coverage
• Estimated ~10 million people watched, listened to or read coverage of the Cambridge Festival from 25 January 2021 – 8 April 2021
• 119 articles
• 300 stories covering the a story about a new test for coeliac disease
• 54 radio and TV broadcast packages
• If you would like further details about the print and broadcast media engagements, please request to see our dedicated media report.

Social media
• 24% of people who completed the pre-event survey found out about the Festival through social media (8% through Twitter, 4% through Instagram, and 12% through Facebook)
• Channel growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of followers post-CSF 2020</th>
<th>Number of followers post-CF2021</th>
<th>% Increase from 2020 to 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>13,529</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook*</td>
<td>11,119*</td>
<td>19,599*</td>
<td>76%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The CSF and CFI Facebook pages were combined, which may be reflected in the disproportionately large increase in follower numbers

● Before the Festival (22 January (website launch) – 25 March 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>Impressions</th>
<th>Avg. daily reach</th>
<th>Engagements</th>
<th>Link clicks/profile actions</th>
<th>Net follower/page liker gain</th>
<th>Most popular demographic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>760,335</td>
<td>n/a?</td>
<td>10,892</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Men or women, age 35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>133,769</td>
<td>(107,781 organic, 22,807 paid)</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>Women, age 35-44 and 25-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- During the Festival (26 March – 4 April 2021) – just the 10 days of the Festival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>Impressions</th>
<th>Avg. daily reach</th>
<th>Engagements</th>
<th>Link clicks/profile actions</th>
<th>Net follower/page liker gain</th>
<th>Most popular demographic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twitter</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>505,325</td>
<td>n/a?</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Men or women, age 35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facebook</strong></td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>97,784 (60,569 organic, 35,612 paid)</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Women, age 45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instagram</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16,068</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Women, age 25-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is some uncertainty about the number of reported Facebook posts during these time ranges.

- **What worked well**
  - Having a strong brand and colour palette so content looked coherent
  - Video trailers for events did consistently well on our channels and main University channels (the Organoids trailer had 3k views and was the 3rd most viewed video on the University Twitter in the month of March)
  - Channel takeovers (e.g. Facebook Live with Helen Scales and Gurdon Institute ‘day in the life’)

- **What didn’t work well**
  - Fraudsters trying to ‘sell’ tickets to free events on Facebook
  - Other Facebook users reposting Festival content under unauthorised banners
  - Other Facebook users creating unrelated/fake events under Festival banners

- **Recommendations for future Festival social media**
  - Create channel-specific content (different channels favour different formats, for example, Facebook favours longer videos and Instagram favours <60 second videos)
  - Speak to other Festival organisers about their social media tips
  - Link with Colleges and Departments earlier to get them to share/re-share Festival content on their channels and reiterate this throughout the Festival planning and delivery
YouTube statistics (as of mid-April) for Festival team content

- 21 videos were posted on YouTube. This included:
  - 4 live events
  - 16 pre-recorded
  - And 1 event (Rand Europe’s ‘Why work needs to shape up,’ which was hosted on Zoom and the recording was uploaded to YouTube later)
- Total number of views, as of mid-April 2021 across all 21 videos was 41,129 (=~91 Babbage Lecture Theatres)
  - Average number of views per video based on this total = 1,959
  - Lowest number of views (excluding the Rand Europe Zoom event recording) is 715 (Learning New Perspectives - Healing Polarisation. Creating Hope in Dialogue)
  - The highest number of views is 6,786 (How to make the world add up)
- The average of the average view durations for our videos is approximately 8 minutes
  - The longest average view time was about 17 minutes (The Rise of the Royal Mistress)
  - The shortest was about 3 minutes (Mastering mental health through video games)
- There were 79 likes per video, on average
  - Max number of likes was 139 (Adolescent mental health and development)
  - Min number of likes was 49 (The Rise of the Royal Mistress)
  - There was a weak correlation between the number of views and the number of likes.
  - And a very weak correlation between (rounded) average view times and the number of likes
- UK, US, and India were consistently represented amongst the top geographies of viewers, with the UK the top location for 15 videos and India the top location for 5.
- The number registered to attend each event turned out not to be a good indicator for the number of views each video ultimately received, with weak correlations between the following, in order of strongest correlation to weakest:
  - Registration numbers vs views during Premiere (R² = 0.45, or 45% of the variation in the number of views during the Premiere can be explained by variation in the number registered.)
    - This data includes numbers for events that were live and pre-recorded.
    - The following outliers were removed from this dataset:
      - Why work needs to shape up (because this did not Premiere on YouTube in the same way as the others),
      - Learning new perspectives (because this Premiere happened 24 hours before the advertised time),
      - Black Lives Matter (because the number of views reported during the event by the SMAV team was only 1, which does not reflect the amount of engagement and number of views by colleagues during the live event)
  - Registration numbers vs total views as of mid-April (R² = 0.11)
  - Registration numbers vs rounded average view time (R² = 0.09)
Website

The Cambridge Festival Website ([www.festival.cam.ac.uk](http://www.festival.cam.ac.uk)) is the main festival resource- sharing all news updates and all events that are part of the festival programme. It is from the website that the public can explore the programme, and book / register to attend individual events.

During the period 28 February to to 29 April 2021 (encompassing the programme launch and festival delivery period) the website received 67,601 unique visitors. The average session duration was 4 minutes. This is above the standard session length (2-3 minutes) for any website.

The top sources of traffic to the website were (in order of referrals).

1. Google search
2. Direct
3. The Cambridge Alumni Newsletter
4. Cambridge University website
5. Facebook
6. What’s On Newsletter
7. Twitter

The demographics for website users show that the website had a broad spread across all age ranges. However, the largest age group of website users were those in the 25-34 age bracket – followed by 18-24 year olds and 35-54 year olds.

The data does show that the figures are roughly similar for those in the age groups 35-44, 45-54 and those 65+. The group who accessed the website the least was 55-64 year olds.

The largest group of visitors to the Festival website where from the UK, which was reasonable for 67% of website traffic. However, we did receive visitors from 170 identified countries. The top 12 sources of website visitors were:

1. United Kingdom
2. India
3. United States
4. Germany
5. France
6. Netherlands
7. Canada
8. Italy
9. Hong Kong
10. China
11. Australia
12. Singapore

Further feedback and evaluation about the website- especially on programme access, searching and booking can be found in the coordinator and audience feedback sections of this report.
This survey was about better understanding who ‘attends’ the online Cambridge Festival and how they found out about it. It was sent to everyone who registered to attend one of the core 21 events at least 24 hours ahead of the event start time.

The link was also sent to everyone on the Festival coordinators email list in from 3 March 2021. Coordinators were encouraged to use this survey if their events required pre-registration. They were also provided with accompanying text they could use to send out the survey to their attendees.

- 954 responses were received to the pre-Festival survey
- **How did you find out about the Cambridge Festival?**
  - Word of mouth was the most popular way people found out about the Festival, followed by the What’s on e-newsletter and the Festival website itself
  - Digital communications were also key:
    - 24% (227 total respondents) found out about the Festival through social media, with Facebook being the most popular social channel
    - There were many additional ways that people heard about the Festival, as indicated by the large proportion of ‘Other’ responses. The most common ‘other’ channel identified was Eventbrite, with 51 responses mentioning it when asked to specify how they’d heard about the Festival.
      - 43% of people who found out about the Festival through Eventbrite were not based in the UK

- The majority of respondents were female (72%)
• 9% of respondents considered themselves to have a disability. (According to the WHO, around 15% of the world’s population are living with some form of disability).

• 45% of respondents were under 45 years old

• 81% were based in the UK. Of those based in the UK:
70% identified themselves as White: British
13% identified themselves as White: Other
The remaining 17% were split amongst 11 other ethnicities, with none of the other categories having more than 3%

- The remaining survey respondents were split across 53 countries - from Argentina to Vietnam! The most frequently represented countries were the USA (39% of non-UK respondents), Canada (15%) and Germany (14%).
- 77% had some prior experience with the University of Cambridge
  - 52% had attended some public events previously
  - 23% reported not having interacted with Cambridge before

Can you tell us a little more about any previous experience with the University of Cambridge, which of these apply to you?

- Primary reasons for attending
  - Interest in specific subject/speaker
    - Interested in art, photography and the environment
    - Learn more about sustainability
    - General interest as I have had a liver transplant, plus Paul Gibbs has been involved in my care.
    - I am an artist and am always looking for unconventional ways to learn about art. I live in Mississippi, USA. There aren’t a lot of opportunities for that here as we are the poorest state in the US.
- Interested in my city where I have lived for almost 70 years, particularly from a "normal", i.e., non-university point of view, of its history as my family have lived here for generations.
  - Personal/professional development/learning or improvement
    - To be a better informed parent and member of society
    - Become more aware of current affairs in my community and how new issues are changing people's lives.
    - To learn about topics that I am interested in, in this case linked to my role in a school.
    - To learn more about the future world and help my teenage son do the same.
    - I am a creative professional who wants to continue to learn new skills from other creative voices.
  - General interest/love of learning/curiosity
    - To learn about something interesting and important
    - To learn about things I’m interested in or have never encountered before
    - To learn about things I’m interested in and to challenge my views.
    - To learn, be entertained, enlightened and surprised.
  - Curiosity about Cambridge research specifically
    - To learn about the topics of current research in Cambridge University.
    - I’m interested in learning more about what is going on in and around Cambridge.
    - Interest in what the univ is doing and it’s relevance to me and the world.
  - Extracurricular/supercurricular activity (for a class/teacher) or to have on UCAS applications or career insights
    - To be able to attend events, which reflect my personal interests and will be able to assist me on possible future UCAS personal statements and applications.
    - To add supercurricular activities to add to my personal statement.
    - To get a better insight for what I’d like to do career wise (possibly geology or volcanology).
  - To engage/inspire children
    - Finding out about developments in science, engaging my children’s interest in science.
    - To have engaging science events for my children that stretches their minds in a super fun way.
    - Inspire and educate myself - and child. Discover Stimulating ideas and creativity that could last me the year.

Themes and example quotes from ‘Is there anything else you would like to tell us?’
- Requests to continue offering online events
  - Please keep doing online events. People who are housebound due to disability or illness have suddenly found the world accessible to them due to the pandemic are now terrified all of that is going to be taken away again when you healthy people go back to “normal”. It doesn’t have to be either/or, you can stick a camera in a lecture theatre with a big sign by it saying don’t walk past this line if you don’t want to be in the live stream. This also makes events accessible to parents with young children who cannot get babysitters, and people living in other parts of the country or world. Please ensure these events have closed captions though, and any powerpoints or props are described audibly as well, so that they are properly accessible.
  - As a parent of three small children, there are somethings more accessible to me online than they would have been in person. No babysitter needed for the two of us to attend an online seminar and ok for one person to be late or pop out to attend to a child. I like the in person experience but there are definitely advantages to being able to attend virtually. It would be nice if when we can have events in the same physical space, there was also an option to attend or just view online too.
  - In previous years we enjoyed attending the festival in person over weekends - and definitely there is a lot of added value in the ‘hands on’ activities and live demonstrations and lab tours, both for adults, for teenagers (possibly pondering a science degree) and for kids. But - as we do not live in Cambridge (we used to many years back ...) we found it difficult to
attend the midweek lectures and events. So opening those for remote participation this year is a real plus for us.

- Online events have been very positive in lockdown and also allow us to take part without having to travel so would be good to continue!

- **Requests to continue offering in-person events**
  - I realise that a lot of people are happy with online events, but I would hate to see live in person events fade out!
  - Looking forward to being back in the lecture theaters in 2022
  - A mixture of accessible in person events and online events is the way forward to allow persons with additional needs to present and/or access events and to attract facilitators and audiences around the world
This survey was about better understanding audience experiences of the online Cambridge. It was shared with attendees via Slido for the 21 core events.

The link was also sent to everyone on the Festival coordinators email list in from 3 March 2021. Coordinators were encouraged to use this survey immediately following their pre-recorded or live event(s) (regardless of whether the event(s) required pre-registration).

- 548 responses were received about more than 80 different events
  - 65 responses (12%) were about core events
- Audience members rated their overall experiences very highly – with over 60% giving 5-stars and only 9% giving 3 stars or less

When asked how the experience made them feel, many participants selected words with positive connotations. (Respondents were able to choose multiple options).
  - Curious was the most popular feeling, with 69% of respondents choosing that option.
  - Inspired was the next most popular, with 48% selecting that option
  - None of the negatively connoted words (i.e. bored, ignorant, frustrated, upset) were chosen by more than 5% of respondents
  - ‘Other’ responses were also largely positive and included words such as: proud, educated, impressed, fascinated, thankful, thoughtful, interested, informed, nostalgic and encouraged

Responses to ‘Which of these statements (if any) are true for your experience?’ were also largely positive.
64% selected ‘I’m interested to know more about the subject’
64% selecting ‘It was well organised’
And only 13% selected ‘I wish it had been more interactive’

- This low-level of desire for increased interactivity may mean that the organisers which used this survey tended to have highly interactive events.
- However, it would also be related to many attendees’ stating that their primary aims are related to learning (rather than dialogue or other interaction-based goals).

Responses to ‘Please use this space to leave any comments or feedback you have about the event,’ were largely positive, although they were very much based on each particular event, so it is difficult to extrapolate much without having attended every event.
Post-Festival Survey

This survey was about better understanding who ‘attended’ the online Cambridge Festival and what they thought about it.

The link was also sent to everyone on the Festival coordinators email list in from 3 March 2021. Coordinators were encouraged to use this survey if their events required pre-registration. They were also provided with accompanying text they could use to send out the survey to their attendees.

- 1,116 responses were received about more than 111 different events
  - 500 responses (45%) were in response to the Festival team’s core events
- Almost all respondents were likely to recommend Cambridge Festival events to a friend. On a scale of 0-100:
  - The average rating was 85
  - 100 was the most common rating with 28% of respondents giving that score
  - And 93% of responses were over 50
- Compared to the Pre-Festival survey, respondents were slightly more likely to agree or strongly agree that Cambridge research had an impact on people’s lives
  - **Notable responses to ‘How do you feel the University of Cambridge’s research is impacting people’s lives?’**
    - **STEM-related comments** - Many responses had to do with science, technology and medicine. Even respondents who had attended events that were relatively unrelated to these areas mentioned them (e.g. two respondents who attended ‘Curator’s Tour: Casting Light on Classical Sculpture’ said ‘Through medical research,’ and ‘New therapies and technologies,’). This may reflect data presented above indicating that many respondents had previous experiences of interacting with content from the University and perhaps that this content tends to be focused around STEM research.
      - In science, engineering and health, especially. But very often the University’s contribution is unseen.
      - Invaluable in linking research to practical uses within medicine which was clearly illustrated in this event by three excellent speakers and coordinator.
      - Producing and reporting science promotes a better understanding of the world; Collaborating with other institutions like media, companies and the state allows for better decisions on economy and politics.
      - In many ways but especially medical advancement, especially in the field of genetics
      - Much of the research seems to have immediate implications to healthcare or technology or politics, et cetera, but there is an element of abstractness to a lot of the research that makes it not directly applicable at this current moment, and therefore not impacting people’s lives - although that is not to say that it won’t be applicable and impactful in the future.
    - **Pandemic-specific comments**
      - Advancing understanding of COVID-19 and its management
      - Some impressive innovative work in fields that impact the here and now (COVID implications for example)...
      - The work of scientists and mathematicians has contributed to evidence that has been provided to the government during the pandemic.
      - it is clear that there is a big impact on health, particularly following COVID-19
    - **Climate change-related comments**
      - Feeding into tech solutions for arresting climate change
  - **Humanities-related comments** – these tended to focus on how humanities research changes the way people think about and look at the world.
• Helps understand current issues through the lens of history
• New research/insights help people change their view of the world, e.g. through more knowledge about women’s actual role in history.
• High quality research provides new understanding across the arts and humanities.
• In my opinion very important since a lot of research on Humanities is only possible in universities. And culture is what makes us human.
• Addressing issues that have historically and currently aren’t addressed adequately. Such as colonialism, racism, police brutality, etc.
• The University of Cambridge’s research is clearly impacting people’s lives through its scientific / medical / technological contributions and the economic impact this has. What’s harder to measure but no doubt also very important though is the impact that research in the humanities / social sciences has on people in the UK and around the world in terms of helping them to reflect on the present moment, how it was shaped by the past, and how we want the future to be. Re the festival, I found this session on the Syrian Cassette Archive to be fascinating and a powerful reminder of the potential of archives to preserve the complexity of a culture and offer more nuanced narratives about it in the face of reductive representations in western media.

• **Public engagement/communications-related comments** – some respondents focused on the public dissemination of the research, implying that the sharing of the research is at least as important as the research itself
  • Making their research open to the public (in this case, via their Festival) creates awareness and recognition of vital issues that are being discussed, and/or need to be discussed at an individual and community level, not just at the professional or systemic level. It makes evolvement and transformation where none existed before accessible.
  • Giving open free access to the general public in forums like the festival of ideas and university lectures and research groups is very empowering.
  • Through the Festival, the museums, & other events held to gain & inform public interest
  • Access to good quality research through these events and communication - helps people find out what is possible and what they might be interested in doing.

• **Don’t know/not sure comments**
  • I honestly don’t know, but it’s Cambridge so it’s bound to be good!
  • I’d need to learn more about the other events and efforts being made but I’m very positive about the events at the Cambridge Festival - excellent work.

---

Research from the University of Cambridge has an impact on people’s lives

- **Strongly disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Agree**
- **Strongly agree**
- **Not sure**

Pre-Festival vs. Post-Festival
- And respondents were slightly more likely to strongly disagree or disagree about not feeling welcome at the Festival (indicating they DID feel welcome)

- Both pre-Festival and post-Festival, most of the audience would like the University to continue offering digital events

- 42% pre-Festival and 30% post-Festival strongly disagreed or disagreed that they would attend events in-person without pandemic restrictions
Despite the widespread agreement that the University should continue to offer digital events, there is some ambivalence about how engaging online events are compared to in-person events.

Many of the responses to ‘If you have any other comments about the event, please use the box below,’ focused on requesting that online events are provided post-COVID. Reasons (other than being internationally based) included: accessibility/disability, ability to re-watch recorded content at a more convenient time, logistical concerns (childcare and parking/transportation restrictions), ability to spread out Festival attendance over a longer time period, ecological friendliness and better Q&A engagement. Example quotes are below:

- Due to the events being online I have been able to attend more events than I would in person due to health issues and childcare. I greatly appreciate the online access.
- Please make live events easier for individuals and families to travel to and attend. We don't all live in central Cambridge!
- I am really grateful for the online format. I would try to attend an occasional event in person, but this enables me to attend many, and those that I am initially less interested in or knowledgeable about. I am a single parent and would not have been able to come to this event in person. So I feel that it makes broadening my own knowledge much, much more possible because I don’t have to select a very small number of events to try to make logistical arrangements to attend.
- A blend of online and in-person events would be brilliant for accessibility.
- The "remote" events have proved very successful, please consider continuing in this way or perhaps in a hybrid form. Remember the housebound and those for whom travelling to events, even post-pandemic, is less easy.
I’m more inclined to attend events online because it’s very convenient. For some people, online might be less daunting than in real life. Online democratises access and engagement in many ways.

I have never attended a Cambridge Festival event I’m too far away, I hugely enjoyed being able to attend virtually and I sincerely hope thought will be given to each dept having online events for us to attend in future. It’s more ecological too.

The move to online is extremely welcome - I am now able to watch recorded sessions that I would have missed if they were in-person only because * I was at another event or * 2 events were not at the same time, but took place on opposite sides of Cambridge with only a short gap between them * I was not free at the time of the talk. You have viewers all over the world - the Antarctica talk had questions from Australia and I think Japan and USA. That enhances your brand in a way that events which are in-person cannot. In-person is still good for some things - Squelch or Pete Wothers’ chemistry demo are not the same online. PLEASE don't drop the online component post-Covid!

I live in a village near Cambridge, but rarely visit the city. I have a school age child who is interested in science, but it's not always easy to find out about Cambridge Festival events in time, as libraries run out of programmes and schools don't promote it. I found this event through a Facebook ad, and will now search online to see if there are others I can access. The format of a live online event, also recorded to watch later is brilliant - so accessible. We've attended lots of events in person in the past, but please continue to do some online events, or include recordings of future live events - it opens up what we are able to attend.

I think online events attract greater audience diversity, both nationally and internationally. I would like to see The University of Cambridge hosting more online events to complement their festival timetable.

I encourage 'hybrid' events once covid restricions are lifted. Combining physical attendance with remote attendance extends the scope to spread your message and social impact

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE continue with zoom events even when in person events resume. Maybe alongside them. I have attended many in person festival events and although some are better in person the majority are better online as it feels like your questions are answered better and its more conversational.

Although we would normally attend in person we would only come on one day. The virtual events mean that we have chosen a selection of things over the whole week. This is feasible as we don't have to travel into Cambridge for them.

Hybrid events are great. My son is 12 and more likely to watch webinars at home whereas I like to be there in person

I foolishly forgot the event was on at the allotted time, so was delighted that I could simply click on the link to watch it later when I remembered. The sound quality was excellent, and visuals pleasantly uncluttered too. I appreciate the work that goes into producing such events so well, which is very important in making them easy to watch and understand (without any distraction). The content itself was very good too.

Although we would normally attend in person we would only come on one day. The virtual events mean that we have chosen a selection of things over the whole week. This is feasible as we don't have to travel into Cambridge for them.
Recommendations for future evaluation

- Take a closer look at the relationship between bookings and attendance for digital-only events (in particular, digital events that will not be available on-demand later)
- Don’t bother having any participants generate ‘unique’ ID numbers for pre- and post-surveys. Enough respondents didn’t follow the instructions and/or several respondents ended up generating the same ‘unique’ number so that this doesn’t really work for person-person comparisons.
- Overall – evaluation for audience
  - It is possible to get numbers from digital engagement so there is less weight on the numbers from evaluations
  - The value of evaluations lies more in the qualitative aspects, and particularly, getting a better understanding of:
    - who comes to the Festival
    - how did they find out about the Festival
    - why do they come to the Festival
    - how did they feel about their experience(s) with the Festival and the specific event(s) they attended
  - If evaluation is done in future years, try to keep some questions exactly the same to enable year-year comparisons
- Post-Festival evaluation for audience – specific recommended changes
  - Add questions about specific events that coordinators can act on (e.g. what was good about this event/how could this event have been improved?)
  - Ask if watching with others (who else, how many others?) or alone
  - Ask how many other events attended/planning to attend
  - Have a way for people to select multiple events from a list to indicate what they attended
  - Ask about length of event – much too short, too short, about right, too long, much too long