Our Heritage Evaluation

An interim report to the Heritage Lottery Fund

August 2015

Contents

1.0 Introduction

This report presents interim findings from an evaluation of the Our Heritage programme which is being undertaken by Ecorys on behalf of the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF).

1.1 HLF and Our Heritage

HLF's strategic framework for 2013-2018 sets out its plans to deliver long term and sustainable benefits in response to the newly emerging needs facing the heritage sector including the need for more people to benefit from HLF through a wider range of funding opportunities and the demand for more small and medium-sized capital projects (for example, smaller parks and green spaces, community buildings, museum collections and archives).

The strategic framework is underpinned by the goal of making a lasting difference for heritage, people and communities. The resulting outcomes can be summarised as follows:

- Heritage: Investment into buildings and places, neglected collections, parks and landscapes, and inspiring communities to record and celebrate their stories.
- People: Inspiring young people to learn and get involved, providing fulfilling opportunities to volunteer and develop skills, and creating thousands of opportunities for an enjoyable day out.
- Communities: Attracting overseas visitors and bringing investment into local economies, re-energising neglected areas, creating distinctive, vibrant places to live and work, and fostering a sense of community.

Our Heritage is one of three programmes operating under the current strategic framework and supports HLF's key objective to 'sustain and transform a wide range of heritage and generate a lasting impact on people and places'. Funded projects range from museums, parks and historic places to archaeology, the natural environment and cultural traditions. The programme offers a single round application process and a maximum grant size of £100,000.

1.2 Purpose of the study

As outlined in the research brief, the purpose of this study is to provide a programme level evaluation of Our Heritage. Specific objectives were to:

- Work with HLF to establish evaluation tools and indicators that will be used to assess relevant outcomes.

- Support grantees in the evaluation work they carry out on their projects – ensuring this work is undertaken in a consistent way as far as possible.
- Collect, assemble and analyse evaluation data from projects.

The evaluation has been designed to draw upon evidence from a random sample of funded projects, selected by HLF from the wider population of projects receiving approval each month, in order to provide insight into the extent to which the desired outcomes are (or are not) being achieved.

By establishing and adopting a common research framework and tools, the evaluation will provide a consistent and comparable set of data from across the project sample. Early engagement with projects also provides an opportunity to reduce duplication of evaluation activity (at project level) and provision of their own survey data to projects at intervals is intended to support continuous improvement and learning.

1.3 Our approach

The approach to evaluation has involved development of a set of survey tools with the intention that the sampled projects will distribute these surveys to the individuals that have been involved in their work. Surveys have been developed for the following groups:

- Volunteers – those who have given their time on a voluntary basis to support the project.
- Visitors – those who have attended an event, exhibition or performance or visited a particular site.
- Participants – those who have taken part in a workshop, activity or outreach session or contributed to the project in some way (for example by undertaking research or designing an exhibition).
- Trainees – those who have received training provided by the project (and where that training was not related to being a project volunteer).

A survey for project managers has also been developed to be distributed and completed when the work is nearing completion.

The survey tools were developed in an online format during 2014, where possible drawing upon questions which had been successfully used in other HLF research and more widely (including lessons from the Manchester Metrics Pilot[1]), and are designed to assess the achievement of outputs and outcomes for heritage, people and communities.

---

[1] The Manchester Metrics Pilot was a project supported by Arts Council England to explore the feasibility of developing a sector-led framework to capture the quality and reach of arts and culture activities.

Table 1.1 (overleaf) summarises the outcomes which are being assessed by the surveys while Figure 1.1 sets out the intervention logic behind the programme. The surveys were successfully piloted in the second half of 2014, although the pilot revealed that some projects were unable or unwilling to use an online survey and instead preferred paper copies. It was also identified that some projects are working with young children or other vulnerable groups who might have difficulty in self-completing the survey. If this is the case, project managers are being advised to ask school teachers or group leaders to complete the survey instead or, where appropriate, project staff or volunteers can offer to provide assistance.

The process for engaging projects in the evaluation can be summarised as follows:

- Each month a sample of newly approved projects is received from HLF.
- The evaluation team contacts the projects in the sample to engage them in the evaluation.
- Once engaged, projects are sent a pack containing copies of the relevant surveys and a guidance note for implementation. Where online surveys can be used a link to the survey is provided for distribution.
- Survey returns are monitored and follow up contact is maintained with projects as required.
- A unique link to the project manager survey is distributed around one month before the expected completion date.

In addition, resources have also been set aside to undertake a review of available programme level monitoring data, undertake a small number of telephone interviews with key programme level stakeholders and also to undertake in-depth interviews with 12 sampled projects in every year of the evaluation to produce case studies. As only a limited number of projects within the sample had completed their activities at the time of this report, it was not possible to undertake a meaningful review of monitoring data although this will be included in the next report.

Table 1.1 Measuring Outcomes

Outcomes for heritage	Measuring outcomes	Project Managers	Volunteers	Visitors	Participants	Trainees
Better managed	Assessment of changes to management of heritage assets.	X				
In better condition	Views on changes in condition of heritage assets and achievement of recognised standards of care.	X				
Better interpreted/ explained	Activities to improve interpretation and explanation and extent to which this has improved the visitor experience.	X	X	X	X	
Identified/ recorded	Activities to identify/record heritage and resulting outcomes.	X	X	X	X	

Outcomes for people	Measuring outcomes	Project Managers	Volunteers	Visitors	Participants	Trainees
Developed skills	Development of specific skills and achievement of formal qualifications.	X	X	X	X	X
Learnt about heritage	Extent to which project has enabled people to learn about heritage and how this has benefitted them in their life.		X	X	X	X
Changed attitudes or behaviours	Assessment of how the project has affected people in their everyday lives and/or encouraged them to take further actions to help maintain or improve the heritage in their local areas.		X	X	X	X
Had an enjoyable experience	Enjoyment of the activity and particular dimensions such as opportunities for social interaction or learning about heritage.	X	X	X	X	X

Outcomes for people	Measuring outcomes	Project Managers	Volunteers	Visitors	Participants	Trainees
Volunteered time	Number of volunteers / volunteer hours over the period of the project. Outcomes for volunteers.	X	X			

Outcomes for communities	Measuring outcomes	Project Managers	Volunteers	Visitors	Participants	Trainees
Environmental impacts will be reduced	Methods and approaches to reducing environmental impacts.	X				
More//wider range of people engage with heritage	Number and profile of visitors/participants.	X	X	X	X	X
Local area is a better place to live, work, visit	Views about impact on local community.	X	X	X	X	X
Local economy is boosted	Evidence on economic impact on local community (including through visitor activity, improvement of skills, progression to employment).	X	X	X	X	X
Organisation is more resilient	Development of organisational resilience (including income generation, skills and capacity of staff).	X				

Figure 1.1 Intervention Logic

OUR HERITAGE PROGRAMME

INPUTS

HLF funding
Match funding
Skills and experience
Time and effort

ACTIVITIES

Work in the following areas:
Archaeological sites
Collections
Cultural traditions
Historic buildings
Histories – people and communities
Histories – places and events
Heritage – languages and dialects
Landscapes and gardens
Memories and experiences
Industrial, maritime and transport history
Natural heritage

OUTPUTS

Number of events/activities
Number of resources produced
Number of assets identified/improved

Number/profile of:
volunteers
Visitors
Participants
Trainees

OUTCOMES

Outcomes for heritage
Better managed
In better condition
Better interpreted/ explained
Identified/recorded

Outcomes for people
Skills developed
Learnt about heritage
Changed attitudes/ behaviours
Enjoyed experience
Volunteered time

Outcomes for communities
Reduced env. Impact
More people engaged
Local area is better place to live, work, visit
Local economy boosted
Organisational resilience

IMPACTS

A lasting difference for heritage, people and communities in the UK

1.4 Progress to date

To date[2], 125 projects have been engaged in the evaluation (from a sample of 158[3]). In addition, a total of 12 projects took part in pilot activity. Survey materials have been distributed to all projects engaged in the evaluation although many are not yet in a position to make use of them as typically projects take several months before they are up and running (have staff in place, volunteers recruited, etc.). Furthermore, for volunteers and trainees in particular, project managers are advised to wait until these individuals have had a meaningful involvement before distributing surveys. Finally, many of the projects have a duration which is upwards of one year so only a small proportion of the sample have so far reached the stage at which they have been asked to complete the project manager survey.

A total of 168 completed beneficiary surveys had been received as of 5th August 2015. The majority of these had been completed by project visitors (80) and volunteers (78). So far, only 10 responses have been received from project participants and no responses have been received from trainees (although around one-quarter of the surveyed volunteers also noted that they had received training). In addition, 10 completed project manager surveys have been received.

Table 1.2 Surveys Completed – July 2015

Survey type	Number of valid returns
Visitor	80
Volunteer	78
Participant	10
Trainee	0
Total (beneficiary)	**168**
Project manager	10
Total	**178**

1.5 Structure of report

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 presents the findings of surveys of project volunteers.
- Section 3 sets out the results of surveys undertaken by project visitors.
- Section 4 summarises survey responses from project participants.
- Section 5 considers the responses received from project managers.
- Section 6 provides conclusions and next steps.

---

[2] Based on the sample provided up to June 2015. The number of projects has varied month by month. This total excludes a small number of projects which were removed due to having also been included in the sample for the evaluation of HLF funded First World War activity.

[3] Further attempts will be made to engage those projects which have not yet responded to requests to participate.

2.0 Project Volunteers

This section presents the results of the project volunteer survey, based on the 78 responses received as of 5th August 2015, spanning 12 individual projects.

2.1 Volunteer Profile

Responses show a fairly even gender split, although the majority of volunteers surveyed are aged over 25 and classify their ethnicity as white. Over one-third (37%) are in paid employment while around three-tenths (31%) are retired.

Table 2.1 Volunteer demographics: Gender

Gender:	%
Male	46%
Female	54%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78 (response numbers vary by profile question).

Age:	%
11-16	0%
17-18	4%
19-25	13%
26-59	49%
60 and over	35%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78 (response numbers vary by profile question).

Ethnicity:	%
Asian (Chinese)	1%
Asian (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, other)	3%
Black (Caribbean, African, other)	1%
Mixed ethnic group	1%
White	85%
Other	8%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78 (response numbers vary by profile question).

Employment status:	%
In paid employment	37%
Unemployed	8%
Housewife/househusband	0%
Studying	15%
Full-time carer	3%
Retired	31%
Other	6%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78 (response numbers vary by profile question).

The most common factor motivating volunteers to get involved in the project was an existing interest in the subject area, followed by a desire to learn more about heritage or help look after heritage.

Table 2.2 Volunteer motivations

Reasons for volunteering	%
I had an existing interest in the subject area (e.g. archaeology, local history)	82%
To learn some new skills (e.g. computing, research, transcribing)	32%
To learn more about heritage	62%
To continue utilising and updating my existing skills (e.g. teaching /presenting, business and management skills, IT skills)	32%
A friend or family member recommended me to get involved	17%
To learn more about/get more involved in the local community	24%
To help others	36%
To help look after heritage	58%
To meet new people/get out of the house	37%
Work experience/help in getting a job	26%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78; multiple responses permitted.

All respondents noted that it was easy to get involved in the project. Some reported that they responded to an advertisement or other marketing material, while others were already an existing volunteer with the lead organisation and some received a recommendation or were approached personally. Around 65% started to volunteer with the organisation when the Our Heritage project started while the rest were existing volunteers (including 9% who had been volunteering for more than 5 years).

Table 2.3 When did you start to volunteer for this organisation?

Length of time	%
When this project started	65%
Within the last 3 years	23%
Within the last 5 years	4%
Within the last 10 years	9%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

2.2   Activity Undertaken

Responses show that the most common volunteer activity is gathering, recording, analysing and/or cataloguing new material which has been undertaken by almost half of respondents. Researching and working with existing collections and archives was the second most popular activity, undertaken by just over one-quarter. A small number of other activities were reported, including filming and welcoming/greeting visitors.

Table 2.4 Involvement in activities

Activities	%
Coordinating or leading activities (e.g. as a member of a committee/management group)	21%
Gathering, recording, analysing and cataloguing new material	44%
Researching and working with existing collections and archives	27%
Conservation activities (e.g. on natural landscapes, or industrial heritage)	13%
Devising and delivering activities for schools	3%
Devising and delivering activities for children and young people outside of school	3%
Devising and delivering activities for the wider public (e.g. talks and small exhibitions)	21%
Helping with marketing and publicity	18%
Providing administrative or IT support for the project	13%
Providing other support to the project (e.g. catering, cleaning)	23%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78; multiple responses permitted.

The number of hours per week ranged from 1 to 24, although a number of people noted that their contribution was made over a relatively limited period, rather than an ongoing basis (for example, one respondent recorded a total of 24 hours over a 3 week period).

2.3   Outcomes

Three-quarters (75%) of respondents commented that they had received some form of training. The most common skills that volunteers had been trained in was supporting visitor participation and/or volunteer management, followed by archaeology and delivering language or interpretation. Other training topics reported by volunteers included history/historical knowledge, general information (for example, related to the history of the lead organisation) and recording/identifying assets.

Table 2.5 Training received

Training received	%
Archaeology	22%
Construction	2%
Conservation – land habitats and species	2%
Conservation – industrial, maritime and transport heritage	7%
Conservation – collections, including oral history	14%
Supporting visitor participation and volunteer management	38%
Managing heritage sites, including customer care and marketing	12%
Research (e.g. using archival material)	16%
Delivering language or interpretation	22%
Media skills, including websites, films and recording	7%
Other	19%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78; multiple responses permitted.

All respondents felt that they had made at least some gain in their knowledge of the specific subject matter covered by the project, while 86% felt that this was the case for the local area, its heritage and people.

Table 2.6 Gains in knowledge

	No gain	Almost no gain	Some gain	Large gain	Very large gain
The specific subject matter of the project	0%	0%	25%	47%	28%
The local area, its heritage and people	7%	7%	20%	48%	19%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Positively, the majority (88%) of respondents felt that they had developed their skills to some extent, particularly communications skills and other interpersonal skills (both of which were skills developed by over half of the sample).

Table 2.7 Skills developed

Skills developed	%
Information management skills (e.g. research, archiving, transcribing)	32%
Communications skills (e.g. speaking, writing, presenting)	53%
Other interpersonal skills (e.g. leadership, team working, developing confidence in social situations)	51%
Technical skills (e.g. computers and ICT, geo-physical archaeology)	16%
Conservation techniques	18%
Business and management skills (e.g. marketing, fundraising, project management)	16%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78; multiple responses permitted.

When asked to rate their skills levels before and after their involvement in the project (on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = none existent and 5 = excellent), there are clear signs of perceived improvement, particularly in the case of information management and business & management skills.

Table 2.8 Change in skill levels

Skills Before	1	2	3	4	5
Information management skills	12%	6%	53%	29%	0%
Communications skills	0%	11%	32%	43%	14%
Other interpersonal skills	3%	17%	35%	41%	3%
Technical skills	10%	10%	50%	20%	10%
Conservation Techniques	10%	50%	30%	10%	0%
Business & management skills	0%	0%	13%	88%	0%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Skills After	1	2	3	4	5
Information management skills	0%	0%	6%	65%	29%
Communications skills	0%	0%	14%	54%	32%
Other interpersonal skills	0%	3%	17%	59%	21%
Technical skills	10%	0%	0%	80%	10%
Conservation Techniques	0%	0%	10%	90%	0%
Business & management skills	0%	0%	0%	63%	37%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

However, the majority of volunteers (91%) felt that their involvement in the project had not contributed to them getting any form of paid work, although this likely reflects the fact

that most respondents were either already in paid work or retired (and so would be assumed not to be looking for work).

Table 2.9 Progression to employment

Progression to employment	%
Yes – directly with the HLF funded organisation that runs this project	0%
Yes – with another organisation in a related area to the activities that I have been undertaking with the project	7%
Yes – but in an unrelated area to the activities that I have been undertaking with the project	2%
No – none at all	91%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

In general, volunteers experienced a high level of enjoyment from their involvement in the project: when asked to assess this enjoyment on a scale of 1 to 10, over half scored this as 10 and 92% rated enjoyed as 8 or more.

Table 2.10 Level of enjoyment

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	4%	19%	19%	54%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

The reasons given tended to be related to heritage or the opportunity for new experiences (new skills, use of existing skills or meeting new people), as illustrated by the following comments:

"A unique opportunity to work on one of the UK's most historic airframes. Also, a wonderful working atmosphere within the team involved."

"Because my time is being employed constructively towards the conservation of a national heritage asset."

"It's been a great experience for me and exposed me to things very outside of my normal day job which has been both enjoyable and rewarding."

However, a small number of respondents were less positive about their experience with lack of involvement highlighted as the main reason, for example:

"Would have liked to do more & feel more involved."

"Very poor feedback from the project and lack of meaningful involvement"

Respondents were then asked to rate a series of feelings or experiences on a scale of 1 to 10 (where 1 = low and 10 = high) and then reflect on whether these ratings had changed compared to before they got involved with the project.

Current ratings of life satisfaction were relatively high, with a median score of 8; 39% of respondents felt that their satisfaction had increased compared to before they got involved with the project while 54% judged that it had remained the same.

Table 2.11 Rating of life satisfaction

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0%	1%	1%	4%	0%	3%	16%	39%	28%	7%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Table 2.12 Before you got involved with the project, how satisfied did you feel with your life?

Before you got involved with the project, how satisfied did you feel with your life?	%
More than now	3%
Same as now	54%
Less than now	39%
Don't know/can't remember	4%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

When asked how much time they spent interacting with other people, again the median score was 8, although a clear majority of respondents felt that their interaction with other people had remained unchanged.

Table 2.13 Rating of interaction with other people

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0%	0%	5%	4%	5%	8%	18%	27%	19%	14%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Table 2.14 Before you got involved with the project, how much time did you spend interacting with other people?

Before you got involved with the project, how much time did you spend interacting with other people?	%
More than now	5%
Same as now	62%
Less than now	32%
Don't know/can't remember	0%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Volunteers were more positive about the extent to which they felt they are playing a useful part in things, resulting in a median score of 9, while 41% reported an increase in feelings of usefulness since taking part in the project.

Table 2.15 Rating of playing a useful part in things

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1%	0%	0%	3%	3%	4%	16%	28%	31%	14%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Table 2.16 Before you got involved with the project, to what extent did you feel that you were playing a useful part in things?

Before you got involved with the project, to what extent did you feel that you were playing a useful part in things?	%
More than now	5%
Same as now	54%
Less than now	41%
Don't know/can't remember	0%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Volunteers were also asked if recently they had been feeling reasonably happy, all things considered, and scores of 8 or 9 were most common with almost one-third reporting that their happiness was less than now before they got involved with the project.

Table 2.17 Rating of feeling reasonably happy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1%	1%	1%	3%	4%	3%	15%	30%	30%	12%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

Table 2.18 Before you got involved with the project, how happy did you feel, all things considered?

Before you got involved with the project, how happy did you feel, all things considered?	%
More than now	3%
Same as now	64%
Less than now	31%
Don't know/can't remember	3%

Source: OH volunteer survey; n=78.

The main things that volunteers felt they had gained from the project were knowledge, experiences and a sense of achievement, as illustrated by the following comments:

"A sense of achievement through being [a] member of a committed and motivated team."

"Experience of interacting with other like-minded individuals; working in an historic part of London and a greater understanding of our history."

Some volunteers also shared more personal reflections which help to emphasise the nature of the benefits that volunteering can bring to individual participants, such as:

"I am already looking at other volunteering opportunities at museums in central London. I am recovering my health after a period of illness and this brief assignment has helped me to get back to normal."

"I am more than ever convinced working in and with the community brings one of life's greatest rewards--friendship and a sense of purpose."

"Volunteering is the only way I can keep busy and feel I'm doing something for other people."

3.0 Project Visitors

This section presents the results of the project visitor survey, based on the 80 responses received as of 5th August 2015, spanning 7 projects.

3.1 Visitor Profile

The profile of visitors completing surveys to date is similar to that of the volunteers with a fairly even gender split, the majority aged over 25 and of white ethnicity. As with volunteers, paid employment and retired are the most common employment statuses, although for visitors, retired is the most common and reflects the relatively higher proportion of the visitor sample who were aged 60 and over.

Table 3.1 Visitor demographics

Gender:	%
Male	46%
Female	54%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

Age:	%
11-16	0%
17-18	1%
19-25	4%
26-59	44%
60 and over	51%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

Ethnicity:	%
Asian (Chinese)	4%
Asian (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, other)	0%
Black (Caribbean, African, other)	0%
Mixed ethnic group	4%
White	91%
Other	1%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

Employment status:	%
In paid employment	36%
Unemployed	6%
Housewife/househusband	1%
Studying	5%

Employment status:	%
Full-time carer	5%
Retired	45%
Other	1%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

Interestingly, postcode data shows that a number of those completing the visitor survey were from overseas (specifically Australia, Canada and the United States).

3.2   Visit Details

Those completing the survey tended to describe their involvement as either attending an exhibition, event or open day. Respondents most commonly visited with members of their family or alone.

Table 3.2 Did you visit alone or with other people?

Did you visit alone or with other people?	%
Alone	33%
With family members	45%
With friends	18%
As the leader of an organised group	3%
As a member of an organised group	3%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

The connection with heritage was a motivating factor for over two-thirds of respondents (68%), while other motivations included the specific subject matter of the exhibition/event, that they happened to be in the area or that they had received a recommendation from a friend.

Over half (54%) believed that they had never previously visited a HLF funded project while a further 35% were unsure.

3.3   Outcomes

Visitors generally reported high levels of enjoyment, resulting in a median score of 8 (out of 10).

Table 3.3 Level of enjoyment

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	13%	34%	24%	25%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

Reasons for the high level of satisfaction largely related to the content and quality of the exhibitions visited. For example:

"A chance to see something I haven't seen before."

"Excellent content, intelligent labelling and explanation. Guide was informed and interested, helpful."

"The enthusiasm and energy of the organisers was infectious. They were full of knowledge and able to communicate that very forcefully to our party. The finds they have made were numerous and very interesting."

The majority of respondents reported having made at least some gain in knowledge, both related to the specific subject matter of the project (97%) and the local area, its heritage and people (77%).

Table 3.4 Gains in knowledge

	No gain	Almost no gain	Some gain	Large gain	Very large gain
The specific subject matter of the project	3%	0%	44%	39%	15%
The local area, its heritage and people	20%	4%	41%	28%	8%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

When asked to sum up what they had got out of their visit, respondents tended to reflect on a greater understanding of the subject, knowledge gained and/or the enjoyment of their visit as illustrated by the quotes below:

"A greater understanding of the subject."

"Knowledge and enjoyment as a result of friendly staff and the interesting exhibition."

"Knowledge, or rather increased knowledge."

Visitors were then asked to provide feedback on a number of dimensions, chosen as a means to assess the quality of the work undertaken by the projects, by rating them on a scale of 1 (very low quality) to 10 (very high quality).

In all dimensions, the median score was 8 or above with relevance and enthusiasm attracting the highest average scores while local impact attracted the lowest which appeared to be due to mixed views about whether the content of some exhibitions was specific to the local area.

Table 3.5 Project quality

Dimension of quality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Presentation: it was well produced and presented	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	10%	33%	21%	33%
Distinctiveness: it was different from things I've experienced before	3%	0%	0%	1%	4%	15%	16%	28%	19%	15%
Rigour: it was well thought through and put together	4%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	8%	29%	25%	33%
Relevance: it had something to say about the world in which we live	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	6%	26%	25%	39%
Challenge: it was thought-provoking	0%	0%	0%	1%	4%	8%	13%	31%	19%	25%
Captivation: it was absorbing and held my attention	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	8%	9%	31%	21%	29%
Meaning: it meant something to me personally	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	10%	14%	26%	20%	25%
Enthusiasm: I would come to something like this again	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	9%	11%	23%	21%	35%
Local impact: it is important that it's happening here	10%	0%	0%	3%	4%	6%	11%	26%	15%	25%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

There were also mixed views about the extent to which the project had given visitors a greater understanding and respect for other people's cultures.

Table 3.6 Has your experience of this project given you a greater understanding and respect for other people and their cultures?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11%	3%	3%	1%	16%	14%	18%	18%	9%	10%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

The main reason for relatively low scores being given were that respondents already felt that they had respect for other cultures, while others interpreted this question as relating to the past/historic cultures and so felt that they had made more extensive gains in their understanding. These opposing views are illustrated by the comments below.

"Already had great respect for other people and cultures."

"Certainly of the past and yes I can relate this to contemporary culture."

Similarly, there was some uncertainty about the extent to which the projects in question had helped the local communities in which they were located.

Table 3.7   How much do you think that the project has helped the local community?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14%	4%	1%	0%	18%	11%	16%	18%	8%	11%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

Scores were mixed and this uncertainty was seemingly related to the presence of visitors from outside of the communities concerned as shown by the following comments:

"Depends if the local community visits it."

"Good attendance of a wide range of people - from the housing scheme in which it is located as well as further afield."

Respondents generally felt motivated to take further action as a result of their experience, recording a median score of 8 for this question.

Table 3.8 Did you feel motivated to do something related to your experience of this project?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14%	5%	4%	6%	15%	8%	18%	14%	10%	8%

Source: OH visitor survey; n=80.

The potential future actions generally involved undertaking further research or sharing the knowledge gained.

"I will research the subject matter in further depth as it has sparked my interest."

"I am a teacher and shall include this in my syllabus."

However, not all respondents were convinced that they would be motivated to do something else:

"Hard to judge at the moment."

"I don't think it motivates but makes you think."

4.0 Project Participants

This section presents the results of the project participant survey, based on the 10 responses received as of 5th August 2015, spanning 5 projects. Four of the respondents were leaders of groups of children who took part in workshops but were deemed to be too young to complete the survey.

4.1 Participant Profile

The cohort of participants which have completed the survey includes some young people and also adults who were asked to respond on behalf of the young people they were supervising.

Table 4.1 Participant demographics

Gender:	No.
Male	5
Female	5

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Age:	No.
11-16	3
17-18	0
19-25	1
26-59	4
60 and over	2

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Ethnicity:	No.
Asian (Chinese)	0
Asian (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, other)	0
Black (Caribbean, African, other)	0
Mixed ethnic group	0
White	10
Other	0

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Employment status:	No.
In paid employment	5
Unemployed	0
Housewife/househusband	0
Studying	3

Employment status:	No.
Full-time carer	0
Retired	2
Other	0

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

4.2 Participant Involvement

The type of involvement of those responding to the survey varied from work to create audio tours, to undertaking surveys of assets and taking part in workshops or other activities. All respondents said that the connection to heritage had attracted them to the project and all reported that it had been easy to get involved.

Half of the sample reported having no previous involvement in heritage projects while the others had some experience in this context.

4.3 Outcomes

Participants felt that they had experienced a high level of enjoyment from their involvement in the project, resulting in an average rating of 10 (out of 10).

Table 4.2 Level of enjoyment

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Comments revealed that participants had particularly involved learning more about heritage as well as the opportunity to be actively involved in the project, as illustrated by the following comments:

"It is very satisfying to be part of such a pioneering project involving the discovery of new and often overlooked/unseen facets of our heritage and social history."

"We all had a really fantastic time. We based our evaluation upon the lasting impression that the visit created - we were really inspired and fascinated by what we experienced. This will leave memories with our children, and has also helped them to develop."

Participants reported having made either large or very large gains in their knowledge of both the specific subject matter and the local area, its heritage and people which perhaps reflects the more in-depth involvement that participants have the opportunity to experience compared to visitors.

Table 4.3 Gains in knowledge

	No gain	Almost no gain	Some gain	Large gain	Very large gain
The specific subject matter of the project	0	0	0	5	5
The local area, its heritage and people	0	0	0	5	5

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Some participants also referenced the new opportunities that the project had afforded them, including the opportunity to make links between the lead organisation and a local school and the opportunity to meet new people and learn from others.

The most common skills developed were interpersonal and communications skills, as well as information management.

Table 4.4 Skills developed

Skills developed	No.
Information management skills (e.g. research, archiving, transcribing)	5
Communications skills (e.g. speaking, writing, presenting)	6
Other interpersonal skills (e.g. leadership, team working, developing confidence in social situations)	7
Technical skills (e.g. computers and ICT, geo-physical archaeology)	3
Conservation techniques	3

Source: OH participant survey; n=10; multiple responses permitted.

This finding is reflected in comparison of the self-reported skills levels before and after participation which shows that gains were made in all areas, particularly communication.

Table 4.5 Change in skills levels

Type of skill rating before	1	2	3	4	5
Information management skills	0	2	1	2	0
Communications skills	0	1	2	3	0
Other interpersonal skills	0	0	2	5	0
Technical skills	1	0	0	2	0
Conservation Techniques	1	1	0	1	0

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Type of skill rating after	1	2	3	4	5
Information management skills	0	0	2	2	1
Communications skills	0	0	0	2	4
Other interpersonal skills	0	0	0	3	4
Technical skills	0	0	1	2	0
Conservation Techniques	0	0	2	0	1

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Participants were also asked to rate a number of dimensions of the project in order to indicate their view on its quality. Enthusiasm was the attribute that scored most highly with an average score of 10 (out of 10), although all other dimensions received an average score of at least 9.

Table 4.6 Project quality

Dimension of quality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Presentation: it was well produced and presented	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Distinctiveness: it was different from things I've experienced before	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6
Rigour: it was well thought through and put together	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
Relevance: it had something to say about the world in which we live	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
Challenge: it was thought-provoking	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	6
Captivation: it was absorbing and held my attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6
Meaning: it meant something to me personally	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	6
Enthusiasm: I would come to something like this again	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9
Local impact: it is important that it's happening here	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Table 4.7 Has your experience of this project given you a greater understanding and respect for other people and their cultures?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	2

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Participants generally felt that their experience had given them a greater understanding and respect of other people/cultures, particularly in terms of past cultures as illustrated by the comments below:

"It has helped me understand better what medieval folk were thinking and doing and has shown me how they (especially ordinary folk) expressed themselves better than I otherwise might have appreciated."

"We had very little idea about the organisation of society in the past and the importance of things we now take for granted; this has helped our children to develop perspective."

There were similar views about the extent to which the project has helped the local community, which comments suggest were based on the opportunity for increased involvement in local heritage (see below).

Table 4.8   How much do you think that the project has helped the local community?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

"I think it is early days to say how much this project has helped local communities. Certainly the village has seen an increase in the number of visitors to the church and village."

"It has helped the community by letting children that live locally be more involved in the towns heritage in a child-friendly audio tour."

All participants felt motivated to do some future action related to their experience of the project, to some degree.

Table 4.9 Did you feel motivated to do something related to your experience of this project?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	4

Source: OH participant survey; n=10.

Comments revealed that potential future actions included encouraging others to visit and undertaking further research:

"Children have been talking to their friends about re-visiting the site in the future and have encouraged others to participate in open days."

"I have found the project fascinating and wish to carry out more research near my home."

Further reflections on what had been gained from participating in the project emphasised the enjoyment and satisfaction that had been gained from the experience as well as the opportunity to gain new skills and knowledge:

"A great deal of personal satisfaction and a sense of pride in helping to have uncovered Neolithic and Mesolithic flints."

"The project provided me with an experience that has helped me understand how to improve my communication skills. It has also been extremely enjoyable to do and pleasurable to complete alongside fellow class mates!"

5.0 Project Managers

This section summarises the results of the 10 project manager surveys which have been submitted to date.

5.1 Audience and activities

All of the projects reported having a broad target audience, although some placed an emphasis on certain groups such as children or older people. One of the projects focused its activities on women from a specific ethnic group but also developed a road show which was aimed at everyone.

The extent of promotional and/or outreach activity varied, with one project reporting having undertaken a six month outreach and learning programme while another mentioned the work of their community development officer. Two projects specifically referenced the use of social media while three projects delivered workshop sessions and another ran a programme of evening talks.

All projects noted that the feedback they had received from participants had been overwhelmingly positive.

"We have had hugely positive responses to the workshop programmes from the diverse range of participants…"

"We have received nothing but positive feedback all round…"

The most common resources produced as part of the projects were websites and collection of oral histories, which were both undertaken by 5 projects.

Table 5.1 Which of the following have you produced or undertaken as part of your project?

Activities undertaken	No.
Collected oral histories	5
New permanent exhibition	0
Interpretation panels / temporary exhibition	4
Learning resources (e.g. for schools)	4
New or improved learning space	0
Website	5
Film	4
Smartphone app	0
Guidebook, leaflet or other printed material	4
Cataloguing or archive conservation	4
Repair or improvement work to a historic building, monument or archaeological site	1
Added to the record of historic building, monument or archaeological site	2
Survey or record of habitat and / or species	0
Conservation work and / or management work to habitats or land	1
Other	2

Source: OH project manager survey; n=10; multiple responses permitted.

The most prevalent type of activity was 'other on-site activities' (105 recorded across the sample) followed by outreach sessions in schools and colleges (94). However, the largest reach was recorded by publications or digital resources with an estimated 39,000 participants, followed by other on-site activities which were estimated to have attracted over 20,000 participants.

Table 5.2 Project activities

	Number of projects	Number provided throughout the projects	Total number of participants
Open days	4	38	1,503
Festivals	1	1	400
Temporary exhibitions and displays	2	24	4,240
Guided tours or walks	2	9	110
Visits from schools and colleges	5	29	739
Outreach sessions in schools and colleges	3	94	1,693
Other on-site activities	5	105	20,144
Other outreach or off-site activities	3	64	1,087
Publications or digital apps/websites	5	18	39,073

Source: OH project manager survey; n=10; multiple responses permitted.

Some projects were able to provide estimates of the profile of those attending their activities:

- The gender split ranged from 50:50 to one project which reported 100% female participation (in line with its target audience).
- Four-fifths of the projects reported participation across all age ranges, while one had targeted young people and another had focused on those aged 25 and over.
- Four-fifths of the projects estimated that the majority of participants were white, while two reported that Asian (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, other) was the most common ethnic group (accounting for 45% of participants in one case and 100% in another).
- Only one project reported that the demographic characteristics of those attending had changed since starting the project (in this case, the participation of black young people was felt to have increased as a result of the workshop programme).

5.2   Volunteers

Overall, the 10 projects reported having engaged approaching 350 volunteers in their activity, with the number ranging from 6 to 242 per project, of which the majority (84%) were new to the organisation.

Volunteers were estimated to have contributed in excess of 11,700 hours of time during the course of the projects, with the number per project ranging from 125 to almost 5,000.

The most popular activities undertaken by volunteers were research and work with existing collections, devising/delivering activities for the wider public and help with marketing and publicity.

Table 5.3 Volunteer activities

Volunteer activities	No.
Coordinating or leading activities (e.g. as a member of a committee/management group)	2
Gathering, surveying, recording, monitoring, analysing or cataloguing new material or data	3
Researching and working with existing collections and archives	5
Conservation activities (e.g. to habitats, landscapes, buildings or industrial heritage)	1
Devising and delivering activities for schools	2
Devising and delivering activities for children and young people outside of school (e.g. in youth groups)	3
Devising and delivering activities for the wider public (e.g. talks and small exhibitions)	5
Helping with marketing and publicity	5
Providing administrative or IT support for the project	2
Providing other support to the project (e.g. catering, cleaning)	2
Other	2

Source: OH project manager survey; n=10; multiple responses permitted.

Project managers were positive about the role of volunteers and the benefits this brought to the project. They felt that the individuals involved would have benefited in a number of ways, including the opportunity to gain knowledge and experience and develop skills and confidence:

"The volunteering experience was a very positive one for all involved. People contributed a variety of different skills and resources, time and energy, knowledge and expertise which benefited our project and organisation greatly."

"The volunteers have benefited by taking part in activities that where not previously available to them. By participating they have enjoyed physical and mental exercise, interaction with like minded people, learnt about new aspects of gardening and horticulture."

Project managers were asked to provide information on the demographic profile of the volunteers:

- 3 projects reported that at least 50% of their volunteers were aged 60 and over while 4 projects were able to engage young people as volunteers (i.e. those aged 25 and under).
- The ratio of male to female volunteers ranged from 0:100 (for a project which focused on women) to 80:20 (for a project which focused on restoration of a church).
- 5 projects reported that the majority of volunteers were white (90% and over) while 2 reported that the most common ethnic group was Asian (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani).

Only one project manager felt that the profile of volunteers had changed since starting the project, resulting in the involvement of more black young people.

5.3 Trainees

Across the sample of projects, 6 reported that training had been provided to an estimated total of around 130 individuals (ranging from 5 to 60 per project). Almost all of the trainees were also volunteers (94%); the remainder were project staff.

The most popular training subjects were supporting visitor participation & volunteer management and media skills, while practical heritage skills such as conservation and archaeology were less popular in this sample. The other skills noted were gardening and organ restoration skills. Only one project manager noted that the training had resulted in a qualification; this was an Arts Award (silver level).

Table 5.4 Training provided

Training provided	No.
Conservation – landscapes, habitats and species	1
Conservation – buildings, monuments and sites	0
Conservation – industrial, Maritime and Transport heritage	0
Conservation – collections, including oral history	1
Archaeology	0
Delivering learning or interpretation	3
Supporting visitor participation and volunteer management	4
Research (e.g. using archival material)	3
Managing heritage sites, including customer care and marketing	0
Media skills, including websites, films and recordings	4
Other	2

Source: OH project manager survey; n=6; multiple responses permitted.

Information about the profile of trainees can be summarised as follows:

- 5 projects reported that all trainees were adults (aged over 18) while 1 project estimated that 60% of trainees were aged 11-18.
- 2 projects reported that all trainees were female; in the remaining 4 projects the proportion of males ranged from 25 to 40%.
- The proportion of trainees of a white ethnicity ranged from 40 to 100%.

Project managers acknowledged that trainees had gained a variety of skills and knowledge which could be used in other work/projects.

"Trainees gained a variety of new practical skills and knowledge. They have benefited from professional and personal skills development working with a team of experienced industry professionals…"

5.4 Managing Heritage

Only 3 of the projects in the sample reported that they managed a heritage site or asset and 2 of these reported that the project had changed the way in which they manage this asset (both referring to improved cataloguing/recording). Only one was able to provide details of the annual maintenance budget, which was reported as being higher than before the project started and another reported that additional staff time had been allocated to maintenance of the site (with specific responsibility for maintenance of the online archive). Two of the three projects had put in place a facility for user feedback on web services and one had introduced a digital preservation strategy.

All project managers were asked about the actions they had taken with regard to creating positive heritage outcomes. The responses are clearly influenced by the subject matter/type of heritage but the most common responses were recording and depositing oral history material, depositing a heritage collection/archive and developing a greater understanding of conservation techniques.

Table 5.5 Actions taken

Actions taken	No.
Recorded and deposited oral history material to appropriate standards with suitable depository	2
Deposited a heritage collection or archive with a suitable repository	2
Achieved BS PD 5454 standard for archival collections	0
Catalogued a heritage collection or archive to an appropriate standard	1
Improved the storage conditions or documentation for a heritage collection	1
Awarded 'national importance' status for a heritage collection	0
Removed a listed building or registered landscape from 'at risk' status	0
Improved the condition of a designated heritage asset (i.e. listed building, scheduled monument, building in a conservation area, locally listed building)	1
Helped adapt a historic building or structure for a new viable use	0
Helped adapt a historic building or structure to cope with a changing climate or improve energy efficiency (e.g. upgrading rainwater disposal system)	0
Recorded archaeological remains before they were lost	0
Identified and contributed new information towards an Historic Environment Record	0
Developed a greater understanding of conservation techniques	2
Logged a new baseline survey of natural heritage (e.g. with National Biodiversity Network)	0
Changed status of a natural heritage site to 'favourable condition'	0
Conserved a BAP priority species or habitat	0
Other	3

Source: OH project manager survey; n=10; multiple responses permitted.

Seven projects involved explaining or interpreting heritage in a new or improved way and four had identified or recorded heritage for the first time or improved how heritage was recorded/identified.

5.5   Organisational benefits

Four project managers reported that the project had led to changes in the way their organisations operates, primarily involving development of new partnerships, systems or ways of working. A further two project managers noted that there had been no change in ways of working but that undertaking the project had given them increased understanding of the responsibility that working in or with heritage entails.

Five project managers commented on new sources (or potential sources) of income which had developed since the Our Heritage project started. This included fundraising at

project activities, increased potential to use the heritage asset for income generating activities (such as events) and new funding contracts/agreements (the latter was mentioned in two cases).

All project managers completing the survey felt that there project had been a success and that they had learnt from the experience.

"This project has been a huge success and a lot of experience has been gained as the project was certainly more demanding on time than originally anticipated."

6.0 Conclusions

This section summarises key findings from the work undertaken so far and sets out our proposed next steps.

6.1 Key Findings

The following points summarise key findings in relation to both the evaluation process and the current evidence of programme impact.

Process

- Engagement with projects has shown a high willingness to participate in the evaluation, with only a small number of refusals recorded to date.
- Following approval, projects generally need a period of several months before they begin their activities and, in some cases, the scheduling of activity means that it may be even longer before they begin to have meaningful involvement with their beneficiaries. This longer than expected lead-in time for projects to be ready to distribute surveys has had implications for the number of surveys that have been completed at this interim stage (although it is expected that numbers will continue to increase significantly in the coming months).
- Related to the above point, many of the projects recruited into the sample will not be completed within the current evaluation timeframe. This longer than anticipated project duration has had implications for the number of project manager surveys which have been completed at this stage and there are ongoing implications for the extent to which some of these projects can fully participate in the current evaluation period.
- A significant proportion of projects have expressed a reluctance to use the online survey format and instead prefer paper copies (mostly due to practical issues relating to availability of internet access/IT equipment or collection of email addresses). In these cases, paper copies of surveys have been provided on the understanding that project managers will collate and return completed responses which can then be entered into the online database.

Impact

- Positive outcomes have been reported by volunteers, visitors and participants, particularly with respect to enjoyment and learning about heritage.
- The survey findings to date suggest that projects are performing well in terms of generating outcomes for people. Volunteers and participants have reported that involvement in Our Heritage projects has led to the development of a range of skills, while volunteers, participants and visitors have reflected on the enjoyment, knowledge and learning they have gained. There is clear evidence that engagement with Our

Heritage projects has helped to generate enthusiasm and interest in heritage and, for some, the motivation to take further action. Responses to the project manager survey show the significant contribution that volunteers have made to projects and there is evidence from volunteers themselves about the benefits they gain for their own personal wellbeing.

- Evidence regarding the outcomes for heritage is more limited at this stage due to the relatively low number of project manager surveys that have been completed. However, the activity undertaken by projects would be expected to impact positively on the management and/or condition and/or recording of heritage assets, a view which is confirmed by the sample of project managers. In addition, visitors and participants have commented positively on the quality of the activity they have experienced which suggests that projects are helping to ensure that heritage assets are better interpreted and explained.

There is mixed evidence about the achievement of outcomes for communities as some visitors and participants appear to be uncertain about the extent to which projects have benefited their local communities, although this perhaps stems from a recognition that projects have attracted audiences from a wider geographical area which in itself could generate benefits by helping to boost the local economy. Information from project managers suggest that their work has attracted significant numbers of visitors and participants, although it is not clear how far this has resulted in a wider range of people engaging with heritage (a point which could be explored further in case studies). In addition, it appears that some projects have not attracted a particularly diverse demographic profile (particularly with regards to ethnicity), although this could be a reflection of the profile of the local area.

However, a number of caveats should be kept in mind when drawing on the interim findings presented in this report:

- Only a small number of surveys have so far been received from participants (although some of these individuals are responding on behalf of larger groups) and project managers. As a result, it is not possible to tell how typical these findings are likely to be of the wider population, particularly in the case of project manager surveys where there appears to be significant variation in the scale and focus of the projects responding to date.
- Although the number of completed volunteer and visitor surveys is larger, it should be noted that the bulk of these responses have originated from a relatively small number of projects which has potential to skew the current set of findings[4].

---

[4] Note – one project in particular appears to have attracted a noticeable number of international visitors, perhaps due to its central London location, and so may be somewhat atypical of the wider population of funded projects.

6.2 Next Steps

The proposed next steps for the evaluation can be summarised as follows:

- Ongoing engagement and follow up with sampled projects with the aim of achieving a significant increase in survey responses. However, given the time lag in receiving surveys from projects it is suggested that the sample selection does not extend beyond projects approved in August 2015 (but further projects could be selected from approvals prior to this date in order to provide the overall sample size needed).
- Case studies to be undertaken by re-contacting projects that have already contributed surveys to further explore some of findings revealed and provide additional contextual information.
- Consider how to manage the involvement and expectations of projects which extend beyond the current evaluation timeframe.