

# Our Place in Time: Measuring Success

Analysis of consultation responses and  
recommended next steps

Final Report 13/02/15



## 1 Introduction

1.1 In taking forward the workstream on measuring success, BEFS consulted stakeholders (through written consultation and workshops over the winter of 2015) on developing a Performance Measurement Framework (Framework) to inform the delivery of the Strategy *Our Place in Time*. Through written consultation stakeholders were invited to consider a proposed approach to performance measurement (which was informed by the output of the measuring success working group). Stakeholders were also invited to respond to a suite of proposed 'Baseline 1' measures (largely based on existing data) and also offer ideas for long term outcomes. In the workshops this format was followed, with additional discussion on the purpose of performance measurement, what success looks like in delivering the Strategy, and how performance measurement would apply to participants' own work. The purpose in asking these questions at the workshops was to help participants 'connect' with performance measurement and see the relevance to their own work, with a view to securing wider buy-in and engagement with the Framework as it develops. Quotes from the workshops highlight perspectives on performance measurement:

“a Strategy presumes problem – what is the problem?”

“We must have the key killer facts”

“Collecting data is the pursuit of why?  
This starts a conversation and conversations inform policy”

“The Framework needs to offer “a handrail rather than a shackles”

“The existence of a Framework is more important than the outcome”

## 2 Key findings

- *Welcome:* All respondents gave constructive contributions around development of a Performance Measurement Framework. Respondents recognised and welcomed the aspiration that the Framework will be ambitious in its scope and purpose.

- *Baseline 1 caveat:* In publishing Baseline 1, it is recommended that the data be accompanied by a clear caveat to demonstrate the limitations of Baseline 1; this is a first step in developing the more ambitious Framework. The meaning of success must be defined first, before determining measures, otherwise the Framework risks defining success according to what we can measure, rather than what needs to be achieved.
- *A three strand approach:* There are different perspectives on the value and purpose of a Framework. It is therefore recommended that the Framework be developed along three strands to respond to different needs/purposes. These would address:
  - Measuring trends: to monitor progress towards high level outcomes using a limited set of robust measures (repeatable, comprehensive etc).
  - Telling the story: to evaluate impacts that are less easy to quantify, but that provide insight, meaning and ‘flesh out’ the robust measures. This would help ‘tell the story’ of the impact of initiatives right across the sector.
  - Building capacity: to build capacity across the sector to enable the delivery of a more wide-reaching Framework which, in the longer term, could help inform and enable collaborative working.
- *Scoping phase:* A scoping phase may be necessary to look at the landscape within which the sector is operating. This would help provide some context to the outcomes that the sector seeks to achieve (for society). It would also help to develop a rationale for any interventions that may be pursued in delivering the Strategy.

### 3 Approaching performance measurement

#### 3.1 Purpose of Framework

Respondents identified that a Performance Measurement Framework for the sector will have a range of purposes;

- To measure success of the Strategy *and significantly to identify and learn from failure,*
- To have a credible, consistent, regularly completed evidence base on the state of the historic environment as a national resource,
- To provide messages about the historic environment (for politicians, academics, journalists etc.) including to provide data to the National Performance Framework,
- To demonstrate wider relevance including impact on people’s well-being,
- To identify threats to the historic environment, understand current conditions and inform priorities for action,
- To determine the allocation of diminishing financial resources,
- To be used as an engagement tool to make the historic environment meaningful for people - to reach a wide range of audiences using accessible language,
- To improve the sector’s accountability and credibility,
- To build sector capacity in planning to achieve outcomes, evaluating impact and channelling effort and resources accordingly.

## 3.2 'Logic-model' format and structure

- 3.2.1 Format: All respondents recognised the proposed format for the Framework (the logic model of input-output-outcome). The 'logic model' approach was seen as appropriate for some but not all. Comments ranged from "a well-respected method and it makes sense to use it" to caution that "this logic works in simple situations (linear, reductionist thinking), but not for more complex systems that characterise the emergent relationships between the historic environment, places and people." Also that it does not describe a measurement Framework, rather evaluation of a delivery mechanism, but that as such, it may help connect the Strategy *Our Place in Time* to sub-strategies (such as Scottish Historic Environment Data Strategy) which would be useful. It was queried as to whether, in the absence of any agreed activities to enable delivery of the Strategy, the Framework should attempt to apply the logic model to projects/programmes across the sector. *It was commented that the challenge will be in relating an overarching 'logic model' for the sector to the equivalent at organisational level.*
- 3.2.2 Analysis by one respondent assessed the 'gulf' between the current Baseline 1 and ambition for the longer term Framework. This identified the Baseline 1 measures as generally descriptive; comprising data which 'set the scene' or rather the 'contextual conditions' describing the *extent* and *condition* of the resource (eg number of designated assets, proportion of assets in good/poor condition). The aim would be to move from this to a Framework which can inform interventions around decision-making, prioritisation, resource allocation. The focus initially might be on monitoring changes to the contextual conditions.
- 3.2.3 With reference to the proposed 'input-output-outcome' format, it was recognised that a second step of 'process' should be inserted. It was noted that, in the information presented for Baseline 1, there is some mixing up of outputs and outcomes and that there is not necessarily a 'causal' relationship between the stages. Furthermore, difficulties can arise where it is impossible to determine whether there is a causal relationship, or whether external factors are having an influence on the outcome.
- 3.2.4 Structure: It was commented that the structure of the Framework need not follow the structure of the Strategy priorities exactly, since there are areas of overlap/cross-referencing – especially in relation to section C (Protect). For example the reference to capacity building under the Protect priority (C) which links to Priority D (participation). Also the Protect priority (C1) which refers to 'holistic management'; this chimes with the mainstreaming section (A4) and would benefit from some reworking. D3 on tourism is fairly narrowly defined and could be broadened to cover wider physical access to sites and information.

## 3.3 Operation

- 3.3.1 Given the comments above, it is recommended that the Framework ought to be developed along three strands to respond to different needs/purposes. These would cover:

- Measuring trends: to monitor progress towards high level outcomes using a limited set of robust measures (repeatable, comprehensive etc).
  - Telling the story: to evaluate impacts that are less easy to quantify, but provide greater insight and meaning, and help ‘flesh out’ the robust measures. This would help ‘tell the story’ of the impact of initiatives right across the sector.
  - Building capacity: to build capacity across the sector to enable the delivery of a more wide-reaching Framework which, in the longer term, could help inform and enable collaborative working.
- 3.3.2 Accountability and impartial reporting: The question of accountability was raised: “who is accountable for success (or failure) of the Strategy?” especially where responsibility for delivering the Strategy (and associated measurement) is collectively held. Who determines interventions and what constitutes ‘success’? (refer to 3.3.3 for views on the use of targets). How does this inform resourcing? The Framework should not be afraid to recognise failure – since this informs how to improve. Impartiality of reporting on the sector’s collective success was raised as an important issue; messages arising on progress need to be determined independently of those who set the direction. Alternatively data could simply be made available, so that anyone to interpret the data according to their own interests/perspectives.
- 3.3.3 Targets: Respondents gave different views on the use of targets for the Framework – mostly against the use of targets because of the collective nature of the Strategy. It was noted that absence of delivery objectives for the Strategy makes it hard to set targets. But it was also highlighted that to ‘drive’ activity towards a desired outcome, targets play a necessary role. An interim approach could be to agree the ‘direction of travel’ with targets set within certain parameters and narrative used to give further explanation. Benchmarking and international comparators may be developed.
- 3.3.4 Testing measures and interpreting data: A technical advice note could usefully inform how to ‘test’ measures for robustness, and guidance will likely be required on how to interpret data. Workshop discussion highlighted issues around how we interpret data, for example no change may be a good outcome, a reduction in footfall may constitute success; also that a greater impact on few may be a better than a limited impact across many. Ambiguous measures must be avoided.
- 3.3.5 Qualitative and quantitative data: Respondents felt that it is vital to use a mix of both types of data, since these complement each other providing both rigour and insight. Qualitative data such as case study material can help encourage exemplary behaviour and help organisations see how they are contributing to the success of the Strategy. A word of warning was expressed; that the Framework needs to be clear about the rationale for using different types of data and that data types should not be pitted against each other.
- 3.3.6 Contributing data and reporting: It was commented that the Framework needs to be relevant if it is to be useful (and used). It will be important to promote the value of the Framework in order to encourage organisations to contribute data on a voluntary (rather

than obligatory) basis. The Framework must be designed for ease of importing data. The Framework needs to offer “a handrail rather than a shackles”. Further discussion is required on reporting since this will be influenced by the measures used, data collection, how up-to-date data is and how timescales of data collection determine its use in informing planning and any interventions.

### 3.4 Resourcing the Framework

Respondents recognised the scale of the task of developing a sector-wide Performance Measurement Framework. One respondent highlighted that further work should focus on what needs to be put in place to deliver such a Framework. It was observed “preparing a Framework that will give insight into the whole of the historic environment, and that will stand for decades, will not be quickly achieved”. Another respondent observed that the timescale for delivering the Framework is very tight; that measuring success is a long term goal and that developing the Framework should be seen as one of continuous improvement. The relationship with the Scottish Historic Environment Audit (SHEA) was also raised and whether there is a continued need for SHEA in the context of this more ambitious initiative. Resourcing of the SHEA is indeed already very limited and workshop discussion highlighted that data collection has a resourcing implication. Developing the Framework represents an overall strengthening of measurement/evaluation activity across the sector; capacity across the sector will need to be developed to enable this. Further work is needed to determine what is involved in data collection, analysis and publication and to develop capacity appropriately.

## 4 What does success look like?

4.1 It was commented in workshop discussion there is not yet any “latent notion of success” – rather that the proposed measures currently represent a collection of ideas. Defining success depends on the values of the user/consumer of the historic environment. Practitioners within the sector are likely to have shared values and an intrinsic understanding what success looks like; this may however be quite different for other audiences. It was questioned is the Strategy (and associated measures) for the sector or for the people of Scotland? Success may be defined at different levels – individual, corporate, society. This is recognised in discussion at 3.2.2 on the challenge of generating alignment through logic modelling across activities within the sector. The meaning of success must be defined first, before determining measures, otherwise the Framework risks accepting success as what we can measure, rather than what needs to be achieved. Ultimately defining outcomes and measures, with or without targets applied, determines the level of ‘stretch’ of the Framework – ranging from achieving ‘easy wins’ to more ambitious outcomes.

4.2 Respondents and workshop participants gave the following suggestions for what success looks like. These should inform the drafting of high level outcomes for the Framework:

“The historic environment is widely recognised as a key contributor to delivering outcomes across the NPF and through SOAs on social and cultural wellbeing, generating economic growth and carbon emission reduction.” (A4)

“The public is better informed by the availability of accurate and retrievable data which are credible, consistent, reliable (delivered through successful implementation of the SHED Strategy and development of a Research Framework).” (B)

“The historic environment is safeguarded for the long-term and contributes positively to the quality of Scotland’s places for people to use and enjoy.” (C)

“The public feels increasing sense of ownership and appreciation of the heritage (as engagement increases, diversifies and strengthens).” (D)

Key issues that may inform sub-outcomes include:

- The management of town centre decline
- Investment for the long term – avoiding the ability to off-load long-term social and environmental costs of development
- Shifting attitudes towards achieving a cycle of continuous investment (ongoing maintenance)
- Changing the imperative; the historic environment is not a liability
- The development of new technologies with applications in other fields
- The public feels engaged with decision-making processes

## 5 General comments on Baseline 1

- 5.1 Respondents found the proposed Baseline 1 very quantitative and narrowly focussed around data sources mostly held by central government, with proposed indicators often far removed from the long term aim with no obvious causal link (logic). It was recognised that the Baseline 1 proposition mostly comprises data already gathered through the Scottish Historic Environment Audit (SHEA) which tends to be ‘counts’ of information. The undesignated historic environment, gardens and designed landscapes are areas notably absent. The relationship with the museums sector should feature.
- 5.2 During workshop discussions it was recognised that the Baseline 1 proposition also runs contrary to the principles of the Framework in that it is not as outcome-oriented as all would wish. *However*, there is a clear aspiration for the Framework to be much more ambitious and stakeholders recognise that we are working with the data that is currently available. The Baseline 1 is the first step and we should recognise the limitations of data which, in the short term could be supplemented with good case study material to help in the transition towards an outcome-oriented Framework.
- 5.3 In publishing Baseline 1, it is recommended that the data be accompanied by a clear caveat to demonstrate the limitations of Baseline 1; that this is understood to be a first step in developing the more ambitious Framework. The longer term Framework would develop measures to inform progress against a limited set of ‘success outcomes’; be broader in scope to include the undesignated environment and area-based designations; draw data from right across the sector; reach a range of audiences; and adopt qualitative as well as quantitative approaches to monitoring, reporting and assessment.

## 6 Commentary on proposed measures

6.1 Most of the consultation responses focussed around ideas for measures. Detailed suggestions for amendments to Baseline 1 and ideas for potential measures that could be developed are given in the tables in Appendix 1. Since consultees were responding to Baseline data which is largely contextual (as explained at 3.2.2 above) many of the suggested amendments continue in this vein.

### 6.2 A: Cross-Cutting Strategic Priorities

*A1: Decision-making is better informed:* Respondents sought more detail on the operation of the measurement Framework, specifically around next steps and roles and responsibilities in taking the Framework forward. Only once the Framework is established will it be possible to assess how stakeholders are using it.

*A2: Leadership and collaboration is enhanced:* As an indicator of leadership, the Baseline 1 indicator 'creation of HES' was questioned (leadership is earned). The indicator might instead highlight the role in leading and enabling delivery of the Strategy. Respondents emphasised that leadership and collaborative working takes place across the sector; the Framework provides opportunity to explore this further including assessing collaboration beyond the 'sector' and international relationships.

*A3: Skills and capacity are developed:* Regarding the proposed Skills Audit, respondents highlighted the need to make use of existing information and made suggestions on the scope of the Audit. Any Audit should explore not only supply and demand but also what is actually *needed* (not necessarily demanded) and where and why there is market failure in terms of meeting need.

*A4: Historic environment is mainstreamed:* Respondents highlighted that the Baseline 1 indicator would be improved if it were to assess how substantive references to the historic environment are in other 'relevant' policies (policies beyond central government should also be included). In the longer term this could be measured by the amount of policy congruence (policies relating to the historic environment do not undermine each other); also that advocacy takes place increasingly 'upstream'. It was stressed that "we need to shift the language we use, as currently the language that the sector uses does not gain any traction".

### 6.3 B: Understand: Investigate and Record

*B1: Understanding of historic environment is increasing:* Respondents recognised that data on the numbers of records/items do not necessarily indicate that understanding is increasing. To improve upon the measure it will be necessary to assess the quality of records and also look at the standards associated with maintaining records.

*B2: Knowledge is increasingly accessible:* Currently the Baseline indicators show *exposure* to information rather than *access*. Again respondents were looking for a more qualitative

indication of the impact of searches, rather than the number of searches – this is a steer for the longer term Framework.

A longer term measure for the Understand priority could be captured as successful delivery of the SHED (Scottish Historic Environment Data) Strategy. A further measure might be developed around the idea of a Research Framework, which in particular might help strengthen connections between researchers and practitioners (including community groups). The social value of community-based projects could be evaluated.

#### 6.4 C: Care and Protect

*C1: Historic Environment is managed holistically:* The Baseline 1 measures in this section deal with measuring condition of the historic environment. *It was however recognised that the focus on condition at C1 is flawed and that the meaning of C1 (holistic management) needs reworking – it links for example to mainstreaming (A4) and could for example assess climate change proofing and contributions to other agenda.*

On condition, one respondent highlighted that understanding condition should be a fundamental priority for the Framework. It was recognised that the Baseline 1 measures assess a very narrow part of the historic environment – condition applies much more broadly across the undesignated historic environment as well. Various improvements were suggested regarding potential indicators including (for Baseline 1) measuring the number of demolitions (Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments); providing a baseline on staffing capacity in local authorities; and in the longer term developing a measure around retention/re-use in order to inform how to address under-use/vacancy of historic buildings. A key measure could be framed around the proportion of the historic buildings in use and contributing positively to the quality of Scotland's places.

*C2: Historic Environment protection is effective and proportionate:* Respondents suggested areas where measures could be developed, for example around planning and Listed Building/Conservation Area Consent processes. Currently indicated by the speed of processing applications, this indicates timeliness and certainty in decision-making (which are valued by applicants). But the question remains - how might this measure be improved to indicate quality of outcome? Also to what extent is the historic environment managed with a long-term view (in contrast to meeting some short term political or financial expediency)? Other areas could address enforcement (including outwith the planning system); the impact of pre-application discussions; the impact of permitted development rights; and also informing management of Scotland's ecclesiastical heritage.

*C3: People are supported and able to engage with the historic environment:* A baseline figure on staffing capacity in local authorities could be expanded upon here to look at standards and the support provided by local authorities to enable communities to engage with their historic environment. Regarding investment, measuring the impact of public investment and associated leverage was welcomed. A longer term measure could be presented around 'growing the cake' /overall amount of investment in the historic environment in Scotland.

## 6.5 D: Value: Share and Celebrate

*D1: Participation opportunities are increasing:* The focus on membership as a measure of participation needs to be broadened to engagement through social media (especially since this is how younger audiences are more likely to engage). Baseline measures could be expanded upon by assessing participation in local initiatives. Data on participation might also be reviewed to assess who is *not* participating. Social and health indicators could be developed here (or under A4 –mainstreaming).

*D2: Learning opportunities are increasing:* Baseline measures could be improved upon by undertaking benchmarking in heritage management courses and also looking across the sector at learning strategies and resourcing.

*D3: Historic environment is promoted to visitors:* Visitor ratings might be contrasted with other types of attraction. A more qualitative assessment might consider the different range of experiences and values of potential visitors. An outcome could be framed around meeting the needs/expectations of a broader range of visitors – domestic and international alike. The international dimension is not very apparent in the Baseline 1 measures; this could be explored here or under collaborative working (A2).

In the longer term we need to develop better measures for assessing significance of the historic environment for different audiences, since people value places in different ways.

## 6.6 Specific suggestions for measures

Specific suggestions for measures are listed at Appendix 1.

## 7 Next Steps

### 7.1 Outline programme for delivering the Framework 2015-16:

Date	Action	Status
<b>January – March</b>		
08/01/15	RSA meeting	<b>complete</b>
15/01/15	Glasgow workshop	<b>complete</b>
21/01/15	Consultation closes	<b>complete</b>
06/02/15	BEFS submits consultation analysis on Baseline 1 and potential measures to HEPU.	<b>submitted</b> Includes: comments and recommendations on changes to Baseline 1 measures
13/02/15	BEFS submits consultation analysis on approach to framework, and outline programme for the development and delivery of the framework	
23/02/15 –	HEPU/HS/BEFS meet to discuss feedback on Baseline 1, agree method for managing suggestions,	

18/03/15	incorporate changes and follow up any priorities for additional data.	
19/03/15 – 30/03/15	Prepare Baseline 1 and narrative/headline communications ready for publication.	
18/03/15	<p><b>HEOG: Key issues for discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ownership of the framework</b></li> <li>• <b>Resourcing of data collection and contribution</b></li> <li>• <b>Extent to which logic model approach might realistically be applied across organisations at this stage</b></li> <li>• <b>Proposed three strand approach in developing framework</b></li> <li>• <b>Insertion of scoping phase to understand current landscape?</b></li> </ul>	
18/03/15 – 31/03/15	<p>Identify and approach individuals to form a new <b>Framework delivery steering group</b> (HEPU, HS, BEFS, 2-3 others with expertise in evaluation/performance management). Remit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• review and recommend delivery model</li> <li>• establish deliverable and measurable outcomes for Framework</li> <li>• advise on ongoing delivery of Framework</li> </ul>	
<b>April - June</b>		
01/04/15	Baseline 1 active; publish on BEFS website and promote (twitter, news release)	
04/15	Refer to and connect with related initiatives (eg Heritage2020, Museums and Galleries Scotland Strategy, Insight Institute)	
23/04/15	Report to <b>BEFS Board</b> on progress.	
13/05/15	<p>Convene <b>Framework delivery steering group</b> to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• action feedback from HEOG (including whether to insert scoping phase)</li> <li>• take on board feedback on operational issues from stakeholder consultation</li> <li>• discuss risks</li> </ul> <p>Points to discuss/agree on OPERATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify actions to develop mechanics (eg toolkit on testing measure robustness, protocols around interpreting data – impartiality, methods of data collection)</li> <li>• Identifying who holds data / process for inviting contributions</li> <li>• Discuss use of ad hoc <b>thematic panels</b> as a</li> </ul>	

	<p>method to finalise outcomes and develop measures. OR use Strategy sub groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify actions needed to undertake capacity building to support wider sector in developing outcomes (eg facilitating delivery of training with Evaluation Support Scotland)</li> </ul>	
06/15	Draft risk register for framework (for BEFS Board)	
06/15	Commence work on CONTENT: Review potential long term outcomes and sub-outcomes, informed by Consultation Analysis report (02/15), MSWG report (09/14) and HES corporate planning. Prepare proposed set of long term outcomes and sub-outcomes.	
	<i>Possible insertion of scoping phase here depending on outcome of HEOG discussion in March.</i>	
<b>July – September</b>		
02/07/15	Report to <b>BEFS Board</b> on progress.	
19/08/15	Convene <b>Framework delivery steering group</b> to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss progress on operational issues</li> <li>Discuss and finalise proposed suite of long term outcomes and sub-outcomes</li> <li>Discuss progressing ad hoc thematic panels to develop measures under outcomes</li> <li>Prepare communications strategy</li> <li>Prepare progress report to HEOG</li> </ul>	
<b>22/09/15</b>	<b>HEOG: key issues for discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Consider progress report on operational issues</b></li> <li><b>Approve proposed suite of long term outcomes and sub outcomes</b></li> <li><b>Approve communications strategy</b></li> </ul>	
<b>October – December</b>		
23/09/15 – 14/10/15	Prepare long term outcomes for publication. Commence convening of ad hoc <b>thematic panels</b> to develop measures.	
15/10/15	Publish suite of long term outcomes.	
08/10/15	Report to <b>BEFS Board</b> on progress on operation and content (inc approved outcomes)	
04/11/15	Convene <b>Framework delivery steering group</b> to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss progress on operation and content</li> </ul>	
15/11/15 – 20/01/16	Meetings of <b>thematic panels</b> to develop measures (including applying ‘test’ previously developed)	
	Through quarter deliver ongoing	

	roadshows/outreach to promote performance measurement	
January - March		
21/01/16	Report to <b>BEFS Board</b> on progress.	
22/01/16 – 10/02/16	Prepare Baseline 2 proposal	
17/02/16	Convene <b>Framework delivery steering group</b> to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss progress on operation</li> <li>• Review proposed measures from thematic panels</li> <li>• Discuss and finalise Baseline 2 proposal which provides measures against long term outcomes</li> </ul>	
<b>16/03/16</b>	<b>HEOG: review and approve Baseline 2</b>	
17/03/16 – 24/03/16	Take on board any comments from HEOG on Baseline 2 and prepare to publish.	
01/04/16	Publish Baseline 2.	
	Through quarter deliver ongoing roadshows/outreach to promote performance measurement.	

## 8 Final remarks

- 8.1 Developing a Framework for measuring success of the Historic Environment Strategy *Our Place in Time* is intentionally ambitious. In one sense the task seems straightforward – it is about understanding how well we are doing, sharing good practice, learning from failure, promoting successes. On the other hand complexities abound around how measures are applied. Respondents to the consultation and during workshop discussion have recognised this. Discussions over the last ten months, since the Strategy was launched, have served to inform people about performance measurement, share ideas around potential measures and outcomes, and think about how the Framework might be delivered across the sector. The focus around measurement within the sector is valuable because we need get better at understanding what working, what is not and how to improve practice. Developing a Performance Measurement Framework will strengthen the sector’s ability to promote and learn from its collective success.

## Appendix 1 - Measures

<b>CROSS CUTTING PRIORITIES MEASURES - CONSULTATION FEEDBACK</b>
<b>Baseline 1 suggested amendments</b>
As an indicator of leadership, the Baseline 1 indicator 'creation of HES' was questioned. An alternative might be 'creation of HES to lead and enable delivery of the Strategy' – or statement on leadership/enabling work in corporate planning for HES
Measure the extent to which stakeholders are contributing knowledge/information to the evidence base
Provide a statement on improvements in evidence-based decision making in central and local government
Expand the assessment of policy areas to include policies of local government, utilities companies, developers, relevant policy areas such as community planning, Common Agricultural Policy etc.
<b>Ideas for potential measures</b>
<i>A1 Decision-making is better informed</i>
Extent to which stakeholders are using the Framework
<i>A2 Leadership and collaboration is enhanced</i>
Assessment of international partnerships and initiatives
Evidence of partnership working with non-heritage organisations (eg: communities, development agencies, tourism providers, arts organisations, etc)
<i>A3 Skills and capacity are developed</i>
Scope of Audit: must go wider than craft skills to address need across the sector (include management skills)
Assessment of capacity in local authorities
Assess vocational training, CPD schemes, apprenticeships, bursaries, career development
Assess number and spread of accredited professionals
Assess extent to which locally based good quality design teams and contractors effectively nurtured.
Assess investment in skills and knowledge
<i>A4 Historic environment is mainstreamed</i>
Assess public awareness-raising initiatives
Assess impact of pre-application discussions

<b>UNDERSTAND: INVESTIGATE AND RECORD MEASURES - CONSULTATION FEEDBACK</b>
<b>Baseline 1</b>
Assessment of HER/SMR coverage (and at a later stage capacity and standards)
Number of organisations contributing to Pastmap
Percentage of Local Authority records on Pastmap
Number of searches on online HERs not accessed through Pastmap
Number of off-line enquiries to Local Authority records
Number of public information initiatives (local authorities)
HER databases to reflect removals as well as additions

<b>Potential measures</b>
<i>B1: Understanding of historic environment is increasing:</i>
Indicators in HS-RCAHMS Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey (data users)
Assessment of use of HLA data in informing decision-making relating to landuse
Assessment of impact of searches and diversity of audience accessing data
Include the number of Listed Building Reviews each year (thematic, area, individual)
<i>B2: Knowledge is increasingly accessible:</i>
Assessment of quality of records
Assess integration of CANMORE and LA records (part of SHED)
Assess amount of data submitted to CANMORE but not yet on record (eg via DES)
Number of reports in DES
Assess other sources/records eg held by amenity groups
Research into the social value of voluntary sector led projects
Qualitative study of understanding of HE in other areas eg by the general public, property owners, and corporate government (link A4 - Mainstreaming)
Develop measures on historic environment significance

<b>PROTECT: CARE AND PROTECT MEASURES - CONSULTATION FEEDBACK</b>
<b>Baseline 1 - suggested amendments</b>
<i>review C1 - holistic management - links to mainstreaming at A4.</i>
Report on % B (or indeed ALL categories) as well as A listed buildings on BARR
Number of Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments demolished annually and reasons for this.
Potentially use SHEA figure for the number of designated assets in a 'stable or improving condition'.
Indicator for staffing levels in local planning authorities (as already partially collated for SHEA), or % of local planning authorities with no archaeological and conservation expertise
Proportion of Conservation Areas with management plans or character assessment reviewed in last 5 years
<b>Ideas for potential measures</b>
<i>C1 Managed holistically (condition)</i>
Local Authority data on condition of monuments
Analysis of BARR - ownership, length of time on register, reason for coming off (repair, mothball, demolitions etc)
Develop a way to quantify unused vacant buildings (possibly using business rates data, including business rates relief for empty listed buildings)
Amount of moth-balling - a legitimate response
<i>C2 Protection is effective and proportionate</i>
Develop a measure around retention/re-use of the historic environment

Level of progress with List review
Proportion of undesignated assets with active management plans
Measure level of enforcement eg analyse BARR for use of CPOs - extent to which public authorities take action
Assessment of planning applications with appropriate mitigation, development plans that accord appropriate significance to the historic environment.
Assess level of compliance with conditions (outwith development control) - degree of enforcement
Assess the extent to which authorities are enabled/incentivised to take action on redundant property
Assess demolitions of listed buildings in world heritage site (Edinburgh) (enforcement of management plan)
Assess impact of permitted development rights on historic environment (changes in regulations)
Assess impact of pre-application discussions over undesignated assets
Assess progress in aligning with planning system and efficiency of consent processes in enabling re-use
Number of designated and undesignated sites in local authority and tertiary trust ownership
Measure progress on issues relating to ecclesiastical heritage (eg removal of ecclesiastical exemption)
<i>C3 People are supported and able to engage</i>
Measure ongoing public investment including leverage from repair grants and impact of CAR/THI funded initiatives - whether these have stimulated ongoing maintenance?
Measure the extent to which investment in Scotland's heritage is increasing and diversifying (growing the cake)
Analyse value and impact of investment on geographical basis
Measure of investment from other grants (eg housing budget)
Measure extent of progress towards achieving VAT reduction on repairs
Monitor progress with AHF-funded projects
Assess impact of HLF funded projects over time (until 2015) looking at level of investment, condition, changes in management committee etc
Assess extent to which the voluntary sector is effectively support (including support provided by local authorities to local communities to enable them to engage with historic environment; and impact of community right to buy on management of listed buildings)
Evidence of decision-making process in local authorities informed by public engagement
Assess engagement with design review process

<b>VALUE: SHARE AND CELEBRATE MEASURES - CONSULTATION FEEDBACK</b>
<b>Baseline 1 - suggested amendments</b>
Include recent Scottish Household Survey results
Quantify memberships and or participation at local level (friends groups, local authority supported activity etc).
Number of loans to schools of artefact investigate kits

Include data on visitor surveys available via local authorities and tourism bodies
<b>Ideas for potential measures</b>
<i>D1: Participation opportunities are increasing</i>
Assess diversity of audiences reached (including volunteering profile and understanding of who is <i>not</i> participating)
Assess participation through social media
Develop measures of educational activities in organisations beyond Baseline 1
Assess volunteer engagement through projects such as SCHARP and Adopt-A-Monument
Quantify access to sites managed across the sector and beyond
Capture participation through initiatives such as Scotland's Urban or Rural Past, CARs, Connected Communities, Creative Scotland projects (suggestion of annual audit of participation opportunities for archaeology (under auspices of Archaeology Strategy)
Capture social value of the historic environment through Scottish Household Survey or forthcoming Place Standard
Refer to the findings of the Southport Report (2011) which identified actions relating to this section (applicable to Scotland)
<i>D2: Learning opportunities are increasing</i>
More qualitative assessment of learning strategies and resources available within the sector
Assessment of take-up of funded school initiatives/entitlements to visits in inaccessible rural areas
Develop measures through Eco-schools (on incorporating heritage into studies)
Assessment of international collaborations
Availability of online courses
Assess lifelong learning opportunities
<i>D3: Historic environment is promoted to visitors</i>
Relate visitor ratings to other attractions

## Appendix 2 – Consultation and workshop feedback

### Consultation

Fourteen responses were received from the following organisations (two individual responses were also received):

- ALGAO Scotland
- Archaeology Scotland
- Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
- Garden History Society in Scotland

Historic Scotland/RCAHMS  
Individual (x2)  
Institute of Historic Building Conservation  
National Trust for Scotland  
Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland  
Royal Town Planning Institute in Scotland  
RSA Scotland  
Scottish Civic Trust  
Scottish Property Federation  
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland

One consultee stated that the consultation document was not easy to read. With hindsight it would have been preferable to include some 'warm up' /contextual questions at the start. Of the sixteen responses, four completed the 'logic modelling' tables which was an attempt to encourage consultees to think through the process of measuring performance in the format of the Framework.

### Workshops

Workshops were held in Edinburgh, Perth and Glasgow with average attendance of 10. In addition, BEFS facilitated a meeting of RSA Scotland fellows and participated in a workshop for RCAHMS-HS staff.

Organisations represented at workshops:

ALGAO Scotland  
Arts & Business Scotland - Resourcing Scotland's Heritage  
Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland  
City of Edinburgh Council  
Couper Angus and Blairgowrie Community Council  
Fife Council  
Glasgow City Heritage Trust  
Historic Scotland  
Individuals/consultants (3)  
Institute of Historic Building Conservation  
National Trust for Scotland  
RCAHMS  
RSA Scotland  
Scottish Civic Trust  
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland  
University Campus Suffolk

The questions used in the workshops were designed to make the topic more meaningful – to relate performance measurement to stakeholders' own activities.

1. Why should we measure success as a sector?
2. How do you measure success at the moment?
3. What do you think about the proposed approach to developing a Measurement Framework for the sector?
4. Views on baseline 1 and suggested long term measures?
5. What does success for the sector look like?
6. How should we measure this?
7. At HS-RCAHMS event: Ideas for measuring each of the Strategy strategic priorities? What do HS-RCAHMS already do and what is replicable across the sector?
8. At Perth we included a mapping exercise (similar to logic modelling): What do you do? What are you trying to achieve? (activity) What does success look like? (outcome) How do you know you are achieving success? (measure)

Comments from the workshop feedback:

“It was more pitched to those who had already been involved. It is a difficult subject to understand without some prior knowledge.”

“It clarified some things and encouraged me that this isn't just a national government initiative - but the proof of the pudding....!”

“I felt listened to - which I hope will be reflected in the outcomes”

100% felt able to participate.

---