

## Response ID ANON-UWGA-7QAJ-7

Submitted to HES Grants Refresh  
Submitted on 2021-09-06 16:56:10

### Introduction

1 Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

On behalf of an organisation

Please provide the name of your organisation:

Society of Antiquaries of Scotland

2 Have you applied for any HES grants since 2016?

Yes

3 Which HES grant programme/s have you applied to since 2016? (Please select all that apply)

Archaeology Funding Programme (ARCH), Coast and Waters Heritage Fund (C&WHF), Historic Environment Support Fund (HESF), Organisational Support Fund (OSF)

Other (Please specify):

Publications support

4 Have you been awarded any HES grants since 2016?

Yes

5 Under which HES grant programme/s have you been awarded a grant since 2016? (Please select all that apply)

Archaeology Funding Programme (ARCH), Historic Environment Support Fund (HESF), Organisational Support Fund (OSF)

Other (Please specify):

Publications support

### Our New Grants Priorities

6 Do you feel that the scope of our new Grants Priorities is relevant and appropriately targeted for historic environment projects?

Strongly agree

If you selected 'Disagree' or 'Strongly disagree', please provide the reason/s for this:

### Historic Environment Grants (Open Programme)

7 To what extent do you support what is being proposed under Historic Environment Grants (the Open Programme)?

Support

If you selected 'Oppose' or 'Strongly oppose', please provide the reason/s for this:

8 Do you feel that the three different tiers of funding proposed under Historic Environment Grants (the Open Programme) are set at the right levels?

Yes

If you selected 'No', please provide the reason/s for this:

9 What do you think about the new application and decision timeframes being proposed under Historic Environment Grants (the Open Programme)?

Just right

Please provide any further feedback that you have on your response to this question:

The timetables for agreeing grant funding are critical, especially where funding relates to employment to deliver the agreed outcomes. It should be a priority to ensure that responses are indeed timely. It may be necessary to include a warning regarding this when offering a rolling programme, so that

applicants recognise the need to a timeous application to avoid losing staff and expertise.

## Draft Eligible Costs Guidance for Historic Environment Grants (Open Programme)

10 To what extent do you support the scope of the draft eligible costs for Historic Environment Grants (Open Programme)?

Support

If you selected 'Oppose' or 'Strongly oppose', please provide the reason/s for this:

## Other Programmes

11 Do you have any comments or feedback on any of the other programmes included in the HES Grants Framework (Partnership Fund, CARS and City Heritage Trusts)? N.B. We have already undertaken external consultation on the CARS programme, but further feedback from anyone who did not take part in this consultation is welcome.

Any Comments/ Feedback:

Partnership Fund: Given the nature of Scotland's Archaeology Strategy (SAS) as an inclusive one that opens archaeology to everyone, it could be constraining to restrict funding only to those as named organisations in the delivery plan. If other organisations were able to successfully and efficiently (a critically important consideration to ensure there is no duplication of effort and that agreed frameworks of delivery are used) deliver against the SAS delivery plan they shouldn't be restricted from doing so simply because they weren't considered at the drafting and updating stages of the SAS delivery plan.

However, it is also to be welcomed that a separate programme is available to avoid competition with other applications.

## General

12 As part of this work, we have completed an Equalities Impact Assessment (Initial Screening). Are there any aspects of our proposals which you feel may present a barrier or disadvantage to anyone who may wish to apply for a grant from HES?

Yes

If you selected 'Yes', please provide the reason/s for this:

Yes, see answer to Q11.

13 To what extent do you support our proposed approach to prioritising and targeting our investment? (p.13 of the HES Grants framework)

Support

If you selected 'Oppose' or 'Strongly oppose', please provide the reason/s for this:

14 How clear did you find the language in the document?

Clear

15 If you have received a grant from us in the past, do you have any feedback on your experience?

Any Feedback:

We have experienced problems with the timely nature of receiving notification of success or otherwise of a grant application. This has led to great stress within our organisation with regards to employment and evidencing sustainability to Trustees for example. The new rolling programme suggested may help to alleviate any bottle-necks that build due to a large number of applications at a single point, but it is critical that responses to applications are delivered within the stated timeframe.

It would be very useful, especially with more people now working from home, to allow a digital signature and the emailing of the final form (which also needs to be highlighted as required at the start of the application process).

It would be useful to have feedback on the outcomes suggested in a funding bid, and ensure that the information provided through reporting on these is recorded as part of the process of the funded project relates to Our Place in Time/Archaeology Strategy/HES KPIs. This would also allow the resulting outcomes of the funding to be articulated publicly, rather than, as currently it seems (from an external view) simply disappearing into HES. Some means of showing how our agreed activity/outcomes/outputs are helping deliver on the heritage sector's priorities would be useful.

We have found it very useful to have a dedicated officer with which we can discuss the funded project at relatively regular intervals.

16 Do you have any more comments/ feedback on the Draft HES Grants Framework?

Any Other Comments/ Feedback:

There is clearly a risk in this new framework that the funding available to archaeology related work is diminished from the previously ring-fenced £1.4m. Given the valuable returns on all the proposed priorities that archaeological work can provide this will require close monitoring. Will awards be published and at what frequency?

We reiterate that it would be useful to ensure that outcomes agreed with HES are shown to have value in delivering on wider sectoral priorities. The mass of information could be used more clearly in reporting on OPiT for example.

We note there is no mention of funding for publications in the proposed framework. We'd welcome some clarity on this vitally important aspect of disseminating the knowledge gained through HES funding and research.