

**An Evaluation of the Delivery and
Impact of Our Place in Time
(OPiT)**

Final Report

September 2019

DC Research

4 Finch Close
Carlisle
CA1 2WB

t: 01228 402 320
m: 07501 725 114
e: stephen@dcresearch.co.uk

www.dcresearch.co.uk

CONTENTS

KEY FINDINGS	2
1. INTRODUCTION	4
Aim and Objectives of the Evaluation	4
Context/Background to Our Place in Time	4
Key Evaluation Tasks	8
Structure of Report.....	9
2. ACHIEVEMENTS OF OPIT – PROGRESS SO FAR	10
Section 2 Introduction.....	10
Overall Progress with OPiT.....	10
OPiT Progress Against Specific Aims & Priorities	17
3. ASSESSMENT OF STRATEGIC AIMS AND PRIORITIES	23
Section 3 Introduction.....	23
Assessment of OPiT Aims and Priorities	23
Issues to Consider – Improvement, Refinement and Priority	24
4. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT – SOME CONSIDERATIONS	26
Section 4 Introduction.....	26
Summary of Governance and Delivery Arrangements.....	26
OPiT Performance Framework	26
Delivery Arrangements.....	28
Governance Structures.....	28
ANNEX 1: LIST OF CONSULTEES.....	30
ANNEX 2: SURVEY RESULTS	31
ANNEX 3: MEMBERSHIP OF OPIT GROUPS (JUNE 2019).....	40

Acknowledgements: DC Research would like to thank the individuals and organisations that have contributed in various ways to this evaluation – in particular, the individuals and groups that were consulted during the evaluation and those organisations and individuals that took the time to reply to the survey. Their time and their input are very much appreciated.

KEY FINDINGS

Overall, there is a **clear consensus that there is now good progress** with OPiT.

Widespread acknowledgement that **progress around OPiT was limited, or slow**, in the first couple of years of the strategy.

The **improved rate of progress since the review of governance arrangements that took place in 2017 is well recognised**.

The very **existence of OPiT – a national strategy for the historic environment sector in Scotland – is seen as a good thing** in and of itself. It has had a **positive impact on the awareness and perceptions** of the priorities for the historic environment sector **both within and outside** of the sector.

OPiT and the surrounding arrangements ensure that there is active political leadership and involvement through the role of the Cabinet Secretary as the Chair of SHEF – clearly seen as a good thing for the sector.

OPiT provides a framework through which a collective approach can be taken by the historic environment sector to a wide range of issues.

OPiT is enabling the sector to work more closely with a wider range of organisations. There is clear progress here, and the Working Group membership shows the level of engagement within and outside the sector that is taking place.

However, there **is clear acknowledgement from the consultations that there is a lot more to be done around 'mainstreaming'** – which is one of the key cross-cutting aims of OPiT, and something that is well recognised as a key priority.

By the end of 2019 the Working Groups will all have produced tangible outputs:

- The **Skills Investment Plan for Scotland's Historic Environment Sector** – launched in 2019 – was developed through the **Skills and Expertise Group**.
- The **Built Heritage Investment Plan** – due to be published in late 2019 – is being developed through activity in the **Built Heritage Investment Group**.
- An **'Impacts Guide'** is currently being developed by the **Climate Change Group** and is due to be published later in 2019.
- The **Volunteering Group** is working on the **Volunteering Participation Campaign** that is currently in development.
- The **Heritage Tourism Group** will be contributing to the new **National Tourism Strategy**, aiming to ensure that heritage tourism is well represented.

For many of the Working Groups it is the next step - **implementing and delivering the relevant plans that will be the key challenge**. This is a critical aspect and OPiT is not yet at this stage for any of the established/emerging plans.

It is well recognised by consultees that **OPiT has clearly helped to achieve many of the softer foundations and is moving in the right direction** (especially since the 2017 review).

The survey found, that for all four OPiT aims, **more than 70% of respondents report that progress so far is as expected**.

The survey also found **more than half of respondents think OPiT is likely to deliver on each of the key aims by the end of the strategy**, although this varies by aim - 75% state that the 'Value' aim is likely to deliver by the end of the strategy, compared to 52% for the 'Protect' aim.

Strong consensus from consultees that the current aims and priorities within OPiT are appropriate, and that there is no need to reconsider the overall aims and priorities of the strategy at this stage.

However, a **key issue to consider going forward for OPiT is the extent to which OPiT should consider becoming a more focused/targeted/prioritised strategy for the future** – one which better reflects the challenges facing the sector and the changes to the context that have occurred since it was launched in 2014.

Any **future amendments to OPiT** could also better reflect priorities/challenges around aspects that have increased in priority and importance since OPiT was launched in 2014: the well-being agenda; the communities/community empowerment agenda; the climate change emergency; and intangible heritage.

Given the importance of 'mainstreaming' as a priority for OPiT alongside the challenges around achieving this, it may be useful to more clearly set out where the key responsibilities and actions around this lie within OPiT.

Findings are positive about the current governance structure and delivery mechanisms for OPiT. There is good feedback from both consultees and survey respondents about the current arrangements, and **the changes following the 2017 review are a key reference point for this current positive perspective.**

The **current Performance Framework arrangements are appropriate** and are working well. However, it is important to acknowledge that the Framework **captures the overall direction of travel of the wider historic environment sector and sets it within the framework of OPiT aims and priorities** – rather than being about what is achieved by/attribution to OPiT delivery & governance arrangements.

There is **overlap with the effort and work involved in producing the OPiT Performance Reports and in updating Scotland's Historic Environment Audit (SHEA).** There is **potential for these to be more explicitly aligned** – to help avoid duplication of effort and/or reporting. This could include producing Performance Reports less frequently or providing less detail in the reports. It may also be useful to consider producing a one-page infographic for OPiT that captures the key headlines.

There is **strong, positive feedback about the added value that a dedicated resource (i.e. the project manager role) has given** to both the Built Heritage Investment Group and the Climate Change Group.

Representatives from other Working Groups suggest their group would benefit from similar support – and there are calls for a similar role to be created for other groups. These are made in the context of a wider request for greater levels of resource to be provided to all Working Groups to support their activities.

Any such considerations would need to reflect **that not all Working Groups are the same – and any allocation of resources would need to reflect the varying remit, purpose, function, and size.** Notwithstanding this, there is merit in considering whether it is worth providing resources to support other Working Groups.

One **key issue that cuts across all the OPiT governance arrangements is about the effective engagement (or lack of effective engagement) with the local government sector.** This has always been an issue for OPiT and has not yet been resolved – addressing this is an important issue going forward.

There is **currently no formal mechanism/process to support collaboration and joined-up thinking across the Working Groups.** There are clear calls for a route through which the Working Group chairs can come together and focus on discussing OPiT specific issues. The most common suggestion is for an annual/biannual **meeting of the Chairs of the Strategy Working Groups.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Aim and Objectives of the Evaluation

- 1.1 Historic Environment Scotland commissioned DC Research in April 2019 to carry out an evaluation of the delivery and impact of Our Place in Time – The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland.
- 1.2 According to the project brief, the aim and objectives of the evaluation were as follows:

Aim:

The aim of this contract is to evaluate the delivery and impact of Our Place in Time (OPiT) to date. 2019 is mid-way year 5 of a 10 year strategy.

Objectives:

- a) To evaluate how far progress has been made in achieving the stated priorities of OPiT, using desk-based analysis and interviews; and evidenced by suitable impact data and case studies.
- b) To assess the strategic aims and priorities in OPiT and make recommendations on whether they are still fit for purpose for the remainder of the strategy period. If not, why not and how should they be improved? To identify areas for refining and for priority focus.
- c) To propose improvements to the OPiT measurement framework, governance structure, delivery mechanisms and role of HES and partners.

There is no appetite to refresh or re-write OPiT at this stage. Therefore it is anticipated that the recommendations from this review will inform the next phase of implementation by enhancing delivery over the next period of the strategy.

Context/Background to Our Place in Time

- 1.3 **Our Place in Time (OPiT)** is the Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland. OPiT was launched in 2014, with an overarching vision that:

"Scotland's historic environment is understood and valued, cared for and protected, enjoyed and enhanced. It is at the heart of a flourishing and sustainable Scotland and will be passed on with pride to benefit future generations."

- 1.4 Three high-level aims were set out through which the vision was to be realised:
 - **Understanding** – By investigating and recording our historic environment to continually develop our knowledge, understanding and interpretation of our past and how best to conserve, sustain and present it.
 - **Protecting** – By caring for and protecting the historic environment, ensuring that we can both enjoy and benefit from it and conserve and enhance it for the enjoyment and benefit of future generations.
 - **Valuing** – By sharing and celebrating the richness and significance of our historic environment, enabling us to enjoy the fascinating and inspirational diversity of our heritage.

- 1.5 The detail of the strategy included four key aims, each with a number of strategic priorities.

Key aim: To ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of our heritage continues to make a major contribution to the nation's wellbeing.

- Ensure that decision making is informed and that sound evidence-based information is available at all levels of decision making.
- Encourage high-quality leadership and collaborative working at all levels and facilitate the creation of partnerships to achieve outcomes that enhance the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of Scotland.
- Develop the skills and capacity at all levels that are needed to manage, nurture and enjoy the historic environment across all our communities.
- Mainstream the historic environment – ensuring the historic environment lies at the heart of a modern, dynamic Scotland.

Key aim: to investigate and record our historic environment to continually develop our knowledge, understanding and interpretation of our past and how best to conserve, sustain and present it.

- Continue to develop knowledge and apply new technologies and techniques to improve what we know, often through strategic partnerships, to aid our understanding of the historic environment.
- To make knowledge about our historic environment as accessible and useful as possible to the widest audience – and to ensure its long term preservation for future generations.

Key aim: to care for and protect the historic environment in order to both enjoy and benefit from it and to conserve and enhance it for the benefit of future generations.

- Continue to develop a holistic and sustainable approach to the management of the historic environment.
- Continue to apply (and develop) effective and proportionate protection and regulation with controls and incentives.
- Ensure capacity by supporting and enabling people to engage with the historic environment, making the values of the historic environment accessible to everyone.

Key aim: sharing and celebrating the richness and significance of our historic environment, enabling us to enjoy the fascinating and inspirational diversity of our heritage.

- Enhance participation through encouraging greater access to and interpretation and understanding of the significance of the historic environment.
- Continue to develop a broad-ranging approach to learning to grow understanding and active participation across all groups in society.
- Support historic environment tourism and encourage access by making full use of our heritage assets to promote Scotland to domestic and international audiences.

- 1.6 In terms of delivery, the original 2014 strategy also set out how the collective success of the strategy would be measured ('Measuring Success') as well as the delivery model and governance arrangements that would be developed for the delivery of the strategy.

- 1.7 These arrangements were reviewed (the review was initiated in December 2015 and reported on in the OPiT Annual Report 2017) and as a result changes were made to the delivery model for OPiT, including standing down and introducing groups, reconfiguring the thematic working groups, and confirming the arrangements for 'Measuring Success'.
- 1.8 In May 2017, the Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF) approved a new OPiT Performance Framework. This Framework was retrospectively applied to the earlier years of the Strategy (OPiT Performance Report 2017) and has been used as the basis for reporting performance since then (OPiT Performance Report 2017 and OPiT Annual Performance Report 2018).
- 1.9 The current delivery and governance arrangements for OPiT include SHEF, five Strategy Working Groups, and the Chief Executives' Forum – with HES leading and enabling delivery of OPiT.
- 1.10 In terms of the remit and purpose of SHEF and the Chief Executive's Forum:
- The **Strategic Historic Environment Forum** is responsible for championing Scotland's historic environment by providing strategic advice and direction on its management and promotion. The Forum meets twice a year and is chaired by the Cabinet Secretary of Culture, Tourism and External Affairs. The Forum promotes Our Place in Time by: encouraging and celebrating collaboration and leadership at all levels across the sector; working in partnership on issues of national importance; aligning activities and resources to deliver agreed priorities.
 - The **Chief Executives' Forum** monitors the progress of Our Place in Time and addresses issues and concerns in the delivery of the strategy. The Forum is responsible for ensuring momentum is maintained in delivering the strategy and identifies common threads and emerging themes. Chaired by the Chief Executive of Historic Environment Scotland, the Forum comprises Chief Executives or equivalents from key organisations involved in the delivery of Our Place in Time. These organisations include Museum Galleries Scotland, Scottish Natural Heritage, Historic Houses, Built Environment Forum Scotland and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.
- 1.11 The five current Strategy Working Groups are:
- Built Heritage Investment Group
 - Climate Change Group
 - Heritage Tourism Group
 - Skills and Expertise Group
 - Volunteering Group

A summary of the remit and overview of membership is provided overleaf – the full membership list for each of the Working Groups is provided in Annex 3 to this report.

Built Heritage Investment Group

The Built Heritage Investment Group's purpose is to develop a national infrastructure investment plan for Scotland's historic built environment. It will achieve this by working in collaboration with public, private and voluntary sector partners.

The group is chaired by David Mitchell, Director of Conservation at Historic Environment Scotland, and comprises members from: The National Trust for Scotland; Historic Houses; Scottish Canals; The National Lottery Heritage Fund; other organisations involved in managing or investing in Scotland's built heritage.

Climate Change

The Climate Change Group works collaboratively across public, private and voluntary sectors to improve energy efficiency and climate change adaptation in traditional buildings.

The group is chaired by Ewan Hyslop, Head of Technical Research and Science at Historic Environment Scotland and comprises members from: Archaeology Scotland; Church of Scotland; National Trust for Scotland; Institute for Historic Building Conservation; other organisations from the historic environment or involved in climate change support.

Heritage Tourism Group

The Heritage Tourism Group explores how to grow the overall value of heritage tourism in Scotland.

The group is chaired by Stephen Duncan, Director of Commercial and Tourism at Historic Environment Scotland, and comprises members from: Visit Scotland; The National Trust for Scotland; Historic Houses; other heritage tourism organisations

The group works collaboratively with public, private and voluntary sector partners to deliver the ambition and targets of Heritage Tourism 2020, People Make Heritage. It aims to grow actual heritage tourism expenditure to £1.7 billion by 2020 by broadening the appeal of heritage experiences to new and existing markets.

Skills and Expertise Group

The Skills and Expertise Group works to identify the existing and future skills needs of the sector. It focuses on developing initiatives that address those needs and functions as the steering group for the development of the first Historic Environment Skills Investment Plan.

The group is chaired by Alex Paterson, Chief Executive of Historic Environment Scotland, and comprises members from: Skills Development Scotland; Scottish Funding Council; Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA); other organisations involved in skills development in the historic environment sector and beyond.

Volunteering Group

The Volunteering Group's purpose is to demonstrate and promote the value of volunteering to the historic environment. It aims to establish ways for individuals, communities and organisations to get involved and stay engaged.

The group is chaired by George Thomson, Chief Executive of Volunteer Scotland, and comprises members from: Historic Environment Scotland; Museums and Galleries Scotland; Scottish Civic Trust; other organisations involved in promoting volunteering in the historic environment.

The group works collaboratively with Heritage Volunteer Organisers Scotland and is taking forward recommendations from the Volunteering and the Historic Environment report.

Source: https://www.historicenvironment.scot/about-us/who-we-are/our-place-in-time/#working-groups_tab

- 1.12 Given HES’s role in leading and enabling delivery of OPiT, the new Corporate Plan is also an important aspect of the policy context for this evaluation.
- 1.13 Historic Environment Scotland’s Corporate Plan for 2019 onwards **‘Heritage for All’** sets out a vision and five outcomes that HES wants to achieve that will help it realise the vision:

“The historic environment is cherished, understood, shared and enjoyed with pride, by everyone.”

1. The historic environment makes a real difference to people’s lives
2. The historic environment is looked after, protected and managed for the generations to come
3. The historic environment makes a broader contribution to the economy of Scotland and its people
4. The historic environment inspires a creative and vibrant Scotland
5. The historic environment is cared for and championed by a high-performing organisation

- 1.14 The links to OPiT are clear in the Corporate Plan, both explicitly and through the links between the Corporate Plan’s five outcomes and the aims of OPiT, as well as the overlap between the Corporate Plan’s Key Performance Indicators and the Key Performance Indicators in OPiT’s Performance Framework.

Key Evaluation Tasks

- 1.15 The evaluation involved carrying out the following key tasks:
- A range of **desk-based research activities**, including: a review of key strategic documents, publications, and relevant papers; a review of annual reports and other performance related publications, data & information; and an assessment of impact data and OPiT case studies.
 - **One-to-one, face-to-face consultations** with key individuals involved in OPiT were carried out. A total of **16 individuals were consulted** and the list of consultees is included in Annex 1 to this report.
 - In addition, **observation and group discussion** took place with one of the OPiT Working Groups (the Built Heritage Investment Group) during the evaluation.
 - An **online survey** was developed and implemented to provide the opportunity for other individuals (not directly consulted) to engage in the evaluation. This includes both those that are represented on the various OPiT governance groups that were not consulted on a one-to-one/group basis, as well as the wider historic environment sector¹. A **total of 73 responses** were received to the survey, and a summary of the findings in included in Annex 2 to this report.

¹ Survey promotion and dissemination was supported by BEFS - <https://www.befs.org.uk/>, and their efforts in this regard are very much appreciated.

Structure of Report

- 1.16 This report is the Draft Final Report for the Evaluation (produced in August 2019) and is structured as follows:
- **Section 2** focuses on the first of the three evaluation objectives and reports on the **progress so far against the current OPiT Aims and Priorities**.
 - **Section 3** focuses on the second of the three evaluation objectives and **assesses the current strategic aims and priorities in OPiT** – considering whether they are still fit for purpose and identifying any areas for improvement, refinement or priority.
 - **Section 4** focuses on the third of the three evaluation objectives and assesses and considers the issues around, as well as proposing improvements where appropriate, to the **OPiT measurement framework, governance structure, delivery mechanisms** and role of HES and partners.
 - **Annex 1** provides a **list of the individuals and groups consulted** as part of the evaluation.
 - **Annex 2** provides a **summary of the results of the survey** carried out as part of the evaluation.
 - **Annex 3** provides a **list of the members** of each of the OPiT Working Groups.

2. ACHIEVEMENTS OF OPiT – PROGRESS SO FAR

Section 2 Introduction

2.1 This section of the report focuses on the first of the three evaluation objectives and reports on the progress so far against the current OPiT Aims and Priorities. This is considered in two aspects - first, the overall achievements of OPiT are considered, followed by consideration of the specific aims and priorities of OPiT.

Overall Progress with OPiT

- 2.2 Overall, there is a **clear consensus, from the majority of consultees, that there is now good progress with OPiT**. This is supported by the results of the survey which also found that progress is following expectations in terms of what has been achieved so far.
- 2.3 Whilst progress is now considered to be good, there is **widespread acknowledgement that progress around OPiT was limited, or slow, in the first couple of years of the strategy**.
- 2.4 There are a range of explanatory and contextual factors mentioned in relation to this limited early progress – not least of which is the establishment of Historic Environment Scotland itself – which did not formally take place until after OPiT was launched. Given the lead and enabling role that HES has with regard to OPiT, it is not surprising that more progress has been made since HES has been able to fulfil its lead and enabling role.
- 2.5 Particular mention is given by consultees to the **improved rate of progress with OPiT since the review of governance arrangements and subsequent changes that took place in 2017**. This involved the reconfiguration of the governance structures and working groups, and there is overwhelming consensus from the evaluation consultations that the changes that took place due to this review were a positive step.
- 2.6 Alongside the notable changes that resulted from the review, there have been ongoing changes around governance and delivery too – including the more recent changes to the membership of SHEF, the ongoing evolution and development of the membership of some of the Working Groups, as well as the appointment of a project manager role to support two of the Working Groups (Built Heritage Investment Group and Climate Change Group) – which has been very well received.
- 2.7 When reflecting on the operation of the original OPiT Working Groups, they were commonly described by consultees as ‘talking shops’ – where there was notable discussion but limited achievement. With the greater focus, clearer remit, and clearer purpose of the groups following the review – as well as a broadening of membership of some of the groups – things are now progressing well according to consultees.

- 2.8 The development of the strategy itself was described by one consultee as being ‘forged through extensive consultation’ – something which captures a general view about this process, and which is regarded as a positive process by those involved.
- 2.9 In terms of overall achievements, **the very existence of OPiT – a national strategy for the historic environment sector in Scotland – is clearly seen as a good thing in and of itself** by consultees. This has had a **positive impact on the awareness and perceptions of the priorities for the historic environment sector both within the sector and outside of the sector**. OPiT helps give an increased profile to the historic environment sector and can sit alongside other similar national strategies – helping to ensure that the historic environment sector is represented at this level.
- 2.10 Also, it is well recognised that the **existence of OPiT and the surrounding arrangements ensure that there is active political leadership and involvement** through the role of the Cabinet Secretary as the Chair of SHEF – and this is clearly seen as a good thing for the sector.
- 2.11 In addition, **OPiT provides a framework through which a collective approach can be taken** by the historic environment sector to a wide range of issues.
- 2.12 The role of OPiT in this regard – as a framework, also described as a ‘tool’ or ‘mechanism’ by consultees – is one of the most common themes emerging from the consultations around the achievements of OPiT.
- 2.13 As well as being described as a ‘framework’, a ‘tool’, and a ‘mechanism’ through which the historic environment sector can work, phrases such as ‘common direction’, ‘common language’ and ‘collective ownership’ were also used by consultees and survey respondents to describe OPiT.
- 2.14 In this way, one of the benefits of OPiT is that it operates as a tool/mechanism/framework to enable the historic environment sector to initiate conversations and discussions that help to deliver common goals. For some, it is also a **reference point for the mainstreaming agenda**, using the common voice of the historic environment sector through OPiT to engage with other sectors (e.g. through their engagement in the Working Groups – see below).
- 2.15 For the Scottish Government, the National Performance Framework outcomes are the priority – and consultees therefore recognise that the contribution of the historic environment to wider society through these outcomes is key. Therefore, the role of OPiT can also be to support and encourage the historic environment sector to be outward looking and engage outside of the sector.
- 2.16 There is also international recognition of OPiT. Some consultees note that the existence of a national strategy for the historic environment has raised the profile of the sector within Scotland at an international level – with other nations being interested in the development and implementation of such a strategy.

- 2.17 However, for some consultees, whilst the use of OPiT as a framework as described above is useful, it does raise issues about the extent to which OPiT currently does, or should, provide a stronger, clearer strategic direction for the sector.
- 2.18 Effectively, some consultees question whether OPiT should be 'more focused' and 'less broad' or 'less vague' – with **calls for the strategy to be updated to reflect the changed context** since it was written in 2014, as well as to **highlight key opportunities and threats** for the sector, and to **clearly prioritise actions and activities** going forward.
- 2.19 These calls for a more focused, clearly prioritised direction and approach would evolve OPiT from its current role – around what one consultee described as 'a shared space for agreed purposes' where OPiT and its governance arrangements are effectively an enabler – supporting and providing an overarching structure within which and through which activities can be delivered.
- 2.20 These issues are considered in more detail in Section 3 of this report when the aims and priorities in OPiT are assessed.
- 2.21 In terms of other progress and achievements, **OPiT is helping to get the voice of the historic environment sector heard outside of the sector itself and enabling the sector to work more closely with a wider range of organisations.** There is clear progress here, and the membership of the Working Groups themselves (see Annex 3) shows the level of engagement and collaboration both within and outside of the historic environment sector that is taking place through the OPiT groups.
- 2.22 The networks within and outside of the historic environment sector are supported by the existence of the Strategy Working Groups – which help 'bring people to the table' – and as such, the role of OPiT and the Working Groups in providing a rationale and mechanism for bringing people together is useful.
- 2.23 However, there **is clear acknowledgement from the consultations that there is a lot more to be done around 'mainstreaming'** – which is one of the key cross-cutting aims of OPiT, and something that is well recognised as a key priority. Whilst its importance is recognised in both the consultations and the survey responses, it is one of the most commonly acknowledged areas where there is more work to be done to achieve notable success.
- 2.24 Some consultees have highlighted that the potential to influence mainstream government policy (from within Government) is more challenging as a result of the loss of the Historic Environment Policy Unit (HEPU) within Scottish Government. This unit was in place when OPiT was launched, but this is no longer the case.
- 2.25 OPiT has also provided a framework through which HES is better able to work in partnership. Feedback from external partners involved in OPiT highlight that **OPiT has helped changed the way that HES interacts with the rest of the historic environment sector**, and partners highlight

that there is now a **better sense of collaboration from HES**. Partners note that OPiT has helped HES to be more outward-looking and has changed the outlook of HES around working in partnership.

- 2.26 Some external partners would welcome clarity on the decisions by HES about when to use OPiT (or not) as the framework through which sector issues are developed. Partners note that HES uses OPiT to develop the approach for some issues, but not for others – and feel that greater clarity on this would be helpful.
- 2.27 One issue raised by some consultees was about the extent of awareness of OPiT - both generally and, in particular, for those not actively involved in the OPiT delivery/governance arrangements. The evaluation survey sought to explore this issue and asked respondents about their general awareness of OPiT, their awareness of the specific priorities of OPiT, their knowledge of the structures and delivery arrangements for OPiT, and any involvement in governance and delivery groups for OPiT.
- 2.28 The full survey results are included in Annex 2², and the main findings were:
- **86%** of survey respondents **described their general awareness of Our Place in Time as** either **'highly aware'** (47%) or **'moderately aware'** (39%).
 - **70%** of survey respondents **said that they had 'very good' (26%) or 'moderate' (44%) awareness of the specific priorities of OPiT.**
 - **Just over half (51%)** of survey respondents **described their knowledge of the structures and delivery arrangements of OPiT as 'highly aware' (18%) or 'moderately aware' (33%).**
- 2.29 Overall, this shows that general awareness of OPiT is high amongst survey respondents, as is awareness of the specific priorities of OPiT. Knowledge of the structures and delivery arrangements for OPiT is lower, with almost as many respondents (49%) having 'limited awareness', 'very little awareness' or being 'not at all aware' as those who were 'highly' or 'moderately' aware (51%).
- 2.30 These results can be disaggregated to compare the responses between those that are involved in OPiT governance and delivery groups and those that are not (see Tables A2.1A, A2.2A, and A2.3A in Annex 2 for the full results). The key findings are:
- In terms of **general awareness, those involved in OPiT groups are more likely to be 'highly' or 'moderately' aware (94%) than those that are not involved (80%).** Those not involved in OPiT groups show higher levels reporting 'very little awareness' or being 'not at all aware' (15% compared to no-one (i.e. 0%) of those involved in OPiT groups.

² Annex 2 also provides an overview of the survey in terms of the survey approaches used, the survey invitees, the response levels, and the mix/type of survey respondents.

- In terms of **awareness of the specific priorities of OPiT**, there is **very little difference between the two groups at the higher levels of awareness**. For those that are involved in OPiT groups, 72% have 'very good' or 'moderate' awareness whilst for those not involved, 70% have 'very good' or 'moderate' awareness. Again, those not involved are more likely to report 'very little awareness' or being 'not at all aware' (20% compared to 0%).
- Not surprisingly, **knowledge of the structure and delivery arrangements for OPiT is clearly higher amongst those that are involved in OPiT groups** – 69% are highly or moderately aware compared to 38% of those that are not involved in any OPiT groups. Given this, as expected, those that are not involved in OPiT groups more commonly report 'limited', 'very little' or being 'not at all aware' of the structure and delivery arrangements – 63% compared to 31% of those that are involved in OPiT groups.

2.31 These results show that, for survey respondents, general awareness is high overall (more than 80%) and is higher still for those that are involved in OPiT groups (over 90%). Understanding of the specific priorities of OPiT is also good (70%+) with very little difference between those involved in OPiT groups and those that are not. Knowledge of the structures and delivery arrangements for OPiT does vary more notably between those that are involved in OPiT groups and those that are not (69% compared to 38%).

2.32 In conclusion, general and specific awareness of OPiT is good amongst all survey respondents – and in terms of both general awareness and understanding of specific OPiT priorities, this holds true irrespective of whether respondents are involved in OPiT groups or not³.

Working Groups

2.33 As noted above, there is now more momentum and greater levels of activity around the various Strategy Working Groups - following the 2017 review.

2.34 In terms of progress at the Working Group level, by end of this current year (2019) the Working Groups will all have produced tangible outputs. Some examples of current/recent activities include:

- The **Skills Investment Plan for Scotland's Historic Environment Sector** – which was produced/launched earlier in 2019 – was developed through the **Skills and Expertise Group**.
- The **Built Heritage Investment Plan** is due to be published in November 2019 – and is being developed through four workstreams of activity operating within the **Built Heritage Investment Group**.

³ The only caveat to these findings is that it would be expected that individuals who would choose to respond to the survey are more likely to have some level of awareness - otherwise they would choose not to respond. As such, these results are not likely to capture the wider view of those that are not at all involved in/aware of OPiT.

- An '**Impacts Guide**' is currently being developed by the **Climate Change Group** and is due to be published later in 2019.
- The **Volunteering Group** is working on the **Volunteering Participation Campaign** that is currently in development.
- The **Heritage Tourism Group** has focused activities around the themed years and will be contributing to the development of the new **National Tourism Strategy** – aiming to ensure that heritage tourism is well represented.

2.35 **OPiT has also been identified as having an influence on other strategies** that have been developed – including 'For All Our Futures' the HES Corporate Plan 2016-19; 'Heritage For All' – HES Corporate Plan 2019 Onwards; National Trust for Scotland's Strategy for Protecting Scotland's Heritage 2018-23; Scotland's Archaeology Strategy 2015; as well as the development of a joint common statement on 'Landscape and the Historic Environment' in 2016.

2.36 However, in relation to the mainstreaming priority, it is interesting to note that **these examples** – identified through the desk research, consultations and survey for this evaluation – **are of strategies that operate within the historic environment sector**. Whilst they provide examples of the role of OPiT in influencing the activities and strategic direction within the sector, it would be **examples of influence on strategies outside of the historic environment sector that would provide stronger evidence of success around mainstreaming**.

2.37 In terms of the operation of the various OPiT Working Groups, the survey sought the views of respondents about the operation of the Working Groups (and SHEF and the CEO Forum) on a range of aspects. The results are summarised below and are presented in more detail within Annex 2.

2.38 The key findings were as follows:

- The **vast majority of respondents (89%) agree that the group(s) they are involved in do have a clear remit/objectives**. 30% 'strongly agree' and 59% 'agree', and no-one from any group disagrees.
- In terms of delivering against the remit/objectives, the results are positive but not as strong - the majority **(59%) of respondents agree that their groups/forum have delivered against its remit/objectives** – 5% strongly agree and 54% agree. Of the remainder, 30% neither agree nor disagree and 11% disagree.
- **81% of respondents agree that the group(s)/forum they are involved in have appropriate membership/representation** (11% strongly agree and 70% agree). The remaining respondents neither agreed nor disagreed – showing that no-one from any of the groups disagreed with this statement.
- More than three-quarters of respondents **(78%) agree that the group/forum represents a good use of their/their organisation's**

time (14% strongly agree and 64% agree). Only a small minority (6%) disagree with the statement.

- **76% of respondents agree that the group/forum meetings are working effectively** (6% strongly agree and 70% agree), with just 9% disagreeing with this statement.
- **More than two-thirds of respondents (68%) stated they agree that the group/forum communications and information sharing is effective** (9% strongly agree and 59% agree), with 30% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

- 2.39 Overall, these are positive results, with more than two-thirds of respondents agreeing with all except two of the statements – the exceptions being the extent to which the group/forum has delivered against its remit/objectives and the effectiveness of communications and information sharing for the group. These two issues still do have the majority of respondents agreeing with the statements, but to a lesser extent than the other aspects.
- 2.40 Some members of the more recent Working Groups note that there has been slower progress due to working in partnership and keeping everyone involved in the activity of the Working Groups, which takes more time.
- 2.41 For many of the Working Groups the next step – i.e. implementing and realising the relevant plan(s) is the key challenge. This is recognised as the difficult aspect – and OPiT is not quite at this stage yet for any of the established/emerging plans.
- 2.42 OPiT has clearly helped to achieve a lot of the softer foundations according to consultees and is moving in the right direction. However, it is not there yet in terms of clear impacts and achievements – and there is more to do here going forward. This position is not surprising given that this evaluation has taken place at the mid-point of OPiT (i.e. in year 5 of a 10-year strategy).

OPiT Progress Against Specific Aims & Priorities

- 2.43 In terms of progress against the specific aims and priorities of OPiT, this is captured on an ongoing basis through the OPiT Performance Framework.
- 2.44 As mentioned in Section 1, the Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF) approved the new OPiT Performance Framework in May 2017. The Framework was retrospectively applied to the earlier years of the Strategy (OPiT Performance Report 2017) and has been used as the basis for reporting performance since then (OPiT Performance Report 2017 and OPiT Annual Performance Report 2018⁴, with the 2019 Report due to published in late 2019/early 2020).
- 2.45 There was a notable and, for some consultees, prolonged process around the considerations about the approach to take for the Performance Framework for OPiT. This activity took place through the Measuring Success Working Group, and ultimately the findings from that Group were used to inform the final framework which was led/developed by a small number of HES staff.
- 2.46 However, whilst prolonged, the process of developing the thinking and approach through the Measuring Success Working Group did allow those involved to develop an appreciation of the key issues around measuring the success of OPiT, and helped to create a consensus about the approach to be taken.
- 2.47 The overall approach – which uses thirteen Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to assess the direction of travel (i.e. using directional targets – increase/maintain/decrease) rather than specific, quantifiable targets – is considered both by those that were directly involved in the development of the Framework and by other consultees to be appropriate for OPiT given the level at which OPiT operates – i.e. at the higher, strategic level.
- 2.48 The combination of specific measures, contextual data and case studies that are used as the key sources of evidence works well – and the case studies are recognised as being a useful part of the Performance Framework – something that helps OPiT ensure it has an inclusive process/approach where individual organisations and projects can submit cases and reflect on where their activities fit within, and contribute towards, the aims and priorities of OPiT.
- 2.49 The list of 13 KPIs is set out in Figure 2.1.

⁴ https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/?publication_type=56

Figure 2.1: OPiT Key Performance Indicators

OPiT: Themes, Priorities and Indicators			
Theme	Priorities	No.	Indicators
CROSS-CUTTING: Strategic	Mainstreaming	01	Increase economic and social wellbeing benefits from the historic environment for the people of Scotland
		02	Improve the environment by reducing CO2 emissions
	Informed decision making	03	Increasingly historic environment evidence informs priorities
	Leadership and shared working	04	Increase joined up working on strategic investment across the public, private and voluntary sectors
	Skills and capacity	05	Improve skills and capacity to deliver priorities
UNDERSTAND: Investigate and Record	Knowledge development	06	Increase customer focus of knowledge created on the historic environment
	Accessible knowledge	07	Improve access to knowledge on the historic environment
PROTECT: Care and Protect	Holistic and sustainable approach	08	Improve or maintain the state of Scotland's historic sites and places
	Effective and proportionate protection and regulation	09	Increasingly the outcomes of management, including designation, reflects what people value
	Ensuring capacity	10	Improve capacity by supporting communities through community empowerment and engagement
VALUE: Share and Celebrate	Enhance Participation	11	Increase the number and range of people volunteering in the historic environment
	Broad ranging approach to learning	12	Increase the number and range of people who learn about the historic environment
	Tourism	13	Increase the number and range of people visiting the historic environment

Source: Our Place in Time Annual Performance Report 2018, p.5

- 2.50 Overall, the development of the OPiT Performance Framework has been well received, and feedback from consultees is positive about the approach that has been taken, and there is clear acknowledgement that it is regarded as an appropriate approach for OPiT.
- 2.51 Whilst it is well-accepted that the approach taken with the Performance Framework is appropriate, it is important to acknowledge that **the Framework effectively captures the overall direction of travel of the wider historic environment sector across these indicators and sets it within the framework of the OPiT aims and priorities** – rather than

being explicitly about what is being achieved by, or directly attributed to, the OPiT delivery mechanisms and governance arrangements. The extent to which OPiT (the strategy itself and/or the governance and delivery arrangements) is responsible for or directly contributing towards the directional targets will vary from indicator to indicator.

2.52 The survey asked respondents to identify how much progress has been made so far for each of the four aims of OPiT, and the results are shown below in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Please identify how much progress you think has been made so far (i.e. at the mid-point (year 5) of the 10 year strategy) for each of the four key aims of Our Place in Time:

	Progress so far is above expectations		Progress so far is as expected		Progress so far is below expectations		Total
Cross-cutting: To ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of our heritage continues to make a major contribution to the nation’s wellbeing.	2.7%	1	78.4%	29	18.9%	7	37
Understand: To investigate and record our historic environment to continually develop our knowledge, understanding and interpretation of our past and how best to conserve, sustain and present it.	5.4%	2	75.7%	28	18.9%	7	37
Protect: To care for and protect the historic environment in order to both enjoy and benefit from it and to conserve and enhance it for the benefit of future generations.	2.7%	1	70.3%	26	27.0%	10	37
Value: Sharing and celebrating the richness and significance of our historic environment, enabling us to enjoy the fascinating and inspirational diversity of our heritage.	13.9%	5	72.2%	26	13.9%	5	36
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=37							

2.53 These results show that for all four aims, **the majority of respondents report that progress so far is as expected with more than 70% of respondents stating this for each aim.** The aim with the greatest number of respondents stating that progress is below expectations is *‘Protect: To care for and protect the historic environment in order to both enjoy and benefit from it and to conserve and enhance it for the benefit of future generations.’* with more than one-quarter reporting this.

2.54 The survey also asked respondents how much progress they think will be made by the end of the strategy for each of the four aims of OPiT and Table 2.2 shows the results.

Table 2.2: Please identify how much progress you think will be made by the end of the strategy for each of the four key aims of Our Place in Time:

	Likely to deliver by end of 10-year strategy		At risk of not delivering by end of 10-year strategy		Total
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	
Cross-cutting: To ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of our heritage continues to make a major contribution to the nation’s wellbeing.	62.5%	20	37.5%	12	32
Understand: To investigate and record our historic environment to continually develop our knowledge, understanding and interpretation of our past and how best to conserve, sustain and present it.	67.7%	21	32.3%	10	31
Protect: To care for and protect the historic environment in order to both enjoy and benefit from it and to conserve and enhance it for the benefit of future generations.	51.6%	16	48.4%	15	31
Value: Sharing and celebrating the richness and significance of our historic environment, enabling us to enjoy the fascinating and inspirational diversity of our heritage.	75.0%	24	25.0%	8	32
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=32					

- 2.55 These results show that whilst **more than half of respondents think that OPiT is likely to deliver on each of the key aims by the end of the strategy**, the proportion does vary across aims - with 75% of respondents stating that the ‘Value’ aim is likely to deliver by the end of the strategy, whilst just over half (52%) report that the ‘Protect’ aim is likely to deliver by the end of the strategy.
- 2.56 The **greatest area of concern from the consultations is about ‘mainstreaming’ as the cross-cutting strategic priority that has not yet been delivered and is at risk of not being delivered by OPiT**. When consultees talk about mainstreaming in this regard, it is often related to the issues around KPI 3 (i.e. around informed decision making – and informing policy) and KPI 4 (i.e. leadership and shared working – and increasing joined up working on strategic investment) rather than the two KPIs that are under the mainstreaming-titled priority (KPIs 1 and 2).
- 2.57 An up-to-date summary of the Performance Framework is included in the forthcoming (2019) Annual Report - the 2019 Report is due to be published in late 2019/early 2020 and a draft version has been made available for the evaluation. Given that the 2019 Report will be published later this year and uses up-to-date data, there is no merit in the evaluation carrying out the

same activity – and the summary results from the 2019 Report are therefore used below. Any issues around potential changes/improvements to the OPiT Performance Framework are addressed in Section 4 of this report.

- 2.58 Figure 2.2 presents an extract from this forthcoming report and shows the most recently reported performance for each indicator, and the change over time from 2017 to 2019.
- 2.59 Figure 2.2 shows that the majority of the KPIs are on track, with only two (KPI3 and KPI4) being ranked as Amber in the 2019 Report. In addition to which no evidence gaps are reported – with evidence gaps identified in previous reports having been addressed to varying extents.
- 2.60 These results align with the findings of the evaluation consultations, and the survey results presented in this report. However, there are a number of issues to consider in terms of the ongoing achievements of OPiT – which will influence the extent to which OPiT will deliver against its aims and priorities within the lifetime of the strategy.
- 2.61 As noted earlier in this section, **for many of the Working Groups it is the next step – i.e. implementing and delivering the relevant plan(s) that have been/are being developed that will be the key challenge.** This is recognised by consultees as a critical aspect – and OPiT is not yet at this stage for any of the established/emerging plans.
- 2.62 It is well **recognised by consultees that OPiT has clearly helped to achieve many of the softer foundations and is moving in the right direction** (especially since the 2017 review was implemented). However, it is not there yet in terms of clear impacts and achievements – and there is more to do here to make this happen.
- 2.63 The current stage of OPiT, well recognised by many consultees, and summed up in discussions with one consultee who reflected on the fact that OPiT is now ‘at the end of start’ rather than ‘the start of the end’ – i.e. much of the groundwork has been done, the Working Groups are now operating effectively and various plans have been or are being developed – but the key next stage is about implementation. This issue is well recognised and in the words of another consultee – ‘the closer you get to implementation, the less that has been achieved so far’.

Figure 2.2: OPiT Key Performance Indicators: Results 2017 to 2019

	Priority	No	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	RAG 2017	RAG 2018	RAG 2019
Cross Cutting	Mainstreaming	01	Increase economic and social wellbeing benefits from the historic environment for the people of Scotland	Green	Green	Green
	Mainstreaming	02	Improve the environment by reducing CO2 emissions	Green	Green	Green
	Informed decision making	03	Increasingly historic environment evidence informs policy	Evidence Gap	Amber	Amber
	Leadership & shared working	04	Increase joined up working on strategic investment across public, private and voluntary sectors	Amber	Amber	Amber
	Skills & capacity	05	Improve skills and capacity to deliver priorities	Amber	Green	Green
Understand	Knowledge development	06	Increase customer focus of knowledge created on the historic environment	Green	Green	Green
	Accessible knowledge	07	Improve access to knowledge on the historic environment	Green	Green	Green
Protect	Holistic and sustainable approach	08	Improve or maintain the state of Scotland's historic sites and places	Green	Green	Green
	Effective & proportionate protection and regulation	09	Increasingly the outcomes of management, including designation, reflects what people value	Evidence Gap	Green	Green
	Ensuring capacity	10	Improve capacity by supporting communities through community empowerment and engagement	Evidence Gap	Green	Green
Value	Enhance participation	11	Increase the number and range of people volunteering in the historic environment	Green	Green	Green
	Broad ranging approach to learning	12	Increase the number and range of people who learn about the historic environment	Green	Green	Green
	Tourism	13	Increase the number and range of people visiting the historic environment	Green	Green	Green

Source: Our Place in Time, Annual Performance Report 2019 (forthcoming)

3. ASSESSMENT OF STRATEGIC AIMS AND PRIORITIES

Section 3 Introduction

- 3.1 This section of the report focuses on the second of the three evaluation objectives and assesses the current strategic aims and priorities in OPiT – reporting on the findings of the evaluation and giving consideration to the extent to which the aims and priorities are still fit for purpose, as well as identifying any areas for improvement, refinement or priority.
- 3.2 It should be noted that the findings presented in this section, and the relevant aspects of the consultations and survey that informed it, reflect the remit of this evaluation (see Section 1) – which noted that *"There is no appetite to refresh or re-write OPiT at this stage. Therefore it is anticipated that the recommendations from this review will inform the next phase of implementation by enhancing delivery over the next period of the strategy."*

Assessment of OPiT Aims and Priorities

- 3.3 There is a **strong consensus from consultees that the current aims and priorities within OPiT are appropriate**, and that there is **no need to reconsider the overall aims and priorities of the strategy at this stage**.
- 3.4 Many consultees recognise that OPiT works well as an overarching framework (as discussed in Section 2), and that the strategy is only five years old at this point. The general view is that the **strategy should be allowed to run its course** rather than making any notable changes at this stage.
- 3.5 Within this, **OPiT is described** (implicitly or explicitly) by many consultees **as being 'motherhood and apple pie'** – i.e. the aims and priorities are sufficiently broad and wide-ranging and reflect aspects that the sector wants to achieve, that no one would disagree with what it sets out as the key aims and priorities. This perspective is recognised as both a benefit but also a challenge for OPiT.
- 3.6 One of the benefits of the current aims and priorities is that they are open to interpretation to such an extent that the wider sector is able to 'hang lots of things underneath' the overarching OPiT framework.
- 3.7 The high level, and breadth, of OPiT is well recognised – and consultees typically feel this works for what OPiT seeks to achieve. **OPiT has helped to provide common themes and a framework around which HES and external partners and stakeholders can align strategic planning** and the development of other strategies, and OPiT helps to give a broader perspective to these more specific strategies and plans.
- 3.8 Within this, **OPiT provides a common language that can be used by the sector** – and this is recognised as a positive aspect and there are examples of OPiT's influence on a range of other strategies/plans (see Section 2 for a list of examples of this).

- 3.9 It is also recognised that **OPiT was developed through an inclusive approach** – where the historic environment sector was engaged and consulted with broadly during the development of the strategy. This process sought to develop **collective ownership and broader awareness of OPiT** – something that has been achieved according to the survey results presented in Section 2.
- 3.10 The common view is that OPiT works in terms of its aims and priorities so there is no need to change it at this stage – it is still relevant and appropriate.
- 3.11 However, for some consultees, whilst the use of OPiT as a framework as described above is useful, it does raise issues about the extent to which OPiT currently does, or should, provide a stronger, clearer strategic direction for the sector.
- 3.12 Effectively, these consultees question whether OPiT should be ‘more focused’ and ‘less broad’ or ‘less vague’ – with **calls for the strategy to be updated to reflect the changed context** since it was written in 2014, as well as to **highlight key opportunities and threats** for the sector, and to **clearly prioritise actions and activities** going forward.

Issues to Consider – Improvement, Refinement and Priority

- 3.13 On balance, the **findings from the evaluation clearly support maintaining the current strategic aims and priorities of OPiT.**
- 3.14 However, a **key issue to consider going forward for OPiT is the extent to which OPiT should consider becoming a more focused/targeted/prioritised strategy for the future** – one which better reflects the challenges facing the sector and the changes to the context that have occurred since it was launched in 2014.
- 3.15 The **calls for a more focused, clearly prioritised direction and approach would evolve OPiT from its current role** – around what one consultee described as ‘a shared space for agreed purposes’ where OPiT and its governance and delivery arrangements are effectively an *enabler* – supporting and providing an overarching structure within which, and through which, a range of activities can be delivered.
- 3.16 The **key consideration** is therefore **whether OPiT remains a broad framework** which enables a collective approach, provides a common language, and a common overarching direction around which there is collective ownership – in which case it can continue as it is. **If OPiT is intended to provide a strong and clear strategic direction and a clear lead around prioritisation** – then it **needs to evolve and be clearer about the specific priorities** and challenges to be addressed in the remaining years of the strategy.
- 3.17 **If it is the latter**, this does not necessitate a review/rewrite of the strategy itself – **such issues could be addressed via an ‘action plan’ or ‘prioritisation plan’ for OPiT** which would set out the specific priorities for the remainder of the strategy.

- 3.18 Beyond this key issue, any **future amendments to OPiT could also better reflect a range of priorities and challenges** around the following aspects – which were identified by consultees as areas that could or should be more clearly reflected within OPiT. This includes: the **well-being** agenda; the **communities/community empowerment** agenda; the **climate change emergency**; and **intangible heritage**. All of these areas have increased in priority and importance since OPiT was originally launched in 2014, and it will be important for them to be reflected in any future iteration of the OPiT strategy.
- 3.19 Finally, **given the importance of 'mainstreaming' as a priority for OPiT** alongside the challenges around achieving this (see Section 2), it **may be useful/helpful for OPiT to more clearly set out where the key responsibilities and actions around this lie within OPiT** – i.e. (i) who (within the OPiT governance and delivery arrangements) has responsibility for leading on this priority; (ii) what actions are being undertaken to achieve it; and (iii) what resources are being dedicated towards achieving it.

4. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT – SOME CONSIDERATIONS

Section 4 Introduction

4.1 This section of the report focuses on the third of the three evaluation objectives and assesses and considers the issues around, as well as proposing improvements where appropriate, to the OPiT measurement framework, governance structure, delivery mechanisms and role of HES and partners.

Summary of Governance and Delivery Arrangements

4.2 In general, the **evaluation findings are positive around the current governance structure and delivery mechanisms for OPiT**. There is good feedback from both consultees and survey respondents about the current arrangements, and **consultees commonly mention the changes that have come about following the 2017 review as a reference point for this current positive perspective**.

4.3 Some of the survey results (initially presented in Section 2 of this report), provide useful evidence of the positive views on the current arrangements from survey respondents:

- **89%** agree that the group(s)/forum they are involved in have a **clear remit/objectives**.
- **59%** agree that their group(s)/forum have **delivered against its remit/objectives**.
- **81%** agree that the group(s)/forum they are involved in have **appropriate membership/representation**.
- More than three-quarters of respondents (**78%**) agree that the group/forum represents a **good use of their/their organisation's time**.
- **76%** of respondents agree that the **group/forum meetings are working effectively**.
- More than two-thirds of respondents (**68%**) stated they agree that the group/forum **communications and information sharing is effective**.

4.4 There are some issues to consider and these are set out below in the remainder of this section, but they should be considered in the light of these overall positive perspectives on the current OPiT delivery and governance arrangements.

OPiT Performance Framework

4.5 As highlighted in Section 2, there is **overall consensus that the current Performance Framework arrangements are appropriate and are working well**. An approach that looks at the overall direction of travel is appropriate given that OPiT is a high-level strategy.

- 4.6 It is also recognised that it took some time to get to this point with the Performance Framework – whilst it was a slow process, on balance it was one that proved useful to help ensure the wider sector was engaged in and understood the approach.
- 4.7 The **case studies are recognised as a useful and important part of the Performance Framework** – and something that helps OPiT ensure it has an inclusive process/approach by allowing/enabling organisations and projects to submit cases and reflect on where their activities fit within, and contribute towards, the aims and priorities of OPiT.
- 4.8 One issue raised by a small number of consultees related to the data and case studies being ‘HES heavy’ in the earlier Performance Reports (i.e. 2017). Progress has been made on this in subsequent reports – with wider sources of data being requested/provided, and a broader range of organisations providing case studies. It is anticipated that the forthcoming 2019 Performance Report will include case studies from more than 60 different organisations.
- 4.9 Given (see Section 2) that the Performance Framework is about the direction of travel of the wider historic environment sector in relation to the 13 KPIs – and is not directly about the success of the governance and delivery structures of OPiT, there is clearly **overlap with the effort and work involved in producing the annual OPiT Performance Reports and the effort and work involved in developing/updating Scotland’s Historic Environment Audit (SHEA)** – which is produced biennially.
- 4.10 There is therefore **potential for the Performance Report and SHEA to be even more explicitly aligned** – to help avoid duplication of effort and/or duplication of reporting. This could include consideration about either producing the Performance Reports less frequently, or (more likely) providing less detail in the reports – and making greater use of appropriate cross-referencing to both SHEA⁵ and also the BEFS website⁶ for the case study examples.
- 4.11 One final consideration is based on feedback from some consultees who reflected on **whether the Performance Reports (as well as OPiT more generally) could be better promoted/publicised**. It would be useful to assess the scale of engagement with the Performance Reports (e.g. by analysing the traffic to, and downloads from, these specific pages on the HES website⁷). In addition, it may also be useful to consider producing a one-page infographic that captures the key Performance Report headlines – in a similar manner to the way in which one is produced for SHEA⁸.

⁵ <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/planning-and-guidance/scotland-s-historic-environment-audit/>

⁶ <https://www.befs.org.uk/resources/historic-environment-case-studies/>

⁷ <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/about-us/who-we-are/our-place-in-time/>;
https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/?publication_type=56

⁸ <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=7821f0c5-cf3f-4ecc-87e4-a9a601032e54>

Delivery Arrangements

- 4.12 Looking beyond the positive feedback on the OPiT delivery arrangements outlined earlier in this section and in Section 2, a very common theme emerged around the **strong, positive feedback about the added value that a dedicated resource (i.e. the project manager role) has given to both the Built Heritage Investment Group and the Climate Change Group.**
- 4.13 Representatives from both groups highlighted the contribution and benefit that having this type of support and capacity has provided to the activity and operation of the groups.
- 4.14 Not surprisingly, **representatives from other Working Groups suggest that their group(s) would benefit from similar support** – and there are calls for a similar type of role to be created for other groups. Some of these calls are made in the context of a wider request for there to be greater levels of resource provided to all of the Working Groups to support their activities and delivery.
- 4.15 However, any such considerations would need to reflect **that not all the Working Groups are the same** – in terms of remit, purpose, function, membership size, etc. – **and any allocation of such resources would need to reflect these varying remits.** Notwithstanding this, there is merit in considering whether it is worth providing some level of resources to support other Working Groups.
- 4.16 As noted above specifically around the Performance Reports, consultees highlighted issues around promotion/publicity of these reports – and some consultees feel that these also apply to OPiT more broadly – i.e. that **there could be greater awareness and publicity about the strategy itself as well as its progress and achievements.** However, the **survey findings from this evaluation found good levels of general awareness about OPiT** (albeit from a self-selecting group who are more likely to be aware given they chose to respond to the survey) and **therefore the extent to which any efforts to increase awareness and publicity are needed would require careful consideration.**

Governance Structures

- 4.17 As with the other aspects in this section, feedback on the governance structures of OPiT is largely positive from the evaluation consultations and the survey, but a small number of issues have been highlighted.
- 4.18 First, there was an emerging theme from the evaluation consultations and survey around the clarity of purpose for SHEF. The recent changes to the SHEF membership (i.e. a move away from individual members and towards the chairs of key delivery partners being represented) are expected to help address this, and **the fact that the Cabinet Secretary for Culture, Tourism and External Affairs chairs SHEF is seen as a very positive arrangement** (giving political ownership to, and adding value to, OPiT). However, there is a general consideration emerging from the primary research for this evaluation about the extent to which SHEF provides a

strategic steer/direction for OPiT, or whether this could be stronger. Reflecting on SHEF's remit (see Section 1), it is really a consideration about the extent to which SHEF is more likely to provide strategic advice in response to issues rather than set the strategic direction for OPiT. As mentioned above, it is expected that the recent changes to SHEF will help to address this issue, and such, it is for ongoing consideration rather than requiring any action at this moment in time.

- 4.19 Feedback on the workings of the CEO Forum and the various Strategy Working Groups is generally positive – and there are no group-specific issues that merit being highlighted here.
- 4.20 One **key/critical issue that cuts across all the OPiT governance arrangements is about the effective engagement (or lack of effective engagement) with the local government sector**. Whilst it is recognised that CoSLA is represented on SHEF, the CEO Forum, and some of the Working Groups, effective engagement with the local government sector has always been an issue for OPiT and has not yet been resolved.
- 4.21 There is no straightforward solution to this challenge – with previous attempts (such as establishing a Local Authority Historic Environment Group) having proved unsuccessful. However, **given the important role of local government within the historic environment sector it is something that should be addressed**.
- 4.22 **Consideration should be given to various options to engage the local government sector** – including (re) establishing a specific local authority group; providing opportunities for local authorities to engage (either on an ongoing basis, or an ad hoc basis on specific relevant issues) in current Working Groups; and/or more effectively engaging local authority representative groups - as well as other options such as an annual event/conference that could seek to engage local government within the broader OPiT structures.
- 4.23 One final issue that has been identified by many consultees involved in OPiT is that there is **currently no formal mechanism or process to support collaboration, crossover, and joined-up thinking across the various Strategy Working Groups**. Whilst the chairs of the groups will meet in other ways given their respective roles, there seems to be a clear call for a mechanism through which the chairs of the Working Groups can come together and focus on discussing OPiT specific issues. The most common suggestion/proposal to address this is for a **meeting of the Chairs of the Strategy Working Groups to take place** (potentially once or twice a year), although other options could be considered.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF CONSULTEES

Table 1: List of Consultees		
Name	Organisation	Role
Lucy Casot	Museums Galleries Scotland	Chief Executive Officer
Bryan Dickson	National Trust for Scotland	Head of Buildings Conservation (Policy)
Stephen Duncan	Historic Environment Scotland	Director of Commercial and Tourism (Chair of OPiT Strategy Working Group - Heritage Tourism)
Diarmid Hearn	National Trust for Scotland	Head of Policy
Andrew Hopetoun	Historic Houses Scotland	Chair
Ewan Hyslop	Historic Environment Scotland	Head of Technical Research & Science (Chair of OPiT Strategy Working Group - Climate Change)
Adam Jackson	Historic Environment Scotland	Head of Strategy and Policy, Development and Partnership
Euan Leitch	Built Environment Forum Scotland (BEFS)	Director
Denise Mattison	Historic Environment Scotland	Head of Corporate Analysis
David Mitchell	Historic Environment Scotland	Director of Conservation (Chair of OPiT Strategy Working Group - Built Heritage Investment)
Alex Paterson	Historic Environment Scotland	CEO of HES (Chair of OPiT Strategy Working Group - Skills and Expertise)
Karen Robertson	Historic Environment Scotland	Senior Research Manager, Corporate Analysis and Performance
George Thomson	Volunteer Scotland	Chief Executive Officer (Chair of OPiT Strategy Working Group - Volunteering)
Emily Tracey	Historic Environment Scotland	Project Manager for Built Heritage and Climate Change, Conservation Directorate
Alison Turnbull	Historic Environment Scotland	Director of Development and Partnerships
Russell Whyte	Historic Environment Scotland	Economic Adviser
Built Heritage Investment Group Meeting – 15 th May 2019		

ANNEX 2: SURVEY RESULTS

As part of the evaluation, an **online survey** was developed and implemented during July and August 2019 to provide the opportunity for other individuals (i.e. those not directly consulted through the one-to-one and group consultations) to engage in the evaluation.

The survey was aimed at both those represented on the various OPiT governance groups that were not consulted on a one-to-one/group basis, as well as the wider historic environment sector.

Direct email invites were sent to all the individuals represented on the various OPiT groups – some of these were sent directly by HES and others were sent by the evaluation study team.

In addition, survey promotion and dissemination to the wider historic environment sector was supported by Built Environment Forum Scotland (BEFS), and their efforts in this regard are very much appreciated.

A **total of 73 responses** were received to the survey, and a summary of the findings are presented below.

In terms of representativeness of respondents, Table A2.4 shows that 59% of respondents indicated they are not involved in any of the OPiT governance and delivery groups, with the resulting 41% being involved in one or more groups. This shows that **the survey generated responses from those directly involved in OPiT and also those in the wider historic environment sector (with more than half of responses being from the wider sector).**

In terms of sectoral representation, the results (Table A2.15) suggest that the majority (72%) of respondents were from the public sector, with the next most common type of organisation being the voluntary/third sector (13%). However, less than half of total respondents chose to answer the question about organisation type, so these results should be regarded as indicative only.

Table A2.1: Which of the following best describes your general awareness of 'Our Place in Time – The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland'?

	%	Count
Highly aware	47.2%	34
Moderately aware	38.9%	28
Limited awareness	5.6%	4
Very little awareness	1.40%	1
Not at all aware	6.9%	5
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=72		

Table A2.2: Which of the following best describes your awareness/understanding of the specific priorities of Our Place in Time?

	%	Count
Very good awareness	26.4%	19
Moderate awareness	44.4%	32
Limited awareness	18.1%	13
Very little awareness	2.8%	2
Not at all aware	8.3%	6
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=72		

Table A2.3: Which of the following best describes your knowledge of the structures and delivery arrangements (i.e. Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF), CEOs Forum, and OPiT Strategy Working Groups) currently in place for Our Place in Time?

	%	Count
Highly aware	18.1%	13
Moderately aware	33.3%	24
Limited awareness	31.9%	23
Very little awareness	8.3%	6
Not at all aware	8.3%	6
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=72		

Table A2.4: Which of the following governance and delivery groups for Our Place in Time are you involved in? (Please tick all that apply)

	%	Count
Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF)	5.7%	4
Chief Executive Officers Forum (CEOs Forum)	7.1%	5
Built Heritage Investment Group	17.1%	12
Climate Change Group	7.1%	5
Heritage Tourism Group	8.6%	6
Skills and Expertise Group	5.7%	4
Volunteering Group	14.3%	10
None of the above	58.6%	41
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=70		

Table A2.1A: Cross Tabulation of: Which of the following best describes your general awareness of 'Our Place in Time – The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland'? against any involvement in OPiT delivery/governance groups

	Involved in OPiT Groups	Not Involved in OPiT Groups	Total	Count
Highly aware	43.8%	50.0%	47.2%	34
Moderately aware	50.0%	30.0%	38.9%	28
Limited awareness	6.3%	5.0%	5.6%	4
Very little awareness	0.0%	2.5%	1.4%	1
Not at all aware	0.0%	12.5%	6.9%	5
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	72

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=72

Table A2.2A: Cross Tabulation of: Which of the following best describes your awareness/understanding of the specific priorities of Our Place in Time? against any involvement in OPiT delivery/governance groups

	Involved in OPiT Groups	Not Involved in OPiT Groups	Total	Count
Very good awareness	34.4%	20.0%	26.4%	19
Moderate awareness	37.5%	50.0%	44.4%	32
Limited awareness	28.1%	10.0%	18.1%	13
Very little awareness	0.0%	5.0%	2.8%	2
Not at all aware	0.0%	15.0%	8.3%	6
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	72

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=72

Table A2.3A: Cross Tabulation of: Which of the following best describes your knowledge of the structures and delivery arrangements (i.e. Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF), CEOs Forum, and OPiT Strategy Working Groups) currently in place for Our Place in Time? against any involvement in OPiT delivery/governance groups

	Involved in OPiT Groups	Not Involved in OPiT Groups	Total	Count
Highly aware	31.3%	7.5%	18.1%	13
Moderately aware	37.5%	30.0%	33.3%	24
Limited awareness	28.1%	35.0%	31.9%	23
Very little awareness	3.1%	12.5%	8.3%	6
Not at all aware	0.0%	15.0%	8.3%	6
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	72

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=72

Table A2.5: For each of the groups you are involved in, to what extent do you agree that: the Group/Forum has a clear remit/objectives?

	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF)	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Chief Executive Officers Forum (CEOs Forum)	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Built Heritage Investment Group	22%	2	67%	6	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	9
Climate Change Group	25%	1	75%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Heritage Tourism Group	25%	1	50%	2	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	4
Skills and Expertise Group	50%	2	50%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Volunteering Group	22%	2	56%	5	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	9
TOTAL	30%	11	59%	22	11%	4	0%	0	0%	0	37

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=24

Table A2.6: For each of the groups you are involved in, to what extent do you agree that: the Group/Forum has delivered against its remit/objectives?

	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF)	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Chief Executive Officers Forum (CEOs Forum)	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Built Heritage Investment Group	0%	0	33%	3	56%	5	11%	1	0%	0	9
Climate Change Group	0%	0	50%	2	50%	2	0%	0	0%	0	4
Heritage Tourism Group	25%	1	50%	2	0%	0	25%	1	0%	0	4
Skills and Expertise Group	0%	0	50%	2	25%	1	25%	1	0%	0	4
Volunteering Group	11%	1	44%	4	33%	3	11%	1	0%	0	9
TOTAL	5%	2	54%	20	30%	11	11%	4	0%	0	37

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=24

Table A2.7: For each of the groups you are involved in, to what extent do you agree that: the Group/Forum has appropriate membership/representation?

	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF)	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Chief Executive Officers Forum (CEOs Forum)	0%	0	50%	2	50%	2	0%	0	0%	0	4
Built Heritage Investment Group	0%	0	78%	7	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	9
Climate Change Group	25%	1	75%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Heritage Tourism Group	25%	1	50%	2	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	4
Skills and Expertise Group	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Volunteering Group	22%	2	56%	5	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	9
TOTAL	11%	4	70%	26	19%	7	0%	0	0%	0	37

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=24

Table A2.8: For each of the groups you are involved in, to what extent do you agree that: the Group/Forum represents a good use of your/your organisation's time?

	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF)	33%	1	0%	0	33%	1	33%	1	0%	0	3
Chief Executive Officers Forum (CEOs Forum)	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Built Heritage Investment Group	11%	1	56%	5	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	9
Climate Change Group	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Heritage Tourism Group	0%	0	75%	3	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	4
Skills and Expertise Group	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Volunteering Group	22%	2	56%	5	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	9
TOTAL	14%	5	64%	23	17%	6	6%	2	0%	0	36

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=24

Table A2.9: For each of the groups you are involved in, to what extent do you agree that: the Group/Forum meetings are working effectively?

	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF)	0%	0	67%	2	0%	0	33%	1	0%	0	3
Chief Executive Officers Forum (CEOs Forum)	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Built Heritage Investment Group	12%	1	38%	3	38%	3	12%	1	0%	0	8
Climate Change Group	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Heritage Tourism Group	0%	0	50%	2	25%	1	25%	1	0%	0	4
Skills and Expertise Group	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Volunteering Group	11%	1	78%	7	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	9
TOTAL	6%	2	70%	23	15%	5	9%	3	0%	0	33

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=23

Table A2.10: For each of the groups you are involved in, to what extent do you agree that: Group/Forum communications and information sharing is effective?

	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Strategic Historic Environment Forum (SHEF)	0%	0	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	0%	0	3
Chief Executive Officers Forum (CEOs Forum)	0%	0	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	0%	0	3
Built Heritage Investment Group	12%	1	25%	2	63%	5	0%	0	0%	0	8
Climate Change Group	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Heritage Tourism Group	25%	1	50%	2	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	4
Skills and Expertise Group	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
Volunteering Group	0%	0	89%	8	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	9
TOTAL	9%	3	58%	19	30%	10	3%	1	0%	0	33

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=23

Table A2.11: Please identify how much progress you think has been made so far (i.e. at the mid-point (year 5) of the 10 year strategy) for each of the four key aims of Our Place in Time:

	Progress so far is above expectations		Progress so far is as expected		Progress so far is below expectations		Total
Cross-cutting: To ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of our heritage continues to make a major contribution to the nation’s wellbeing.	2.7%	1	78.4%	29	18.9%	7	37
Understand: To investigate and record our historic environment to continually develop our knowledge, understanding and interpretation of our past and how best to conserve, sustain and present it.	5.4%	2	75.7%	28	18.9%	7	37
Protect: To care for and protect the historic environment in order to both enjoy and benefit from it and to conserve and enhance it for the benefit of future generations.	2.7%	1	70.3%	26	27.0%	10	37
Value: Sharing and celebrating the richness and significance of our historic environment, enabling us to enjoy the fascinating and inspirational diversity of our heritage.	13.9%	5	72.2%	26	13.9%	5	36
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=37							

Table A2.12: Please identify how much progress you think will be made by the end of the strategy for each of the four key aims of Our Place in Time:

	Likely to deliver by end of 10-year strategy		At risk of not delivering by end of 10-year strategy		Total
Cross-cutting: To ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of our heritage continues to make a major contribution to the nation’s wellbeing.	62.5%	20	37.5%	12	32
Understand: To investigate and record our historic environment to continually develop our knowledge, understanding and interpretation of our past and how best to conserve, sustain and present it.	67.7%	21	32.3%	10	31
Protect: To care for and protect the historic environment in order to both enjoy and benefit from it and to conserve and enhance it for the benefit of future generations.	51.6%	16	48.4%	15	31
Value: Sharing and celebrating the richness and significance of our historic environment, enabling us to enjoy the fascinating and inspirational diversity of our heritage.	75.0%	24	25.0%	8	32
Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=32					

Table A2.13: Are there any areas where the delivery of Our Place in Time could be improved?

Answer Choices	Percent	Count
Yes	48.5%	16
No	6.1%	2
Don't Know	45.5%	15

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=33

Table A2.14: Are there any particular issues that you think should be a priority for Our Place in Time going forward?

	Percent	Count
Yes	50%	16
No	12.5%	4
Don't Know	37.5%	12

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=33

Table A2.15: Type of Organisation

	Percent	Count
Public sector	71.9%	23
Private sector	9.4%	3
Voluntary/Third sector	12.5%	4
Other (please explain)	6.3%	2

Source: Evaluation of the Delivery and Impact of Our Place in Time – DC Research Survey, July-August 2019 n=32

ANNEX 3: MEMBERSHIP OF OPIT GROUPS (JUNE 2019)

SHEF
Fiona Hyslop, MSP (Chair) - Cabinet Secretary for Culture, Tourism and External Affairs
Jane Ryder - Chair, Historic Environment Scotland
Ray Macfarlane - Chair, Museums Galleries Scotland
Sir Moir Lockhead - Chair, National Trust for Scotland
Iain McDowall - Chair, Built Environment Forum Scotland
David Melhuish - Director, Scottish Property Federation
Andrew Thin - Chairman, Scottish Canals
Lord Thurso - Chair, VisitScotland
Dr Mike Cantlay - Chair, Scottish Natural Heritage
David Johnstone - Chair, Scottish Land and Estates
Cllr Kelly Parry - CoSLA

CHIEF EXECUTIVES FORUM (CEOs Forum)
Alex Paterson, HES (Chair)
Adam Jackson, Head of Strategy And Policy, HES
Lucy Casot, CEO, Museums Galleries Scotland
Caroline Clark, Director, NLHF
Andrew Hopetoun, Chair, Historic Houses Scotland
Euan Leitch, Director, BEFS
Sally Loudon, CEO, COSLA
Francesca Osowska, CEO, Scottish Natural heritage
Simon Skinner, CEO, NTS
George Thomson, CEO, Volunteer Scotland
Simon Gilmour, Director, Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
Victoria Collinson-Owen, Heritage Trust Network / Scottish Redundant Churches Trust
Una Richards, Heritage Trust Network / Scottish Historic Buildings Trust

Built Heritage Investment Plan Group
David Mitchell, HES (Chair)
Emily Tracey, HES (Project Manager)
Margot Baxter, HES (Project support)
Robbie Calvert, Royal Town Planning Institute
Lucy Casot, Museums Galleries Scotland
Caroline Clark, HES
Jocelyn Cunliffe, RIAS
Bryan Dickson, National Trust for Scotland
James Fowlie, COSLA
Andrew Hopetoun, Historic Houses Association
Adam Jackson, Historic Environment Scotland
Euan Leitch, BEFS
Calum Lindsay, COSLA
David Melhuish, Scottish Property Federation
Paul Mortimer, NHS
Peter Robinson, Scottish Canals
Neil Rutherford, Scottish Futures Trust
Colin Tennant, HES
Russell Whyte, HES
Raymond Young, Church of Scotland General Trustees
John Connolly, NHS
Linda Gillespie, Community Ownership Support Service
Diane Gray, National Lottery Heritage Fund
Marcelina Hamilton, Scottish Land & Estates
Alan Hampson, Scottish Natural Heritage
Jude Henderson, Federation of Scottish Theatre
Richard Kinsella, Network Rail
Craig McLaren, Royal Town Planning Institute
Riona McMorrow, National Lottery Heritage Fund
Richard Millar, Scottish Canals
Colin Proctor, Scottish Futures Trust
Alastair Reid, Registers of Scotland
Matt Ritchie, Forest Enterprise Scotland
Sally Thomas, Scottish Natural Heritage

Climate Change Group
Ewan Hyslop, HES (Chair)
Emily Tracey, HES (Project Manager)
Margot Baxter, HES (Project support)
Derek Alexander, National Trust for Scotland
James Anthony, Eco-Congregation Scotland
Anna Beswick, Adaptation Scotland
David Bethune, Eco-Congregation Scotland
Mairi Davies, HES
Jane Downes, University of the Highlands & Islands and Orkney Research Centre for Archaeology (ORCA)
Sarah Govan, ClimateXChange
Yann Grandgirard, Edinburgh World Heritage
Torsten Haak, Glasgow City Heritage Trust
David Harkin, HES
Adam Jackson, HES
Euan Leitch, BEFS
Karen Robertson, HES
Chiara Ronchini, HES
Charles Strang, Institute for Historic Building Conservation
Eila McQueen, Archaeology Scotland
Janie Neumann, Visit Scotland
Adrian Shaw, Church of Scotland
George Tarvit, Sustainable Scotland Network
Adam Wilkinson, Edinburgh World Heritage

Heritage Tourism Group
Stephen Duncan, HES (Chair)
Sarah Blackwell, HES (minutes)
Mark Bishop, National Trust for Scotland
Karen Christie, Tourism Strategy Project Manager (Co-ordinator) Scottish Tourism Alliance
Fiona Cook, Scottish Government Tourism
Riddell Graham, VisitScotland
Amy Mack, HES
Gillian MacDonald, HES
Russell Whyte, HES
Jane Young, Inveraray Castle

Skills and Expertise Group

Alex Paterson, HES (Chair)

Bryan Dickson, National Trust for Scotland

John Campbell, Museum Galleries Scotland

Elaine Ellis, Skills Development Scotland

James Fowlie, COSLA

Adam Jackson, HES

Euan Leitch, BEFS

Finlay Lockie, Historic Houses Association

Gordon McGuiness, Skills Development Scotland

Denise Millar, Scottish Canals

Richard Oram (University of Stirling / Universities Scotland)

John Renwick, Energy Skills Scotland / Colleges Scotland

Alison Turnbull, HES

Andrew Youngson, Scottish Funding Council

Volunteering Group

George Thomson, Volunteer Scotland (Chair)

Joanna Todd, HES (Minutes)

Catherine Cartmell, Museums Galleries Scotland

Joanna Hambly, Scottish Coastal Archaeology and the Problem of Erosion (SCAPE)

Lucie Douglas, HES

Craig Ferguson, National Trust for Scotland

Adam Jackson, HES

Cara Jones, Archaeology Scotland

Susan O'Connor, The Scottish Civic Trust

Lauren Roden, National Galleries of Scotland

Jeff Sanders, Dig It!, Society of Antiquities of Scotland

Joe Traynor, Museums Galleries Scotland

Allan Watson, National Trust for Scotland

Rosie Wylie, HES