

Response ID ANON-UWGA-7Q1R-Y

Submitted to HES Grants Refresh
Submitted on 2021-09-06 16:41:29

Introduction

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

On behalf of an organisation

Please provide the name of your organisation:

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

2 Have you applied for any HES grants since 2016?

Yes

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

Archaeology Funding Programme (ARCH), Organisational Support Fund (OSF)

Other (Please specify):

4 Have you been awarded any HES grants since 2016?

Yes

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

Archaeology Funding Programme (ARCH), Organisational Support Fund (OSF)

Other (Please specify):

Our New Grants Priorities

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

Agree

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

Historic Environment Grants (Open Programme)

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

Oppose

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

We note that for the proposed 'Large Grants' and 'Small Grants' there are two and three application deadlines a year. We believe that HES should consider alignment with other key heritage funding bodies that are regularly used for match funding (such as the NLHF or the Architectural Heritage Fund). For example, with NLHF there is no application deadline for grants under £250,000 and for applications above that amount have a choice of four deadlines a year.

HES might also need to consider the audience for the express and small grants (for example volunteer based community groups) and consider specifically briefing professional intermediaries who can help volunteer based communities apply for the new funding grants (for example, train the trainer type of approach).

Please see also our request (in section 16 of this consultation) for more information on the requirement for a 'Conservation Accredited Professional Adviser' and why there is not a similar stipulation for archaeology based projects.

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

No

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

We request there to be additional clarity on the purpose of 'Express grants' – are these designed to respond to dynamic situations (such as emergency conservation work) or are these designed to be accessible for smaller activity-based applications (for example an interpretation panel). If they are designed to respond to more dynamic situations, we would suggest that the threshold of the small grants is lowered from £25,000 to allow more flexibility when applying for funding.

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

Too short

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

We broadly support the new decision timeframes; however we repeat our response to Qu 7 - we note that for the proposed 'Large Grants' and 'Small Grants' there are two and three application deadlines a year. We believe that HES should consider alignment with other key heritage funding bodies that are regularly used for match funding (such as the NLHF or the Architectural Heritage Fund). For example, with NLHF there is no application deadline for grants under £250,000 and for applications above that amount have a choice of four deadlines a year.

We also note each funding tier will be subject to a funding cap. While the open nature of the Express Grant will support a more flexible application process, we ask if there is potential for the funding allocated to this funding tier to be fully used within the first quarters of each funding cycle.

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

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

Oppose

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

We disagree that development work such as condition surveys should be exempt from the open programme and note that pre-emptive work such as this can save further funding allocation as a project develops. For example, an assessment of Scheduled Iron Age Broch can help inform heritage management decisions going forward but also help inform the budget required to stabilise a monument. While the Architectural Heritage Fund will support building projects, they won't fund similar activities on sites classed as 'archaeology'. While we recognised the aspiration that these sites may be exempt from 'what can't be funded', it would be useful to have more clarity on this.

We happy to provide further information about this if that would be helpful.

Other Programmes

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

Any Comments/ Feedback:

We have no additional comments to make.

General

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

Yes

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

As noted above – the deadlines and funding caps may act as a barrier to some applicants (in particular voluntary community groups), depending on their fundraising skills and knowledge of existing funding opportunities.

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

Support

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

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

Very clear

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

Any Feedback:

Very positive experience – the grants team have always been very helpful and accommodating.

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

Any Other Comments/ Feedback:

We note the 'Requirement for Conservation Accredited Professional Adviser' to be embedded within any team leading on a grant-aided repair or consolidation project (listed on page 10). We ask for more detail on why the same consideration or stipulation (of a accredited member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) is not listed for grant-aided archaeology work. We request that if accreditation is required for Conservation based projects, the same consideration be afforded to archaeology based projects. We would be happy to discuss this further or provide additional information on this issue.