

[Submitted by online form – 2 November 2018]

### 3. Our Vision

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our vision for HES?

Agree

#### **What do you like, dislike or what would you change?**

The vision remains the same as in the previous plan. We think that its focus on people is appropriate and situates the importance of the historic environment to society (inclusive of everyone) at the heart of the organisation's activities. Historic Environment Scotland (as well as RCAHMS and Historic Scotland) have a strong record in this regard, and we support HES in seeking to enable further positive developments in approaches to heritage management which increase the relevance of the historic environment to Scotland today.

### 4. Our outcomes: Social

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES?

Disagree

#### **Do you have any comments?**

We strongly agree that HES should set a social outcome as a key priority. As we see it, the key goals for heritage and social impact are that it;

- Becomes increasingly relevant to people's lives
- Increasingly contributes to health and wellbeing benefits

The outcome as drafted does not use the language of health and wellbeing, which misses an opportunity to connect this major area of potential heritage public benefit with Scotland's National Performance Framework. We would like to see both concepts (relevance and wellbeing) in the headline outcome.

You may also wish to have an outcome that specifies that the difference to lives is a positive one. On the precision of wording, more could mean 'more people than now' or 'more people

than are affected by sport/arts/etc'. Is the aim to be more effective than before or more effective than others?

Finally, under the 'what we will do' section, bullet point one says 'we will create heritage without boundaries'. We do not agree that HES *creates* heritage. More appropriate verbs include reveal, recognise, or curate.

## 5. Our outcomes: Environmental

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES?

Disagree

Do you have any comments

We support an environmental priority for HES, however, we feel that the outcome, as drafted, fails to capture the potential of the historic environment to contribute to this area. For example, the objective does not suggest any more than a basic response to NPF and international climate change goals. An ambitious target in this area could seek to pitch the historic environment as a vehicle for the discussion of climate change, and a mechanism for influencing society's attitudes to environmental sustainability.

In the current draft, the headline for this outcome does not provide a measurable comparator. It begs the question; isn't the historic environment already looked after? If yes, is the job already done? This confusion could be prevented by re-drafting.

## 6. Our Outcomes: Economic

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES?

neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any comments?

As with other outcomes, we are concerned that this headline does not reflect anything unique about the historic environment. It therefore appears to be both uninspiring and unambitious in the context of a document which must both articulate HES' vital role as a publicly-funded body and set an ambitious target for the organisation in terms of contribution to society.

Again, there is a comparative without a comparison. Broader than what? Broader than before or broader than some other wealth generators? The term 'broad' needs definition too: how is economic breadth measured?

This section includes a paragraph which reflects the need to ‘share [the value and importance of the historic environment] with everyone from government and policy-makers to teachers and pupils...’. This is an extremely important role, and we approve of how this role as a champion of the benefit the historic environment can bring is articulated here. However, this role does not appear anywhere else in the document. We would like to see this sentiment applied to all five objectives, or overarched above them, for instance, in the ‘what we do’ section.

In the final paragraph, we recommend substituting the word ‘wealthier’ for ‘more prosperous’.

## **7. Our Outcomes: Cultural**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES?**

Agree

### **Do you have any comments**

We strongly support a cultural priority for HES. We believe that this value area essentially is a focus on making sure that Scotland’s heritage reflects diverse and complex identities, celebrates and nurtures inclusivity and mutual understanding. This concept has powerful resonance and relevance to Scottish society today, and should be a strong feature of Scotland’s heritage offer.

However, we disagree with the precise wording of the headline, as the wording ‘the historic environment encourages’ appears to give agency to the historic environment. Rather it is HES/the historic environment sector which encourages inclusive and diverse approaches.

Finally, and again, there is also a lack of ambition in the headline outcome, and a missed opportunity to connect with the potential of the organisation to drive not only the inclusivity and representative diversity of the heritage offer, but the benefits that heritage can create for the wider nation.

## **8. Our Outcomes**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed outcome for HES?**

We are unsure whether this outcome sits well, as drafted. In taking into account our other comments, it may be that a reorganisation of the organisational elements of the plan would provide for greater clarity on HES’ role mission, values. These elements are currently dispersed in various sections throughout the document, but would benefit from sitting up front in the document, together.

### 9. Measuring Success

What would success look like for the Corporate Plan?

Do you have comments on our suggested approach to measurement?

The Corporate Plan should be a document which sets out how the organisation makes its case for investment from Government. At present, we feel that the plan does not provide any clear reasoning for why HES should be funded at any particular level. Outcomes are vague and lacking comparators, and would leave the assessment of success open to argument. We fear that this document could end up undermining the case for funding HES if it fails to set out an ambitious plan for how HES will contribute to Scotland's aims as a nation.

Without seeing KPIs, it is difficult to understand the scale at which HES seeks to impact in any of the priority areas or assess its approach to measurement. We are unsure whether basing KPIs on 'people's opinions' is a sensible idea, given that measurement will primarily be used as a tool to prove to Government that HES delivers impact and value for money.

Whilst we expect that the publication on annual reports will be able to provide this detailed level of analysis of HES' impact, we feel that some description of the scale for HES' ambition should be recorded within the high level corporate plan.

### 10. Equalities Impact Assessment

Do you think any of the objectives in the Corporate Plan will impact differently on people because of their age, disability, gender, gender identity, race and/or ethnicity, religion, belief or sexual orientation?

We do not perceive any equalities issues with the Plan.

### 12. Strategic Environment Assessment

We have completed a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the draft Corporate Plan to identify environmental implications of the plan.

No comment.

Have the key issues associated with the environmental implications of the draft plan been identified?

No comment.

### 13. Your interests

Are there any key areas relating to HES's impact on you or your organisation, business or other interests that should be considered in our Corporate Plan?

We are keen to ensure that HES supports staff to pursue professionalism through accreditation and continuing professional development. We would like to work with HES to promote ClfA membership to its staff and develop training opportunities.

We would also like HES to consider whether it should join ClfA's Registered Organisation scheme in an effort to champion professional standards.

#### **14. Delivering the Corporate Plan**

**What can you or your organisation do to help us deliver our Corporate Plan?**

We will continue to work with HES to help to deliver Scotland's Archaeology Strategy. We will continue to rely on HES to be an ally and an intermediary in representing the needs of the historic environment to government. We will continue to look to HES to champion professionalism in the sector, to help ClfA to improve standards for the archaeological profession and so to improve public benefits from archaeology.

#### **15. Any further comments**

**Please use this section to provide any other comments you think are relevant to our Corporate Plan.**

Please note, this response accompanies a letter which sets out our thoughts on the overall document, its purpose, and thoughts on elements not analysed within this consultation, for example 'who are we', 'what we do'. We would like to record within this official response that we are concerned with the way in which the document does not, in our opinion, provide a strong basis for HES' role as an organisation nor the unique contribution which historic environment makes to the nation.

We applaud HES' attempts to ensure that the corporate governance of the organisation is based upon values which are relevant to the public and which are legitimised through democratic consultation. However, the document would benefit from revision to enhance clarity of purpose, tightening of language, and a re-structuring in order that it more clearly and effectively underpins HES' vital role in managing the historic environment, shaping and enhancing its contribution to society, leading and collaborating with the sector and other stakeholders, and advocating for the historic environment. The document must reflect HES' strong claim to public funding and set out a plan which will protect the organisation's independence as a NDPB.

The document should be ambitious, providing ammunition for the Cabinet Secretary to seek greater profile and funding for heritage. At present we feel that the document fails to articulate this context, or a clear and strong message on the value and voice of the organisation.

It would also be helpful if the document paid closer attention to language used in OPiT and the draft Historic Environment Policy to ensure consistency (for example, the definition of the historic environment).

There are some strong passages in the draft, and we are keen to highlight how these could be used to anchor a revised version of the draft. For example, the final paragraph of the 'The Historic Environment is Scotland's Story' section is strong:

*"At HES we want to use the past to make a better future. We want the historic environment to make a real difference to people's lives: to our health, to our economy, to our culture, to our environment. We want heritage to break down barriers, to involve everyone and to bring them together, so that we all benefit. This Corporate plan sets out how we aim to do this."*

This paragraph provides a strong basis on which to build outcomes around. We support the value-led approach to the other four priorities. However, at present, we feel that it is the priority area itself (social, environmental, economic, cultural) which is the most valuable element, as is identified in the paragraph we quote above. We recommend leading each priority with this area (social, environmental, economic, cultural, and organisational) and replacing the current headings with clearer outcomes.

We feel that it is extremely difficult to judge the document on its merits without inclusion of key performance indicators: the outcomes themselves are imprecise and attainment could not be measured, potentially leaving HES open to hostile accusations of failure, or weak claims to success. In essence, the current draft attempts to articulate 'what' HES will do (although lacking clarity and ambition), but the equally important detail on 'how' is not included.

As stated in our answers to the survey questions, we believe that the document lacks a section which underscores key role of HES as a champion for the historic environment, including as an advocate to government (ie with a responsibility to hold them to account). We approve of the language used under the Economic priority which states that HES will 'share [the value and importance of the historic environment] with everyone from government and policy-makers to teachers and pupils...'. We would like to see this articulated in an overarching way as part of the organisation's 'mission'.

We also believe that enhanced reflection on importance of collaboration with partners in the sector in any mission/what we do section would be beneficial. In essence, we feel that the document could be re-ordered to provide a clearer articulation of the organisational values in the plan, and that the organisational 'priority' may be better considered as sitting above the other four priorities alongside vision, role, mission, values, and governance.