

# 2006-2008 Heritage Incentives Program

---

## Program 12 – RAHS Local History and Archives Projects Report on 2006-7 projects

### **Program Objective**

*This program provides funding to the Royal Australian Historical Society to assist local historical societies and individuals to undertake historical research and publication of local history; cataloguing, interpretation and conservation of local archives; conservation and interpretation of NSW heritage items.*

---

### **Overall program summary**

92% of applications received were funded. Overall \$134,080 was spent on projects through this program made up of \$40,500 grant funding and \$93,580 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program is \$1:\$2

### **Evaluation**

*What do the KPIs tell you about these outcomes?*

Overall, the program was a great success and achieved the stated program purpose and met the needs of applicants and the funding program priorities.

*What were the key results or achievements for the year?*

- An Aboriginal project focusing on the Stolen Generation; two projects [travelling stock routes and woolsheds] which will help a wide range of people.
- 100% of completed projects reported that the project was successfully completed
- 90% of projects contribute to heritage tourism

*Were there any challenges or disappointments that had a major effect on your results?*

More funding dollars are needed for most who embark upon a project and seek heritage funding end up contributing an enormous amount of private funding to their project.

*What will you do next year?*

Next year RAHS will encourage grant recipients to seek out media coverage for their projects as a condition of funding.

### **Outcome 1 - Increased community understanding about heritage items**

86% of responses stated that heritage funding makes a difference as it enables groups to embark on projects which expose them to the public in a positive way.

### **Outcome 2 - HIP funded projects are successfully completed**

100% of completed projects reported that the project was successfully completed.

State reasons why projects were successfully completed:

- Funding assistance

State reasons why projects were not successfully completed:

- Not enough money available.

### **Outcome 3 - HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism**

90% of projects contribute to heritage tourism and have wider community benefits beyond the scope of the project.

**Outcome 4 - HIP funded projects created paid employment**

27% of projects employed people. Most grant recipients tend to do the work themselves but are increasingly calling upon professionals to assist. Most can not afford to hire professionals.

**Outcome 5 - HIP funded projects are actively supported by the community**

Only 50% of projects generated media interest. Media is not always interested in good news stories. Country press is more responsive than city.

100% of projects rely on volunteer contributions – projects are community based and undertaken for interest and enjoyment and not financial return.

**Outcome 6 - Satisfied HIP funded project applicants**

Overall satisfaction level with the Heritage Branch is very high (80% mostly and 20% exceeding expectations), with good responses to customer service satisfaction with the vast majority of responses in the some and mostly categories.

Some concerns with completing and claiming funding for completed projects.

The Heritage Branch funding program could positively contribute to projects by:

- By providing further support for future publications.
- By providing financial assistance closer to the announcement of the receipt of the grant. Some small historical society would struggle financially while waiting to receive the grant(s).
- A heritage architect has suggested a second volume, covering commercial and non-residential buildings, in Kogarah
- This project is complete, but I am sure there will be further projects in the future, which would benefit from assistance.

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Increase the funding, so volunteers could receive a gratuity. People dedicated to a heritage project have no way of claiming for petrol, tolls, telephone, and non-receipted items.

## Program 12 – RAHS Local History and Archives Projects Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators

---

### Outcomes RAHS program results

92% of applications received were funded		37 of applications received 34 of projects funded
HIP funding multiplier effect \$1:\$2	Applicant \$93,580 contribution to project HIP \$40,500 contribution to project	HIP funding as a average 30% of project

#### Evaluation:

92% of applications received were funded – ie high likelihood that your project will be funded.

Overall \$134,080 was spent on projects through this program made up of \$40,500 grant funding and \$93,580 contributed by applicants.

The RAHS local history and archives projects program is a successful program, meeting the needs of applicants and the funding program priorities.

The multiplier effect for the program is \$1:\$2

## Outcome 1

### Increased community understanding about heritage items

*This outcome measures the **increase in community understanding** about state and local heritage items through HIP funded projects.*

#### Key Performance Indicator 1 – Increased community understanding of heritage items

Funding helped to <u>increase community understanding about heritage item/s</u>	1 (no) 2 (yes)	14% of responses 86%
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------

#### Evaluation:

86% of responses stated that heritage funding makes a difference as it enables groups to embark on projects which expose them to the public in a positive way. Key results or achievements for this year were an Aboriginal project focusing on the Stolen Generation; two projects [travelling stock routes and woolsheds] which will help a wide range of people.

---

## Outcome 2

### HIP funded projects are successfully completed

*This outcome measures the **successfully completed projects** and their contribution to the conservation and management of State Heritage Register and state heritage items through HIP funded projects, as assessed by the applicant.*

#### Key Performance Indicator 2 – Successfully completed HIP funded projects

<b>Yes</b> , the project was <u>very successful</u> - we achieved	66.7% of projects completed
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

everything we set out to	
<b>Yes</b> , the project was <u>mostly successful</u> - we achieved most of what we set out to do	33.3% of projects completed
<b>No</b> , the project was <u>not successful</u> - we did not achieve what we set out to do	0% of project completed

### Evaluation

100% of completed projects reported that the project was successfully completed.

More funding dollars are needed for most who embark upon a project and seek Heritage Funding, end up contributing an enormous amount of private funding to their project.

State reasons why projects were successfully completed:

- Funding assistance

State reasons why projects were not successfully completed:

- Not enough money available.

### Outcome 3

#### HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism

*This outcome measures the contribution to heritage tourism. Contribution to heritage tourism is defined as (open days, part of a heritage trail, part of a main street or heritage precinct or commercial heritage tourism venture).*

This is a NSW Government and Heritage Branch priority **Result indicator - At least 70% of funded projects assist heritage tourism**

#### Key Performance Indicator 3 – HIP funded projects contributed to heritage tourism

<b>Yes</b> , my project <u>contributed (directly or indirectly***)</u> to heritage tourism	90% of completed projects
<b>Yes</b> , my heritage property/item, was <u>open for public inspection</u> (eg Open Days for Heritage Festival, etc)	40% of responses
<b>Yes</b> , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>local heritage trail</u> or interpretation walk around your area.	13% of responses
<b>Yes</b> , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>main street or town centre heritage precinct</u> .	13% of responses
<b>Yes</b> , my heritage property/item is a <u>commercial heritage tourism venture</u> – (eg Bed and Breakfast accommodation, or heritage tourism venture such as a gold mining site, etc)	20% of responses
<b>Yes</b> , my project contributed to <u>heritage tourism</u> – (eg contributes indirectly or directly to a local tourism strategy, or heritage tourism venture such as a gold mining site, etc)	20% of responses

<b>No</b> , my project <u>didn't contribute</u> to heritage tourism	10% of projects completed
---------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------

\*\*\* direct contributions to tourism are \$ and product, indirect contributions to heritage tourism include research reports, education projects and promotions that indirectly contribute to tourism outcomes.

### Evaluation

90% of projects contribute to heritage tourism and have wider community benefits beyond the scope of the project.

## Outcome 4

### HIP funded projects created paid employment

*This outcome measures the contribution to employment creation and increased trade and professional skills in heritage conservation.*

(A NSW Government and Heritage Branch priority outcome.)

#### Key Performance Indicator 4 – Paid employment created by HIP funded projects

<b>Yes</b> , my project <u>created paid employment</u>	27 % of projects completed
<u>Number and type of paid tradespeople</u> employed on my project (eg roofer, plumber, carpenter and joiner, etc)	4 tradesmen Av of 1 per project
<u>Number and type of paid professionals</u> employed on my project (eg engineers, architects, historians etc)	1 professional Av of 0.25 per project
<b>No</b> , my project <u>did not create any employment</u>	73 %

### Evaluation

27% of projects employed people. Most grant recipients tend to do the work themselves but are increasingly calling upon professionals to assist. Most can not afford to hire professionals.

## Outcome 5

### HIP funded projects are actively supported by the community

*This outcome measures active community support for HIP funded projects through volunteer hours and media coverage.*

#### Key Performance Indicator 5 - Volunteer hours contributed to HIP funded projects

<b>Yes</b> , my project <u>created an opportunity for volunteers</u>	100% of projects completed
Number of <u>volunteer hours</u> contributed to my project	6990 hours, Av of 466 hours per project
<b>No</b> , my project <u>did not create an opportunity for volunteers</u>	0 %

### Key Performance Indicator 6 – Media coverage for HIP funded projects

<b>Yes</b> , my project <u>created media interest and coverage</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	50 % of completed projects
Number of <u>media inquiries and media releases</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	22 Items 3 items per project
<b>No</b> , there was no <u>media interest or coverage</u> of my project	50 %

### Evaluation

Only 50% of projects generated media interest. Media is not always interested in good news stories. Country press is more responsive than city.

100% of projects rely on volunteer contributions – projects are community based and undertaken for interest and enjoyment and not financial return.

Next year we will encourage grant recipients to seek out media coverage for their projects as a condition of funding.

## Outcome 6

### Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

*This outcome measures HIP funded project customer service satisfaction levels*

### Key Performance Indicator 7 - Customer service satisfaction

<u>Helpful assistance and advice</u> was provided to me for my HIP funding and project by the Heritage Branch	1 (none)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	6%
	3 (some)	40%
	4 (mostly)	20%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	13%
The <u>Application Form</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	6% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	33%
	4 (mostly)	66%
	5 (very easy to complete)	0%
The project <u>payment claims</u> were easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	6% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	26%
	4 (mostly)	53%
	5 (very easy to complete)	0%
The project <u>final report</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	6% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	26%
	4 (mostly)	53%
	5 (very easy to complete)	6%
Overall <u>satisfaction</u> level with the Heritage Branch	1 (none)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	0%
	4 (mostly)	80%
	5 (exceeded expectations)	20%

## **Evaluation**

Overall satisfaction level with the Heritage Branch is very high (80% mostly and 20% exceeding expectations), with good responses to customer service satisfaction with the vast majority of responses in the some and mostly categories.

Some concerns with completing and claiming funding for completed projects.

The Heritage Branch funding program could positively contribute to projects by:

- By providing further support for future publications.
- By providing financial assistance closer to the announcement of the receipt of the grant. Some small historical society would struggle financially while waiting to receive the grant(s).
- A heritage architect has suggested a second volume, covering commercial and non-residential buildings, in Kogarah
- This project is complete, but I am sure there will be further projects in the future, which would benefit from assistance.

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Increase the funding, so volunteers could receive a gratuity. People dedicated to a heritage project have no way of claiming for petrol, tolls, telephone, and non-receipted items.