

2006-2008 Heritage Incentives Program

Program 7- Heritage Education and Promotion Program Evaluation

Program Objective

This program provides support for heritage education and promotional projects that are designed to impact positively on the public appreciation of our heritage.

Overall program summary

50% of applications received were funded, of these 100% were successful completed.

Overall \$463,500 was spent on heritage works through this program made up of \$66,900 grant funding and \$356,300 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program was \$1:\$4

Evaluation

What do the KPIs tell you about these outcomes?

Overall, the program was a success and achieved the stated program purpose in assisting emergency.

What were the key results or achievements for the year?

- 100% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 4.6 tradespeople and 3.6 heritage consultant per project.
- 100% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism.

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

No.

What will you do next year?

This program has been withdrawn from the 2008-9 NSW Heritage Grants program due to redirected funding priorities.

Outcome 1 - Increased community understanding about heritage items

100% of projects reported increased community understanding about heritage due to the project funding

Outcome 2 - HIP funded projects are successfully completed

80% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful in achieving the project aims

Contributions to successful projects include:

- Work of many people involved with the project including researchers and volunteers
- Community involvement and willingness to assist

Contributions to unsuccessful projects include:

- Limited budget

Outcome 3 - HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism

100% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism. This result exceeds the NSW Government result indicator of at least 70% of projects.

Feedback on contributions to heritage tourism include:

- Contributed as a National Trust Heritage Week activity
- Use of websites and blogs for easy access to information
- People who took part in tours recommended these to others

Outcome 4 - HIP funded projects created paid employment

100% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 4.6 tradespeople and 3.6 heritage consultant per project.

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

80% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 310 hours contributed by volunteers for each completed project.

Outcome 6 - Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

Overall, more than 60% applicants expectations were met in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

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

- Providing funding for future projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Meeting with the Heritage Branch to ensure project scope and outcomes are clearly understood

Program 7 – Heritage Education and Promotion Program Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators

Overall program results

% of applications funded		12 applications received 6 projects funded 6 projects completed
HIP funding multiplier effect \$1:\$4	\$356,300 Applicant contribution to project \$66,900 HIP contribution to project	HIP funding as a average 20% of project cost

Evaluation

50% of applications received were funded, of these 100% were successful completed.

Overall \$463,500 was spent on heritage works through this program made up of \$66,900 grant funding and \$356,300 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program was \$1:\$4

Outcome 1

Increased community understanding about heritage items

*This outcome measures the **increase in community understanding** about State Heritage Register and state heritage items through funded projects.*

Key Performance Indicator 1 – Increased community understanding of heritage items with HIP funding

HIP funding helped to <u>increase community understanding about</u> heritage	1 (no) 2 (yes)	0% of responses 100%
---	-------------------	-------------------------

Compiled from community feedback project questionnaires using a standardised survey.

Evaluation

100% of projects reported increased community understanding about heritage due to the project funding

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 projects

Yes, the project was <u>very successful</u> - we achieved	80% of projects completed
--	---------------------------

everything we set out to	
Yes , the project was <u>mostly successful</u> - we achieved most of what we set out to do	0% of total projects completed

No , the project was <u>not successful</u> - we did not achieve what we set out to do	20% of projects completed
--	---------------------------

Evaluation

80% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful in achieving the project aims

Contributions to successful projects include:

- Work of many people involved with the project including researchers and volunteers
- Community involvement and willingness to assist

Contributions to unsuccessful projects include:

- Limited budget

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 Office priority - Result indicator - At least 70% of funded projects assist heritage tourism)

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

Yes , my project <u>contributed (directly or indirectly^{***})</u> to heritage tourism	100% of projects completed
No , my project <u>didn't contribute</u> to heritage tourism	0% of projects completed

Yes , my heritage property/item, was <u>open for public inspection</u> (eg Open Days for Heritage Festival, etc)	40% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>local heritage trail</u> or interpretation walk around your area.	80% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>main street or town centre heritage precinct</u> .	80% of projects completed
Yes , 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 projects completed
Yes , my project contributed to <u>heritage tourism</u> – (eg contributes indirectly or directly to a local tourism strategy,	80% of projects completed

or heritage tourism venture such as a gold mining site, etc)	
--	--

*** 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

100% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism. This result exceeds the NSW Government result indicator of at least 70% of projects.

Feedback on contributions to heritage tourism include:

- Contributed as a National Trust Heritage Week activity
- Use of websites and blogs for easy access to information
- People who took part in tours recommended these to others

Outcome 4

HIP funded projects created paid employment

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

(A NSW Government and Heritage Office priority outcome.)

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

Yes , my project <u>created paid employment</u>	100% of projects completed
No , my project <u>did not create any employment</u>	0% of projects completed

<u>Number and type of paid tradespeople</u> employed on my project (eg roofer, plumber, carpenter and joiner, etc)	23 tradespeople Av of 4.6 per project
<u>Number and type of paid professionals</u> employed on my project (eg engineers, architects, historians etc)	18 professionals Av of 3.6 per project

Evaluation

100% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 4.6 tradespeople and 3.6 heritage consultant per project.

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

Yes , my project <u>created an opportunity for volunteers</u>	80% of projects completed
No , my project <u>did not create an opportunity for volunteers</u>	20% of projects completed

Number of <u>volunteer hours</u> contributed to my project	1550+ volunteer hours AV 310 hours per project
--	---

Evaluation

80% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 310 hours contributed by volunteers for each completed project.

Key Performance Indicator 6 – Media coverage for HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created media interest and coverage</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	80% of projects completed
Number of <u>media inquiries and media releases</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	20 items of media interest or media coverage

No , there was no <u>media interest or coverage</u> of my project	20% of projects completed
--	---------------------------

Evaluation

80% of funded projects created media interest, with an average of 4 media items per project.

Other forms of community involvement were:

- Involvement of historical societies, local council heritage committees and museums, education centres
- Volunteers who have taken on paid positions through the project

Outcome 6

Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

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 Office	1 (none)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	40%
	4 (mostly)	60%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	0%
The <u>Application Form</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	0% of response
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	20%
	4 (mostly)	80%
	5 (very easy to complete)	0%
The project <u>payment claims</u> were easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	20%
	3 (some)	20%
	4 (mostly)	40%
	5 (very easy to complete)	20%
The project <u>final report</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	40%
	4 (mostly)	40%
	5 (very easy to complete)	20%

Evaluation

Overall, more than 60% applicants expectations were met in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

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

- Providing funding for future projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Meeting with the Heritage Branch to ensure project scope and outcomes are clearly understood
-