Renaisi

THE CENTRE FOR YOUTH IMPACT

The National Lottery Heritage Fund's Kick the Dust Programme: Year 1 Report February 2019

HERITAGE FUND

We are an award-winning social enterprise that helps people and places to thrive

Contents

Appendices

The National Lottery Heritage Fund's Kick the Dust Programme: **At a glance**

Types of heritage

Industrial heritage

Historic sites and collections

Natural heritage

Stories of people and places

Culture and traditions

Kick the Dust aims to make heritage relevant to the lives of young people, aged 11-25, now and into the future. Building on their needs and interests, the programme aims to see a greater number and diversity of young people benefit from high quality engagement with heritage.

Where are Kick the Dust activities taking place?

South Asia

Scotland-wide

Glasgow

Yorkshire

Belfast

North West

Leicester

Norfolk

Birmingham

Wales-wide

England-wide

London

£10m over 5 years

1. Executive Summary

In 2016 The National Lottery Heritage Fund (The Fund) launched Kick the Dust (KtD), a £10million pilot grants programme that aims to make heritage relevant to the lives of young people, aged 11-25, now and into the future. Building on their needs and interests, the programme aims to see a greater number and diversity of young people benefit from high quality engagement with heritage.

The programme evaluation has been commissioned to Renaisi and the Centre for Youth Impact (CYI) and has the ambition to contribute to the body of knowledge, policy and practice related to youth engagement with heritage. The programme evaluation is working closely with the awarded projects to assess the impact of the programme, improve project evaluation and encourage reflective practice, and contribute to the evidence base on the value of youth engagement with heritage. The impact evaluation is guided by a programme Theory of Change and evaluation framework that has identified several common outcomes that will be measured by each of the twelve projects, aligned to the programme's overarching aims. The evaluation will gather both qualitative and quantitative data to generate insights into how the programme is developing, how learning from evidence is being used to improve practice, and how projects are working towards organisational change and sustainability.

Grants of £500,000 to £1m were awarded to twelve projects, led by a consortium of heritage and youth partners. The projects have now been underway for just over 18 months. Shortly after being awarded funding, projects entered a six-month development phase to develop a more detailed activity plan for the first year of the delivery phase. The development phase was an opportunity to consult with young people about their interests and barriers to engagement with heritage, identify how young people would be involved in planning and managing the project, test out and refine activities, and develop an evaluation plan.

One of the main aims of the programme evaluation is to build the capacity and skills of projects to produce high quality evaluations. This serves two purposes: to help demonstrate the value of youth engagement in heritage and to use evidence to test and refine practice and inform yearly activity plans. A number of challenges have been encountered which makes it difficult to assess the quality of evaluations at this stage; however, a key learning so far is that variations in approaches and levels of ambition have emerged which seem to be driven by existing levels of knowledge about evaluation methodology and levels of confidence in engaging young people.

The development phase of the programme has been an important formative period for projects and provided several benefits. It has provided a useful amount of time and resource for projects to test and develop their ideas, uncover and build on young people's needs and interests, and develop strong partnerships between youth and heritage organisations. Outputs from the development phase offer insight into the barriers to increasing young people's engagement in heritage. Projects have used these insights to develop their activity plans for the first delivery year. An analysis of projects' activity plans shows that the programme is progressing towards achieving several of its key outcomes, but the extent to which each project contributes to each outcome might vary.

One of the key long-term outcomes for the programme is that heritage organisations are more resilient, so that they can continue to make heritage relevant to the lives of young people into the future. To achieve this, the programme challenges individual projects to transform their learning about what works into sustainable organisational change. While projects have demonstrated well how they intend to make a difference to beneficiaries (young people and staff), many have struggled to clearly identify how these changes will be made sustainable within heritage

organisations and how this can be evidenced. It would be beneficial, therefore, for The Fund to consider how it can bring in additional expertise on the change management process, to build projects' capacity of how to take a structured and planned approach to organisational change.

1.1 Strengths and challenges of the development phase

After the development phase was completed, a survey was undertaken with the 12 project leads to capture their overall experience. Key findings from the development phase survey suggest that this phase was an asset to projects, was well-funded and an overall positive experience. The strengths and challenges of the development phase identified in the survey include:

Timeline and budget

The **timeline and budget** for the development phase were adequate and **were an asset** to the programme. Only one project stated that either the timeline or the budget were not adequate. This was due to the scale or complexity of their project, or difficulties bringing the consortium together.

Approach to Activity Plan

Projects valued the flexibility the development phase provided. They used the time to test their ideas and revisit their Activity plans based on what they had learned. **Consultation with young people** was an important and formative element of projects' Activity plans, and **young people** played a significant role in decision-making.

Working as a Consortium

Cross-sector partnerships were extended and expanded. All projects either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that good relationships were built between partners, partners were "bought-into" processes and ways of working, there was a shared agenda and vision among partners, and they were willing to learn from each other's expertise.

The consortium was considered by projects to be **integral to the success of the project**. Partners will provide continual feedback, help with problem solving, and contribute valuable skills and experience, contributing to overall sustainability of the sector.

1.2 Recommendations

Several recommendations have been generated based on main strengths and challenges to date.

Recommendations for grant-awarded projects:

- Embed cross-sector partnerships into project governance and management as this can positively contribute to the sustainability and resilience of organisations.
- Be more bold and ambitious by planning for a level of change that goes beyond beneficiaries, and includes organisational or sector-wide sustainability and resilience in the long-term.

- Quality of engagement is an important part of the narrative about "what works" and projects should consider investing time and resource in understanding and making explicit what high-quality engagement with young people looks like.

Recommendations for The Fund

- The Fund has demonstrated a high level of ambition around the theme of young people in heritage, and they can continue to develop their leadership in this area by maintaining the involvement of young people in The Fund's decision-making and committing to supporting the risk-taking and failure that comes with innovation.
- In the future, The Fund should consider revisiting the balance between prescription and flexibility in relation to the content and structure of activity plans and local evaluation planning, or consider where aspects of planning can be made more consistent.
- Future programmes that aspire for change at different levels (organisational, community-level, beneficiary-level) could benefit from having multiple theories of change or models that cover the different areas of intended impact rather than creating one overarching shared model.
- Future programmes with similar aims and structure to KtD may benefit more from a Learning Partner style of evaluation rather than an impact evaluation.

Recommendations for other funders who support youth engagement

- Funders should allow time for organisations working with young people to test and strengthen ideas.
- Funders should encourage youth organisations to build more partnerships with heritage organisations and to consider ways that they encourage youth organisations to use natural and cultural heritage as a resource for youth work.

2. About Kick the Dust

In 2016 The National Lottery Heritage Fund (The Fund) launched Kick the Dust (KtD), a £10million pilot grants programme that aims to make heritage relevant to the lives of young people, aged 11-25, now and in to the future. Building on their needs and interests, the programme aims to see a greater number and diversity of young people benefit from high quality engagement with heritage. The programme is also about developing the skills and confidence of heritage sites and services to sustain their work with young people over the long-term.

Kick the Dust was named by young people with an aspiration to 'stir up heritage'. Decision-making in the programme and advocacy about young people and heritage has been informed by 15 young Heritage Ambassadors recruited by The Fund, the #DustKickers.

The Kick the Dust programme is intended to:

- make heritage relevant to more young people from a greater diversity of backgrounds, building on their needs and interests;
- increase the ambition, scale and quality of youth engagement with heritage;
- develop sustainable, on-going work with young people within heritage organisations;
- show the value of youth engagement with heritage

Grants of £500,000 to £1m were awarded to twelve projects, led by a consortium of heritage and youth partners. In July 2017, the twelve successful projects were announced. These projects will be funded between 2017 and 2023.

The Kick the Dust programme application process had two phases. The first-round application included a delivery-grant request and a development-grant request. Applications that were successful in this first-round entered the development phase, a 6-month period whereby applicants developed a more detailed second-round application using the development grant. The development phase involved consultation with young people, co-production, research, and testing ideas that would inform each project's activity plan[1]. At the end of the development phase projects submitted a second-round application before entering the first year of delivery. Uniquely for KtD, projects are expected to develop their Activity plans for a single year rather than for the whole programme.

---

[1] An Activity plan is a document that sets out everything a project wants to do that is not capital work

Table 1: Summary of projects

Project title	Grant awarded	Organisation	Location of project activities
Norfolk Journeys	£776,500	Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service	Norfolk
Y Heritage	£707,500	The Y, Leicester	Leicestershire
Keeping it Wild	£886,600	London Wildlife Trust	Greater London
Future Proof Parks	£919,200	Groundwork	England-wide
Our Shared Cultural Heritage	£868,600	The British Council	Manchester, Glasgow, International (India, Bangladesh, Pakistan)
Shout Out Loud	£994,500	English Heritage	England-wide
Reimagine, Remake, Replay	£949,600	The Nerve Centre	Belfast
Hope Streets	£998,800	Curious Minds	North West England
Scotland 365	£776,000	National Museums Scotland	Scotland
Don't Settle	£696,700	Beatfreeks Arts Ltd.	Birmingham
Ignite Yorkshire	£962,300	IVE	Yorkshire
Hands on Heritage	£874,500	National Museum Wales	Wales

Project activities

Kick the Dust projects are engaging young people in a range of heritage activities ranging from connecting groups of young people with local artists and creative producers to re-write stories about Yorkshire's traditional waterways, to an eight-week programme of outdoor practical conservation work, habitat management, and visitor engagement of local green spaces. Projects will also provide training and development opportunities for young people, including volunteering, paid traineeships, apprenticeships and mentoring; and test various approaches to youth governance.

To sustain the programme's aims over the long-term, projects will be expected to build and maintain cross-sector partnerships, provide development opportunities for heritage staff, use learning to communicate about approaches that work and advocate for the value of youth

engagement in heritage. The Fund defines heritage as anything from the past that people value and want to pass on to future generations. This could range from people's memories and experiences, historic buildings, monuments and museum collections to parks and nature (habitats, species and geology). The figure below shows the five typologies of heritage engagement for the programme. The typologies are:

- Reinterpreting industrial heritage
- Reinterpreting historic sites and collections
- Conservation of natural heritage
- Telling untold stories of people and places
- Curating shared cultural traditions and heritage

Figure 1: Typology of heritage engagement

1 project involves reinterpreting industrial heritage

6 projects involve reinterpreting historic sites and collections

2 projects involve conservation of natural heritage

2 projects involve telling untold stories of people and places

1 project involves curating shared cultural traditions and heritage

While there will be some variation within projects, these typologies present the main forms of engagement.

2.1 About this report

The programme evaluation was commissioned in October 2017. It was originally intended that this report would include findings from the first year of programme activities, however, project delivery started much later than expected due to delays in the submission of second-round applications. All 12 second-round applications were expected to be submitted by the end of March 2018, however the last applications were not submitted until June. This meant that project start times were staggered rather than all projects starting at the same time. Furthermore, recruitment of key project staff did not commence until late summer or autumn and by the end of 2018 two projects were still in recruitment. Because of these delays, there has been no data collection relating to activities delivered by projects. The tools for this have been agreed with projects and are currently in use. The first round of data collection relating to project activities will take place in September 2019.

This report provides a summary of the programme evaluation design, and an overview of how the programme is progressing towards its aims and outcomes. The report draws on data collected from a survey with Project Managers on the implementation of the development phase, and information from project activity plans and evaluation briefs. It concludes with recommendations for improvement in the future.

3. Background to Kick the Dust

Young people have been a priority for The Fund for a long time. The Fund launched its Young Roots funding programme in 2002 which has supported a range of projects that engaged young people aged 11-25 with heritage in the UK, with grants between £10,000 to £50,000. However, Kick the Dust is the first programme to fund youth projects at this scale in terms of grant available per project, project duration and breadth of activity. The programme was developed in response to research that showed that despite investing in young people, they were still under-represented as audiences, users, and volunteers at heritage sites and services. The research also found that young people valued heritage less than adults, are less satisfied with what is on offer, and are less likely to participate.[2]

Kick the Dust is a strategic programme for The Fund and its ambition is to demonstrate the role of heritage in meeting young people's needs, as well as helping to raise the ambitions of heritage organisations and improving practice. The focus for KtD therefore is just as much on the impact for the young people who engage with the programme as much as for heritage organisations and how they work with young people (and the youth sector) in the future. The emphasis of the programme is about challenge and learning for the heritage sector; to bring about long-term change to the culture and practice of heritage organisations.

The programme was informed by research that considered the new landscape for the youth sector in relation to The Fund's funding, the needs of the heritage sector to develop more opportunities for young people, and how to involve young people in decision-making.[3] This research found that heritage organisations required more time and resource to test, develop and embed high quality practice. This would require longer and larger grants of up to five years to change how heritage organisations engage with young people. It was acknowledged that heritage staff needed to build their expertise and confidence in working with young people. The Fund also wanted to work in partnership with the youth sector to draw in their expertise. Finally, the research found significant need for greater support with evaluation and a more rigorous approach to how evidence is collected and used to inform practice.

The programme therefore is an opportunity to test whether given the time to be more strategic with their funding and to better evaluate their work with young people:

- heritage organisations could test and embed good practice
- heritage organisations could change the way they engage with young people
- heritage organisations could develop their expertise and confidence in working with young people

Based on this research and learning, Kick the Dust was launched in 2017 with three important underlying principles.

1. The programme will be youth focused, with young people at the heart of it and with young people and adults working collaboratively. The programme will embed youth engagement in heritage for the long-term.

---

[2] BritainThinks, 20 Years in 12 Places: http://britainthinks.com/pdfs/Heratige-Lottery-Fund-20-years-in-12-places.pdf

[3] Young People and Heritage Sector Icarus Report:
https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/research/young_people_and_heritage_sector_icarus-report-accessible-2.pdf

2. Staff will develop the skills and confidence to sustain youth engagement in heritage and organisations will be committed to involving young people in the running of the organisations.
3. The programme will be committed to evaluation and evidence. There will be high quality evaluation on individual projects, but also look at the impact of the programme as a whole.

4. Programme evaluation

This programme evaluation has the ambition to contribute to the body of knowledge, policy and practice related to youth engagement with heritage. The overarching aims of the evaluation are to:

- assess the impact of the programme;
- improve project evaluation and encourage reflective practice, including giving young people a voice in evaluation; and
- contribute to a national debate about the value of youth engagement with heritage.

The impact evaluation is guided by a programme Theory of Change and evaluation framework that has identified the primary outcomes of the programme. The evaluation framework also includes a shared evidence base across the 12 projects, highlighting where projects will contribute to the programme-level impact study.

There is also a focus on programme learning to support projects to conduct on-going evaluation and use the findings as part of continuous reflective practice. Throughout the programme the cohort will be brought together as a Community of Practice to share their insights from delivery, explore common challenges, co-create ideas of how to improve practice based on evidence, and share tools and resources. The projects have been engaged in two Community of Practice events in the first 18 months of the programme, the first in December 2017 and the second in November 2018. These events have focused on developing the programme Theory of Change, developing the evaluation methods, and discussing approaches to reflective practices.

The full programme evaluation framework is included in **Appendix 1**.

4.1 Theory of Change

A Theory of Change was developed for the programme, providing the rationale which underpins the evaluation, and presents an overarching model for how KtD funding will achieve its overarching aims. The Theory of Change has identified a set of outcomes that are shared across the 12 projects; it builds on The Fund's outcomes for people, heritage and communities and makes the project outcomes more relevant to the aims and ambitions of the programme.

The Theory of Change was developed by a process that included:

- Reviewing project application forms and activity plans
- Initial interviews with all 12 projects
- Consultations with Kick the Dust projects at the first Community of Practice event and with the Heritage Fund

The Theory of Change outlines the changes that are expected to happen for young people (i.e. what difference it makes to the participants) as well as heritage organisations, within the timeframe of the programme.

The Theory of Change is divided into three key elements: programme activities, mechanisms of change, and programme outcomes (immediate, medium, and long-term).

The complete Theory of Change is included in **Appendix 2.**

4.1.1 Programme activities

Project activities are divided into delivery activities (e.g. those that focus on direct engagement with young people), and strategic activities (e.g. those that focus on quality improvement and organisational change). This division reflects the equal contribution of both types of activity to the programme's long-term impact. The process for data collection on activities has been agreed with projects and is outlined in the programme's common measurement framework (explained in more detail below).

4.1.2 Programme outcomes

The programme evaluation emphasises outcomes for heritage, people, and communities under four levels of outcomes:

- Mechanisms of change - measures relating to people's experience of engagement in the programme
- Immediate outcomes – changes that result directly from programme activities
- Medium-term outcomes – changes that indicate wider sector change
- Long-term outcome – overarching aims of the programme

The long-term outcomes are the overarching programme aims and fall outside the scope of the programme evaluation. However, the achievement of the other three levels of outcomes will give an indication of how well these aims have been reached.

4.1.3 Mechanisms of Change

Given the programme's emphasis on quality, the Theory of Change includes several measures that represent the 'key ingredients' of high-quality engagement in heritage. These are referred to in the evaluation framework as 'mechanisms of change'.

'Mechanisms of Change' is an approach to measuring people's experiences of engaging with services that are delivered in diverse and sometimes diffuse settings. It is an approach to evaluation that is increasingly common in youth work as it helps youth organisations understand what it is that young people feel and experience during their engagement that leads to positive outcomes. These experiences can be regarded as the key ingredients that make an engagement with a young person high quality.

This evaluation acknowledges that there are three groups of people that are at the heart of Kick the Dust, whose experiences of the programme are critical to its success: young people, heritage staff, and consortium members. Mechanisms of change, therefore, will measure the experiences that are cultivated by engagement in Kick the Dust.

The mechanisms of change for the programme are summarised in the table below.

Table 2: Kick the Dust mechanisms of change

Participant	Mechanism of change
Young people	Young people from all backgrounds feel: • Safe • Welcomed and included • Respected by heritage staff • Positively challenged • A sense of excitement • A sense of purpose and achievement
Young people	Young people are empowered to make change by feeling: • That their opinions and perspectives are valued • Represented and influential
Heritage staff	Heritage staff feel: • That young people make a positive contribution • Supported and challenged by youth work and other partners • Empowered and that they have the right skills to engage young people • That senior management subscribe to the importance of work with young people
Consortium members	Cross-sector partnerships (heritage and youth) are extended and expanded through: • A shared vision • Good relationships • Willingness to learn from each other's expertise

4.1.4 Immediate and medium-term outcomes

The immediate outcomes of the programme are grouped into outcomes for heritage, people, and communities; to align with The Fund's outcome framework. These outcomes represent the changes or benefits that result from programme activities

The programme's aspirations for sector-wide change are outlined in the medium-term outcomes in the Theory of Change. It is expected that learning from reflective practice and evaluation over the lifespan of the programme will influence changes in policy and practice within heritage organisations, leading to increased sustainability of the sector. The medium-term outcomes emphasise sustainment of high quality youth engagement in heritage; young people playing a positive role in managing and maintaining heritage, more and stronger cross-sector relationships, improved capacity and capability to evidence the value of work with young people, a more diverse and inclusive heritage sector, and increased relevance of heritage to young people from a range of backgrounds.

4.2 Evaluation methodology

The evaluation methodology is informed by the programme evaluation framework and the common measurement framework. The programme evaluation framework set outs the overarching research

questions and guides the overall process. It includes the indicators that are linked to each outcome on the Theory of Change, the data sources available, and the tools required for data collection.

The common measurement framework sets out the expectations for all 12 KtD projects on data collection, to contribute to the programme's evidence base. The common measurement framework also includes a set of standardised questions for measuring outcomes.

The methodology for the programme evaluation has been informed by the need for a balance between a flexible approach to accommodate the differing needs and delivery approaches of each of the projects, and a clear focus on outcomes and robustness of evidence. The evaluation methods for the programme include:

- Surveys with heritage and project staff
- In-depth case studies with four KtD projects
- Common data points collected by projects as outlined in the common measurement framework, using tools developed by Renaisi and the Centre for Youth Impact
- On-going learning and reflection on practice

Projects will also collect their own specific data, in consultation with their project evaluators (if they have one). The programme evaluation will collate the project-level evaluations and synthesise to draw out common themes and lesson learned from across the programme.

The evaluation is mixed method and involves some quantitative data collection to help assess what difference the programme has made to young people and heritage organisations. The evaluation will collect programme outputs and activities using a bespoke data collection tool developed by Renaisi which will be collected from projects on an annual basis. The first round of data collection is scheduled for September 2019.

Qualitative data will enable in-depth exploration of the approaches projects are taking, how they are using evidence and reflective practice for programme learning and development, and tracking institutional change. Qualitative data will also be collected as part of on-going learning and reflection on practice during programme learning activities, to draw together evidence on embedding practice.

4.2.1 Surveys with heritage and project staff

The programme evaluation will also involve undertaking two longitudinal surveys with heritage staff and KtD project staff.

The heritage staff survey will capture data on the extent to which the project has contributed to sustainable on-going work with young people, including development of skills and confidence of staff, perceptions about the benefits for heritage, and wider cultural changes.

A survey will also be conducted with project staff, which is defined as the main people responsible for the work during the project, including key partners and any young people employed as part of the project. The project staff survey will capture reflections from the project team on working in partnership, changes and improvements in youth engagement practice, evaluation practice, and observed engagement of young people.

Both surveys will be disseminated in three stages – a baseline survey at the beginning of programme year two, an interim survey at the programme mid-point and at the end of the programme.

4.2.2 Case studies

The programme evaluation methodology includes case studies with four Kick the Dust projects. The case studies provide an opportunity to explore the impact of the programme in greater depth and gain insight into the change taking place across heritage organisations. They will be qualitative in focus to understand delivery processes, development of heritage staff, and will track progress longitudinally across the programme evaluation.

The four case study projects were selected based on a range of criteria including context, type of heritage, and ambitions relating to organisational change. The four projects chosen were:

- Hope Streets, Curious Minds
- Hands on Heritage, National Museums Wales
- Keeping it Wild, London Wildlife Trust
- Shout out loud, English Heritage

The research questions guiding the qualitative fieldwork will be based on the programme outcomes as outlined in the Theory of Change. Case study methodology will involve observation of project activities and qualitative data collection with the following audiences:

- **Young people involved in governance** or other leadership roles, to understand how youth voice is being embedded, and young people's level of influence.
- **Participants engaged in project activities**, to understand young people's experiences and perceptions of heritage.
- **Heritage staff and volunteers**, to understand the culture of youth engagement in organisations, staff skills, confidence and development, and strengths and challenges of delivery.
- **Consortium partners**, to understand how partnerships are built and maintained, roles and responsibilities of members, and ways of working.
- **Project staff** to understand project set up and delivery including processes, outcomes, partnerships, sustainability, challenges and influence.

At the time of writing this report some of the programme evaluation tools are still in development but will be completed in early 2019.

4.2.3 Common measurement framework

The Common Measurement Framework is a toolkit for KtD projects that outlines what each project will contribute to the programme evaluation through direct data collection on project outputs and outcomes. This data will be reported on an annual basis. This will include:

- **Project activities**: the framework includes a list of outputs that captures the range of activities taking place across the programme. Projects will report the number and type of activities delivered.
- **Participant engagement**: projects will report how many young people are engaged in their project and at what level they are engaged using the 'continuum of engagement' developed for the programme.
- **Training and development of participants and staff**: projects will report the number of young people and heritage staff/volunteers trained and mentored, qualifications achieved, participants in paid placements and apprenticeships, and young people in paid employment (full time and part time).
- **Project volunteers**: projects will report the number of volunteers recruited and whether their volunteering is skilled, semi-skilled, or unskilled.

- **Participant demographic data**: projects will report demographic data on all young people engaged throughout their project. Demographic data will include age, disability status, ethnicity, socio-economic status, sexual identity, and gender identity.
- **Quality of engagement** with young people (mechanisms of change).
- **Outcomes for heritage and young people:** these will be measured using a tool developed by Renaisi and CYI.

The complete Common Measurement Framework is included in **Appendix 3** and the survey tool to measure outcomes for heritage and young people is included in **Appendix 4.**

4.3 Project-level evaluations

One of the main aims of the programme evaluation is to improve project evaluation by building the capacity and skills to produce high quality evaluations. This aim serves two purposes: to ensure that heritage organisations can contribute to the evidence base about the value of youth engagement; and to use evidence to test and refine practice and inform yearly activity plans.

In the application phase, projects were encouraged by The Fund to set between 3% and 7% of their total budget to commission evaluation support. The programme evaluation provided bespoke 1:2:1 consultancy support according to projects' needs and also by bringing them together as a cohort twice a year to develop, discuss, and reflect on evaluation.

A key question for this report is to what extent have the quality of project-level evaluations improved? Analysis of project evaluations has been limited by several factors that mean it has been difficult to answer this question. These factors include:

1. Most evaluation plans are **still incomplete**. At the time of this report only three projects had a completed evaluation plan. Furthermore, almost all projects have commissioned their evaluation to independent consultants. While this has been encouraged by the programme, it has taken a long time for information on evaluations to emerge.

2. Despite the lack of completed application plans, the second-round application documents provided some information on initial plans. However, there was **not much consistency in the** structure and content of these documents, making it **difficult to synthesise** the information into a coherent summary of how plans were developing.

3. At the start of the programme, **projects varied in terms of their levels of skills and expertise** in relation to evaluation. Some projects felt that they had a lot of expertise in evaluation and tended to be more developed in their thinking at the beginning of the development phase, while others were less confident and more unsure about what they needed to do. As a result, it has been **difficult to define high quality evaluation** when projects were at such different starting points.

4. Projects are being asked to undertake **two different types of evaluation at the same time**. The programme aspires for projects to use evidence for developmental learning that will support project design and activities while at the same time asking them to produce robust evidence of impact. Trying to achieve both in one project might overstretch evaluation capacity and create some tension between the two needs. Projects might have to make significant or frequent changes to programme design, making it **more difficult to generate meaningful insights** into impact.

5. Capacity building support was limited by a number of **missed opportunities to influence quality and consistency** of evaluations. On reflection, the first Community of Practice event did not do enough to establish some clear parameters for projects in terms of **how**

the Theory of Change was intended to influence their activity plans. A second Community of Practice event was supposed to take place a few months later, which would have focused on shaping individual project evaluations in more detail. This second event did not take place as planned due to resource constraints at The Fund. As a result, it was not possible to provide support to develop common approaches to evaluation, drafting evaluation plans, and commissioning external evaluators.

Useful learning that has emerged so far is that there is some variation in motivations and aspirations for evaluation. Three variations have emerged so far which can be summarised as:

- Taking a more creative, participatory methods to "humanise data" and develop approaches that are more appropriate for use with young people.
- Using KtD as an opportunity to develop in-house evaluation skills and capabilities and achieving a consistent level of evaluation practice throughout the organisation.
- Strengthening evidence of impact by achieving a Level 3 standard of evidence.

There are several factors that appear to be driving these variations. This includes their existing levels of confidence and expertise in relation to evaluation, and other factors such as levels of confidence in engaging young people, and organisational motivations. To illustrate this, one KtD project is a youth-led arts organisation that is highly confident in engaging young people and has a lot of experience using a range of creative and digital methods to collect experience data. Their knowledge of evaluation methodology, however, is limited. They are striving to learn how their more creative methods can be used alongside evaluation to improve how evaluation is done with young people. Another KtD project is led by a large cultural institution that is more confident about their evaluation skills and already have an evaluation framework in place which is used by all their projects. They are striving to use this expertise to achieve a higher standard of evidence. For each of these underlying approaches, quality could look quite different, which makes it particularly difficult to make comparisons.

Despite the limitations described above, it has been possible to capture some early insights into how project evaluations are progressing. Most projects have demonstrated that they have taken steps to create a clearer framework for their evaluation by refining their outcomes and/or developing a logic model or Theory of Change. The two projects that did not have a Theory of Change or logic model stated that they intended to develop one with the support of an external evaluator. Three projects had also adopted the programme evaluation's approach to measuring quality by including mechanisms of change in their models. All three of the projects that have a completed evaluation plan have specified that they will collect some baseline data for their evaluation. Information available so far shows that a range of interesting approaches to evaluation are beginning to emerge. Table 3 below provides examples of project-level outcomes and methods of data collection that have been drawn from projects that had a completed evaluation plan at the time of this report.

Table 3: Project outcomes and evaluation methods

Outcomes for heritage

Project Outcomes	Methods
Parks and green spaces have additional volunteering and fundraising capacity Young people are supported to lead activities which educate others about the value of historic parks	Visual materials of physical conditions Observations and ethnographic visits Audience records

Project Outcomes	Methods
Increased cultural democracy	Online surveys and website analytics
Heritage is less "didactic" and raises more questions	Audit of museum spaces
Young people's rights are at the centre of heritage management	

Outcomes for people: attitudes and behaviours, knowledge and skills, fun and engaging experiences of heritage, etc

Project Outcomes	Methods
Increasing fundraising skills	Participant and volunteer questionnaires
Testing new delivery models	Mystery shopping
Increased awareness/ability to discern quality practice	Walking tours
Attitudes and behaviours of adults towards young people changes	Interviews
Increased understanding of different cultures and heritage among different generations	Participant case studies
Development of co-production skills	Participatory research such as vlogs and journals
More young people apply for jobs in heritage	Website comments and discussion groups
	Training surveys
	Observation

Outcomes for communities, organisational resilience, and partnership working

Project Outcomes	Methods
Co-production embedded in organisational practice	Participant surveys
Evidence of youth voice in organisational policies, strategies, etc.	Observations and ethnographic visits
Stronger local partnerships	Organisational data such as Memorandums of Understanding, Diversity & Equality Strategies, quality measures and accreditation, training plans
Improved relationships museums and youth sector	
Improved relationships between museums and communities	Interviews with stakeholders
Increased social cohesion	Observations of young people's involvement of institutional activities
Positive role of young people in the community is demonstrated	Meeting minutes
Youth workers become leaders in working with heritage	Interviews
Improved dialogue between communities	ACE quality metrics
	Partnership agreements
	Counterfactual

5. Kick the Dust development phase

The six-month development phase was an opportunity for projects to develop a detailed programme of activities to engage young people in heritage. Projects were encouraged to use this time to:

- Identify how young people will be involved in planning and managing the project.
- Set up the project consortium.
- Develop a detailed timetable, costs and cash flow for the delivery phase.
- Consider in detail how the project will affect heritage organisations and how they will manage this change.
- Develop a plan for building confidence and experience of heritage organisations and maintain project outcomes after funding has ended.
- Develop an evaluation plan.
- Collect baseline data to measure the difference their project makes.

After the development phase was completed, a survey was undertaken with the 12 project leads to capture their experience, understanding how it benefited projects' planning, and any barriers they faced.

This section of the report provides an analysis of development phase outputs to understand how the programme is progressing towards its aims. Activity plans provide insight into how the programme is building on the needs and interests of young people, and how projects are working towards increasing the resilience of heritage organisations. This is then followed by findings from the survey with project leads on the overall value of the development phase.[4]

The section that follows provides a summary of the strengths and challenges of the programme so far and concludes with recommendations for improvement in future programmes.

5.1 Outputs from the development phase

5.1.1 Building on young people's needs and interests

The development phase of the Kick the Dust programme involved consultation with young people, co-production, research, and testing ideas that would inform each project's activity plan. Although establishing a standard baseline across the programme was not required during the development phase, each project conducted some baseline research and consultation to gather evidence relating to young people's awareness and knowledge of heritage, their current engagement in heritage, barriers preventing them from engaging, and their views on how to make heritage more accessible to young people. Research and consultation activities used a range of qualitative and quantitative methods including:

- Face to face, participatory consultations such as focus groups and workshops
- Questionnaires and online surveys with young people and heritage organisations
- Desk-based research and literature reviews

---

[4] Out of the 12 projects, eight projects leads completed the survey. In some cases, the missing responses were because the person who was project lead at the time of the development phase had moved on from the project. While the findings summarised below give useful insight into people's experiences of the development phase, they do not represent everyone's views.

- Visitor profile data from local museums
- Interviews with heritage staff
- Visits to local heritage organisations

Insights from projects' research and consultation activities identify several cross-cutting themes and trends that reveal the specific barriers that exist to increasing youth engagement in heritage that the programme will need to address to achieve its aims. Figure 2 below highlights the most common barriers that were identified across all 12 projects.

Projects' development phase baseline research findings

1. Current engagement limited to **school visits** and **work experience.** School programmes are popular with providers, but these don't encourage young people to **spend their *free time*** engaging with heritage.

2. Heritage is not designed with **young people in mind**. Targeted events and activities are **aimed at children or adults** – young people feel they are not the target audience.

3. Governance schemes prevalent, but tend to engage **'usual suspects'** – not diverse, facing less barriers, with high cultural capital and more aspirational.

4. Heritage is not communicated in a **youth-friendly way**; young people are unaware of the existence of youth-friendly projects.

5. Young people **do not feel connected** with heritage. Heritage is not inclusive of a range of backgrounds, perspectives, and interpretations.

6. Heritage staff **do not feel confident** working with young people, and they lack dedicated youth staff.

7. Young people **do not feel represented** in the sector, or that there are clear routes of progression

8. Young people **do not feel welcome** in heritage spaces**:** they feel stigmatised as 'troublemakers', they don't understand the rules of arts participation; or no-one asks them to take part.

9. **Financial:** admission fees, transport costs for rural participants. **Accessibility:** need to bring carers, different ways of interacting with heritage.

Now that these barriers have been identified, a key question for the programme is: How are KtD projects building on young people's needs and interests, to make heritage more relevant to more and a greater diversity of young people?

Table 4 below provides an analysis of how the needs and interests of young people have informed project design and activities. It also shows how these activities are expected to contribute to programme impact by highlighting where they align with the Theory of Change. This provides useful insight into how the programme as a whole is progressing towards its outcomes.

The table shows how the project activities will contribute to several of the programme's outcomes, but there are still some unknowns at this stage.

- Projects will target many under-represented groups such as young people with special educational needs, young people in supported accommodation, young people from socio-economically deprived areas, and young people with disabilities. It remains to be seen whether the more high-level and structured forms of engagement (governance and other

leadership roles) reach more than the "usual suspects" e.g. those facing less barriers and with more cultural capital.

- Ten out of the 12 projects will target specific groups of young people, while the other two projects will have a "general" audience. It is not clear at this stage how projects will address the barriers and needs that are specific to different groups of young people. It is expected that cross-sector partnerships with organisations that have specialist knowledge of under-represented groups will provide the necessary skills and expertise to engage diverse groups of young people, however insights into progress in this area will not emerge for some time.

- It is also less clear from this information how changes to heritage will be made more sustainable, so that organisations can continue high quality engagement with young people for the long term. The next section focuses on the longer-term ambitions of the programme and emerging insights into the longer-term resilience and sustainability projects aim to achieve.

Table 4: Progress towards programme outcomes

Barrier identified	What needs to change?	Current progression towards outcomes at this stage	Relevant KtD programme outcome
Current engagement limited to school visits and work experience	Heritage needs to create more and a greater range of opportunities for young people to engage with heritage.	All projects will provide a range of opportunities to engage, to suit different needs and interests from one-off and taster events, creative collaborative activities to curate content, direct involvement in conservation, consultation activities, training and skills development (including volunteering), research and evaluation roles, paid roles, and governance roles. All projects will aim to share good practice with other organisations, such as through new strategies or toolkits for improving youth engagement and participation.	Young people will take up more opportunities to volunteer and share their talents in a range of heritage organisations Young people will learn about heritage in a range of engaging, creative ways
Heritage is not designed with young people in mind	Heritage needs to create more opportunities for young people to have a voice in the management of heritage, including opportunities to shape and inform the creation of heritage content.	All projects have recognised the importance of providing young people with the opportunity to play an active part in curation and content production and decision-making. Young people will lead on and co-produce a range of projects, exhibits and events to engage their peers in heritage. Many projects have also recognised the need for young people to consult on organisational policies so that youth voice is embedded throughout the organisation. One project will facilitate joint action planning between heritage organisations and young people, and opportunities	New heritage content is created Young people will play a positive role in managing and maintaining heritage New interpretation is directly influenced by young people or designed specifically to engage young people
Governance schemes prevalent but target "usual suspects"	Opportunities for young people to play a role in governance need to be made more inclusive and accessible to a wider range of young people.	All projects have recognised the need to create opportunities for young people to play a role in governance. Projects will trial different approaches to youth governance and youth-led decision-making such as youth boards, project steering groups, youth committees and forums.	Young people will play a role in governance Young people from all backgrounds feel that their opinions/perspectives are valued Young people from all backgrounds feel represented and influential

Barrier identified	What needs to change?	Current progression towards outcomes at this stage	Relevant KtD programme outcome
		At this stage, however, projects have not been clear about how they will ensure that these opportunities are extended to a diverse range of young people.	
Heritage is not communicated in a youth-friendly way	Heritage needs to use a wider range of communication styles and methods to engage young people, and create opportunities for young people to inform communication content.	A few projects will focus on creating opportunities for young people to inform, design and shape marketing and branding content and feed into communication strategies for the heritage sector. Some projects have also identified the need to improve the use of digital tools to communicate heritage including videos, blogs, and social media.	Heritage is better communicated
Young people do not feel connected to heritage	Heritage content needs to be more inclusive, and reflect a greater diversity of stories, histories, and perspectives.	All projects have recognised the need for heritage to be more inclusive, however there are several projects where this has been embedded at the heart of young people's engagement. These projects will focus on young people leading on heritage inquiry and research to uncover hidden stories and untold heritage, or reinterpreting sites and collections.

Three projects have a particular focus on improving young people's sense of belonging and identity, and increasing their feeling that heritage sites and spaces belong to them. | Heritage content is more inclusive and diverse

Young people's perceptions of heritage will change

Heritage is more relevant to a diverse range of young people |
| Heritage staff do not feel confident working with young people. | Heritage needs to build strong relationships with organisations that can bring specialist skills in working with young people with greater needs and barriers.

Heritage needs a set of quality metrics for high quality engagement with young people that can | All projects have recognised the importance of improving the skills and confidence of staff to engage with young people and are trialling a range of approaches to learning and development.

Some projects have developed more interesting approaches such as experiential CPD for staff, reverse mentoring, and embedding youth work staff in heritage.

Projects also recognise the value of the advice and guidance that cross-sector partnerships bring in helping to improve the quality of youth engagement. | Heritage staff feel supported and challenged by youth work and other partners

Heritage staff feel empowered and that they have the skills to engage young people

Heritage staff will gain confidence in engaging young people

Heritage staff will gain/develop skills |

Barrier identified	What needs to change?	Current progression towards outcomes at this stage	Relevant KtD programme outcome
	inform staff development and training.		
Young people do not feel they are welcome in these spaces.	Heritage staff need to change attitudes and perceptions of young people and create a safer, more welcoming environment.	All projects have also recognised that there needs to be a significant shift in people's perceptions of young people, especially heritage staff and volunteers at the front of house. Projects are developing targeted activity and training that will aim to change people's perceptions and attitudes towards young people.	Young people feel safe, welcomed and included Young people feel respected by heritage staff Heritage staff feel that young people make a positive contribution to heritage
Young people do not feel represented in the sector	Heritage needs to create more career pathways for young people, more opportunities to develop young people's skills and talents, and create more paid training roles.	All projects have recognised the importance of young people learning and practising new skills, and across the programme there will be a range of accreditations and training courses delivered. Several projects will provide young people with mentors to help them progress in their engagement. Projects have also recognised the importance of having more paid opportunities for young people, especially those who may not be able to afford to take unpaid or voluntary roles. Therefore, some young people will have access to paid opportunities including paid trainee roles, work placements, apprenticeships, and training bursaries. There has been less of a focus on how the workforce can be more representative and inclusive in the future. Only one organisation has considered how to increase diversity of the heritage workforce by working with organisations to revise their recruitment strategies.	More and inclusive heritage sector Young people will practice new skills, some as part of paid training opportunities
Financial costs and physical access needs	Heritage needs to be free for young people to access and increase understanding of any	Currently there is limited information from projects directly on whether activities will be free. None of the funded activities in Kick the Dust are chargeable or have fees.	Heritage is more accessible to young people

Barrier identified	What needs to change?	Current progression towards outcomes at this stage	Relevant KtD programme outcome
create barriers for young people	physical access barriers that might be preventing young people from engaging.	It is not clear how projects intend to address specific access barriers, although cross-sector partnerships with organisations that have specialist knowledge of different groups of young people will help to inform programme design.	

5.1.2 Ambitions for resilience and sustainability

One of The Fund's aspirations for the programme is that heritage organisations will be more resilient. An important question for the programme therefore is how heritage organisations are working towards being more innovative, ambitious and sustainable; enabling the sector to adapt to changing circumstances. From a practical perspective, achieving these aspirations requires projects to build-in longer-term organisational changes into project design and implementation. In the development phase therefore, projects needed to consider not only how they will improve their practice within projects, but also how ways of working and lessons learned about what works can be extended beyond the life of the project.

The programme evaluation will look for evidence of increasing resilience in several key areas including:

1. Heritage organisations will have access to more tools and resources to support high quality youth engagement
2. Reflection and learning becomes part of regular organisational practice
3. Changes to internal policies and processes/practices which aim to increase engagement of young people from diverse backgrounds
4. Heritage organisations apply for further funding/have a funding strategy in place to support high quality youth engagement

Based on the information available at this stage of the programme, there several themes emerging in relation to project approaches to resilience and organisational change. A full breakdown for each project can be found in **Appendix 5**, however these themes have been grouped and summarised in the table below.

Table 5: Approaches to resilience and organisational change

Area of change	Approaches
Internal vs external organisational change	1) Internal change: project is aiming to achieve change within their own organisations (project lead is a heritage organisation) 2) External change: project is aiming to facilitate change in other organisations by acting as an expert or specialist
Changes to policies or ways of working	This includes reviewing and revising organisational policies or practice, in consultation with young people, but these activities are less clearly defined at this stage of the programme.
New or revised organisational strategies	This mostly includes adopting new strategies that are specifically aimed at young people as well as improving existing strategies so that they address young people's needs and interests e.g. marketing and communications strategies, heritage management, etc.
Developing the heritage workforce	This approach is the most common among projects and involves improving skills, confidence and attitudes of heritage staff through bespoke and tailored training.
Embedding youth voice	Embedding new models of governance and/or heritage management that give young people a role in decision-making and programme design.
Dissemination of learning and good practice	Projects have stated that they will publish a range of learning materials and events including academic papers, research studies, impact reports, networking or dissemination events, and toolkits for the heritage sector.

Analysis of project activity plans show that the level of ambition for organisational change appears to vary, with some projects demonstrating more ambition than others. There are also a few areas that have been given less consideration overall.

Half of the KtD projects have more developed plans for driving organisational change. They aim to embed change at multiple levels within heritage organisations from governance and policy-making, heritage management, staff recruitment and professional development, and frontline practice. There are also some more innovative ideas emerging from a small number of projects, including:

- Creation of a new youth-led heritage organisation
- Development of a framework assessing the inclusiveness of heritage collections
- Development of a young people's cultural rights scheme for heritage
- Embedding environmental resources and nature in youth work

For the other half of the projects, ambitions for organisational change are less clear. These projects seem to have limited their ambition primarily to staff training and development and sharing best practice, but with little indication of how this will lead to long-term change. Some projects have stated that they will review organisational policies but have not specified which policies these will be or which policies might be the most relevant to achieving sustainable work with young people.

While all projects involve an element of training and development of heritage staff, these staff might eventually move on and these skills might be lost. There has been less consideration to how skills and knowledge can be retained for the long-term such as through revised recruitment or professional development strategies. Two projects show promise in this area, as they intend to produce a learning and development framework for heritage staff. There has also been less evidence overall of organisational ambitions for future funding and whether projects intend to develop new fundraising and development strategies.

The findings in this section point to a key piece of learning for the programme. While projects have generated many ideas for communication and dissemination of learning for the sector, the fact that so many projects have struggled to articulate a clear plan for organisational change beyond stating that they will share learning or embed new models of engagement. It is not clear how this learning or new ways of working become embedded. This might suggest that the programme has missed an opportunity to build capacity around effective change management. Programme theory (e.g. Theory of Change/logic model) works well for describing how activities are intended to deliver impact for individuals, but is not the best method for developing a theory of organisational change.

Organisational change is a difficult process that is driven by a number of different forces and there is no single model of change, but it does require an effective change management process. Gathering evidence and learning is a key step in this process, but it requires going beyond identifying good practice. Projects must have mechanisms built in for organisational change, and this is likely to require additional expertise to be brought in from The Fund at the outset.

5.2 Overall experience of the development phase

A survey was conducted with project leads at the end of the development phase, to understand what difference the development phase had on activity plans and partnerships building. A copy of the survey questions used can be found in **Appendix 6.**

Findings from the survey demonstrate that projects valued the flexibility the development phase provided, as it provided time for them to test their ideas and revisit their activity plans based on what they had learned. Consultation with young people was an important and formative element of projects' activity plans,

and young people played a significant role in decision-making. The flexibility of the development phase was key, as without it there would be no mechanism to integrate the youth voice.

"It is useful to have flexibility to change the plan in future years, meaning we are able to develop the project …in terms of what works well and feedback from participants."

"In-line with the original intentions of the KTD programme, it needs to be flexible and progressive with young people playing an increasing role in decision making and planning."

Projects had the option of commissioning an external consultant to draft the activity plan, or do it in house. Four projects reported that they had written their activity plans in-house, and four had their plan written by a consultant. Those that wrote their plan in-house found drafting it was intensive and more time-consuming than they had expected, but still felt positive about the experience, using words like "informative"; "defining"; "essential" and "rewarding" to describe it.

"To have that time funded is a luxury and allowed us to do a better and more thorough job to come up with a solid plan."

"The second-stage process was more time-consuming and intensive than we and partners had envisaged. The level of detail required before sign off was unprecedented in our experience."

Projects were also encouraged to consult with new and existing young audiences and this helped to ensure that young people's voice was embedded from the beginning. The direct involvement of young people in the activity plan design stage was described as "essential" by six of the respondents. The feedback they received from young people gave them more clarity on their purpose and offering, and they made changes because of the consultation. Youth consultation sparked useful debate with project partners as well as *"kick-starting"* their engagement with young people for the long-term. One respondent wrote that their plan had intentional *"gaps in the detail"* to allow young people to make changes to its design and delivery, and most agreed that the level of detail required was reasonable and appropriate.

However, one project noted that consulting with young people was not always easy because it was focused on something that was hypothetical. Feedback would have been better if the young people had participated first and then provided feedback.

"Capturing the views of young people was not easy, given that this was all focused on what was then a hypothetical project. Young people told us that in some ways they need to be participating first, and would then be better placed to provide feedback and input."

One project described their consultation with other stakeholders as being just as useful as their consultation with young people, and potentially more so.

"It was useful to reflect what we found back to museum partners…[w]e found consultation with youth workers actually more revealing - it led to our adapting the programme to account for their attitudes towards heritage. While the young person consultation confirmed our hunches, the Youth Worker consultation influenced what we planned to do."

Going forward, young people will continue to influence project design in a range of ways that can be summarised as: (1) trialling different activities to gather thoughts and feedback; (2) an 'embedded' approach with an on-going feedback loop; and (3) youth governance structures, such as regular youth boards and steering groups.

Survey respondents identified several opportunities for #DustKickers to play a positive role in the programme going forward including:

- Observing activities and giving their honest feedback and recommendations for improvement
- Supporting with data collection and gathering feedback from the young people
- Share their expertise, especially for input into activity design and evaluation

- Play a role in project governance such as steering committees, etc.
- Championing projects and using their influence to champion Kick the Dust in the heritage sector

5.2.1 Timeline and budget

Having a six-month development phase embedded into the application process was an asset to the programme. It gave projects the time to engage with young people in a meaningful way, to test their ideas, and use their learning to make improvements to their Activity plan before submitting the second-round application. Only one project stated that the six-month time period was not long enough, as they found it difficult to get the consortium arranged and working together within the time frame.

Completing activity plans within the timeline and budget was sometimes hindered by miscommunication or lack of clarity about programme timelines and application processes, which led to some delays in the timing of round-two application submissions. Respondents reported receiving conflicting or confusing advice, and communication from The Fund about programme timelines was often unclear, leaving many confused about key dates. Respondents suspected that conflicting advice may have been the result of a lack of understanding internally about the programme's requirements.

"It was not clear what was expected of us for progress review meetings and reports - it seemed to change from one conversation to the next".

Although the development phase was felt to be a formative period, it was at times very stressful or highly pressurised. This was linked to the complexity of a project's activity plan or the difficulty that came with getting long-term buy-in from young people.

"Planning and consultation with young people needed to be done before we could start the activity plan, but this was not possible within six months."

"The scale and intensity of the second stage development process was beyond our initial expectation, meaning that we were under-resourced to complete this. We ended up investing much of our own resource…this also impacted on partners, who again had to invest more of their own time in the development phase than envisaged."

5.2.2 Mentor support offered during development phase

Four projects had mentors during the development phase. Three respondents said the support they received from the mentor was excellent, while another rated it as good. Those that did not have a mentor were more likely to report feeling confused by the application process. One project that did not have a mentor reported that they would have preferred more proactive support from The Fund.

One project, which did not have a mentor, described the support they received directly from The Fund's staff as flexible and *"reasonable with deadlines"*, although they thought that progress review meetings felt *"rather like an interview panel at times".* Another project was disappointed not to have been assigned a mentor.

"We had many questions about the programme and application process, but [The Fund] didn't yet have the answers, as this is a new programme for them too".

5.2.3 Working as a consortium

Forming a partnership was an important, obligatory requirement of the programme to ensure that the heritage sector supports and learns from the youth sector (and vice versa), and to engage young people more meaningfully with heritage. Out of eight survey respondents, two of the consortia had pre-existing

partnerships with one another; one was made up of completely new partnerships; and the remaining four were a mix of old and new partners.

Overall, the experience of working as a consortium was positive, with all respondents "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" that good relationships were built between partners, that partners were "bought-into" processes and ways of working, that there was a shared agenda and vision among partners, and they were willing to learn from each other's expertise.

"When you are looking at a 5-year programme, starting with the right partners is really important - we needed to test this out and be sure. The development phase gave us permission to do this."

Other aspects of working as a consortium that contributed to strong partnerships included:

- the ability to test approaches with partners from project inception
- collective problem solving and working towards a common goal
- regular meetings ensured strong communication and working relationships
- diversity of opinion, experience, values and knowledge
- ability to delegate tasks and share activities across partners

"The intensity of the period made everyone really focus their energies and minds. It was collective problem solving from the outset."

"We managed to share some of the activities and tasks to make sure the best possible people delivered each section."

Nevertheless, these enabling factors were not experienced among all projects. For example, some projects struggled with delegation, and felt they needed more clarity around the partnership model, and another struggled with getting the partners to prioritise Kick the Dust among their existing workloads.

"It has taken the development process to be clear about what each consortium partner could bring to the project…[t]his is about getting the best use of our consortium partners' time and not overusing them or demanding more than is realistic."

Four respondents faced difficulties in their consortia, including challenging relationships, changes in senior leadership and conflicting priorities, which – for one respondent – resulted in "*uncertainty of organisational vision for [the project] moving forward.*" With one new partnership, there was a lack of familiarity with The Fund parameters and processes, and they struggled with budget-setting across the partners.

The consortium was considered by projects to be integral to the success of the project, and it is expected that partners will provide continual feedback, help with problem solving, and contribute valuable skills and experience, contributing to the overall sustainability of the sector.

5.2.4 Working in a cohort

All respondents found the first community practice event in December 2017 useful. Although only four respondents shared more detailed feedback, there was some overlap in the responses.

Respondents appreciated the opportunity to share ideas and approaches, as well as meeting other project managers. One project explained that they found it helpful to benchmark their approach with others, echoed by another saying it helped with development of their activity plan.

During the Community of Practice event, projects appreciated hearing about The Fund's overarching expectations and from a #DustKicker in person.

Two respondents reported that some of the evaluation focused sessions "*didn't seem to work*" or that these sessions felt a bit laboured. One respondent said that this was because they were still at very early stages in their consultation and therefore found the sessions confusing.

Three respondents reported that they had linked up with other projects during the development phase to share and explore ideas. What they found most useful about linking up with other projects was being able to problem solve on understanding the expectations for Activity plans, share approaches to ways of working, and explore how to make heritage relevant to young people. One respondent had discussed with another project things such as looking for additional funds, balancing risk-taking and innovation versus participation and targets, for example.

5.3 The value of the development phase

Key findings from the development phase survey suggest that it was an asset to projects, was well-funded and an overall positive experience.

"The development phase was an absolute gift…we genuinely were able to test out our ideas, confirm hunches or change the programme."

The strengths of having a development phase were that it gave young people a voice in project decision-making, and helped to create strong-cross sector partnerships that were underpinned by a shared vision. These partnerships will continue to provide crucial support for projects during the programme and will be essential to achieving sustainability in the long-term.

Although the development phase was an important and formative period for projects, delays could be avoided in the future by ensuring that communication from The Fund about timelines, requirements, and guidelines are clear and consistent, and offer more proactive support, especially for those new to The Fund or those who plan to develop their activity plans in-house.

The next section below provides a detailed summary of the findings from the survey, followed by feedback from projects on how they would like to link with #DustKickers in the future and how The Fund can continue to provide leadership on the theme of young people in heritage.

6. Lessons learned and recommendations

This report has provided an overview of activities from the first 18 months of the Kick the Dust programme. This has included an introduction to the programme evaluation's aims and objective, overarching methodology, and supporting frameworks. It has also included a review of the outputs from the programme six-month development and how they have contributed to programme outcomes.

This final section of the report provides a summary of the programme's strengths and challenges based on initial findings.

6.1 Strengths and challenges

6.1.1 Strengths

The programme so far has demonstrated many strengths in three areas: programme design, evaluation design, and legacy.

Programme design: The programme has been informed by a formative development phase. Projects were given the right amount of time and resource to test and develop their ideas, uncover and build on young people's needs and interests, and develop strong cross-sector partnerships with a shared vision. Furthermore, young people were given a voice in decision-making and design at both the level of The Fund and individual projects. This has enabled projects to be bold and ambitious in how they engage young people in heritage.

Programme evaluation: The programme evaluation methodology is guided by a clear framework and there is a shared approach that informs how projects will contribute to the programme's evidence base. Projects have demonstrated that they have taken steps to create a clearer framework for their evaluation by refining their outcomes and/or developing a logic model or Theory of Change. Projects are in the process of establishing their key targets and measures, and are using a range of creative and ambitious methods including participatory approaches, use of digital tools, or achieving a Level 3 standard of evidence.

Legacy: Uniquely for The Fund, the programme aspires to create long lasting and sector wide change so that it can continue to make heritage relevant to the lives of young people into the future. The programme challenges individual projects to transform their learning about what works into sustainable organisational change. At this early stage, some projects already demonstrate high level ambitions for change including creating a new youth led heritage organisation and a young person's cultural rights scheme for heritage.

6.1.2 Challenges

The activities and outputs of the past 18 months have identified the many strengths of the programme, but have also raised a few potential challenges that the programme will need to consider as it moves forward. These challenges are related to: tensions between flexibility and structure; support to define organisational change strategies, and accommodating failure in impact study design.

Tension between flexibility and structure: Projects are required to demonstrate the impact of their work against a pre-existing outcomes framework while at the same time operating in loose and flexible programme format. This means that the path to achieving outcomes is not fixed, nor is it always entirely clear. The development of the programme over the past 18 months shows that KtD is a diverse programme where each project is trying to achieve different things in different ways, which makes it difficult to fit all projects under one overarching structure. The programme evaluation has tried to accommodate this flexibility and diversity by keeping evaluation outcomes relatively broad. A structured impact evaluation works best when there are clear goals that are fixed with well-defined activities that are comparable. A

possible limitation of the programme evaluation therefore is that comparisons between projects will be difficult to do will not offer meaningful insight into what is most effective.

Organisational change: The longer-term impact on organisational sustainability and resilience has been less defined across the programme compared to the impacts for beneficiaries. Projects have struggled to clearly identify where change within heritage organisations will happen and how this can be evidenced. This lack of clarity might be because the programme is in an early stage of testing and exploring, and projects may still be in the process of building their understanding of what change needs to happen. Organisational change is a difficult process that requires a specific set of skills, tools, and techniques to deliver effective change. Going forward, it would be beneficial for the programme to think through organisational change and identify some broad themes that can be categorised (e.g. governance, strategy, learning culture, management, etc) so that projects have a basic framework from which they can articulate better where they expect to see change happen. It would be beneficial for The Fund to bring in additional expertise on the change management process, to build projects' capacity of how to take a structured and planned approach to change.

Accommodating failure: Sometimes innovation fails. One of the fundamental values of KtD is its openness to experimentation, adaptation, and learning; but it is possible that these experiments will fail or that evidence of what works will emerge too late in the programme for change to be embedded. The Fund will need to think about what the legacy of the programme looks like if it allows for failure.

6.2 Recommendations

Several recommendations have been generated based on main strengths and challenges to date.

6.2.1 Recommendations for grant-awarded projects:

- **Embed cross-sector partnerships into project governance and management.** Strong cross-sector partnerships can positively contribute to sustainability and resilience of organisations when there is a shared vision, agreed ways of working, and a willingness to learn from each other's expertise. Ways of working should be informed by examples of good practice and the effectiveness of the partnerships should be included in project evaluations as measures of success.
- **Be more bold and ambitious** by planning for a level of change that goes beyond beneficiaries, and includes organisational or sector-wide sustainability and resilience in the long-term. Sustainability does not have to be defined solely in relation to income, but can include improved quality, policy change, embedding beneficiary voice in governance and design, and influencing others.
- **Quality of engagement** is an important part of the narrative about "what works" and projects should consider investing time and resource to understanding and making explicit (as part of a theory of change or logic model) what high-quality engagement with young people looks like. In the KtD programme evaluation this has been articulated as "mechanisms of change" but quality essentially relates to the internal experiences and external conditions that are necessary for change to happen. Quality monitoring should form a key component of project evaluation and learning.

6.2.2 Recommendations for The Fund

- **Develop leadership:** The Fund has demonstrated a high level of ambition on the theme of young people in heritage, and they can develop their leadership in this area by continuing to involve young people in The Fund's decision-making, and committing to supporting the risk-taking and failure that comes with innovation.
- **Increased consistency in the development phase:** In the future, consider revisiting the balance between prescription and flexibility in relation to the content and structure of activity plans and local evaluation planning, or consider where aspects of planning can be made more consistent. This will

make it easier to draw out actionable learning and insights to inform evaluation and learning across programmes.

- **Different models for different levels of change**: Future programmes that aspire for change at different levels (organisational, community-level, beneficiary-level) could benefit from having multiple theories of change or models that cover the different areas of intended impact rather than creating one overarching shared model.
- **Alternatives to impact evaluation:** Future programmes with similar aims and structure to KtD may benefit more from a Learning Partner approach to evaluation rather than an impact evaluation. Learning partnership styles vary but often focus on using grassroots knowledge to generate "what works" learning. This type of approach offers more flexibility to capture the contextual factors that shape impact and the contribution that funding makes, without requiring a rigid impact evaluation.

6.2.3 Recommendations for other funders who support youth engagement

- **Allow time for organisations working with young people to test and strengthen ideas:** Funders should invest in longer periods of funding for programmes focused on youth engagement. Engaging with young people in a meaningful way can take a long time and may require upskilling of staff or building partnerships with organisations that can offer specialist expertise, which takes time to develop. Young people can be an invaluable part of activity planning and programme design. Factoring in development time so that young people can test ideas and give feedback can help to improve quality and ensure greater, long-lasting impact for beneficiaries.
- **Encourage youth and heritage sector partnerships:** Funders should encourage youth organisations to build more partnerships with heritage organisations and to consider ways that they can encourage youth organisations to use natural and cultural heritage as a resource for youth work.