Common Ground
Evaluation Report of the Development Phase Activity April 2018 to June 2019

Introduction:
The following report outlines the work undertaken during the Development Phase of Common Ground and highlights the key learning.

Work in this phase took place between April 2018 to June 2019, concluding with the submission of the second round application.

Executive Summary
The Common Ground development phase has been an extremely valuable process for all of those involved in the project. Through the work we have consulted, designed, tested and refined a youth engagement model so that more young people could have high quality heritage experiences on a sustainable basis.

Development Phase Approved Purposes:
- Appoint a Project Manager to assist in development work and preparation of second round submission documents.
- Appoint an evaluation consultant to establish monitoring and evaluation methodology.
- Survey heritage assets and themes in target locations for year one.
- Finalise Terms of reference for the consortium and delivery partners.
- Test Heritage Hack events at two key locations, with Waveney Youth Council and PHACE.
- Develop and test links with Teaching School Creative Arts Leaders in Schools and Academies.

Through the delivery of these approved purposes and building on previous research and development, from July 2018 to May 2019 we have:
- established the strategic partnership and brokered delivery partnerships,
- undertaken research including primary research where we listened to young people and acted on what we have learnt;
- tested participation and engagement activities and delivery frameworks.

Establishing strategic and delivery partnerships
Through the Development phase we have confirmed and developed the strategic partnership of national and regional organisations. Common Ground is driven by a cross-sector collective of youth, community, arts, natural and cultural heritage organisations. Based in the East of England with a national footprint, we have a variety of heritage and youth experience, a clear vision for impact and solutions oriented ambition for change at local, regional and national levels. Our Project Board members are now confirmed as:
- National Trust, Fiona Hall, Visitor Experience Consultant
- Norfolk and Norwich Festival Trust, Daniel Brine, Festival Director, Michael Corley, Head of Bridge
- Norfolk Wildlife Trust, David North, Head of People and Wildlife
- Prince's Trust, Graeme Tolley, Partnerships Manager New Anglia
- SHARE Museums East, Kathryn Moore, Museum Development Officer
- Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Katy Runacres, Wild Learning Officer
We have established partnerships with regional support partners, our main support partners are confirmed as:
- Norfolk Museums Service,
- Historic England and
- Local Cultural Education Partnerships:
  - Ipswich Local Cultural Education Partnership,
  - Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Cultural Education Partnership,
  - Lowestoft Rising,
  - PHACE, and
  - Young Fenland Cultural Consortium.

We are committed to resourcing, leading and promoting the benefits of heritage, focussing local delivery through delivery partners and Places Based Projects, with three partners on the Board also delivering. Our delivery partners are confirmed as:
- Ipswich Museum,
- National Trust’s Peckover House and Garden,
- Norfolk Wildlife Trust’s Gaywood Valley Living Landscape,
- Suffolk Wildlife Trust’s Carlton Marshes, and
- Vivacity’s Flag Fen Archaeology Park.

Our deliver partners will collaborate with a natural or cultural heritage partner within a 30 minute drive time. Our other confirmed partners are:
- Houghton Hall,
- Lowestoft Museum,
- Peterborough Museum,
- Wisbech and Fenland Museum.

We have explored the diversity and difference across the partnership, and understand its complexity. Respecting that each partner has different (in some cases multiple) sites, policies, strategies and operations, our plan will strengthen work, strategically and operationally, by building on what already exists, not duplicating effort, instead filling the gaps and improving practice. We have shared and learned about what’s different, for example approaches to monitoring and evaluation, volunteering and continuing professional development. We have reflected these differences in our project structures and systems and made decisions to ensure that every young person that takes part is valued, and their value for heritage is understood. For example, implementing a centralised recruitment, selection and contracting process for Traineeships and building induction, support and continuing professional development activities on individual organisational policy and practices. We will continue to review what works and what does not work, focussing on: the partnership (e.g. management structure), strategies (e.g. recruitment and progression), practice (e.g. working with young people), and process (e.g. delivery and resource alignment).

Research and pilots
Building on secondary research, we have consulted people, tested activities, developed frameworks, analysed data and refined our plans. The list below summarises research and development activity achieved during the development phase of Common Ground. We have:

- Undertaken secondary research, creating area profiles alongside a comprehensive heritage asset mapping exercise and customer engagement analysis and segmentation;
- Listened to more than 50 young people age 11-25 in consultations and focus groups, understanding young people’s needs, interests and ideas;
- Listened to more than 100 experts in heritage, culture, education, higher education, youth work, voluntary and community sector and skills, in structured discussions,
understanding priorities for business growth and sector skills and viable options for delivery;

- Commissioned an independent evaluator to facilitate discussions with the Project Board and young people about strategic evaluation, change and outcomes, directly shaping the evaluation framework, outcomes and tools. And to evaluate pilot activity;
- Commissioned artists to work with 36 children, young people, families and community members in Lowestoft, working in partnership with Suffolk Wildlife Trust to deliver a Pop Up Heritage Hack event in an empty shop unit in Lowestoft town centre in October 2018, producing and sharing a process and impact report and baseline data;
- Commissioned artists to work with 20 young people, facilitating an intensive Heritage Hack Lab event at Flag Fen near Peterborough in December 2018, working in partnership with Vivacity on a design brief to improve the young visitor experience. We published the fanzine co-created with young people presenting ideas and advice to improve access and interpretation now being used by staff to shape future plans. The independent evaluator created reports and baseline data, refining outcomes in consultation with young people (outputs and images from Flag Fen and Lowestoft can be viewed here: https://nnfestival.org.uk/festival-bridge/common-ground/);
- With additional investment from Historic England, commissioned film makers to facilitate a youth led film and heritage project with 20 young people in March, Fenland, skilling up young people in film making, film archive and heritage interpretation, showcasing their work to an audience of family, friends and stakeholders at Lux Cinema in Wisbech in April 2019. The film can be viewed here https://vimeo.com/337561848;
- Undertaken literature research of good practice in the field; conducted site visits to the Calke Abbey, Derbyshire, Carlton Marshes, Flag Fen, Houghton Hall and Gardens, Ipswich Museum, Lowestoft Museum, Peckover House and Garden, and Peterborough Museum; conducted telephone interviews with the National Lottery Heritage Fund and The London Wildlife Trust (Keeping it Wild), and hosted face to face meetings with Norfolk Museums (Norfolk Journeys);
- Researched case studies, presenting examples of youth leadership and cutting edge interpretation to provide examples of what we plan to achieve. Our case studies include examples from Feral State, London Wildlife Trust, Nerve Centre Belfast and Volunteer Makers;
- Worked in partnership with the Prince’s Trust to consult young people and staff on a new design for Get Started;
- Consulted with Local Cultural Education Partnerships Lowestoft Rising and Young Fenland Cultural Consortium and PHACE to co-plan pilot activities and shape the programme and partnership model;
- Worked with 40+ staff and company leaders to test frameworks, refine engagement models and scrutinise plans, ensuring activity is fit for purpose at national and regional programme and local project levels.

Listening to young people
We ran 3 focus groups between September and December 2018 in Lowestoft, Stowmarket and Norwich with 37 young people age 16-25 years old. The sessions, start to finish, took about 2 hours and included a heritage experience for reference: a guided tour of Lowestoft Museum, reflection on the Prince’s Trust Team Programme at the Museum of East Anglian Life, a newly created alternative tour, led by Norfolk and Norwich Festival's creative learning team, of Tombland, Norwich.

Young people who took part included: young people aged 18-24 from Ipswich, Norwich, King’s Lynn and Lowestoft from the Prince’s Trust Talent Match programme supporting long-term unemployed people into work, education or training; 16-25-year-olds from Stowmarket
and Ipswich, from the Prince’s Trust Team programme, a 12-week personal development programme including a community project which took place at the Museum of East Anglian Life; 16-25 year-olds from Norwich, connected to Norfolk and Norwich Festival Trust as volunteers, participants or specific interest (e.g. working in museums). Participants included a mix of heritage and non-heritage engagers, with a small number of heritage volunteers or those interested in visiting art galleries. The majority of participants at the Norwich focus group were regular attenders and/or participants at museums and heritage sites.

As a warm up to focus groups, we asked young people the question: What is heritage to you? We gave one or two prompts, asked participants to map key and associated words. The activity stimulated deep discussion with all groups about heritage, place, society and history – one participant said: “We don’t want a sugar-coated history”. The word cloud provides a summary of responses with the importance of each word shown with font size. This ‘quick look’ exercise provides a fairly instant visual representation of young people’s thoughts about heritage – the exercise will be used at the beginning and end of Place Based Projects to monitor and share any changes in feelings.

Word cloud: What is heritage to you? (n=29)

![Word Cloud Image]

When asked about the value of heritage, young people told us about:

- Local heritage not always being relevant to their lives, interest or needs
- A sense of personal identity and belonging being important, and exploring heritage in your own time
- Experiences being worthwhile when they enable active involvement, self-expression, immersion, independence and feeling a “sense of satisfaction and achievement”
- Experiences that are “quirky, creative and multi-sensory” are attractive
- The importance of hands-on learning, accessing information through storytelling and technology: “Technology is everything these days. We’ve not known anything other than technology, and it would make it relate to us”
- Being outdoors, in nature, experiencing the benefits of natural heritage and feeling positive health and wellbeing benefits: “It’s important now to have somewhere to disconnect”
• Taking part in events, unusual tours, activities designed for teenagers and young adults
• Viewing temporary exhibitions, watching live demonstrations, exploring familiar and unusual material culture
• Feeling excitement, being playful, interacting, playing games, being social.

The main barriers to participation are relevance, time and money, followed by poor targeted marketing and communications, opening times and transport (availability, costs). Generally, attitudinal barriers related to perceptions of heritage as dull, traditional (“felt old fashioned”), unconnected. When considering work experience, one participant spoke about the difficulty of turning volunteering into a career. When asked about what stops young people visiting or getting more involved in heritage, young people specifically spoke about:
• Poor marketing, e.g. flyers dropped in venues not used by young people
• Seasonal or inconvenient opening times
• Ineffective use of language and interpretation
• Lack of funding to develop youth engagement
• Limited or no access using public transport
• Competing priorities, e.g. studies, exams
• Lack of family engagement with heritage
• Lack of accessible volunteering or work opportunities

When asked about the possible solutions, young people spoke about:
• Young people having an input, e.g. marketing, programming, curating
• Youth-oriented marketing and communications including digital marketing, e.g. Instagram, Twitter
• Accessible visitor information online, onsite, and branding and signage in the locality
• Converting people who attend events to regular visitors
• Funding
• Transportation
• Outreach, events and activities
• Meeting other young people online before getting involved
• Skills programmes
• Ambassador programmes
• Cross-sector working, e.g. with education

Speaking generally about engaging in heritage, one young focus group participant said: "Technology is everything these days. We’ve not known anything other than technology, and it would make it relate to us." These words are inspirational (although the future planning should be aware of balancing the benefits of digital and social media), setting the Project Board a clear challenge and opportunity.

A final task at the end of each focus group was to complete a speech bubble, noting the most salient points from the session. Key themes emerged from this quick fire exercise and subsequent discussions, notably in the thematic areas: multi-sensory, relevance, immersive, temporary, experiential, inclusive, researched, colourful, youthful (see quotes below).
• Young people led - all levels!
• Personalisation! Making it tailored to the individual
• Make ‘heritage’ seem exciting and relevant as opposed to dull and irrelevant?
• How might we … make nature appealing to those who are otherwise uninterested?
  A. Use the cute and cuddly animals to encourage people in and to understand the ecosystem needed to support these animals

1 Focus Group, Lowestoft Museum, Lowestoft, 26 September 2018.
How might we tell stories about the past in ways that are sensual, requiring participation and incorporate technology?
What if we input virtual reality into exhibitions?
What if we got visitors to re-enact?
Idea: Create an online forum where you can ask young people questions and they can answer and reply and have a conversation about it.

Summary of Learning:
- Make work relevant by involving young people in the design and delivery of programme elements.
- Make engagement active by delivering activities that are creative, playful and participatory.
- Make activities social, offline and online, like supporting social media platforms so that young people can meet before taking part, or network whilst taking part.
- Make opportunities accessible from travel to opening times.
- Make offers attractive through youth-oriented marketing and programming.
- Ensure volunteering opportunities are flexible (and social).
- Support families to engage.
- Embed digital into marketing, programming and evaluation.
- Make funding available for youth engagement.
- Involve young people in decision making, embedding youth voice and opportunities to lead.

Heritage Hack Pop Ups and Heritage Hack Labs
Heritage Hack events are inspired by design thinking and the ambition to engage young people in product and service development, taking a youth-based approach. The idea is that teams of young and creative people work together on a live brief, generating ideas and solving problems to come up with new heritage interpretations and customer experiences for young people. Activities should be designer/artist-facilitated, offer an interactive space designed to give young people and local communities a voice and influence, and to see how their contributions make a difference. A workshop format, the conditions should support information exchange, active engagement, independent learning and self-direction, creativity and experimentation. The main objectives for are to:
- Increase young people’s engagement in heritage at the ideas stage through collaboration and problem solving
- Give young people and local communities a voice in creating new heritage experiences and interpretation
- Help young people define natural and cultural heritage for themselves
- Do so through activities that are informative, active, creative, experiential and immersive.

Artist collective Juneau Projects were commissioned to deliver two pilot events, one in an empty shop unit in Lowestoft town centre on 23 October 2018 during NessFest, an annual youth arts festival, the second on site at Flag Fen Archaeology Park near Peterborough. Juneau Projects worked initially in partnership with Norfolk and Norwich Festival Trust and Suffolk Wildlife Trust, and following visits from Vivacity Ltd to the Lowestoft event, evaluation and site visits, with staff from Vivacity Ltd. The objectives for Suffolk Wildlife Trust were to raise awareness of Carlton Marshes and to test a different way of reaching young people that was not on site or targeting a specific pre-existing group. The objectives for Vivacity were to consult with non-users (young people aged 16-25) in order to inform interpretation plans. The pilots were evaluated by an independent evaluator, with monitoring and evaluation embedded into each event: registration data, feedback, observations, follow-up surveys, and at Flag Fen, a focus group on project experience and programme outcomes.
Each event was designed so that participants responded to a live (and for the purpose of the pilot, broad) brief: *How might we tell the stories of Carlton Marshes/Flag Fen?*. For Carlton Marshes, Suffolk Wildlife Trust set up touring activity boxes with information, specimens and dressing up and Juneau Projects set up a series of activities: laser cut model making, photography, augmented reality, 3D printing, ideas walls. For Flag Fen, the Education Officer gave a tour of the site and Juneau Projects set up a series of activities for teams of young people to research, develop and present their ideas using mind mapping, mood boards, laser wood-cut model making, photography and label printing, to produce a fanzine of site orientation and interpretation ideas for staff at Flag Fen.

Heritage Hack pilot overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Hack Pop Up</th>
<th>Heritage Hack Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ness Fest, Lowestoft</td>
<td>Flag Fen, Peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site drop in design lab on Lowestoft High Street at 1-day festival for 11-19 year olds</td>
<td>1 day on-site visit and design workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief: “How might we tell the stories of Carlton Marshes?”</td>
<td>Brief: “How might we tell the stories of Flag Fen?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Activity - Model making, photography, animation, 3D printing</td>
<td>Design Activity – Pages for a Fanzine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Partner – Juneau Projects</td>
<td>Design Partner – Juneau Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Partner – Suffolk Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Heritage Partner - Vivacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 35 young people participated in both pilots, mainly male (n=23), with the predominant age groups age 16-18, age 13-15 and age 22-25 (n=21) (Figure 3.4). 16 per cent identified as having a special educational need or disability (10 per cent Lowestoft, 20 per cent Peterborough). 70 per cent of participants were referred by agencies.

Heritage Hack pilot participant profile (Lowestoft n=16, Peterborough n=19, TOTAL = 35)
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Index of multiple deprivation decile 1-3 wards are amongst the 30 per cent most deprived in England. Evaluation of pilot projects identified that more participating young people were from neighbourhoods amongst the 30 per cent most deprived for education and skills than for Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) overall.

---

Participants from wards in IMD Decile 1-3

Through observation and feedback, and structured consultation in Peterborough on why young people took part, we have learnt that there are three audience segments for Common Ground: Heritage Advocates; Creative Talent; Filling the Gap.

In Peterborough young people spoke about: learning about Flag Fen/the site (45%); having a good time (30%); contribute ideas about better engaging younger audiences (20%); learning something new (15%), learn about Peterborough, history, the environment; pursuing a specific interest e.g. weaponry, Roman herb garden (10%); and making a positive contribution to the local community, know more about plans for the site/local area, meet new people. Furthermore, in survey responses, 3 out 5 respondents cite an interest in art and design. The following case studies provide an insight into who took part and why, summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowestoft Case Study A</th>
<th>Girl of 15. Loves art (she says so, so do all her family) Is doing Art GCSE, creating her portfolio at home. Wants to do more with her art in future Has been to Carlton Marshes a few times. Went with school, she thinks, then had returned to see wildlife &amp; for art/photography projects Attended Hack Lab with sister and a friend’s family. Appears to be young carer Stayed for estimated 2 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft Case Study B</td>
<td>2 girls (age unknown, estimated 11-13). One is into sport, the other into art Came to Hack Lab between activities at library (face painting) May have been to Marshes with school (not sure) The Marshes are not interesting for them but the sporty girl would go there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
again if there were a sports event there  
Focused on model making, stayed c. 45 mins  
Feels there is nothing much to do locally for their age group in the holidays.  
The High Street is boring. There should be more things like the Hack Lab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowestoft Case Study C</th>
<th>2 boys (age unknown, estimated 14-15). One likes to do art but is bad at it, the other does not enjoy so much but is better. They worked as a team. Stayed all afternoon. Focus was on animation when I met them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peterborough Case Study D | 3 young women with high level of prior interest (currently volunteer or regularly visit heritage sites). One is studying or working towards a career in heritage sector.  
Lots of ideas for the site – better signage, workspace within café for more casual regular visits, season tickets or membership for affordability, arts and craft activities.  
The day appears to be working well for this group. They have made new friends and are bouncing ideas off each other. They have good social skills and are clear and confident in their ideas. They really want to be heard and influence change. |
| Peterborough Case Study E | Group of three young women attending with adult learning service. One is a young parent. She sometimes goes to the zoo with her pre-school age child. She would not bring her child here as there is nothing for them to do.  
One lives in Bourne where they feel there is not much to do. They want to move away rather than influence local change.  
Individuals did not choose to attend this event, they were ‘told they had to’. The group recently went to Peterborough Museum and found it interesting. Flag Fen is not as interesting as there is much less to see and do and it is too cold. This group finished the fanzine activity very quickly, then waited to go home. |
| Peterborough Case Study F | Group of 3 young men attending with adult learning service. Limited verbal communication skills, possibly due to lack of confidence or SEN/D  
One draws beautifully. Others are finding it difficult to contribute as they do not consider themselves to be creative. Being creative on demand is difficult. They are here with YPLP and want to develop literacy skills so will work on wording to go with drawings.  
They have an idea based around Bronze Age cookery which is their own idea but they are not committed to it (lack of confidence?). When asked if they would be interested in being involved with Flag Fen, one says it is not a place they could work or volunteer because he is so clumsy and would break things (perception of heritage). |

Worth noting, this experience may have confirmed negative pre-conceptions about Flag Fen for some participants, which should be a consideration in future planning and targeting. For both Lowestoft and Peterborough, amongst participants there were very different levels of interest, prior knowledge and aspiration – it is good to create this meeting point. However, it should be considered in future planning whether needs would be better met by different opportunities. Finally, authenticity of the creative experience is compromised where participants do not know whether and how their ideas will be listened to – heritage staff and designers/artists should share and manage the risk in creating high quality outcomes that should be directly and immediately made public e.g. a visitor map of ideas for the site, display wall of young people’s ideas? This would be an important step towards the more ambitious projects that will follow like co-creating events and permanent interpretation.
Why young people took part (Peterborough)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About specific site</td>
<td>Having a good time</td>
<td>Making heritage sites more interesting for younger audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About history and the environment</td>
<td>Meeting people</td>
<td>Creating local opportunity for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the local area and plans for the future</td>
<td>Making a positive local contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing delivery models we learnt about the benefits of working in the community compared to onsite at the heritage setting, most notably in Lowestoft the high quality of materials and activities (noted by young people) including new and unusual technology and the relaxed drop in environment positioned in the heart of the community. And in Peterborough the successful recruitment of a diverse group in terms of prior engagement with heritage and the low-tech, accessible creative environment which allowed participants to express their ideas freely.

**Delivery model comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Hack Pop Up (Lowestoft)</th>
<th>Heritage Hack Lab (Peterborough)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offsite, part of wider festival</td>
<td>Onsite, full day, allowed for immersive experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible, flexible drop in format</td>
<td>Attracted referral partners and groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracted school age ‘creative talent’ and ‘filling a gap’ participants in pairs and/or with siblings/families</td>
<td>Site tour and ‘camp fire’ interpretation led by heritage staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupervised model making table drew people in. Progress to photography, animation, 3D printing</td>
<td>Accessible ‘low tech’ graphic design activity to capture responses to and ideas for site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefact Quiz &amp; info table from Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Highly varied needs, expectations and levels of confidence amongst participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes: creative responses to artefacts and the marsh as an environment for young people</td>
<td>Produced helpful booklet of young people’s ideas for interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peterborough participants liked: being asked for their ideas and opinions; a structured day of activity; getting to know heritage staff; and the combination of learning and contributing. In terms of what could be improved, participants spoke about: more immersive and hands on interpretation activity; a different order for the days and more interactive start; a site tour adapted for young people (less jargon, more historical context); and more clarity on how the fanzine ideas will be used. Overall, participants felt that they had an increased knowledge and interest in Bronze Age/ Flag Fen. Some, but not all, felt they made a contribution to future plans, and for Vivacity, the fanzine is stimulating debate and new thinking.

For Suffolk Wildlife Trust, the workshop was a successful ‘first contact’ with the local the target group experiencing high levels of deprivation and the use of high quality materials and activities (noted by young people) including new and unusual technology, has helped the trust to think differently about programming with, by and for young people.

For Vivacity, the fanzine document is a helpful resource to argue to funders and understand what the site means to others; it includes ‘surprising ideas and feedback’. One month following the workshop, the fanzine has been given out to senior management team at Vivacity. The document is friendly and accessible and makes the point ‘how do we step back and listen to this group?’ and will circulate the fanzine to the Flag Fen advisory group.
Ideas generated in Heritage Hack pilot workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlton Marshes, Lowestoft</th>
<th>Flag Fen, Peterborough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In response to the live brief, workshop participants presented youth engagement ideas that were: artistic (pike and bird sculptures); functional (viewing and information structures, bird feeding structures); playful (games and gaming); cultural (recreations of historical equipment); re-enactments (traditional crafts, acting out past events); social (spaces to hang out and relax); sports (activity equipment). Participants also shared interests in photography, animation caring for wildlife.</td>
<td>In response to the live brief, workshop participants presented designs that covered: site introduction, orientation, re-interpretation and transportation connecting the site to Peterborough; interactive soundscapes and projections to bring history to life; chill out space incorporated into the site with WiFi, charging points, comfortable seating, mood lighting and refreshments; site-specific theatre and performance; workshops from making clothes to horticulture and husbandry. See fanzine is available online³.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Findings:

- Heritage Hack Pop Ups provide an effective ‘first contact’ with young people, reach under represented young people and facilitate signposting to next steps.
- Heritage Hack Labs are an effective way to engage existing and new visitors, allow meaningful consultation on existing interpretation and increase interest in heritage and a sense of being respected.
- The Project Board should plan for groups that are readily able to engage with activities, and recognise that some participants may require more interpretative context and support.
- The Project Board should continue to monitor levels of education and skills deprivation amongst participants to assess whether this is a particular issue in targeted geographic communities.
- The Project Board should now work towards a greater integration of heritage and creative activities, make the brief more real life and specific, and ensure participants understand what will be done with their ideas.
- For the medium term, the Project Board should plan to allow young people to construct knowledge and inform experiences throughout activities, and youth voices (plural) should be embedded in all decision making.
- For the longer term, young people should be involved in making decisions about what happens to participants’ ideas and which ideas are selected to be delivered as Place Based Projects. Young people should be actively involved in how ideas are developed and produced.

Fenland Film Project
We commissioned film makers to produce a film, led and made by young people in Fenland, that shows what young people think about heritage, their experiences of heritage now and what would make heritage relevant to their lives in the future. The film was supported with additional funding from English Heritage. Our Fenland is included in our second stage application submission.

Fourteen young people were recruited from an existing network of young people engaged to local arts company 20Twenty Productions. Project film makers and facilitators reported that participants arrived at the sessions eager to take part and learn, and there was a real sense of commitment towards achieving the final film. All sessions were well attended.

The group were offered a range of video making techniques to implement to help produce their film including stop-frame animation, VJing, formal video, and a range of phone-based video apps. Facilitators reported that: “the process of preparing animations for filming, using simple collage approach, was also instrumental in allowing the group space, time and freedom to develop ideas, and the results had the effect of bringing the young people’s drawings to life, which strengthened the youth-led aesthetic of the final film.” Facilitators also reported that the approach enabled significant technical film skills development alongside developing knowledge of local heritage, stating: “this was done on the participants’ terms with the freedom to explore and make mistakes if necessary”. Seven young people are being submitted for Bronze Arts Award moderation, with one participant having started work towards a Silver award.

In response to questions about what the young people were aiming to achieve during the project, one young person said: “Heritage is a commonly misunderstood word that’s places with ‘boring’ when the project outcome will hopefully be to show people that the subject can be much more”. When asked about what they had gained, one young person stated: “I’ve developed my animation and stop-motion skills. I’d done some before but not much, but this
is the first time I’ve produced a proper animation which is cool”. And when asked what was most enjoyable, one young person said: “Filming things around March – because I’ve never really walked around and noticed things before”.

Young people celebrated their work at a film screening in Wisbech, which will be screened again in March for the wider community, and in Norwich for project stakeholders. The film can be viewed here: https://vimeo.com/337561848

Summary Findings:
- Activities should be structured with a brief, encourage leadership and independent learning and support young people to take creative control of each process element within the constraints of the resources available.
- Activities should offer young people creative freedom and allow for a more experimental approach to explore heritage and related themes.
- New offers should be needs-based, peer-led and co-created. To ensure our capacity matches our ambition, training and development for staff and volunteers should be available.

How the development phase has informed the planning for the delivery phase:
Based on the learning from the development phase we will now:
- Target resources for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds facing educational, social or personal barriers such as low income family, not in education, employment or training, disability, looked after young people and care leavers, mental health challenges;
- Improve partnership working and increase collaborative planning, delivery and evaluation across culture, heritage, youth and education sectors;
- Increase community referrals and community-based outreach activity with community, youth, adult learning and voluntary organisations;
- Build relationship-based models to develop understanding and value over time across a regional network of delivery partners, supported by aligned resources, robust programme evaluation and knowledge and practice exchange;
- Listen to young people and take action, and support young people’s agency, embedding voices into decision making and co-creation into activities;
- Think long term, taking a strategic approach to audience planning and enterprising approach to investment and sustainability – we will build the capacity of staff and volunteers through professional development and training and increase investment for place-based projects during programme delivery to a minimum of £25k new investment.

We have made important decisions during the development process and the delivery of pilot projects. We have:
- Identified local areas and assessed their readiness to take part in relation to capacity, workforce development needs, youth engagement priorities, new programming capability and partnership working. Place-based project investment will catalyse youth and creativity-led programming and interpretation. An action research approach and professional development will consolidate and embed learning. Advocacy will strengthen support locally and attract new investment;
- Added a Youth Advisory Board for advice and advocacy purposes, embedding voices into decision making and co-creation into activities;
- Added a Partnerships Consultant to respond to the need for senior level partnership support and complimenting independent evaluation activity. Responsibilities include
partnership development, expert guidance on youth engagement direction of the programme, advocacy and legacy planning;

- Added an Artist/Designer to provide expert guidance on the creative direction of the programme, co-creation and human-centred design. Main responsibility is to design, deliver and review Heritage Hack events;
- Refined core team roles: Added new responsibilities for the Project Manager, including facilitating the Youth Advisory Board and line managing Trainees; Consolidated Project Coordinator main responsibilities, coordinating Arts Award, events and meetings. Added a new role, Communications Assistant (0.2 FTE), extending the hours of an existing member of staff to coordinate marketing and communications activity including targeted recruitment and opportunity campaigns, social media and online marketing, assisting the Youth Advisory Board on marketing related activity and coordinating the regional Heritage marketing network to distribute marketing and promotional activity and strengthen coordination across the partnership.
- Increased outreach activities, responding to identified need to work in the community early in each location, building relationships with referral agencies, building trust with potential audiences and undertaking consultation, relationship building and knowledge development. Part of this response has been based on the understanding that that our CALSA network of teachers will assist in this engagement but is not rooted in a wide enough nor consistent set of community contacts to deliver this function reliably;
- Created two events-based opportunities for consultation and co-creation, delivering artist-led youth engagement consultation in the community before place-based projects start (Heritage Hack Pop Ups) and immersive onsite ideas generation and design events after place-based project teams are in place (Heritage Hack Labs);
- Embedded Traineeships in heritage organisations, with centralised contract management and support provided by the Project Manager and developed digital and micro-volunteering opportunities, with more young people giving time for short periods and building up youth-led digital marketing activity through on and off-site volunteering;
- Designed Arts Award offers for open, targeted and digital offers. Offering 3 levels of Arts Award, all viable options for young people taking part (Discover, Explore, Bronze) with the Gold award remaining an option for participants who have the time (minimum 12 months) and support, e.g. Youth Advisory Board.
- Added a major national digital heritage campaign, #30DaysWild, to support user-generated content, develop digital audiences and engage more young people with heritage wherever they are.
- Positioning of wellbeing outcomes within planning. Through our first application we discussed wellbeing as a secondary outcome of the project. Yet, in creating a detailed Theory of Change and Evaluation Framework we have seen that wellbeing does not fit cleanly and for reasons of validity and capacity, it is not appropriate to incorporate wellbeing as a measured output for the project. The positive impacts of heritage on the wellbeing young people remain an interest of all partners and a wider impact that we believe will be realised in the delivery phase of Common Ground. As such, throughout delivery we will:
  - design engagements for young people with positive wellbeing in mind using the 5 Ways to Wellbeing methodology of “connect, be active, take notice, keep learning, and give” as a guide.
  - due to our concerns regarding the validity of implementing this we will not use a specific wellbeing measure such as Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale.

---

4 https://volunteermakers.org/, accessed 20 February 2019
• through our evaluation processes the delivery team will capture and highlight anecdotal evidence of wellbeing

The development phase has thus been essential to the development of the activity and positions the project for a successful delivery phase.

Ends
Michael Corley
October 2019