

Q&A Doc – Evaluation of the ‘Spaces, Places and Belonging’ Community Hub  
2025 – 2027

**Q:** We have spotted that the maximum available weighted score adds up to 110 – usually this would be 100. Can I please check if this is a mistake, and if so, could you please share the correct scoring criteria?

**A:** The maximum available weighted score is correct, and the total of 110 is not a mistake.

**Q:** We note the importance of engagement/co-production of evaluation measures/framework with grantees and other stakeholders. We also note that the evaluation framework and baseline report should be delivered by March 2026. However, your website indicates that only a few grantees will have been notified by this date (the first round of the Seed Corn grants and some recipients of Skills Bursaries). The first round of Project Grants will not be made until August 2026. Is there an expectation, therefore, to engage with just the early grantees? Will the Hub team help to facilitate contact with grantees?

**A:** Yes - the baseline report and evaluation framework will largely be based on engagement with only the first awardees from Round 1 of Seed Corn and Round 1 of Bursaries – around 11-12 grantees – as well as any background work or desk review, including of the application, previous (pilot) projects and their evaluations, and other existing datasets.

Further work, including the mid-term report and final report, should be based on engagement with both this original sample as well as any other grantees which have subsequently been funded in that time. The Hub team will be able to facilitate reaching out to grantees throughout the lifetime of the programme.

**Q:** Is there an expectation that evaluation formative findings will help to share the development and delivery of the Skills Development and Training programme? What is the timescale and likely delivery plan for this programme?

**A:** We plan to run a Skills Development and Training Programme that will be formed of two rounds – one in Summer 2026, and one in Summer 2027. The content of these programmes will largely be informed by feedback from application forms and a survey being distributed by CAHG, one of our project partners, in Autumn 2025. However, formative findings from evaluation will

likely also be drawn upon, especially when reviewing Round 1 of the programme and designing/publishing Round 2.

**Q:** The ITT mentions the potential role of evaluators in capacity building - what do you anticipate this role might include? Would it include, for instance, involvement in the Skills Development and Training programme? If so, is there a timescale for this programme, and if so, what are the tentative dates?

**A:** We would welcome tenders which propose capacity building activity as part of the evaluative approach. There is no expectation that the evaluators would deliver the whole or even a significant part of the development and training programme, however if evaluators were to propose (e.g.) training or workshops on evaluative methods or data collection, which could be integrated into the wider training programme, this would likely strengthen any bid.

**Q:** I am writing to ask a few questions to help with the evaluation design.

(1) The first set of questions is around the different samples of population:

a) How many programme staff and partners are there?

**A:** Four members of staff at TNA (x1 full time, x1 0.2FTE, x2 0.05FTE)

3 partners/Co-Is (x1 at CAHG 0.05FTE, x1 at Leeds Museums and Galleries 0.05FTE, National Library of Wales, 0.05FTE)

A Digital Fellow will also be recruited by CAHG – this may be a contractor, so the exact FTE is tbd.

b) How many staff and / or volunteers are involved in the delivery of training?

**A:** x3 members of staff at TNA and x1 Digital Fellow (hired by CAHG)

c) Roughly how many applications are expected for the 55 grants available?

**A:** These are hard to predict at this stage, but we are expecting it to be very oversubscribed. A rough prediction would be:

- Seed Corn Grants: 100-250

- Project Grants: 100-200

- Bursaries: 20-60 per round (8 rounds)

d) Roughly what scale of beneficiaries do you anticipate from the grants allocated?

**A:** Minimum of 55 recipients across the programme, but if applicants bid for smaller pots within the scale of funding, there could be up to 80 recipients over the course of the programme. Naturally, wider beneficiaries include community groups and public users of heritage, who could run into the hundreds or thousands.

**Q: (2)** Second is a question around the logistics of the evaluation. Is the evaluator to encompass the administration of all the evaluation tasks within the budget, or will the programme team have capacity to assist with, for example, distributing surveys?

**A:** The programme manager (1FTE, at TNA), and Project Lead (0.2FTE, at TNA) will be able to facilitate with administration tasks related to the evaluation. This will include activities such as distributing surveys and facilitating engagement with grantees.

**Q:** Are you able to provide any further details on the expected content, format and timeframe of the skills-building and training programme?

**A:** It will be delivered in two rounds (Summer 2026, Summer 2027). It will take the form of 6-9 individual sessions and will be delivered through various media, including in-person workshops, online webinars, hybrid Zoom sessions etc. The exact content of the training programme is yet to be determined, and will be informed by feedback from application forms, and a survey being distributed by CAHG (project partner).

**Q:** When do you expect the digital platform to go live? Are you planning to collect any analytical data on this (e.g. page views, content downloads etc)?

**A:** The digital platform will be in development for a large part of this programme. No decisions have been made at this stage as to when we want the platform to go live, but we would imagine towards the start/middle of 2027. The aim will be to collect basic levels of interactive data – page views, content downloads etc.

**Q:** The ITT mentions that the provider may want to use monitoring data as part of the evaluation. What monitoring data are you intending to collect and will the evaluator be able to inform the design of this?

**A:** We would expect the evaluators to work with the programme team to design the monitoring and evaluation process for our grantees.

**Q:** Will grantees/other beneficiaries be aware of the evaluation and will they provide consent to take part/share contact details with the evaluator?

**A:** The programme team will facilitate contact/engagement with grantees, and involvement with such activities will be part of the grant agreement signed by awardees. We have already informed applicants that an external evaluation will take place as part of our launch webinar, and will reemphasise this messaging throughout the Hub's lifetime.

**Q:** We note, "Grantees should be prepared to engage regularly with and provide information to the evaluation team. While reporting is compulsory for all applicants, it is for the purpose of measuring the impact of the funding programme only and does not affect eligibility for the grant." Do you have an estimate of the amount of time you expect grantees to engage with the evaluation each year?

**A:** Reporting is likely to be light touch, especially for the Seed Corn Grants and Bursaries, documenting progress and achievement across the course of each funded activity. Evaluators should expect grantees to be able to complete monitoring forms and (e.g.) be sampled for interview, however should also be mindful of the skills and capacity of smaller cultural institutions and community heritage groups in particular, when designing their evaluative methods.

**Q:** Are there any page limits or requirements regarding the length of responses you are expecting for each section?

**A:** No.